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1. This document contains the summary records of the eleventh session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia from 28 November to 2 December 2016.
2. Some 700 participants attended the session among which delegations from twenty-four States Members of the Committee, ninety-three States Parties not Members of the Committee, four States non party to the Convention, two intergovernmental organizations, four category 2 centres under the auspices of UNESCO, fifty-five accredited non-governmental organizations to the Committee and twenty press/media entities.
3. The full list of participants is available [online](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/preliminary-list-of-participants-00885).
4. The session was conducted in four languages: English and French (the two working languages of the Committee), Arabic and Spanish.
5. The Intangible Cultural Heritage Section of UNESCO provided the Secretariat for the meeting.
6. The elected Members of the Bureau of the eleventh session of the Committee were:

Chairperson: Mr Yonas Desta Tsegaye (Ethiopia)

Vice-Chairpersons: Algeria, Bulgaria, Republic of Korea, Saint Lucia and Turkey

Rapporteur: Mr Murat Soğangöz (Turkey)

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

**DRAFT DECISION 12.COM 4**

The Committee,

1. Having examined document ITH/17/12.COM/4,

2. Adopts the summary records of the Committee’s eleventh session contained in this document.

**SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE ELEVENTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE**

*[Monday, 28 November 2016, morning session]*

**ITEM 1 OF THE AGENDA:**

**OPENING OF THE SESSION**

**Document:** [*ITH/16/11.COM/INF.1 Rev*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-INF.1_Rev._EN.docx)*.*

1. The **Chairperson** of the eleventh session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, **Mr Yonas Desta Tsegaye**, officially opened the meeting, noting that there were 650 registered participants. He began by announcing that the debates would be interpreted in four languages: English; French; Arabic, thanks to the generous support of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; and Spanish, thanks to the generous support of the Government of Spain. He spoke of his honour in welcoming participants to the eleventh session of the Intergovernmental Committee, recognizing the presence of all the Ministers and dignitaries of the States Parties, as well as States non party to the Convention, experts and representatives of NGOs and civil society. They included Her Excellency (H.E.) Ms Meaza Gebremedhin, State Minister of Culture of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Mr Michael Worbs, Chairperson of the UNESCO Executive Board, Mr Getachew Engida, Deputy Director-General of UNESCO, Mr Francesco Bandarin, Assistant Director-General for Culture of UNESCO, and Ms Jyothi Hosagrahar, Director of the Division for Creativity of the Culture Sector of UNESCO. He also welcomed Mr Tim Curtis for his first Committee meeting as the new Secretary of the Convention. The Chairperson looked forward to the deliberations and decision-making on the many important issues over the coming week for the effective safeguarding of living heritage. Noting the heavy agenda, the Chairperson asked for cooperation in keeping the interventions concise, and would count on the Vice-Chairpersons (from Algeria, Bulgaria, Republic of Korea, Saint Lucia and Turkey) from time to time to ensure the smooth progress of the session. The Rapporteur was Mr Murat Soğangöz (from Turkey). He invited H.E. Ms Meaza Gebremedhin to say a few words of welcome.
2. **H.E. Ms Meaza Gebremedhin** recalled her invitation to host this session during the tenth session of the Committee in Windhoek, and spoke of the honour that the Ministry and its staff felt in now receiving the delegates in the beautiful city of Addis Ababa. Ms Gebremedhin took the opportunity to extend her gratitude to the Committee for accepting its proposal to host the meeting, and thanked all those who had attended the opening ceremony the previous night that provided a glimpse of Ethiopia’s culture, richness and originality. In addition to the performance by the artists and indigenous people, Ms Gebremedhin spoke of the numerous cultural practices and representations, oral traditions and expressions, performing arts, ritual and festive events, indigenous knowledge and skills and traditional craftsmanship yet to explore, adding that the majority of the performers during the previous night’s event had travelled hundreds of kilometres from all corners of the country to demonstrate the diversity and vivid originality of Ethiopia. She hoped the delegates would agree that the decision to host this event was the right one. Moreover, the Ministry had been excited about the meeting throughout the year during its meticulous preparation, whose strategic focus, goals and institutional values regarding the exploration, development, preservation and protection of this nation’s cultural heritage was in conformity with those of UNESCO. Hence, the meeting held great meaning and value in promoting respect for the immense cultural diversity and creativity of the people of Ethiopia. On behalf of the Ministry, Ms Gebremedhin expressed her heartfelt appreciation to all the delegates who had stayed for the opening ceremony despite their long journeys, adding that she was sure they would further explore the originality and diversity of Ethiopia’s cultural heritage, and enjoy the hospitality of the Ethiopian people. She also believed that the meeting would pass important decisions to promote the world’s intangible cultural heritage and address the issues of vulnerability so as to pass on a well-developed and preserved cultural heritage to the next generation. She concluded by wishing everyone fruitful deliberations and an enjoyable stay in Addis Ababa.
3. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture of UNESCO**, Mr Francesco Bandarin, thanked Ms Meaza Gebremedhin and the Chairperson, Mr Yonas Tsegaye, and spoke of the pleasure and honour of opening the eleventh session of the Committee. He began by extending greetings to the delegates on behalf of the Director-General, Ms Irina Bokova, and welcomed all the participants who had have travelled long distances to the beautiful country of Ethiopia. Mr Bandarin spoke of his particular pleasure in returning to Ethiopia where he had worked for many years on the reinstallation of the Akxum Obelisk; a cooperation programme of UNESCO that was successfully implemented a few years ago. He was touched by the hospitality of the Ethiopian authorities and he thanked the representative of the government and the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa for hosting the meeting. Mr Bandarin recalled that this was the tenth anniversary of the Convention’s entry into force, which provided an important opportunity to take stock of its implementation. By placing communities at its heart, the Convention continues to be a source of innovation in the field of cultural heritage as evidenced by the growing number of periodic reports to be examined by the Committee in the coming days. He was confident that the discussion on the development of the overall results framework of the Convention would help reflect on the learning and progress achieved so far that was essential to the future development of the Convention. He also remarked on the wider context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development approved by the United Nations Assembly in 2015, which recognized cultural heritage and sustainable development as working hand-in-hand, with intangible cultural heritage playing a key role in the provision of quality education, ensuring food security, and addressing environmental issues. UNESCO was taking the UN 2030 Agenda seriously as its main programmatic guidance tool for the next 14 years, and was currently developing policy guidelines for the 2030 Agenda for Culture in order to align all the UNESCO culture programmes towards the sustainable development goals. It was believed that this would make it easier to integrate UNESCO programmes and develop tools to measure the impact of UNESCO’s activities in the field, with intangible cultural heritage clearly an enabler and driver of sustainable development. This was acknowledged in many UNESCO reports in the different fields of education, social sciences and so on, and more recently in the Global Report on Culture for Sustainable Urban Development, which was launched during the Third United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Development – HABITAT III – in October 2016. The report (available on the UNESCO [website](http://en.unesco.org/sustainable-cities)) highlighted among its main findings the fundamental role that intangible cultural heritage continues to play in building peaceful, inclusive and sustainable societies. However, although much progress had been made, it was essential to remain vigilant. Emergencies related to conflicts and natural disasters posed a growing threat to cultural heritage as a whole, including intangible cultural heritage. The debate on the role of intangible cultural heritage in emergency situations would thus be essential for guiding the future work of the Convention.
4. **Mr Bandarin** spoke of the heightened concern expressed by UNESCO on the situation witnessed in many countries and regions, such as the Middle East, the Arabian Peninsula and in Africa, where heritage has been threatened and, in many situations, destroyed. This situation has become a priority for UNESCO. In 2015, the UNESCO General Conference adopted a strategy for the Protection of Cultural Heritage and the Promotion of Cultural Pluralism in the Event of Armed Conflict[[1]](#footnote-2) that included intangible cultural heritage. During the past year, UNESCO had developed an important action plan to strengthen capacities to deal with these issues, including strengthening the Conventions. UNESCO has been supported by many partners in this endeavour, including the European Union for a project in Syria, Mali and, in the future, in Iraq, and by many other donors notably Qatar, Spain, Norway and many others. However, Mr Bandarin acknowledged that this was a huge task requiring the full engagement of all the Conventions and all partners. Through the Committee’s debate, it would determine how the Convention could respond and support international action to enable communities to safeguard their intangible cultural heritage and cultural diversity in general. Mr Bandarin concluded by highlighting UNESCO’s current efforts to prepare the preliminary proposal for the next programme and budget, the 39 C/5, whose budget issues made it all the more important to reiterate the relevance of the Convention to UNESCO’s work and mission. He reminded delegates of the importance of supporting the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund. Mr Bandarin then introduced the new Secretary, Mr Tim Curtis, a colleague with broad experience in this region who later worked in the UNESCO Office in Bangkok, and Ms Jyoti Hosagrahar, the new Director of the Division of Creativity that encompassed the 2003 Convention and the 2005 Convention for the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. Mr Bandarin wished the delegates well in the coming deliberations.
5. The **Chairperson** thanked Mr Bandarin for his encouraging words, and declared the eleventh session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage open. He invited the Secretary to provide some practical information.
6. The **Secretary** thanked the Chairperson and welcomed all the participants and the press, thanking in particular Spain and Saudi Arabia for generously financing the Spanish and Arabic interpretation. The Secretary noted that live video transmission would be available during the session. He also noted that it was a paperless meeting, unless documents were specifically requested, with all documents downloadable from the session’s [webpage](https://ich.unesco.org/en/11com). The host country also generously provided USB keys. A copy of the 2016 edition of the Basic Texts was distributed in English or French among each delegation, which reflected the latest resolutions of the most recent General Assembly and Committee meetings. Copies in Arabic or Spanish were also available on request, and electronic copies were available [online](https://ich.unesco.org/en/convention). It was again noted that 650 people had registered to attend the session from more than 120 different countries. The Secretary then provided practical information regarding meals, transport and refreshments, noting that the host country had generously offered complimentary transport, city tours and its famous coffee.
7. Thanking the Secretary, the **Chairperson** then invited UNESCO’s Deputy Chief of Security for UN coordination, Ms Mary Mone, to say a few words.
8. **Ms Mary Mone** spoke of the sense of privilege and honour of being present at the session. As a UNESCO Security Coordinator with 29 years’ experience in the UN system as a security professional, eleven with UNESCO, she wished to reassure delegates that everything had been put in place in terms of security through excellent cooperation with the host country, UNDSS and security colleagues who were present in the compound. The security level was low, stable and calm, and she would remain with the delegates for the rest of the event should any concerns arise.
9. The **Chairperson** thanked Ms Mone for her reassuring words.

**ITEM 2 OF THE AGENDA:**

**ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA OF THE ELEVENTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE**

**Documents** [*ITH/16/11.COM/2 Rev.*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-2_Rev.-EN.docx)

*[ITH/16/11.COM/INF.2.1 Rev.3](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-INF.2.1_Rev.3-EN.docx)*

*[ITH/16/11.COM/INF.2.2 Rev.3](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-INF.2.2_Rev.3-EN.docx)*

**Decision** *11.COM 2*

1. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to introduce the agenda items.
2. The **Secretary** remarked on the full agenda that included 20 items, some of which contained sub-items. Items 2, 3, 4, 16, 17 and 18 were part of every Committee session, determined by the Rules of Procedure, while a number of items were related to some specific decisions made by the previous session of the Committee or the General Assembly. All the remaining items, such as the examination of nominations and periodic reports, were related to the articles of the Convention or to the provisions of the Operational Directives. The Secretary further remarked that all the documents had been published online by the statutory deadline of 31 October, four weeks before the opening of this session, according to Rule 42 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee. See [List of provisional documents](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-INF.2.2_Rev.3-EN.docx). All the documents had the code ITH/16/11.COM/ followed by the number corresponding to the agenda item. Information documents were preceded by ‘INF’ and revised documents, supplemented by corrigenda or addenda, were annotated with ‘REV’. The [provisional timetable](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-INF.2.1_Rev.3-EN.docx) for the five-day session had been adopted by the Bureau at its meeting on 20 October in Paris and subsequently slightly revised to specify the time when the Chairperson would provide information on the activities of the Bureau and when the NGO Forum would present its report. The Committee would meet from 9.30 a.m. to 12.30 p.m. and from 2.30 p.m. to 5.30 p.m. with a two-hour lunch break. Starting the following day, the Bureau would meet every morning from 9 a.m. to 9.30 a.m. to adjust the provisional timetable as needed. Observers were welcome to attend. It was clarified that the Committee was being called upon to adopt the agenda, not the timetable.
3. The **Secretary** then drew attention to two side events prepared by the Secretariat and various co-organizers for this session. One side event would take place that evening on ‘Living heritage in Addis Ababa’, a photo exhibition co-organized by the Intangible Cultural Heritage Section of UNESCO and Ethiopia’s Authority for Research and Conservation of Cultural Heritage. The exhibition featured intangible cultural heritage in the urban context of Addis Ababa, captured through the lenses of two young and talented Ethiopian women photographers. The second event, a roundtable discussion on ‘Learning with Intangible Cultural Heritage in Education’ and convened by the Intangible Cultural Heritage Section of UNESCO and the UNESCO International Institute for Capacity Building in Africa (IICBA), would take place the following day with the objective of sharing recent experiences on integrating intangible heritage into education and generating ideas for future work. Information on other side events organized by States during the week was available on the Convention [website](https://ich.unesco.org/en/side-events-00899). The Secretary concluded by saying that further announcements would be made in due course, and a press/media conference was scheduled to take place later that day.
4. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary, adding that it was clear that there were important issues to discuss over the next five days on a very tight schedule and he was counting on the Committee’s cooperation to keep interventions brief, limiting remarks to the minimum time required, and not to take the floor more than twice under a single item. Members wishing to introduce written amendments into the draft decisions were invited to do so by completing the relevant form, which was available both from the Secretariat and on the Convention website. Written amendments could also be submitted electronically. During a general debate, and after each item had been debated by the Committee, the floor would be given to Observers, time permitting. However, Observers were not permitted to intervene during discussions on draft decisions. Concerning the Report of the Evaluation Body to the Committee, and in particular items 10.a, 10.b and 10.c, the Committee had 49 files to examine, and the plan was to dedicate 12 hours to doing so - over two days - or 14 minutes per file. Due to the tight schedule, and in order to allow sufficient time for the Committee to discuss each agenda item, the Chairperson recalled that the Committee last year had adopted a working method that allowed for the efficient examination of these items. This was discussed during the Bureau meeting on 20 October, and during the Information and Exchange Session that took place on the same day, and was communicated to members of the Committee by the Secretariat on 7 November. The Bureau thus proposed continuing with the working method adopted in 2015. As such, Members of the Committee wishing to discuss or amend specific draft decisions concerning nominations were invited to make this known, prior to the Bureau morning meeting the following day at 9 a.m. This would allow the Bureau to better organize the time available for debate. Proposed amendments should be sent by email, to the address communicated by the Secretariat, or by completing the relevant form. Consequently, it would be taken for granted that draft decisions on nominations for which no request for amendment or debate had been put forward could be proposed for adoption as a whole, saving time and allowing more time to be spent on other nominations. Nevertheless, Committee Members were entitled to ask for the floor; this process was simply to better organize the adoption of draft decisions in advance.
5. The delegation of **Cuba** thanked the host country for its welcome before turning to the working methodology as just outlined. It understood and appreciated the time limits on debates and the conduct of business to successfully complete all the agenda items. However, the delegation expressed concern that it would not be able to put forward amendments during the debates, although it fully understood that putting forward a whole new draft agenda for the session would involve abiding by all the rules and procedures. However, discussions on the nominations themselves could be lively and members of the Committee might wish to propose amendments in reaction to those discussions. The delegation therefore wished to state from the outset that it did not intend to submit amendments in advance but rather during the debates for which it was entitled under the Operational Directives and the Rules of Procedure, on the understanding of course that it provided the text. The delegation reiterated that UNESCO, as an intergovernmental body, should not try to curtail any discussion or debate on issues that were very sensitive to all present. It asked the Chairperson for his indulgence in this regard and to acknowledge the fact that Cuba would be putting forward some amendments as discussions developed.
6. The delegation of **Algeria** wished to thank colleagues and the host country for their exceptional hospitality, wishing all the delegates a happy and fruitful session. It also supported Cuba regarding amendments, adding that it wished to reserve the right to present amendments before the Committee in the Room. It understood that debates were lively and that issues might be brought to light during discussions, and thus it was preferable to allow Members to put forward amendments as issues arose.
7. Thanking the host country for organizing this meeting, the delegation of **Palestine** also wished to return to the discussion of agenda item 8 and fully agreed with Cuba and Algeria with regard to the proposed methodology. Nevertheless, it felt that perhaps it would be better not to enter into this discussion in great depth at this point but to take up the discussion during agenda item 8, not least because the working methodology had already been discussed at length in previous sessions.
8. The **Secretary** wished to clarify that the proposal by the Chairperson in no way undermined the right of any Member to propose an amendment during the discussion, as per the Rules of Procedure. It was simply a proposal to help facilitate the work.
9. Thanking the Secretary for the clarification, the **Chairperson** informed the Committee that a request had been received from Cuba for one minute of silence.

*[One minute of silence was observed in respect of the recent passing of Mr Fidel Castro]*

1. The delegation of **Cuba** explained that the minute of silence was for the passing of Commander Fidel Castro, who was a great example and whose work had helped with the inscription of nine elements of UNESCO World Heritage. The delegation thanked everyone for their generosity and messages of support.
2. The Chairperson turned to the adoption of the agenda, recalling that all the documents were available on the Convention website. With no further comments or objections, the Chairperson declared Decision 11.COM 2 adopted.

**ITEM 3 OF THE AGENDA:**

**OBSERVERS**

**Document** [*ITH/16/11.COM/3*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-3-EN.docx)

**Decision** *11.COM 3*

1. The **Chairperson** then turned to agenda item 3 on Observers.
2. Introducing the item, the **Secretary** explained that this annual exercise was required by the Committee’s Rules of Procedure Rules 8.1 and 8.2, which allowed the following participants to be admitted automatically as observers: States Parties non-Members of the Committee, States non party to the Convention that are Member States of UNESCO, Associate Members of UNESCO, Permanent Observer Missions to UNESCO and representatives of the UN and organizations of the UN system. Rule 8.3 also referred to intergovernmental organizations other than those referred to in Rule 8.2, public and private bodies, and private persons that were also able to attend as observers upon their written request. By its Decision 10.COM 3, the Committee authorized the participation as observers of the Arab League Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization (ALECSO) in the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth sessions of the Committee, and the International Centre for Research and Documentation on African Traditions and Languages (CERDOTOLA) in the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth sessions. One other organization, the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC), had submitted a written request to attend the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth sessions of the Committee as an observer. The Secretary recalled that accredited NGOs were automatically accepted as observers at Committee sessions, in conformity with Rule 6 of the Rules of Procedure.
3. The **Chairperson** recalled that observers were permitted to speak during a general debate or after a decision had been taken, but not during debates on draft decisions. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision 11.COM 3 adopted**.

**ITEM 4 OF THE AGENDA:**

**ADOPTION OF THE SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE TENTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE**

**Document** [*ITH/16/11.COM/4*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-4-EN.docx)

**Decision** *11.COM 4*

1. The **Chairperson** moved to the approval of the draft summary records of the tenth session of the Committee held in Windhoek, Namibia.
2. The **Secretary** explained that the summary records took note of the Committee’s discussions and decisions during its tenth session. The long document was thus intended to provide a faithful record of the debates and interventions of all Members of the Committee and observers, which could be reused whenever required. The timetable and recordings of the debates of the Committee’s tenth session were available [online](https://ich.unesco.org/en/10com).
3. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision 11.COM 4 adopted**.
4. Before moving to the next agenda item 5, the **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Bureau had been convened on three occasions since Namibia; one electronic consultation and two face-to-face meetings so far. All the working documents and decisions of the Bureau meetings were available on the [website](https://ich.unesco.org/en/11.com-bureau) of the Convention. During the electronic consultation, held in March 2016, the Bureau approved the final report of the Committee to the General Assembly, the revised overview and summaries of the periodic reports examined by the Committee in 2015, as well as three International Assistance requests up to US$25,000 from Fiji, Kenya and Zambia. The first face-to-face meeting was held in June 2016, during which the Secretariat presented a proposal to ask for the utilization of funds allocated for ‘other functions of the Committee’ and two International Assistance requests up to US$25,000 from Lesotho and Zambia. The plan and the two International Assistance requests were approved two weeks after the meeting through electronic consultation. The Bureau met again in a face-to-face meeting on 20 October 2016 to discuss and approve the provisional timetable of the eleventh session of the Committee. During this meeting, the Bureau examined and approved four International Assistance requests, and was asked to examine requests up to US$100,000 for the first time following the higher ceiling approved by the General Assembly at its sixth session in June 2016. The two projects falling into this category which were approved were: i) from Botswana to support the implementation of the safeguarding plan for ‘Earthenware pottery-making skills in Botswana’s Kgatleng District’, inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List in 2012, for US$68,261; and ii) from the Seychelles to support a capacity-building programme at the national level, covering the implementation of the Convention and community-based inventorying for US$90,000. The Bureau also examined the International Assistance request submitted by Kenya for the amount of US$144,430 for the project ‘Safeguarding of Enkipaata, Eunoto and Olng’esherr, three male rites of passage of the Maasai community’. The Chairperson recalled that the Committee had examined this request in 2015 and delegated authority to the Bureau to approve a revised request. Finally, during the same meeting the Bureau also approved an International Assistance request for US$24,995 from El Salvador. The total amount approved amounted to US$451,000. The Chairperson took the opportunity to invite the representatives of the ICH NGO Forum to report briefly on the symposium held the previous day: this had been a fixture at Committee sessions since 2010 with the outcomes systematically presented to the Committee in conformity with the decision made in Baku in 2013.
5. Speaking on behalf of the ICH NGO Forum, **Mr Léonce Ki** [from the NGO, Association pour la sauvegarde des masques] expressed his gratitude to the Committee, as well as to UNESCO and the Ethiopian authorities for welcoming and supporting the accredited NGOs in their participation in this session as observers. The ICH NGO Forum was also grateful for the growing attention accorded to the Forum in which the accredited NGOs meet and coordinate activities related to the implementation of the 2003 Convention. Mr Ki thanked the Committee for covering the costs of 22 NGO colleagues’ participation in this eleventh session, and the inclusion of the Forum’s activities as official events during the Committee session. The Forum also appreciated the interpretation services and the provision of meeting rooms for the symposium held the previous day and the annual plenary meeting of the ICH NGO Forum to be held that same evening. Mr Ki remarked that the participation of NGOs in these sessions was particularly dynamic, as it continued to grow in number; there had been 40 NGOs at the last session in Namibia and 55 NGOs at this session, with more than 90 registered representatives. He also noted the presence of six NGOs offering advisory services within the Evaluation Body. The Forum looked forward to the discussions, attaching great interest to the potentially important reflections on the development of an overall results framework for the Convention, particularly with regard to emergencies and safeguarding. The Forum also welcomed the search for solutions on the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in emergency situations, as well as the many proposals for the Convention's mechanisms, in particular, the six nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List, the seven proposals for the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices, and the request for International Assistance. The Forum expressed its hope that the Fund would be mobilized as a source to promote a range of safeguarding measures and actions. With regard to the very important aspects to be discussed, the NGO Forum had sought to make a special contribution to the exchanges and reflections by organizing its fifth symposium, which had been held the previous day. Mr Ki invited Ms Ananya Bhattacharya to present a brief report on the results of the symposium.
6. **Ms Ananya Bhattacharya** [from the NGO, Contact Base] remarked on the tradition of opening the Committee session with an NGO Symposium, with the previous day’s symposium having attracted over 80 participants comprising NGOs, communities, researchers, States Parties and Members of National UNESCO Commissions from over 32 countries. The first topic discussed highlighted the challenges for NGOs in the promotion of intangible cultural heritage values, and there were presentations by important speakers who were active both outside and within the Convention’s framework. NGO experiences from Ethiopia, Nigeria, Cameroon and Uganda were also shared. The second topic concerned the legal protection of intangible cultural heritage in the case of armed conflict, a subject in which expertise and research were being developed among the accredited NGOs. This topic, as well as migration and emergencies, would be further explored in future forum initiatives. The symposium raised key observations and insights, including: i) the need for greater awareness of intangible cultural heritage and the 2003 Convention in Africa; ii) the challenges in access to and ownership of intangible cultural heritage documentation; iii) the importance of research in safeguarding and revitalization; iv) how rituals and festivals celebrating intangible cultural heritage facilitate community interaction and dialogue; v) the urgency of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage with the decline in present custodians, the elder generation; vi) the need for awareness and effective access to international legal instruments; adopting human rights perspectives in situations of conflict; and vii) the role of NGOs in fostering peace. The Forum was also working to share practices of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, noting that the [Heritage Alive](http://www.ichngoforum.org/category/heritage-alive/) online journal for sharing safeguarding continued to grow steadily. In 2016, following its call for articles on traditional medicines and knowledge transmission, the Forum had received new articles, which had since been published on the Forum’s [website](http://www.ichngoforum.org). Moreover, the Editorial Board welcomed participation in the open workshop side event to be held during lunchtime to discuss newly shared safeguarding experiences from the field, as well as other emerging issues and challenges in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, which could be subjects for further research, policy and practice development, and capacity building in the context of diversity, digitization, urbanization, migration and conflict situations. This was part of the overall process of how, through the implementation of the Convention, NGOs could work towards an integrated and transformative 2030 Agenda for sustainable development, considering intangible cultural heritage as both a possible driver and an enabler for these processes. Another meaningful next step would be to take the Forum’s work in 2017 to a higher level by: i) implementing an international capacity-building programme for accredited NGOs, developing the outreach of the NGO network; ii) launching and developing regional networks; and iii) setting up good governance structures for the Forum’s organization itself. The Forum was delighted to share that its website and social media channels, [Twitter](https://twitter.com/IchNGO) and [Facebook](https://www.facebook.com/Intangible-cultural-heritage-and-civil-society-123664631007622/), were reaching numerous stakeholders. In addition, and in close coordination with the ICH Section of the Secretariat, the Forum was developing a database to share, complement and align information on the NGOs on the UNESCO website. In recent years, the Forum had also been invited on a regular basis to support projects of NGO networks all over the world through its expertise, networks and communication tools. Various interesting NGO supranational initiatives, cooperation and conferences were being set up in all regions, which varied from regional and sub-regional NGO meetings in Asia and the Pacific facilitated through ICHCAP, to regional networking efforts in Europe which were evolving into concrete cross-border intangible cultural heritage safeguarding projects, and activities to raise funds and multi-stakeholderships for NGO capacity building in Africa. To strengthen these developments, the Forum invited States Parties to contribute financially towards supporting the NGOs in their complementary work in the implementation of the Convention, which would bring capacity towards the specific objectives of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and fostering NGO cooperation. Ms Bhattacharya requested support to make the global capacity programme for the NGO Forum possible, either through direct funding or through the ICH Fund. In this regard, the Forum thanked the Directorate General of Culture and the Ministry of Education and Culture of Indonesia for supporting the Forum on this occasion. Ms Bhattacharya wished the delegates well in their reflections and wise decisions to safeguard intangible cultural heritage.
7. The **Chairperson** thanked Mr Léonce Ki and Ms Ananya Bhattacharya for their clear presentations. On behalf of the host country, the Chairperson was very happy to host the Forum and was pleased to learn of its fruitful discussions. Furthermore, he took this opportunity to recognize the vital role of NGOs in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage and thanked them for their continuous efforts.

**ITEM 5 OF THE AGENDA:**

**REPORT BY THE SECRETARIAT ON ITS ACTIVITIES**

**Documents** [*ITH/16/11.COM/5*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-5-EN.docx)

[*ITH/16/11.COM/INF.5*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-INF.5-EN.docx)

**Decision** *11.COM 5*

1. The **Chairperson** thenturned to agenda item 5 and the Secretariat’s report.
2. The **Secretary** explained that the report this year presented the activities of the Secretariat undertaken in the first six months of the UNESCO biennium, namely from January to June 2016. The reporting period had been revised in order to align with the other reporting mechanisms within UNESCO. Thus, the Committee that meets in the first year of the biennium would examine a six-month report (as at the present session), whereas the following Committee would examine the period of one and a half years (as would be the case at the twelfth session, which would cover the period from January 2016 to June 2017). This would align the reporting mechanism with the General Assembly (that takes place in June), as well as the General Conference of UNESCO (that takes place in November). The Secretary further explained that the report should be read in tandem with four other important documents: i) the financial statement of the Convention’s Fund for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (Document [ITH/16/11.COM/INF.5](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-INF.5-EN.docx)); ii) the report of the Secretariat to the General Assembly on its activities (Document [ITH/16/6.GA/6](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-6.GA-6-EN.docx)); iii) the follow-up to the recommendations of the External Auditor’s ‘Report on the governance of UNESCO and dependant funds, programmes and entities’ (Document [ITH/16/11.COM/7](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-7-EN.docx)); and iv) the Director-General’s reports to the Executive Board on the execution of the programme adopted by the General Conference (EX/4). In an effort to streamline the format of this year’s report, it focused on strategic results and was thus organized into two parts. The first part presents an overall strategic assessment focusing on key achievements, as well as the overall challenges encountered and remedial actions taken, and the second part presents an assessment of progress by performance indicator against targets, as adopted within the Document 38 C/5 Approved programme and budget 2016–2017, representing the second biennium of the 2014–2017 quadrennium. The report also contained two annexes dedicated to the follow-up on the Internal Oversight Service’s (IOS) audits and evaluations. Due to time constraints, the Secretarychose to limit his presentation to the overall strategic assessment and challenges; details of the results of each activity can be found in paragraph 24 of the working [document 5](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-5-EN.docx).
3. The **Secretary** began the report with the **Overall strategic assessment** of the Secretariat’s activities. Under the reporting period – as in the past – the Secretariat concentrated its efforts on two main actions. Firstly, supporting the governance of the Convention, i.e. its ‘statutory work’, and secondly, providing support for the implementation of the Convention through the Capacity-building Programme, as approved by the Committee. The Secretariat supported five statutory meetings between January and June 2016, which included the sixth session of the General Assembly in May 2016 that saw the election of 12 new Committee Members and the approval of the Plan for the use of the ICH Fund. Significantly, the Assembly adopted substantial revisions to the Operational Directives, which included: i) the increase of the ceiling for International Assistance requests to be submitted to the Bureau from US$25,000 to US$100,000; ii) the adoption of a new chapter on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development at the national level; and iii) the extension of the referral option to the Representative List, the Urgent Safeguarding List, the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices, and International Assistance requests. The Secretary spoke of how the increase in the ceiling for International Assistance requests represented an important step forward as it would give States Parties easier access to funds, i.e. a State Party could now submit substantial requests for financial assistance up to US$100,000 without impeding its right to submit either a nomination, another request greater than US$100,000, or another proposal to the Committee. The raised ceiling would contribute to reversing the trend of under-utilization of the ICH Fund. It was noted that under the reporting period, only five projects had been granted international assistance up to US$25,000 by the Bureau. However, the Secretary reminded the Committee that this only covered the reporting period up to June, while the increase to US$100,000 had occurred at the end of May, and thus only covered a period of one month. At the same time, the Secretariat had changed the working methodology for treating International Assistance requests up to US$100,000 by organizing at least three meetings of the Bureau per year (in March, June and October). In this context, the number of International Assistance requests examined by the Bureau under the reporting period had increased (six requests) compared to the equivalent period in 2014 (no requests) and in 2015 (four requests). Nevertheless, the Secretary wished to flag that these provisions broadened opportunities of access, but not those related to its supply or delivery.
4. The **Secretary** then spoke about the **adoption of the new chapter of the Operational Directives** on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development, calling it a milestone in the development of the Convention, and which should be considered within the larger framework of the adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in September 2015 by the UN system. The new chapter provided guidance for States Parties on measures they could implement to give effect to the Convention’s potential as a tool, not only for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage but also for pursuing sustainable development in line with the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals. With regard to the **listing mechanisms**, the Secretary explained that an important part of the Secretariat’s work was devoted to the processing of nominations to the two Lists, proposals to the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices, requests for International Assistance, and the periodic reports of States Parties. He was pleased to inform the Committee that the treatment of nominations for the 2017 cycle was currently on schedule. The sound governance of the Convention was also facilitated by **enhanced knowledge management services**, which were known to be highly appreciated by States Parties as the number of States Parties continued to grow and as experiences in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage further accumulated. The work undertaken during the reporting period focused on improving both the functioning of the Convention’s knowledge management system and its usefulness for diverse groups of stakeholders. For example, in May 2016, the Secretariat had launched a new monitoring interface that allowed users to access submitted reports, review the schedule of submissions and search them by mechanism, status and country. The Secretariat continued to enhance the webpage dedicated to [category 2 centres](https://ich.unesco.org/en/category2) with key documents for each of the eight centres, including recent work plans and annual reports. Efforts had also been made to enhance the Convention’s website with improved navigation and ergonomics, search engine optimization and additional multilingual content. As regards **periodic reporting**, the Secretary stressed that there were still a high number of overdue reports and – in an attempt to improve participation – the Secretariat had provided detailed information in this regard during the sixth session of the General Assembly in June 2016. The Secretariat had started updating the *aide-mémoire* for completing the reporting form, and he was well aware that this was a complex task for States Parties. However, it should be seen as a key tool for monitoring the implementation of the Convention, and through periodic reports, State Parties could showcase the efforts deployed to safeguard intangible cultural heritage under the Convention.
5. With regard to the **Capacity-building Programme**, the **Secretary** further explained that this was aimed at supporting Members States in strengthening human and institutional resources in intangible cultural heritage. One of the recent achievements and new orientations of the programme was the completion of in-depth needs assessments in ten countries whose objective was two-fold. On the one hand, they constituted a sound basis for decision-making about future strategy and policy choices in the field of intangible cultural heritage and, on the other hand, they served as a basis for the preparation of multi-year projects tailored to countries’ specific needs and contexts, thus helping to fine-tune capacity building. Another achievement during this period was the completion of a large-scale project in five Portuguese-speaking African countries that showed how significant progress had been made in mobilizing all stakeholders, developing the institutional infrastructure required for safeguarding, conducting community-based inventorying, and facilitating collaboration among the project countries. However, the project also brought to the fore that more support was required to strengthen capacities in the preparation of safeguarding plans and to develop policies and legislation. The Secretary recalled that a global [Network of Facilitators](https://ich.unesco.org/en/facilitator), trained by the Secretariat to deliver training and advisory services related to the Convention, supported the capacity-building programme. This network was constantly reinforced, as this was key to the programme. For example, one innovation since the beginning of 2016 was the development of an online tutorial on the use of the materials for workshops on safeguarding plans. The Secretariat also produced a cross-regional analysis of 73 facilitators’ reports to consolidate their perspectives on programme implementation and their recommendations for further development. Lastly, network members had contributed to the development of tracer studies to find out how differences in individuals’ participation in the capacity-building programme had affected their engagement with intangible cultural heritage, and their recommendations to further improve the programme. The Secretary informed the Committee that a meeting for the facilitators would be held during the present Committee session (on Wednesday and Thursday). Regarding the material itself, new training materials had been developed on policy development for intangible cultural heritage, while materials on preparing nominations had been revised and enlarged with thematic units on the effects of inscription and on periodic reporting concerning inscription. The Secretary also spoke about the network of **Category 2 Centres**, recalling that the Secretariat had organized, for the fourth time, an annual coordination meeting in June 2016 to exchange information and to discuss new perspectives for cooperation and future synergies among the centres, as well as between UNESCO and the centres. The Secretariat also continued its work on the evaluation and renewal process of a number of centres, as per the statutory requirements.
6. In the field of **monitoring and evaluation**, as per the decisions of the Committee, the **Secretary** further explained that the Secretariat had developed an overall results framework for the Convention with the preparation and organization of a category VI meeting of experts from 7 to 9 September 2016, which was generously funded and hosted by the National Commission of the People’s Republic of China for UNESCO. The meeting laid an important ground for reflections on the overall goals of the Convention and ways to demonstrate how the desired results were achieved; the results would be presented under agenda item 14. The Secretary also wished to mention that the first semester of 2016 showed a steady increase in the number of States Parties to the Convention, particularly from Africa, with eight new States Parties and one extension of territorial application, with a few more States Parties in the pipeline. There were now 172 States Parties. Half of the new States Parties had benefitted from capacity-building activities prior to ratification, which showed the value of the programme. Nevertheless, the Secretariat was presented with some challenges, notably to ‘keep the boat afloat’ under the difficult circumstances faced by UNESCO. It acknowledged that its efforts were not enough to ensure that the Convention maintained a real life beyond its statutory meetings and capacity-building workshops. Moreover, unless the scope of the Convention was expanded, it risked facing stagnation and irrelevance at a time when it must be dynamic and adapt to today’s issues that include, for example, massive rural to urban migration, natural disasters and conflicts, the challenges of the SDGs, linking intangible cultural heritage with educational systems and so on. One way to do so was to make use of the grossly under-utilized International Assistance mechanism as an operational window to the Convention. This mechanism could provide an opportunity to enhance the impact of the Convention far beyond just being a system of grants. Through the implementation and monitoring of International Assistance, more could potentially be learned about: the desires and aspirations of communities concerning their intangible cultural heritage; the effectiveness of certain approaches to safeguarding; the concrete possibilities of leveraging intangible cultural heritage to meet sustainable development goals and more. However, this required more than just processing and approving requests for assistance and financial verification of spending, but would entail the establishment of a monitoring and learning system around the projects that would tap into the broader issues confronting intangible cultural heritage in general. However, this would cause an increase in workload that is currently unrealistic under the current structure of the Secretariat.
7. The **Secretary** then turned to some of the **key challenges**. He spoke of the Secretariat’s work that called for a clear and operational demonstration of the role that intangible cultural heritage can play in achieving **sustainable and human development**. Following the adoption of the new chapter of the Operational Directives, the Secretariat was aware that further information to operationalize it, for instance in the form of case studies or others, would be welcomed. The Secretariat was also making several efforts to identify programmatic entry points with specific indicators of the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals. Another context of operation concerned **emergency situations**, as previously mentioned by the ADG, in which the Secretariat was increasingly called upon to participate in the Culture Sector’s global response. Following the adoption, by the 38th session of UNESCO’s General Conference in November 2015, of the strategy to reinforce UNESCO’s action for the safeguarding of culture and the promotion of cultural pluralism in the event of armed conflict, as well as Greece’s intervention on the subject at the General Assembly in June 2016, an in-depth reflection was clearly needed on the role of the 2003 Convention and UNESCO’s possible actions in emergency situations (covered under agenda item 15). The Secretary also wished to highlight a number of pending issues that the Secretariat had been unable to tackle given its heavy workload, which include: i) the creation of tools for the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices to share safeguarding experiences, as had been requested; ii) further consolidation of the network of facilitators in the capacity-building programme; iii) the enhancement of cooperation with organizations within and outside the UN system; and iv) the proper implementation of International Assistance.
8. The **Secretary** then turned to the issue of **financial resources**, recalling that 65 per cent of the Regular Programme budget of the biennium for the Section was dedicated to covering the costs of the statutory requirements of the Convention. Thus, the Secretariat’s resource mobilization efforts essentially concentrated on the global capacity-building strategy. However, during the reporting period, no further resources could be mobilized, and some of the long-standing contributors announced that they would not renew their engagement, which was considered critical given that supplementary voluntary contributions to the ICH Fund and Funds-in-Trust were essential to the success of capacity-building efforts. The Secretary thus renewed its earnest and strong call to urge potential donors to contribute in favour of the 2003 Convention and the capacity-building programme in particular.
9. With regard to the **human resources** of the Secretariat, which continued to be of great concern, the **Secretary** cautioned that the mismatch between the available human resources and the steady increase in workload and expectations on the part of States Parties remained a major challenge and vulnerability for the Convention itself. The paradox was that increasing the ceiling of International Assistance requests would see a greater number of requests being treated by the Bureau in the future, resulting in a definite increase in workload for the Secretariat and thus drawing attention to the issue of delivery. It was explained that the workload went beyond presenting the documentation to the Bureau for approval, but set in motion an entire mechanism that could not be implemented under the current structure of the Secretariat. It was thus urgent to think creatively in order to find a solution to address the issue of delivery that was inexorably linked to the capacity of the Secretariat. In this way, this part of the Convention, which has been under-utilized for several years, could be drawn upon as the operational window of the Convention to provide assistance, knowledge and experience.
10. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** congratulated the Chairperson who would no doubt successfully lead the Committee in its work. It also extended its deep appreciation and friendship to the people and the Government of Ethiopia for its warm and generous hospitality, as well as the excellent conference facilities and logistical support. Referring to the Secretariat’s report, the delegation applauded the Secretary and his staff for their substantial efforts and achievements despite the limited budget and resources. It also wished to congratulate the eight States for duly ratifying the Convention since December 2015, adding that it was very encouraging to note the increasing number of African countries. A hearty welcome was also extended to Thailand, a fellow member of the ASPAC Group. However, the delegation noted with concern that the Secretariat was facing a number of challenges and it was very important to secure the financial and human resources required to maintain a certain level of programme delivery. In the meantime, the category 2 centres could contribute to alleviating the heavy burden, as was rightly pointed out by the Secretariat in 2015.
11. The delegation of **India** thanked the Government of Ethiopia for hosting this important meeting and for the excellent hospitality, adding that it was confident in the Chairperson’s leadership skills to bring about successful discussions. It also welcomed Mr Tim Curtis to his first meeting as Secretary of the Convention. Referring to the Secretariat’s report, the delegation congratulated the Secretariat for its excellent work, especially in relation to the capacity-building programme. It also welcomed the new Member States that had recently ratified the Convention, noting that the Convention was fast reaching complete universality with 172 members at present, which had been achieved thanks to the Secretariat’s capacity-building activities and untiring efforts to encourage countries to ratify the Convention. The delegation further commended the Secretariat for its excellent work carried out since January 2016, especially relating to the new Operational Directives on intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development, as well as raising the financial limit of the Bureau for approving International Assistant requests from US$25,000 to US$100,000. It was confident that the new Operational Directives on sustainable development would greatly assist Member States in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, and it hoped that the enhanced financial powers of the Bureau would encourage Member States to avail themselves of the under-utilized Fund in implementing specific projects. The delegation also appreciated that the Secretariat had completed the technical completeness check of nominations in the 2017 cycle by the deadline of 30 June 2016. However, perhaps the time had come for the Secretariat to communicate more with submitting States in order to seek additional information or clarifications during the course of the evaluation of nominations, which might help the Evaluation Body in their examination of files. The delegation was confident that during the long period of 18 months – between the submission and examination of files by the Committee – a stage could be established to introduce this important step in the evaluation process. It hoped that the issue would be further debated during the coming days. Lastly, the delegation was aware of the difficult situation faced by the Secretariat in terms of human resources in the wake of increasing demands, and while it recognized the earlier calls made by the Committee for voluntary contributions by Member States, it also welcomed creative suggestions from the Secretariat.
12. The delegation of **Austria** congratulated the Chairperson on his chairmanship and Mr Tim Curtis on his new position, and was confident of a fruitful and successful meeting. It also thanked Ethiopia for hosting this important meeting, and for the wonderful welcome and opening ceremony. The delegation congratulated the Secretariat on its report and for the excellent documents, adding that it appreciated the Secretariat’s achievements and dedication, considering the high workload. It agreed that by increasing the ceiling for International Assistance, the ICH Fund was more likely to be utilized, which it welcomed. However, it could also foresee the additional workload for both the Secretariat and the Bureau. Referring to the implementation of the new chapter of the Operational Directives on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development, the delegation acknowledged that this would be a major topic for years to come, as well as on issues such as climate change, health, urban development that also have an impact on intangible cultural heritage. It was looking forward to working and sharing its experience on these topics, for instance, in the form of case studies, as suggested by the Secretariat. The delegation welcomed the efforts in updating the guidance documents for completing the periodic reporting forms, as well as the recommendation to find lighter ways of sharing safeguarding experiences, such as dedicated websites, and electronic letters or online forums. The capacity-building programme remained one of the central aspects of the Convention, and the delegation was satisfied to hear about the number of activities that had taken place thanks to the Secretariat but also to the network of facilitators and the new training materials. With regard to the challenging situation faced by the human resources of the Secretariat to meet all the requirements of a successful implementation, the delegation welcomed the suggestion to expand outreach and visibility through cooperation with UNESCO field offices, category 2 centres, UNESCO Chairs, educational institutions and particularly civil society. Additionally, increased cooperation could come from the National Commissions for UNESCO with their broad experience in the implementation of Conventions with many possible synergies for the culture Conventions.
13. The delegation of **Turkey** spoke of its appreciation for the Chairperson’s leadership and the warm hospitality extended by the Ethiopian Government and people. It congratulated Mr Curtis on his first year as Chief of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Division and as Secretary of the Convention. The delegation thanked the Secretariat for the well-structured and streamlined report thanks to the new format, and congratulated the newly ratified States Parties as well as the Secretariat for its efforts in the process, adding that it was happy that the number had now reached 172. It expected the Secretariat to continue its efforts in this regard to achieve a universal ratification of the Convention. Referring to the Secretary’s presentation and paragraph 22 of the report in particular, in which the Secretariat flagged the potential challenges due to the increased workload following the increase in the ceiling of International Assistance requests, the delegation believed that although the requests had not yet dramatically increased, the situation might change and the Committee needed to be aware of this threat and reflect on taking action accordingly. As the ceiling increase was aimed to enhance access to International Assistance and to alleviate the underutilization of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund, the delegation felt that it would be critical to provide the Secretariat with adequate human resources to ensure a better implementation of the funds, adding that it was sure the Secretariat was already searching for a creative solution in this regard. Also, having examined Annex I of the Report, the delegation commended the Secretariat for the substantial progress achieved so far in the implementation of the 24 recommendations of the UNESCO standard-setting evaluation concerning the Convention, adding that the establishment of the follow-up mechanism and capacity-building activities was important to ensure proper monitoring, pending the creation of the overall results framework for the 2003 Convention. The delegation found it helpful that the yearly brochure on inscribed elements had been replaced with brochures on elements on the Urgent Safeguarding List and selected for the Register of the Best Safeguarding Practices. It encouraged the Secretariat to further promote the Urgent Safeguarding List as it addressed one of the core aims of the Convention, and given the Secretariat’s limited resources more efforts could be made to develop alternative means, particularly by mobilizing NGOs and the private sector to widely disseminate the good safeguarding practices as a complement to the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices.
14. The delegation of **Cuba** congratulated the Secretariat for its report and for the work it carried out with all States Parties. With regard to the ICH Fund and the increased ceiling for International Assistance requests to be treated by the Bureau, the delegation felt that the measure would help resolve the problem of the Fund in providing greater access to the fundamental mechanism for capacity building, adding that the Committee should proceed in this vein within the Convention. At the same time, it cautioned the designation of the Bureau as the body carrying out the evaluation, although this was a temporary solution, which would overload and overstep the role of the Bureau. Nevertheless, the delegation supported the initiative, as it was an efficient mechanism to ensure capacity building and also to tackle the huge workload within the Committee. With regard to the 24 recommendations of the External Auditor, the delegation believed that this was a fundamental report taken at a time when UNESCO was concerned about governance and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of its bodies and thereby strengthening the intergovernmental character of its different bodies. The delegation also appreciated the explanation provided in Annex I with respect to Operational Directives where a number of recommendations had been presented, noting that this debate was in progress. It believed in strengthening South-South cooperation and exchanging best practices among field offices, which it felt was fundamental to the Committee’s work and for the implementation of the Convention, as mentioned in Recommendations 2 and 6. With respect to Recommendation 11[[2]](#footnote-3), the delegation supported the recommendation under point 7 and thanked the Secretary for its efforts in this regard, adding that this would contribute to the overall debate on governance. The delegation also referred to the importance of debating the issues of armed conflict as a contribution to the action plan, currently being approved, with respect to UNESCO’s work.
15. The delegation of **Philippines** conveyed appreciation to the Government and people of Ethiopia for hosting this session and for their hospitality in Addis Ababa, the cradle of ancient civilizations and traditions, which was reflected in the spectacular opening ceremony the previous evening. It thanked the Secretary for the report and congratulated the Secretariat on its impressive work to promote the Convention. The delegation spoke about the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), currently chaired by the Philippines, which – at its last summit – had adopted a declaration on reinforcing intangible cultural heritage cooperation in the region, as it would celebrate its 50th anniversary in 2017. It hoped to strengthen ASEAN engagement and cooperation with the Committee and the ICH Secretariat, and encouraged the Secretariat to continue to focus on capacity building in developing countries. The increase in the ceiling of International Assistance requests would hopefully aid in this endeavour, but developing a more targeted, strategic and long-term approach may likewise be necessary. The delegation would also touch upon this issue later on under item 15. The delegation spoke in support of paragraph 8 of the draft decision in this regard, as well as of further enhancing dialogue and cooperation between the various category 2 centres as it looked forward to coordination meetings leading to synergies and joint initiatives. It also agreed with paragraph 18 of the report, which suggested that States Parties would appreciate case studies that could illustrate the relationship between intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development, especially in the context of the newly adopted chapter of the Operational Directives, which would need clarification towards its implementation. Lastly, as the Convention deals with communities, the delegation was in favour of launching a reflection process on how the Committee and its mechanisms could more constructively engage with civil society, perhaps first in the context of assessing elements on the Urgent Safeguarding List.
16. The delegation of **Senegal** began by congratulating the Chairperson and thanking the Government of Ethiopia for its excellent organization and warm welcome. It also congratulated the Secretariat for its formidable work despite its modest human and material resources, which testified to the dynamic nature of the Secretariat both in Senegal and at the level of Africa, which it supported wholeheartedly. [Another speaker, national expert] The Expert remarked on the alarm raised by the Secretary in addressing the challenges of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage that called upon States Parties to be more creative, but also to assume greater responsibility, which suggested working more closely with national structures and NGOs as they play an extremely important role in terms of mediation, and facilitating and mobilizing research. In the case of Senegal, it was working fully with NGOs. It had just completed a national pre-inventory in which NGOs fully participated, and from which creativity might emerge. The Expert spoke of the need to diversify resources to achieve one’s goals, adding that the very future of the Convention was at stake. He was, however, happy to note the growing number of African States ratifying the Convention, which was becoming increasingly universal. He concluded by thanking Ethiopia, following on from Namibia, in honouring Africa as hosts of the Committee, not least because Addis Ababa is the historic capital of Africa, which was shown the previous evening through the demonstration of the different facets of its diverse culture.
17. The delegation of **Algeria** thanked the Secretariat for the presentation of its report and for the work accomplished, which was all the more commendable given the decreasing resources available to implement its objectives. The delegation remarked that there was no mention in the report of extrabudgetary funding. Especially as the Secretary had appealed to ‘think outside of the box’, it sought clarification on how to bring new resources to the Convention and to the Secretariat in the implementation of the Committee’s decisions within the global financing framework to be adopted by UNESCO, in particular the structured financing dialogue.
18. The delegation of **Lebanon** thanked the Secretariat for the clear report on the activities of the Secretariat, as well as the challenges facing the Convention. With regard to the financial aspects of implementation, the delegation sought further information on the reasons behind the shortage of financial resources and whether it was due to a lack of donors or whether the Convention was not adequately visible to attract the necessary attention.
19. The delegation of **Mongolia** congratulated the Chairperson on his appointment and expressed gratitude to Ethiopia for hosting this session. It also congratulated the Secretariat for its excellent work, taking note of the number of activities undertaken by the Secretariat in facilitating access, while appreciating the higher amount in requests for International Assistance, particularly concerning urgent safeguarding activities. The delegation therefore supported the Secretariat in developing its cooperation with category 2 centres and in its capacity-building activities, and encouraged the Secretariat to use new tools in line with the 2030 Agenda. It wished the Committee a fruitful week ahead.
20. The **Chairperson** thanked Mongolia, and before giving the floor to other delegations, invited the Secretary to respond to the questions.
21. The **Secretary** thanked the delegations for their recognition of the Secretariat’s work; their favourable comments were much appreciated. Referring to a couple of themes that had emerged from the comments, the Secretary noted the ongoing concerns regarding the human resources of the Secretariat and the issues of funding. Citing the points made, the Secretary noted that India had raised a question about dialogue within the evaluation process; Cuba had mentioned strategic planning going forward; a number of delegations had mentioned outreach to civil society and other forms of partnership; and Turkey and others had mentioned the importance of maintaining the focus on the Urgent Safeguarding mechanism of the Convention, among other topics. With regard to funding and extrabudgetary funding, the Secretary referred to agenda item 6 on voluntary resources to the Fund whose report specifically referred to the implementation of the International Assistance mechanism, which would be covered under item 7; the Secretary felt that both of these were linked and related to the question from Algeria on the structured financing dialogue that was also ongoing within UNESCO. The Secretary explained that one of the problems concerning the Fund was that assessed contributions to the Convention continued to accumulate over several years and yet the Secretariat was not in a position to implement them owing to the rules and procedures of the Convention of the General Assembly and the Committee on how this should be implemented. At the same time, donors were seeing an increasing under-utilization of the Fund and wondered why further funds were needed when there were unspent funds still available. However, the funds could not be spent by the Secretariat, hence funding continued to be a problem. Nevertheless, an important step was made in the General Assembly to increase the access to that Fund, but a request for International Assistance, once approved by the Bureau, engaged an administrative mechanism following UNESCO’s rules of procedures, which meant that funds then needed to be monitored from the perspective of both finances and intangible cultural heritage. The question was how learnings from these projects could become an operational dimension of the Convention. Thus, the growing fund remained under-utilized but the Secretariat could not decide on its implementation, while the extrabudgetary funds continued to diminish as a result of this misperception. The Secretary referred to a similar conclusion by Turkey that the Committee had yet to resolve this issue, though a solution would eventually be found on how to best implement the Fund while maintaining the importance of engaging in the broader fund-raising approach rather than giving up on it. With regard to the point raised by the Philippines about case studies on sustainable development, and looking at issues of emergencies relating to natural disasters, the Secretary agreed that these were topics that the Convention should be tackling but that the extrabudgetary funds only covered the processing of statutory obligations and the capacity-building programme. Hence the alarm cry and the need for creative partnerships and visibility outreach, which the Secretariat had started to explore for the less than 20 per cent use of the funds and for the ‘other functions of the Committee’ approved by the General Assembly and the Bureau. The Secretary assured the Committee that the other points raised would be dealt with under the other agenda items, such as emergency situations, monitoring frameworks and so on. The Secretary reiterated that the only solution going forward was to be able to use part of the funds granted under International Assistance to enable its implementation, without which the Committee would come unstuck.
22. With the close of the session, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Secretary for some practical announcements.
23. The **Secretary** informed delegates that a press conference would be held during lunchtime with all media invited to attend. New NGOs were invited to a welcome and introduction session. States wishing to hold performances or present audio-visual material following the examination of their files were asked to provide the material to the Secretariat. The host country invited Committee Members and Ministers for lunch.

*[Monday, 28 November 2016, afternoon session]*

1. The **Chairperson** returned to the discussion on agenda item 5, giving the floor to Members still wishing to speak.
2. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** thanked the people and Government of Ethiopia for the excellent welcome, congratulating the Chairperson and assuring him of its support. It also congratulated the Secretariat for the quality of its work, adding that it was well aware of the difficult financial situation it faced in carrying out its growing workload with regard to new thematic issues in addition to those already in place. The delegation also shared the Secretariat’s concerns in searching for creative solutions to increase the ICH Fund, and welcomed the ratification of the Convention by new Member States, one of which [Ghana] shared common borders and elements of intangible cultural heritage, which opened up the prospect of a multilateral nomination.
3. The delegation of **Hungary** congratulated Ethiopia for hosting the session, adding that it was confident of fruitful discussions under the Chairperson’s able leadership. It thanked the Secretariat for the excellent report and wished to emphasize a point also mentioned by Turkey regarding the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices, which it believed played a primordial role in disseminating the values of the Convention and thus deserved much greater visibility.
4. The delegation of **Armenia** spoke of the honour of being a Member of the Committee, having previously been an Observer, adding that it would work in favour of intangible cultural heritage, the Convention and all Member States. The delegation thanked the Secretary and the Secretariat for the work achieved, and congratulated the Chairperson for his dedication to his work throughout the years, which undoubtedly had been rewarded in his appointment. Reiterating earlier comments made by previous speakers on the possibility of discussing nomination files, the delegation agreed that Members should have the possibility to discuss files regardless of whether nominations had received positive or negative recommendations.
5. The delegation of **Mauritius** congratulated the Chairperson, the new Secretary, and the Secretariat for its excellent work, as well as the host country and the Government of Ethiopia for organizing this session and for its warm welcome. As a new Member of the Committee, the delegation sought to fully collaborate with and support the work of the Committee, adding that it had once benefitted from financial assistance in the preparation of its inventories. It was therefore pleased that this assistance had been increased to US$100,000, which would benefit all Member States.
6. The delegation of **Colombia** thanked Ethiopia for its warm welcome, and congratulated the new Secretary and his working team for their excellent work. With regard to the report, the delegation supported the Secretariat’s proposals for the need to strengthen and build capacities, adding that better use of the new training tools and the prioritization of capacity building was particularly important in reinforcing the interrelations between intangible and tangible cultural heritage, the sustainable development goals and the 2030 Agenda, as well as other international commitments which have an impact on intangible cultural heritage. This was thus a good strategy for the role of intangible cultural heritage to be materialized in actual processes of sustainable development.
7. Noting that all 15 Members had spoken, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Secretary to briefly respond to the issues raised.
8. The **Secretary** began by reaffirming the possibility of interventions by Members at any time on any decision and on any file, whether they comprise positive or negative recommendations. Turning to questions directed to the Secretariat, namely those concerning the stresses faced by the Secretariat in terms of human and financial resources, he explained that these issues would be addressed under the relevant agenda item on voluntary contributions, particularly as they related to the structured financing dialogue and fundraising. The Secretary drew attention to this item because of the particularity of International Assistance concerning the assessed contributions to the Fund and the longstanding difficulties in implementing the assessed contribution component of the Fund going forward. The Secretary believed that those difficulties would likely increase because the Secretariat would not be able to deliver the funds to Member States under the current structure. He remarked on comments made by India, Austria, the Philippines, Mongolia and Colombia that emphasized the importance of intangible cultural heritage as a key component of sustainable development and the 2030 Agenda, assuring the Committee that a lot had been achieved already through the adoption of the Operational Directives. The task ahead was now to put it into action, which would be reflected in the plans within the Committee and the preparatory work of the ICH Section for the 38 C/5.
9. Referring to the points raised by Members, the **Secretary** noted that Austria had proposed sharing some case studies in order to further operationalize the new Operational Directives on sustainable development, and this idea was welcomed with the Secretariat and the Section happy to work towards moving that forward. Turkey, Cuba and Colombia raised the point of the audit and evaluation on capacity building as a key window of the Convention’s activities, and the Secretariat would continue in that regard. The Secretary appreciated the recognition of achievements made under some of the recommendations, such as 11 and 12, and looked forward to strengthening South-South cooperation. India raised an issue concerning the nomination cycle, and the Secretary felt that it would be hard to gather more information from the submitting State, though further discussion on this issue would be possible under the appropriate agenda item later in the week. Austria, the Philippines and Mongolia had spoken about expanded cooperation with category 2 centres, and the Secretariat was currently working on renewing and fine-tuning agreements in order to learn from the first phases of these collaborations over the years. The Secretary was pleased to note that Turkey and others had welcomed the new format of the report, and although it was awkward this year, it should simplify the Committee’s work with the overall reporting system in the long term. Cuba mentioned the importance of intangible cultural heritage in emergency situations, which would be further discussed under agenda item 15, while the Philippines and Senegal emphasized the importance of civil society engagement, particularly in the monitoring of elements on the Urgent Safeguarding List, which the Secretary believed was an interesting idea and one that could be discussed under agenda item 9.b.
10. Having responded to all the remarks, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision and, noting an amendment by Turkey, proceeded on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no forthcoming comments, paragraphs 1 and 2 were adopted. He noted an amendment to paragraph 3 by Turkey.
11. The delegation of **Turkey** sought to add a sentence at the end of paragraph 3, after the word ‘ratification’, which would read, ‘encourages the States not party to the Convention and requests the Secretariat to continue its efforts to promote ratification’, adding that in 2015 seven States had ratified the Convention and it hoped other States would do the same.
12. The **Secretary** noted that South Sudan had not been included on the list, as the instrument had only been received during the drafting of the decision.
13. With no objections, the **Chairperson** inserted South Sudan, and ‘seven’ was changed to ‘eight’ States.
14. The delegation of **Turkey** reiterated that the English version could include ‘to ratify’, which would read ‘States not party to the Convention to ratify and requests […]’.
15. With no further comments, the **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 3 adopted as amended. Paragraph 4 was also adopted. Paragraph 5 had an amendment by Turkey.
16. The delegation of **Algeria** had no specific objectionto the amendment but suggested that it be placed as a separate paragraph, as paragraph 5 was presently too cumbersome.
17. The **Chairperson** noted the proposal by Algeria to split the paragraph.
18. The delegation of **Cuba** suggested returning to the proposed new paragraph following the adoption of paragraph 5 in order to clarify its wording.
19. With no objections, the **Chairperson** pronouncedparagraph 5 adopted then turned to the new paragraph 6 as proposed by Turkey and Algeria, which would read, ‘and further notes that the establishment of a follow-up mechanism, pending the creation of the overall results framework for the Convention, would likely result in improved focus and increased efficiency’.
20. The delegation of **Austria** questioned whether‘would likely to result’ was correct.
21. Then delegation of **Algeria** sought to amend the French version for better readability, ‘note en outre qu’en attendant la création d’un cadre global’. The delegation also sought clarification from Turkey about what was implied by ‘the establishment of a follow-up mechanism’.
22. The **Chairperson** asked the Rapporteur to delete ‘to’ from the sentence.
23. The delegation of **Mauritius** agreed.
24. Clarifying the point by Algeria,the delegation of **Turkey** explained that the follow-up mechanism had been mentioned in the Secretariat’s report and was why it could be useful to mention it here, pending the creation of an overall results framework as it would boost the focus and increase the efficiency of the Committee’s work.
25. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** also had the same question, and sought clarification from the Secretariat on the follow-up mechanism they intended to implement.
26. The **Secretary** remarked that the issue concerning the overall results framework for the Convention would be discussed under agenda item 14, adding that the current status would be fully explained at that time.
27. The delegation of **Cuba** explained that its proposal was actually to ask for more information on this issue, adding that if the paragraph referred to a decision that had already been taken then a reference to the specific document would have to be made. However, if it referred to expected results at the time of the 39 C/5, then this should also be referenced. Otherwise, the paragraph would appear to be referring to a new mechanism, in which case it should read, ‘asks the Secretariat to put forward a new follow-up mechanism’. Thus, it was important to find the right wording and perhaps suspend the decision until the discussion of the issue under agenda item 14 when the Committee would have more time to go into greater detail, even though it had no objections to the proposal by Turkey.
28. The delegation of **Lebanon** also sought clarification, not least as capacity building was included in the reports submitted to and examined by the Secretary, such that a follow-up mechanism already existed.
29. The delegation of **Armenia** had a linguistic proposal that would replace ‘would likely result’ with ‘is likely to result’.
30. The **Chairperson** noted the point of order from **Cuba**.
31. The delegation of **Cuba** was finding it hard to follow the debate even though it had asked the Secretariat to clarify this point. It proposed bypassing this paragraph and moving on, especially as there were no proposed changes to the amendment. The delegation asked the Secretary to outline the status of the discussion at this point.
32. The **Secretary** set about explaining the background of the overall results framework for the new Committee Members who perhaps had not been involved in the previous debates. He recalled that the Secretariat had been requested at its ninth or eighth session to develop a separate overall results framework for the Convention as a follow-up to the IOS evaluation, which would be a separate mechanism to the normal results framework within the context of the C/5 or C/4. The Secretariat thus was requested to specifically develop, in consultation with States Parties and the Committee, a results framework for the implementation of the Convention, pending the availability of extrabudgetary funding to host an open-ended intergovernmental working group. The Secretariat’s report had outlined the steps taken between January and June 2016 to honour that request, namely, organizing an expert meeting for a results map, which would be presented later under item 14. The results of that request were not presented under this agenda item, which specifically reported on the activities of the Secretariat, but would be presented under agenda item 14.
33. The delegation of **Turkey** noted that this was not a new mechanism, and following the Secretary’s explanation, proposed moving this issue to agenda item 14.
34. The delegation of **Algeria** thanked Turkey for its flexibility, adding that it was indeed important to keep this point. However, it sought clarification from the Secretariat as to whether the mechanism had been created or not. If that was the case, the Committee could amend the paragraph under agenda item 14.
35. The **Secretary** explained that the framework had not yet been prepared, but that he would present the work undertaken so far under item 14.
36. The **Chairperson** noted that Turkey had withdrawn its amendment.
37. The delegation of **Turkey** agreed, but would wish to see it amended under item 14.
38. The **Chairperson** confirmed the withdrawal of Turkey’s amendment, which would be re-opened under item 14. With no objections, the Chairperson proceeded to paragraph 6. With no further comments or amendments, paragraph 6 was adopted. A grammatical revision was noted in the French version. He then turned to paragraph 7.
39. The delegation of **Cuba** did notobject to paragraph 7 but asked that the Committee be more careful in its use of language in decisions, noting that the wording employed suggested a reproach (i.e. ‘regrets’), and could therefore be more positive. It proposed to ‘reinforce’ the implementation of the mechanism, which was considered a more positive and less negative approach.
40. The **Chairperson** took note of the sharp contrast in the paragraph, which started with ‘regrets’ and ended with ‘encourages’.
41. The delegation of **Algeria** understood that States could be ‘encouraged’, but proposed ‘notes’ instead of ‘regrets’, as it was a finding based on fact.
42. The delegation of **Cuba** supported Algeria’s proposal.
43. The delegation of **India** was about to propose ‘recognize’, but agreed with Algeria.
44. With no further objections,the **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 7 adopted. He then turned to paragraph 8 and an amendment by Turkey [underlined], which read, ‘to explore creative solutions to resolve the potential administrative and human resource bottlenecks likely to come up in the implementation… ’.
45. The delegation of **Cuba** expressed concern about the wording of paragraph 7, even though it understood that it was asking the Secretariat to explore creative solutions to mitigate the financial situation. The delegation did not intend to amend the paragraph, noting that this issue was mentioned in the report. However, it noted that the Committee should recall the Rules of Procedure and Operational Directives i.e. these proposals came from the Auditor’s Report, which had not been approved by the General Assembly. The delegation remarked that many bodies, following reports such as these, had actually tried to cut down on meetings to reduce costs, but at the same time it was very important that the Committee maintained its intergovernmental status and ensured that opportunities for discussions continued so that the Convention could conduct its business under the best possible conditions. It was fully aware of the pressure on the Secretariat, which it valued. However, even at this time of crisis, economic and financial difficulties should not override the basic tenets of UNESCO by reducing work and meetings. Despite its concern, the delegation was fully confident in the work carried out by the Secretariat; nevertheless, it wished to maintain the intergovernmental status of the Committee and do everything possible to ensure that the work was carried out under the best possible conditions.
46. The delegation of **Algeria** sought a clarification on the meaning behind ‘creative solutions’; it questioned whether this referred to fundraising or absorptive capacity, as they were not the same. It asked whether the Secretariat was proposing, together with the States Parties, finding solutions so as to be able to use the funds available today for International Assistance, i.e. even though funds were available, the Secretariat was unable to utilize them in the most appropriate way.
47. The delegation of **Turkey** understood from the paragraphthat the Secretariat was likely to face human resource and administrative bottlenecks in the future and it was thus being asked to prepare and present some recommendations on how to solve these. It was thus recommended that the Secretariat present background documentation and proposals on how to solve such bottlenecks, which would then be submitted to the Committee for consideration. The delegation asked the Secretary for assurance that this would not indeed hamper decision-making by the Committee, and that it would be the Committee making the decision based on recommendations from the Secretariat.
48. Responding to the point raised by Algeria, the **Secretary** explainedthat theparagraph referredto the ability to implement the assessed contributions to the Fund for the use of International Assistance, and to look for solutions that would allow the Secretariat to effectively deliver International Assistance to the requesting States Parties. He further explained that this had been outlined, in the report in that the Secretariat could not foresee the outcome of opening up access to funds up to US$100,000 and thus sought to make it easier for States Parties to access the Fund, and for the Secretariat to deliver funds, given the state of human resources. The problem lay in the fact that upon approval, requests had to go through an administrative and substantive review through the issuing of contracts, monitoring, follow-up and so on, which involved a large amount of work. Given the current human resources situation at UNESCO, the Secretary simply wished to flag the concern, as there were no readily available solutions, except for a solution whereby part of the International Assistance would be used to enable the Secretariat to deliver assistance.
49. In light of the explanation, the delegationof **Algeria** wished topropose an amendment to paragraph 8, on the understanding that this referred to *existing* financial resources that should be explicitly mentioned. The amendment by Turkey could thus be deleted, as the difficulties were current and not at any given time in the future. Hence, references such as ‘to come up’ should be deleted, and the following sentence could be inserted: ‘for a better use of existing financial resources’.
50. The **Chairperson** asked Algeria to be more forspecific.
51. The delegation of **Algeria** explained that theaddition of ‘for a better use of existing financial resources’ was in response to the explanation given by the Secretary, i.e. it referred to existing funds that were currently subject to bottlenecks in disbursement due to the lack of human resources to deliver the funds. With regard to the amendments by Turkey, the delegation noted the reference to ‘potential’ difficulties when in fact it should refer to ‘actual’ difficulties, i.e. not related to the future. Hence its proposal to delete the two amendments by Turkey.
52. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** also sought clarification from the Secretary as to the precise proposal requested by the Secretariat in relation to the use of the funds, noting that the Secretariat wished to designate some of those funds to cover administrative tasks and human resources. However, the question was whether the Committee could authorize such use or whether it was a decision for the General Assembly.
53. The **Chairperson** concurred thatamoredetailed explanation was required.
54. The delegation of **Turkey** also sought greaterclarification from the Secretariat, as it understood from the report that there were no human resource or administrative bottlenecks at the *present* time because there were currently only six requests for International Assistance but that this could arise in the future, hence its proposal based on the ‘potential’ of difficulties ‘likely to come up’. If that were the case, it wished to retain its amendments.
55. The delegation of **Algeria** had no objections to the amendment, adding that the correct wording, whether the difficulties were current or at some time in the future, depended on the Secretary’s clarification.
56. The **Secretary** explainedthat the problem was already being experienced and that it was only going to get worse, adding that the Fund had not appeared to be functioning correctly over the last few years. The accumulation of funds and the implementation rate were low because the requests had been low, but the question was whether the delivery of those requests had been optimal, and although the situation had improved the answer was likely to be ‘no’. The Secretary further explained that the report covered a period of only six months, until June 2016, which was only two months after the funding ceiling had been raised. Thus, the report did not cover the period from 2016 to the present, by which time the Secretariat had received several more International Assistance requests. Hence, the difficulties already existed even though that was not reflected in the reporting period.
57. The **Chairperson** turned to Turkey, asking if it wished to withdraw its amendment.
58. The delegation of **Turkey** was satisfied with theclarification although this was not clear from the report, which had stated that only six requests had been received with no apparent processing difficulties. However, it accepted that if this trend were to continue into the future then this would cause a problem.
59. The **Chairperson** remarked thatthe minimal number of requests did not change the fact that every year there was an accumulation of funds, which currently stood at around US$9 million, and that the Secretariat was not able to respond to potential requests that the Committee was encouraging.
60. The delegation of **India** understood from the clarification that bottlenecks currently existed and could potentially increase in the coming years. It therefore proposed complementing the existing amendment to reflect both situations, which would read, ‘invites the Secretariat to explore creative solutions to resolve the present and the potential administrative and human resource bottlenecks likely to come up in the implementation…’.
61. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** remarked that it was still waiting for an answer to its question.
62. The **Secretary** thanked Côte d'Ivoire for its question and, having looked into the Committee's provisions and Operational Directives, was unfortunately unable to provide a clear answer at this time. The General Assembly does decide on the allocation and use of the resources of the Fund, but there was no clarity as to *how* they could be used on a specific line-by-line basis. The Secretariat would continue to consult the regulations, though it could confirm that the General Assembly decided on the budgetary envelope of the Fund dedicated to International Assistance, which amounted to 59% [in the last financial cycle]. The question was to understand the scope of ‘international assistance’ and whether it encompassed everything, including how to facilitate the delivery of the funds, which was the crux of the problem.
63. The delegationof **Côte d’Ivoire** agreed thatbecause of this ambiguity, the Committee should continue to study the issue and return to it later.
64. The **Chairperson** noted a pointoforder from Palestine.
65. In response to the explanation, the delegation of **Palestine** remarked thatin such instances the Committee required legal advice, while noting the absence of the Legal Advisor on the podium.
66. The **Secretary** explained thattheLegal Advisory Services had informed the Secretariat that they did not have the resources to attend Committee meetings outside Paris, but that they were ready to answer any questions by phone, as presented to the Executive Board at its last session.
67. The delegation of **Palestine** had understood that theLegal Advisor would be present and available when required and not by phone only.
68. The delegation of **Austria** sought anotherclarification with regard to how the cost recovery policy was applied in International Assistance requests and the ICH Fund compared to voluntary contributions.
69. The **Secretariat** explained that there was acost recovery policy on the implementation of the Fund but that the cost recovery only applied *after* the implementation of the Fund, hence the vicious cycle. The more the Secretariat was able to implement, the more it could recover, but staff were needed to implement it in the first instance to enable recovery afterwards. The Secretary reminded the Committee that the idea of cost recovery was to recover costs from Regular Programme funded staff who work on non-regular programme funds; however, the Secretariat did not have the Regular Programme staff to work on recovering those costs.
70. The delegation of **Algeria** could accept the amendment with a minor language correction in the French version. Otherwise, paragraph 8 was balanced and met the expectations of the Secretariat, while allowing the Committee to identify with the points raised in the debate.
71. The **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of paragraph 8, as amended, which was duly adopted. With no comments or objections concerning paragraphs 9, 10 and 11, they were duly adopted. The Chairperson noted an amendment to paragraph 12.
72. The delegation of **Austria** agreed that it was very important to have networks and partnerships in cooperation with UNESCO Chairs and civil society, among others. In that vein, it wished to include National Commissions for UNESCO, thereby using their experiences but also with regard to using the synergies of the different Conventions.
73. The delegation of **Turkey** thanked the Secretariat for its initiative on UNESCO Chairs, which was deemed important for the visibility of ICH and the Convention in the university system, adding that UNESCO Chairs and the UNITWIN[[3]](#footnote-4) network could not be separated. The addition of the National Commissions for UNESCO should thus be inserted after the mention of UNITWIN.
74. The delegation of **Cuba** firmly supported the proposal by Austria in that National Commissions for UNESCO served as liaison between States Parties and UNESCO. In addition, it was explicit in the report in its recommendations and internal control that the field offices of UNESCO also played a fundamental role in promoting and implementing the Convention.
75. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** agreed thatinformation-sharing and outreach activities were very important, for which all the institutions played an important role. In this regard, the delegation suggested placing UNESCO Chairs, UNITWIN, the National Commissions, UNESCO category 2 institutes, and the other institutions under ‘UNESCO-related institutes’ or institutions.
76. The **Chairperson** asked whethercategory 2 centres should be cited, or all UNESCO institutions in a wider domain.
77. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** explained thatit was presentinga simpler way of accommodating all the wishes of the States Parties in including every UNESCO-related institute. For instance, UNESCO schools also played a very important role in information-sharing and outreach.
78. The delegation of **Hungary** supported Turkey in the inclusion of the UNITWIN Network through personal experiences in Hungary, but also UNESCO schools. Thus, all educational programmes connected with ICH were important.
79. The **Chairperson** returned to the proposalby the Republic of Korea to list all the potential institutions as UNESCO-related institutions and partners, which would encompass all the institutions and bodies cited.
80. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** concurred with the proposal.
81. The delegation of **Turkey** noted that paragraph 11 referred to category 2 centres working on ICH at UNESCO. With regard to paragraph 12, UNESCO also had a programme of ‘UNESCO Chairs and UNITWIN Networks’, which should be taken together under a single name.
82. The delegation of **Austria** agreed with Turkey that UNESCO-related institutions covered National Commissions for UNESCO. However, other entities, particularly civil society and educational institutions, should be kept separately. Thus, ‘UNESCO-related institutions’ should not encompass all the entities.
83. The **Chairperson** solicited help fromAustria to rewrite the amendment.
84. From the remarks, the **Secretary** understood that the UNESCO Chairs and the UNITWIN Network constituted a programme rather than an institution. However, there were also institutions such as the National Commissions and category 2 centres. The proposal by the Republic of Korea was to group these entities under UNESCO-affiliated or UNESCO-related institutions, while Austria wished to maintain educational institutions, civil society and others, which may or may not be UNESCO institutions. The Secretary suggested that the solution might be to recognize the specific programmes of UNESCO Chairs and the UNITWIN Network, which are programmes and not institutions, and reference all UNESCO-related institutions, as well as educational institutions, civil society and others, which are non-UNESCO programmes or institutions. The amendment proposed could thus read, ‘Further invites the Secretariat to expand the outreach and visibility of its activities by consolidating networks and partnerships, such as cooperation with UNESCO Chairs and the UNITWIN Networks, UNESCO-related institutions, educational institutions, civil society and others’.
85. The **Chairperson** suggestedre-arranging the paragraph and adding ‘as well as’.
86. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** agreed to the formula proposed.
87. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** proposed, ‘Further invites the Secretariat to expand the outreach and visibility of its activities by consolidating networks and institutions affiliated with UNESCO, educational institutions and civil society’. In this way, it would regroup all the UNESCO-related institutions.
88. The delegation of **Cuba** understood the concerns of the delegations that wished to have UNESCO Chairs singled out as well as UNITWIN Networks. In the framework of the Convention, UNESCO Chairs were indeed working on ICH, in Latin America for example. Moreover, it was noted that paragraph 12 underlined networks and civil society, as well as National Commissions and UNESCO-related institutions, which were all considered essential to the visibility of the Convention and were thus not mutually exclusive, thus UNESCO Chairs and UNITWIN Networks should be included as well.
89. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** believed thatthere was a risk ofomitting institutions when compiling a list of UNESCO networks and institutions, hence the rationale of having a global term that encompassed all the entities without any risk of omission.
90. The **Chairperson** returned to theoriginal proposal by the Republic of Korea to make the paragraph as generic as possible, while addressing all the potential target institutions.
91. The delegation of **Turkey** explained thatthere were some important roles in the university system that promoted the research, promotion and transmission of ICH from generation to generation, and which were thus hugely important. The UNESCO Chairs and UNITWIN Networks comprised about 700 universities working on UNESCO programmes. There were now almost ten UNESCO Chairs working on ICH. Paragraph 11 discussed the role of category 2 centres, but the role of UNITWIN and UNESCO Chairs should also be highlighted, as acknowledged by the Committee in 2015. It therefore wished to maintain paragraph 12 with the addition of the UNITWIN Networks.
92. The delegation of **Palestine** noted thatthe Committee was in agreement with the rationale of the paragraph, and proposed ‘with UNESCO-related programmes and institutions’ because UNITWIN is a programme and not an institution, and it also covered all the entities. Alternatively, the paragraph could mention every entity, separated by a colon, to address everyone’s concerns.
93. Noting the time spent, the delegation of **Cyprus** supported Palestine’s proposal, though it did not agree with the use of colons in case an entity was inadvertently omitted.
94. The delegation of **Lebanon** supportedthe proposal by Palestine and Cyprus.
95. With no further comments, the **Chairperson** adopted paragraph 12 as amended. He then turned to the decision as a whole.
96. The delegation of **Cuba** had no objection to the adoption of the draft decision, but requested that in future sessions the Secretariat provide a more complete background and documentation on all the efforts and endeavours carried out as part of the framework with regard to budgeting and looking ahead to the next 39 C/5. The delegation believed that all of the bodies involved could provide more information to inform the Committee of their day-to-day work, adding that it was sure the Secretariat would take on board this recommendation in its next report.
97. The **Secretary** understood thatCuba was referring to the next agenda item dealing with voluntary and supplementary contributions, adding that the Secretariat was fully recognizant of the request.
98. Given the importance of the issue, the delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** proposed that the use of the funds be included as an agenda item at the next General Assembly.
99. The **Secretary** confirmed that thiswas indeed the case, and continued to be so.
100. With no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision 11.COM 5 adopted**. Before moving to the next agenda item 6, the Chairperson announced that the Minister of Cultural Renaissance of Arts and Social Modernization of Niger wished to address the Committee.
101. On behalf of Niger, the **Minister of Cultural Renaissance of Arts and Social Modernization of Niger** expressed gratitude to the delegates, the people of Ethiopia and UNESCO for organizing this session. The Minister conveyed greetings from the President of the Republic and the Government of Niger, and congratulated the Members of the Committee and other advisory bodies for their excellent work in safeguarding the intangible heritage of humanity. In this regard, Niger worked tirelessly to make a positive contribution to the implementation of the 2003 Convention, as evidenced by the inclusion of two elements on the Representative List, which included ‘Practices and expressions of joking relationships in Niger’, an instrument of prevention and resolution of social conflicts, and ‘Practices and knowledge linked to the Imzad of the Tuareg communities of Algeria, Mali and Niger’, which was also an expression of the cultural diversity and connection that united the Sahel States. Aware of the contribution of intangible cultural heritage to development, the Government of Niger was implementing a programme of cultural renaissance, principally based on the promotion of traditions and other cultural values, which in turn contribute to education and citizenship; a new dynamic was reflected in the mission of the Ministry of Cultural Renaissance, Arts and Social Modernization. The Minister spoke of the country’s openness to any cooperation and partnership to enhance cultural heritage, but also to counter the scourge of Boko Haram, which had brought devastating conflict to Niger, Nigeria, Cameroon and Chad. Unfortunately, lives were being lost, and ICH was being threatened and often destroyed. For this reason, Niger envisaged the establishment of a programme for the protection and preservation of cultural heritage, as foreseen in the national policy on culture and its Article 18, to implement administrative, financial and technical measures to preserve cultural heritage, especially when it was endangered. The Minister would soon contact the Secretariat about its programme to protect and safeguard cultural heritage in the north of the country at the border with Mali, which was currently being finalized. The Minister congratulated UNESCO once again for its many efforts to increase the visibility of culture throughout the world.

**ITEM 6 OF THE AGENDA:**

**VOLUNTARY SUPPLEMENTARY CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE FUND**

**Document** [*ITH/16/11.COM/6 Rev.*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-6-Rev.-EN.docx)

**Decision** *11.COM 6*

1. Noting that the session was behind schedule, the **Chairperson** urgedthe Committee to move swiftlyandheturned to agenda item 6. He noted that this was closely linked to all other business and, in particular, to the implementation of activities that could not be supported by UNESCO’s Regular Budget, which had been experiencing difficult times for several years. Moreover, it was the General Assembly’s prerogative to approve a biennial plan for the use of the resources of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund. However, this plan only applied to assessed contributions by States Parties under Article 26 of the Convention. For voluntary supplementary contributions to the Fund, it was the Committee’s responsibility to approve any specific projects to be supported by them. The Chairperson noted that there were unfortunately not many offers or contributions awaiting the Committee’s approval.
2. The **Secretary** turned to the report on voluntary supplementary contributions to the ICH Fund, noting that the corresponding document had been revised, and now had the code ITH/16/11.COM/6 Rev. The Secretary drew the Committee’s attention to two revisions to this document as a result of i) a voluntary supplementary contribution from the Netherlands that was received on 31 October (the deadline for publishing the documents of the present session online), and ii) Viet Nam’s inability to pay the voluntary contribution accepted by the Committee in 2013 [to support the organization of an expert meeting on ICH and climate change]. The Secretary explained that document 6 outlined the voluntary contributions to the ICH Fund that were earmarked for specific purposes. It was noted that at its ninth session, the Committee had approved the Concept Note for the 2014–2017 Complementary Additional Programme (CAP) entitled ‘Strengthening capacities to safeguard intangible cultural heritage for sustainable development’; reference was made to Decision 9.COM 7, which was developed by the Secretariat for the capacity‑building strategy. At the time in 2014, the CAP was UNESCO’s main tool for programming extrabudgetary activities in that it directly underpinned the work of the C/5, was intended to act as a vehicle for dialogue with donors, and was designed to bolster the alignment between extrabudgetary and regular programme resources. The Committee, as the Convention’s Governing Body deciding on specific projects to be funded by the ICH Fund, considered that it could endorse this programmatic framework to ensure that the work under the Convention was aligned with UNESCO’s C/5 and C/4, and thus with the priorities of the General Conference. According to Decision 9.COM 7, any future voluntary supplementary contributions received between two Committee sessions to support capacity-building activities and within the scope of that programme were considered accepted by the Committee. The Secretariat was thereby authorized to make immediate use of such contributions without having to wait for the Committee’s approval. Since its last session, the ICH Fund had received two contributions within the scope laid out in the CAP, namely: i) a contribution of US$131,868 from the Government of Catalonia, Spain, to further support a multi-year capacity-building programme in Mauritania, Morocco and Tunisia (the Committee had taken note of this commitment at its last session, but the contribution had since been paid); and ii) a contribution of US$110,375 from the Government of the Netherlands to build on the results of the capacity-building programme implemented in Suriname and the Dutch Caribbean Islands since 2014 (this was the Netherlands’ third contribution to this programme).
3. The **Secretary** then turned to another voluntary supplementary contribution that was proposed outside the capacity-building programme and which therefore required the Committee’sapproval under paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft decision: a contribution of US$300,000 from the Cultural Heritage Administration of the Republic of Korea, assigned to help improve the periodic reporting mechanism under the Convention, which could not be considered to be functioning at this stage (as outlined in Annex 1ofdocument 6). Annex 2 responded to the Committee’s request to be informed of any voluntary support given to the Convention, whether channeled or not through the ICH Fund. It therefore presented the list of different supports to the Convention since the last session of the Committee, including: i) earmarked contributions to the ICH Fund as accepted by the Committee; ii) voluntary contributions to the sub-fund for enhancing the human capacities of the Secretariat, established by the General Assembly; iii) new projects approved under established Funds-in-Trust; and iv) loans and secondments of personnel. A particular circumstance reported in the working document and the draft decision concerned the non-payment of two earmarked contributions approved by the Committee. In both cases, the Secretariat had been formally informed of the difficulties encountered by Brazil and Viet Nam to honour their previous offers (as reflected in paragraphs 7 and 8 of the draft decision). Finally, the Committee was invited to take note that the two open-ended intergovernmental working groups it decided to organize on developing an overall results framework for the Convention and on the procedure of the transfer of an element from one List to the other and the removal of an element from a List had not yet received the extrabudgetary support on which they depend (paragraph 9 of the draft decision). The Secretary was, however, pleased to inform the Committee that the Secretariat had received a written intent from the Ministry of Culture of the People’s Republic of China to support the first of the two open-ended intergovernmental working groups relating to the results framework, and negotiations were well underway to organize it in Chengdu in early June 2017 (to be addressed under agenda item 14).
4. The **Secretary** then made reference to two graphs (presented on the screen) from the working document on the evolution of the resources mobilized in support of the capacity-building programme, as well as the human resources of the Secretariat. The graphs showed collected data for the last three biennia and the current biennium, and were self-explanatory in that both graphs reflected a clear and alarming decline in support across all modalities, including the Fund. It was noted that the graph represented resources mobilized and not expenditures incurred. Concerning the capacity-building programme, only 12% of the target that had been set had been reached so far, which made it highly improbable that the US$6 million target fixed for the 2014–2017 quadrennium would be reached. The Secretary remarked that the situation was no better regarding the support to the human resources of the Secretariat which, in fact, had never reached the annual target of US$1.1 million set by the General Assembly, and had never been at such a low level since the establishment of the sub-fund in 2010. The figures were also important to clear up a persistent misunderstanding, as previously discussed, concerning the positive balance of the Fund (US$10 million as of 30 June 2016). The Secretary drew the Committee’s attention to the fact that this positive balance *only* concerned assessed contributions and that these contributions were implemented in accordance with the plan for the use of the resources of the Fund approved by the General Assembly. The Secretary noted that 80% of the resources *depend* on requests made by States Parties: i) 64.5% for International Assistance requests submitted by States Parties; ii) 15.5% for the participation in Committee sessions of experts in ICH representing developing States, Members of the Committee, States Parties, accredited NGOs from developing countries, as well as for covering the cost of services provided by the Evaluation Body. In other words, the Secretariat was not in a position to initiate that part of the Fund, which had consequently been increasing over the years. To reiterate, the assessed contributions were ever-increasing, giving the impression that there were ample funds for programmes, but this was not in fact the case as disbursement could *only* occur at the request of States Parties. At the same time, the extrabudgetary funding mechanism had been in constant decline, such that the Secretariat would no longer be able to deliver the capacity-building services that had been ongoing. The Secretary then referred to Statement I of the Financial Report on page 6 of [information document 5](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-INF.5-EN.docx) (shown on the screen) in which the two columns in the middle showed the voluntary contributions to the Fund between 1 January and 30 June 2016. The Secretary noted a shortfall of income over expenditure of US$435,568.36 of the Fund dedicated to specific activities approved by the Committee, as well as a shortfall of income over expenditure of US$87,296.99 in the sub-fund for enhancing the human capacities of the Secretariat. Accordingly, the Secretary clarified that, although the Fund still showed positive balances as at 30 June 2016 (US$911,921 for earmarked funds and US$301,892 for the sub-fund), there was a shortfall of income over expenditures, meaning that, over the reporting period (1 January to 30 June 2016), the Secretariat was spending sums received *before* 1 January 2016, but the Fund was *not* being replenished. The Secretariat was in a position in which it had to spend more money to maintain the capacity-building programme than it was receiving, which was obviously unsustainable and an alarm bell for the capacity-building programme.
5. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for his clear explanation and expressed his personal thanks to the donors. He welcomed the new support, but found the situation as presented extremely worrying, adding that it deserved the attention of both the Committee and all States Parties. He then gave the floor to the Republic of Korea to present its generous offer.
6. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** thanked the Secretary for his excellent presentation, and for clarifying the financial situation of the ICH programme, particularly the state of voluntary contributions. The delegation concurred that periodic reporting was not only the obligation of States Parties, but it was also an effective tool for sharing best safeguarding practices. For this reason, the Republic of Korea, as a Member of the Committee, had made continuous and concerted efforts to support the improvement in report submissions for the last three years. In this context, it was pleased to announce that it was offering a voluntary financial contribution of US$300,000 to establish a mechanism to facilitate the submission process. It was hoped that the gesture of support would contribute to the concerted effort of fellow States and the Secretariat in tackling this issue of high priority and importance. To this end, the Republic of Korea would continue to closely cooperate with the Secretariat in the future.
7. The **Chairperson** thanked the Republic of Korea, adding that the new prospects enabled by this generous contribution would no doubt be enthusiastically received, and he opened the floor to the other donor countries.
8. The delegation of **Turkey** thanked the Secretariat for the brief and clear report. It took note of the limitations of the Regular Programme budget and the limited number of regular staff in the Section as a result of UNESCO’s financial situation, as well as the declining trend of voluntary contributions to the global capacity-building programme and to the sub-fund of the ICH Fund, which were all of great concern. The delegation commended the Republic of Korea for its timely voluntary contribution pledge to address one of the core challenges faced by the Convention: the perennial problem of overdue periodic reports by States, as which had hampered the overall monitoring of the Convention.
9. The delegation of **Spain** took the opportunity to thank Ethiopia for its wonderful hospitality and for hosting the session, adding that there were many different ways of approaching the Convention, which was vitally important for Spain. One such way would be to involve those regions such as Catalonia that were keen to play a role in the Convention, as it believed that it was very important to seek out partners both at national and regional levels to ensure that the goals of the Convention could be fully met.
10. The delegation of **India** shared the concern expressed by the Secretariat on the declining extrabudgetary contributions to the ICH Fund for capacity-building programmes, as well as to the sub-fund for the human resources of the Secretariat. It thanked the Member States that had provided additional voluntary contributions to supplement funds, and in this regard it welcomed the contribution by the Republic of Korea to help build mechanisms to encourage the submission of periodic reports. The periodic reports, some of which had been overdue for a long time, were the only means under the Convention to oversee the implementation of the Convention at national level. It therefore requested that this contribution be accepted at the earliest.
11. The delegation of the **Philippines** commended the financial support offered by the Republic of Korea to improve the periodic reporting mechanism of the Convention. It believed that periodic reports could be maximized as valuable information tools to evaluate the Convention’s impact on the ground. It also hoped that additional voluntary funds from donors could be channeled for capacity-building.
12. The delegation of the **Netherlands** thanked the Ethiopian Government for the warm welcome, and reiterated the importance of the global capacity-building programme and UNESCO’s efforts in that respect, also for the future. The delegation spoke of the very good results seen in the Caribbean region thanks to the capacity-building programme implemented by UNESCO, noting the creativity invested in the training programmes and in the new materials for making inventories and safeguarding plans for ICH in the region. In addition, it highlighted the creativity of the UNESCO facilitators, stressing that the capacity-building process was inspirational. The delegation hoped that all States Parties would consider the importance of continuing the global capacity-building programme, which was so crucial for the implementation of the Convention at all levels, to obtain lasting results. Working together on capacity-building had already resulted in a platform of sustainable cooperation on ICH in the Dutch Caribbean Islands and Suriname in which UNESCO National Commissions and NGOs were working closely together. It was therefore important that UNESCO report on the lessons learned and provide best practices from the programme so that everyone could learn from these results. The delegation concluded by thanking the Secretariat for all the work achieved.
13. Noting the good news, the **Chairperson** nevertheless remarked that the Secretary’s presentation must draw the Committee’s attention to the largely inadequate mobilization of resources. He hoped that together, creative solutions could be found to continue the efforts of both the countries and the Secretariat to implement the Convention and realize its full potential. The Chairperson expressed his gratitude to those who had supported the Convention and its Secretariat since the last session, namely, Azerbaijan, Belgium (Flanders), China, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain (Government of Catalonia) and the United Arab Emirates (Abu Dhabi Tourism & Culture Authority and Hamdan Bin Mohammed Heritage Centre), and the Norwegian Centre for Traditional Music and Dance. With no further interventions, the Chairperson proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. There were no comments or amendments to paragraphs 1-8, and a small amendment proposed by the Chairperson in paragraph 9 to acknowledge China’s forthcoming support [an insertion at the end of the paragraph which read, ‘while welcoming the expressed intent of the People’s Republic of China to fund and host the former’], which were duly adopted. Paragraphs 10–12 were also adopted. Turning to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision 11.COM 6 adopted**.

**ITEM 7 OF THE AGENDA:**

**FOLLOW-UP TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXTERNAL AUDITOR’S ‘REPORT ON THE GOVERNANCE OF UNESCO AND DEPENDANT FUNDS, PROGRAMMES AND ENTITIES’ (DOCUMENT 38C/23)**

**Document** [*ITH/16/11.COM/7*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-7-EN.docx)

**Decision** 11.COM 7

1. The **Chairperson** then proceeded with agenda item 7, included on the agenda pursuant to 38 C/Resolution 101 by the General Conference of UNESCO inviting all intergovernmental programmes, committees and organs of the Conventions to inscribe, in 2016 if feasible, an item on their agenda concerning the follow-up to the recommendations of the External Auditor’s report with the aim of improving their governance. The Chairperson informed the Committee that he had received a letter from the President of the General Conference of UNESCO dated 6 April 2016 to this effect. By the same resolution, the General Conference also established an open-ended working group to further discuss the recommendations of the audit report. He explained that the follow-up letter from the President of the General Conference dated 17 October 2016 confirmed that the Committee’s report on its debates under this item would feed into the work of the Working Group on the Governance, Procedure and Working Methods of the Organization, and particularly its Sub-Group 2 on the governance of the intergovernmental programmes, committees and organs, to be examined in early 2017. The results and proposals of the current debate would thus be presented to the Chairperson of this open-ended working group. The Committee was requested to submit its report by 5 December 2016. The Chairperson gave the floor to the Secretary to provide some more information on this item.
2. The **Secretary** further confirmed that this item was included on the Committee’s agenda at the request of the General Conference of UNESCO, and namely its 38 C/Resolution 101. It was noted that this was not the first time the Committee had been asked to examine issues relating to governance. In fact, as mentioned in document 7, a number of recommendations by the External Auditor in document 38 C/23 had already been examined by the Committee, namely at its eighth, ninth and tenth sessions, and by the General Assembly at its fifth session when examining: i) the evaluation of UNESCO's Standard-setting Work of the Culture Sector, Part I: 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage completed by UNESCO’s IOS in 2013; and ii) the audit of the working methods of all six culture Conventions, assessing the adequacy and efficiency of the working methods of UNESCO’s standard-setting work in the Culture Sector, also completed by IOS in 2013. The annex to document 7 summarized those recommendations that are of direct relevance to the governing organs of the 2003 Convention and the decisions or actions taken, if any.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for the useful information, opening the floor for comment.
4. The delegation of **Austria** remarked that both the Committee and the General Assembly had confirmed the need to make use of the synergies and coherence of the culture Conventions through its decisions. For instance, the agenda had been shortened so as to delegate more authority to the Bureau, and new working methods had been adopted. The delegation believed that this had contributed to thorough and efficient work, which it welcomed. It encouraged the Secretariat to proactively continue to propose measures to reduce the costs of governance, to ensure that delegates elected to the Committee were well-qualified and prepared for the meetings, to follow up on proposals to improve coherence in the procedures of the different organs, and to share good practices of governance of the different Conventions, especially when prioritizing work under budgetary restraints. As discussed by the Executive Board and the General Conference, the delegation also fully subscribed to the External Auditor’s critical analysis of UNESCO’s governance organs, though some recommendations did not seem to reflect the political realities of an intergovernmental organization. It also did not seem realistic to further discuss changing the periodicity of meetings of the different Conventions or to elect the same Member States in all governance bodies of UNESCO Conventions. For instance, in the case of the 2003 Convention, the proposal to make Committee meetings biannual and General Assembly meetings quadrennial would result in a serious delay in developments. That said, it supported any measure that would help focus discussions at governance meetings, such as avoiding political statements, delegating minor decisions, and especially facilitating informal negotiations and consensus on difficult decisions ahead of meetings. One other minor consideration might be to facilitate the preparation of the work of this Committee. The Secretariat had provided all the documents on time on 31 October, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, or four weeks ahead of the meeting, and since it could be assumed that some of the documents had been finalized prior to this date, it would probably have been helpful to make them available online as soon as they were ready so that Committee Members could already start their preparations.
5. The delegation of **Cuba** thanked the Secretariat for its explanations regarding the complex process faced by UNESCO, a subject debated throughout all UNESCO’s bodies, while noting that the recommendation to present a report to the next session of the General Conference was tentative and notcompulsory. It was not a requirement because it was expressed as a recommendation. The delegation thanked the Secretariat for the information provided, noting that the 2003 Convention had undertaken more revisions of its working methods than other UNESCO bodies, which appeared to have remained unchanged for 40 years. However, this ongoing reform of governance of the Operational Directives made it possible for the Committee to continuously provide thoughts and improvements on governance and the working methods for greater efficiency and efficacy. The delegation therefore reiterated its thanks to the Secretariat for all its work over the last few years, even before the General Conference adopted 38 C/Resolution 101 that in paragraph 5 asked the different Convention bodies to include it as an agenda item. It believed that this was a process that required continuous thought. The Committee is an example of how to improve its functioning and practice, and it cannot confine itself to the implementation of recommendations that have not been approved by the UNESCO General Conference or its Executive Board. The delegation remarked that the Secretariat had clearly stated, as opposed to other UNESCO bodies, that only three of the fifteen recommendations had been accepted and the idea of combining all the Conventions in a single meeting would not really meet its objective, even though continued thought was required on the Committee’s working methods, mechanisms and consultative and subsidiary bodies, such as the Evaluation Body. Moreover, the debate on UNESCO and governance was about more than just the number of meetings to be held or the number of reports to be published. It was true that UNESCO’s financial situation was very complex and efforts had to be made to improve efficiency and efficacy, which should be referred back to the General Assembly for a wider debate over concerns relating to working methods. The Evaluation Body and the mechanisms for examining the nominations, and the hierarchical relations between the General Assembly and the Committee was another issue. The delegation remarked that this Committee compared very favourably to other UNESCO bodies as it worked with more synergies. Nevertheless, the Committee had to consider whether the Evaluation Body adopted in 2014 was functioning as had been hoped, and really preserved its intergovernmental nature. This issue had to be brought before the General Assembly so that – through an open-ended consultation process with all the States Parties – greater thought could be given to how the Convention should be managed for greater efficacy, as was the case in other bodies.
6. The delegation of **Turkey** thanked the Secretariat for the working document and the Annex, which facilitated understanding of the current situation of the Convention regarding the recommendations of the External Auditor. While considerable progress had been made in implementing some of the recommendations, the delegation understood that the implementation of certain recommendations, particularly recommendation 3 was not possible for practical reasons as the functions and purposes of UNESCO’s culture Conventions differed, with varying numbers of States Parties, making it impossible to merge governing bodies. Additionally, some of the recommendations seemed unfeasible due to previous Committee decisions, which only showed how the Committee and its Members held different views from the External Auditor’s reports on certain aspects. The delegation believed that the Committee and its Bureau had made good progress in terms of time efficiency, as well as in establishing an efficient working culture. It encouraged the Secretariat to continue its work on the outstanding issues, adding that one of the pressing challenges for improving the governance of the Convention was the need for dialogue in the treatment of nomination files, particularly during the evaluation process.
7. The delegation of the **Philippines** spoke of its active role in serving as co-Chair of the sub-groups of the working group on governance established by the General Conference. Noting that the Committee had already done much to address governance issues and improve its working methods, it was important to send as much information as possible to the President of the General Conference in response to his request. In this regard, the delegation believed that the Annex of the Secretariat’s report under item 5 and the document under item 8 contained valuable information that could be sent to the open-ended working group on governance.
8. With no further requests to speak, the **Chairperson** turned to the draft decision.
9. The **Secretary** wished to make a minor clarification to the comment by Austria in that the Secretariat strived to make the documents available as soon as they became available, but the translations of documents made it difficult as all the documents were returned in one go.
10. Turning to the draft decision, the **Chairperson** proceeded on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no objections, paragraph 1 was adopted.
11. The delegation of **Cuba** felt that the preamble part of the decision should recall decision 38/C Resolution 101 of the General Conference, as mentioned in paragraph 5 of the working document, but it could await paragraph 3 of the draft decision.
12. The **Chairperson** noted that the reference was indeed missing.
13. The delegation of **Cuba** confirmed that it wished to see the reference appear in paragraph 3.
14. With no comments on paragraph 2, the **Chairperson** pronounced it adopted.
15. The delegation of **Cuba** first wished to adopt paragraph 3, as its amendment would be a separate paragraph after paragraph 3.
16. With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 3 adopted.
17. The delegation of **Cuba** proposed in paragraph 4, ‘Further recalling 38/C Resolution 101’.
18. The **Chairperson** noted that paragraph 3 was already ‘further recalling’ and proposed ‘also recalling’. With no objections, the Chairperson pronounced paragraph 4 adopted. There were no comments or objections to paragraphs 5 and 6, which were duly adopted. The Chairperson noted a proposal by the Philippines in paragraph 7.
19. The delegation of the **Philippines** found its amendment [underlined] in paragraph 7 on good governance, as discussed in the preamble, to be fairly self-explanatory, which would read, ‘Decides to transmit as requested both Annexes of Document ITH/16/11.COM/5, Document ITH/16/11.COM/7, Document ITH/16/11.COM/8 and the relevant decision of the Chairperson of the Open-ended Working Group on the Governance, Procedures and Working Methods of the Governing Bodies of UNESCO’.
20. The delegation of **Cuba** expressed concern about sending such a report to the working group on governance. Nevertheless, it thanked the Secretariat for the clarity of the information and the progress made in this recommendation; however, these recommendations had not been approved by the General Conference and therefore were not compulsory even though the Committee sought to implement measures to improve effectiveness and efficiency. The delegation felt that it was not a coherent approach to take the Auditor’s recommendations, which had not been approved by the General Conference, and to bring that together with other measures that had been adopted. The delegation suggested listing the measures adopted by the General Conference without associating them with the Auditor’s recommendations. This would involve work on a new document, and not just in the annexes. In addition, this should not be the only report sent to the working group on governance. The Convention and its bodies had to consider the spirit of Resolution 101, which had yet to be done. Other bodies had done this through digital consultations and by bringing up the issue in an agenda item before the General Assembly. Thus, the delegation found it difficult to recommend the report to the working group on governance as the final result of its work. The delegation conceded that it was a good starting point but that work was still required based on broad consultations with States Parties. Moreover, many of the measures had been adopted prior to the adoption of the General Conference resolution that called for more in-depth thought about the problems faced by the 2003 Convention and its Committee. The proposal [by the Philippines] therefore raised problems. The Committee had invited the Bureau to consult with the States Parties on the working methods of the Convention and on the resolution on governance within a certain timeframe and to include it in the next General Assembly following the next session of the Committee. In 2017, the General Conference would be working on this issue, so a more precise form of wording was required.
21. Having listened to Cuba, and to assuage its concerns, the delegation of **Algeria** agreed that neither the Executive Board nor the General Conference had yet adopted the recommendations by the External Auditor and that only three recommendations had been fully adopted by the States Parties. However, the External Auditor had made a very realistic analysis of the situation of many UNESCO programmes and Conventions and therefore wished to reflect that analysis somewhere, even though not everyone agreed with the solutions proposed. The delegation therefore proposed, ‘Decides to transmit to the working group on governance a report on the situation of the ongoing reforms’, and to delete ‘as requested’, ‘both annexes’, and ‘and the relevant decision’. In this way, the paragraph would not go into detail, and documents that were not necessarily consensual would not be sent to the working group.
22. The delegation of **Senegal** had no objection to Algeria’s proposal because it was important for the Committee to send a document to the working group on governance. It agreed that the problem lay in the fact that this issue had not been addressed in the spirit desired by the Conference or the working group itself. As explained by Cuba, it would have been desirable and preferable for the General Assembly to have the opportunity to discuss the recommendations made by the External Auditor, not least because some of the recommendations were relevant, while others were subject to caution. However, as the working group had requested that the Committee produce a document by the end of the year, the Committee had no choice but to comply. The delegation regretted that there had been no opportunity to reflect on all the recommendations by the External Auditor. However, in the meantime, the Secretariat and the Committee had already carried out work, and it was important that this be transmitted to the working group. At the same time, it would be useful for the document itself, which contained some reflections and observations by the Secretariat on some of the recommendations (for example, the Secretariat expressed very clearly that recommendation 5 was impractical and not even relevant), to be forwarded to the working group. In any case, the Committee would only decide on this matter in the coming year, following the General Conference. Thus, there was an opportunity in the working group to continue to reflect on all these issues, but the working group needed to have a basic document on which to work. For this reason, the delegation supported the amendment, even though it would have preferred the original wording.
23. The delegation of **Cuba** supported the amendment by Algeria as well as the remarks by Senegal, as it also believed that to comply with the recommendation a document should be sent with regard to the measures in force. However, the Committee could go further and perhaps add another paragraph requesting that the Secretariat launch a consultation process with States Parties on the working methods and procedures of governance of the Convention, and in the same or separate paragraph it could also request that the Secretariat include this item on the agenda of the next General Assembly. This would cover the paragraph by Algeria in that the working group would receive the progress made with the Convention. The delegation found the actions taken commendable, noting that they would complement a consultation process on working methods, as carried out by subsidiary bodies and Convention bodies of UNESCO. Thus, this issue would be included on the agenda of the next General Assembly, together with a report put forward following this consultation process. Should States Parties or the Secretariat consider that broad consultations would be complicated, the delegation suggested that perhaps only the Committee Members be involved, with the Bureau playing a crucial role in preparing the report. The delegation suggested that the Secretariat give its view on the best mechanism that could be used for this more in-depth and definitive process.
24. Noting the parallel issues, the **Secretary** remarked that Senegal had pointed out the specific request was made by the President of the General Conference that each of the subsidiary bodies and their organs should respond to it, while Cuba called for a broader consultation. The Secretary added that such a discussion in the General Assembly constituted a broader consultation with the States Parties. The issue of course was the timing, as this would not happen before the General Conference. An additional consultation would raise the question of time and resources. Acknowledging that the Committee needed to respond to the request by the President of the General Conference, the Secretary agreed that this did not hinder the Committee from including the item on the agenda of the General Assembly, but from a chronological point of view it would not be possible to report those discussions to the General Conference.
25. The delegation of **Cuba** understood and shared the Secretary’s concerns, adding that this issue should have been included on the agenda of the General Assembly held in June 2016, which now meant having to deal with a problematic timeframe. So to respond to the request from the General Conference to provide feedback, the delegation suggested that the changes and modifications that had already been made to the Convention could be linked to the recommendations by the Auditors. However, it also felt that it would not be the right place or time because the recommendations had not yet been approved. A new document would have to be examined at the next Executive Board session in 2017, which would have feedback from the General Conference. Many bodies were not able to work under the 2016 deadline, despite the recommended deadline. With regard to the consultation process, the delegation agreed that the General Assembly was the broadest forum and therefore it was ready to wait for the next session in 2018, given also the huge resources such a process would require. Nevertheless, the delegation did not think the Committee should be pressured about the deadlines, as the recommendations were never actually adopted. Thus, it could accept Algeria’s proposal and, to respond to the request by the General Conference, have a separate paragraph that requested that the Secretariat include this issue on the agenda of the next General Assembly. In this way, the Committee could prepare the groundwork on working methods, procedures and governance based on the outcomes of the working group.
26. The **Secretary** took note that the proposed paragraph 9 (to include this issue as an agenda item at the next General Assembly) would now become paragraph 8, and paragraph 9 (requesting a broad consultation) would now be deleted.
27. The delegation of **Cuba** concurred.
28. The delegation of **Algeria** sought to have clear wording in paragraph 7 before moving to paragraph 8, with a clarification in the sentence, ‘a report on the status of the foreseen or ongoing reforms’.
29. The delegation of **Turkey** was of the understanding that there would be another Committee session before the next General Assembly, adding that the Committee would need to first discuss the report before taking the recommendation to the next General Assembly of the Convention.
30. The **Secretary** clarified that the report had already been submitted to the Committee, which should now be brought to the General Assembly rather than going through another Committee session.
31. The delegation of **Turkey** was comfortable with the explanation.
32. The delegation of **Cuba** understood Turkey’s concern because normally the Committee would engage in a consultation process and then the Secretariat would prepare a report, which was not yet the case. Nevertheless, the Committee needed to seek a solution that did not involve taking the present report to the next General Assembly. The delegation suggested that States Parties be asked to make contributions prior to the session as part of the preparatory work for the next General Assembly, or the Secretariat could launch a consultation or a request to receive feedback and information on measures that the States Parties felt should be included in this discussion on governance. The delegation reiterated the point made by Turkey that the Committee should review this issue at its next session, as this report was not what it wished to see at the next General Assembly. The Secretariat could also draft a report based on the current discussion, together with other issues that could be included in the next General Assembly, taking into account the workload of the Secretariat and budgetary limitations.
33. In light of the discussion, the **Secretary** proposed, ‘Requests the Secretariat to include this item on the agenda of the next session of the Committee with a view to proposing it at the next General Assembly’. The Secretary explained that the report would respond to the instruction by the President of the General Conference, but the discussion process could continue going towards the General Assembly.
34. The **Chairperson** continued with the adoption of paragraph 7, and with no further comments it was duly adopted, as was paragraph 8. He then turned to the adoption of the decision as a whole and with no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision 11.COM 7 adopted**.
35. The **Secretary** thanked the interpreters for their tolerance, and reminded delegates of the opening of a side event, ‘Living heritage in Addis Ababa’, co-organized by the Authority for Research and Conservation of Cultural Heritage in UNESCO.

*[Tuesday, 29 November 2016, morning session]*

**ITEM 8 OF THE AGENDA:**

**CLARIFICATION ON THE DECISION MAKING PROCESS CONCERNING INSCRIPTION, SELECTION, OR APPROVAL, OF NOMINATIONS, PROPOSALS AND REQUESTS**

**Document** [*ITH/16/11.COM/8*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-8-EN.docx)

**Decision** *11.COM 8*

1. The **Chairperson** remarked that there was a slight delay in the agenda, which was discussed by the Bureau that morning, and that there was now a revised timetable with agenda items 8, 9.a, 9.b and 9.c to be concluded in the morning session, followed by agenda items 10 and 10.a in the afternoon session. He specified that so far the Bureau had received requests for debates on twelve nominations and proposals. The Chairperson appealed to Members be remain concise and adhere to substantive issues.
2. The **Secretary** reminded delegates wishing to hold performances and/or present audiovisual material during nominations to inform the Secretariat. He also informed delegates that a roundtable discussion was scheduled to take place during lunchtime, ‘Learning with intangible cultural heritage in education’, organized by the ITH Section and the UNESCO International Institute for Capacity Building in Africa (IICBA). Moreover, starting that day, the NGOs would hold daily plenary meetings from 5.30 p.m. to 6.30 p.m.
3. The **Chairperson** moved to the examination of agenda item 8.
4. The delegation of **Palestine** believed that the Evaluation Body respected its mandate in basing its evaluation solely on the file and its contents in that the Body was not requested to go beyond what was contained in the nomination file. However, it was the role of the Committee to complete the evaluation by taking into consideration additional information, such as the political, economic and social context of the country, which might not necessarily be contained in the file. For example, in the nomination files by Iraq and Nigeria, it was known that these countries faced terrorism and/or armed conflict. In addition, the Committee had been requested to change its practice as a result of such concerns raised by all States Parties since its inception. With the tendency in UNESCO towards synergy between the different culture Conventions, there had been requests at the different Assemblies to harmonize the Rules of Procedure. In this regard, the meaning of consensus, as explained in all other organs, committees or assemblies, meant that the Chairperson of the assembly, when seeking an objection on an item under consideration, would conclude that consensus had been reached if there were no objections. Only in this Committee was the practice treated differently, so the reasons to change the practice were numerous, while the reasons to maintain the practice were few and difficult to defend. As the practice had been observed for years, despite the concerns raised by the delegation of Spain, which had requested that this item be included on the agenda during the last General Assembly, the issue could no longer wait and required a solution in this session. The delegation felt strongly that any proposal to dilute or postpone this issue would be unacceptable. In this regard, the delegation – in broad consultation with States Parties and Members of the Committee – proposed some amendments that sought to harmonize and align the practice with the other UNESCO Committees. Concluding, the delegation asked the Chairperson whether it would be possible to give the floor to Observers following the debate, as this issue concerned all States Parties.
5. Thanking Palestine for its remarks, the **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of agenda item 8, which had been added to the agenda at the request of Spain, in accordance with Rule 9.2 (c) of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee. Working document 8 provided background information on the decision-making process concerning the inscription of elements on the Urgent Safeguarding List and the Representative List, as well as on the inclusion of proposals on the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices and the approval of International Assistance requests. In particular, the first part of the document explained how the draft decisions were prepared, and the second part clarified the procedures followed in recent Committee sessions when adopting decisions concerning nominations, proposals and requests. Before opening the floor for debate, the Chairperson provided some background information. He recalled that nominations to the two Lists, proposals to the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices, and requests for International Assistance greater than US$100,000 were evaluated by the Evaluation Body. The Evaluation Body presented its recommendations to the Committee for each file based on its evaluation in the form of draft decisions. Prior to the examination of these draft decisions, each Member of the Evaluation Body individually evaluated each file and subsequently met to undertake a joint evaluation. During the joint evaluation, the Body reached consensus on each specific criterion of each file. In other words, the Body functioned as a collective entity and spoke with one voice. The Chairperson underlined that Members of the Evaluation Body were proposed by States Parties and elected by Members of the Committee. Also, membership to the Body was evenly distributed geographically and between experts and NGOs, which prevented geographical or institutional bias in their recommendations.
6. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that during recent sessions it had followed specific procedures for decision-making concerning nominations, proposals and requests. To establish consensus – for decisions concerning nominations, proposals or requests – the Chairpersons of recent sessions sought expressions of actively voiced expressions of support in order to take a positive view of amendments. They therefore considered silence as a sign of support for the original recommendation by the Evaluation Body rather than as a support for a proposed amendment to a draft decision. The reasoning behind this different approach concerned the fact that: the work was entrusted by the Committee to the Evaluation Body; the Body had spent considerable time and carried out in-depth work over several months; and recommendations had been prepared in a collegial way. The Chairperson remarked that the Rules of Procedure of the Committee were silent on the issue of adopting decisions by consensus, which was the sole prerogative of the Chairperson. However, he emphasized that the good conduct of the debates was also the responsibility of each Committee Member, as provided for in its Rules of Procedure, in calling a point of order. Before opening the floor, the Chairperson gave the floor to Spain to briefly explain the rationale behind this agenda item.
7. The delegation of **Spain** thanked the Chairperson and the Secretariat for including the item on which the Committee could discuss this fundamental issue, i.e. the decision-making process in the approval of nominations. It believed that it was within the spirit of UNESCO Conventions to give preference to consensus, adding that the Chairperson of the Committee played a fundamental role in achieving such consensus. Thus, the role of the Chairperson required some clear parameters in this regard. As explained by Palestine, the significance of silence had to be clarified, particularly with respect to examining recommendations made by the Evaluation Body. The delegation believed that for the sake of transparency and visibility there should be no discrimination or arbitrary decisions between one nomination and another, and Members of the Committee should be clear as to what was being asked of them when evaluating nominations. Thus, the debate would focus on the meaning of silence by Committee Members in terms of whether they agree or not with the consensus. In this way, the Committee would achieve harmonization and coherence among practices in other Committees. It would also determine the actual practice in the present and future Committee sessions so as to be transparent and prevent arbitrary decisions, which would help in the preparation of files, while ensuring the coherent application of the rules by both the Committee and the Secretariat.
8. The **Chairperson** thanked Spain for its explanations and reiterated the importance of conducting the debate in a coherent and transparent way, assuring the Committee that he would do his best to guide the discussion on agenda item 10 in the examination of nominations, proposals and requests. The Chairperson opened the floor for debate.
9. The delegation of **Cyprus** wished to refer to the timeline *before* the Committee examined the files. Firstly, when a State submits a file for evaluation, the Secretariat checks the file and sends it back to the submitting State if it considers that it lacks technical information. Afterwards, once the information has been received, the Secretariat transfers the file to the Evaluation Body, and upon evaluation, the Evaluation Body submits its report to the Committee. The delegation proposed that the Evaluation Body be given the opportunity to consult with the submitting State so that they could complement any information deemed incomplete by the Evaluation Body, i.e. prior to sending the final report to the Committee. Alternatively, the report by the Evaluation Body could be sent to the Chairperson of the Committee who would maintain contact with the submitting State. The delegation also remarked that the Evaluation Body reports were only received by Members of the Committee one month prior to its session, which it considered a very short time frame, adding that normally documents should be received six weeks prior, giving Members more time to prepare.
10. The delegation of **Cuba** found the issue to be interesting, not least because it was strongly linked to several other items on the agenda, for example, the establishment of a new Evaluation Body and the issue of governance, and therefore deserved further reflection. It understood that practices were borne out of the Committee’s rights, but there were also directives and statutes to be respected. Moreover, some of the practices, which were borne out of legislation, were not followed as stipulated. Hence the problem and why the existing rules should be respected. For instance, there are existing rules on voting. The Committee should not fall into the trap of accepting the Chairperson’s unilateral decision. As mentioned by Palestine, only this Committee tolerates such practices, and there was no clarity regarding consensus within its own Committee. The delegation was particularly mindful of the perception by delegations, countries and communities that deserved a clear answer. It believed that the powers bestowed on the Chairperson of the Committee were excessive, which was undoubtedly one of the issues of governance regarding how the Committee structures its debates. This also took into consideration the working methods and mechanisms of evaluation that exist within the Committee. Indeed, no one should have more power than the Evaluation Body in examining the nominations. Thus, the roles of the Committee, the Chairperson, and the Evaluation Body should be thoroughly reviewed to ensure that all the different stakeholders act within the spirit of the Convention. This item was thus timely, and clarity needed to be restored, especially when examining the practices of the Committee in future sessions.
11. The delegation of the **Philippines** supported the amendment by Palestine.
12. The delegation of **Austria** understood that the decision-making process was very important to States Parties, and it also agreed that the working procedures should be in line with other governmental bodies of UNESCO. It noted that the Operational Directives were very clear on the procedures for the evaluation of nominations, registers and requests, and it took the opportunity to reiterate its full trust in the high-quality work of the Evaluation Body. The delegation recalled that it was the Committee itself that had established the Evaluation Body, and thus it should have full trust in its work, and it appreciated the amount of time dedicated to the in-depth work carried out on all the files. With regard to the final adoption of the draft decisions on the nominations, the Committee was fully in line with the usual practice of UNESCO's governing bodies to adopt decisions by consensus achieved through debate rather than through formal voting because this also reflected the spirit of the Convention, which was to have mutual understanding and international cooperation. A change in the working methods of the Chairperson would require in-depth reflection, and the delegation agreed with Cuba that a far-reaching debate was required. Thus, the Committee should not run hastily into any kind of change in working methods, but should instead invite other States Parties, as suggested by Palestine, and NGOs to contribute to this important issue. However, in general, the Committee should endeavor to build consensus, as is the norm in the governing bodies of UNESCO. Moreover, nowhere in any of the UNESCO documents was there a clear definition of consensus, as it had always been a form of interaction between participants.
13. The delegation of **Senegal** began by thanking Spain for proposing this item, as it was important for the future of the Committee. In this regard, as a new Member, the delegation intended to respect the tradition and practice of the Committee, reaffirming its commitment to the principle of consensus. The delegation spoke of the anomaly in the Committee's practice compared to the other culture Conventions, as well as the scientific programmes and governing bodies of UNESCO, which could no longer continue. It recalled the discussion on the recommendations of the External Auditor in which one recommendation sought synergy and harmonization in the working methods and practices for all the culture Conventions with regard to the decision-making process. When discussing consensus, it was important to avoid as much as possible the perception of a vote, yet the delegation felt that the Committee's current practice was somewhat troubling in that it essentially becomes a vote, though not in name, and does not follow the modalities defined in the Rules of Procedure. The other disturbing aspect was the adverse effect on the submitting States, as Members of the Committee readily offer support to the nomination, leading to the politicization of decisions. The other point raised by Cuba, which the delegation fully shared, was that the current practice conveyed excessive powers to the Chairperson. In practice, this may even lead the Chairperson to take the decision in place of Members of the Committee, since it was the Chairperson who decided whether consensus was reached or not. The delegation believed that this power should rest with the Members of the Committee, which is why it was important to change the current practice of the Committee. This point was also raised by Spain with regard to the lack of transparency and predictability, such that the Committee relied on the wisdom and interpretation of the Chairperson to determine whether consensus was reached or not. Another point was *how* the Committee reached consensus. The delegation believed that consensus should be reflected by the sentiment in the room, adding that the current practice was unusual and unlike other Committees within UNESCO whereas in other organizations of the UN system silence should never be interpreted as a ‘no’. However, in this Committee, if a State did not express itself on a subject, it was considered by the Chairperson to mean a ‘no’. This misunderstanding was why it was important to clarify these issues during the present session so that a simple mechanism could be established that would enable the sentiment of the room to be correctly interpreted, in line with the practice of other UNESCO Committees and culture Conventions.
14. The delegation of **Algeria** joined the previous delegations in emphasizing the huge relevance of the discussion. In this regard, it congratulated Spain for its proposal and the Secretariat for formulating the draft decision. Moreover, it was considered useful for the Chairperson, during the opening of the session, to explicitly state the method he intended to use in the adoption of the decisions, while recalling the Rules of Procedure with regard to those decisions. The delegation also requested that the Chairperson clarify the interpretation of silence and his way of seeking and declaring consensus.
15. The delegation of **Zambia** thanked Ethiopia for hosting this session and the General Assembly for electing Zambia to serve on the Committee. Considering the importance of ICH, the delegation noted that such cultural diversity was the currency of sustainable development, as highlighted in various UNESCO statutes. It spoke of the successful implementation of intangible heritage and safeguarding as a continuous process involving all stakeholders. As a Member of the Committee, Zambia pledged its part in ensuring that this was achieved. The delegation also sought improved collaboration in employing safeguarding efforts between and among countries that share common elements. It was convinced that one of the best ways to achieve good results in safeguarding ICH was to promote the establishment of regional or thematic platforms such as the Southern African Intangible Cultural Heritage Platform, of which Zambia is a member. The delegation looked forward to achieving more success in the implementation of the Convention during its tenure as a Member of the Committee. It supported the proposed amendments by Palestine and presented by Spain because it held the view that the decision-making process should be seen to achieve more than facilitating failure, i.e. the Evaluation Body currently worked like an examination body when in fact it could work in consultation with the submitting States. This would ensure that more States have their nominations inscribed than turned down. So in that regard, it supported the amendment by Palestine.
16. The delegation of **Turkey** thanked Spain for bringing up this issue before the Committee. It believed that the current practice valued the technical work and expertise of the Evaluation Body, a body composed of its own national experts, as well as the time devoted to the drafting of its recommendations to the nomination files. The delegation did not feel that this worked against the sovereignty of the Committee since the Committee was still able to amend the draft decisions, provided that the amendment proposal enjoyed wide support among its Members. Thus, the decisions within the Committee were still taken by consensus and the practice should therefore be maintained. It was the prerogative of the Chairperson to decide on the decision-making procedure, and the delegation believed that the Committee should not be limiting this discretion by written instruction, which did not exist in other culture Conventions. It understood that there was disappointment among States Parties due to the high number of files receiving referrals from the Evaluation Body, and also because of the number of files receiving slight referrals. It agreed that this was indeed disappointing, but it also believed that slight referrals, although discouraging for States Parties, could be avoided by introducing a dialogue mechanism within the evaluation process. Concluding, the delegation spoke in favour of maintaining the current practice and cautioned against taking any hasty decisions.
17. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee of the Rules of Procedure on the issue of adopting decisions by consensus, as was the prerogative of the Chairperson. He thus asked Members to keep interventions brief and to focus on the position they wished to take.
18. The delegation of **Congo** congratulated the Chairperson and Ethiopia on the organization of the session, as well as the Secretariat for its work. The delegation supported the remarks made by Spain and Palestine, and supported by Algeria, adding that this provided clarity and transparency for the rest of the Committee’s work.
19. The delegation of **India** congratulated the Chairperson for facilitating a very important discussion on the decision-making processes in the Committee, which was unique and different from other Committees. The delegation noted the large support from the floor for the proposal put forward by Palestine and Spain, which was that decision-making processes should be in line with those adopted in other Committees, i.e. consensus should be achieved by evaluating both support and objections to the draft resolution under consideration. The delegation thus supported this method and the transition to a new system, which was the system followed in other Conventions, so as to ensure greater efficiency and action.
20. The delegation of **Lebanon** also spoke in favour of changing the decision-making practice. While respecting the prerogatives of the Chairperson, the delegation believed that there must be synergy and coherence among the various UNESCO Conventions, and that only in this Committee was silence misinterpreted. It thus supported the interventions by Palestine and Senegal, and those of Cyprus and Spain on the method of work of the Evaluation Body.
21. The delegation of **Hungary** joined those in thanking Spain for including this important point on the agenda. It believe in the importance of dialogue, and was thus of the view that enhanced dialogue between the Evaluation Body and the submitting State could only be beneficial. The delegation noted the clear appetite to debate the issue of consensus, and agreed that it was necessary to examine ways to harmonize procedures with other culture Conventions.
22. The delegation of **Colombia** thanked Spain for having opened this debate and for its efforts to find a solution. Taking into account the remarks by Cyprus regarding the Evaluation Body, the delegation believed that the submitting State should have more contact with the Evaluation Body. It also believed in a consensus, and that at least one quarter of the Members of the Committee should be able to open a debate.
23. The delegation of **Guatemala** thanked Spain for the Spanish interpretation. Following on from the remarks by Zambia, it believed that, as well as consultations, States needed to have a more flexible and dynamic mechanism, with greater dialogue between them and the Evaluation Body so that any additional information could be provided. Moreover, this would facilitate the Committee’s work and prevent disappointment on the part of States in having to wait for a new cycle to re-submit files.
24. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** joined those in thanking Spain for putting forward this very important issue on governance. Because it was so fundamental, the delegation supported the remarks by Austria, Cuba and others in proceeding with caution before implementing any changes, but it supported the spirit of the amendment proposed. However, on the issue of silence, the delegation took note that all agreed that silence actually spoke loudly, adding that in general there was a definite need to understand the significance of the silence. However, the question was whether it was always necessary in every instance to interpret the silence. For example, there are times when Committee Members can comprehend what is happening and can agree. The delegation agreed that while supporting this spirit, the Committee should put in place a mechanism that encouraged things to move efficiently and avoid frustration. In addition, there would definitely be situations when the Committee would want to understand the silence, and at such times, if requested by one or two States, then the Committee could allow for a different procedure. Nonetheless, it was important to proceed with caution, especially as silence was not a problem in every case, and when it was so, a different procedure would allow for more dialogue.
25. Thanking Saint Lucia, the **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that the discussion on specific decision-making procedures, concerning nominations, proposals and requests, focused on how to interpret silence when there were contrasting opinions and when the Committee wished to establish a consensus.
26. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** thus supported the proposal put forward by Spain.
27. The delegation of **Côte d'Ivoire** thanked the Chairperson for his calm and impartiality in this very difficult debate. It supported Spain in the inclusion of this item on the agenda of the current session, adding that it advocated consensus-based decision-making and, alternatively, voting. This principle was reflected in the recommendations by the External Auditor, which called for harmonization and synergy among the different culture Conventions. The delegation thus joined in its voice with Cuba, Senegal, Austria and Algeria to support the proposal by Palestine.
28. The delegation of **Armenia** remarked that some people might have asked themselves if silence, or unspoken words, could be misconstrued and possibly used against them, or whether staying silent was indeed useful in the Committee's work. Regardless, it was of the utmost importance to find a solution before reaching the point of voting, because a vote suggested that not everything was perfect and that it was impossible to find a common base. Moreover, it might even diminish the value of the decision taken. Thus, the delegation believed that every effort should be made to find an agreed settlement so as to not come to a vote. In this vein, the work of the Chairperson and the Secretary were instrumental in being able to negotiate on certain sensitive issues, eventually coming to a point where all the obstacles had been removed and positive decisions could be successfully taken. It also supported the idea of very close cooperation with the Evaluation Body, as the principle was not to deliver unnecessary rejection, since this only complicated the work of the Committee. In addition, a rejection on a minor issue meant having to repeat the entire process, which would take time and effort on the part of the submitting States, the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body itself. Thus, if there were issues that could be solved during the evaluation process, it would be preferable to do this during that time. The delegation concluded by thanking Spain for raising the issue and supported the amendment by Palestine.
29. The delegation of **Ethiopia** thanked Spain for bring forward this item, Palestine for breaking the silence and India for its constructive engagement. It believed in the spirit of the Convention and decision-making by consensus. Regarding the interpretation of silence, as is the case in other multilateral forums, it never implies an objection, while consensus reflects the disposition of the Committee towards the issue under consideration. As per the Rules of Procedures, the privilege was clearly bestowed on the Chairperson to ensure that the Committee reached a consensus.
30. The delegation of **Afghanistan** expressed its confidence in the Committee’s ability to resolve this technical problem with serenity and collective wisdom, and it thanked Spain, Palestine, India and others for their positive contributions. It was cognizant of the gap in the regulations in that there was a deliberate absence on the part of the founding States to concede a different method to the work of the Committee. It was of the view that the Committee should recognize the role and place of technical expertise, and above all, reiterate the pre-eminence of States in ensuring the spirit of collegiality, support and solidarity in the pursuit of the objectives of the Convention. In any event, the Committee should remain consensual or, at worst, closest to consensus, as witnessed in other UNESCO forums. This would facilitate the work of both the Chairperson and the Secretariat, rendering the debates serene and efficient, and the decisions more acceptable.
31. The delegation of **Bulgaria** appreciated Spain’s proposal and supported the idea that decision-making should be applied in the same way as in other UNESCO committees and organs. It supported the change in practice, adding that silence could not be understood as an objection during the decision-making process on nominations. The delegation therefore warmly welcomed the proposal by Palestine, as well as the proposal by Zambia, Guatemala and others to enhance the dialogue mechanism between the Evaluation Body and the submitting States.
32. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** appreciated the points raised by all the delegations, recognizing that there were different methods and that each method had its own strengths. Moreover, it emphasized the prerogative of the Chairperson in determining when consensus had been reached.
33. The **Chairperson** noted that twenty Committee Members had taken the floor. Before proceeding to requests from Observers, he gave the floor to Palestine.
34. The delegation of **Palestine** wished to thank all those who had supported the request by Spain, as well as the amendments by Palestine. The delegation clarified that there were two topics under discussion: the first concerned the current practice of decision-making, and the second concerned cooperation and dialogue with the Evaluation Body. The delegation took note that the Members concurred that the current cycle of 18 months should be reviewed to allow more time for consultations and evaluations, as expressed by Cyprus, and previously by India. However, this topic could not be tackled at the present time, but possibly during the debate on item 10 or possibly item 18. The focus of attention under this item should therefore be on the decision-making practices, particularly with regard to nominations files.
35. Thanking Palestine for the clarification, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to Observers.
36. The delegation of **Mexico** thanked Ethiopia for its warm welcome and for its magnificent display of living intangible cultural heritage, and Spain for enabling Spanish interpretation. The delegation wished to draw upon its experience with other Conventions. From 22 to 25 October 2013, Mexico had organized the meeting ‘UNESCO Conventions’, which emphasized the mandate expressed by the UNESCO Director-General to have a coherent vision of all the Conventions from the Latin American perspective. It was said that one had to continuously review the contributions of the other Conventions, and that it was clear from the Members of the Committee that this was indeed crucial in the decision-making process. Moreover, Palestine very eloquently spoke about how fundamental these points were [interrupted].
37. For the sake of time, the delegation of **Côte d'Ivoire** requested that the Chairperson limit the interventions by the Observers to one minute.
38. The **Chairperson** found the comment relevant, asking Mexico to comply.
39. Summarizing, the delegation of **Mexico** referred to a proverb in Spanish that says ‘silence means consent’, which should be understood as a basic legal principle. With regards to the remarks by Palestine on dialogue during evaluations, the delegation concurred that this topic could be taken up under agenda item 10.
40. The **Chairperson** noteda request from Mauritius, a Member of the Committee.
41. The delegation of **Mauritius** thanked Spain for introducing the item, adding that the Evaluation Body itself had described the examination work as very complex and sensitive. Hence, the Committee should be very careful with changing the rules. As long as the Committee aligned with UNESCO’s other Conventions, the delegation could agree to the proposal.
42. Thanking Mauritius, the **Chairperson** noted the list of Observers, reminding them to limit themselves to one minute.
43. The delegation of **Egypt** congratulated Ethiopia for its hospitality and successful organization of the meeting, as well as the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body for their work. The delegation thanked Spain for its proposal and supported Palestine's amendment endorsed by many delegations on the need to harmonize the Committee’s working methods with other organs of UNESCO, especially as regards the decision-making process. Concerning the evaluation process, the delegation also supported the views expressed earlier by several Members on the need to foster a dialogue or interaction between the Evaluation Body and the submitting States when evaluating the nomination files. It believed that it was very important to support the work of the Evaluation Body, especially as the evaluation process occurs over a period of time during which developments might occur, for example, with regard to safeguarding measures that the Evaluation Body should be made aware of in order to reach a comprehensive evaluation.
44. The delegation of **Venezuela** supported the remarks by Members of the Committee when it came to governance, adding that it was fundamental for the Committee, the Assembly and the Convention to promote a methodology that clarified the mechanisms in interpreting the criteria of the nominations for the sake of balance and transparency. The delegation felt that the Evaluation Body had a consultative function, not a decision-making one, and therefore its decisions were not binding. As a result, the Evaluation Body could not predetermine decisions but could only make preliminary recommendations on the nomination files according to the Committee’s operational guidelines, while giving the State concerned the opportunity to present clarifications as required. This would facilitate the work of the Committee and strengthen national capacity in this regard [interrupted].
45. The delegation of **Cuba** called a point of order, explaining that the Chairperson could not change the rules of the game by cutting short the intervention of Observers, adding that delegations should be afforded the same amount of time as previous speakers. The delegation understood that the Committee was short on time, as expressed by Côte d’Ivoire, but it could not change the rules mid-session as all States held the same speaking rights and had major concerns.
46. The **Chairperson** understood the remarks by Cuba. Nevertheless, he recalled the discussion in the Bureau in which time was of concern. He would therefore limit the time for Observers, but not for Members of the Committee.
47. The delegation of **Venezuela** thanked the Chairperson for his comprehension. It concluded by suggesting that the results of the evaluation should maintain a degree of confidentiality between States Parties and the Secretariat in order to avoid the information being misused by third parties, which would damage the Convention's established procedures. Finally, the delegation was aware of the financial difficulties and wished to acknowledge the work by the Secretariat and its efforts to promote the visibility and credibility of the Convention.
48. The delegation of **Belgium** thanked the Chairperson and the Committee for allowing it to contribute to the debate. Firstly, with regard to coherence and synergies, the delegation believed that the Convention’s procedures were in fact in line with other Conventions, as the texts were exactly the same. The delegation also believed that because the Convention itself was different, owing to the intergovernmental aspect of the Evaluation Body behind which stood a community and people, this affected the interpretation of silence. Secondly, the question was: did this actually hamper the Committee in taking decisions? The delegation referred to the decisions taken at the last Committee session in which the Committee had changed many of the recommendations, as was its mandate. Finally, on the issue of clarity and transparency, the delegation commended the practice by which the Chairperson clearly outlines the practice when examining proposals, as this supported transparency, and it saluted the proposal by Turkey to include further dialogue so as to alleviate some of the concerns expressed.
49. The delegation of **Azerbaijan** congratulated Ethiopia for the successful session, and expressed thanks for its warm hospitality. It wished to share experience drawn from its time as a Member of the Committee and Chairmanship in 2013. According to the established practice, it believed that silence in the Committee could not be considered either as a support for or against consensus. It was a prerogative of the Chairperson to make the ruling based on the expressed positions. The delegation believed that this was the best way to deal with proposals. Nevertheless, the issue needed more clarity and the delegation supported the idea of further reflection, as well as the idea that the Chairperson should clearly explain from the outset how he or she intended to proceed.
50. The delegation of **Germany** believed that the decision-making process of the Committee was an important governance issue and therefore supported the proposals by Spain and Palestine for greater transparency and synergy, harmonization and coherence among the different Committees. However, the present session was not the right time, as the Committee should proceed cautiously.
51. The delegation of **United Arab Emirates** expressed its gratitude and thanks to the Government of Ethiopia for its hospitality and for hosting this session, and congratulated the Chairperson. It also supported the position voiced by several Members of the Committee, emphasizing the importance of the issue. The delegation was pleased that the issue had been raised but also felt that the Committee should dedicate more time to discussing it.
52. The delegation of the **Democratic People’s Republic of Korea** welcomed Spain's proposal on this important issue and shared the opinion of Cuba and Palestine, adding that this was a crucial issue for all States Parties, particularly with regard to intangible cultural heritage that was shared at the national and international levels. The delegation remarked that sometimes recommendations by the Evaluation Body were not geared to a country's specific situation, and it thus urged for transparency and clarity so that submitting States could clearly accept the recommendations of the Evaluation Body. It wished to express the hope that the Committee would be truly faithful to the spirit of the Convention so that States Parties could do the same.
53. Noting that there were no more speakers, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Secretary for his comments.
54. Summarizingsome of the issues raised,the **Secretary** remarked on the many references to synergies and procedures, governance issues, the duties of the Chairperson, and the interpretation of remaining silent. He also noted the wish for dialogue between submitting States and the Evaluation Body, and strongly suggested that Palestine's intervention be brought into agenda item 10 when the Committee would be discussing the Evaluation Body and its broader governance issues, which were perhaps beyond the scope of this particular item. The Secretary confirmed that it had received the amendment by Palestine.
55. The **Chairperson** then turned to thedraft decision and its adoption on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no further comments or objections, paragraphs 1–3 were adopted. Palestine proposed an amendment in paragraph 4, with deletions and insertions [underlined], ‘~~Reminds itself of the importance of observing with rigour the Rules of Procedure of the Committee, while also affirming~~ Reaffirms that the working method of the Committee privileges decision making by consensus, thus promoting the spirit of international cooperation and mutual understanding’. With noobjections, paragraph 4 was adopted as amended. Palestine also proposed an amendment in paragraph 5, ‘~~Further requests~~ Recommends the Chairperson~~s~~ of ~~future~~ the Committee session~~s,~~ in case of amendments on a draft decision recommended by the Evaluation Body, to privilege decision-making by consensus through evaluating both supports and objections to the draft decision under consideration’. With no objections, paragraph 5 was duly adopted.
56. The delegation of **Turkey** sought to know if the written formulation had a precedent in other culture Conventions. Also, it questioned whether, in adopting paragraph 5, the Committee agreed that consensus was actually a type of informal voting, because it determined those who ‘supported’ and ‘objected’ to a decision, which was the same as voting.
57. The **Secretary** explained thatthe paragraph wasfirst of all a recommendation to the Chairperson, and which thus reflected the spirit of the Chairperson in his role as interpreter of the consensus in the room. The paragraph would have had another interpretation had it ‘requested’ the Chairperson. With regard to evaluating the ‘support’ and ‘objections’ to a draft decision under consideration, the Secretary further explained that a request to verbally consider all opinions would resemble a vote, but in this regard could be interpreted as normal procedure. The Secretary reiterated that he was not a lawyer and was therefore not committed to a legal affairs interpretation.
58. Understanding Turkey’s concern, the delegation of **Cuba** thanked the Secretary for the explanation, which clarified that this was in fact a recommendation to the Chairperson. However, the delegation affirmed that any Member of the Committee was within their rights to call for a vote in cases where reaching a consensus was deemed complicated, as outlined in the Rules of Procedure, a fundamental democratic rule. The delegation reiterated that a vote could be called upon should the Committee fail to reach a consensus, as was the prerogative of a Member State.
59. Responding to the question raised by Turkey, and having attended sessions of other Committees, the delegation of **India** was of the understanding that an amendment that comes up for consideration invariably receives support, but in the case of one or two objections, it was the prerogative of the Chairperson to assess the consensus. The delegation added that there was neither a need for a vote nor was it desirable. Moreover, the 1972 Convention functioned in this way. The delegation remarked that this decision was good in that it was adopted by consensus. It sought to reassure the Committee that this decision was not ushering in a vote, especially as none of the delegations wanted a vote in matters of culture, which were essentially celebratory in nature, and as such the decision was very much in line with other Committees.
60. The **Chairperson** thanked India and Spain, reiterating that paragraph 5 was a recommendation to the Chairperson on determining the general opinion in the room. With no legal procedural objections, he invited the Committee to adopt the draft decision as a whole.
61. The delegation of **Turkey** asked theSecretariat to comment on whether there was similar wording in other culture Conventions.
62. The **Secretary** was unable to provide a definitiveanswer on whether similar wording could be found in decisions in the other culture Conventions.
63. Responding to the question by Turkey, the delegation of **Palestine** insisted that there were no such recommendations to the Chairperson in other Conventions because the practice was not at all similar. This unusual practice was only found in the 2003 Convention. Hence the request to include this recommendation in order to harmonize the decision-making practice with the other organs and committees of UNESCO.
64. The delegation of **India** supported the clarification by Palestine, adding that this practice was followed in the other Conventions even though it was not codified.
65. The **Chairperson** concurred that paragraph 5 was a recommendation on the practice. With this understanding, he turned to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole. With no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision 11.COM 8 adopted**. To clarify, the Chairperson would consider silence as a consensus on the motion of the amendment. He then proceeded to the set of sub-items under item 9.

**ITEM 9.a OF THE AGENDA:**

**EXAMINATION OF THE REPORTS OF STATES PARTIES ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION AND ON THE CURRENT STATUS OF ELEMENTS INSCRIBED ON THE REPRESENTATIVE LIST OF THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE OF HUMANITY**

**Document** [*ITH/16/11.COM/9.a*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-9.a-EN.docx)

**Reports** [*6 periodic reports*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/9a-periodic-reporting-00857)

**Decision** *11.COM 9.a*

1. The **Chairperson** turned to the set of sub-items under agenda item 9, beginning with item 9.a on the examination of reports of States Parties on the implementation of the Convention and on the current status of elements inscribed on the Representative List.
2. The **Secretary** reminded theCommitteethat it was itstask to examine the six periodic reports submitted by States Parties in the current cycle and to provide its own report to the General Assembly. The Annex to document 9.a presented a general overview of the 2016 periodic reports and the measures taken by reporting States to implement the 2003 Convention with regard to the elements included on the Representative List. Referring to the table in paragraph 6 of the Annex, the Secretary explained that it showed the status of the 37 States Parties that were expected to report in 2016. A total of 31 States were currently overdue (84 per cent of the reports), and 21 were more than one year overdue. The Secretary further reminded the Committeethat this was arecurring problem such that the Committee in 2015 had decided for the first time ever to encourage States Parties to fulfill their reporting requirements before submitting new nominations. The Secretariat had also taken some actions, including: a new [webpage](https://ich.unesco.org/en/submissions-and-deadlines-00861) dedicated to periodic reporting with personalized information for every State; reminder letters with an updated version of the personalized form enclosed; a briefing during the sixth session of the General Assembly; and the updating of the ‘Additional guidance for completing reports’. The Secretary wished to again thank the Republic of Korea for its generous contribution of US$300,000 to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund to help the Secretariat improve the periodic reporting mechanism, as approved by the Committee under agenda item 6. Nevertheless, the question remained: Why were reports not being done? Moreover, it would be important to analyse their role in the overall results framework for the Convention(agenda item 14). Moving forward at what may be an open-ended working group (pending extrabudgetary resources), the question was whether this framework might influence the periodic reporting mechanism. The debate on the overall results framework could also nourish the debate on how to improve the existing reporting system, for instance, through regional reporting, multiple reporting or through the preparation of a global report. Regarding the Annex, further to an overview of the main topics covered by the six reports presented in Part II of the Annex, in Part III the Secretariat had provided an in-depth and cumulative analysiscovering all the reports submitted so farthat focused in 2016 on the integration of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding into cultural and other policies. A cumulative focus was proposed for the 2017 cycle on the measures taken by States Parties to build and strengthen capacities in their territory for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. Part IV of the Annex consisted of abstracts for each of the six reports received, which would be made available on the Convention website for those received between 2011 and 2015. The draft decision proposed by the Secretariat thus emphasized some general trends and addressed several topics raised in the Annex.
3. Thanking the Secretary, the **Chairperson** opened the floor to States that had submitted a report to share their experiences on the challenges and opportunities they encountered while implementing the 2003 Convention at the national level.
4. The delegation of **Austria** appreciated the offer to share its experience. Focusing on two aspects that were considered particularly insightful, the delegation first spoke about drawing up the national inventory, described as an evolving and learning process that needed regular updating, monitoring and revision. Since the Austrian ratification of the Convention in 2009, the criteria for inscription on a national inventory had been revised, added and occasionally deleted. Austria had started to evaluate the effects of inscription in preparation for the report, which was beneficial for its implementation process in general. However, it still needed a mechanism to remain in contact with the practitioners after inclusion on the inventory, as well as to create a better balance between the five domains. In this regard, the reports of the other States Parties could serve as a means of comparison as well as of sharing ideas and good practices. Secondly, the report was prepared in close cooperation and in collaboration with all of the relevant actors involved in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in Austria, including experts from the field, official bodies and the communities. This instilled a process of reflection, for example, with regard to the status of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, the safeguarding measures taken, why they were effective, and if not why not, and what was missing in that case. While it saw from the reporting that the implementation of the Convention had strong effects on many levels, it also realized that there was still a lot to be done. So the report could be regarded as a living agreement between the relevant players in keeping the spirit of the Convention alive at the national level. Therefore, the overall preparation of the report was considered a positive experience. The delegation concluded by thanking the Secretariat for its support and assistance in the preparation of the report, in terms of guidance documents but also upon request.
5. The delegation of **Czechia** thanked the Chairperson for the opportunity to make a few remarks on its first report, adding that it was a fruitful experience that allowed for better connections between the various actors involved in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in the country. The preparation of the report also allowed it to review its intangible cultural heritage safeguarding systems, and to reflect on possible improvements. Since then, Czechia has set up a departmental inventory system such that new elements of intangible cultural heritage, identified with the participation of the communities or individuals concerned, were now inscribed at the departmental level before submitting a candidature to the national list, which is regularly updated. The system of implementation of the Convention in Czechia has clearly defined roles for the different actors at the State level, accredited institutions, and regional and local bodies, with a so-called ‘sophisticated’ mechanism for cooperation with the communities concerned and the bearers of the elements. Representatives of all the relevant actors and communities meet within the National Council for the Intangible Cultural Heritage, an advisory body to the Ministry of Culture. Mutual exchanges make it possible to continuously share knowledge about intangible cultural heritage through concrete examples. This also makes it possible to track the state of the elements, the transformations, innovations or negative effects associated with commercialization. Through this process, a more efficient strategy for the effective safeguarding of traditional folk culture was developed in 2003, and since its implementation it has been regularly checked. It hoped that the good practices mentioned in the report would inspire other countries in their implementation of the Convention. Since the report is an important exercise, Czechia has decided to publish it for the general public.
6. The delegation of **Ukraine** was grateful for the opportunity to present some words about its report. With its long social and cultural history and diversity of cultural traditions, Ukraine has a real treasure of intangible cultural heritage elements that need to be regularly collected, preserved and updated. The Ukrainian Centre for Cultural Studies was nominated as the main institution for carrying out such activities and preparing the report. The delegation saw its mission to safeguard ICH in Ukraine as being through the establishment of efficient partner relationships between cultural centres, universities and schools, local communities, professional associations and element bearers. In this context, the delegation highlighted three issues. First was the necessity to raise awareness of the role of intangible cultural heritage for social development, social cohesion and identity-building. With these aims, many conferences, workshops, seminars and training, including internationally, had been organized with the assistance of partners in neighbouring countries such as Lithuania, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova and others. In addition, it used inscribed elements, such as Petrykivka painting, to prepare best practices and develop projects at the national, regional and local levels. There was also the need to take care of elements in need of urgent safeguarding that were associated with general processes, such as globalization and urbanization, which affect rural areas, as well as those related to the political and economic situation, and major conflicts, which impact not only Ukrainian national culture but also the culture of other nations residing historically in Ukraine, such as the Crimean Tatars and Karaites. Ukraine is a multinational State consisting of 134 nationalities and ethnic groups; the efficient implementation of the Convention therefore occurs through intercultural dialogue. On behalf of the Ministry of Culture of Ukraine, the delegation expressed its interest in international cooperation in training, research and the realization of common projects, and it hoped to have some feedback and good proposals.
7. The delegation of the **Philippines** remarked thatthe submission and examination of periodic reports on the status of elements was both useful and critical. It regretted the low rate of timely submissions and encouraged all States Parties to submit reports on time, adding that there might be ways to provide incentives to States Parties to enable this. Timely submissions could perhaps be linked to prioritizing the evaluation of nominations to the various lists or requests for International Assistance. The Committee might also consider means to make the updating and submission of reports easier, such as facilitating the online updating of reports by States Parties through a protected password system. Lastly, the delegation believed that the reports could likewise be vehicles for dialogue and cooperation between and among States Parties, the Secretariat and other relevant stakeholders. It would be glad to see side events or dialogue fora stemming from these reports with a view to distilling best practices and challenges, perhaps through a peer review or sharing experiences for mutual benefit. The synopsis of the few reports submitted already contains a wealth of information. Raising their profile could add a sense of urgency and elevate the importance of States Parties’ reports, thereby creating more incentives for their timely submission.
8. The delegation of **Burkina Faso** took the opportunity to thank UNESCO for its welcome, adding that it had previously been a Member of the Committee and was currently carrying out the important work of inventorying elements of cultural heritage, for which it thanked UNESCO. The delegation conceded that difficulties had been encountered due to the unfavourable political situation in the country, which meant that it could not submit its report on time. Nevertheless, it thanked UNESCO for its support to carry out this work. The country was also implementing a system of living human treasure that was accompanying these elements as it had identified a number of people with the knowledge and skills to ensure the transmission of these elements to the younger generation. The delegation concluded by conveying greetings on behalf of its cultural authorities and the Minister of Culture, Mr Tahirou Barry.
9. The delegation of **Hungary** congratulated the States who had prepared reports, although it was fully aware that many countries had yet to submit their reports, as mentioned in paragraph 4 of the draft decision, with some reports having been overdue for several years. The delegation believed that reports played an important role in the implementation of the Convention as they could be useful for other countries in sharing experiences and enabling international cooperation, the principal aims of the Convention. Knowledge gleaned from the reports would also help States Parties in the preparation of their own reports. In addition to encouraging States to submit their reports before the next deadline, the delegation suggested that the global capacity-building programme should emphasize this issue, taking into account the respective needs of the States Parties concerned.
10. The delegation of **Norway** informed the Committee that Norway had submitted its last report in 2014, adding that the process of preparing the report was itself very valuable and had a great capacity-building effect, especially when developing the report in cooperation with NGOs and experts in the research institutes in the country. The delegation therefore warmly recommended that States Parties take the opportunity to build their own capacity through this reporting process.
11. The delegation of **Turkey** thanked the Secretariat for its work on the 2016 periodic reporting cycle, and particularly for the in-depth study on the integration of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding into cultural and other policies. The 2016 overview of submitted reports provided an analysis of the experiences and challenges encountered by the submitting States Parties, while the in-depth study was very useful for understanding how intangible cultural heritage interacted with and contributed to other policy areas, especially policy measures on sustainable development. Given the fact that the new chapter on sustainable development was integrated into the Operational Directives and the 2030 Agenda was now in progress, the delegation wished to encourage all States Parties to highlight the contribution of intangible cultural heritage to sustainable development. It recognized the ongoing challenge of submitting reports on time; only 6 out of 37 States Parties had submitted their reports in the 2016 cycle. This challenge limited the Committee’s ability to monitor the implementation of the Convention, depriving it of a significant amount of experience, perspectives on the different challenges and lessons learned in the many States Parties. The delegation congratulated the Republic of Korea for its voluntary contribution to help improve the periodic reporting mechanism, and it expected the Secretariat to develop a well-designed project, including effective measures, to strengthen the mechanism thanks to the additional resources available.
12. The delegation of **Austria** thanked the Secretariat for the excellent overview of the reports, as well as the abstracts, which offered a large amount of information on the great diversity of actions undertaken to achieve progress in the implementation of the Convention. It also welcomed this new initiative to give the floor to the States Parties that had submitted reports to hear about their experiences in preparing the report, while also sharing the challenges and opportunities they had encountered. From its own experience, the delegation accepted that submitting the report was not an easy task and that it required a lot of time and effort. However, it was also rewarding in terms of bringing together a number of strengths resulting from implementation over the years, and it offered an opportunity to share experiences, challenges and lessons learned. Thus, the reports have a very important monitoring function for the Convention. The delegation regretted that so many countries, even 84 per cent, did not fulfil their reporting obligations. States Parties should ask themselves the reasons for this, and how it could be rectified. In this context, it welcomed the Secretariat's initiatives in helping States fulfil their reporting obligations, such as the dedicated [webpage](https://ich.unesco.org/en/submissions-and-deadlines-00861), reminder letters and the guidance documents. The delegation thanked the Republic of Korea for its generous contribution to the ICH Fund to help improve the periodic reporting mechanism. Furthermore, it saw the abstracts of the report as an excellent tool; they could even encourage other States Parties to attempt the task. However, the delegation felt the need to undertake measures to further strengthen the visibility of the many activities taking place. The Secretariat had reminded the Committee that the overall results framework might influence the reporting mechanism. In this context, the delegation drew the Committee’s attention to a very successful activity of the 2005 Convention, the Global Report 2015[*Reshaping Cultural Policies*](http://en.unesco.org/creativity/global-report-2015) that tracks progress in the implementation of the Convention and its goals. It analyses current trends, advances the challenges faced by all the relevant policy actors and provides examples of innovative policies and measures that address current issues. Considering the large amount of information obtained from six cycles of the reporting, the delegation wondered whether a global monitoring report could be compiled on the implementation of the 2003 Convention. The delegation noted that the Committee had access to: i) a number of countries with an institutional framework for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage; ii) in-depth information on inventory-making, safeguarding measures and international cooperation; iii) a number of policy areas where intangible cultural heritage contributes, such as sustainable development, economic and rural development, tourism, social and community development, social conflict resolution, and creating social harmony, to name only a few; iv) reports about inscribed elements; and v) information on the use of International Assistance. This wealth of information could provide a good overview of the implementation of one of UNESCO’s most successful Conventions; no other Convention has seen the ratification of 171 States Parties in 13 years. The delegation suggested that the funding could come from the ICH Fund under budget line 3.
13. The delegation of **India** commended the Secretariat for its excellent work in providing an analysis of the six periodic reports. It also commended the Secretariat for sending reminders, making available an online tool on periodic reports to monitor the progress of each State Party, as well as the additional guidance for completing form ICH-10 that was currently being updated. Nevertheless, it expressed concern about the high number of overdue reports, with 84 per cent of the reports still overdue. Periodic reports make it easier to evaluate the implementation of the Convention at national levels and help share best practices. The delegation recognized the need for capacity building in the submission of periodic reports, and therefore welcomed the offer of US$300,000 from the Republic of Korea to help improve the periodic reporting mechanism.
14. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** regretted that the periodic reports were very late and that 84 per cent of the States that were expected to submit reports had not yet done so; this was concerning as it was an issue that affected the future of the Convention.The delegation asked the Secretariat how it could reverse this trend and whether this was a capacity-building problem. Should submission by States Parties be enforced, and if so, how could this be done in practice?
15. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Secretarybefore the adoption of the decision.
16. Thanking the speakers for their various interventions, the **Secretary** agreed that the periodic reporting mechanism of the Convention was not functioning. With regard to the global report, the Secretary wondered how it could be considered global when only 16 per cent of States Parties had submitted reports, although it was clearly a wonderful idea and would be a real achievement for the Convention. The question raised by Côte d'Ivoire was an important one in that it asked what could be done. The Secretary reminded the Committee that it was the prerogative of the State to submit their reports, as per the decision in the last Committee meeting that encouraged States to fulfil their reporting obligations before applying to the Lists. One approach would be to ask the Committee whether it wished to reinforce this rule. However, the offer by the Republic of Korea was very interesting and allowed for a reflection on how the reports could be used to give visibility to the work of the States Parties. Thus, as pointed out by Norway, the reporting mechanism should be seen not just as an obligation but as an opportunity to better understand the status of ICH within a country. The Secretary reminded the Committee that the real impact of the Convention was not during international meetings but within communities, and this would be showcased through the mechanism. The Secretariat would be happy to further explore the multiple ways in which the reporting mechanism could be enhanced. There was a suggestion to integrate this into the capacity-building programme, which could work, but the States Parties also had to see this is as an opportunity to make their work public, which would also be a learning opportunity. The Secretary was open to discussions and possibilities, adding that the idea of a global report would be great if it were truly global. Nevertheless, the Secretariat would reflect and propose some ideas to the Committee on how to improve this mechanism.
17. With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, noting an amendment in paragraph 1 from Turkey [to make reference to working document 6].
18. The delegation of **Turkey** explained that it had proposed this amendment because it had proposed another amendment in 5 bis [new paragraph 6] where it thanked the Republic of Korea for its generous offer and therefore wished to reference decision 6.
19. With no objections, the **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 1 adopted as amended.Paragraphs 2–4 were also duly adopted. The original paragraph 5 was also adopted. The amendment proposed by Turkey appeared as a new paragraph 6, which would read, ‘Welcomes the generous offer of the Republic of Korea to contribute to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund in order to help the Secretariat improve the periodic reporting mechanism of the Convention, and requests the Secretariat to undertake measures to strengthen the visibility and implementation of this mechanism and to report to its twelfth session’.
20. The delegation of **Hungary** congratulated the Chairperson for his management of the meeting. It wondered about the precise meaning of the second part of the paragraph, adding that perhaps the global capacity-building exercise could be seen as a possible mechanism to highlight the importance of the reports. In this way, the delegation wondered whether this was implied in the measures the Secretariat might undertake to strengthen the visibility and implementation of the mechanism. Otherwise, it wished to propose a sentence in that regard.
21. The **Chairperson** soughtclarification from the Secretariat.
22. The **Secretary** explained thatit could potentially be used for that purpose but not necessarily. He understood that there was a request for capacity building, but there were other areas where the Secretariat was developing capacity building for periodic reporting though not specifically with this funding. The Secretary did not think that this decision was the place for it because there was already funding for the capacity-building programme and for developing materials, which would diminish if it were placed here. Although the sum offered by the Republic of Korea was generous, it was not a large amount of money for mechanism development, visibility plus capacity building, and there was the risk that it would not be properly implemented. Thus, Hungary’s suggestion would seem to be better placed in the global capacity-building programme.
23. The delegation of **Hungary** was satisfied with the answer.
24. The **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 7 adopted.
25. The delegation of **Austria** referred to the new chapter in the Operational Directives on sustainable development and wondered whether it could be reflected in paragraph 8. It noted that Turkey had referred to it in its amendment in 9 bis [new paragraph 11] and therefore proposed inserting ‘including sustainable development’ after ‘other policies’ in order to further stress this important fact.
26. The delegation of **Turkey** clarified that this was the reason it had proposed its amendment but it was fine with Austria’s proposal.
27. With no objections, the **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 8 adopted, as amended.Paragraphs 9 and 10 were also duly adopted as proposed. The amendment by Turkey became a new paragraph 11, which would read, ‘Encourages States Parties to underline in their periodic reports the contribution of national policy measures regarding the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage to sustainable development, particularly in the context of the role of culture in the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals’. With no objections, the new paragraph 11 was duly adopted. The Chairperson noted an amendment by Côte d'Ivoire in a new paragraph 12.
28. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** explainedthat it would complement the former paragraph 11 [now paragraph 13], with the addition, in the latter part of the sentence, of the following, ‘and requests the General Assembly to take the appropriate decision concerning the non-production or production delays of periodic reports’.
29. The **Chairperson** noted thereshuffle in the numbered paragraphs, with the amendment by Côte d'Ivoire now a new paragraph 13. With no objections to paragraphs 12 and 13 as amended, they were duly adopted. The Chairperson turned to the adoption of the decision as a whole and with no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision 11.COM 9.a adopted**.

**ITEM 9.b OF THE AGENDA:**

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

**Document** [*ITH/16/11.COM/9.b*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-9.b-EN.docx)

**Decision** *11.COM 9.b*

1. The **Chairperson** proceeded to the examination of agenda item 9.b.
2. The **Secretary** explained that the Committee had the task of examining the six reports submitted by States Parties on elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List, and of providing a summary of those reports to the General Assembly, as listed in the table in paragraph 6 of the working document. The table in paragraph 5 shows the 11 reports that were expected between 2013 and 2015 but which had not yet been submitted for examination by the Committee. It was noted that China had already submitted its seven overdue reports in May 2016, and Peru had also submitted its report in October 2016. The Committee would examine all these reports in 2017, hopefully together with those from Brazil, Indonesia and Mauritania, which were one year late. The working document included assessments of the six reports. As was customary, the Secretariat summarized the reports on the effectiveness of the safeguarding activities, on the participation of communities in implementing the safeguarding plan and in the reporting process, as well as on the viability of and current risks for the inscribed element. Adraft decision for each of the six reports was proposed. Finally, the Secretary informed the Committee that Viet Nam had submitted its Urgent Safeguarding List report on the status of ‘Xoan singing of Phú Thọ Province, Viet Nam’. However, in compliance with Decision 10.COM 19, this would be examined at the twelfth session of the Committee in 2017 together with a new nomination of the same element for possible transfer to the Representative List.
3. The **Chairperson** noted that some of the States that had submitted a report in this cycle, namely France, the Islamic Republic of Iran and Mongolia wished to share their experiences in preparing it, and on the challenges and opportunities linked to the inscription of these elements on the Urgent Safeguarding List and the implementation of the corresponding safeguarding plans. They would be given the floor after the adoption of the individual decisions concerning their reports, as for the other States that had submitted reports. With no States Parties wishing to take the floor at this stage, the Chairperson moved to the examination of the first of the six reports submitted by **France** on **‘Cantu in paghjella, a secular and liturgical oral tradition of Corsica’**.
4. The **Secretary** proceeded with the examination of the draft decisions, explaining that a few standard paragraphs, as well as specific ones, addressed the needs, welcomed the achievements and underlined the challenges for each inscribed element. In the case of France, in paragraph 4, it proposed taking note of its continued efforts to safeguard this element inscribed in 2009, in particular through the systematic recording and transmission of the element by bearers, especially for school-aged children. Paragraph 5 encouraged the State to address the current threats by continuing the programme of recording the chants, strengthening their transmission through training workshops, and seeking increased opportunities for traditional performances. Finally, the Committee might wish to encourage the State to continue its cooperation with the ‘Cantu in paghjella’ Association and the Regional Directorate of Corsica in safeguarding the element and to provide adequate financial support for expanding the transmission activities.
5. The **Chairperson** then turned to Decision 11.COM 9.b.1, as shown on the screens. With no comments or amendments, he **declared Decision 11.COM 9.b.1 adopted**.
6. The delegation of **France** warmly thanked the host country for its welcome, adding that its periodic report had been drawn up in close cooperation with the practitioners, and in particular the association ‘Cantu in paghjella’, the cornerstone of its continual practice in Corsica. The report was based on the community of practitioners who transmit the practice to the younger generation called ‘paghjelli’. The report described some of the lessons learned. For example, it was noted that the population shared a great enthusiasm for this element of heritage as they became aware of its wealth but also its great vulnerability. The singers, who are not paid, have to set aside their professional jobs to practice the cantu, which ends up restricting their involvement. To overcome this difficulty, the French Ministry of Culture granted an annual sum of 45,000 Euros to compensate the singers and to help promote training that would increase the numbers of trainees, and thus the capacity to train others in turn. The transmission of the practice today benefits two distinct groups: adults and students. Adults are trained through workshops or traditional vigils, while schoolchildren are taught in bilingual French-Corsican classes. The initiative began in September 2015 and has produced excellent results and continues to this day. Finally, collections and recordings have been more systematically organized during masses and vigils, and thanks to the availability of funds, the public was now able to discover cantu in practice and its interpretations. Concluding, it was clear that inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List had enabled the practice to create a real dynamic around which to safeguard, protect and transmit it; it would not have reached that level otherwise. Furthermore, the drafting of the periodic report provided the delegation with an excellent opportunity to take stock of the measures implemented and their effectiveness.
7. Thanking France, the **Chairperson** then turned to the examination of the second report submitted by the Islamic Republic of Iran on **‘Traditional skills of building and sailing Iranian Lenj boats in the Persian Gulf’**.
8. The **Secretary** noted that paragraph 4 acknowledged the safeguarding efforts undertaken by Iran, in particular the awareness-raising and capacity-building activities, and the creation of a Lenj Research Centre. Paragraph 5 invited the State to continue its cooperation with all relevant stakeholders, in particular in seeking ways to reconcile modern methods of boat building and navigation with traditional methods. Finally, the Committee might wish to encourage the State to increase the number of Lenj workshops and to support its practitioners, among other safeguarding actions, included in paragraph 6.
9. The **Chairperson** then turned to Decision 11.COM 9.b.2, and with no comments or amendments, the **Chairperson declared Decision 11.COM 9.b.2 adopted**.
10. The **Chairperson** moved to the examination of the third report also submitted by the Islamic Republic of Iran on **Naqqāli, Iranian dramatic story-telling**.
11. The **Secretary** noted that this draft decision proposed that the Committee acknowledge the continued efforts of Iran to safeguard this element, especially though its support for practitioners, and commend it for having established the first Naqqāli House (paragraphs 4 and 5). Furthermore, in paragraph 6, the Committee might wish to invite the reporting State to build four more Naqqāli Houses in various regions of Iran, as suggested in the report, and to establish a Naqqāli Foundation for processing and disseminating recordings. Finally, the State might be encouraged to continue supporting naqqāls and to collaborate with practitioners and experts in identifying and implementing innovative safeguarding approaches, as proposed in paragraph 7.
12. The **Chairperson** then turned to Decision 11.COM 9.b.3, and with no comments or amendments, he **declared Decision 11.COM 9.b.3 adopted**.
13. The delegation of the **Islamic Republic of Iran** thanked the Committee for the opportunity to share its experience, and Ethiopia for its hospitality. The delegation presented a short report on its experience in preparing the two periodic reports, the opportunities linked to their inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List and the implementation of the safeguarding plan. Regarding the preparation of the reports, the delegation had held many meetings with representatives, practitioners, communities and bearers, NGOs and related organizations responsible for implementing the safeguarding plan, and the data had been compiled into reports by the ICH Secretariat of Iranian cultural heritage. Regarding opportunities, the inscription of these elements raised public awareness about the importance of ICH generally and about the values of these two elements in particular. It also attracted people’s attention, especially older people who became interested in practising the element, and who actively participated in its safeguarding resulting in greater transmission of the element, mostly through traditional master-apprenticeship. One of the challenges included the death of some practising masters, resulting in a permanent loss of valuable knowledge and skills. Another key challenge was the decreasing number of orders for wooden Lenj. Some measures had therefore been taken, such as lowering taxes for practising masters and for insurance, as well as for their repair shops; this resulted in lower costs and a rise in the number of orders. In addition, a seminar was held in which masters, bearers and practitioners came together to present their problems, experiences and expectations. This had resulted in a historical house in one of the historical ports of Iran, Bandar Kong, being allocated to these communities by the city council for future activities. Regarding Naqqāli, one of the activities was a public call for children and youth who practise Naqqāli to send a video of their performances to the Secretariat of the programme, leading to great interest among the youth, especially young women and girls who watch the videos. As a result, the number of practising women and girls is growing considerably and those reaching a professional level are invited to attend various ceremonies, even abroad. The delegation hoped that the status of both elements would improve in the very near future so that they could soon be transferred from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List.
14. The **Chairperson** then moved to the fourth report submitted by Mali on the element **‘Secret society of the Kôrêdugaw, the rite of wisdom in Mali’**.
15. The **Secretary** noted that paragraph 4 proposed taking note of the efforts of Mali in safeguarding this element inscribed in 2011, in particular through the establishment of Kôrêdugaw associations throughout the country as well as educational programmes for young people. In paragraph 5, the State is invited to further develop the existing cooperation between the communities in the different regions, Kôrêdugaw associations, local and customary authorities, village councils and resource persons in order to ensure the long-term viability of the element. Finally, the Committee may wish to encourage the State to address the lack of financial resources required to implement all the planned safeguarding activities; one possibility could be provided by international cooperation mechanisms, which were therefore mentioned in paragraph 6 as a possible way to mobilize funds.
16. The **Chairperson** then turned to Decision 11.COM 9.b.4, noting an amendment in paragraph 6 submitted by Turkey. With no comments or amendments on paragraphs 1–5, they were adopted. The amendment [the insertion at the end of the paragraph 6, which read ‘including the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund’] was pronounced adopted, as was paragraph 7. With no comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision 11.COM 9.b.4 adopted**.
17. The delegation of **Mali** thanked the Government of Ethiopia for the good organization of the session and for its warm welcome, as well as the Secretariat for its work and above all the constructive exchanges that had taken place during the preparation of the periodic report. The delegation spoke of the regular inventories that had been conducted in various cultural sites, municipalities and regions since its ratification of the Convention in 2005. These inventories recognized the wealth, diversity and vivacity of ICH in Mali, but they also revealed the difficulties of transmitting it. The inventoried elements are regularly updated; to this end, it was also necessary to continue raising awareness, and above all to strengthen the capacities of the bearer communities, the primary guardians of this intangible heritage. Mali had also set up management committees within the communities to facilitate the evaluation and concerted safeguarding of the elements inventoried. Concluding, the delegation remarked on the need to prepare the periodic reports in order to evaluate and adapt any of the proposed safeguarding measures, but also to renew trust with the communities, consolidate knowledge, and propose projects to safeguard the inventoried elements.
18. The **Chairperson** then moved to the fifth report submitted by Mongolia on the element **‘Folk long song performance technique of Limbe performances – circular breathing’**.
19. The **Secretary** suggested that the Committee might wish to take note of the safeguarding activities implemented so far by Mongolia in paragraph 4. These included, among others, a field study of the current state of Limbe and its repertoire, formal and non‑formal training courses, scientific meetings, as well as awareness-raising and promotional activities. Paragraph 5 invited the State to further support training activities, especially of new Limbe performers, to improve research methods for the safeguarding of this element and to cooperate with all relevant stakeholders in safeguarding efforts. Finally, in paragraph 6 it proposed that the Committee encourage the State to remain committed to the safeguarding of this vulnerable element, possibly by ensuring stable financial support for its practitioners.
20. The **Chairperson** then turned to the draft decision 5, and with no comments or amendments, he **declared Decision 11.COM 9.b.5 adopted**.
21. The delegation of **Mongolia** took the opportunity to renew its gratitude to Ethiopia and to the Secretariat for its excellent work. It took note that the Committee had invited Mongolia to develop improved safeguarding methods, especially in formal and non-formal education and transmission processes. Mongolia had also made efforts to establish a firm foundation for its future viability. The **‘Folk long song performance technique of Limbe performances - circular breathing’** was inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List in 2011. At present, as could be concluded from the periodic report, Mongolia still needed to consolidate a reliable financial support for its practitioners and for specific safeguarding activities in order to guarantee its future viability and raise awareness. To this end, the delegation informed the Committee that it intended to request International Assistance in the near future. The delegation acknowledged the relevant NGOs, bearers and communities in Mongolia who had participated in the preparation of the report and made it possible. The delegation concluded by calling upon all States Parties to endeavour to submit their periodic reports on time for the efficient implementation of the Convention, particularly for elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List. It also encouraged the Secretariat to develop a capacity-building mechanism for reporting as soon as possible.
22. The **Chairperson** then moved to the sixth and final report submitted by the United Arab Emirates on the element **‘Al Sadu, traditional weaving skills in the United Arab Emirates’**.
23. The **Secretary** noted that paragraph 4 acknowledged the efforts undertaken so far, and it especially emphasized the strengthening of inter-generational transmission, the improvement of the economic condition of the bearers and the development of their income-generating opportunities. Paragraph 5 suggested that the Committee encourage the State to continue its activities. Finally, the Committee might wish to encourage the State to continue cooperating with all relevant stakeholders in safeguarding the element, to expand its activities to all of the seven emirates and to fully implement the actions foreseen, such as building a Sadu House.
24. The **Chairperson** then turned to the draft decision, and with no comments or amendments, he **declared Decision 11.COM 9.b.6 adopted**.
25. The delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** described Al Sadu as a traditional weaving handicraft practised by Bedouin women who use sheep, goat and camel wool to make soft furnishings for their homes, as well as accessories for camels and horses. Researchers, the communities concerned and bearers had noted that the Al Sadu tradition was at risk, basing their judgement on the fact that the majority of the skillful bearers were elderly women between 60 and 80 years old, and that their numbers were decreasing rapidly to the extent that soon they would no longer be able to transmit this heritage to new generations. The United Arab Emirates had nominated Al Sadu traditional weaving skills for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List in 2011, implementing ambitious safeguarding measures. After four years of implementation, and in order to prepare this periodic report in 2015, an independent research body had been assigned to evaluate the situation of Al Sadu and, in particular, to examine the demography of Al Sadu practitioners. The report had been thoroughly discussed by representatives of eight civil societies, NGOs and 59 individual bearers who participated in the preparation of the periodic report through two workshops and a series of meetings. The findings revealed that the inscription had had a positive impact on raising awareness at individual and State levels about the safeguarding of Al Sadu, thus ensuring its transmission to future generations. The delegation believed that the element had reached a stage in which it could be taken to the next level, i.e. inscribed on the Representative List. While it appreciated the evaluation, it was surprised that it would have to maintain this element on the Urgent Safeguarding List. It therefore sought further clarification on the decision, despite recommendations from some practitioners that it required more support. Nevertheless, as coordinators of the file, and by following up with researchers and ICH specialists, the delegation believed that the element had reached a situation in which it could now be inscribed on the Representative List. The delegation wished to thank Saudi Arabia for the possibility of speaking Arabic, and thanked the Chairperson and the Secretariat for their efforts in evaluating these reports. This was a new experience in the field of protecting and safeguarding threatened elements, but the efforts deployed were immense as were the financial resources. It was noted that since the practitioners had taken over the safeguarding of the element it had been reborn. The delegation would now wait another five years before it provided another report, during which time it was hoped that the element might reach a situation that would enable its transfer to the Representative List.
26. Thanking the United Arab Emirates, the **Chairperson** remarked that the final item was the adoption of the ‘chapeau’ decision 11.COM 9.b, but it was now lunchtime.
27. The **Secretary** informed the Committee of a number of side events taking place during lunchtime, namely, a roundtable discussion on learning with ICH in education, and the projection of the film ‘GUZO North, A journey to the origins of music in Ethiopia’ hosted by the delegation of Germany.

*[Tuesday, 29 November 2016, afternoon session]*

**ITEM 9.b OF THE AGENDA (CONT.):**

1. The **Chairperson** returned to the unfinished business of the ‘chapeau’ Decision 11.COM 9.b on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no forthcoming comments or objections, the Chairperson pronounced paragraphs 1–6 adopted. He then turned to the adoption of the decision as a whole, and with no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision 11.COM 9.b adopted**.

**ITEM 9.c OF THE AGENDA:**

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

**Document** [*ITH/16/11.COM/9.c*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-9.c-EN.docx)

**Decision** 11.COM 9.c

1. The **Chairperson** then moved to the reports submitted by the beneficiaries of International Assistance in agenda item 9.c, adding that this was an important means of taking the temperature of the implementation of this Convention on the ground.
2. The **Secretary** reminded the Committee of Article 24.3 of the Convention that reads, ‘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’. The Secretary remarked on the progressive systematization of reporting procedures, now with a mandatory standard form, with which all reports had been prepared. As the time of submission of the progress and final reports depended on the specific dates for each project – as agreed between the beneficiary State and UNESCO at the time of establishing the contract – the Secretariat had to choose a criterion for selecting the reports to be brought to the Committee’s attention at any given session. Considering the Secretariat’s efforts to align the reporting periods, as previously explained under item 5, it had opted to take all the reports due at 30 June 2016 and that had not been considered by the Committee at its last session. Consequently, the period covered by each report varied from one report to another depending on the implementation of the project. To ensure that the Committee had access to the largest number of reports of ongoing projects at any given session, paragraph 8 of the draft decision proposed that 30 June remain the deadline for States to submit reports to the Secretariat. Aware that these reports represented only a portion of the ongoing projects (some did not have to submit reports in this period), the working document also included a list of all projects that could be considered as ‘active’, i.e. approved by the Bureau or its Committee, whether or not a contract had yet materialized. This amounted to a total of twenty active projects for a total of US$1.68 million, according to the following geographical distribution: Group II: none; Group III: none; Group IV: five; Group V(a): thirteen; Group V(b): two.
3. The **Secretary** explained that in accordance with Decision 8.COM 7.c that had set an experimental mechanism of short-term based technical assistance to States Parties wishing to request International Assistance, four beneficiary countries had received technical assistance through the provision of experts suggested by the Secretariat and agreed by the requesting States: Côte d’Ivoire, Lesotho, Togo and Uganda. Two others, Albania and Ecuador, received technical assistance in 2016although they had not yet resulted in an approved project. Since 30 June the previous year, four more International Assistance requests had been granted by the Bureau, as previously reported by the Chairperson. The Committee was thus invited to take note of the achievements made possible thanks to the financial assistance granted by the Committee or its Bureau. However, in addition, document 9.c also presented a comprehensive overview of all the International Assistance implemented since it was first established, i.e. 54 projects for a total amount of US$2.75 million. While the Secretariat hoped these projects had had and continued to have positive effects in their recipient countries, it felt that both the use and potential of this mechanism remained under-exploited. The Secretary remarked that the question of its use was likely to improve with the increase in the maximum amount of requests that could be examined by the Bureau, which should allow States to avoid the dilemma of submitting an International Assistance request (of up to US$100,000) or a nomination since they were no longer evaluated and examined by the same bodies. The question of the potential of this financial assistance remained valid and on the table, as it could potentially become the operational window of the Convention, i.e. it could help construct a clear and complete picture of the priorities of States and communities in developing and implementing safeguarding actions and it therefore offered a real and realistic view of States’ expectations of the Convention through their use of the Fund. Projects implemented through International Assistance were definitely also seen as a repository of lessons learned and hopefully of good safeguarding practices from which others could learn. In sum, together with periodic reporting, International Assistance appeared to be the mechanism that could assist the Committee to fulfil its functions, as listed in Article 7 of the Convention, i.e. ‘encourage and monitor the implementation of the Convention’ and ‘provide guidance on best practices and make recommendations on measures for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage’. However, this was not presently the case. With the resources currently available, the Secretariat merely processed requests, provided in-depth assessment to improve the chances of approval by the competent body, and then made the contractual arrangements, but for that alone the Secretariat did not have the necessary resources. Moreover, requests up to US$100,000 were already experiencing processing delays. In other words, achieving the full potential of the International Assistance mechanism as mentioned was impossible under the current configuration of the Secretariat. This was acknowledged in the Committee’s earlier adoption of Decision 11.COM 5, inviting the Secretariat ‘to explore creative solutions to resolve the present and potential administrative and human resource bottlenecks in the implementation of the International Assistance mechanism’. The Committee was again – in the present decision – invited to highlight this ongoing concern.
4. With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Chairperson** moved to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no comments or amendments on paragraphs 1–9, they were duly adopted. Turning to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision 11.COM 9.c adopted**.
5. Before moving to the next item, the **Chairperson** wished to give countries that had benefited from International Assistance, such as Kenya, Mongolia, Morocco, Uganda, Viet Nam and Zambia, an opportunity to share their experiences, as well as others that might wish to take the floor.
6. The delegation of **Kenya** thanked the host government for the wonderful hospitality, congratulated the Chairperson for his able leadership, and commended the Secretariat for its efficiency and commitment to its work. Speaking of Kenya’s experience of International Assistance, the delegation recalled that following the Committee’s decision at its fourth session in 2009 to approve International Assistance under the ICH Fund, a contract was established in July 2011 between UNESCO and the Department of Culture in the then Ministry of State for National Heritage and Culture (now the Ministry of Sports, Culture and the Arts), for the implementation of the project ‘Traditions and practices associated with the Kayas in the sacred forests of the Mijikenda’, which consisted of three stages. The project aimed to safeguard heritage inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List, including through the training of nine Kaya communities on developing income-generating activities linked to their living heritage, apprenticeships for young elders, field trips to the Kayas by more than 400 students (who were inducted by the Kaya elders on the importance of safeguarding the traditions and practices of the Mijikenda), and the organization of intercommunity cultural festivals showcasing the Kaya traditional lifestyles, such as their traditional medicine, foodways and handcrafts. The project further produced and disseminated over 6,000 brochures in Swahili and English for related awareness-raising activities. Nevertheless, a number of challenges were encountered during implementation. Although the activities planned under the contract were duly implemented, the State Party came across administrative and financial challenges, first and foremost in the restructuring of the implementing Ministry after the general election in Kenya in 2013, which delayed the implementation of the activities and the submission of the final report by the date stipulated in the contract. Consequently, at the request of the Department of Culture, the contract was amended in July 2013 for an extension of one year until December 2014. Thereafter, the Ministry received funds in September under the account of the former Ministry of National Heritage and Culture. Unfortunately, the account was closed in the same month and the balance was transferred to the exchequer account of the National Treasury, which then required a parliamentary procedure to make the funds available to the Department of Culture. While the process took time to resolve, the intervention by the Ministry of Sports Culture and the Arts to re-allocate the funds to implement the final phase of the project salvaged the situation. The same funds were much later refunded to the Treasury. The delegation explained that in order to make the project sustainable, the Kenyan National Commission for UNESCO had started a programme to award the best conserved and managed Kayas, to enable them to continue practising the traditions.
7. The **Chairperson** thanked Kenya for sharing its experience.
8. The delegation of **Mongolia** remarked that Mongolia had been actively implementing the Convention’s objectives at the national level in close cooperation with UNESCO, mainly through its Office in Beijing, and its associated organizations, such as category 2 centres, including the International Information and Networking Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (ICHCAP) in the Republic of Korea, involving communities and groups. The delegation expressed its appreciation of the collaboration with and assistance afforded by the ICH Fund, which had played a significant role in promoting and safeguarding ICH in Mongolia. As a beneficiary, the Mongolian Government wished to thank all the donors that had contributed to the Fund, as well as the Secretariat for its generous support in safeguarding and revitalizing the Mongolian traditional epics, which had been dying out. In addition, Mongolia had benefitted from support for a project to improve the capacities of NGOs involved in ICH, which had been successfully implemented by a UNESCO-accredited NGO, the Foundation for the Protection of Natural and Cultural Heritage. The project started in 2015 and, as a result of the successful implementation of the project, today all the participants of the national capacity-building workshops for NGOs highly value the significance of the project, its impact and implications.
9. Thanking Mongolia, the **Chairperson** noted a request from Kenya to project a film.

*[A short film on the Mijikenda was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson** thanked and congratulated Kenya.
2. The delegation of **Morocco** congratulated the Chairperson for his leadership, and thanked Ethiopia for its hospitality and excellent organization of this session and Saudi Arabia for having generously provided Arabic language interpretation. It also thanked the Bureau for providing preparatory assistance for the nomination ‘Taskiwine, Amazigh dances and songs of the western High Atlas’, which was Morocco’s first nomination, but would certainly not be its last, for possible inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List. Pursuant to Decision 9.COM 4.BUR 2, Morocco had received preparatory assistance in the amount of US$14,100 from the ICH Fund in 2014. The preparatory assistance had enabled the preparation of the nomination of ‘Taskiwine, Amazigh dances and songs of the western High Atlas’, for its possible inscription in 2017, and had allowed the NGO Targa, the beneficiary of the assistance and the main NGO representing the bearer communities of this project, to carry out a number of activities in collaboration with the cultural heritage inventory services of the Ministry of Culture and other partners. In particular, these activities concerned the production, with the active participation of the communities concerned, of a first inventory of the ICH of the western High Atlas region, notably the constituent elements of the dance and songs called Taskiwine, and the organization of consultations with the communities, groups and individuals concerned in the presence of elected representatives, authorities and officials of the Ministry of Culture, researchers from Ibn Zohr University of Agadir, and the multidisciplinary Faculty of Taroudant. The two consultations were held to this end between the date of receipt of the preparatory assistance and the date of submission of the nomination in March 2016. These consultations had also contributed substantially to strengthening the capacity of local associations in the field of ICH. A professional production company had also produced a documentary film and a photo album on Amazigh dance and songs.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked Morocco for sharing its experience, noting a request from Uganda to show a film.
4. The delegation of **Uganda** expressed its gratitude to the Chairperson for his able guidance, Ethiopia for its hospitality, and the Secretary and the Secretariat for their excellent coordination of the meeting. Speaking about the ‘Bigwala, gourd trumpet music and dance of the Busoga Kingdom in Uganda’, near Jinja and inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List in 2012, the delegation explained that it had benefited from International Assistance in 2014. Thanks to this International Assistance, Uganda had surpassed the planned targets of the safeguarding measures, which had generated a lot of interest among the different community members, such as children, youth, women and men, to take part in most of the project activities. The financial mechanism was therefore an important tool for implementing safeguarding measures, and the delegation urged other States Parties to make maximum use of it. Uganda was committed to submitting its report on the status of the element before 15 December 2016 and to implementing the safeguarding measures not yet carried out, as well as guarding against the negative effects that may arise. Finally, the delegation requested the expeditious approval of the remaining files under the 1972 Convention.

*[A short film on the Bigwala was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson** thanked Uganda, giving the floor to Viet Nam.
2. The delegation of **Viet Nam** thanked Ethiopia for its kind hospitality. The project ‘Safeguarding the oral traditions and expressions of the Dzao people of Lao Cai and Lai Chau Provinces of Viet Nam’ in the amount of US$24,350 was supported by International Assistance from the ICH Fund and was carried out from August 2015 to August 2016 by the Viet Nam Association of Folklorists with the collaboration of local folklorists and local communities. The project provided courses on the Dzao language with oral traditions and expressions for 100 female learners and teachers in seven villages in the northern part of Viet Nam. The project also carried out 30 surveys on how to learn the Dzao language and oral traditions, such as folk songs, ritual chants and so on. Sixteen teachers were selected and a Memorandum of Understanding was signed with seven communal authorities to organize the classes. Community and stakeholder participation was the key for the successful implementation of the projects. Shamans and artists were the teachers, and the learners were teenagers and middle-aged people, especially women. In addition to its original attributes of safeguarding Dzao oral traditions, the project was very well received by local folklorists, the local community and the local government, raising UNESCO’s visibility in the region. The delegation thanked the community members and the Secretariat, adding that it hoped to benefit from the Fund again in the near future.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked Viet Nam, giving the floor to Zambia.
4. The delegation of **Zambia** expressed gratitude to the Secretary for having facilitated the approval of two International Assistance requests by Zambia; this was the first time it had ever benefited, having received two projects in one year. The first project is ‘Inventorying of the music and dance of the Lozi and Nkoya people of Kaoma District’, which was approved for US$24,928.30 in 2015. The programme was kick-started with a preparatory meeting held from 14 to 15 October [2016], with the progress report soon to be submitted by the Zambia National Commission for UNESCO. The meeting sought to chart the way forward and serve as guidance in the implementation of the project. The second project is ‘Inventorying of proverbs of Lala community of Luano District of Zambia’ in the central province of Zambia, which was approved for roughly US$25,000 in 2016. As the project had just started, a report had yet to be submitted. Moreover, there had been a technicality in the budget, which had since been resolved, but the money had been released to the project facilitator who was currently working in the field.
5. The **Chairperson** thanked Zambia, and took the opportunity to thank all the States Parties that had shared their respective experiences.

**ITEM 10 OF THE AGENDA:**

**REPORT OF THE EVALUATION BODY ON ITS WORK IN 2016**

**Document** [*ITH/16/11.COM/10*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-10-EN.docx)

**Decision** *11.COM 10*

1. Having concluded agenda item 9, the **Chairperson** turned tothe examination of agenda item 10. Before starting, he invited the Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, Mr Eivind Falk, representing the Norwegian Crafts Institute, and the Rapporteur, Mr John De Coninck, representing the Cross-Cultural Foundation of Uganda, to join the podium. The Chairperson informed the Committee that due to unforeseen circumstances the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, Ms Masami Iwasaki, was unable to participate in the present session. Thus, Mr Falk, as Vice-Chairperson, would present the recommendations for each of the nominations and proposals. The Chairperson recalled that the Evaluation Body had been established by the Committee at its tenth session in Windhoek in Namibia in order to evaluate nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List and the Representative List, as well as proposals to the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices and requests for International Assistance greater than US$ 25,000. The Chairperson explained that the Committee would begin item 10 with an oral report on the recommendations of the Evaluation Body presented by the Rapporteur on a number of cross-cutting and specific issues raised during the Body’s work on the four mechanisms. Following the oral report, the floor would be opened for a general debate, and then item 10 would be suspended. The overall decision 11.COM 10 would not be adopted until the Committee had examined all the individual nomination files. The Committee would begin with the evaluation of the five nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List, including the nomination to the Urgent Safeguarding List combined with an International Assistance request, under item 10.a. This would be followed by the 37 nominations to the Representative List, under item 10.b, and then the seven proposals to the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices, under item 10.c. The Vice-Chair would briefly present all the nominations and proposals with a succinct explanation justifying the draft decisions, along with the projection of photographs on the screens.
2. Regarding the debates on the files, the **Chairperson** wished to underline the heavy task ahead with the examination of 49 nominations under the tight schedule. In order to allow sufficient time for the Committee to discuss the specific files, the Bureau (during its Paris meeting on 20 October 2016) had agreed to adopt the same procedure as last year and to invite Committee Members wishing to discuss or amend specific draft decisions to inform the Secretariat that morning by 9 a.m.. Noting that some Committee Members had expressed concern regarding this procedure during item 2, adoption of the agenda, the Chairperson wished to reiterate that this procedure was merely organizational and it would not stop any Member from taking the floor on any decision if it so wished. Therefore, in principle, the Committee would adopt draft decisions (for which amendments had been submitted) on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis; for other decisions, they would be adopted as a whole. In either case, the submitting State would have two minutes for comments after adoption, as was customary. It was noted that the Secretariat had thus far received requests for debate on ten nominations to the Representative List and two proposals to the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices. Furthermore, the Chairperson reminded the Committee that the General Assembly had at its sixth session (30 May - 1 June 2016) adopted amendments to the Operational Directives extending the ‘referral’ option to the Urgent Safeguarding List, as well as proposals for the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices and International Assistance requests in the interest of coherency and simplicity, as reflected in Decision 6.GA 7. The ‘referral’ was thus now available for all four mechanisms. The Committee was also asked to keep in mind that in the same adopted decision, a referral of a nomination file should in no way be understood by the submitting State, nor should it imply or guarantee that the element would be inscribed in the future. It also chose to reserve the option ‘not to’ inscribe, select or approve for cases where the file provided insufficient evidence that the criteria had been satisfied, and to delete the four-year waiting period for the Representative List. Concerning nominations recommended for ‘referral’, the Chairperson explained that in conformity with Decision 9.COM 13.c in 2014, the Evaluation Body recommended a referral when information was lacking in a nomination, whether technical or substantial in nature. Depending on its priorities, the submitting State might wish to re-submit its file in the following cycle or another future cycle, as stated in each appropriate decision. In any case, files referred and later re-submitted were considered as new nominations and were therefore subject to the overall ceiling of files in the priority system, as described under paragraph 34 of the Operational Directives.
3. The **Chairperson** also wished to clarify how the Committee should proceed with amendments to the draft decisions on nominations, particularly in light of the decision taken earlier that morning under item 8 regarding the clarification of the decision-making process concerning the inscription, selection or approval of nominations, proposals and requests. As reflected in the decision, the spirit of consensus should prevail in the Committee’s debates when there were amendments on a draft decision, such that it should continue to work in the same manner as for all the other items and taking account of the decision made earlier. The Chairperson recalled that the Evaluation Body had been created to assist the Committee with the nominations because it did not have time to examine each nomination thoroughly. He reminded the Committee that it was composed of elected members proposed by the Committee itself, and it was therefore asked to act in respect of its own Evaluation Body.
4. The delegation of **Cuba** asked the Chairperson to refrain from valued judgments with regard to decisions that may or may not have been made, so as to maintain the impartiality of the Committee. It recalled that Cuba, supported by other delegations, had already made clear that it was ready to examine all the nominations not recommended for inscription by the Evaluation Body. The delegation noted that this was not established procedure in any of the Operational Directives, adding that it did not want to follow a template or a procedure decided upon by the Bureau. Although the Bureau organized the session and offered advice, the Committee, when adopting its own work methodology, could of course re-examine the nominations. The delegation thus disagreed with the Chairperson’s proposal, reiterating that although the Bureau supported the Committee, it was the Committee itself that decided on the methodology of its work with regard to nominations. The delegation remarked that this was a recurrent issue at every Committee meeting. Moreover, it was by no means questioning the Evaluation Body; rather, it had some questions regarding the working methods that the Committee had set out for the Evaluation Body, the outcome of which would likely emerge from the ensuing debate. The delegation recalled the first day of the Committee meeting in which the Committee had adopted its methodology of work, adding that Members could not be obstructed from re-examining nomination files because of practices that had not been approved by the Committee and that had not actually been studied or examined on the first day. The delegation appealed to the Chairperson to remain impartial on this point. Otherwise, it would not abandon the obligation of amending the functions and powers of the Chairperson, as previously discussed under item 8.
5. The **Chairperson** wished to clarify that the Bureau, in its morning session, had compiled all the amendments and requests for amendment received up until 9 a.m. so that it could schedule them accordingly. By no means did this imply that Members of the Committee could not propose any additional amendments. The Chairperson explained that this procedure simply facilitated the scheduling of items, particularly if there were extended sessions when there would only be two languages of interpretation available. In this way, amendments could be suitably scheduled within the time available. Nevertheless, any Committee Member could submit an amendment at any time prior to the opening of the file.
6. The delegation of **Cuba** did not doubt the explanation, especially as the Secretary had brought up the issue of opening a nomination file at the start of the meeting, but not with regard to presenting any amendments. Summarizing, the delegation took note that Committee Members were entitled to re-open and re-examine files should they wish, as well as to put forward amendments without the need to present them in advance, as per the procedure. The delegation reassured the Committee that it was not seeking to impose anything; rather, it wished to establish that Members could open a discussion on any nomination file that had not been recommended without it questioning the work of the Evaluation Body in any way.
7. The **Chairperson** concurred with Cuba. He now wished to recall several other working methods adopted by the Committee that it was asked to respect during the general debates: i) priority is given to Members of the Committee, but the floor would be opened to States Parties non-Members of the Committee and other Observers, if time permitted; and ii) participation in the debates on draft decisions concerning specific nominations, proposals and requests was limited to Committee Members. The Chairperson further recalled rule 22.4 of the Rules of Procedure in which submitting States, whether or not they are a Member of the Committee, shall not speak to advocate the inclusion of their file, but only to provide information in response to questions raised by Committee Members, if any. Moreover, since its sixth session in Bali in 2011, the Committee had established a working method according to which it would not accept new information or evidence after the assessment of the Evaluation Body, particularly during the Committee meeting. However, it would accept a clarification concerning the information already contained in the file. This was to ensure fair treatment of files among submitting States. The Chairperson reminded Members and Observers that large numbers of people were following the meeting via audiocast or through the news media and it was therefore important to keep as close to the schedule as possible. With no forthcoming comments, the Chairperson gave the floor to the Rapporteur of the Evaluation Body, Mr John De Coninck.
8. The **Rapporteur** spoke of his sense of privilege in introducing the overall report of the Evaluation Body on its work in 2016, which would not have been possible without the hospitality of the Chairperson and the Ethiopian government. The report provided an overview of the files examined in 2016, the Body’s working methods as well as observations and recommendations on a number of cross-cutting issues. He began with general information regarding working methods. The Body was composed of twelve members, as established by the Committee in 2015, which included three new members. As in the previous year, six members were individual expert representatives of States Parties non-Members of the Committee, and six represented accredited NGOs. At the Body’s first meeting in March 2016, Ms Masami Iwasaki from Japan was elected as Chairperson, Mr Eivind Falk from the Norwegian Crafts Institute was elected as Vice-Chairperson, and Mr John De Coninck from the Cross-Cultural Foundation of Uganda was chosen as Rapporteur. Unfortunately, Ms. Masami Iwasaki had been unable to attend the present session, and the Vice-Chairperson had therefore kindly agreed to present the Body’s recommendations on the individual files. The Committee determined that a total of 50 files could be treated in the 2016 cycle. The detailed rationale for the selection of these files could be found in document 10. The files included: five nominations for the Urgent Safeguarding List, one for the Urgent Safeguarding List combined with an International Assistance request, 37 for the Representative List, and seven for the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices. The Evaluation Body received the files in March – April 2016, after the Secretariat had established their technical completeness. Prior to the second meeting in June 2016, all members of the Body had submitted their individual assessments and recommendations on each criterion for each file through the dedicated website. During the week-long June meeting, the recommendations were collectively debated and consensus was reached on each criterion of all the submissions, as well as on cross-cutting topics and other issues. Following the meeting, draft decisions were prepared for each criterion and each file, as well as general observations and recommendations. The Body then met again in September 2016 to discuss, amend, validate and adopt all the reports, thus representing the consensus of the Evaluation Body Members. The Rapporteur was thus presenting this consensus and speaking on behalf of the twelve Members of the Body.
9. The **Rapporteur** briefly outlined some of the issues, observations and conclusions that had emerged during the deliberations. Firstly, with regard to **working methods**, the Body emphasized that it had based its recommendations exclusively on the analysis of the adequacy of the information presented, and not on the element as such, nor its merits or the intentions of a project. To enhance consistency and compliance, the Body was keen to ensure reliability in its evaluations. Particular attention was thus paid to applying criteria R.2 and R.5 as uniformly as possible across the files, and suggestions to improve the requirements for R.2 and R.5 in the forms were made to make this easier in the future. The Body was also aware that, whilethe Committee had clarified the requirements for meeting criteria U.5 and R.5 in 2015, the 2016 cycle files had been submitted before this decision had been taken. At the same time, the Body was aware of the need to reflect its cumulative experience and to recognize that standards necessarily evolve, as noted in the Committee’s Decision 6.COM 13. Additionally, the Body paid attention to linkages between criteria. Thus, in the case of inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List, if threats to an element were not well-defined (U.2), it proved difficult to evaluate the adequacy of safeguarding plans (U.3). Similarly, if an element was poorly defined under criterion R.1, this could have an impact on meeting criterion R.2. The Body therefore wished to respectfully remind submitting States to ensure coherence in their files. To ensure equity, as had been the custom, a Member of the Body did not participate in the evaluation of a nomination submitted by the country of domiciliation of the NGO he/she represented or by the nationality of an expert or a representative from an NGO. This was the case for 10 of the 50 files examined in this cycle, including a multi-national file for which half of the Body members could not participate in the evaluation. It was noted that should more situations of this type occur, it might hamper the Body’s ability to function. The role of the Vice-Chairperson was also discussed, with the Body suggesting that the Vice-Chair play a more active role in the preparation of the report, so as to be better prepared if called upon to replace or support the Chairperson during the Committee session, as was currently the case. As previously mentioned, in 2016, the General Assembly had revised the Operational Directives to extend the referral option to all the mechanisms of the Convention, making it possible for the Body to propose more nuanced evaluations and recommendations. Where the option was used, the Body indicated the nature of the missing information to provide submitting States with appropriate feedback.
10. With regard to the Body’s working method when evaluating **proposals for the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices**, the **Rapporteur** explained that the Body focused on the options (to select, not to select, or to refer for additional information) for each criterion as a guide for discussion rather than as a determining decision, conducting its evaluation on an overall assessment of the proposal for selection. It was noted that documentation material, including photographs and videos, was seen as essential information, together with the information provided in a nomination form itself. The Body noted several cases where the description of an element lacked clarity and where it had to rely on supporting documentation. The Rapporteur reminded submitting States that documentation material could not be a substitute for the information required on the form. Where there was an extension of an already inscribed element to other communities (either within the same country or in different countries), the Body resolved that the level of information in the newly submitted nomination should meet the criteria across all locations/countries, including those covered by the initial inscription. Concern was also expressed regarding the practice of ‘recycling’ community consent that was given at the time of the initial inscription. Finally, regarding the combined mechanism of nominations for inscriptions to the Urgent Safeguarding List with a request for International Assistance, it was noted that during this cycle the Body had evaluated a nomination file using this combined mechanism for the first time. Prior to its evaluation, Members of the Body discussed the relevance of each set of criteria and the number of scenarios that could occur for files using this combined mechanism. It was agreed that more experience was needed before reflecting on the adequacy of this mechanism.
11. The **Rapporteur** also wished to highlight three points that arose regarding the overview of the files. Overall, the Body found that the quality of the nomination files had improved compared to earlier cycles. Firstly, it appreciated the growing number of multinational files and their expansion to additional countries, as well as the degree of international cooperation required. The Body also noted an increasing number of proposals for the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices, as well as a first combined nomination, as mentioned earlier. Secondly, the Body found a diversity of submissions in this cycle that covered new perspectives on ICH (such as forms of social organization and of ancient cultural heritage with a global outreach). Such submissions triggered useful discussions on the contours of ICH and on diverse perceptions arising from different cultural and political contexts. Several elements also related to sacred sites and/or were shared by different religions, and there appeared to be a growing interest in objects/spaces associated with elements, thus strengthening the link between intangible and tangible aspects of cultural heritage. Finally, the Body particularly noted the quality of some of the files submitted for selection as Best Safeguarding Practices. For example, it appreciated: those that highlighted a successful link between revitalizing an element of ICH and development and between intangible and tangible cultural heritage; the use of dedicated monitoring mechanisms to track the impact of a practice; and the attention given to the environmental impact of a practice and how it had been tackled.
12. The **Rapporteur** remarked on the unsurprising **number of challenges** that had arisen. The first challenge concerned unclear language or poor translations, leading to ‘second guessing’ or discarding the information provided, thus placing the submitting State at a disadvantage. Submitting States were reminded to avoid inappropriate language, such as ‘masterpieces’, or ‘unique(ness)’, which was not in keeping with the spirit of the Convention. With regard to the title of elements, the Body wished to encourage submitting States to avoid any unnecessary reference to or implication of ‘exclusiveness’ or ‘ownership’ in the title. Thus, a title referring to a country or location is preferable to the use of a country’s adjective, and the Body proposed a modification every time it seemed appropriate. The Body also encouraged States Parties to be precise when providing a title, and thus avoid any risk of ‘monopolizing’ an element or form of expression. The Body also expressed concern about files that emphasized a nation-building (or nationalistic) purpose, as this was not in accordance with the spirit of the Convention, and could give prominence to authorities at the expense of the bearers and communities of the element in question. Relatedly, many elements have roots in violent historical events (such as in the colonial domination over indigenous populations) whose memory in contemporary expressions of ICH may now act as factors of unity. Where this may be the case, the submitting State was encouraged to present the historical context in a balanced manner. With regard to **human rights**, while all nomination files must address the issue of compliance with the provision of human rights instruments, this was seen as especially important for certain types of elements, such as initiation rites. Similarly, the rights of children need to be fully respected. The Rapporteur reminded submitting States to pay attention to **animal rights**, while considering cultural appropriateness in the treatment of animals, which should be carefully explained given the international audience of the inscriptions. Some of the files raised the question of the environmental sustainability of practices and thus the viability of an element, access to protected species, and replacement opportunities. Where relevant, States Parties were encouraged to proactively address such issues.
13. Regarding the **link between intangible and tangible cultural heritage**, notwithstanding the importance of this link, the **Rapporteur** wished to clarify that nominations need to focus on *intangible* aspects when identifying threats and safeguarding measures, and avoid any over-emphasis on tourism or on the physical site where the practice is enacted. For files concerning a sport (including martial arts), this was considered as an element of ICH. In this regard, the Body sought adequate information on the cultural and social significance of the practice, and the degree to which the communities concerned were not limited to commercial practices of the sport. The Body reiterated the need to clearly define and identify the communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals concerned with a particular element, including the gender dimension, and to apply this definition consistently. Vague definitions (such as ‘all men in country X’ or ‘all women in country Y’) rendered evaluation problematic. Lastly, submitting States were encouraged to avoid any over-emphasis on staged performances when submitting videos and to include the voices of the communities as well as subtitles to videos so that the evaluators could understand the lyrics and other information. The Body proposed that this requirement be made explicit in future.
14. The **Rapporteur** wished to conclude by sharing a few remarks regarding the **specific inscription criteria** of both the Urgent Safeguarding List and the Representative List. Regarding **R.1/U.1**, the Body discussed how to treat elements of a generic nature (akin to a social system, form of organization, or common belief), especially when their scope was broad and the bearers and practitioners were not precisely identified. The Body considered that in such cases it was helpful if the file demonstrated that: i) communities recognized the element as part of their ICH and identified with its transmission mechanisms; ii) practitioners identified with a specific community in terms of a sense of identity and continuity; and iii) the file presented clear evidence of the specificity of the element in a particular context. The Body reminded submitting States to avoid emphasizing the history of a practice and technical details at the expense of its social and cultural dimensions. Regarding **R.2**, it was noted that the criterion continued to present challenges and that often the information provided included statements of good intent rather than detailed evidence. In many files, the response also tended to erroneously focus on the consequences of inscription on the element itself. In this cycle, no fewer than 11 of the 21 nomination files recommended for referral were deemed as not having met criterion R.2. As the criterion constituted the essence of the Representative List, the Body welcomed a reformulation of the sub-questions in the nomination form to avoid ambiguities in the future. Regarding **U.2**, submitting States were reminded that U.2 concerned the specific threats affecting the viability of an element and not only common threats to ICH as a whole. Regarding **R.3/U.3**, the Body sought details with regard to proposed safeguarding measures, including financial information, timelines and evidence of commitments by States Parties and recommended that general intentions be avoided. A ‘top-down’ centralized approach to the preparation of safeguarding measures was also observed in some files. The Body stressed the importance of demonstrating the communities’ central role in preparing and implementing the proposed safeguarding measures. The Body also expressed concern about situations where non-compliance with measures might lead to unspecified coercive legal sanctions. The Body emphasized the importance of clear statements and explanations on how to counter any negative impacts or unintended consequences of inscription, such as tourism and over-commercialization. The Body also drew attention to the risk of safeguarding measures themselves leading to the decontextualization of an element. In the case of multinational files, the Body emphasized the importance of coordination between countries when developing and implementing safeguarding measures. Regarding **R.4/U.4**, while there was no standard requirement concerning the number, diversity or form of evidence of consent to be provided, the Committee had indicated a preference for the use of non-standard evidence and for a broad representation of the bearers and practitioners of the element. The Body therefore took into consideration the diversity of formats, and petitions alone were not considered acceptable. The Body also reviewed files that included consent by community ‘representatives’. States Parties were reminded that the nomination should demonstrate how the communities were consulted, and in what way any intermediaries were indeed representatives of the community in question. Regarding **R.5/U.5**, the Body had experienced difficulties in tracing the required information and in establishing consistency, and thus proposed a revision of the forms so that the submitting States were assisted in systematically presenting detailed and comprehensive information. This would enable the Secretariat to check all the fields and request any missing information from the submitting State when it examined the technical completeness of the file. Regarding the updating of inventories, and given the lack of any precise guidance regarding the required frequency of this updating (pending a guidance note on inventorying following the Committee decision in 2015), the Body considered the mention of updating as sufficient, including a stated intention to establish an updating mechanism. Where information on updating was only available in supporting documents or through website links, this was only considered as admissible if it was made available in either English or French. In this cycle, ten nomination files had been recommended for referral owing to the lack of an inventory updating mechanism; eight of these were recommended for referral for this reason alone. The Rapporteur hoped that the guidance note on inventorying, currently under preparation, and the revised forms would assist submitting States in addressing all the requirements under criterion R.5/U.5. With regard to **inventory extracts**, the Committee had decided that the inclusion of an element in an inventory required more evidence than a listing and should comprise a description and an extract. While waiting for a guidance note on inventorying to be developed, the Body considered it appropriate to apply flexibility, and privileged the obligation for States Parties to draw inventories ‘in a manner geared to [its] own situation’, as outlined in Article 12 of the Convention. The Body also considered that in the case of an extension of an element already inscribed on the Representative List, an inventory of the different parts of the element would be accepted in lieu of the inclusion of the proposed element as a whole in the inventory.
15. With regard to the **combined nomination for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List with a request for International Assistance**, the **Rapporteur** explained that the Body had been challenged in its evaluation of the first file that followed the ICH-01bis format. Firstly, it noted a number of discrepancies between the criteria to grant International Assistance indicated in the Operational Directives and the questions on the form, as well as between the way objectives and results were defined in the different parts of the form itself. Furthermore, the Body observed that consideration 10.a (national scope) may not always apply and – as this aspect was not included in the form – the submitting State may not have to provide information on this. The Body therefore called for a revision of the form. Regarding the **Register of Best Safeguarding Practices**, the following points arose. The Rapporteur further explained that overall, the Body carefully adhered to the purpose of the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices, i.e. it recognized practices that best reflected the principles and objectives of the Convention while demonstrating effectiveness in safeguarding. The Body considered that ways to safeguard ICH, such as a measure or policy, or building inter-sectoral partnerships, were eligible and even desirable. While the Body recognized that the Register had been designed to meet the particular needs of developing countries, it was also aware that it could play a useful role in highlighting good practices elsewhere. The Body therefore wished to underline that a safeguarding practice should be relevant and customized to the local context, and should also provide learning points. Regarding the name of the register itself, the Body noted that there was some confusion between the purpose of the ‘Register of programmes, projects and activities that best reflect the principles and objectives of the Convention’**,** which, as the wording officially states, was to select effective safeguarding practices to be promoted, disseminated and potentially replicated elsewhere, and the currently used shortened title ‘Register of Best Safeguarding Practices’, which placed an emphasis on the register as a mechanism intended to select only the ‘best’ safeguarding practices. In light of this, the Body recommended using the shortened title ‘Register of Good Safeguarding Practices’ as a way to better reflect the intent of the Register and the spirit of the Convention. The Body drew the submitting States’ attention to the need to demonstrate how the practice reflected the principles and objectives of the Convention rather than solely as a description of programme implementation or the activity in question, while demonstrating its ‘effectiveness’ in contributing to the viability of the ICH concerned and the role of communities in this respect. Submitting States were therefore advised to desist from outlining future intentions or initiatives and – where relevant – to demonstrate consent from the diversity of bearers involved in the programme or activity proposed for selection. With regard to criterion **P.6** (the use of the project as a model), the Body decided to interpret this criterion by including programmes or activities that could serve as a theoretical model and/or be rooted in a particular practice. With regard to **P.7**, the Body recalled that the criterion related to the commitment of the State and other parties involved to promote the practice concerned. Given the difficulty of gauging intent, the submitting States were encouraged to provide supporting evidence of such willingness by those concerned. With regard to criterion **P.8** on assessment, the Body reminded States Parties that the focus for this criterion was on the impact of the programme or activity proposed for selection rather than any other safeguarding measures themselves. Finally, with regard to **P.9** (applicability to developing countries), the Body pointed out the difficulty of applying this criterion, especially where a safeguarding practice (particularly in a developed country) had not been initially designed with the criterion in mind. The Body proposed instead that the criterion focus on its ability to replicate or foster international cooperation or sustainable development.
16. The **Chairperson** thanked the Rapporteur for his presentation, noting that he had raised important issues that would inform the Committee’s debate. Before opening the general debate, he gave the floor to the Secretary to provide additional information.
17. The **Secretary** informed the Committee of two issues concerning actions that had been carried out by the Secretariat in relation to criterion R.5, the inclusion of the element in an inventory, and to correspondence concerning nominations since the Evaluation Body process in 2016. Both criterion R.5 and criterion U.5 followed the same difficulties, as experienced by previous Evaluation Bodies. In accordance with Decision 10.COM 10, and in consultation with the current Evaluation Body, the Secretary had revised the presentation of section 10 in nomination forms ICH 01 and ICH 02 to assist submitting States in systematically presenting detailed and comprehensive information concerning the inclusion of the element in an inventory. The objectives were to reduce the risk of missing information and to allow the Secretariat to identify missing information during its technical treatment of the file before its submission to the Evaluation Body. These revised forms had been available online since 7November 2016. The Secretariat had also been working on the ongoing development of a guidance note on inventorying ICH in order to provide advice to States Parties on the preparation of inventories and to clarify the expectations of the Evaluation Body and the Committee with regard to criteria R.5 and U.5, which would be finalized prior to the next Committee session. With regard to correspondence from the public or other concerned parties, the Secretariat had received a number of letters and emails on some nominations in the current cycle. Following the procedures set by the Committee in its Decision 7.COM 15, the correspondence had been transmitted to the submitting States concerned for their possible response. When received – at least four weeks before the meeting of the Evaluation Body – letters and responses from submitting States were then uploaded onto the Convention website and made available to the Evaluation Body. The Committee could also consult this correspondence online, including any letters received from 20 August to 27October 2016, since these could not be made available to the Evaluation Body, in conformity with Decision 7.COM 15. However, the Secretariat also received a number of anonymous letters and emails concerning nominations. The Bureau of the Committee, which met on 20 October 2016, had been informed that the Secretariat did not transmit this correspondence to the submitting States given its anonymous nature. The Secretary hoped the Committee would agree with this practice in order to protect the procedure relating to handling correspondence concerning nominations from any possible abuse from anonymous correspondence.
18. Thanking the Secretary, the **Chairperson** opened the general debate on the report.
19. The delegation of **India** congratulated the Evaluation Body for the presentation of its very comprehensive report and for its work, adding that 50 nomination files in one year was no mean feat. However, the delegation noted that there were more cases of referral than it would like to see, and questioned why this was so, especially as Committee Members and States Parties did not have the chance to clarify or to supply additional information that would have improved the process. It referred to the 1972 Convention in which there was a clear window for States Parties to supply additional information that inevitably improved the chance of success and inscription, which was ultimately the objective as this boosted communities back home. The delegation thus recommended that the Convention include a time window during which States Parties could clarify and supply additional information. In addition, as mentioned in the report, as many as 11 States had stumbled on R.2. It was thus important for the Secretariat to provide greater clarity on R.2 to ensure submitting States knew what to expect. This was the case for R.5 with the new guidelines coming into force, such that R.5 was now very difficult to misunderstand. In this regard, the delegation sought a more in-depth discussion on the issue and stated the case for an open-ended working group of States Parties, also open to Observers, that would bring these recommendations to the next Committee session for adoption, and then on to the General Assembly, which would lead to greater interaction, transparency and dialogue between the Evaluation Body and the States Parties.
20. The delegation of **Palestine** thanked the Rapporteur and the Secretariat for their clear report and working document. It also thanked India for its remarks that were in line with its own thoughts on the issue, i.e. what should be done by submitting States to improve their chances of success. While it appreciated the actions of the Evaluation Body, it believed that there was ample scope to improve the methods implemented, which would help the submitting States’ chances. The delegation sought clarification by the Rapporteur on the use of both the Register of *Good Safeguarding* Practices and the Register of *Best Safeguarding* Practices. The delegation greatly appreciated the Secretariat’s hard work but found that the proposed draft decision was too lengthy in that there were some operational paragraphs that could be omitted, and suggested taking into consideration the purpose of the decision, while keeping the operational paragraphs in the unnumbered preamble.
21. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Rapporteur to respond.
22. The **Rapporteur** clarified the official title of the mechanism as ‘Register of programme projects and activities that best reflect the principles and objectives of the Convention’, while a shortened title was also used, ‘Register of Best Safeguarding Practices’. The Evaluation Body, however, questioned whether the shortened title ‘Register of Good Safeguarding Practices’ could not be used for the reasons outlined in the report. With regard to the issue of a communication window that would enable submitting States to enter into dialogue with the Evaluation Body, the Rapporteur felt this would be best clarified by the Secretariat.
23. The **Secretary** took note of the comments concerning the draft decision. However, the procedure on agenda item 10 was to first adopt the decisions on every individual nomination [under agenda items 10.a, 10.b and 10.c], followed by an overall ‘chapeau’ decision. The Committee could of course choose to discuss the working method now, but there was a risk that the debate would delay the examination of the nomination files, which were eagerly awaited by many people. The Secretary explained that item 10 was structured so that the debate on the process and future work of the Evaluation Body would be discussed after the examinations of all the nomination files.
24. The **Chairperson** confirmed that the Committee would return to the issues raised.
25. The delegation of **Senegal** congratulated the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body on the whole evaluation process of the nomination files, particularly the Secretariat in the preparation phase with its technical assessment. The delegation appreciated the tremendous amount of work undertaken, and welcomed the expertise of the Evaluation Body.
26. Interrupted by Cuba, the **Chairperson** noted a point of order from Cuba.
27. The delegation of **Cuba** agreed that the work of the Committee should be facilitated, as long as the debate was scheduled at some later point, adding that postponing or deferring the debate now did not mean that the Committee should directly move to the adoption of the decisions on screen without any prior discussion.
28. The delegation of **Cyprus** asked the Chairperson to clarify whether the debate on item 10 would be suspended until after the files had been examined, as stated, or whether it would be continued, as this would hamper moving forward.
29. The **Chairperson** recognized another point of order from Cuba.
30. The delegation of **Cuba** was happy to have the debate now, but as the Secretariat had proposed a working method, it wanted to make sure that the debate on this item would not be sidestepped, adding that the Committee should not proceed to the decision without the discussion first taking place. The Committee could therefore decide to have the discussion now or whenever it wished to do so, as long as there was consensus, and as long as the discussion on this issue was not evaded.
31. The **Chairperson** noted another point of order from Algeria.
32. The delegation of **Algeria** noted that the Chairperson had made a proposal, agreed upon by the Secretary, to suspend the decision on item 10 and to return to its adoption following the evaluation of all the nomination files, as amendments had been presented in draft decision 10 that required substantive discussion. Thus, the delegation supported moving forward, on the understanding that the Committee would return to item 10 afterwards.
33. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee whether it agreed with the proposal by Algeria.
34. The delegation of **Palestine** understood from the Secretary’s explanation that there would be a general debate on item 10, and the final adoption of decision 10 would be suspended until after the inscription of the elements had taken place.
35. The **Secretary** explained that the process proposed was the same as in previous sessions, which was to suspend the debate and the overall draft decision under item 10, continue with the examination of all the nomination files and then return to the overall discussion of item 10 and its draft decision. The Secretary further explained that the draft decision was long because it covered all four of the Convention’s mechanisms. Moreover, the Committee was not actually at a stage of adopting any decisions, but it was free to open a discussion at any time.
36. The delegation of **Turkey** agreed with Palestine that the Committee should continue with the general debate on agenda item 10, in response to the report by the Rapporteur, and suspend the adoption of the draft decision until after the inscriptions, which had been the practice in previous sessions.
37. The **Chairperson** remarked that this was the proposal put forward.
38. The delegation of **India** endorsed the remarks by Palestine.
39. The delegation of **Senegal** agreed with the proposal by Turkey and India.
40. The delegation of **Lebanon** also endorsed the remarks by India and Palestine
41. The **Chairperson** noted the consensus, and opened the floor to Observers.
42. The **Chairperson** noted a point of order from Senegal.
43. The delegation of **Senegal** had wished to speak but had been interrupted due to an earlier point of order, and sought to continue.
44. The **Chairperson** explained that there had been multiple changes in the speakers list, clarifying that the Committee would continue its debate and then suspend the decision. A point of order was called by Algeria.
45. The delegation of **Algeria** understood that the debate on item 10 andthe adoption of its draft decision would be suspended until after the adoption of the nominations, adding that item 10 could not be separated in this way, i.e. having a general debate on a decision now only to reopen it two days later for adoption. The delegation was uncomfortable with this way of proceeding because the discussions during the general debate were relevant to the decision. Thus, either the Committee should move forward to examining the nomination files or start its debate on item 10 followed by the adoption of the draft decision; but not one part now and one part later.
46. The **Chairperson** reiterated that despite the presentation of the Evaluation Body, the Committee was not being asked to adopt draft decision 10 at present. One option was that the Committee could continue with the debate, proceed with the evaluation of the nominations, and return to the adoption of the decision, or it could choose to go with the proposal to suspend the debate before the decision on the overall item 10.
47. The delegation of **Cuba** remarked that the Committee was going in circles, and that it concurred with the remarks by Algeria. It understood the importance of moving forward and helping the work of the Secretariat, but the Committee should never interrupt a debate. Nevertheless, it proposed either suspending the debate and resuming when the decision was adopted, or having the debate now, in which case the Committee would also adopt the decision now. Either way, it would depend on whether the Rapporteur of the Evaluation Body was available at the time of adopting the decision, in which case adoption would have to occur now.
48. The **Chairperson** asked the Secretary to comment on the two options from a procedural perspective.
49. The **Secretary** explained that the proposal to suspend the draft decision was due to the fact that the decision required debate, which not only concerned the report of the Evaluation Body but every element or proposal to be inscribed or selected, or assistance approved, i.e. the total sum of work of the Evaluation Body. The Secretary understood that the floor was open for comments related specifically to the report of the Evaluation Body, adding that comments related to the decision may or may not be useful at this stage because in any case the Committee would have to return to the debate when adopting the decision. The Secretary reassured the Committee that the Evaluation Body would be present for the entire point 10, including its sub-items.
50. The **Chairperson** further clarified that the draft decision 10 was not solely about the report of the Evaluation Body but comprised sub-items 10.a, 10.b and 10.c. He opened the floor to Members wishing to make interventions now before proceeding with items 10.a, b and c, followed by the draft decision 10 as a whole.
51. The **Secretary** understood that there were concerns about the whole evaluation process insofar as Members wishing to make proposals feared losing that opportunity. The Secretary reassured the Committee that this was not the case, and that – for the sake of consistency with previous years – the most appropriate time was the moment of the decision when Members would benefit from the experience of the whole debate concerning the Evaluation Body’s work. Thus, it seemed appropriate that the floor be opened for comments on the report itself, whereas comments on the process or on any proposals to improve or refine the process should be examined after the discussion of the sub-items, leading to the overall decision.
52. Referring to India’s intervention, the **Chairperson** remarked that its proposal would be considered during the adoption of the draft decision rather than now. He then opened the floor for comments.
53. In light of the clarifications, the delegation of **Algeria** suggested moving to item 10.a.
54. The delegation of **Turkey** asked whether the Committee was now moving to the general debate or the inscriptions.
55. The delegation of **Senegal** admitted that this was rather confusing, but that it did appear more logical to make comments on improving the working methods of the Body at the moment of decision-making. In this regard, it supported the remarks by Algeria.
56. In light of the explanations, the delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** also believed it judicious to proceed with the nominations and return to the general debate afterwards, as the Committee’s observations would help nourish the general debate.
57. The delegation of **Austria** remarked that the usual practice, following the presentation of the report by the Evaluation Body, was to have a general debate on what had or had not gone well during the evaluations, as explained by the Secretary. However, it could agree to proceed and postpone the discussion.
58. The **Chairperson** aligned with the many interventions to suspend the debate and proceed to 10.a, returning to the adoption of item 10 after the examination of its sub-items.

**ITEM 10.a OF THE AGENDA:**

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

**Document** [*ITH/16/11.COM/10.a+Add.*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-10.a+Add.-EN.docx)

**Nominations** [*6 nominations*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/10a-urgent-safeguarding-list-00890)

**Decision** *11.COM 10.a*

1. The **Chairperson** turned to the next item, 10.a, with the examination of four nominations submitted by Botswana, Portugal, Uganda and Ukraine, reminding the Committee that Kenya had withdrawn its file. The Committee would then examine the combined nomination to the Urgent Safeguarding List and simultaneous International Assistance request submitted by Cambodia, which would be the first time that the Committee had examined such a nomination. Before examining the nominations, it was important to recall the criteria that would guide the decisions, which were duly shown on the screens. Criterion U.1: the element constitutes intangible cultural heritage as defined in Article 2 of the Convention; U.2(a): the element is in urgent need of safeguarding because its viability is at risk despite the efforts of the community, group or, if applicable, individual and States Parties concerned; or U.2(b): the element is in extremely urgent need of safeguarding because of its faces grave threats as a result of which it cannot be expected to survive without immediate safeguarding. Criterion U.3: a safeguarding plan is elaborated that may enable the community, group or, if applicable, individuals concerned to continue the practice and transmission of the element. Criterion U.4: the element has been nominated following the widest possible participation of the community, group or, if applicable, individuals concerned and with their free, prior and informed consent. Criterion U.5: the element is included in an inventory of the intangible cultural heritage present in the territory or territories of the submitting States Parties as defined in Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention. Criterion U.6: in case of extreme urgency, the States Parties concerned have been duly consulted regarding inscription of the element in conformity with Article 17.3 of the Convention. The Chairperson turned to the examination of the first file submitted by Botswana.
2. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** began by thanking the host country for its warm welcome and introduced the first nomination, **‘The use of Moropa wa Bojale ba Bakgatla ba Kgafela and its associated practices’** [draft decision 11.COM10.a.1] submitted by Botswana. ‘Moropa wa Bojale ba Bakgatla ba Kgafela and its associated practices’ play a key role in Bojale – an initiation ceremony for girls of *Bakgatla ba Kgafela* communities in Botswana and South Africa. The drum is played while girls learn about their culture and adulthood through song and dance. Bearers include the queen of the royal family and other female royals, the paramount chief’s sister and the Council of Elderly Women. A modernized education system and migration have weakened its continuity. Although the Evaluation Body decided that the nomination satisfied U.4 and U.5, it found that it did not provide sufficient information to allow it to determine whether criteria U.1, U.2 and U.3 were satisfied. As for U.1, additional information was needed to clarify the contour of the element, specifically whether Moropa was the nominated element or rather part of a larger element, the Bojale. In addition, information was needed as to the implications of the practice related to human rights, especially for the young women and girls concerned. As for U.2, the Body found that more specific threats needed to be identified, as opposed to general threats such as urbanization and the aging of practitioners. Furthermore, the file had to adequately demonstrate the urgent need for inscription. The film accompanying the file, in fact, suggested that the element was not currently under threat. As for U.3, the lack of precision concerning U.2 was reflected in the vagueness of the proposed safeguarding measures. As such, the Evaluation Body recommended that ‘the use of Moropa wa Bojale ba Bakgatla ba Kgafela and its associated practices’ be referred to the submitting State for more information.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chairperson for the detailed explanation of the different issues raised and, with no requests for amendments, proposed adopting the draft decision as a whole.
4. The delegation of **Afghanistan** sought a clarification from the Evaluation Body regarding paragraph 4, which invited the State to re-submit the nomination, adding that it did not stipulate whether this would be on the Representative List. Given that the re-submission could possibly occur in a few years, and the status of the element could therefore change in that time, the delegation asked whether the paragraph should specify the list to which it would be submitted.
5. The **Vice-Chairperson** clarified that it was important to note that the element itself was not evaluated but rather the nomination file. Moreover, the Body found that the file needed some information to justify inscription, and that the accompanying film actually suggested that the element was not currently under threat. Thus, clarification would be needed should the State Party decide to re-submit in another cycle.
6. With no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.a.1, to refer ‘The use of Moropa wa Bojale ba Bakgatla ba Kgafela and its associated practices’ to the submitting State for additional information**.
7. The delegation of **Botswana** thanked the Chairperson and the Government of Ethiopia for its warm welcome and hospitality, and for successfully hosting this meeting. It took note of the comments, and was grateful for the continued efforts of its respective communities to safeguard their ICH, and they therefore endeavoured to improve with each submission. The delegation would revisit the file, address the issues raised, and re-submit the file in a future cycle. It thanked the Evaluation Body for its excellent work and UNESCO for having approved its International Assistance request to implement the safeguarding plan for the inscribed element, **‘Earthenware pottery-making skills in Kgatleng District’** under the Urgent Safeguarding List. It also greatly appreciated being one of the first recipients of the funds following the increase from US$25,000 to US$100,000.
8. The **Chairperson** thanked Botswana, noting that Palestine wished to take the floor.
9. Noting the time, and with four nominations yet to examine, the delegation of **Palestine** recalled that the usual practice when an element was recommended for inscription was to adopt the decision as a whole. It asked whether it was possible to continue the examinations after 5.30 p.m. in order to complete this item.
10. After consultating with the interpreters, the **Chairperson** confirmed that the session could be extended for a further ten to fifteen minutes.
11. The **Vice-Chairperson** **of the Evaluation Body** then turned to the next nomination **‘Bisalhães black pottery manufacturing process’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.a.3] submitted by Portugal. Bisalhães in Portugal is known as ‘the land of pot and pan producers’ or more specifically, where black pottery is made. Designed for decorative and cooking purposes, it features on the village’s coat of arms and has been an important part of the community’s identity with old methods still used today. Transmitted almost exclusively through kinship ties, its future is under threat due to a diminishing number of bearers, waning interest among younger generations, and popular demand for industrial alternatives. From the information included in the file, the Evaluation Body decided that the nomination satisfied all five criteria. It found that the active involvement of the communities, groups and individuals concerned in preparing the nomination was well-described. Finally, the Evaluation Body decided to recommend the inscription of ‘Bisalhães black pottery manufacturing process’ on the Urgent Safeguarding List.
12. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for the detailed explanation and, with no requests for debate or amendments, proposed adopting the draft decision as a whole. With no comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.a.3 to inscribe ‘Bisalhães black pottery manufacturing process’ on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding**.
13. The delegation of **Portugal** thanked the Chairperson and Ethiopia for its hospitality, and the Committee for the inscription of ‘Bisalhães black pottery manufacturing process’ on the Urgent Safeguarding List. With this decision, another of Portugal’s traditional practices was inscribed, this time from a small community in the north of the country in the municipality of Vila Real. Pottery was once a widespread activity in Portugal due to its excellent clay and the ancestral knowledge of its potters. Nowadays, however, practitioners are aging and need encouragement to transmit their art to the next generation. The delegation was convinced that this international recognition by UNESCO would help the Bisalhães community and the craft to thrive, not only in Bisalhães but also in the few other communities in Portugal and in the world where black pottery is still produced. The Mayor of Vila Real [present] and the artisans of Bisalhães pottery also extended their thanks for the inscription.
14. After congratulating Portugal, the **Chairperson** invited the Vice-Chair to introduce the next nomination submitted by Uganda.
15. The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the next nomination, **‘Ma’di bowl lyre music and dance’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.a.4], submitted by Uganda. The Ma'di bowl lyre music and dance is one of the oldest cultural practices of the Madi people of Uganda. The traditional songs and dances, performed for various occasions, including weddings and harvest celebrations, are a tool for strengthening family ties and learning about community culture. Rituals are also involved. Transmitted by senior bearers, the future of the practice is at risk due to its being considered old-fashioned by younger generations, and as the materials used come from species that are now endangered. The Evaluation Body decided that the information provided in the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The proposed safeguarding plan responded to the threats identified and incorporated various activities directed towards raising awareness, building capacities and conserving raw materials. The Evaluation Body therefore decided to recommend the inscription of ‘Ma’di bowl lyre music and dance’ on the Urgent Safeguarding List.
16. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chairperson for the detailed explanation and, with no requests for amendments, proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.a.4 to inscribe ‘Ma’di bowl lyre music and dance’ on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding**.
17. The delegation of **Uganda** extended its gratitude to the Chairperson, the Committee, the Evaluation Body, and the host Government and honourable Minister for the warm welcome and hospitality. The delegation was overjoyed with the inscription of ‘Ma'di bowl lyre music and dance’: the fifth element in a row to be inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List. Ma’di is situated in the northwest of Uganda. On behalf of the Ma’di community the delegation greatly appreciated UNESCO’s preparatory International Assistance of US$10,000 in 2014, which enabled the timely completion of the nomination file. The preparatory assistance allowed for the mobilization and full participation of the Ma’di cultural bearers, students, elders and the local district governments. Uganda appreciated the work of the Evaluation Body and the guidance given mainly to explore alternative materials associated with the enactment of the element. Uganda was committed to implementing the safeguarding measures identified in the plan for the benefit of younger generations. It expressed its gratitude to the Commission for Culture, as well as colleagues in the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development for their immense support and guidance.
18. Thanking Uganda, the **Chairperson** invited the Vice-Chairperson to introduce the next nomination submitted by Ukraine.
19. The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the next nomination **‘Cossack’s songs of Dnipropetrovsk Region’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.a.5] submitted by Ukraine. Cossack songs are sung by communities of the Dnipropetrovsk region which tell stories about the tragedy of war and personal relationships of Cossack soldiers. The songs are sung for pleasure and to connect to the past. Three groups of singers of Cossack songs exist: Krynycya, Boguslavochka and Pershocvit, which involve men and women. Transmission of the tradition occurs within families but its continuity is in question due to an aging bearer population and few other knowledge sources for new generations. The Evaluation Body decided that the information provided in the file was sufficient to decide that all five criteria had been satisfied. The file demonstrated how the viability of the element was threatened and provided a detailed plan centred on the existing three active singing groups. The Evaluation Body therefore decided to recommend the inscription of ‘Cossack’s songs of Dnipropetrovsk Region’ on the Urgent Safeguarding List.
20. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chairperson for the detailed explanation and, with no requests for amendments, proposed adopting the draft decision as a whole. With no comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.a.5 to inscribe ‘Cossack’s songs of Dnipropetrovsk Region’** **on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding**.
21. The delegation of **Ukraine** expressed its appreciation for the support of the nomination, and its gratitude to the Evaluation Body for its work and careful examination of its file, to the Committee for its support and trust, to the Secretariat for all its help, as well as to all the experts for their active participation in the preparation of the file. It extended its gratitude to Ethiopia for its generous hospitality and organization. Most of the bearers of the element are women, many of whom are of an older generation. This inscription recognized their ancestors and living traditions that are transmitted from generation to generation. The communities are especially grateful for having had the chance to see their element acknowledged and respected. This was an exceptional event for Ukraine and for the Ukrainian people, especially for the patriotic meaning of Cossack songs. The inscription would reinforce the national identity and dignity of not only the local and regional community, but also the nation. The delegation confirmed its will to follow the recommendations of the Evaluation Body, especially concerning the participation of communities in the implementation of the safeguarding plan and other measures.
22. Thanking Ukraine, the **Chairperson** closed the day’s session, adding that the session would begin with the examination of the next file submitted from Cambodia. He gave the floor to the Secretary for some practical announcements.
23. The **Secretary** reminded Bureau members to start identifying new members among their electoral group for election later in the week. Also, Germany and the UNESCO Chair on Transcultural Music Studies at the University of Music Franz Liszt Weimar invited all delegates to a film presentation of the ‘GUZO North A journey to the origins of Ethiopian music’ after the closing of this session.

*[Wednesday, 30 November 2016, 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** reminded the Committee that it had inscribed three elements from Portugal, Uganda and Ukraine to the Urgent Safeguarding List, and would now continue with the examination of the nomination submitted by Cambodia for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List combined with a request for International Assistance. The Committee would then examine nominations to the Representative List, with the possibility of an extended session if required.
2. The **Secretary** informed the Committee that several meetings would be held during lunchtime: one for UNESCO facilitators; a working session for NGOs; and an open workshop on the Heritage Alive journal established by the NGO Forum. It was noted that the Committee meeting was widely followed on social media.
3. The **Chairperson** turned to the examination of the file submitted by Cambodia.
4. The delegation of **Cuba** spoke of the process to be used in the examination of nominations to the Representative List. It acknowledged that there were time limits on an already very tight agenda. Nevertheless, it wished to see flexibility exercised at the moment of inscribing elements, given that inscription was a very important moment for all delegations, and two minutes was not considered long enough for the presentation of an element. The delegation asked the Chairperson for his indulgence so that speakers would not be interrupted, as had been witnessed earlier, especially as many delegations had travelled far.
5. The delegation of **Algeria** concurred that it wasuseful to allow delegations, especially communities, to express their views given that they had come a long way.
6. The delegation of **Lebanon** shared the sentiment expressed by Cuba and Algeria to allow more time for the submitting State to present its element.
7. The delegation of **Guatemala** supported the remarks by Cuba, Algeria and Lebanon.
8. The delegation of **Senegal** was also aware of the time constraints, but nevertheless supported the request by Cuba to allow more time for communities to express themselves during inscriptions.
9. The delegation of **Palestine** endorsed the remarks, adding that this was a once in a lifetime experience.
10. The **Chairperson** understood the concerns and the interest of the communities. However, the Committee had to examine 30 files, which would be challenging unless a timeframe was established. He agreed to grant the necessary speaking time, especially from the communities, but noted that time should be used optimally.
11. The delegation of **Cuba** thanked the Chairperson for his flexibility and his good time management during the session.
12. The delegation of **Hungary** sought clarification about the timing of the intervention, and whether it concerned the intervention by the submitting State before or after the adoption of the decision.
13. The **Chairperson** replied that it referred to reflections by communities after decisions had been taken.
14. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** welcomed the Chairperson’s indulgence with respect to the speaking time given to communities; however, a human society required rules and, as such, a time limit of between three and five minutes was necessary so that everyone could be heard.
15. The **Chairperson** noted a point of order from Cuba.
16. The delegation of **Cuba** understood the point of view and encouraged delegations to use the time wisely. However, implementing a time limit would actually make time management more difficult. It accepted the Chairperson’s flexibility and his agreed stance not to cut presentations short.
17. Summarizing, the **Chairperson** agreed not to cut presentations by communities short, but he reminded delegates to be as quick as possible in order to facilitate the examination of decisions. With that understanding, he turned to the examination of the nomination file submitted by Cambodia, **‘Chapei Dang Veng’**, explaining that Cambodia had used the new integrated mechanism introduced for the first time in the 2016 cycle. It had submitted a nomination to the Urgent Safeguarding List and simultaneously requested International Assistance 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. The Chairperson underlined that it was important that the Committee decide on the conformity of the nomination with the criteria for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List independently of its decision on whether the request met the criteria for International Assistance. Before starting the examination, the Chairperson recalled the criteria [A.1–A.7 and paragraph 10 of the Operational Directives in criteria 10.a and 10.b] for granting International Assistance, which were projected onto the screens. In addition, it was important to note that the Committee was requested to evaluate whether the request met the criteria for International Assistance as a whole. In other words, it was not necessary to meet every criterion for the request to be granted. The Chairperson gave the floor to the Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body to present the nomination.
18. The **Vice-Chairperson** then turned to the final nomination **‘Chapei Dang Veng’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.a.6] submitted by Cambodia. Chapei Dang Veng is a Cambodian musical tradition associated with the lives, customs and beliefs of Cambodian people. It features the chapei (a lute often played at cultural festivals) accompanied by the performer singing, with lyrics ranging from educational and social commentary to satire incorporating poems, folk tales or Buddhist stories. Transmitting knowledge and values, creating a space for commentary and contributing to peacebuilding, the tradition, which is transmitted orally, may soon disappear as it has few practitioners due to the Khmer Rouge regime. The Evaluation Body decided that the information in the file was sufficient to determine that all five criteria were satisfied. The objectives of the safeguarding plan were coherent with the threats and the file provided a specific timeframe for each activity and confirmed community involvement in the implementation of the measures. The Evaluation Body therefore decided to recommend the inscription of ‘Chapei Dang Veng’ on the Urgent Safeguarding List. Cambodia also requested an allocation of US$238,970 from the ICH Fund for the implementation of the safeguarding plan. The Evaluation Body evaluated and decided that from the information provided in the file the request responded to the criteria for granting International Assistance in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Operational Directives. The Body decided that the proposed safeguarding activities were well-conceived, appeared feasible and were presented with a logical flow. It was, however, necessary to avoid any danger of decontextualization of the element. The Evaluation Body decided to recommend the approval of the International Assistance request from Cambodia for the implementation of the safeguarding plan for ‘Chapei Dang Veng’ and to grant an amount of US$238,970 to the submitting State to this end.
19. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chairperson for the detailed explanation, and with no requests for amendments, proposed adopting the draft decision as a whole.
20. Expressing its congratulations, the delegation of **India** commended Cambodia for presenting the nomination of Chapei Dang Veng for inscription, while also utilizing the ICH Fund to safeguard the element, which was the way to go in the future.
21. With no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.a.6 to inscribe ‘Chapei Dang Veng’ on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding, and to approve International Assistance in the amount of US$238,970 to the submitting State**.
22. The delegation of **Cambodia** expressed its heartfelt thanks to Ethiopia, especially the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, which it thanked for its warm hospitality and for hosting this session. The delegation thanked the Secretariat, especially the Secretary, for bearing the tremendous workload required to ensure the success of the meeting. It also expressed its sincere appreciation and profound gratitude to the Evaluation Body and the Committee for its careful examination of the nomination and for inscribing Chapei Dang Veng on the Urgent Safeguarding List with financial assistance, which clearly demonstrated the international community’s concerns and commitment towards helping safeguard the element for future generations. The decision encouraged Cambodia to act immediately to ensure the continuity and transmission of this important element. Having learned from the best practices showcased by other countries from around the world, the delegation would develop a concrete and practical mechanism within the Cambodian context to safeguard ICH by working closely with bearer communities, NGOs concerned, and local authorities at all levels. It fervently hoped that in the near future it would request the transfer of the element from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List. Finally, the readiness to work with the Secretariat was underlined to avoid any discrepancies, as recommended by the Committee.

**ITEM 10.b OF THE AGENDA:**

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

**Document** [*ITH/16/11.COM/10.b*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-10.b-EN.docx)

**Nominations** [*37 nominations*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/10b-representative-list-00891)

**Decision** *11.COM 10.b*

1. Thanking Cambodia, the **Chairperson** then moved to the next agenda item 10.b and the examination of nominations for inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. Before starting the examination of the nominations, the Chairperson wished to remind the Committee of the inscription criteria [R.1–R.5], which were duly explained and shown on the screens. He recalled that all five criteria needed to be met and then turned to the first examination submitted by Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, India, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Turkey, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan.
2. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the nomination of **‘Nawrouz, Novruz, Nowrouz, Nowrouz, Nawrouz, Nauryz, Nooruz, Nowruz, Navruz, Nevruz, Nowruz, Navruz’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.1] submitted by Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Turkey, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. New Year in these countries is celebrated on 21 March and is known as Nauryz, Navruz, Nawrouz, Nevruz, Nooruz, Novruz, Nowrouz or Nowruz. For two weeks, various customs take place including a special meal, family visits, public rituals and street performances to encourage peaceful communities, transmitted through participation. The Evaluation Body decided that, from the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The first inscription of this multinational nomination had been in 2009, and the original seven States Parties have observed a positive effect thanks to the inscription. Together with five additional States, the submitting States believed that this extended inscription would also encourage cultural dialogue and understanding for the purpose of peace, social cohesion, integration, reconciliation and solidarity. The Evaluation Body decided to recommend the inscription of ‘Nawrouz, Novruz, Nowrouz, Nowrouz, Nawrouz, Nauryz, Nooruz, Nowruz, Navruz, Nevruz, Nowruz, Navruz’ on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chairperson for the detailed explanation, and with no requests for amendments, proposed adopting the draft decision as a whole. With no comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.1 to inscribe ‘Nawrouz, Novruz, Nowrouz, Nowrouz, Nawrouz, Nauryz, Nooruz, Nowruz, Navruz, Nevruz, Nowruz, Navruz’ on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
4. The delegation of the **Islamic Republic of Iran** spoke of Nawrouz as one of the most ancient New Year’s celebrations celebrated for millennia across a large geographic area among diverse nations, communities and ethnic groups. The inscription of the Nawrouz multinational nomination file, prepared by twelve States Parties, proved that it was alive, representing the spirit of the 2003 Convention. It congratulated UNESCO for this achievement, adding that it hoped other States Parties would join this element, proposing that every year one of the twelve Nawrouz countries might celebrate with the eleven others. On behalf of twelve countries, the delegation expressed gratitude to the Secretariat for the inscription. [Another speaker: Ambassador of Iran to UNESCO] He spoke of Omar Khayyam, who had calculated the exact time of entering Nowruz centuries ago, and his poetry was full of this image. He recited a poem in Persian, which was translated, ‘When the rain is washing the face of the tulips then go out, stand up and decide decisively for the cup of wine, because this green flower which is growing now, soon will be gone from your dust when you are not here. Therefore, while you are here, take Nowruz and take the cup of wine like that tulip’.
5. The delegation of **Kazakhstan** spoke of the honour of speaking on the occasion of the inscription of Nauryz to the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. Nauryz is one of the main holidays for Kazakh people, as well as many other Asian nations, and has been celebrated for more than 5,000 years, bringing together people of different ages, ethnic, professional and religious backgrounds. Nauryz holiday embodies peace, mutual respect and national unity for modern Kazakhstan. The delegation expressed its gratitude to all the partners who had taken part in preparing the extended file, and to the experts of all twelve countries who were involved in this complex process, especially the Iranian colleagues, coordinators of the multinational file. The delegation thanked the Chairperson and the Committee for its decision, and Ethiopia for its warm hospitality.
6. The delegation of **Afghanistan** thanked the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body and congratulated the States Parties for their contribution towards the successful inscription of the nomination, which perfectly reflected the spirit of the Convention.
7. The delegation of **India** expressed delight at the extension of the inscription to a group that now included twelve countries, adding that it was a beautiful link that bound all the countries together. The delegation saluted the Ambassador of Iran, Mr Ahmad Jalali, for his leadership in bringing this nomination to such a successful conclusion.
8. The delegation of **Mongolia** congratulated the twelve submitting States on the success of the joint nomination of Nawrouz. As Nawrouz is widely celebrated among the ethnic Kazakh minority communities in Mongolia, it expressed its strong intention to join the nomination in the near future.
9. The **Chairperson** congratulated the submitting States, and proceeded to the next nomination file submitted by Azerbaijan, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkey.
10. The **Vice-Chairperson** then turned to the next nomination **‘Flatbread making and sharing culture: Lavash, Katryma, Jupka, Yufka’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.2.] submitted by Azerbaijan, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkey. Making and sharing flatbread (lavash, katyrma, jupka or yufka) in communities of Azerbaijan, Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkey is a widely-practised tradition. It usually involves family members but in rural areas neighbours may participate together. Baked in an oven, metal plate or cauldron, the bread is shared during regular meals, weddings, births, funerals and various holidays, particularly for prosperity. Transmitted through participation and from master to apprentice, the practice expresses hospitality and solidarity, and symbolizes common cultural roots reinforcing community belonging. The Evaluation Body decided that, from the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The file demonstrated that flatbread making and sharing culture plays a variety of social and cultural functions, contributing to social cohesion, mutual respect, peace, hospitality and exchanges between related communities. The nomination process was initiated by communities and NGOs in the five countries and was supported by the relevant authorities. The Evaluation Body decided to recommend the inscription of the ‘Flatbread making and sharing culture: Lavash, Katryma, Jupka, Yufka’ on the Representative List.
11. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chairperson for the detailed explanation, and with no requests for amendments, proposed adopting the draft decision as a whole.
12. The delegation of **Armenia** requested that the decision be postponed in order to find a solution to some parts of the draft decision that it sought to discuss with the submitting States. The delegation explained that this would avoid opening a debate when a solution could be found, as had been the case two years previously on a similar nomination.
13. The delegation of **Afghanistan** recalled an Armenian proverb which in itself constituted an element of ICH: ‘What you give belongs to you, what you keep for yourself is lost forever’. The gift in question was bread, and sharing bread and salt, or ‘breaking the crust’, as they say in French, was not only something positive, but was a duty in many societies. In this regard, the delegation sought to retain the spirit of consensus and the respect for the excellent work of the Evaluation Body. Moreover, all the criteria had been met. The delegation called on the Committee to remain committed to the spirit of consensus. However, if there were technical issues in the nomination, then Azerbaijan, Turkey and the other States should be given the opportunity to clarify, although the excellent work of the Evaluation Body showed that all the criteria had been positively received.
14. The delegation of **Cyprus** asked Armenia to explain the reasons for the postponement.
15. The delegation of **Mongolia** thanked the Evaluation Body for its hard work, and supported Afghanistan’s proposal requesting the Committee to respect the Evaluation Body’s decision.
16. The delegation of **Senegal** was surprised by the request for postponement, as the Evaluation Body had recommended inscription and all the criteria had been met, especially since the Committee had not been given a justification. The delegation was against the postponement and wished to move forward.
17. The delegation of **Philippines** supported the recommendation by the Evaluation Body to inscribe this multinational nomination, adding that it had been reviewed by experts in the Philippines. It further noted that its multinational nature not only showed the wide reach of the tradition but also highlighted the spirit of the Convention, promoting the rapprochement of cultures and intercultural understanding, leaving no space for the notion of ‘exclusivity’ of the element. Any position that would affect its inclusivity and openness would run against the spirit of the Convention itself. Furthermore, it recalled the importance of the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity as a list representing the diversity and intersectionality of human creativity, and demonstrating the immense need to safeguard these traditions. It would be an affront to deny such intersectionality and inclusivity. The delegation therefore supported the multinational file.
18. The **Chairperson** asked Armenia the reason for the postponement.
19. The delegation of **Armenia** had presented a number of amendments to the draft decision, but wished to discuss these beforehand with the submitting States to find a common and consensual solution. Its approach was not to discriminate one country against a group of five countries. The delegation wished to ensure that, regardless of the nomination proposed, nominations would be treated in exactly the same way to prevent double standards. It explained that the Evaluation Body had proposed that the name of the countries be indicated in the title of the element instead of its adjective. Armenia [in a previous nomination] had proposed having no country name in the title, while Turkey was also among the delegations that insisted on having the country name in the title. The delegation could not understand why this file should be treated differently from a similar nomination two years ago. They recalled that two additional paragraphs had been added in the Armenian nomination file, and thus it was very logical for the exact same paragraphs and wording to be added to this nomination. The logic behind the addition of those paragraphs to the decision two years ago was to avoid any possible misunderstanding or misinterpretation that the element under consideration was also practised outside the borders of the nominating State or States. The question was therefore why one approach should be acceptable for one nominating State and not in the case of five nominating States, as was the case here. The delegation thus sought a postponement so that it could discuss these issues with some of the submitting delegations, thereby saving time in the editing process, but also to avoid any complications that might come about if the Committee decided to resort to a vote rather than negotiating a solution.
20. The delegation of **Hungary** commended the submitting States of Azerbaijan, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkey for its successful nomination that truly reflected the spirit of the Convention in terms of international cooperation, reflecting the common cultural heritage in the region.
21. Interrupting Hungary, the **Chairperson** noted a point of order from Armenia.
22. The delegation of **Armenia** asked whether the file was under consideration, as it had requested that the discussion on the file be postponed and thus statements should only be made with respect to the postponement, and not on the nomination itself.
23. The **Chairperson** noted the request by Armenia to postpone the decision, and the Committee was requested to consider this matter first.
24. The delegation of **Hungary** did not support the postponement and requested a decision.
25. The delegation of **India** remarked that the nomination under consideration was successful in terms of its preparation, drafting process, proposed safeguarding measures and inventory, as demonstrated by the assessment of the Evaluation Body. However, Armenia spoke about consensus and needing time to find an amicable solution. Upholding dialogue, negotiation and the spirit of compromise, the delegation supported efforts to find a solution.
26. The delegation of **Afghanistan** stated that a point of order was by definition a breach in the Rules of Procedure, and sought clarification on the reason for this.
27. The **Secretary** reminded Afghanistan of Rule 28.1 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee, which stated that a State Member may raise a point of order and it shall immediately be decided by the Chairperson.
28. Noting the point of order, the delegation of the **Republic of Korea** wished to refrain from taking the floor at this time.
29. The delegation of **Cuba** recalled that Turkey and Azerbaijan had arrived at an agreement [in a previous case], adding that it wished to know until what time the postponement was proposed, i.e. was it until the next Committee meeting, the end of this session, or the time it took to negotiate with the different stakeholders? The delegation sought clarity, adding that this was important because it was normal to negotiate agreements within the framework of the same Committee session.
30. The **Chairperson** clarified that the consensus had to be reached that day given the number of items up for discussion in the present session.
31. The delegation of **Hungary** recalled its earlier intervention in which it had sought a decision that day, although it was open to discussions being made outside of the session among the States Parties if that was the general wish of the Committee, provided that the decision was taken that day.
32. The delegation of **India** reiterated that it supported a dialogue between the States concerned, subject to the States themselves wishing to comply.
33. The delegation of **Cyprus** supported India’s position to allow for dialogue among the States Parties.
34. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** endorsed the remarks by India and Cyprus, adding that in the spirit of consensus and of the Convention, States Parties should be able to consult together.
35. The delegation of **Austria** also supported the proposal by India.
36. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** supported the proposal, but reminded the Committee of its obligation towards community leaders, such as the Governor of Jeju who had flown in today especially to take part in the discussion on their nomination file. The delegation therefore requested that the discussions on the file take place after the completion of all the nomination files, which might mean the next day.
37. The **Chairperson** thus proposed delaying this item.
38. The delegation of **Congo** supported the suggestion by India that the States concerned could come to an agreement and consider the matter that day.
39. The delegation of **Afghanistan** saw no problem in delaying the adoption of the decision until later in the day, which should preferably be reached by consensus.
40. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked whether the concerned parties would speak if given the time.
41. The **Chairperson** replied that this was the basic assumption of the request for a delay, and encouraged the concerned States Parties to engage in further consultations.
42. The delegation of **Mauritius** favoured dialogue and hoped that that the item could be treated at a later stage with the full dialogue of all the bodies concerned.
43. The delegation of the **Philippines** supported the proposal by India to engage in dialogue within the day.
44. The delegation of **Algeria** was also in favour of discussion that could bring about consensus. However, it asked the Chairperson to help facilitate the States concerned in reaching a decision.
45. The delegation of **Ethiopia** wished to hear from Turkey on the matter.
46. As one of the submitting States of the file, the delegation of **Turkey** explained that it had been very openly constructive to dialogue since the beginning of the process, which had been facilitated by the Secretariat. The delegation would continue to pursue dialogue, as was the Committee’s wish, in order to reach consensus.
47. The **Chairperson** assumed that constructive engagement would take place and that the Committee would return to the file after lunch. The Chairperson recognized the Islamic Republic of Iran requesting the floor, but as there was no specific question addressed to Iran, he was unable to comply.
48. The delegation of **Afghanistan** wished to allow the Islamic Republic of Iran to take the floor.
49. The **Chairperson** reiterated that the Rules of Procedure requested that a specific question be addressed to the State Party concerned. The Chairperson asked Afghanistan to be specific in its question.
50. The delegation of **Afghanistan** had not entered into the particulars of the file, and thus wished to hear if the Republic of Iran had anything specific to add at this stage.
51. The **Chairperson** asked Afghanistan whether it agreed to the postponement of the item, adding that any detailed discussion would anyway happen later in the day. He then turned to the next nomination submitted by Bangladesh.
52. The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the next nomination **‘Mangal Shobhajatra on Pahela Baishakh’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.3] submitted by Bangladesh. Mangal Shobhajatra is a festival for the public that celebrates Pahela Baishakh (New Year’s Day) on 14 April, organized by students and teachers of Dhaka University’s Faculty of Fine Art. The tradition began in 1989 when students, frustrated by living under military rule, wanted to bring the community hope for a better future. It features floats and masks symbolizing strength, peace and the driving away of evil to allow for progress. Transmitted by the school, it promotes public solidarity and democracy. The Evaluation Body was pleased to see the nomination concerning this element of ICH, which has a fairly short history, and was initiated by the enthusiastic students and the teachers of university. After careful examination, the Body decided that while the nomination satisfied R.1, R.2, R.3 and R.4, the information included in the file was not sufficient to allow the Committee to determine whether criterion R.5 was satisfied. The file presented an extract of the inventory of the ICH of Bangladesh, organized by the Ministry of Cultural Affairs. However, this extract demonstrated the inclusion of the celebration of Pahela Baishakh as a whole in 2007, rather than Mangal Shobhajatra specifically. The submitting State had not demonstrated how the inventory had been drawn up with the participation of communities, groups and relevant NGOs. Information on updating mechanisms was also missing. The Evaluation Body therefore decided to recommend the referral of the Mangal Shobhajatra on Pahela Baishakh to the submitting State for more information.
53. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chairperson for the detailed explanation of the file, noting an amendment submitted by India.
54. The delegation of **India** commended Bangladesh for submitting the nomination, adding that it had found the festival’s representation of solidarity and democracy, uniting people irrespective of their caste, creed, religion, gender or age most appealing, noting how relevant this was in today’s world. It noted that the element had met four criteria (R.1, R.2, R.3 and R.4) and that it had received a referral for not fulfilling one criterion only, R.5, relating to the inventory. Having studied the file, the delegation found that the State had provided sufficient information on the inclusion of the element in the ICH inventory of Bangladesh, and had attached the relevant pages from the inventory. It was thus clear from the various parts of the nomination file that the inclusion of the element in the inventory was the result of a thorough cultural survey involving field visits as well as the participation of bearers and practitioners. It was also clear that the Ministry of Cultural Affairs was the body responsible for its maintenance and updating, which importantly had been carried out with the express consent of the bearers and practitioners. The delegation recalled that the Convention stated that “each Party shall draw in a manner geared to its own situation, one or more inventories of the intangible cultural heritage present in its territory”. Obviously, the Committee could not expect the inventories of all States Parties to be identical in order to meet criterion R.5. The delegation was therefore of the view that the element had met criterion R.5 and strongly recommended its inscription. To this end, the delegation proposed deleting the entire paragraph 3, replacing it with the existing R.5, which would read, ‘The element was included in 2007 in a survey of the tangible and intangible cultural heritage of Bangladesh prepared by the Asiatic Society of Bangladesh for Ministry of Cultural Affairs as part of the celebration of Pahela Baishakh. This survey is considered as the inventory of the intangible cultural heritage of Bangladesh. It is maintained and updated by the Ministry of Cultural Affairs of Bangladesh’, and inserting a new paragraph 3, which would read ‘inscribes Mangal Shobhajatra on Pahela Baishakh on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity’. In addition, the two remaining paragraphs would be deleted in their entirety.
55. The **Chairperson** thanked India, adding that he would return to hear the details of the amendment following the general debate.
56. The delegation of **Zambia** supported the proposal by India to inscribe the element, adding that it had been pointed out that criterion R.5 referred to Article 12 of the Convention, which stated that the inventory could be geared towards a country’s own specific arrangements.
57. The delegation of **Mauritius** commended Bangladesh, noting that it clearly mentioned in the file that the element inscribed in the inventory was based on the express consent of the bearers and practitioners.
58. The delegation of **Turkey** also commended Bangladesh, noting that the element contributed to the solidarity and cultural identity of its community. It clearly described how it provided visibility in general and awareness of ICH. The file also referred to a bottom-up approach in the safeguarding measures proposed. With regard to R.5, the delegation believed that the Convention allowed for certain flexibility in the preparation of national inventories in line with national circumstances. In addition, the delegation was not in favour of exercising too much rigidity in inventory making as this might place the threshold too high for some countries. Bangladesh had an inventory, an extract of which had been submitted with the nomination file, and the Committee had also been informed that the Ministry of Cultural Affairs of Bangladesh was responsible for maintaining and updating the inventory. Thus, the delegation was satisfied that the nomination met R.5 and it fully supported the proposal by India to inscribe the nomination.
59. The delegation of **Afghanistan** joined in the remarks by India and Turkey and agreed that the information sought was present in the file.
60. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** thanked India for the detailed explanation of the file and the circumstances of inventory-making in Bangladesh. As a result, the delegation was in favour of the proposed amendment. However, this in no means implied that inventory-making is less than an essential part of safeguarding ICH at the national level, and the delegation believed that the Evaluation Body had pertinently raised that point in its draft decision.
61. Noting the long list of speakers, the **Chairperson** noted that Members were largely in favour of the amendment, and therefore requested proceeding with the draft decision.
62. The delegation of **Hungary** agreed to the Chairperson’s proposal, but also wished to flag the comment by the Republic of Korea and sought to make an amendment to the decision in this regard.
63. The delegation of **Austria** commended Bangladesh on submitting an element that fostered intergenerational dialogue and social cohesion. However, as mentioned by the Evaluation Body, the inventory had been drawn up in the form of a survey published in 2007 and it was unclear how the communities had participated in drawing it up and how it was updated. The delegation added that for all files that did not fulfill criterion R.5, it had tried to find further information in the respective periodic reports, but the report was not yet available to enable this.
64. The **Chairperson** invited Bangladesh to respond to the Austria’s question.
65. The delegation of **Bangladesh** thanked the Chairperson for his leadership and Ethiopia for its warm hospitality. The delegation spoke of the country’s commitment to safeguarding ICH and was aware that inventories were an important step. As such, the Ministry of Cultural Affairs commissioned a cultural survey in 2005–2006 on the ICH of Bangladesh, the results of which had been formally adopted as the inventory of ICH of Bangladesh in 2007. The Ministry of Cultural Affairs is also responsible for maintaining and updating the ICH inventory, and the eleven volumes included the nominated element. The delegation informed the Committee that Prof. Nisar Hossain, Dean of the Faculty of Fine Arts of the University of Dhaka [present], had been closely involved both in the cultural survey conducted in 2005–2006 and in preparing the nomination file in 2014-2015. In fact, the survey not only included research but also field visits to consult with the communities of practitioners and bearers of all the elements included in the inventory. The delegation was also mindful that inventories needed constant updating, which was equally true of its own inventory. Currently, the Ministry of Cultural Affairs and the UNESCO Dhaka Office were jointly implementing the project ‘Strengthening National Capacities for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage for Sustainable Development’, one of the objectives of which was to update and rationalize the ICH inventory of Bangladesh. The Secretary was said to be well aware of the project. The element ‘Mangal Shobhajatra on Pahela Baishakh’ had again been included in the inventory in progress as part ofthe aforementioned project. It reminded the Committee to bear in mind that the political and administrative structures of all States, and therefore the scope and methodology of inventory-making, were not identical in all States Parties.
66. The delegation of **Guatemala** asked for flexibility on criterion R.5 with regard to the file.
67. The **Chairperson** remarked that the Committee was in consensus to move to the draft decision, giving the floor to Algeria. He noted a point of order from Palestine.
68. The delegation of **Palestine** recalled that the proposal was to focus on the draft decision and only afterwards to give the floor to the countries concerned for their views. It thanked Bangladesh for its clarification, requesting that the Chairperson abide by this initial proposal.
69. The **Chairperson** thanked Palestine and proceeded to the draft decision, after which Members could take the floor.
70. The delegation of **Mauritius** agreed to speak later.
71. Noting the amendments, the **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no further comments or objections, paragraph 1 was adopted. Paragraph 2 in criteria R.1 – R.4 was duly adopted. The Chairperson turned to criterion R.5, noting the amendment by India.
72. The delegation of **Palestine** co-sponsored the amendment by India.
73. The delegation of **Cuba** thanked India for putting forward the amendment, which it also supported, adding that this would not be the first or last time that the Committee would face this situation. It thanked Bangladesh for having provided the information and asked that decisions that are reviewed be reflected in the decisions themselves based on the information given during the session. Otherwise, it would appear that it was a direct recommendation from the Evaluation Body, which was not the case. Although it supported India’s proposal, it asked that the amendment reflect the fact that further information had been provided by Bangladesh. Given that the Committee would encounter this situation many times, it was important that the proviso in the decision reflect the reality and not be open to other interpretations.
74. The **Chairperson** asked whether it was proposing something different.
75. The delegation of **Cuba** was ready to adopt the amendment by India, but proposed a separate paragraph reading ‘thanks the delegation of Bangladesh for the additional information provided that allowed further evaluation of criterion R.5 by the Committee’, which would truly reflect the discussion.
76. The **Chairperson** took note of Cuba’s proposal and suggested proceeding with the adoption of the paragraph by India, and then returning to the new amendment.
77. The delegation of **Ethiopia** remarked that Article 12 of the Convention clearly stated that a one-size-fits-all approach could not guide any State Party in preparing its inventory. With due consideration for national circumstances, and based on the information provided in the nomination file and the explanation by Bangladesh, it supported India’s amendment.
78. In view of the clarifications by Bangladesh, the delegation of **Mauritius** also fully supported India’s amendment.
79. The delegation of **Turkey** also co-sponsored the amendment in R.5 and inscription.
80. The delegation of **Senegal** thanked Bangladesh for the clarity of the information, and also supported India’s amendment.
81. The delegation of **Zambia** echoed the remarks by Cuba.
82. Thanks to the arguments put forward by India and the explanations provided by Bangladesh, the delegation of **Congo** supported the inscription of the element, which satisfied criterion R.5.
83. The delegation of **Algeria** supported the amendment by India as well as the nuances proposed by Cuba, which outlined that the Committee did not disapprove of the Evaluation Body’s work but that it adopted R.5 based on information provided by Bangladesh.
84. The delegation of **Armenia** commended Bangladesh for its nomination and for the additional clarification. It thanked India for its proposal, which it also requested to co-sponsor.
85. The delegation of **Austria** thanked Bangladesh for the explanation and its interpretation of the information, and supported the proposal by India. It was also in favour of an additional paragraph that had encouraged the State Party to provide the concise information needed for R.5. However, it maintained that the information provided was not new, as the Evaluation Body clearly stated that the Committee meeting was not the place to introduce new information but could only involve an interpretation of information already contained in the file. The delegation thus cautioned the Committee, insisting that it formulated the paragraph and its judgment based on the file submitted and evaluated by the Evaluation Body.
86. The delegation of **Mongolia** supported India’s amendment on R.5 and accepted the explanation by Bangladesh, as well as Cuba’s proposal for an additional paragraph.
87. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** subscribed to the proposal by India and Cuba, as well as the remarks made by Austria. Bangladesh had provided a clarification on information that was contained in the file and was not new information, only better explained by Bangladesh.
88. The delegation of **Lebanon** thanked Bangladesh for its explanation on R.5, and strongly supported the amendment by India in this regard.
89. The delegation of **Bulgaria** commended Bangladesh for providing clear and detailed information, and also supported the proposed amendment by India on R.5.
90. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** commended Bangladesh for its nomination and clarification, and supported the amendment by India. It also fully supported Cuba’s proposal for an additional paragraph that reflected the ensuing process that helped arrive at this positive position.
91. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** also co-sponsored the amendment.
92. The delegation of **Cyprus** congratulated Bangladesh for its explanations, adding that it supported the inscription of the element. However, the Committee would not have faced this situation had there been dialogue between the Evaluation Body and the State Party.
93. With no further comments, the **Chairperson** proceeded to the adoption of R.5 that read, ‘The element was included in 2007 in a survey of the tangible and intangible cultural heritage of Bangladesh, prepared by the Asiatic Society of Bangladesh for the Ministry of Cultural Affairs, as part of the celebration of Pahela Baishakh. This survey is considered as the inventory of the intangible cultural heritage of Bangladesh. It is maintained and updated by the Ministry of Cultural Affairs of Bangladesh’, which was duly adopted. He then turned to the new paragraph 3, proposed by India and Turkey, ‘to inscribe’ Mangal Shobhajatra on Pahela Baishakh on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
94. The delegation of **Palestine** also co-sponsored the amendment by India and Turkey.
95. The delegation of **Hungary** expressed support for paragraph 3 and inscription of the element in view of the adopted R.5.
96. Before moving to the adoption of the decision as a whole, and for the sake of consistency,the delegation of **Cuba** sought to add a new paragraph 3, which read ‘Thanks the delegation of Bangladesh for the clarifications provided to the Committee concerning criterion R.5’. It supported the amendment for inscription but believed that this would accurately reflect what happened in the discussion. Moreover, it felt that, as already pointed out by Cyprus, at some point it would be good if the Committee thought long and hard about the relationship between it, the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body. This would mean the information could be obtained earlier by the State Party, which would allow for a more objective evaluation of nominations during the Committee sessions.
97. The **Chairperson** remarked that it was standard practice to proceed to the adoption of the decision after adopting the criteria, which would then be followed by thanking the State. The proposal by Cuba would thus come after the adoption of the decision. Algeria called for a point of order.
98. The delegation of **Algeria** agreed with the approach that the delegation should be thanked after the full adoption of the decision, but also understood Cuba’s concerns about a possible misinterpretation of events. The delegation therefore felt that it would be more judicious to place paragraph 3 before criterion R.5, as in the original decision. It would thereby distinguish between the recommendation of the Evaluation Body and the decision of Members of the Committee following the debates. The delegation asked that the Committee think carefully when adopting this decision, as it would serve as a form of jurisprudence thereafter. In this regard, it proposed an amendment, which read, ‘Further decides that after having considered the clarifications given by the submitting State that the following criterion is satisfied’, and the deletion of ‘the information contained in the file’. This would distinguish between the recommendation of the Evaluation Body and the adoption by the Committee, while not disavowing the Evaluation Body yet highlighting the debate on criterion R.5.
99. The delegation of **Cuba** agreed that Algeria’s proposal improved its own amendment; however, it should also make clear that the clarifications had been provided by the submitting State to the Committee during the session, i.e. that the information had not been sent by email or to the Evaluation Body or at any other time. It must therefore confirm that it had been presented to the Committee.
100. The delegation of **Armenia** wished to add its name to the paragraph on the inscription.
101. The **Chairperson** asked whether the Committee was ready to adopt the proposal by Algeria.
102. The delegation of **India** commended Cuba and Algeria for introducing the useful amendment. However, the delegation wished to know from the Chairperson and the Secretariat whether this practice would be adopted going forward each time information was brought forward by a submitting States to the Committee, and which may extend beyond one criterion.
103. The **Chairperson** explained that the proposal emanated from the Committee, and thus if it sought to include it then it should be part of the paragraphs that it amends and adopts.
104. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** proposed retaining ‘the information contained in the file’ in the proposed amendment.
105. The **Chairperson** sought to establish a new speakers list for Algeria’s proposal, as the previous list concerned R.5.
106. The delegation of **Cyprus** asked the Chairperson to be alert to the order of speakers. It strongly supported the amendment by Algeria as it clarified the link between the recommendation of the Evaluation Body and the subsequent decision of the Committee.
107. The delegation of **Mauritius** supported the amendments in paragraph 3 and R.5.
108. Referring to the proposal by Côte d’Ivoire, the delegation of **Cuba** understood the preoccupation. However, it noted that if the amendment included ‘the information contained in the file’ it would run counter to the work of the Evaluation Body because the Evaluation Body based its recommendations on the information contained in the file, whereas the decision was based on new information. The delegation sought the best solution, as it did not want it to appear as if the Committee were repeating the work of the Evaluation Body, not least because the decision was based on new information received by the Committee and it was therefore not contradicting the Evaluation Body.
109. Referring to the ‘chapeau’ paragraph (currently paragraph 3), the delegation of **Hungary** was of the understanding that the paragraph had already been adopted and that the Committee had already moved onto paragraph 4, regarding inscription. Nevertheless, it was open to the possibility of inserting text into this paragraph. However, it shared the concern raised by India as to whether each time a submitting State made a clarification on any of the criteria, a paragraph should be included in the decision. The delegation felt that this was going too far, as the decision did not require so much detail, especially considering the permanency of decisions. It asked the Committee for its indulgence in the inclusion of the paragraph in light of the overall context of the decision, as this was not the best way forward. The delegation proposed moving to the other paragraphs in the decision.
110. The delegation of **Zambia** cautiously supported the inclusion of the new paragraph following the concerns by India, adding however that this should be an exception and not common practice. It believed that the Committee should not be taking over the job of the Evaluation Body, hence its previous comment on the need to review the way the Evaluation Body operated. That is, it should not operate like an examination centre with a pass or fail but should provide guidelines that would enable the submitting State to communicate with the Evaluation Body to help clarify information so that nominations brought to the Committee were ready for a decision. The delegation endorsed the inclusion of paragraph 4.
111. The **Chairperson** urged the Committee to align with the most important paragraphs for adoption.
112. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** found the concerns raised by India, echoed by Hungary, to be relevant. It therefore asked the Secretary whether it was customary or established practice to systematically include such a paragraph recognizing the submitting State’s additional explanation or information, or should it be included in the draft decision as a new practice on an exceptional basis. With regard to paragraph 3 (the substantive part) and all of paragraph 4, the delegation remarked that they were entirely interlinked, noting that consensus had been reached in paragraph 3. The delegation asked the Chairperson why the Committee was once again being asked to state its position on paragraph 4 when the substantive paragraph had achieved consensus, as the subsequent paragraph should automatically be considered as having achieved consensus.
113. Clarifying, the **Secretary** explained that this had not been the practice in the past, and was thus a new proposal. The practice in previous sessions had been to finish and adopt all the paragraphs related to the inscription process, i.e. R.1–R.5, followed by the decision on whether to inscribe, refer or not to inscribe, before the inclusion of any additional paragraphs that the Committee might wish to include. If the Committee now wished to refer to every single criterion, this would indeed be a new practice.
114. The delegation of **India** thanked the Secretary for the clarification. Noting that this was a new practice, it reminded the Committee that it should then apply this new principle to all the other decisions in which there were amendments. The delegation understood the benefits and was thus not opposed to the principle, arguing that it should be applied uniformly, as was logical. The question was whether the Committee was seeking to establish a new practice, in which case it could not be applied exceptionally to some decisions only. The delegation also wished to point out that the Committee was not entirely in consensus regarding the wording of the amendment proposed by Cuba and Algeria. There seemed to be a slight contradiction in that the notion of providing new information before the Committee was, by extrapolation, overturning the decision of the Evaluation Body. The delegation noted two critical points: i) that this was a new practice; and ii) that the practice adopted should be applied uniformly thereafter.
115. The **Secretary** wished to address another important issue. Namely, at its sixth session in Bali in 2011, the Committee had extensively discussed and established the working method such that it “would not accept new information or additional evidence that the submitting State would like to present after the assessment of the Evaluation Body and in particular during the Committee meeting. Only clarifications concerning the information already included in the file evaluated by the Evaluation Body are possible”. The second issue was how to deal with this in terms of the text itself.
116. The delegation of **Algeria** recognized that the Committee was in the process of establishing a new practice, adding that the Committee was in any case sovereign and could decide what should or should not be done. Having said that, the delegation understood the Members’ concerns. However, if the Committee deleted paragraph 3, without mentioning the debate, it would give the impression that R.5 had been considered as satisfactory by the Evaluation Body, which was not the case. It was only upon listening to the clarifications by the submitting State that the majority of Members deemed R.5 to be satisfactory; a decision contrary to the recommendation by the Evaluation Body, which therefore had to be reflected in the decision. Thus, the Committee listened to the Evaluation Body and thanked it for its work, but having listened to the clarifications by the submitting State considered the criterion met.
117. Summarizing, the **Secretary** explained that the argument put forward by Algeria and Cuba, and supported by others, was that the Committee should give explain why it had changed the Evaluation Body’s recommendation, which should be reflected in the text of the decision. The concern raised by India and the Republic of Korea was that the Committee would significantly delay its working method if it had to go through this process at every amendment and for every criterion. The Secretary therefore proposed removing the amended paragraph (from the paragraph with the five criteria concerning the inscription) and place it *after* the decision on inscription. For the sake of consistency (a concern voiced by India), and as this was a standard paragraph, it could be placed after the paragraph reading ‘decides to inscribe’. In this way, it would refer to the clarifications provided by the submitting State on whichever criteria they might be. This standard paragraph would allow the Committee to move ahead efficiently by accepting the amendments without having to reopen the paragraph on each criterion because the paragraph could specify any clarifications brought forward on one or more criteria. In any case, the paragraph would be adapted depending on the nomination file, which would also allay the concern by India with respect to applying uniformity.
118. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee whether it could agree to the proposal.
119. The delegation of **Cuba** thanked the Secretary and India for their clarifications, and agreed that practices could be changed as many times as needed, including through the addition of new paragraphs, because these were living, breathing methods. Nevertheless, a standard paragraph was required when the submitting State provided information, especially when the situation was repeated again and again. The delegation explained that its initial proposal was to try and focus on the specific criteria in which more information was needed, and was thus a clarification. Nevertheless, it would in fact change the recommendation of the Evaluation Body. The delegation did not have a preference regarding the position of the paragraph, although the format of the preamble and how texts worked was well understood. It maintained, however, that a reference needed to be included whenever a submitting State provided a clarification, and this should be the case across the board for all States, as it was important that the decision could be seen in ten years’ time and accurately reflect the debate around the decision.
120. The delegation of **Senegal** reiterated the importance of the clarification made by the Secretary; that is, no new information could be accepted during the debate, only clarifications. In this regard, Bangladesh had provided the clarifications needed to shed light on the Committee’s decision, which was the spirit of Cuba's proposal. Above all, it did not disavow the Evaluation Body, as expressed by Algeria, by clearly stating that criterion R.5 had been satisfied thanks to the clarifications provided. The position of the paragraph did not matter, and it could appear at the end of the decision to respect the order. The delegation remarked that the Committee had already adopted paragraph 3, and therefore fully agreed with the Secretary; it was important to recall the spirit of the decision, which is to say that there was a clarification that made the decision possible.
121. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee to consider the proposal by the Secretary.
122. The delegation of **India** fully agreed with Senegal and the Secretary and, reverting to Cuba’s amendment, proposed a standard paragraph, which would read, ‘Thanks the delegation of - [in this case, Bangladesh] for the clarification provided to the Committee on criteria - [in this case, R.5]’. This could be the final paragraph 4.
123. The **Chairperson** asked whether the Committee agreed with India’s proposal.
124. The delegation of **Austria** felt that the most important thing for the Committee and for submitting States, now and in the future, was to ensure consistency and clarity for the sake of credibility. It was not in favour of changing the rules and preferred to follow past practice, as suggested by the Secretary, which was to adopt the criteria and then have the ‘congratulatory’ or additional text on the inventory, or wherever, at the end of the decision. The delegation sought to avoid the impression that it was possible to include new information during the Committee session, adding that at its sixth session the Committee had already adopted a decision stating that new information would not be accepted. The formulation of the paragraph should therefore make it very clear to submitting States that the Committee based its judgment on the contents of the submitted file and that it neither made a judgment on the element nor accepted new kinds of information.
125. The delegation of **Palestine** agreed with Senegal and India, as well as with the proposal by the Secretary, and requested that the Secretariat prepare the other decisions with the different criteria, as there were so many amendments, to save time.
126. In a constructive spirit and to enable the Committee to move forward, the delegation of **Algeria** agreed with the proposal by India and the Secretariat to include a standard paragraph to ‘thank the submitting State for the clarifications provided to the Committee during the debates’, while referencing the criteria on which the clarifications were made. This addition would make it clear that the clarifications had been presented during the Committee session.
127. The delegation of **Turkey** supported the remarks by Austria to avoid any reference to new information as the Committee based inscriptions on clarifications made.
128. The **Chairperson** returned to paragraph 3, ‘to inscribe’, as proposed by India and co-sponsored by other Members. With no further comments or objections, paragraph 3 was adopted. The Chairperson proceeded to the new paragraph 4, which was adopted.
129. The delegation of **Hungary** reiterated its support to inscribe the element with the clarifications made in R.5. Nevertheless, it wished to reinforce the point that inventory-making was the cornerstone of how ICH was safeguarded with the participation of communities, as enshrined in the Convention. The delegation added that it had been personally and very actively involved in the drafting of the Convention in 2002 to 2003, when this issue had been debated at length. It wished to make it absolutely clear that it was crucial for an element to feature on the inventory of the State Party before being nominated to the Lists of the Convention. The delegation therefore proposed an additional paragraph 5, which read, ‘Calls attention to the importance of Article 11.b., 12, as well as 15 of the Convention with regard to drawing up and updating inventories of the intangible cultural heritage prior to submitting nominations to the lists of the Convention’. It added that this reiterated the Convention in order to avoid any future ambiguities about the importance of criterion R.5.
130. The delegation of **Cyprus** mentioned that it would be problematic to recall the clarifications provided by a State on every occasion. It also found the proposal to recall Convention articles problematic as it would involve the addition of paragraphs for every criterion under scrutiny. The delegation nevertheless found it important to emphasize that the element had not been inscribed directly by the Evaluation Body but with the agreement of the Committee.
131. The delegation of **Cuba** shared Hungary’s concern, but it was not convinced that the paragraph should be included in every decision, and suggested instead that it be considered in the overall decision for item 10, which examined such problematic process issues. It agreed with Cyprus that there was no need to refer to articles of the Convention in the decisions of the elements, and proposed keeping the discussion concerning the overall decision 10 until once all the nominations had been examined.
132. The delegation of **Austria** supported Hungary’s amendment, as it agreed with the importance of drawing up inventories, but also because it reflected past practice to remind the State Party to provide this information or to draw attention to the information needed. Although it might not be used as a standard sentence for all nominations to come, it was important to retain the spirit of the amendment in recommending that the State Party be more concise on R.5.
133. The **Chairperson** noted a point of order from Palestine.
134. The delegation of **Palestine** found the proposal of Hungary and Austria problematic in that it was a general recommendation and therefore had no place in the specific decision, whose purpose was to inscribe the element, not recall the importance of some concepts in the Convention itself.
135. The **Chairperson** remarked that it was not a point of order, and returned the floor to Côte d’Ivoire.
136. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** supported the proposal by Cuba and others with regard to the paragraph, adding that it could be introduced at the time of the general debate in the final decision on item 10, after all the nomination files had been considered. Alternatively, the reference to the articles could be deleted, retaining only the general information applicable to all the other nominations.
137. The delegation of **Hungary** noted that Members were expressing general support for the paragraph but not in this decision. It was therefore open to the consensus and the understanding that the paragraph would be introduced later under decision 10, and it withdrew its amendment.
138. The **Chairperson** thanked Hungary for its understanding and withdrawal.
139. Thanking Hungary, the delegation of **Afghanistan** added that the decision should retain a minimum of information.
140. The delegation of **India** noted some very valid and excellent points, which could perhaps be part of a larger discussion under item 10; however, the Committee needed to move forward.
141. The **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the decision as a whole. With no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.3 to inscribe ‘Mangal Shobhajatra on Pahela Baishakh’ on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
142. The delegation of **Bangladesh** remarked on this very happy moment for all members of the delegation. On behalf of its Government and the people of Bangladesh, it expressed its thanks and gratitude to the Committee Members for inscribing Mangal Shobhajatra on Pahela Baishakh. This is the most inclusive and secular festival in the country that promotes peace, harmony and cohesiveness among Bangladeshi society. The inscription of the element would not only encourage its bearers and practitioners to enhance the visibility of the element, but it would also raise awareness of ICH in general. The delegation reiterated its thanks to the Committee for its support, particularly India for leading the necessary amendments to the draft decision. Due to time constraints and logistical inadequacy, it was not able to present a demonstration of the Mangal Shobhajatra procession. However, it wished to sing the first two lines of the theme song of Mangal Shobhajatra; a song written by Bengali poet Rabindranath Tagore who was born in undivided India in 1861 and was awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1913.

*[A singing performance of the verses]*

1. The **Chairperson** thanked Bangladesh, and turned to the next nomination submitted by Belarus.
2. The **Vice-Chairperson** then turned to the next nomination **‘Celebration in honor of the Budslaŭ icon of Our Lady (Budslaŭ Fest)’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.4] submitted by Belarus. During the first weekend of July, 40,000 pilgrims from different Christian denominations and countries had visited Budslaŭ in Belarus for the Celebration in Honor of the Budslaŭ Icon of Our Lady. The pilgrims visit the icon, associated with granting miracles, housed in the Church of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and a fair also takes place in the town square. The traditional practice helps to encourage unity and reinforce values that promote peace. Knowledge is transmitted in church communities. While the file satisfied criteria R.1 and R.2, the Evaluation Body had decided that the information included in the file was not sufficient to determine whether criteria R.3, R.4 and R.5 were satisfied. As for R3, the file focused on safeguarding tangible dimensions such as landscaping around the Budslaŭ church, the restoration of its interior, etc., but it did not sufficiently explain safeguarding the intangible aspect of the element. In addition, the file needed to address the potential unintended side effects of inscription, considering the possible expansion of tourism. As for R.4, the representatives of the Catholic Church signed the free, prior and informed consent, but the file did not present any letter of consent from representatives of other Christian confessions, and local communities were not visible. In addition, the file did not provide sufficient information on how this consent had been obtained. Lastly, the file needed to provide information concerning the participation of the community concerned in both the implementation of the proposed safeguarding measures and the inventorying process. The Evaluation Body decided to recommend the referral of the **Celebration in honor of the Budslaŭ icon of Our Lady (Budslaŭ Fest)** to the submitting State for more information.
3. Thanking the Vice-Chairperson, and with no requests for amendments, the **Chairperson** proposed adopting the decision as a whole.With no comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.4 to refer ‘Celebration in honor of the Budslaŭ icon of Our Lady (Budslaŭ Fest)’ to the submitting State for more information**.
4. The delegation of **Belarus** thanked the Chairperson, the Committee and the Evaluation Body for their work, adding that it would use the recommendations to get a positive reaction in the future.
5. The **Chairperson** thanked Belarus and turned to the next nomination submitted by Belgium.
6. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** then moved to the next nomination **‘Beer culture in Belgium’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.5] submitted by Belgium. Making and appreciating beer is part of the living heritage of a range of communities throughout Belgium. It plays a role in daily life, as well as festive occasions. Almost 1,500 types of beer are produced in the country, including by some Trappist communities. Craft beer has become particularly popular. Beer is also used by communities for cooking, producing products like beer-washed cheese and for pairings with food. Transmission occurs in the home, social circles, breweries, universities and public training centres. The Evaluation Body decided, from the information included in the file, that the nomination satisfied all five criteria. Beer culture in Belgium serves as an identity marker for the communities concerned, and fosters knowledge concerning nature, social practices and craft skills, which underlie beer-making, constituting an integral part of daily and festive life in Belgium. The Evaluation Body decided to recommend the inscription of **‘Beer culture in Belgium’** on the Representative List.
7. Thanking the Vice-Chairperson, and with no amendments submitted, the **Chairperson** proposed adopting the decision as a whole.With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.5 to inscribe ‘Beer culture in Belgium’ on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
8. The delegation of **Belgium** was honoured by the inscription of ‘Beer culture in Belgium’ on the Representative List, and expressed its gratitude to the Committee for its decision, the Ethiopian authorities for hosting the session, and members of the Evaluation Body for their professionalism. The delegation underlined that it represented not only Belgium but all amateurs and brewers, museums and associations, zythologists and beer lovers, women and men who are part of this large community that contributes to the sustainability, diversity and safeguarding of this element. The delegation spoke of the many measures in place since the 1970s to revive and safeguard this wide diversity, which also ensured the current and future sustainability of the element, taking into account the risks linked to alcohol consumption and support for sustainable development. These objectives formed an integral part of a multiple framework of action for the ICH of Belgium. Above all, the inscription of ‘Beer culture in Belgium’ was the result of a common effort, which reflected how the Convention was a platform that brought together authorities and the heritage communities of Flanders, Wallonia, the German-speaking community and Brussels in the culmination of a joint approach.
9. The **Chairperson** thanked Belgium, and turned to the next nomination submitted by China.
10. The **Vice-Chairperson** then moved to the next nomination **‘The Twenty-Four Solar Terms, knowledge in China of time and practices developed through observation of the sun’s annual motion’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.6] submitted by China. To better understand the seasons, astronomy and other natural phenomena, the ancient Chinese looked at the sun’s circular motion and divided it into 24 segments called Solar Terms. The terms, such as First Frost, based on observations of the environment, have been integrated into calendars as a timeframe for daily routines and production, being particularly important for farmers. Some folk festivities are associated with the terms, which have contributed to the cultural identity of communities. Knowledge is transmitted within families and schools. The Evaluation Body was pleased to find that the traditional Chinese calendar, which has profoundly influenced people’s way of thinking and code of conducts, continues to be an important carrier of Chinese cultural identity. It continues to provide the timeframe for their everyday lives and communal festive events to this day. The file satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body decided to recommend the inscription of ‘The Twenty-Four Solar Terms, knowledge in China of time and practices developed through observation of the sun’s annual motion’ on the Representative List.
11. Thanking the Vice-Chairperson, the **Chairperson** remarked that China wished to revise the descriptive summary of the element so as to clarify terminological errors. With no further amendments, the Chairperson proposed adopting the decision as a whole.With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.6 to inscribe ‘The Twenty-Four Solar Terms, knowledge in China of time and practices developed through observation of the sun’s annual motion’ on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
12. The delegation of **China** congratulated the Chairperson on his chairmanship and thanked the Ethiopian hosts for their warm hospitality. On behalf of the Ministry of Culture, the delegation extended its sincere appreciation to the Committee, the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat for their great efforts in examining and inscribing the Twenty-Four Solar Terms. This was the third inscribed element submitted by China under the domain ‘knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe’ as defined in the Convention. As a traditional knowledge system of time that has enjoyed thousands of years of intergenerational transmission, the Twenty-Four Solar Terms clearly embodies the concepts of respect for nature and harmony between man and nature. It reflects the balanced management of agricultural production and the related rituals and folk activities in compliance with the change of seasons. Thus, it has significant cultural meanings and social functions, and contributes to social cohesion and sustainable development. It testifies to the continuous development of Chinese civilization. The delegation believed that its inscription on the Representative List would not only enhance the cultural identity of the communities and groups concerned but would also contribute to ensuring the visibility and awareness of the significance of ICH in general. China reiterated its solemn commitment to safeguarding this element with the widest possible participation of stakeholders. China was currently in a Solar Term period of Lesser Snow [Xiao Xue], meaning that the weather gets bitterly cold but not yet with any heavy snow, so it was a time for people to prepare for harvest celebrations. The delegation concluded by wishing a good harvest and prosperity to all in the coming year.
13. The **Chairperson** thanked China, turning to the next nomination submitted by Cuba.
14. The **Vice-Chairperson** then moved to the next nomination, **‘Rumba in Cuba, a festive combination of music and dances and all the practices associated’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.7]submitted by Cuba.The Cuban rumba is associated with African culture but also features elements of Antillean culture and Spanish flamenco. A symbol of marginal Cuban society, the practice developed in poor neighbourhoods of cities, shanty towns and rural areas spreading from the west to the east of the country. The Cuban rumba, with its chants, movements, gestures and music, acts as an expression of resistance and self-esteem while evoking grace, sensuality and joy to connect people. Transmission occurs via imitation within families and neighbourhoods.After careful examination, the Evaluation Body decided that the nomination satisfied all five criteria.The rumba in Cuba is currently performed and practised by a wide variety of people regardless of their gender, social and geographical status or religious beliefs, thereby strengthening social cohesion and mutual respect. The participation of a wide range of stakeholders in the nomination process was well-documented. The Evaluation Body decided to recommend the inscription of the ‘Rumba in Cuba, a festive combination of music and dances and all the practices associated’ on the Representative List.
15. Thanking the Vice-Chairperson, and with no requests for amendments, the **Chairperson** proposed adopting the decision as a whole.With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.7 to inscribe ‘Rumba in Cuba, a festive combination of music and dances and all the practices associated’** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
16. The delegation of **Cuba** spoke of the emotion of having rumba included on the Representative List. The dance was actually born in Africa with obvious close links to Cuba. Indeed, Fidel Castro played a fundamental role in developing this dance, even from the start of the revolution, and it was thus a full expression of culture as a fundamental right. He also defended the belief that the cultural development of a community was the only way of ensuring a fair, inclusive and just society. In 1961, Castro spoke to intellectuals and stressed how it was essential to place artistic heritage within reach of people so that they could understand all the manifestations of culture. As part of its guiding principles, the revolution sought to create a real heritage of the people. The delegation thanked everyone who had made this inscription possible, especially Dr Miguel Barnet [president of the National Association of Cuban Writers and Artists, poet, ethnologist and writer], who had had a deep-seated conviction that this day would arrive. On behalf of Cuba’s rumba musicians, Mr Esmidio Iyerosum welcomed and expressed thanks for the inclusion of rumba on the Representative List, stating that rumba crystalized the story of the nation, and that dancing and singing represented Cuba.

*[A film on the rumba was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson** congratulated and thanked Cuba for the inspiring short film.
2. The **Secretary** reminded the Committee of a number of activities taking place during lunchtime, namely, the UNESCO Facilitators’ meeting, the open workshop of the ICH NGO Forum on Heritage Alive and the Africa Group meeting.
3. The **Chairperson** adjourned the morning session.

*[Wednesday, 30 November 2016, afternoon session]*

**ITEM 10.b OF THE AGENDA (CONT.):**

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

1. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the delegation of Brazil had requested one minute of silence on behalf of the 71 people killed in the plane crash the previous day in Colombia.

*[1-minute silence respected for the plane crash victims in Brazil]*

1. The **Chairperson** began with the nomination submitted by Spain, as agreed by the Committee in the morning, before returning to the alphabetical order of the files.
2. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** moved to the next nomination, ‘**Valencia Fallas festivity’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.30], submitted by Spain. The Fallas Festivity is a traditional practice of communities in Valencia to mark the coming of spring. It features a monument of caricatures by local artists that provides a commentary on current social issues. Erected in the town square from 14 to 19 March, it is then set alight, symbolizing a rejuvenation of social activity. Marching bands, outdoor meals and fireworks are part of the festivities, which enhance social cohesion and provide an opportunity for collective creativity transmitted within families. The Evaluation Body had decided that, from the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The file adequately described the Fallas festivity and the cultural meaning of the ‘falla’ monument in terms of renewal, identification and social cohesion. The file also demonstrated how a wide range of stakeholders, including the communities concerned, local town councils, universities, regional government and individual experts had been involved in this nomination. The Evaluation Body therefore decided to recommend the inscription of ‘Valencia Fallas festivity’ on the Representative List.
3. Thanking the Vice-Chairperson, and with no requests for amendments, the **Chairperson** proposed adopting the decision as a whole.With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.30 to inscribe** ‘**Valencia Fallas festivity’** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
4. The delegation of **Spain** thanked the Committee for its support and the inscription of the Fallas festivity, as well as also the Evaluation Body for its report, and the Secretariat for its preparatory work. It also thanked the Government of Ethiopia for its warm welcome and magnificent organization. Fallas is a cultural event with deep Mediterranean roots in which fire plays a fundamental role. Around the Fallas, there are a multiplicity of artistic creations from pyrotechnics to music, fireworks, oral text, artisanal works and gastronomy, which means that this festivity involves the entire community, making it one of its richest cultural expressions. The transmission of the tradition, brought about by the participation of the communities with more than 160 townships and 800 commissions, is proof of the protection and support given to this living practice of ICH. This inscription clearly met the criteria of the Convention in which Spain had been actively involved since its negotiation. The delegation recognized the joint work of the Ministry of Culture, the community of Valencia, the city Government of Valencia, and commended all its people for their creativity, commitment, hope and their genius, which made Fallas possible in Valencia every year.
5. On behalf of the thousands of people who take part in the Fallas, the **Representative of the Valencia Government** expressed gratitude to the Committee for its recognition of the Fallas, adding that there would be thousands of Valencians taking to the streets to celebrate. The Representative believed in extending the concept of intangible heritage and the philosophy behind the Convention. This recognition was thus a great stimulus to look for greater excellence and better uphold the values enshrined in Fallas. He was aware of the great responsibility involved, as well as the commitment to preserve all the elements in the nomination, the creativity of artists, artisans, sociability and intergenerational transmission. The Representative invited delegates to join in the experience first-hand by being part of the festivity next March.

*[A film of the Valencia Fallas**festivity was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson** congratulated Spain and turned to the nomination submitted by the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea.
2. The **Vice-Chairperson** presented the next nomination, **‘Ssirum (wrestling) in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.8], submitted by the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea.In communities of North Korea, men would traditionally practice ssirum as a way of building their physical strength to do work. They learned the form of wrestling from their father or grandfather, consolidated their skills with brothers or neighbours, then developed their techniques at school and in competitions. Today, ssirum is practised in the same manner using the torso, hands or legs. It is a cultural tradition that encourages trust, respect and understanding among practising communities to promote harmony. While the Evaluation Body had decided that the nomination satisfied criteria R.4 and R.5, it had experienced some difficulty, firstly in determining whether the element constituted ICH, as defined in Article 2 of the Convention. The information provided in the file did not allow for a sufficiently clear definition of the element, but rather described a sporting practice with the main focus being on elite practitioners as opposed to a tradition with specific cultural significance. Information concerning the involvement of women in the practice of the element was also lacking. As for R.2, as was often the case with other files, this file described how inscription would contribute to the visibility of the element itself rather than ICH in general. Also, where mention was made of inscription fostering dialogue among communities, groups and individuals, the file needed to be more explicit as to precisely how inscription would contribute to these outcomes. Another important issue was that the file did not provide sufficient information on the involvement of local communities in the design and implementation of these measures. While a number of promotional activities to enhance the visibility of the element were described, the file did not sufficiently demonstrate anticipation of the unintended results of inscription and how these would be mitigated. The Evaluation Body decided to recommend the referral of Ssirum (wrestling) in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea to the submitting State for further elaboration.
3. Thanking the Vice-Chairperson, and with no requests for amendments, the **Chairperson** proposed adopting the decision as a whole.With no comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.8 to refer ‘Ssirum (wrestling) in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea’ to the submitting State for more information**.
4. The delegation of the **Democratic People’s Republic of Korea** extended its gratitude to all for the efforts to ensure the success of the session. It regretted, however, that Ssirum had not been inscribed but referred. As an element of ICH enjoyed by the Korean people, if it had been inscribed it would have made a great contribution to raising awareness and understanding of relevant heritage, not only among Korean people but among all other communities in the world with similar elements, as well as to the visibility of ICH in general. Nevertheless, with the aim of safeguarding ICH on a higher level within the framework of the Convention, it would re-submit its file.
5. The **Chairperson** congratulated the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, and proceeded to the next nomination, submitted by the Dominican Republic.
6. The **Vice-Chairperson** presented the next nomination, **‘Music and dance of the merengue in the Dominican Republic’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.9], submitted by the Dominican Republic. The merengue is considered part of the Dominican community’s national identity that plays an active role in various aspects of people’s daily lives: from education and social gatherings and celebrations to political campaigning. In 2005, 26 November was declared National Merengue Day with merengue festivals held each year. Danced in pairs, flirtatious gestures are used as dancers move to music. Transmitted through participation, the traditional practice attracts people from different social classes, helping to promote respect and coexistence within communities. The Evaluation Body had decided that, from the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.2, R.3 and R.4. It had decided, however, that the information included in the file was not sufficient to determine whether criterion R.5 was satisfied. While the file provided evidence of the inclusion of the element in the Partial Inventory of Dominican Cultural Heritage, under the responsibility of the Ministry of Culture, and while this was still being prepared, it failed to demonstrate the participation of communities, groups and relevant NGOs in the inventorying process when the element was included in the inventory, and how the inventory was or would be regularly updated. The Evaluation Body thus decided to recommend the referral of the ‘Music and dance of the merengue in the Dominican Republic’ to the submitting State for more information.
7. Thanking the Vice-Chairperson, and with no requests for amendments, the **Chairperson** proposed adopting the decision as a whole.
8. The delegation of **Cuba** wished to open the debate and to ask the submitting State for more information on R.5, adding that it would present an amendment.
9. The delegation **Palestine** also wished to open a debate on the same point.
10. The delegation of **Afghanistan** noted the good work of the Evaluation Body and its reference to insufficient information, and sought clarification from the submitting State.
11. The delegation of **Palestine** requested that the Dominican Republic provide an explanation in R.5 on the participation of the community in the preparation of the inventory, and its regular updating.
12. With a clear request for clarification, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Dominican Republic.
13. The delegation of the **Dominican Republic** thanked the Committee for the opportunity to provide some clarification regarding R.5 on the participation of the community in the drawing up of the inventory. It was noted that the delegation had distributed a brief document among the Members of the Committee with a more complete overview of this information. The delegation explained that the Dominican Republic’s national inventory of ICH dated back to 2011, following UNESCO training on inventory-making, and had been prepared by staff trained during the UNESCO workshop, in particular the Director for Folklore and Communities. Currently, the inventory contained five cultural expressions, one of which was the merengue that was being presented, which had been included in the national inventory since 2011. It had been declared as belonging to the cultural heritage of the country in 2014. The inventory also included the two elements ‘Cocolo dance drama tradition’ and ‘Cultural space of the Brotherhood of the Holy Spirit of the Congos of Villa Mella’, both of which had already been inscribed on the Representative List since 2008. The delegation clarified how communities were included in the inventory process, in particular in ‘Dolorita de los morenos’ and ‘La hermandad de los toreros de Santo Domingo y de la Virgen de La Altagracia’. The inclusion of merengue in the inventory had been decided upon by the leading male and female practitioners of this dance; this work had been carried out between September 2011 and the beginning of 2013, with the participation of the bearers. Moreover, evidence of the meetings and interviews with these leading figures had been provided to the Evaluation Body, and the contact emails and telephone numbers of the people involved were appended. Indeed, the anthropologist Mr Carlos Hernández Soto, who had participated in many UNESCO meetings, had also been involved in this process. The document distributed contained photos of the different meetings with the communities, as well as the interviews and consultations*.* The inclusion work had been carried out in many areas of the country, and the Committee was invited to consult with the many leading figures involved in this process; an anthropologist had also coordinated this work. Photos also showed the work of the bearers concerned and a list of participants. In fact, all the elements included in the inventory of ICH bore testimony to the participation of the bearers and practitioners of those elements. Moreover, the process of bringing people together to actually write up the methodology had occasionally been long and difficult, requiring a lot of patience. This had been made more difficult due to some technical and logistical difficulties encountered. Nevertheless, the delegation had always endeavored to do its best to resolve these issues, and it was ready to provide more information to the Committee and the Secretariat if this was deemed necessary. The delegation believed merengue to be a fundamental part of the culture of the Dominican Republic, adding that there was no other cultural expression that embodied the country more than the merengue. It hoped that the clarifications would allow the Committee to review the recommendation by the Evaluation Body and inscribe the element on the Representative List, which was extremely important and symbolic for the people of the country.
14. Thanking the Dominican Republic, the **Chairperson** asked whether Cuba wished to intervene at this stage.
15. The delegation of **Cuba** would wait for the debate to save time.
16. The **Chairperson** therefore proceeded to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no comments or objections, paragraphs 1–4 were adopted.
17. The delegation of **Cuba** corrected the Chairperson in that only paragraphs 1 and 2 with the four criteria had been adopted, and not paragraph 4.
18. The **Chairperson** agreed, asking Cuba to propose its amendment.
19. The delegation of **Cuba** explained that its amendment was to delete paragraph 3, remarking that, as neighbours, it understood how important merengue was for the region and the world. Indeed, it found it difficult to understand that the element could not be inscribed, which was essentially due to a lack of communication. With regard to R.5, the delegation wished to insert a paragraph, which would read, ‘thanks the delegation of the Dominican Republic for the clarifications provided…’, while recalling the debate and the need to be more flexible in interpreting how countries drew up their national inventories. Indeed, it would be difficult for Latin America and the entire region to accept the decision not to inscribe this element due to a misunderstanding on R.5. Moreover, if the Evaluation Body had been able to communicate directly with the submitting State then these types of problems could have been avoided. The amendment also included the deletion of the section, ‘and while this is still in the process of elaboration, it fails to demonstrate the participation of communities […]’, replacing it with another paragraph that supported inscription of the nomination. A final paragraph would be included, as was the case for Bangladesh, which thanked the submitting State for the clarification.
20. In paragraph R.5, the delegation of **Palestine** proposed deleting ‘while’, which would read, ‘the file provides evidence of the inclusion of the element in the […]’, stopping at the Ministry of Culture, and deleting also ‘and while’ at the end.
21. The delegation of **Guatemala** supported the inscription of merengue due to its ability to cross borders in the region and the world. It highlighted the importance of Juan Luís Guerra, a Goodwill Ambassador to UNESCO and a major proponent of this style of music. The delegation had also included merengue in its own national inventory in 2011, and it had counted on the support of the different communities and relevant groups in processes that were indeed very long and complex, which is why it sought flexibility on this issue.
22. Also from the Caribbean and Latin American region, the delegation of **Saint Lucia** remarked that it would be appalled if the element were not inscribed. It accepted the clarifications provided by the Dominican Republic and thus supported the amendments by Cuba. However, it expressed concern about the understanding of what constituted ‘satisfactory’ in the inventorying process. The delegation explained that [Caribbean] countries might be operating at some disadvantage compared to other countries, perhaps due to different cultural ways of working, but that there should always be a window of flexibility accommodating these particular circumstances, especially given the recurrent nature of the issue of R.5. It was satisfied with the clarification given and the submitting State’s explanation of its legitimate and valid inventorying process.
23. The delegation of **Algeria** supported Cuba's amendment, as amended by Palestine, though it awaited the final version of the amendment by Cuba. From the clarifications provided, it accepted that the element had been inscribed on the national inventory in 2011 and, given that the nomination had been submitted in 2013 or 2014, this date could be considered an update in itself.
24. The delegation of **Ethiopia** supported the amendment by Cuba.
25. Taking into account the clarifications, the delegation of **India** was convinced that the necessary parameters had been met. In this regard, it supported the amendment by Cuba to inscribe the element.
26. The delegation of **Palestine** asked that the Committee continue with its amendments on the other paragraphs, and that Cuba complete its amendment to paragraph 3.
27. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that it had to first adopt R.5 before proceeding with the rest of the paragraphs.
28. The delegation of **Senegal** also supported the amendment, adding that although it was not from the same region, the merengue was extended to Senegal by creole communities.
29. The delegation of **Colombia** remarked that the merengue was part of the soul of the Dominican Republic and was recognized in the Caribbean region as one of its most important musical expressions, linking all the different countries. Indeed, life, community and the social fabric were very much embodied in the merengue and that community participation is ensured in this element. It therefore supported both the inscription of the merengue and the amendment.
30. The delegation of the **Philippines** found no failure on the part of the submitting State regarding the participation of communities or relevant groups in the inventory process, which had been carried out by cultural heritage practitioners such as local farmers, radio shows, producers, musicians, dancers, composers and singers who had actively participated in the workshops and meetings sponsored by the Ministry of Culture, Office of Material Cultural Heritage. In this regard, it supported Cuba’s amendment and the inscription of the element.
31. The **Chairperson** noted the general support for the amendment in R.5.
32. The delegation of **Hungary** supported the inscription of the element, but wished to modify the amendment under R.5. The delegation recalled that R.5 concerned the inscription of an element on the national inventory, which was made with the participation of communities and regularly updated. Noting the case of other inscribed elements, for example Nawrouz, R.5 should specifically spell out the basis on which the clarification was received from the submitting State. The delegation therefore suggested adding a sentence to specify that the inventory had been prepared with the participation of communities and was regularly updated.
33. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee whether it accepted Hungary’s amendment.
34. The delegation of **Armenia** supported the amendment by both Cuba and Hungary.
35. The delegation of **Mauritius** supported the amendment by Hungary.
36. The delegation of **Republic of Korea** was in favour of the amended draft decision by Cuba, modified slightly by Palestine. In general, draft decisions were the outcome of careful deliberation by the Evaluation Body in a faithful attempt to guard the principles of the Convention. However, it accepted the point made by the Evaluation Body in the original proposal of there being minor technical oversights, which were appropriately and convincingly explained by the submitting State.
37. The delegation of **Cyprus** also supported Cuba's amendments, but wished to return to the same paragraph that had been added in the case of Bangladesh on the same subject, and not to include it on R.5 as proposed by Hungary.
38. The **Chairperson** reminded Cyprus that the paragraph would be added afterwards to all the decisions and therefore there was no need to discuss it further.
39. The delegation of **Zambia** supported the suggestion to adopt the first sentences, but it was not comfortable with the reference to ‘partial’ inventory, unless it held some significance.
40. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** supported the amendment by Cuba and Hungary.
41. The delegation of **Cyprus** noted that the Committee was about to adopt paragraph 5, when it had said it would not include Hungary's amendment but the other paragraph.
42. The **Chairperson** concurred.
43. In relation to Zambia’s proposal, the **Secretary** clarified that ‘partial’ was the language used by the submitting State in relation to its inventory; it was not an adjective given by the Evaluation Body.
44. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for the clarification.
45. The delegation of **Zambia** requested that the submitting State explain the significance of ‘partial’ inventory.
46. Before returning to the submitting State for clarification, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to Cuba.
47. In the spirit of consensus and progress, the delegation of **Cuba** asked Zambia if it could accept the amendment by Hungary, which sought to reflect the reality of the debate in the decision, as previously discussed. An additional paragraph would be added afterwards; the standard paragraph used in the case of Bangladesh. The delegation recalled that it had been agreed that the proposal by Hungary on Article 12 of the Convention on inventories would be included in the overall decision.
48. The **Chairperson** asked Zambia if it agreed to the proposal by Hungary.
49. With the amendment suggested, the delegation of **Zambia** agreed.
50. The **Chairperson** now turned to the adoption of R.5.
51. The delegation of **Palestine** remarked that ‘partial’ was part of the name of the inventory, as explained by the Secretary, and thus should remain.
52. The delegation of **India** agreed with the very good proposal by Hungary, which improved the system going forward, adding that it was good to know that there was an emerging consensus on this point.
53. With no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson** pronounced criterion R.5 adopted as amended. Paragraph 2 as a whole was also duly adopted. The Chairperson proceeded to paragraph 3.
54. Based on the decision in the case of Bangladesh, the delegation of **Cuba** wished to incorporate the paragraph into the decision that thanked the submitting State for the clarification provided to the Committee on criterion R.5. In addition, it sought a new paragraph that ‘decides to inscribe Music and dance of the merengue in the Dominican Republic in the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity’.
55. The delegation of **Palestine** supported the amendment by Cuba as well as the additional paragraph.
56. With no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 3 adopted as amended. The Secretariat inserted the standard paragraph 4, with some editing to adapt to this specific nomination.
57. With regard to the last paragraph, the delegation of **Cuba** proposed to encourage the State to provide further information for the purpose of its periodic report, as had been included for other nominations. The delegation did not want to disregard the recommendations by the Evaluation Body that would help the submitting State improve its safeguarding practices, which would be taken on board by this paragraph.
58. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee whether it agreed to the proposal by Cuba for a paragraph 5.
59. The delegation of **Cuba** clarified the paragraph, which would read, ‘Encourages the submitting State to continue to work in order to ensure the full participation of the communities concerned in the elaboration and the updating of the inventories’. The delegation explained that this recommendation would help the State safeguard its element and properly draft its periodic report.
60. The **Secretary** asked Cuba to clarify and to provide the amendment in written form.
61. The delegation of **Cuba** clarified that the recommendation to the submitting State was simply to work on ensuring the participation of the communities and to update its inventory. It would thus be a good recommendation based on the assessment by the Evaluation Body, but it did not imply that the delegation was against inscription.
62. The delegation of **Palestine** noted some discrepancies in the wording between the French and English versions. It sought the indulgence of Cuba not to encourage or recommend certain actions to the submitting State, suggesting first adopting the new paragraph 4 and then discussing the new paragraph 5.
63. The delegation of **Hungary** supported Cuba’s suggestion on both paragraphs 4 and 5, as it understood that it was not replacing the previous paragraph 5, which should be reformulated to ‘encourage’, as was the case in the rumba. The two paragraphs addressed certain specific topics that had been referred to in the nomination file and, once inscribed, these encouragements would help the submitting State further manage its inscribed element. The delegation reiterated its support for Cuba’s proposal with a reformulation that kept the context of inscription, but formulating the points as encouragements rather than criticisms.
64. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee to proceed with the adoption of Cuba’s amendment in paragraph 4, and the paragraph that ‘encourages’. With no objections, paragraph 4 was adopted as amended.
65. The delegation of **Cuba** read out paragraph 5, ‘Encourages the submitting State to continue to work to ensure the full participation of the communities concerned and the elaboration and updating of the inventories’.
66. The **Chairperson** asked whether Saint Lucia was comfortable with the wording.
67. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** echoed the remarks made by Palestine that questioned the necessity of including this recommendation, given that all submitting States should be encouraged to continue involving communities in the preparation of their inventories. It did not understand why the Dominican Republic had been specifically singled out, as it was already satisfied that the State was indeed working on it.
68. The **Chairperson** noted that Palestine and Saint Lucia were proposing a deletion.
69. The delegation of **Palestine** did not wish to insist on its position, adding that this did not change the terms and was a form of encouragement, and that it was ready to adopt it.
70. The **Chairperson** asked SaintLucia whether it could accept the proposal.
71. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** agreed to the adoption of paragraph 5.
72. The **Chairperson** proceeded to the adoption of paragraph 5, which was duly adopted. Turning to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, and with no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.9 to inscribe ‘Music and dance of the merengue in the Dominican Republic’ on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
73. The delegation of **Dominican Republic** expressed great joy and gratitude to the Committee for including the merengue on the Representative List, adding that this was a very important milestone for the country. It spoke of the great national celebration that would be held that evening in the country, with much merengue dancing in the coming days, adding that merengue would be brought to one of the Committee session in the future. In this way, everyone could experience what the music means to people, and its capacity to unite young and older generations, different communities and neighborhoods, men and women in a moment of joy. The delegation concluded by reaffirming its commitment to safeguarding this expression of culture, as well as others that form part of its inventory, now and into the future.
74. The **Chairperson** congratulated the Dominican Republic, and proceeded to the next nomination submitted by Egypt.
75. The **Vice-Chairperson** then moved to the next nomination, **‘Tahteeb, stick game’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.10], submitted by Egypt. In ancient Egypt, tahteeb was a form of martial arts. Now a festive game, some of the old symbolism and values associated with the practice remain. Performed before an audience, it involves a brief, non-violent interchange between two adversaries wielding long sticks while folk music is played. Practitioners are male, mostly from Saeedy populations in upper Egypt. The rules of the game are based on mutual respect, friendship, courage, chivalry and pride with transmission occurring within families and neighbourhoods in the communities. The Evaluation Body decided that the nomination satisfied criteria R.1 and R.4. The Evaluation Body decided, however, that the information included in the file was not sufficient to determine whether criteria R.2, R.3 and R.5 were satisfied. The nomination file did not adequately demonstrate how inscription would raise awareness of ICH in general. The responses to the other sub-questions were considered satisfactory, including the potential contribution of inscription to urban-rural dialogue and mutual respect. As for R.3, while the submitting State had described the safeguarding measures proposed, the participation of relevant communities in the development and implementation of these measures was not sufficiently demonstrated. In addition, the communities and groups needed to be placed at the centre of all safeguarding efforts. The submitting State was also encouraged to reflect on the possible effects of decontextualization resulting from some of the proposed measures. As for R.5, the file did not mention how the communities were involved in the inventorying or how the inventory was updated. The Evaluation Body decided to recommend a referral of Tahteeb, stick game, to the submitting State for more information.
76. The **Chairperson** noted that there were two amendments for the different criteria: an amendment from Armenia on R.2 and an amendment from Algeria on R.3 and R5. The Chairperson opened the floor for general comments.
77. The delegation of **Cuba** wished to know how the communities were involved in the development and implementation of safeguarding practices.
78. Noting a direct question, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to Egypt to respond.
79. With regard to R.3, the delegation of **Egypt** explained that section 5 of the nomination file had indicated that two NGOs had been directly involved in the nomination process. One of the NGOs, the Association for Upper Egypt for Education and Development, had a principal role in the safeguarding measures. In 2015, the Association developed the training of trainers TTT programme to prepare new Tahteeb trainers. The Ministries of Sports and Culture both officially validated this programme in 2016. The first implementation stage had started earlier that month [November 2016]. Twenty persons had been selected for training as Tahteeb trainers. Traditional players and bearers from the local communities concerned played a key role in the TTT programme. They were on board and in charge of the selection of the new trainers along with the NGO experts. They also revised and approved the Tahteeb instructors’ guides; a manual drafted by the NGO that served as a reference for new players and trainers. The direct involvement of traditional players and bearers in this process was an effective guarantee to preserve Tahteeb from any effects of decontextualization, safeguarding its principles, rules and ethics. Moreover, there is an annual Tahteeb festival held by the Ministry of Culture in which all traditional players and bearers are invited to participate and perform. Both officials and the communities collaborate through this festival to safeguard this heritage and ensure its viability.
80. The delegation of **Lebanon** wished to ask Egypt to provide more information on the gender dimension of Tahteeb and its evolution.
81. The delegation of **India** found the nomination very interesting, and sought clarity specifically on how the Tahteeb was inventoried and updated on the national list.
82. Noting the direct questions, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to Egypt to respond.
83. The delegation of **Egypt** thanked Saudi Arabia for the Arabic interpretation. With regard to the question on gender from Lebanon, the delegation remarked that the Convention must take into account the cultural specificities of each community. It explained that Tahteeb was made up of a triangle in terms of its practices. One of the points of the triangle is the bat, the second is the performance and the third is the crowd. Indeed, many women in the crowd participated as spectators. Women also played an important role in the intergenerational transmission of this tradition. Regarding Tahteeb practised in towns, women participated more and more in the actual sport itself, and restrictions that existed in rural areas regarding women participating in Tahteeb no longer exist. With regard to India’s question, this was not the first time that the nomination had been presented; it had actually been put forward in 2014 at the ninth Committee session. The delegation pointed out that in Decision 9.COM 15 it was found that, from the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. Tahteeb had been inventoried in 2013.
84. The **Chairperson** asked Egypt to answer the question fully.
85. The delegation of **Egypt** reiterated that the Secretariat had been satisfied with its situation in 2014, which was reflected in the decision. The element was thus included in the inventory with the help of the National Commission of UNESCO in which with the communities were involved. A group of experts had been created, made up of practitioners of the game, and they had fully participated. The inventory was updated by a UNESCO-accredited NGO, which was also made up of practitioners.
86. The **Chairperson** thanked Egypt for fully responding to the questions.
87. The delegation of **Bulgaria** valued the merits of the Tahteeb stick game and tradition, which dated back more than 5,000 years, as noted in the nomination. The file also presented extensive information on the practices and transmission of the element in Egypt today. With regard to R.2, the delegation wished to know how the inscription would raise awareness of the proposed element in particular.
88. The delegation of **Armenia** wished to hear from Egypt on how inscription would raise the profile and general awareness of UNESCO, ICH and the element. It also sought clarifications regarding its transfer from generation to generation and the steps taken towards this end in Egypt.
89. The delegation of **Algeria** thanked the Evaluation Body for its pertinent observations, and Egypt for its very detailed responses. The delegation remarked that Tahteeb is a very important element within Egyptian culture and that the Committee should work to protect its specificity, adding that the Egyptian Government was doing everything to safeguard the element. Moreover, its inscription on the Representative List would make Tahteeb part of a universal, global heritage, hence its support for its inscription.
90. The **Chairperson** noted a further clarification request from Egypt.
91. With regard to the question on R.2, the delegation of **Egypt** clarified that Tahteeb represented such values in society as pride, friendship, courage and respect. It originated in ancient Egypt and remained strongly present in Egyptian society, having evolved over the years into a festive game accompanied by music and practised during many social and religious events. In this context, the inscription of Tahteeb would raise the awareness and visibility of ICH in general by promoting essential common values of society. It would also help to preserve the many cultural elements directly related to this heritage. It was also worth noting that Tahteeb had recently been included in the curricula of several educational institutions as physical education to promote essential societal values among young generations through intangible heritage.
92. The **Chairperson** recommended proceeding to the decisions.
93. The delegation of **Turkey** thanked Egypt for the clarifications made. It also believed that Tahteeb represented essential values of society. It is performed during many social and religious events directly related to the society’s culture and the different aspects of life. Therefore, its inscription would promote these common societal values and raise awareness of intangible heritage in general, and not only the element itself. It also noted that Tahteeb played an instrumental role in fostering dialogue between urban and rural populations. The delegation therefore found that R.2 was satisfied.
94. The **Chairperson** moved to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no further comments or objections, paragraph 1 and criteria R.1 and R.4 in paragraph 2 were adopted. The Chairperson the turned to the amendments, and to R.2 proposed by Armenia.
95. The delegation of **Ethiopia** believed that the nomination file clearly demonstrated the support of the Egyptian authority and the active involvement of NGOs in the process, and thus it supported the amendments proposed by Algeria and Armenia.
96. The delegation of **Palestine** wished to reiterate the importance of this element, and it co-sponsored both amendments by Algeria and Armenia.
97. The delegation of **Turkey** supported the amendment on R.2.
98. The delegation of **Lebanon** supported the amendments by Armenia and Palestine.
99. The delegations of **Zambia, India and Guatemala** supported the amendment on R.2.
100. The delegation of **Hungary** supported the amendment with a slight modification in the line that stated, ‘bring UNESCO and ICH values’, adding that it was a vague formulation and that it was better to state that ICH would bring values to the younger generation and requested that it be added as co-sponsor.
101. The delegations of **Cuba, Saint Lucia, Mongolia, Bulgaria, Mauritius** and **Afghanistan** supported the amendment in R.2.
102. Noting the consensus, the **Chairperson** proceeded to the adoption of R.2.
103. The delegation of **Turkey** noted a correction to the supporters’ list to include Mauritius.
104. The **Chairperson** returned to the adoption of R.2, and with no objections, it was pronounced adopted, as amended by Hungary. Criterion R.3 was also duly adopted. The Chairperson turned to criterion R.5.
105. The delegation of **Mongolia** took note that R.5 had already been decided in Decision 9.COM 10.15, and it wished to maintain that decision. The delegation explained thatsince R.5 had already been accepted in 2014, but rejected by the Evaluation Body in 2016, it wished to revert to the previous decision.
106. The **Secretary** clarified that the nomination file had never been presented to the Committee in 2014, as Egypt had withdrawn its file following the recommendation of the Evaluation Body.
107. The delegation of **Mongolia** apologized for the misunderstanding.
108. The delegation of **Senegal** remarked that theclarification was very timely, adding that the recommendation of the Evaluation Body considered that this criterion had certainly satisfied certain elements. Together with the clarifications provided by Egypt, in that the inventory had been carried out with the communities and also updated, the delegation supported the amendment by Algeria.
109. The **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of criterion R.5. With no objections, criterion R.5 was adopted. He then turned to paragraph 4, [which would become paragraph 3], as proposed by Algeria. With no objections, it was duly adopted. The Chairperson then turned to the standard paragraph, as previously agreed [which was adapted to this nomination], and with no objections, it was duly adopted.
110. The delegation of **Hungary** returned to the discussion on R.5, and the standard paragraph adopted for the Dominican Republic nomination, explaining that R.5 was about three things: i) the element is on a national inventory; ii) it involved the participation of communities; and iii) it is regularly updated. Based on the intervention by Egypt, these criteria were met, also in the case of R.5. Thus, the same sentence should also be included in R.5, as was the case in the Dominican Republic file.
111. Thanking Hungary for its positive comment, the **Chairperson** asked the Committee whether it could accommodate this positive addition, adding that only with consensus could it return to R.5 and re-adopt it. With no objections, the Chairperson asked Hungary about the wording.
112. The delegation of **Hungary** confirmed that the sentence should be the same as that included in the Dominican Republic decision, i.e. ‘The inventory is elaborated with the participation of communities and is regularly updated’.
113. The delegation of **Austria** supported Hungary’s proposal, adding that it was very important to stress the importance of inventories. It asked whether it was possible to read out the new amendments in order to get familiar with them prior to their adoption.
114. The **Chairperson** read out the new amendment in R.5, which read 'Tahteeb was inventoried in 2013 by the Association of Upper Egypt for Education and Development and the Egyptian National Commission for UNESCO (currently in charge of the inventory list for ICH in Egypt). The inventory is elaborated with the participation of communities and is regularly updated’. With no further comments or objections, criterion R.5 was adopted. The Chairperson returned to paragraph 4.
115. The delegation of **Palestine** had a minor modification in the generic formulation, ‘thanks the submitting State’, adding that it preferred to have the name of the State in each of the decisions.
116. The **Chairperson** returned to paragraph 4, and with no objections, it was pronounced adopted as amended. Turning to the adoption of the decision as a whole, and with no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.10 to inscribe ‘Tahteeb, stick game’** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
117. The delegation of **Egypt** expressed its deep appreciation to all Members of the Committee, the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body for their work and efforts in the inscription of Tahteeb stick game on the Representative List. This was Egypt’s first successful nomination and it believed that the inscription of this element, with its festival spirit and artistic dimension, was very important to Egypt in the current context. It also believed that the inscription on the Representative List of UNESCO, as the highest international organization for culture, would encourage government and local communities to work and collaborate further for the inscription for and safeguarding of new elements of intangible heritage. The delegation congratulated the traditional bearers and the tahteeb players and trainers for the inscription of this element of heritage, which they had borne for nearly 5,000 years.
118. The **Chairperson** congratulated Egypt, and noting that the next nomination was the ‘Gada system, an indigenous democratic socio-political system of the Oromo’ submitted by Ethiopia, the Chairperson ceded his place to his Vice-Chair from Bulgaria. According to Rule 15 of the Rules of Procedure, the Chairperson shall abstain from exercising his functions for all issues relating to an element of the ICH present in the territory of his State.

*[The Vice-Chairperson from Bulgaria chaired this session]*

1. The **Vice-Chair** proceeded to the next nomination submitted by Ethiopia.
2. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** then moved to the next nomination **‘Gada system, an indigenous democratic socio‑political system of the Oromo’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.11] submitted by Ethiopia. Gada is a traditional system of governance of the Oromo people in Ethiopia developed from knowledge gained over generations. It regulates political, economic, social and religious activity serving as a mechanism for enforcing moral conduct, building community cohesion, and expressing culture. Gada is organized into five classes taught by oral historians with each having to progress through a series of grades before it can take the leadership. Men, whose fathers are members, participate. Transmission occurs within families and at school. The Evaluation Body had decided that, from the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.2, R.4, and R.5. The Evaluation Body decided, however, that the information included in the file was not sufficient to determine whether R.3 was satisfied. The file introduced future safeguarding measures (which include filmmaking, the publication of books, training sessions and research), but more information on the role of communities in their implementation would have been useful. The file emphasized that the utmost care would be given to protecting the element from threats of tourism: more details on measures in this respect would have been welcome. Furthermore, the file noted that ‘those who failed to implement the safeguarding measures will be legally accountable pursuant to the laws of the country’. This contradicts the view of the Committee that there should be no compulsion with regard to safeguarding measures ([Decision 8.COM 7.a.6](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/8.COM/7.a.6)) and that it was imperative to avoid using coercive measures to safeguard ICH. The Evaluation Body decided to recommend the referral of the Gada system, an indigenous democratic socio‑political system of the Oromo to the submitting State for further information.
3. The **Vice-Chair** noted an amendment by India.
4. The delegation of **India** expressed its sincere gratitude to the people and Government of Ethiopia for their warm welcome and generous hospitality. It recalled that Ethiopia had nominated the element for inscription in February 2015, and that the nomination file extensively referenced the importance of cultural spaces to the Gada system. The nomination file also indicated that the utmost care would be taken to preserve the cultural spaces and the traditional Gada assembly, and points to the need to safeguard cultural symbolism and the sacred meaning of the cultural places and ritual practices of the Gada intangible heritage. Moreover, the nomination file proposed a safeguarding measure in which the public would be sensitized to increase vigilance in protecting cultural places and artifacts. The geographical place and range of the element included the Oda, the sycamore tree that is regarded as the symbol of the Gada system. Any enforcement of the system was limited to the protection of the cultural spaces and manifestation of the Gada system. Such protection was required both under the customary practices of the Gada system, as well as the laws protecting such physical property from destruction and desecration. The delegation had also learned that the submitting State’s support of the implementation of the safeguarding measures was replete with proposals that had nothing to do with compulsion. For example, the State Party indicated that it had ratified the Convention and adopted programmes to create a conducive environment that would allow for the safeguarding and promotion of its ICH, including the Gada system. The nomination further indicated the State Party’s pledge to continue its financial and organizational support for the implementation of the proposed safeguarding measures through education, research and the involvement of institutional structures. With regard to the add-on reference to make those legally accountable, the delegation believed that the State Party had indicated that the legal and institutional safeguarding mechanisms were the already practised customary laws in the traditional Gada system itself. The protection was mainly reinforced through the supreme value that communities attached to the place and artifacts; a safeguarding measure that was both sustainable and effective and which the State Party would continue to encourage and support. The delegation also believed that protecting all aspects of the Gada from harm was a duty it had to Ethiopia and to the world. It also appreciated the high level of community participation in the implementation of the safeguarding measures; the file included numerous examples of the involvement of the bearers and practitioners of the Gada system in the practice, promotion and safeguarding of the element. The nomination file further indicated that the community had been consistently consulted in designing the safeguarding measures. Regarding threats that tourism might pose, the nomination file had adequately provided both the current and proposed safeguarding measures, ensuring that such threats were either avoided or minimized. Such safeguarding measures were primarily through the numerous administrative structures in place, as well as through community vigilance. The delegation requested that the Committee consider its amended decision proposed by India and 19 others, including Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Cyprus, Guatemala, Hungary, Lebanon, Mauritius, Mongolia, Palestine, Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Turkey and Zambia.
5. The delegation of **Palestine** thanked India for its clear intervention. From a technical perspective, it found that the safeguarding measures on legal and institutional mechanisms had referred to the tangible aspects of the element, which may lead to some confusion. The nomination file also indicated that the community had participated in and practised these measures as customary laws, which were very important to take into consideration as they were a part of the traditional Gada system itself. The protection was reinforced through the supreme value that communities attached to the place and artifacts that were the tangible aspects of the Gada system. These two aspects – the tangible and intangible – extensively reinforced the importance of cultural spaces and the tangible aspects of the Gada system. The delegation noted that section 3.b.2 and section d. of the nomination form indicated that the utmost care would be taken to safeguard the cultural spaces and the traditional Gada assembly centres established around the Oda; the Oda is the sycamore tree around which assembly centres are always situated. These manifestations were tangible aspects of the element. Considering these factors, the delegation supported the amendment to the draft decision by India, which enjoyed huge support.
6. The delegation of **Senegal** believed that this file provided an opportunity to celebrate the values of a traditional African socio-political system, as an instrument of social cohesion, which advocated the values of freedom, equality and democracy often denied in traditional African systems. This symbolism is extremely important for Ethiopia, for Africa and for cultural heritage because it plays a role in regulating inequalities and injustices, so enshrined within UNESCO. For these reasons, it shared the view so brilliantly evoked by India. The delegation added that this traditional system had its own internal rules of operation, which called upon a number of precautions, and whose customs allowed this heritage to survive. The submitting State must help to better protect what exists, even though it was already well protected by the traditional system itself. It fully understood the Evaluation Body in its interpretation of cohesion. However, in this traditional system, the exclusions that exist were in the interest of the people and the community. It could therefore not be reprimanded or punished in this regard. The delegation wished to thank the submitting State for all the measures and mechanisms put in place to involve civil society, NGOs, and other State structures, and also the communities for their participation in the promotion of research, education, and the transmission of those values ​​that were shared in Africa and by humanity as a whole. For these reasons, it fully supported India's amendment.
7. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** remarked on the good work carried out by the Evaluation Body and recognized its concerns with regard to the communities. However, the delegation believed that the nomination file contained many justifications on how Gada bearers and practitioners were fully involved in the practice, promotion and safeguarding of the element. For example, it was clearly stated in section 3.b that the community had been systematically consulted during the design of the safeguarding measures to ensure that the safeguarding practice was participatory. The delegation therefore sought further information from the submitting State.
8. The **Vice Chair** asked whether there was a specific question for Ethiopia.
9. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** sought clarification on the concerns raised by the Evaluation Body regarding community participation, and how communities had been involved in the preparation of the nomination file.
10. The **Vice Chair** gave the floor to Ethiopia to respond.
11. The delegation of **Ethiopia** strongly believed that the nomination file was self-explanatory on safeguarding measures. In the safeguarding section of the file, reference was made only to the legal and institutional safeguarding mechanisms designed for the tangible aspects of the element related to the traditional Gada assembly centres around the Oda sycamore tree. The community practised these measures as customary laws within the traditional Gada system itself. Protection was mainly reinforced through the supreme value that the communities attached to the place and artifacts that are the tangible aspects of the Gada system. This protection was proposed based on the customary practice of the Gada system as well as laws that protect such physical property from possible development pressure to sustainably safeguard the Gada system. The delegation expressed that there was no compulsion to apply this to the practice of the element itself but only toits tangible aspects in the proposed safeguarding measures. Concluding, the delegation noted that the Committee had recognized the extraordinary efforts made in the submission and presentation of the Gada system as an element worthy of inscription.
12. The delegation of **Turkey** commended the submitting State for its nomination and expressed its full support for its inscription. It also wished to associate with the statements made by India. [Another speaker] The **President of the UNESCO National Commission** remarked that the traditional Gada socio-political system endured without compromising its functionality among the Oromo community. As noted in the file, the system is delivered through extensive community involvement and exemplary application. The Gada is transmitted from generation to generation in an effective way, in everyday life and through the educational system. The submitting State had affirmed the implementation of legal reforms to safeguard the element in question. The file contained sufficient information on the preservation, prevention and safeguarding measures planned in the future, such as book publishing, education and research. The experts in the delegation considered that the file satisfied criterion R.3. The delegation was convinced that the Oromo community cherished this element from generation to generation as an inseparable part of their cultural identity, as outlined by the [Subsidiary] Body in its decision 8.COM 7.a.6, where emphasis was placed more on the laws relating to cultural policies than on the element itself. The delegation invited the submitting State to explain this aspect to the Committee.
13. The delegation of **Zambia** was of the opinion that the nomination file was self-explanatory on safeguarding measures. The file proposed legal safeguarding measures that considered the cultural symbolism and sacred meaning of the different artefacts and tangible aspects of the element, and the community were sensitized to increase vigilance. Protection was required both under the customary practices of the Gada system as well as laws that protect such physical property from destruction. Considering these factors, the delegation supported the amendment by India.
14. The delegation of **Mauritius** found that in section 3.b Ethiopia had clearly shown its continued financial and organizational support for the implementation of existing and planned safeguarding measures through education and research, and the involvement of institutional structures, both governmental and non-governmental. The delegation therefore supported India’s amendment.
15. The delegation of **Algeria** thanked the submitting State for its warm welcome and for the impeccable organization of the meeting. With regard to the concerns raised by the Evaluation Body concerning the involvement of the community in the preparation of the file, the delegation believed that the file contained numerous examples of the full involvement of the project bearers and practitioners of the Gada system in this regard, as stated in sections 3.b and 4, as well as of their full involvement in ensuring the viability of the element. It therefore expressed its support for the amendment by India.
16. The delegation of **Cyprus** requested moving forward given the thorough explanation of the file by India, and the clarifications provided by Ethiopia.
17. Thanking Cyprus for its constructive proposal, the **Vice-Chair** proposed moving on.
18. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** wished to give strong emotional and spiritual support to the amendment proposed. The delegation spoke of the very strong and shared heritage between Saint Lucia and the Caribbean with Africa, and particularly with Ethiopia, with many Caribbean communities recognizing it as its spiritual home. It appreciated the contribution from Senegal that called for a cautious approach with regard to traditional practices and such issues as compulsion and coercion, adding that many tangible elements were in reality intertwined with intangible heritage such that serious threats required legal protection. The delegation gave the example of sacred rituals connected with sacred grounds, and when outsiders, especially tourists, become stakeholders in that tangible heritage. Tangible heritage was so intertwined with the intangible that bearers become stakeholders in the survival and sustenance of intangible heritage, and carried with them some of their values and worldview, which outsiders were not in sync with. In that respect, legal coercion was extremely important. The delegation concluded by saying that the world should afford greater attention to traditional political practices like these and the values they confer, particularly as a foil to the current world of politics today.
19. The **Vice-Chair** thanked Saint Lucia for its spirited intervention.
20. The delegation of **Hungary** supported the inscription of the nomination, adding that Gada was an element that occurred so rarely, and that the indigenous democratic socio-political system could not be easily described and interpreted from the safeguarding perspective. It was convinced that the nomination had its place on the Representative List in its own right, as it underlined the significance of creating social dialogue on both local and national levels. The element represented cultural diversity, which was supported by Ethiopia through numerous measures that took care of the ethnic minorities’ cultural values.
21. The **Vice-Chair** wished to proceed to the adoption of the draft decision.
22. The delegation of **Congo** supported the amendment by India and the remarks by Senegal to inscribe the element.
23. The delegation of **Austria** commended Ethiopia for submitting this highly interesting element of a traditional system of governance. It believed that this added a new dimension to the range of ICH elements on the Representative List, and strongly supported India’s amendment.
24. The delegation of **Republic of Korea** strongly supported the Gada system, having joined the co-sponsoring group for the proposed amendment. It also extended the Korean people’s strong solidarity and its full support of inscription.
25. The delegation of **Armenia** spoke of the joy felt in reading this kind of interesting nomination, and in getting acquainted with something new, which brought new elements, variety and tradition to the Convention and to the Representative List. It thanked India for very eloquently presenting what was on the minds of most Members. It therefore supported the amendment presented and its inscription.
26. Supporting the amendment, the delegation of **Colombia** spoke of its very large population of people with African origins, and supported Ethiopia’s desire to inscribe the element, which was extremely crucial for an important ethnic group in Ethiopia.
27. The **Vice-Chair** turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no further comments or objections, paragraphs 1–4 were adopted. Turning to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Vice-Chair declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.11 to inscribe ‘Gada system, an indigenous democratic socio‑political system of the Oromo’** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.

*[Celebratory chants by Ethiopia]*

1. The delegation of **Ethiopia** spoke of its honour and appreciation of the Committee, and its gratitude for its wise and democratic decision to recognize the great Gada system of the Oromo people of Ethiopia as part of the ICH of humanity. The delegation was delighted because the decision demonstrated approval of the authenticity and originality of the great values that had sustained the Oromo society for so long. The values reflected by the great socio-political Gada system of Oromo includes peaceful coexistence, respect for all, democracy, smooth power transfer, inclusiveness of all members of society, young and old, female and male and more. The delegation believed that the values tied to the Gada system deserved to be safeguarded, nurtured, shared and spread widely. Today, the ancient Gada system was not only the asset of the Oromo people but also the precious legacy of all humanity. The delegation believed that Ethiopia, as a country endowed with cultural blessings and a glorious history of independence, had a lot more to offer the rest of the world. Ethiopia is a home of diversity and a mosaic of so many cultural expressions that deserved recognition, which went hand in hand with the new Ethiopia as a land of origins. The delegation saluted all those who had supported the element. Concluding, it extended its sincere thanks to the Authority for Research and Conservation of Cultural Heritage based in Paris and all institutes, groups and individuals concerned who had played a role in putting together the nomination file. It congratulated the Oromo society and all Ethiopians on this great event.
2. The delegation of **Ethiopia** extended the greetings and appreciation of the Oromo people. According to history and research, the Oromo Gada system is a democratic socio-economic political system of the Oromo people, which has been practised for centuries. There are different traditions within the Gada system, including moggaasa (naturalization) and guddifacha (adoption), as well as the democratic governance system. The Gada system follows democratic electoral procedures, such as periodic elections, which take place every eight years with a smooth transfer of power. It also covers core values: respecting individuals, individual rights and minorities. The Oromo Gada system has the highest level of complexity, reflecting the identity of its core values. The delegation believed that people could learn from the Gada system and from its unique values of shaping laws, and building and developing a modern democracy. The procedure of the Gada system remains active and attractive among the Oromo people even today. The decision to inscribe the Gada system on the Representative List not only encouraged Ethiopia to be proud of its tangible and intangible values, but it also drew greater attention to its responsibility to safeguard and promote the ideas of the Convention. The delegation concluded by inviting the delegates to enjoy the Gada system in western, central, eastern and southern Oromia.
3. The **Vice-Chair** congratulated Ethiopia, and informed the Committee that it would continue its proceedings in an extended evening session.

*[30-minute pause]*

*[Wednesday, 30 November 2016, evening session]*

*[The Chairperson reprised his role]*

1. The **Chairperson** thanked the Committee for accommodating the Ethiopian celebration, and proceeded with the examination of the remaining nomination files.
2. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** then moved to the nomination **‘Culture of Jeju Haenyeo (women divers)’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.24] submitted by the Republic of Korea. On Jeju Island, a community of women, some in their 80s, goes diving to gather shellfish for a living. The Jeju haenyeo (female divers) harvest up to seven hours a day, 90 days of the year holding their breath for every 10m dive. Beforehand, prayers are said for safety and an abundant catch. Transmission occurs in families, fishery cooperatives and the Haenyeo School. The traditional practice advances the status of women in the community, represents the island’s identity and promotes sustainability. The Evaluation Body decided that, from the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The file adequately demonstrated that diving by the Jeju divers is ecologically sound, given in part to the prohibition of advanced fishing methods. The culture of Jeju divers also contributed to the promotion of women’s rights through an appreciation of their skills and contribution to household incomes. The Evaluation Body therefore recommended the inscription of ‘Culture of Jeju Haenyeo (women divers)’ on the Representative List.
3. Thanking the Vice-Chairperson, the **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been put forward and thus proposed adopting the decision as a whole.With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.24 to inscribe ‘Culture of Jeju Haenyeo (women divers)’ on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
4. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** spoke of its great privilege to witness the inscription of the Culture of Jeju Haenyeo on the Representative List. It expressed its sincere gratitude to the Secretariat for its implementation of the Convention, especially the Evaluation Body for its hard work, and all the Committee Members for their efforts so far. Jeju Haenyeo or women divers are emblematic of the strong and independent Jeju women who have lived together with nature, seeing the sea as their home. As traditional wisdom carriers of marine ecology, the culture of Jeju Haenyeo represented a venerable history and lifestyle on Jeju Island. Passed down from one generation to the next, it is a symbol of gender equality and the eco-friendly approach to ecosystems and community culture; the haenyeo safeguarded and promoted this very important cultural heritage for all humanity. The inscription was an opportunity to renew its commitment to safeguarding the culture of Jeju Haenyeo in a more sustainable and systematic way.
5. The **Chairperson** introduced the next item concerning draft decision 11.COM 10.b.2, which had previously been postponed, informing the Committee that a consensus had been reached on a text to the draft decision. He welcomed the consensus text, which had been reached in the spirit of understanding and dialogue. He therefore asked the Committee whether it could adopt the decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.2 to inscribe ‘Flatbread making and sharing culture: Lavash, Katyrma, Jupka, Yufka’ on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
6. The delegation of **Cyprus** remarked that the additional last paragraph was not clearly visible. It was displayed on the screen, and read, ‘Takes note that the culture of making and sharing flatbread is shared by communities in the region and beyond (see [Decision 9.COM 10.3](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/9.COM/10.3))’.
7. As a coordinating country for the nomination, the delegation of **Azerbaijan** spoke of its privilege and honour, thanking the Committee for its decision to inscribe the element and the Evaluation Body for its careful examination and recommendation to inscribe it. Shared by the communities of Azerbaijan, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkey, flatbread culture is a highly widespread practice that builds on the cultural values of its peoples. It is not just bread; it is a treasury of values, principles and common history. This inscription was the result of the hard work and cooperation of an excellent team of experts, and would strongly encourage the bearers to continue the practice, passing it on to the next generations. The delegation congratulated all the communities in all five countries for this achievement, which celebrated the unity and diversity of heritage for the sake of peace and sustainable development. It also demonstrated how a single transboundary element of intangible heritage could help communities accept each other’s differences without claiming the origin, uniqueness or authenticity of its own form of shared heritage. It contributed to enhancing international cooperation, one of the core principles of the Convention. The delegation would further reinforce the measures to safeguard intangible heritage and support the awareness-raising and implementation of the Convention. This was an historic moment for the flatbread practitioners to see their heritage recognized at the international level. As the essence of the Convention goes behind territorial borders, the delegation believed that greater attention and priority should be given to multinational nominations. Last but not least, the key word in the nomination title was ‘sharing’, which was the essence and meaning of this nomination. Everything starts with the sharing of bread. When you share bread you share friendship, you share the house. When you share the house, you share peace and security.
8. The **delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran** cited a poem written 1,100 years ago by Abul-Hassan Kharaqāni, a mystic Sufi, which said, ‘Whoever enters this house give him bread; receive him, respect him with bread. Welcome him and do not ask of his religion or ethnic origin or tribe or faith or race. Give him bread because anyone, any human who deserves to receive life from God definitely deserves to receive bread from all of us. Receiving bread means respecting all life’. The delegation hoped that this inscription would help disseminate this kind of perspective.

*[The Vice-Chairperson from Turkey chaired this session]*

1. The **Vice-Chair** turned to the next nomination file submitted by France.
2. Resuming the order of files, the **Vice-Chairperson** **of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **‘Carnival of Granville’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.12], submitted by France. The Carnival of Granville is a four-day celebration that takes place in the lead up to Shrove Tuesday. Involving the local community and nearby communes, festivities include a series of float processions that often take a humorous look at current events, politics and celebrities involving the work of 2,500 ‘carnivalists’, marching bands, balls for different age groups, a confetti battle, and a ‘night of intrigues’ for carnival-goers to dress in costume. Contributing to community unity, transmission occurs within families and committees. The Evaluation Body decided that, from the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. An Organizing Committee had been a key agent in ensuring the viability of the element, and had also initiated the nomination process on behalf of the carnivalist community. The file clearly demonstrated the active participation of the bearers of the element in preparing the nomination, as well as their involvement in the proposed safeguarding measures. The Evaluation Body decided to recommend the inscription of Carnival of Granville on the Representative List.
3. Thanking the Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, the **Vice-Chair** noted that no amendments had been put forward and proposed adopting the decision as a whole.With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Vice-Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.12 to inscribe ‘Carnival of Granville’ on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
4. Thedelegation of **France** was happy and proud to join in the inscription of the element on the Representative List. The Carnival of Granville is one of the oldest carnivals in France, and the delegation made a special mention of all those who had brought the project to its consecration, which was a long process initiated by the community of *carnavaliers* more than eight years before with the Ministry of Culture. During these years, the organizers of the festival had sensitized the population to intangible heritage during the different carnivals, and had set up participatory processes throughout the year to collect the information and documents included in the nomination file. The delegation added that a committee would soon be established to ensure that members of the community would be able to follow up on this inscription so as to preserve the carnival for future generations. On behalf of all the ‘carnivalists’, the delegation thanked the Committee for recognizing the work and involvement of the communities of Granville, which had been recognized as the fifteenth element on the Representative List for France. It concluded by inviting delegates to participate in the 143rd edition of the Carnival that would take place from 24 to 28 February 2017.
5. Thanking France, the **Vice-Chair** turned to the next nomination submitted by Georgia.
6. The **Vice-Chairperson** **of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **‘Living culture of three writing systems of the Georgian alphabet’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.13] submitted by Georgia. Georgia’s written language has produced three alphabets – Mrgvlovani, Nuskhuri and Mkhedruli – which remain in use today. Mrgvlovani was the first alphabet from which Nuskhuri was derived and then Mkhedruli. The alphabets coexist thanks to their different functions, reflecting an aspect of Georgia’s diverse cultural identity. Its educational system is based on the Mkhedruli alphabet taught in primary and high schools and in the home, while Mrgvlovani and Nuskhuri were practised and taught predominately by its Apostolic Autocephalous Orthodox Church community. The Evaluation Body had decided that, from the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.2, R.3 and R.4. It had decided, however, that the information included in the file was not sufficient to allow it to determine whether R.5 was satisfied. The file demonstrated the attribution by the Georgian State and the National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of the status of ‘National Monument’ to the element in 2015. However, the file did not provide sufficient information on the updating process of this list and did not explain how the communities had participated in the inventorying process. The Evaluation Body therefore recommended the referral of the ‘Living culture of three writing systems of the Georgian alphabet’ to the submitting State Party for more information.
7. The delegation of **Hungary** commended Georgia for the interesting nomination, noting that criteria R.1, R.2, R.3 and R.4 were satisfied, but that there were concerns in R.5. It thus sought clarification from Georgia on the updating process of the national inventory and on how communities had participated in the inventorying process itself.
8. The delegation of **Mongolia** renewed its thanks to the Evaluation Body, and supported the remarks by Hungary, referring again to Article 12 of the Convention that enables States Parties to develop inventories in the way that best suited their situation. It also noted that criterion R.4 had been met through adequate community participation. The delegation felt that evidence of community participation and involvement in the development of the inventory might have been missed at the time of its submission. Nevertheless, it saw in the supporting document that the national registry had been made between 2011 until 2015 and was thus up-to-date. The delegation therefore supported an amendment to inscribe the element.
9. The delegation of **Afghanistan** commended Georgia on its submission, and referred to two pieces of information it had found in the file: the process of community participation was described in the first paragraph of section 4.e., though it would be good for Georgia to be given the chance to further elaborate; and the document on the national inventory - the State’s Register of Intangible Heritage of Georgia, accessible online - provided clear evidence of the regular updating of the inventory (with the latest version dated October 2016). Finally, the national report on the implementation of the Convention of 2014 and its update in 2015, provided by the State Party, also provided proof of the regular updating of the national inventory.
10. The delegation of **Turkey** found that the file was a good example of the transmission of intangible heritage through a variety of writing systems, which was proof of human creativity that contributed to the cultural identity of Georgian people. With regard to R.5, the delegation found that that file mentioned inventory-making and updating mechanisms, and that there was sufficient information explaining the process. It therefore believed that the file met criterion R.5, and supported the amendment tabled for its inscription. It also sought clarifications from Georgia regarding R.5.
11. The delegation of **Armenia** noted that, in accordance with the requirements of criterion R.5, the element was inscribed in the ICH Register of Georgia, and, in accordance with the country's heritage legislation, the element had been granted the status of ICH in the national inventory. At the same time, there was detailed information on the national inventory procedures, as provided in the national periodic report, which had been considered by the General Assembly in 2016. In addition, Armenia, as a neighboring country with an alphabet dating from the same period as the Georgian Mrgvlovani alphabet, fully supported this nomination and proposed that Georgia respond to the following questions: Does Georgian domestic legislation provide for a specific procedure or periodicity for the updating of its national inventory? What are the existing legal procedures for updating this inventory? What is the role of the communities in updating the national inventory? Is the country considering actions to improve its national legislation in this regard? The delegation asked the Secretariat to display the draft decision with amendments. It supported the amendment by Bulgaria.
12. The **Vice-Chair** thanked Armenia, adding that the Committee was not yet at the decision-making stage, and it gave the floor to Georgia to respond to the questions raised.
13. The delegation of **Georgia** explained that the law of Georgia on cultural heritage defined the procedures for the regular updating of the national inventory, as described in detail in the national report presented to the Committee in 2015. The inventory was a permanent process in which bearer communities played a key role in putting forward initiatives and participating in the process of listing elements, which were considered by the intangible heritage section of the National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia. The inventory process was coordinated to ensure that communities were involved in the identification of elements and in the preparation of inventory files, as required by the national law. The inventory was based on the Convention, and hence the communities’ participation in the process was an integral part. The intangible heritage board at the National Agency meets regularly to discuss files, and advises the director on the inscription of elements with all relevant information and documentation. The register, as well as the instructions on the listing procedures, were accessible online and were regularly updated on the website of the Agency, as well as in the official legislative journal. The Agency carries out regular training and public awareness campaigns across the country, and cooperates with local governments to support thematic and territorial inventories by NGOs and academic institutions. This work had resulted in the increased awareness and commitment of communities, state and non-state actors to intangible heritage over the past years. Intangible heritage was also one of the priorities under the culture strategy 2025, adopted by Georgia in July 2016. As regards the participation of communities, the delegation believed that the first paragraph of section 4.a provided a sufficient description of this process. It also believed that the Committee should take into consideration the value of this element for all Georgians, and its work towards establishing the legal and institutional mechanisms for the regular updating of the national inventory for intangible heritage.
14. The **Vice-Chair** thanked Georgia for its clarifications, and noting there was a consensus towards inscribing the element, proposed moving to the draft decision.
15. The delegation of **India** commended Georgia for putting forward this very interesting nomination, noting that it had satisfied four criteria in R.1–R.4 with only R.5 not met; this was a problem that the Secretariat was seeking to rectify going forward. Having listened to the response from Georgia, the delegation was fully convinced that the submitting State would be taking steps to fulfill the completeness of R.5.
16. The delegation of **Cuba** thanked Georgia for the clarifications given, adding that this was a very important element that deserved to be shared, and that it supported its inscription.
17. Following the clarifications, the delegation of **Guatemala** supported the nomination.
18. The **Vice-Chair** proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision. With no comments or objections to paragraph 1, or to criteria R.1, R.2, R.3 and R.4 in paragraph 2, they were duly adopted. The Vice-Chair noted an amendment by Bulgaria in R.5, which read, ‘The inventorying process was undertaken with the participation of the communities and groups concerned and relevant non-governmental organizations’.
19. The delegation of **Armenia** wished to add its name as co-sponsor.
20. The delegation of **Ethiopia** supported the amendment presented by Bulgaria.
21. The delegation of **Saint** **Lucia** recalled the important intervention by Hungary regarding the inventory process and suggested inserting the template text here.
22. The **Vice-Chair** replied that it was contained in the second part of R.5.
23. The delegation of **Hungary** remarked that the amendment proposed was slightly different in that there was no mention of the inventory being regularly updated. It suggested sticking to the formula employed earlier, which was, ‘the inventory is elaborated with the participation of communities and is regularly updated’.
24. In response to Hungary, the **Vice-Chair** inserted ‘and is regularly updated’ at the end of the sentence. With no objections, paragraph R.5 was duly adopted. The Vice-Chair moved to the next paragraph 3, and the amended proposal by Bulgaria to inscribe the element on the Representative List.
25. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** supported the amendment by Bulgaria.
26. With no further comments, the **Vice-Chair** pronounced paragraph 3 adopted.
27. The **Secretary** wished to draw the Committee’s attention to the new paragraph 4, and Bulgaria’s amendment, which was not in line with previous discussions. He recalled that the Committee had earlier established a standard paragraph, adding that the adopted paragraph on R.5 had already mentioned that the inventory was regularly updated and the call for additional information in the amendment was not allowed. The Secretary therefore suggested substituting the proposed amendment with the standard paragraph, should Bulgaria agree. It would read: ‘Thanks the delegation of Georgia for the clarifications provided to the Committee on the information included in the file concerning criterion R.5.’
28. The delegation of **Bulgaria** agreed.
29. With no further comments or objections, the **Vice-Chair** pronounced the new paragraph 4 adopted, and proposed adopting the decision as a whole.With no objections, the **Vice-Chair declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.13 to inscribe** ‘**Living culture of three writing systems of the Georgian alphabet**’ [**on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
30. The delegation of **Georgia** spoke on behalf of all Georgian people, the bearers of the living culture of the three writing systems of the Georgian alphabet, in expressing its great joy following the inscription of the element. This culture had been formed as a result of the centuries-old evolution of the Georgian alphabet, and the coexistence of these three varieties of alphabet with their distinctive cultural and social functions. The element represented the fundamental values of the cultural identity and self-expression of communities in Georgia and beyond, creating a common space for the sustainable cultural development of society. The delegation remarked that the Convention was a unique platform for understanding, appreciating and celebrating the fascinating diversity of the world’s intangible heritage, adding that it was committed to the implementation of the Convention. The delegation concluded by thanking the Evaluation Body for its pertinent recommendations, and the Secretariat for its excellent work, expressing particular gratitude to the Members of the Committee, especially Bulgaria for its valuable support.
31. Thanking Georgia, the **Vice-Chair** proceeded to the next file, submitted by Germany.
32. The **Vice-Chairperson** **of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **‘Idea and practice of organizing shared interests in cooperatives’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.14] submitted by Germany. A cooperative is an association of volunteers that provides services to community members to improve living standards, overcome shared challenges and promote positive change. Based on the subsidiarity principle that puts personal responsibility above state action, cooperatives allow for community-building through shared interests and values. Today, a quarter of Germany’s population participates in the practice transmitted within cooperatives, universities, via the German Cooperative and Raiffeisen Confederation, the Akademie Deutscher Genossenschaften, the German Hermann-Schulze-Delitzsch Society and the German Friedrich-Wilhelm-Raiffeisen Society. While the Evaluation Body decided that the nomination satisfied R.5, the information included in the file was not sufficient to determine whether criteria R.1, R.2, R.3 and R.4 were satisfied. As for R.1, the file emphasized the notion of collaboration through cooperatives and the worldwide understanding of cooperatives. However, the bearers and practitioners of the element were not clearly defined and it was therefore unclear whether the communities concerned only included members of specific institutions or everyone involved in cooperatives in Germany. As for R.2, the file indicated that inscription would encourage dialogue among communities with similar cooperative organizations; it did not clearly define how such an inscription would enhance the visibility of ICH in general. Considering that it was difficult to clearly understand the contours of the communities concerned with this element, the consultative process appeared to have been somewhat top-down, and the range of evidence for consent provided did not appear to reflect the variety of stakeholders consulted. The Evaluation Body decided to recommend a referral of the nomination to the submitting State for more information.
33. The **Vice-Chair** noted that an amendment had been received by the Bureau for this file but first opened the floor to general comments only.
34. The delegation of **Lebanon** welcomed the determination and efforts of Germany to include this element on the Representative List, and sought clarification on how inscription could ensure the visibility and awareness of ICH.
35. Noting that important questions had been raised by the Evaluation Body on three connected criteria (R.1, R.2 and R.3) and that this was the first nomination by Germany, the delegation of **Bulgaria** found that the main merit of this nomination was that it clearly showed the part played by ICH in ensuring social cohesion. The idea and practice of organizing shared interests in cooperatives had proven very effective in satisfying existential needs, and such an inscription would give ICH widespread visibility around the world.
36. The delegation of **Cyprus** sought an explanation from the submitting State on criterion R.1, adding that because it was unclear, criteria R.2, R.3 and R.4 could not be met. Therefore, it sought clarification from the submitting State on the meaning of the term ‘cooperative’ in its own language, as a literal translation could sometimes be misleading.
37. The **Vice-Chair** gave the floor to Germany to respond to the question by Cyprus.

The delegation of **Germany** explained that the Evaluation Body had positively recognized in R.1 that the idea and practice of organizing shared interests in cooperatives – in German, Genossenschaften – had been handed down from generation to generation. Indeed, the file indicated a minimum time spent of 10–12 generations who had practised that concept of solidarity, as well as constantly recreating it in response to new developments in the environment. For instance, most recently, cooperatives had been created in the fields of culture and renewable energy. The file gave evidence of how their social practices had provided the community of cooperative members with a sense of identity and continuity. This practice could therefore be clearly recognized to be part of their cultural heritage. In view of R.4, the delegation underlined that this was the very reason the bearer community, on its own initiative, had successfully sought inscription on the German inventory of ICH in 2013. It underlined that all this information could be found in the nomination file on pages 5, 6, 9 and 13. The delegation thus believed that the element was fully congruent with the letter and spirit of Article 2 of the Convention.

1. The delegation of **Algeria** wished to hear more from the submitting State on R.1. In particular, it would like clarifications on the information contained in the file regarding Article 2, on the importance of the idea of a cooperative and the sense of identity derived from it.
2. The delegation of **Armenia** remarked that this was one of those nominations, like the Gada system, which was particularly interesting in that it stood out from the usual nominations, as it was non-traditional and inspired further reading. The delegation was confident that inscription would ensure the visibility of the element as well as of ICH, and sought an explanation from Germany as to the ways that this could be done and as to the added value of such inscription.
3. The **Vice-Chair** gave the floor to Germany for further clarifications on the issues raised by Algeria and Armenia.
4. The delegation of **Germany** returned to the question by Cyprus on the translation of ‘cooperative’, agreeing that in both English and French ‘cooperative’ did not fully reflect the German word ‘Genossenschaft’, which referred to an individual called a ‘Genosse’. In German in the Middle Ages, Genosse was similar to ‘brother’; a person with his own equal dignity who was able to contribute his abilities to a group often bound by oath, while the work of a cooperative focused more on the aspect of cooperation in economic terms. Regarding the question by Armenia on R.2, and a similar question raised by Lebanon, the delegation explained that the inscription of the element would contribute to ensuring the visibility and awareness of the significance of ICH because of its effectiveness in satisfying essential needs and that it clearly demonstrated the part played by ICH in ensuring social cohesion. The large number of bearers and practitioners in Germany alone, more than 20 million people, as well as many more around the globe, act as multipliers in the various domains of daily life, for example, in education and culture, house-building and renting, agriculture, crafts, transport, credit systems and many others. Information on this could be found in the nomination file on pages 6 and 7. The delegation underlined that large media coverage could be expected. Returning to the question from Algeria, the delegation clarified that over the 10–12 generations, this concept of solidarity had been practised and constantly recreated in response to new developments, for example, in the fields of education and culture, house-building and renting, and so on, up to the most recent challenges such as renewable energy, as outlined in the file.
5. The delegation of **India** welcomed the nomination, which covered new perspectives on ICH and a form of social organization. While pursuing shared interests through cooperatives is a worldwide phenomenon, and one that is widespread throughout India, the delegation had learned about the specific characteristics of the community in Germany through this file. Inscribing elements such as these further demonstrated the relevance of ICH in the sustainable development agenda. It thus supported the amendments tabled by Bulgaria.
6. The delegation of **Austria** noted that the file explained how cooperatives allowed for the identification and organization of shared interests, a community-building practice. Austria was aware of the German cooperatives (Austria has a similar element inscribed on its own national inventory), and could therefore confirm that these associations provided communities with a sense of identity. It understood and fully supported the Evaluation Body in ensuring consistency and equity in its evaluation. In this particular case, with regard to criterion R.4, the delegation remarked that the German process of inventorying and nominating elements for inscription was very similar to its own, and it regularly shared its experiences and challenges with Germany regarding implementation processes. It could therefore affirm that the bottom-up approach was at the heart of the German implementation process. However, as the Evaluation Body had found that the consultative process appeared to be top-down, the delegation sought a brief clarification from the submitting State as to how the free, prior and informed consent of the communities had been obtained for this particular nomination.
7. The delegation of **Mauritius** commended Germany for its submission. However, it sought clarification as to whether the idea and practice of organizing shared interests in cooperatives had originated in Germany.
8. The delegation of **Senegal** concurred that the nomination aroused curiosity and interrogation on the typology of expressions that the Committee was accustomed to inscribing. The delegation recalled a debate in June 2016 when Senegal had launched its inventorying campaign. It had discussed these typologies and how to improve the classification domains in the inventory. Indeed, the question of social cohesion had been asked. Which elements contributed to social cohesion and community participation? Which elements linked man and nature? This nomination file reminded the delegation of that discussion. In this regard, the delegation did not want to refer specifically to criteria but believed that it was necessary to broaden the perspective with respect to the expressions of ICH, adding that this element had the prospect of enriching ICH.
9. The delegation of **Germany** began with the question from Mauritius by saying that this system of cooperatives had not been created in Germany, citing from the file, ‘as the idea has also its roots in Great Britain, France and some Slavic countries’. With regard to criterion R.4, and the question raised by Austria on criterion R.4, the delegation clarified that the element had been submitted following a broad based consultation within the community of cooperatives (within the Genossenschaften)*.* The nomination file presented letters expressing the free, prior and informed consent of the cooperatives, summarizing the very extensive, bottom-up participatory process of national inventorying of 2013, which included the aspiration to international nomination. Support for the nomination for inscription was confirmed through internal consultation and communication within the cooperatives and through public media; information could be found on page 13, and in the documentary ‘Evidence of Consent to Nomination’.
10. Referring to the remarks by Germany, the delegation of **Algeria** noted that the element had its roots not only in Germany, but also in other countries around the world, such as France, Great Britain and others. In fact, this idea of cooperatives was the epitome of sharing ICH. It was found in different countries and in different regions of the world, and had even been at the origin of evolution itself in that people had always joined forces to achieve a common goal. The delegation therefore believed that the element deserved its place on the Representative List.
11. Having listened to the general comments and clarifications, the **Vice-Chair** proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision paragraph by paragraph. With no objections, paragraph 1 was adopted. The Vice-Chair noted an amendment by Bulgaria in paragraph 2, R.1.
12. The delegation of **Guatemala** supported the proposal by Bulgaria.
13. With no further comments or objections, the **Vice-Chair** pronounced R.1 adopted, and moved to R.2 and the amendment by Bulgaria.
14. The delegations of **Guatemala**, **Ethiopia** and **Armenia** supported the amendment.
15. With no objections, the **Vice-Chair** pronounced R.2 adopted, and turned to R.3 and the amendment submitted by Bulgaria. She noted the support from Guatemala, Lebanon, Algeria and Afghanistan for the amendment and, considering the general support in the room, the Vice-Chair pronounced R.3 adopted, and moved to R.4 and another amendment by Bulgaria. She noted the support from the delegations of Lebanon and Austria for the amendment. With no objections, the Vice-Chair pronounced R.4 adopted. With no amendments received for R.5, it was duly adopted. The Vice-Chair turned to paragraph 4 [new paragraph 3] and the amendment by Bulgaria ‘to inscribe’. The Vice-Chair noted the support from the delegations of Guatemala and Saint Luciafor the amendment.
16. The delegation of **Cuba** reminded the Committee of the earlier debate to include the paragraph in the case of nominations that had been favourably recommended.
17. Thanking Cuba, the **Vice-Chair** specified that this paragraph was being included and shown on the screen. She returned to paragraph 3 as amended by Bulgaria, and with no objections, it was duly adopted. The Vice-Chair turned to paragraph 4, which was also adopted, and proposed adopting the draft decision as a whole.With no objections, the **Vice-Chair declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.14 to inscribe** ‘**Idea and practice of organizing shared interests in cooperatives’** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
18. The delegation of **Germany** was extremely grateful for the inscription of its first element on the Representative List. It thanked the Committee for the good debate and for the positive decision, adding that this served as motivation to actively promote and safeguard the many aspects and perspectives of the safeguarding of ICH. Self-help, self-responsibility and self-administration were principles that enabled people in Germany to cope with all kinds of challenges. Through this recognition, the cooperative idea had been given new energy and power. The delegation concluded by once again thanking Ethiopia for its great and warm hospitality and the perfect organization of the session.
19. The **Vice-Chair** congratulated Germany on its first inscription, and informed the Committee that the submitting States of the next nomination, the multinational file on ‘Falconry, a living human heritage’ had requested that the debate be postponed until the next day, as the extended session did not benefit from Arabic and Spanish interpretation, The Vice-Chair thus proceeded to the following file, submitted by Greece.
20. The **Vice-Chairperson** **of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **‘Momoeria, New Year’s celebration in eight villages of Kozani area, West Macedonia, Greece’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.16] submitted by Greece. From 25 December to 5 January, dancers, actors and musicians in Kozani, Greece, perform in village streets and visit homes to wish each other prosperity for the New Year. The Momoeria dancers represent the priests of Momos (god of laughter and satire) or commanders of Alexander the Great trying to convince nature not to endanger the livelihood of villagers, while actors perform a play with musicians. Transmitted by older generations, it is part of community identity and builds social integration. The Evaluation Body had decided that, from the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. Momoeria is a deep-rooted practice that serves as an identity marker for Greeks of Pontian origin and as an affirmation of social cohesion. The file had convincingly explained active community participation. A wide range of the stakeholders concerned had provided free, prior and informed letters of consent expressing their own feelings and views on the element, its transmission and viability. The Evaluation Body recommended the inscription of ‘Momoeria, New Year’s celebration in eight villages of Kozani area, West Macedonia, Greece’ on the Representative List.
21. Thanking the Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, the **Vice-Chair** noted that no amendments had been put forward and thus proposed adopting the decision as a whole.With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Vice-Chair declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.16 to inscribe ‘Momoeria, New Year’s celebration in eight villages of Kozani area, West Macedonia, Greece’** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
22. On behalf of the eight communities concerned, the delegation of **Greece** expressed its thanks to the Committee for its decision, and its gratitude and respect to the Evaluation Body for its meticulous and thorough treatment of the file and work in general. It believed that, overall, its recommendations were well balanced and adhered to the principles of the Convention. Referring to the experience and insights gained while working closely with the communities in the inventorying and preparation of the nomination file, the delegation was impressed by the strong resonance that this element stirs in the numerous Pontian-origin Greeks. The wish for community prosperity in the year ahead, including healthy offspring and a good harvest, is at the heart of all these diverse New Year’s celebrations. The fact that community members who might have migrated many years ago still write or call fellow villagers to ensure that the Momoeria procession makes a stop in front of their house, even if it had been uninhabited for years, is impressive evidence of the significance that the bearers ascribe to the element. This was why educational programmes aimed at sustainability worked very well among the children of the communities. The delegation spoke of how communities never missed a year in performing the element, even during periods of great trouble or danger, i.e. the refugee communities following the Lausanne Treaty and the exchange of populations between Greece and Turkey in 1923. The trauma of their uprooting from lands they had inhabited for hundreds of years, millenia perhaps, was resolved by the performance of the element of ICH, the crucial part of which was currently inscribed as Momoeria. By performing Momoeria every year, communities were able to reconstitute in their new land and feel new strong bonds among themselves and the neighboring communities. The long consultations with the communities while inventorying and submitting the nomination file brought to the fore the importance of ICH in emergencies and conflicts, natural disasters, and so on, particularly in maintaining social cohesion. Further reflections on the social meaning of this element had motivated the delegation in opening the debate on the importance of ICH in emergencies. The delegation assured the Committee that there would never be a deviation from the Convention’s principles either by the communities or Greece. The recommendation made by the Committee in its decision would be fully taken into account. By inscribing this element, it believed that the importance of ICH in overcoming traumatic situations, like refugee crises, and reaffirming social cohesion in times of stress would be enhanced. It extended its wholehearted thanks to Ethiopia, ‘the land of the shining people’ in Greek, for its warm hospitality and the chance to witness its long history and rich cultural heritage.
23. Thanking Greece, the **Vice-Chair** informed the Committee that India had requested that the examination of its nomination be postponed until the next day. With no objections, the Vice-Chair turned to the next nomination file submitted by Iraq.
24. On behalf of the submitting State, the delegation of **Palestine** requested that the examination of the nomination file be postponed until the next day, as there was no Arabic interpretation available.
25. With no objections, the **Vice-Chair** proceeded to the next file submitted by Japan.
26. The **Vice-Chairperson** **of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **‘Yama, Hoko, Yatai, float festivals in Japan’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.19], submitted by Japan. In cities and towns throughout Japan, float festivals are held annually to pray to the gods for peace and protection from natural disasters. The Yama, Hoko and Yatai float festivals, considered the biggest events of the year, involve the collaborative efforts of various sections of the community, and as a traditional practice reflect the diversity of local culture. Responsibilities are shared by everyone, from float construction to music and coordination, with senior bearers teaching the young, and with workshops also being held. From the information included in the file, the Evaluation Body considered that the nomination satisfied all five criteria. More specifically, it noted that communities had long ensured the viability of the element through efforts led by ‘safeguarding associations’, implemented by the communities concerned in cooperation with State actors, and that the National Association for the Preservation of Float Festivals would monitor the impact of inscription. Furthermore, the Body appreciated the attention given to the environmental impact of the proposed element and the focus on the measures taken to ensure the sustainable use of natural resources associated with it. Therefore, the Evaluation Body decided to recommend the inscription of the element on the Representative List and commended the submitting State for resubmitting this nomination as an extension, at the national level, of an element previously inscribed. If inscribed, this element would replace the 2009 inscriptions respectively of ‘Hitachi Furyumono’ and ‘Yamahoko, the float ceremony of the Kyoto Gion festival’.
27. Thanking the Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, the **Vice-Chair** noted that there were no amendments and thus proposed adopting the decision as a whole.With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Vice-Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.19 to inscribe** ‘**Yama, Hoko, Yatai, float festivals in Japan’ on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
28. The delegation of **Japan** thanked the Chairperson, the Committee, and the Vice-Chair, the Members of the Evaluation Body, all the States Parties and the Secretariat. Yama, Hoko, Yatai Float Festivals are festivals carried out by local people to pray for stability in the local community or to ward off disasters. The float, adorned with decorations embodying rich cultures, represents the festivals and is at the same time supported by traditional craft techniques such as woodworking, lacquer making and dyeing. The decorations have also been transmitted for many generations in a sustainable manner through creativity and efforts to use materials in an environmentally-friendly way. The community members take pride in participating in the festivals, preparing for them all year. This encourages dialogue and exchange among people of all generations and genders in each region, and unites the local communities. The 33 festivals included in this nomination play important roles in showing the diversity and richness of local cultures in Japan. The delegation spoke of the Government’s commitment to supporting the local communities in implementing the safeguarding measures proposed. On behalf of all the communities concerned, the delegation expressed its heartfelt thanks once again for the inscription of the element.
29. Congratulating Japan, the **Vice-Chair** reminded the Bureau to start identifying new members of the Bureau within their Electoral Group that could be elected under agenda item 17.
30. The **Secretary** reminded the delegates that the Republic of Korea had invited everyone to a special booth that had been set up in celebration of the inscription of ‘Culture of Jeju Haenyeo’ on the Representative List.

*[Thursday, 1 December 2016, morning session]*

**ITEM 10.b OF THE AGENDA (CONT.):**

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

*[The Chairperson reprised his role]*

1. The **Chairperson** thanked Bulgaria for taking up the chairmanship on his behalf during the inscription of the Ethiopian file, as well as Turkey during the extended session. He recalled that the Bureau had met for the third time and discussed several issues. There were still nineteen nominations to the Representative List and seven proposals to the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices left to examine. He reminded the Committee that after these examinations it would return to agenda item 10 and the overall draft decision 11.COM 10. He gave the floor to the Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body to present the next nomination on ‘Falconry, a living human heritage’.
2. The **Vice-Chairperson** **of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **‘Falconry, a living human heritage’** [draft decision 11.COM 10 b.15], submitted by Austria, Belgium, Czechia[[4]](#footnote-5), France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Kazakhstan, Morocco, Mongolia, Pakistan, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic and the United Arab Emirates. Originally a way to obtain food, falconry has evolved to be more associated with conservation, cultural heritage and community engagement. Falconers train, fly and breed the birds, developing a bond with them and becoming their main protectors. Present in 60 countries, aspects of the practice may vary but the methods remain similar. Falconers practise in groups. Some travel weeks at a time recounting stories in the evenings. Transmission occurs within families, by apprenticeship, mentoring or training in clubs and schools. This element was first nominated in 2010 by eleven State Parties, and in 2012, two more State Parties joined and submitted the extended nomination, which was inscribed. This was yet another extended nomination, encompassing a total of eighteen State Parties, with five[[5]](#footnote-6) newly joined States. After careful examination, the Evaluation Body decided that this extended nomination satisfied all five criteria. Falconry promotes respect for nature and the environment, and provides its communities with a sense of belonging, pride, continuity and identity. The Evaluation Body decided to recommend the inscription of Falconry, a living human heritage, on the Representative Listof the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
3. Thanking the Vice-Chairperson, the **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been put forward and thus proposed adopting the decision as a whole.With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Vice-Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.15 to inscribe ‘Falconry, a living human heritage’** **the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
4. The delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** spoke of its delight in the inscription of this very important element. It felt proud because the nomination represented one of the most important aspects of the Convention itself, as well as an important expression of ICH. The delegation thanked the Evaluation Body, the Committee and the Secretariat for the work they had undertaken leading up to the inscription of the element. It was also proud and happy that other countries had joined the element. It took the opportunity to wholeheartedly thank Germany, Italy, Portugal, Kazakhstan and Pakistan for working together and having coordinated the submission of the element. Without their endeavours, the extended inscription would not have been possible, and it thanked everybody involved in the transmission of this living tradition. It was the people themselves, the bearers and practitioners of the tradition, who had asked to bring forward this nomination. There were currently 40,000 falconers acknowledged all over the world who were involved in the transmission of this tradition, and they were also happy to have this element inscribed. International cooperation was also important; the States Parties represented Europe, Asia and Africa. The delegation was proud of this cooperation that had resulted in inscription on an extended basis. Falconry of course represented a whole suite of values, such as the protection of the birds and the environment. The delegation would take every measure to ensure that this tradition was carried forward and continued to respect nature and the environment.
5. The delegation of **Kazakhstan** remarked that it was the eighteenth State Party in the multinational nomination file, which had united countries of different regions and continents. It was a long-awaited moment, first of all, for the bearers and practitioners of this element, the Qusbegi and Bürtkitshi in Kazakhstan who had been transmitting this art from generation to generation since ancient times. Hunting with birds of prey was cultivated several thousand years ago on the steppes of Eurasia, as evidenced by archaeological excavations and ancient manuscripts recounting the lives of nomads. Gradually this type of hunting became widespread among many nations in Europe, Asia and beyond. The importance of this element can be illustrated by the appearance of the golden eagle on Kazakhstan’s national flag. The delegation expressed deep gratitude to the Committee and the Evaluation Body for their decision, and to all the partners who had helped prepare this extended dossier, especially colleagues from the United Arab Emirates, coordinators of the file. Such multinational projects play an important role in strengthening intercultural dialogue by raising awareness of common historical and cultural heritage. The delegation therefore believed that, during the current International Decade for the Rapprochement of Cultures, multinational files would gain momentum and grow substantially thereafter.
6. The delegation of **Italy** thanked the Committee for the inscription, and congratulated all the Member States and their communities for having joined the multination file, promoted by the United Arab Emirates and extended to Italy. The truly multilateral and multinational character of this element, as emphasized by the Emirati colleague, highlighted even more the importance of ICH as an instrument of intercultural dialogue, strengthening the integration of culture into sustainable development. Special thanks were expressed to the Evaluation Body, the Secretariat, and the Ethiopian authorities for organizing and hosting this session.
7. The delegation of **Portugal** spoke of its honour to join the large group of countries that had already listed falconry on the Representative List, notably the United Arab Emirates, Austria, Belgium, the Czech Republic, France, Hungary, Mongolia, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Spain and Syria, as Portugal was joining forces with Kazakhstan, Germany, Pakistan and Italy today. Portugal noted that this file goes beyond the cultural sphere, for it also reminds us of the links between humans and their environment and of the deep connection between human beings and other species. It acknowledged that in current times our planet is at risk and that the protection of life on earth is one of the sustainable development goals. Therefore, the recognition of Falconry by so many countries and by UNESCO itself could draw attention to the importance of biodiversity for future generations. For Portugal, this nomination was presented by the Mayor of Salvaterra de Magos [present] (an historical community on the banks of the Tagus), the Portuguese Association of Falconry, and the Universidade de Évora, all of whom wished to thank the Committee for its decision.
8. The delegation of **India** congratulated the group of countries that had successfully presented this nomination of global heritage.
9. The **Chairperson** proceeded with the next nomination file, submitted by India.
10. The **Vice-Chairperson** **of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **‘Yoga’** [draft decision 11.COM 10 b.17], submitted by India. The philosophy behind the ancient Indian practice of yoga has influenced various aspects of how India’s society functions, from health and medicine to education and the arts. Based on unifying the mind with the body and soul for greater mental, spiritual and physical well-being, it consists of a series of poses, meditation, controlled breathing, word chanting and other techniques. Traditionally transmitted from master to pupil, nowadays yoga ashrams, hermitages, educational institutions and community centres also help to transmit the practice. The Evaluation Body had decided that the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.3 and R.4. Yoga is deeply rooted in Indian culture, history and society, and considered as a symbol of Indian cultural identity. The file introduced safeguarding measures that reflect the involvement, combined efforts and commitment of yoga communities, practitioners and others. However, the Evaluation Body was unable to determine whether criteria R.2 and R.5 were satisfied with the information provided in the file. As for R.2, the file needed to demonstrate how the inscription would raise the visibility of ICH in general, not the element itself. Also, for R.5, the file explained how yoga was inventoried, but the documentation submitted (a snapshot) cannot be considered as an extract of the inventory, and the file did not provide information on the regular updating of the relevant inventories by the institutions concerned. The Evaluation Body therefore decided to recommend a referral of the nomination to the submitting State for additional information.
11. The delegation of **Turkey** commended India for presenting the nomination of yoga. It spoke of yoga as an ancient science of harmonizing the body, mind and spirit for holistic health and well-being, and as an invaluable gift to humanity practised globally by millions. The United Nations Resolution 69/131 in 2014 and the record of 177 co-sponsors that declared 21 June as the International Day of Yoga testified to the universality of yoga. With regard to criteria R.2 and R.5, the delegation found that it was clear from the information provided in the file that the inscription of yoga would encourage dialogue, from the width and depth of its practice to the innumerable expressions that were prevalent, helping to elucidate its universality. The dialogue that would ensue between communities, groups and individuals would not only be pan-Indian but would scan the globe because practitioners, transmitters, students and others would be encouraged by its inscription to promote dialogue, its spread, its historicity, its analytical and meditative aspects, its practice and its other dimensions of universal appeal, combining both the tangible and the intangible. The delegation was of the view that this would immensely contribute to the visibility and awareness of ICH in general at the local, national and international levels. With regard to criterion R.5, the Evaluation Body had itself acknowledged that several institutions in India, including the Sangeet Natak Akademi, which maintained the national inventory of ICH, had inventoried yoga, and that practitioners and stakeholders had been involved and given their consent. It was noted that India had already provided details of its national inventory in the nomination form, duly acknowledged by the Evaluation Body. India had also stated in the nomination file that its national inventory of ICH was an ongoing effort to consolidate on a common platform all the separate inventories, databases, archives and digital documentation maintained by the various cultural bodies, NGOs and institutions. The delegation believed that the ongoing process adequately addressed the concerns raised by the Evaluation Body. In conclusion, the delegation was convinced that both criteria R.2 and R.5 were fulfilled, and hence strongly supported inscription.
12. The delegation of **Mauritius** commended India for presenting its nomination, adding that it had already submitted an amendment. Yoga is an ancient science of harmonizing the body, mind and spirit, through holistic health and well-being, and is an invaluable gift to humanity, practised globally by millions. The United Nations Resolution 69/131 in 2014 and its declaration of 21 June as the International Day of Yoga testified to yoga’s universality. The delegation noted that the Evaluation Body had found that criteria R.2 and R.5 had not been met. It had closely examined the relevant information in the nomination file and in the documents submitted along with it and noted under R.2 that yoga was said to improve dialogue among the individuals, groups and communities who practise it, as well as within performing art communities, educational institutions, health centres, and individuals who were stressed and affected by unhealthy lifestyles. Its inscription would encompass and elucidate many of its historical, analytical, theoretical and practical aspects, which was necessary for experiencing the intangible behind the tangible. It was clear from the information provided in the file that the inscription of yoga would encourage dialogue and draw attention to its many aspects, from the width and depth of its practice to its innumerable expressions, thus helping to elucidate its universality. The Evaluation Body also acknowledged that ancient manuscripts and scriptures were used in the teaching and practice of yoga, and that a vast range of modern literature on the subject was available. Furthermore, as per Article 12 of the Convention, each State Party shall draw up its inventory in any manner that is suitable to its own situation. It was therefore clear that India had fully satisfied criterion R.5. It noted that the State Party had already provided details of its national inventory in the nomination form, which had been duly acknowledged by the Evaluation Body. A clear website link to the inventory was also provided, under which all links to the databases accredited to yoga organizations and NGOs had been placed. The inventory on yoga contained a description and video footage of the element, amplifying its various aspects, their significance, together with photographs. It was also noted that in 2015 the Committee had acknowledged the need for more clarity on criterion R.5; as a result, decision 10.COM 10 of 2015 had provided clear guidance on what constituted an extract with regard to inventories by Member States. In pursuance of this, in November 2016 the Secretariat had revised the nomination form with clear questions under this criterion for use by Member States for the 2018 cycle. It was noted that the nomination on yoga had been submitted *prior* to this Committee decision and therefore the State Party had not benefitted from the guidance of the Committee in its nomination. The State Party should therefore not be penalized for something that the Committee and the Evaluation Body had already accepted as not evident. The submitting State had stated in the nomination file under criterion R.5 that the national inventory of India was an ongoing effort to consolidate on a common platform all the separate inventories, databases, archives and digital documentation maintained by the various cultural bodies, NGOs and institutions. The delegation believed that the ongoing process adequately addressed the concerns raised by the Evaluation Body; the updating of inventories and ongoing efforts clearly signified that this was a work in progress which included all stages of consultation and review.. Finally, the delegation drew attention to the fact that yoga was recognized and practised at the international level by the vast majority of States Parties. In the context of Mauritius, yoga had proved to be beneficial to Mauritian society. Many educational institutions, community centres, senior citizen associations, youth organizations, as well as ministries and departments conduct regular yoga courses. In this era of stressful working conditions across the world, and of increasing societal ills, yoga contributed immensely to the holistic welfare of the population and humanity in general. Yoga is *sine qua non* for the socio-economic development of a society, reduces the State’s health expenses, and increases productivity. The delegation was therefore convinced that both criteria R.2 and R.5 were fulfilled. Given the undeniable universality of the element, it strongly recommended its inscription and in that vein had submitted an amendment to the decision.
13. The delegation of **Algeria** acknowledged that yoga was a philosophy, an emblematic lifestyle of India that was practised globally. In its great generosity, India offered it to humanity for which it was thankful. In its report, the Evaluation Body indicated that yoga strongly influenced other aspects of life, including health, medicine, education and the arts. With regard to R.2, the delegation sought a minor clarification from India on the influence of yoga on ICH in general, as already described in the report of the Evaluation Body.
14. The **Chairperson** noted thespecific question to India.
15. The delegation of **India** thanked Algeria for the insightful question, and assured the Committee that yoga was pan-Indian and practised across the country, cutting across community, class, income, gender, faith and age. In response to criterion R.2, the nomination file had indicated that yoga would improve dialogue among the various individuals, groups and communities who practise it, and also within performing art communities, educational institutions, health centres, and individuals affected by stress and unhealthy living conditions and lifestyle. Knowledge about yoga was spread beyond the boundaries of India, and this was a global practice that also cut across also race. This was said to definitely help increase the visibility of ICH in general. The dialogue that would ensue between communities, groups and individuals, as a consequence of the inscription of yoga, would not only be pan-Indian but would scan the globe. For practitioners, transmitters, students and others would be encouraged to spread its historicity, its analytical and meditative aspects, its practice and its other dimensions of universal worldwide appeal, thus combining the tangible and the intangible. In response to the question by Algeria, the delegation stated that the inscription of yoga on the Representative List would promote respect for cultural diversity and human creativity, as it would create a commonality and bond between and across practitioners, transmitters and the diverse communities and individuals that follow the practice. Its universal application and practice transcended and accepted all humanity, and thus promoted and enhanced respect for diversity and human creativity globally.
16. Thanking India, the **Chairperson** noted the many speakers on the list, and surmised that the nomination benefitted from broad support. He therefore proposed giving the floor to one State Party per Electoral Group before proceeding to the decision.
17. The delegation of **Palestine** suggested that the Members be limited to one minute, especially as Mauritius had covered all the aspects.
18. The **Chairperson** agreed to the proposal and returned to the speakers’ list.
19. The delegation of **Guatemala** felt that it was important to promote very renowned elements such as yoga, which was practised in many countries and was widely known. Inscription would therefore lend greater visibility to the Convention, in addition to the positive message sent to the practising communities, and criterion R.2 was therefore shown to be satisfied. At the same time, the delegation noted that the element had been included in the national inventory in 2014 and that the body in charge of maintaining and updating the latter was the Sangeet Natak Akademi. On this basis, criterion R.5 was deemed satisfied. The delegation therefore fully supported the inscription of yoga on the Representative List.
20. The delegation of **Palestine** echoed the remarks by Mauritius, adding that although yoga first came from India it was now an international, universal element practised by States worldwide. It thanked India for presenting this element and the Committee for supporting its inscription. With regard to R.2, the visibility of yoga was even superior to the visibility of the Convention itself, so it would no doubt contribute.
21. The delegation ofthe **Philippines** strongly recommended the inscription of yoga, adding that India had adequately demonstrated all the criteria, specifically on the issues of visibility and the inventory. Firstly, it was clear, not only from the element itself but more importantly in the nomination file, that yoga would promote dialogue and respect, and protect cultural diversity. The practice, and how it is communicated and transmitted, was itself a vehicle for visibility and safeguarding. Furthermore, India had stated that there was an ongoing effort to consolidate all the separate inventories, databases and archives held by the different institutions. These efforts demonstrate the State Party’s resolve to regularly update its inventories, thus showing its systematic and holistic concern for yoga. The delegation therefore recommended its inscription, a move very much needed in a world where safeguarding measures must be at the forefront of the global cultural agenda.
22. The delegation of **Ethiopia** commended India for presenting its nomination of yoga, adding that it was one of the co-sponsors of yoga when it was recognized at the United Nations on 11 December 2014. Given this overwhelming support, it was only logical that UNESCO should follow suit in its recognition of yoga as an element of the ICH of humanity. As clearly indicated by the previous speakers, the inscription of yoga would contribute to the visibility of ICH in general, and raise awareness of its importance at the local and national levels. Yoga is a pan-Indian practice that is spread across the country, cutting across community, class, income, gender, faith and age. The inscription would encourage dialogue as it would draw attention to the many aspects of its practice to the innumerable expressions that have prevailed. The dialogue that would ensue between communities, groups and individuals would not only be pan-Indian but would also scan the globe as practitioners, transmitters, students and others would be encouraged by its inclusion on the Representative List. Additionally, the inscription of yoga would promote respect for cultural diversity and human creativity, as it would create a commonality and bond between practitioners, transmitters, and the diverse communities and individuals that follow the practice. Yoga promoted respect for all, and its universal application and practice transcended and accepted all humanity, and promoted and enhanced respect for diversity and human creativity globally. Regarding R.5, a consensus to include yoga in the ICH inventory of India had been arrived at after consultation with its respective community bearers and stakeholders. The information for the completion and updating of the inventories had been acquired from the various groups, institutions, centres, communities, bearers and stakeholders of the element. National seminars, workshops, panels and individual interviews had been conducted in order to obtain valuable knowledge and approval. The inventory had incorporated these organizations’ websites into the national portal for the wider and better dissemination of information and management. The delegation was thus convinced that both criteria R.2 and R.5 were fulfilled, and given the undeniable universality of the element it strongly recommended its inscription, for which it supported the amended decision.
23. The delegation of **Lebanon** commended India for the nomination of yoga, adding that it was about time that this element was safeguarded, especially as yoga had become an international practice that unified different groups and communities beyond borders. Moreover, it saw that India had already provided details of its national inventory in the nomination. It therefore strongly supported its inscription, and encouraged India in its ongoing effort to update its inventory.
24. The delegation of **Mongolia** thanked the Evaluation Body for its hard work in the evaluation of this element. It agreed with Palestine that yoga was a global element of ICH, and that it fulfilled all the criteria for inscription. It therefore strongly supported its inscription.
25. The delegation of **Bulgaria** commended India, adding that it looked forward to the inscription of yoga on the Representative List because, like UNESCO, it helped shape a better world.
26. The delegation of **Armenia** recalled that on 27 September 2014 at the General Assembly, the Prime Minister of India, Mr Narendra Modi, in his address to the United Nations, had called yoga an invaluable gift to India’s ancient civilization and tradition. He thus called for 21 June, the summer solstice, to be acknowledged as the International Day of Yoga. As the longest day of the year in the northern hemisphere, it had a special significance for all humanity in the different parts of the world. As a result, on 11 December 2014 the United Nations General Assembly declared the International Day of Yoga. Two years on, the Committee was embarking on yet another historic acknowledgement, and the delegation congratulated India for bringing forward this important nomination.
27. The delegation of **Senegal** supported the remarks by Turkey and Mauritius, adding that Senegal had also co-sponsored the recognition of yoga as an international practice at the United Nations in 2014. The delegation noted the remark by Palestine that yoga was more visible than UNESCO. Although this was not the case, yoga was still very visible in the world, and it supported the amendment for its inscription.
28. The delegation of **Colombia** believed that the global importance of yoga as a practice originating in India had certainly helped millions of people improve their quality of life. There were so many manifestations in the world that needed support from States to maintain the principles, roots and the philosophy underpinning this practice. The delegation commended India for nominating the element, and recommended its inscription, adding that the arguments put forward by the Evaluation Body could be clarified by the submitting State.
29. The delegation of **Republic of Korea** supported inscription and the proposed amendment on yoga. Regarding criterion R.2, it believed that no one doubted the common value of yoga as an element of ICH. The element was already widely recognized and it would be very difficult to find a more convincing explanation as to how inscription would contribute more towards its visibility. Nevertheless, its inscription would certainly contribute to safeguarding the practice at the national and global levels.
30. The delegation of **Zambia** commended India for submitting yoga for inscription, adding that, with regard to R.2, the delegate had known about yoga for some 30 years and thus its visibility was undoubted. The inscription of yoga would strengthen its visibility all over the world. In this regard, the delegation supported its inscription.
31. The delegation of **Cuba** spoke of living ona small island in the Caribbean where many people proudly practised yoga, adding that this was an example of the universality of this practice and its ability to reach different civilizations in different regions of the world, with different ways of living and philosophies. The delegation was grateful for the explanations provided by India, and it also commended the comments from Members that had enriched the debate. The delegation thus supported its inscription.
32. The delegation of **Afghanistan** commended India, reminding the Committee of the definition of yoga, which was the art of accomplishing more while doing less. It therefore proposed stopping further interventions and moving directly to the amendments and the adoption.
33. The delegation of **Hungary** very warmly recommended this nomination from India, which it had eagerly awaited for some time. With regard to criterion R.2, it was of the opinion that the nominating State was extremely modest in putting forward its claim on this criterion. Evidently, yoga had a general, global appeal and was widely known. On a personal note, the delegate spoke of his own experience in a yoga class in Budapest the previous week when the yoga instructor had admitted never having heard of ICH, adding that it was really the Representative List that needed the yoga and not vice-versa. It warmly supported this nomination and looked forward to its inscription.
34. The delegation of **Congo** congratulated India for taking the initiative to introduce this nomination and supported the inscription of the element on the Representative List.
35. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** strongly supported the nomination of yoga for inscription, and coming from an even smaller country in the Caribbean, far away from India, acknowledged that yoga was one of the most logical nominations for inscription. The delegation felt disconcerted that the compilers of the nomination had not emphasized R.2 with regard to visibility, adding that a small window of communication between the Evaluation Body and the submitting State would have solved this. Nevertheless, it was logical to inscribe yoga, and it strongly supported the nomination.
36. The delegation of **Austria** sought to ask the State Party about inventory-making in R.5, but felt that it had already been clarified.
37. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** noted theenthusiasm surrounding the culture of yoga, and congratulated India for having submitted the nomination. Yoga is also practised in Côte d'Ivoire, where there are yoga institutes everywhere, and the delegation believed that its inscription would clearly increase the visibility of ICH. It therefore supported its inscription.
38. The delegation of **Cyprus** remarked that its question had already been posed by Algeria and – following the clarifications by India – it strongly supported inscription.
39. The **Chairperson** proceededto the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no comments or objections to paragraph 1, it was duly adopted. Turning to paragraph 2: R.1 was adopted; R.2 was adopted as amended by Mauritius; R.3 was adopted; R.4 was adopted; R.5 was adopted as amended by Mauritius. With no objections to paragraph 3 ‘to inscribe’, it was duly adopted. The standard paragraph was inserted as a new paragraph 4.
40. The delegation of **Hungary** wished to refer to the other standard paragraph that was adopted in all the decisions in R.5, i.e. that the inventory had been prepared with the participation of communities and was regularly updated. For the sake of consistency, and as confirmed by India, the delegation proposed including this addition in R.5.
41. Noting that R.5 had already been adopted, the **Chairperson** asked the Committee whether it would agree to re-opening the paragraph to include this additional text.
42. The delegation of **Hungary** clarified that it wished to add, ‘the inventory is elaborated with the participation of communities and is regularly updated’. However, it was noted that the process of updating was already mentioned in the adopted paragraph R.5. With regard to first part of the sentence, ‘with the participation and consent of practitioners and stakeholders’, it was not clear whether it only referred to yoga or the inventory in general, and the delegation asked the Secretary to assist in the wording.
43. The **Secretary** felt that Hungary’s concerns were already addressed in the wording of paragraph R.5, which read, ‘Yoga is inventoried by several institutions [...] with the participation and consent of practitioners’, as it referred to the inventories, while the Sangeet Natak Akademi ‘also regularly updates’. Thus, both concerns had been met.
44. The delegation of **Hungary** concurred and withdrew its amendment.
45. The **Chairperson** returned to the adoption of paragraph 4, and with no objections, it was duly adopted. With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.17 to inscribe ‘Yoga’** **on** **the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
46. The delegation of **India** expressedwholehearted thanks, on behalf of the 1.3 billion Indians, for the inscription of Yoga as a human treasure. The Prime Minister of India, Sri Narendra Modi, captured the essence of yoga when he spoke at the United Nations General Assembly on 27 September 2014 and said, “Yoga is an invaluable gift of India’s ancient tradition. It embodies unity of mind and body, thought and action, restraint and fulfilment, harmony between man and nature, a holistic approach to health and wellbeing. It is not about exercise, but to discover the sense of oneness within yourself, the world and nature”. The delegation added that yoga, as set out in ancient Indian scriptures, was a complete control of the mind, and through this control, achieved efficiency in action. A person who controlled his mind is like an unflinching lamp kept in a windless place. This meant absolutely serenity could be obtained through a controlled and focused mind. So, from the abstract and subtle mind to concrete action, there is a sequence. Yoga symbolized the sequence. In other words, if the mind is focused it is bound to produce efficiency in action. The delegation sought the Chairperson’s indulgence in showing a film on yoga, followed by a demonstration of yogic breathing, which it hoped would energize the Committee.

*[A film on yoga was projected]*

1. **Presentation of yoga.** Thepresentergreeted the delegates with a warm *namaste*, expressing his gratitude and sincere thanks for gifting this precious present by inscribing Yoga as an element of ICH for humanity. He felt honoured to be in the sacred land of Ethiopia. The presenter wished to mark this historical occasion with a morning of bliss and delight in the form of a brief yoga breathing technique with some ujjayi pranayama. Ujjayi is a Sanscrit word that means to triumph. In today’s busy world sometimes we forget to find ourselves, and the purpose of this breathing technique was to re-conquer the centre of our being by following our own breath, comprehensively and holistically, and by doing it collectively it recalled the true purpose of yoga, which is to triumph against all the adversities that stand before humanity. Doing it together helped us to find the shared values and love that bind us together across oceans, beyond languages, above religion, and thus yoga stood for solidarity. [Another speaker] **Mr BR Sharma** explained thatlife-breath is a life-giving principle. Life starts with the first breath, and ends with the last breath. If we learn to manipulate this breath, we can maintain our health; we can develop a kind of harmony within our body, mind and spirit. Mr Sharma presented the yogi breathing technique by asking delegates to sit upright, close their eyes, inhale (to add awareness to one’s breath), and exhale (and contemplate that particular sound). Doing this ten to fifteen times would immediately bring about a change in facial expression as well as thoughts.
2. The **Chairperson** thanked the instructor for the excellent presentation, and turned to the nomination file submitted by Iraq.
3. The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the next nomination, **‘Khidr Elias feast and its vows’**, [draft decision 11.COM 10 b.18] submitted by Iraq.Every February, communities in Iraq honour a holy figure called Alkhidr who is believed to grant worshippers their wishes, particularly those who are in need. Families gather on a sacred hill dressed in traditional clothes enjoying special dishes and performing dabkka (a popular dance), or deliver offerings by the bank of the Tigris making vows for wishes to be granted and sending candles along the river. Families and schools transmit this cultural practice, which is said to build social cohesion.The Evaluation Body had decided that the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.3, R.4 and R.5.The feast of Khidr Elias is an element of ICH shared by different components of the Iraqi population beyond ethnicity or religious beliefs. A number of safeguarding measures were proposed. The communities, groups and individuals concerned had been involved in planning these measures. The Evaluation Body, however, decided that the information included in the file was not sufficient to determine whether R.2 was satisfied.The file made a persuasive case in terms of how inscription would promote an element that bridged divides across the country, and how it would encourage the bearers of the element to renew their practical activities. The nomination thus clearly stated that inscription would encourage mutual dialogue, collaboration and solidarity among different ethnic groups and religious communities. However, the submitting State did not demonstrate how inscription could enhance the visibility and raise awareness of the importance of ICH in general.The Body decided to recommend referral of the ‘Khidr Elias feast and its vows’ to the submitting State for more information.
4. The **Chairperson** noted an amendment, opening the floor to debate.
5. The delegation of **Lebanon** thanked the Evaluation Body for its work, and offered its heartfelt thanks to Iraq for presenting this element for inscription on the Representative List, especially as it represented a very important symbol for Iraq, which brought together several religious and ethnic groups. It was noted that the Evaluation Body had found that the nomination was lacking in information. However, it did meet several criteria of the Convention, and the element was considered as a very important symbol for a divided country that had suffered many wars and continued to suffer. This element represented the union between several confessions, between several ethnic groups that join together in order to honour the Khidr Elias. The communities that join together to honour the Khidr Elias do feel very strongly that they have something in common, and the delegation was convinced that inscription would contribute to a deepening of what the element represented, that is, social cohesion. In this regard, the delegation, together with Palestine and other countries, had presented an amendment to the draft decision to accept the inscription of this element on the Representative List, keeping in mind that the Iraqi people were in great need of such a symbol.
6. The delegation of **Palestine** explained that Khidr Elias not only concerned Iraq, but was important for the entire region. It is a symbol of a saint for Muslims and for Christians in the Middle East. There are three festivities devoted to it in Turkey, Jordan, Palestine, Lebanon; this holy figure of Khidr Elias is known throughout the region, and it has equivalence both in Islam and in Christianity. The delegation echoed the remarks made by Lebanon in thanking the Evaluation Body, adding that its evaluation was accurate on R.2, concerning visibility and the awareness of the local population, but that there was a problem in the formulation. The delegation turned to R.2 and how it could be satisfied with regard to visibility and awareness about the importance of cultural heritage. It explained that as Iraq was suffering from armed conflict and terrorism, the media would instead focus on the element’s inscription, especially as it brought people together and encouraged dialogue between the different religious and ethnic communities. This would contribute towards raising both the visibility of the Convention and awareness about the importance of cultural heritage in general. In this way, criterion R.2 would clearly be satisfied. Nevertheless, the delegation agreed with the Evaluation Body that the nomination file was badly drafted, hence the importance of this kind of exchange. It insisted that this element was an expression of ICH and that the Evaluation Body was correct in its evaluation; it was the drafting that was incorrect. It hoped that this clarification would allay any concerns.
7. The delegation of **Afghanistan** joined in the remarks made by the previous speakers, underlining the commonality between the Christian and Muslim communities. Moreover, in a situation where the cultural heritage of the country had suffered for so long and so disastrously, the delegation believed that special attention granted to ICH in Iraq would automatically pay tribute to cultural heritage in general. It also commended the Evaluation Body for its work, adding that the mythical name of Khidr brought forth the memory of rebirth, renaissance and rejuvenation. The delegation recommended paying special attention to and supporting this file.
8. The delegation of **Mongolia** renewed its appreciation of the Chairperson and the Evaluation Body for its work. It supported Lebanon’s amendment, as affirmed by Palestine, and was in favour of the inscription of the element on the Representative List. The delegation encouraged Iraq to continue to promote its writers, poets, dancers, musicians and artists to continue to revive ICH in Iraq in the future. It strongly supported the inscription of this element.
9. The delegation of **Algeria** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body and all his colleagues for their work and relevant remarks on the Iraqi nomination. However, the delegation hoped that the Committee would consider the nomination with leniency in view of the difficult times currently in Iraq. Iraqi cultural heritage was being attacked on all fronts and it believed that the inscription of this element on the Representative List would serve as a significant symbol that would give courage to the Iraqi people. Above all, this element was a living example of living together, and especially of dialogue between religions.
10. The **Chairperson** took note of the broad support among Members of the Committee.
11. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** aligned with the comments made by Palestine on the role of the inscription in terms of visibility in the communities of Iraq, as well as with Algeria and its call for indulgence. This raised a very important issue that would be discussed later [under agenda item 15] on the role of intangible heritage in cases of emergency. The delegation strongly supported the inscription of this element.
12. The delegation of **Ethiopia** co-sponsored the amendment by Lebanon and Palestine.
13. The delegation of **India** associated with the statements made by the different delegations, and supported the inscription of the element.
14. The delegation of **Guatemala** supported the inscription of the element.
15. The delegation of **Armenia** believed that inscription would bring positive attention to intangible heritage and culture in general for the Iraqi people, taking into consideration the considerable damage inflicted on Iraqi culture by terrorism. This would thus serve as the best message and purpose, and it therefore supported the inscription.
16. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** supported the inscription of the element on the Representative List.
17. The **Chairperson** proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision on aparagraph-by-paragraph basis. With no objections to paragraph 1, it was adopted. With no objections to criteria R.1, R.3, R.4 and R.5 in paragraph 2, they were duly adopted. The Chairperson then turned to criterion R.2 with the proposed amendments.
18. The delegation of **Hungary** supported the amendment to R.2 with a slight modification in the text, adding that it was not the visibility of the Committee that was expected in R.2 but rather that of ICH.
19. The **Chairperson** turned to Palestine to accept the slight modification.
20. The delegation of **Palestine** agreed.
21. The delegation of **India** questioned the use of ‘most likely’, adding that the inclusion of the element on the Representative List would enhance the visibility both of the Convention, and of ICH in general.
22. The delegation of **Palestine** supported the amendment.
23. The **Chairperson** noted that Lebanon supported this amendment. He then turned to the adoption of criterion R.2 with its amendments. With no further comments or objections, criterion R.2 and paragraph 2 as a whole were adopted, as amended. Paragraph 4 ‘to inscribe’ was also adopted. He then turned to the adoption of the decision as a whole. With no further objections or comments, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.18 to inscribe ‘Khidr Elias feast and its vows’ on** **the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
24. The delegation of **Algeria** spoke on behalf of the Arab Group and the Iraqi people to express heartfelt thanks to the Committee. The inscription of this element represented a very important symbol for the Iraqi people because they participated in the protection of its heritage. Unfortunately, the delegation of Iraq was unable to participate, but despite its absence, it appreciated the attention afforded to it during the difficult situation that the country and its people faced. Hence, this historic decision would have enormous positive repercussions in Iraq.
25. The **Chairperson** congratulated Iraq on behalf of the Committee. He noted a request from Saudi Arabia to examine its nomination file before lunchtime when Arabic interpretation would be available. Out of courtesy to Saudi Arabia, which had made Arabic interpretation possible, the Chairperson sought the Committee’s consideration in this regard. With no objections, the Chairperson introduced the next nomination file.
26. The **Vice-Chairperson** **of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **‘Almezmar, drumming and dancing with sticks’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.27], submitted by Saudi Arabia.Almezmar is a traditional practice of the Hijazi community in Saudi Arabia performed for family celebrations or national events. Involving up to 100 male practitioners, two rows stand opposite each other clapping and chanting songs about gallantry or love. Drums beat in the background while pairs of performers twirl large sticks in the group’s centre and others follow. Transmitted by performing arts troupes and heritage centres, the practice acts as an identity marker and part of the community’s collective memory.The Evaluation Body decided that from the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The file indicated that the communities concerned, who played a central role throughout the process, had initiated the nomination. Supporting evidence of their full prior knowledge, consent and engagement in the nomination was attached to the file. Some community members even used social media to promote the announcement of the nomination stages to a wider community audience. Information about the nomination had also been published in newspapers. The Evaluation Body had decided to recommend the inscription of the ‘Almezmar, drumming and dancing with sticks’ on the Representative List.
27. Thanking the Vice-Chairperson, the **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been put forward and thus proposed adopting the decision as a whole.With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.27 to inscribe ‘Almezmar, drumming and dancing with sticks’ on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
28. The delegation of **Saudi Arabia** thanked the Committee and the Evaluation Body for recommending the inscription of its file, for which it was delighted. This is a very popular practice in certain areas of the country and the delegation was extremely happy to be able to inscribe elements from different parts of Saudi Arabia. It commended all those who had participated in the success of this element of heritage, particularly the practitioners. The delegation made a special mention of the Chair of the Saudi Arabian authority for protecting national heritage and for the endeavours to protect and safeguard this element. It thanked friends and members of the delegation. It concluded by sending greetings to the family of Mr Muhammad Salim, a skilled trainer in the most famous performing group of this element in Saudi Arabia, whose help had been crucial in preparing this nomination. The delegation had hoped that he might attend the session to celebrate this success, but unfortunately he had passed away two months ago.

*[A film about Almezmar was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson** thanked Saudi Arabia, and turned to the next nomination submitted by Kazakhstan.
2. The **Vice-Chairperson** **of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **‘Kuresi** **in Kazakhstan**’ [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.20], submitted by Kazakhstan. Kazakh kuresi is a type of traditional wrestling practised in communities in Kazakhstan that requires players to battle it out on foot to get the opponent’s shoulders on the ground. Where trainers previously coached boys to participate in local contests, these days Kazakh Kuresi is a national sport practised by men and women with international competitions broadcasted in multiple countries. Said to build tolerance, goodwill and solidarity amongst communities, Kazakh kuresi is transmitted in master classes and sports clubs. The Evaluation Body had difficulties in four criteria, and decided to ask the State Party for more information. As for R.1, while the file described Kuresi in Kazakhstan as a popular sport, it did not provide sufficient information to apprehend its cultural significance and social functions. Furthermore, the focus tended to be on the elite dimensions of the sport, while the community dimension was poorly described. Although the file stated that the skills of the wrestlers, trainers and judges were transmitted to young men and women, further elaboration on the transmission mechanisms was needed. As for R.2, the file stated that inscription would result in public recognition of the element. However, it lacked additional information to demonstrate how inscription would contribute to the visibility of ICH in general. As for R.3, the file outlined future safeguarding measures. However, these seemed to espouse a top-down approach, both in terms of their design and future implementation: bearers and practitioners involved should reach beyond professional wrestlers since ordinary citizens were also active practitioners of the element. As for R.4, the Evaluation Body would have liked to see consent of a less standardized nature, as well as originating from a wider variety of representatives from the communities concerned. It also pointed out that the text submitted in the file was almost identical under Sections 4.a. and 4.b. and consequently may need revision. The Evaluation Body therefore decided to recommend a referral of the ‘Kuresi in Kazakhstan’ to the submitting State for more information.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chairperson for the detailed explanation of the different issues, noting that there were objections in four out of the five criteria, with amendments from Bulgaria for each.
4. Having carefully examined the file, the delegation of **Bulgaria** greatly appreciated the significance of the practice presented and the scope of its socio-cultural impact. This is an example of a tradition spread throughout the territory of the State that is extremely popular among the different generations, viable and well safeguarded. It could be described as being representative for the submitting State. The element is the focal point in safeguarding efforts by numerous communities in Kazakhstan, as well as by a range of governmental and non-governmental organizations involved in promoting knowledge and skills about this specific form and style of Kazakh traditional wrestling. The delegation respected the observations made by the Evaluation Body on the file. However, it considered that some of the positive aspects of this widespread and well-maintained practice had not been sufficiently outlined, and therefore wished to open the nomination for discussion.
5. The delegation of **Afghanistan** sought clarification from the delegation of Kazakhstan on the draft decision of the Evaluation Body regarding the community dimension and the transmission mechanism of the element.
6. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to Kazakhstan to respond to the specific question.
7. The delegation of **Kazakhstan** expressed gratitude to Afghanistan for its question. It recalled that Kazakhstan had ratified the Convention only in 2012, adding that it understood its responsibilities and commitments under the Convention both nationally and internationally. It was currently working on its inventory of ICH with the active participation of the communities concerned. Considering the Committee’s recommendations, the country prioritized the preparation of multinational files and was party to five multinational nominations. Only one national nomination was inscribed on the Representative List. On 16 December, the country would celebrate the 25th anniversary of its independence and competitions would take place nationwide, including Kazakhstani’s favourite traditional sport, Kuresi. Two bearers of Kuresi, who had been directly involved in the preparation of the file, were present. Wrestling is considered a masculine sport, but women also participated in Kuresi. The delegation included representatives of the Ministry of Culture and Sport, as well the Chairperson of the National Intangible Cultural Heritage Committee who had also participated in preparing the nomination. The delegation referred to section 2 of the nomination, which stated that this element had been widely practised in every community and village since ancient times. Local trainers coach young boys on the basics of traditional wrestling and sports sections are now offered in all regions of Kazakhstan. Communities and State agencies involved in safeguarding and nominating the element included the Ministry of Culture and Sports, the National Kazakh Kuresi Federation Fund for developing Kazakh Kuresi, called Kazakhstan Barysy, local municipal authorities, and regional representatives of the Kazakh Kuresi Federation. With regard to the transmission of the element, the mechanisms were adequately described in the nomination. Moreover, they functioned efficiently, as the element had been successfully safeguarded and transmitted throughout the centuries. The delegation made reference to section 3, which stated that knowledge and skills related to the element were transmitted via contests and tournaments, master classes, sports sections, and popularized though media coverage. The element was therefore alive, widely practised and transmitted from generation to generation, which was indicated in the nomination. The delegation drew the Committee’s attention to the fact that the Federation of Kazakh Kuresi is a public association aimed at promoting and developing this element, uniting both professional Kuresi wrestlers and amateurs.
8. The **Chairperson** urged Kazakhstan to respond to the specific question raised.
9. The delegation of **Kazakhstan** wished to highlight that the Kazakh Federation was not a State or government agency but a public voluntary association that united both professionals and amateurs of different ages, and organized competitions and performances. Anyone could join the family of Kuresi irrespective of their level of training and social status. The transmission of this element occurred through mass cultural events and traditional festivals where anyone could contest their strength regardless of gender. Baluans, heroic wrestlers, were invited to such events and the most talented wrestlers were allowed to train with them at a more professional level. Kazakh Kuresi is manifested in social practices, rituals and festive events. The level of promotion of this element within communities depends on the number of famous wrestlers, which defines the status of that community. Baluans are invited to other communities to raise the level of training of the local bearers. Such meetings have a competitive character and gather new followers. The delegation spoke of the essential features of transmission, for example the blessing ceremony by older wrestlers, who are respected by the wider community and who bless the start of each contest to wish for a peaceful event. In addition, the ceremony, the wrestling techniques, and even their names have been safeguarded since ancient times, reflecting the specific character of nomadic life. The Kazakh Kuresi was thus copied from horseback wrestling, which embodied the cultural identity of the nomads.
10. The **Chairperson** noted that Kazakhstan had responded to the question, and gave the floor to Guatemala.
11. The delegation of **Guatemala** remarked that the national sport of Kuresi had its basis in the community, was practised by youth and older generations, and trainers taught the ancient traditions to younger generations. The element represented history, tolerance, goodwill and solidarity among communities; as with any sports activity, people need models. The delegation believed that Kuresi was representative of ICH and if inscribed, it would support the importance of these ancient techniques, not just at the national level but also internationally. The delegation also believed that the Kuresi nomination complied with all the criteria and it supported its inscription.
12. The delegation of **Mongolia** supported Bulgaria’s amendment regarding criterion R.2, adding that the nomination file, in section 2, paragraph 3, had mentioned how the inscription of the element could enhance the visibility of ICH in general. Kazakhstan is very close to Mongolia, and the delegation was aware of the importance of Kazakh Kuresi, which was more than a sport. Its question had already been answered by Kazakhstan.
13. The delegation of **Palestine** remarked that Kazakhstan had clearly addressed the viability of the element and its safeguarding measures, as well as the participation of communities. However, it sought clarification from Kazakhstan with regard to R.1, which the Evaluation Body judged had not been met.
14. The **Chairperson** invited Kazakhstan to respond to the specific question raised.
15. The delegation of **Kazakhstan** thanked Palestine for the question, adding that some clarification on R.1 had already been given that made reference to the specific character of nomadic life and the cultural identity of nomads who wrestled on horseback. Kazakh Kuresi was thus derived from this form of wrestling, but was performed on the ground. This practice embodies the free and proud spirit of the nomads, as well as respect for the opponent, as wrestling holds a sacred meaning in that none of the wrestlers are supposed to bend or kneel. The delegation spoke about the magnitude of the communities who safeguard and promote this element, for example the Kazakh Federation of Kazakh Kuresi unites more than 100,000 people.
16. The **Chairperson** thanked Kazakhstan for clearly addressing criterion R.1.
17. The delegation of **Algeria** asked the Kazakhstan to explain the process of gathering community consent, especially for the updating of inventories.
18. The delegation of **Kazakhstan** reiterated that there was a huge community of bearers and practitioners of Kazakh Kuresi. In Kazakhstan, the National Intangible Cultural Heritage Committee, under the National Commission of Kazakhstan, united representatives of the different communities, bearers and practitioners. Representatives of the scientific community and universities, and the Federation of Kazakh Kuresi all took an active part in the process of inventorying the element in the national list. In fact, the nomination file had been prepared by the community itself, which might explain why the nomination text was unclear and required greater clarification.
19. The delegation of **Armenia** sought an explanation from Kazakhstan on two issues: i) whether this element was practised among other ethnic minorities living in Kazakhstan; and ii) how inscription would contribute to intercultural dialogue in the country and visibility of ICH in Kazakhstan.
20. The **Chairperson** wished to first give the floor to Members of the Committee.
21. The delegation of the **Philippines** requested that Kazakhstan enlighten the Committee on R.4, as the nomination file had mentioned that only a particular segment of the community had given their free, prior and informed consent, and thus it sought clarification on how this consent had been gathered across the various sectors of the Kuresi community.
22. The delegation of **Austria** found the element interesting, as it too had undertaken discussions for a possible similar inscription of sporting practices on the national inventory. It wished to hear from the Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body whether the clarifications heard so far in this discussion appeared to now meet the criteria, especially in R.1.
23. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** explained that the Evaluation Body had adhered to the information contained in the nomination file. In terms of the information and clarifications provided, he believed that the community dimension and the cultural significance of the sport, while they may exist, were not sufficiently detailed in the file and that the clarifications provided did not fully cover this gap. The Vice-Chairperson still felt that the way in which the nomination had been written tended to give prominence to the competitive, professionalized and elitist dimension of the element rather than its rootedness in the communities and how it embodied a cultural identity and provided a cultural dimension to the communities concerned. It was therefore a matter of emphasis, and the Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body would likely stick to the original recommendation that more information would be very welcome.
24. The delegation of **Turkey** congratulated Kazakhstan for its nomination file, adding that Kazakh Kuresi was an important element of ICH. Having listened to the clarifications by the submitting State with regard to community participation and safeguarding measures, the delegation was convinced that the national sport of Kuresi satisfied R.3 and R.4. The submitting State was clearly devoted to safeguarding and developing the element, and the relevant institutions, with the participation of the communities concerned, had jointly initiated the proposed safeguarding measures. It therefore believed that the file contained sufficient information to meet criteria R.3 and R.4.
25. The delegation of **Cyprus** felt that the Evaluation Body had given a very good answer, adding that it doubted that the four criteria could be satisfied in the space of half an hour.
26. The delegation of **Cuba** had not intended to take the floor but did so since silence meant consent, adding that this interpretation was rather dangerous for this Committee given the debates during this session. The delegation was happy that the opinion of the Evaluation Body had been sought because this had not been the case during examination of the other nominations, adding that this was important because it was as if the Committee disregarded the opinions and work of the twelve members, elected by the Committee itself, over the past year. The delegation felt that the Committee had been embarking on a very complicated and dangerous path in its practice over the past few days, which made it impossible to take decisions without contradiction. Thus, it firmly defended the need to create a working group in order to harmonize and reinforce the working methods of the Evaluation Body, adding that this session had not been a shining example of governance and relations between all the different bodies involved.
27. The delegation of **India** thanked Kazakhstan for presenting its nomination and its clarifications on the community dimension and transmission mechanisms. However, it noted that the Evaluation Body under R.3 had remarked that the safeguarding measures espoused a top-down approach, both in terms of design and future implementation. The bearers and practitioners involved should reach beyond professional wrestlers, as ordinary citizens were also active practitioners. Moreover, the Evaluation Body had mentioned that some of the measures seemed to suggest that the viability of the element was at risk, yet the file suggested otherwise elsewhere. It wished to hear from Kazakhstan about its views on the Evaluation Body’s assessment.
28. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** commended Kazakhstan's effort on the proposed element, as well as the work carried out by the Evaluation Body. It aligned with the remarks by Cyprus in giving the floor to the Evaluation Body. The delegation cautioned the Committee in that people were listening everywhere in the world and paying close attention to the decisions it was making.
29. The delegation of **Palestine** spoke of the serious problem emerging in that the Committee was not being coherent with its established practice, adding that some interventions presented today had not been presented in very similar nominations before, which it deemed unacceptable. The delegation suggested stopping the debate and moving to the amendments to decide whether or not to adopt them, at which time objections could be heard.
30. The delegation of **Turkey** supported the remarks by Palestine.
31. The delegation of **Cuba** shared the concerns expressed by Palestine, reiterating its deep-felt concern about the methodology adopted, and the need to remain coherent with that, but that it did not think that the Committee had embarked on the right path.
32. Given the different views in the room, the delegation of **Austria** wished to give the floor to Observers and NGOs before moving to the decision-making.
33. The **Chairperson** noted a point of order from Palestine.
34. The delegation of **Palestine** explained that this request should have the consent of all Members of the Committee, adding that no similar request had previously been made, and it was thus opposed to giving the floor to Observers at this stage.
35. The **Chairperson** clarified that the Committee was not yet through the decision-making process and no requests from Observers had been received. He thus proceeded to the adoption of the decisions on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no objections, paragraph 1 was adopted. He then turned to R.1 in paragraph 2, as amended by Bulgaria.
36. From the explanation heard from the Evaluation Body, the delegation of **Austria** was not convinced that all the issues of sport and communities had been covered.
37. The **Chairperson** confirmed that Kazakhstan could not be given the floor as the Committee was in the midst of decision-making.
38. The delegation of **Turkey** wished to add its name to the amendments by Bulgaria.
39. The delegation of **Palestine** was satisfied by the clarifications given and wished to co-sponsor the amendment.
40. The delegation of **Senegal** supported the amendment by Bulgaria.
41. The delegation of **India** found the clarifications satisfactory in R.1 and supported the amendment.
42. Having heard the clarifications, the delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the adoption of the amendment.
43. The delegations of **Mauritius, Philippines, Guatemala** and **Congo** supported the amendment.
44. With no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson** pronounced R.1 in paragraph 2 adopted. He then turned to R.2.
45. The delegations of **Mongolia, Turkey, Guatemala** and **India** supported the amendment.
46. The delegation of **Palestine** wondered whether it was necessary to listen to all the expressions of support, and if there was no objection, the Committee could move faster.
47. The **Chairperson** noted no objections to the proposal by Palestine, and with no further comments R.2 was adopted as amended by Bulgaria. He then turned to criterion R.3.
48. The delegation of **Turkey** and **Ethiopia** supported the amendment by Bulgaria.
49. With no objections, the **Chair** pronounced criterion R.3 adopted, as amended by Bulgaria. He then turned to criterion R.4.
50. The delegation of **Turkey** supported the amendment.
51. The delegation of **Afghanistan** remarked that in the clarifications from Kazakhstan, the name of the association was mentioned, and it wondered whether it would not be appropriate to include it so as to enhance the cultural aspect.
52. The **Chairperson** asked Afghanistan to explicitly cite the text.
53. The delegation of **Afghanistan** suggested giving the floor to Kazakhstan.
54. The **Chairperson** was unable to do so as the Committee was at the decision stage.
55. The delegation of **Afghanistan** proposed inserting ‘and association of Baluans’, after ‘Representatives of Agency of Sports and Physical Culture’.
56. The delegation of **India** supported the amendment by Afghanistan.
57. The delegation of **Palestine** also supported the amendment by Bulgaria. It wondered again whether it would be better to listen for objections rather than expressions of support, so that the Committee could move faster.
58. The **Chairperson** assured Palestine that he was fully aware of the recommendations presented to the Committee, and with no requests for the floor, he turned to the adoption of R.4. With no objections, it was duly adopted. He then turned to R.5, as amended by Bulgaria.
59. With regard to updating the inventory, the delegation of **Mauritius** wishedto know whether this would be carried out after inscription, or whether it was currently being done every two or three years.
60. The **Chairperson** asked whom Mauritius wished to address.
61. The delegation of **Mauritius** explained that it was unclear from the paragraph whether the inventory would be updated in the future or was currently being updated.
62. The **Chairperson** clarified that R.5 mentioned ‘every two to three years’.
63. The delegation of **Mauritius** explained that the paragraph mentioned, ‘will be updated’, and thus proposed ‘is being regularly updated’.
64. The delegation of **Zambia** supported the amendment by Mauritius, adding that it was unsure whether it needed to state ‘every two to three years’ if it was ‘regularly updated’, adding that it could include ‘by the Ministry concerned’ instead of ‘by the Ministry of Culture and Sport’ in case the function of updating shifts to another ministry.
65. With no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson** pronounced R.5 adopted. He then proceeded to the adoption of paragraph 2 as a whole, which was duly adopted as amended. Paragraph 3 ‘to inscribe’ was also adopted.
66. The **Secretary** reminded the Committee of the standard paragraph that had previously been discussed, which would cover all the clarifications presented. In the interests of time and consistency, the Secretary proposed deleting the two paragraphs 4 and 5 and replacing them with the standard paragraph that had been used for all the files where the State Party had brought forward clarifications.
67. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee whether it could agree to the proposal.
68. The delegation of **Armenia** supported the proposal, adding that it was more in line with the previous paragraph just adopted.
69. The delegations of **Palestine** and **Turkey** approved the proposal by the Secretariat.
70. The **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the standard paragraph [now paragraph 4], after the deletion of the two original paragraphs 4 and 5. With no objections, paragraph 4 was adopted. The Chairperson proposed adopting the decision as a whole.With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.20 to inscribe ‘Kuresi** **in Kazakhstan’** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
71. The delegation of **Kazakhstan** spoke of its great honour on the occasion of the inscription of Kuresi. It thanked the Chairperson and the Committee for its extraordinary support. Kuresi in Kazakhstan is the ancient art of traditional wrestling, and one of the main elements of celebration and national identity of the Kazakh people. The beauty of this sport and the power of heroic wrestling by Baluans have been reflected in national epics, tales and legends of Kazakh literature since ancient times, and a similar form of wrestling also exists among other people of Central Asia. Currently, Kuresi is a popular traditional sports game. The inscription of this element would raise public interest in the history and culture of nomadic civilizations, and promote national sports and scientific research worldwide. The delegation congratulated the bearers and practitioners, and all the organizations involved in transmitting this art from generation to generation, particularly the National Federation Kazakh Kuresi and the public foundation Kazakhstan Barysy. The delegation remarked that a Baluan was part of the delegation, and that these beautiful performances could be seen during the ‘Expo’ exhibition in Astana in 2017.
72. The **Chairperson** congratulated Kazakhstan, and gave the floor to the Secretary for some practical announcements.
73. The **Secretary** informed the Committee of the activities taking place during lunchtime. The UNESCO facilitators were meeting for the second time. The ICH NGO Forum on capacity building would also meet, and a cocktail reception would be hosted by Turkey following the day’s session.

*[Thursday, 1 December 2016, afternoon session]*

**ITEM 10.b OF THE AGENDA (CONT.):**

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

1. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body to present the next nomination submitted by Mauritius.
2. The **Vice-Chairperson** **of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **‘Bhojpuri folk songs in Mauritius’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.21], submitted by Mauritius. Geet-Gawai is a traditional, pre-wedding ceremony combining rituals, prayer, songs, music and dance performed mainly by Bhojpuri-speaking communities in Mauritius. Taking place at the bride or groom’s home, it involves family members and neighbours. Married women sort items like rice and money in a piece of cloth while others sing songs to honour Hindu gods and goddesses. Next, everyone dances to uplifting songs. An expression of community identity and collective memory, it is transmitted by families, community centres and academies. The Evaluation Body had decided that, from the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The file sufficiently demonstrated how the practice of Geet-Gawai has become an expression of collective, cultural memory, while strengthening a common identity. It also demonstrated that local groups and stakeholders would continue their work to document and spread knowledge on the element, as they have been doing. The Evaluation Body decided to recommend the inscription of the Bhojpuri folk songs in Mauritius, Geet-Gawai, on the Representative List.
3. Thanking the Vice-Chairperson, the **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been put forward and thus proposed adopting the decision as a whole.With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.21 to inscribe ‘Bhojpuri folk songs in Mauritius’** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
4. The delegation of **Mauritius**,represented by Mr Santaram Baboo, Minister of Arts and Culture of Mauritius, thanked the Chairperson and expressed sincere thanks to the Evaluation Body for its positive recommendations. He also thanked the Committee for inscribing ‘Bhojpuri folk songs in Mauritius, Geet-Gawai’ on the Representative List, which clearly showed that Mauritius was on the right path in the implementation of the Convention. The people of Mauritius welcomed the inscription of its second element after its first inscription, of the ‘Mauritian Traditional Sega’, in 2014. Today’s inscription would further promote Mauritius on the international ICH map. As a reminder, the Geet-Gawai is a pre-wedding ceremony that combines rituals, prayers, songs, music and dance. It was brought to Mauritius in the early eighteenth century during the settlement of the indentured labourers, where it flourished in the sugar-cane state across the country. Geet-Gawai is an important social medium for communication among family members as well as the general public who gather together and exchange meaningful, memorable and emotional moments. The inscription confirmed the commitment of Mauritius to safeguard, protect and popularize the Bhojpuri Geet-Gawai, especially among the youth, bearers of the element, and the population at large. In addition, it would benefit the Indian diaspora across the world. Mauritius is a very active Member State of UNESCO, through the wide range of Conventions, and was fully committed to respecting all its commitments. The Minister expressed sincere thanks to UNESCO for its relentless efforts to promote and sustain culture around the world and for its excellent work. Thanks went to Ethiopia for the support given to make this conference a success and to all the States Parties that had expressed support for the nomination.

*[A film on Bhojpuri folk songs was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson** noted a request to speak from India.
2. The delegation of **India** wished to warmly congratulate Mauritius for the inscription of this beautiful and vibrant musical element, which was melodious, rhythmic, spontaneous and above all soulful, and which was truly rooted in the lives of the performers and tradition-bearers.
3. The **Chairperson** proceeded to the next file, submitted by Mexico.
4. The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the next nomination, **‘Charrería, equestrian tradition in Mexico’[[6]](#footnote-7)** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.22], submitted by Mexico. Charrería is a traditional practice of livestock herding communities in Mexico. Initially used to help herders from different estates better coexist, these days purpose-built associations and schools assist in continuing the transmission of the tradition, also considered a sport, by training community members up to competition level. Different categories of charrería are performed by male and female practitioners in front of an audience. It is considered an important aspect of community identity and a way of transferring social values to younger generations. The Evaluation Body had decided that, from the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.3, R.4 and R.5. It was especially pleased to see that the safeguarding measures proposed were detailed and included the creation of a Charrería Conservatory and the establishment of Community Training Centers for the transmission of different handicrafts related to the element. The Evaluation Body had decided, however, that the information included in the file was not sufficient to determine whether R.2 was satisfied. The nomination file explained in rather vague terms how the inscription of the element would provide an opportunity to show the world the values of the element. However, the file did not explicitly demonstrate how inscription would contribute to the visibility of intangible heritage in general and raise awareness of its importance at local, national and international levels. The Evaluation Body had therefore decided to recommend a referral of the ‘Charrería, equestrian tradition in Mexico’ to the submitting State for more information.
5. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chairperson and, noting an amendment for this file from Lebanon, and given the issue of time, suggested only giving the floor to Members submitting amendments, then going straight to the adoption of decisions.
6. The delegation of **Lebanon** commended Mexico for its nomination file, adding that what it found most appealing were the highlighted values of equity, equality and solidarity. The Charrería was said to be one of the most important traditions of Mexican culture, with deep bonds with its identity features. The nomination file submitted reflected the wealth of an equestrian tradition founded on values of respect, dialogue and inclusion, which had been transmitted through the generations since the sixteenth century. The delegation sought further clarifications from the submitting State on how inscription would increase the visibility of ICH in general and raise awareness of its importance at local, national and international levels.
7. Thanking Lebanon, the **Chairperson** wished tomove to the adoption of decisions on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis after giving the floor to Mexico for its brief answer.
8. The delegation of **Mexico** began by saying that Mexico and the Charro communities had waited six years for this long-desired moment. For the country and the bearer communities, Charrería is much more than an equestrian cultural manifestation; it brings together different elements of Mexican identity, as stated in the file submitted in 2014. Charrería highlights values such as equality, equity and solidarity, and its inscription on the Representative List would contribute to the linkage of those values with ICH and the importance of safeguarding. Moreover, the constant and dynamic practice of Charrería throughout Mexico, with 1,007 Charro associations and almost 2,000 Charro events every year, attested to its extensive dissemination and high visibility. Once inscribed, further measures would be taken to disseminate and highlight this element of ICH, as well as the goals and spirit of the Convention. Likewise, one of the pillars underpinning the nomination were the bonds of solidarity and cooperation among the 184 Charro communities scattered across three states in Mexico that express mutual respect and mutually enrich each other whenever they come together. Through inscription, the delegation believed that this would become an attribute of the values underpinning the Representative List. Charrería would be a vehicle of ICH that also promoted dialogue between the different communities, linking up the Charro communities in Mexico and the USA. Inscription would thus contribute to greater understanding of the importance of ICH from the most inclusive standpoint. Concluding, the delegation believed that Charrería itself was reliable proof of human creativity and cultural diversity, not just because of its origin but because of the variety of cultural expressions that come together in this tradition and that have been transmitted from generation to generation, achieving linkages between entire communities.
9. The **Chairperson** moved to the adoption of the decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Turning to paragraph 1, he noted a correction proposed by Lebanon on the description aspect of the element, which was duly adopted without objection. The Chairperson then turned to paragraph 2, and criteria R.1, R.3, R.4, R.5, which were duly adopted as proposed. He then turned to R.2, and the amendment by Lebanon.
10. The delegation of **Palestine** supported all the amendments submitted by Lebanon and strongly supported the inscription of this element.
11. The delegation of **Mauritius** accepted Mexico’s clarification regarding R.2.
12. The delegations of **India, Turkey, Colombia and Algeria** were satisfied with the clarifications provided by Mexico and supported inscription.
13. Noting the long list of speakers and the general consensus, the **Chairperson** proposed moving to the adoption of criterion 2 in paragraph 2, which was duly adopted. He then proposed the adoption of paragraph 2 as a whole. With no objections, it was duly adopted. He then turned to the next paragraph 3, as proposed by Lebanon and Palestine.
14. The delegation of **Turkey** supported inscription and the amendment by Lebanon.
15. The delegation of **Cuba** endorsed inscription and all the amendments.
16. The delegation of **Armenia** supported the adoption of paragraph 3.
17. The **Chairperson** noted that all the criteria had been adopted, and thus the following paragraphs could be considered ready for adoption. With no objections, paragraph 3 ‘to inscribe’ was adopted. The standard paragraph [the new paragraph 4] was adapted to the nomination and inserted, and with no objections, it was duly adopted. The Chairperson proposed adopting the decision as a whole.With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.22 to inscribe ‘Charrería, equestrian tradition in Mexico’ on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
18. The delegation of **Mexico** thanked the Committee for its consideration and support of the inscription of ‘Charrería, equestrian tradition in Mexico’ on the Representative List. The Mexican Government was committed to its safeguarding and to disseminating more information on this practice in order to build intercultural dialogue in favour of peace and development. The delegation was especially delighted that after five years, the inscription of Charrería had been recognized here in Ethiopia, a country with which Mexico had a long friendship and far-reaching roots. It thanked Spain for the possibility of Spanish interpretation. [Another speaker] On behalf of the Ministry of Culture and the National Institute of Anthropology and History, the delegation was grateful to all those who had heard the call of the people of Mexico regarding Charrería. Indeed, this is a practice that goes beyond its borders. The delegation wished to give the floor to a representative of the Charro communities to share the eloquent image of this tradition that exists in all communities in Latin America. Indeed, being Charro means being Mexican [Mexican expression]. On behalf of the Charrería community of Mexico, the representative wished to express his gratitude to the Committee which had spoken in its favour, as well as to the Evaluation Body. Now that the Charrería was inscribed and considered as an element of ICH, it would give a chance not only to Charrería but also to Mexico as a country to strongly commit and ethically safeguard the practices of all the peoples in all the communities that practise this tradition. Indeed, Charrería is part of its national identity, and this inscription would add another important grain of sand to building Mexico’s national identity in terms of ICH in general.
19. Congratulating Mexico, the **Chairperson** moved to the next nomination submitted by Nigeria.
20. The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the next nomination, **‘Argungu international fishing and cultural festival’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.23], submitted by Nigeria. Every year in the north-west of Nigeria, communities participate in the Argungu International Fishing and Cultural Festival. The four-day festival, between February and March, features kabanci – water competitions including hand fishing, canoe racing, wild duck catching and other traditional practices. Men and boys participate while women perform songs and dances. Considered a contributor to identity and a means of maintaining peace between the Argungu and neighbouring Sokoto, knowledge about the tradition is transmitted within chieftaincies involved, families and via apprenticeship. The Evaluation Body had decided that, from the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1 and R.5. It had decided, however, that the information included in the file was not sufficient to determine whether criteria R.2, R.3, and R.4 were satisfied. As for R2, rather than suggesting how the element would contribute to ensuring the visibility of ICH in general, the file appeared to focus on the consequences of inscription for the element itself. As for R.3, the proposed safeguarding measures included research, documentation and protection of the resources and sacred nature of the river. Yet the possible negative consequences arising from inscription (large-scale tourism) were missing. Also, it was considered useful to present more information on how the different community groups were involved in the planning and what their future roles and responsibilities would be. As for R.4, the wide and active participation in the nomination of the communities and groups concerned was not adequately addressed, giving the impression that the nomination process was top-down. Given the diversity of community groups and individuals involved, a broader representation of community consent would have been welcome. While the file mentioned secret aspects of the element, specific measures to ensure that these were respected were absent. The Evaluation Body decided to recommend to the Committee a referral of the ‘Argungu international fishing and cultural festival’ for more information.
21. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chairperson for the detailed explanation, informing the Committee that several amendments had been received and, for the sake of time, suggested only giving the floor to Members submitting amendments before proceeding to the adoption of the decision.
22. The delegation of **Senegal** wished to reiterate that since its first intervention it had had nothing but sincere respect for the Evaluation Body, which comprised proven experts who had correctly carried out their work. The Committee was simply expressing the need for clarifications on some aspects. With regard to this ancient festival, which was now associated with several other traditional cultural events, aside from fishing, it featured canoe racing, fishing with bare hands, traditional wrestling and other aspects that contributed towards making this festival a true representation of the cultural diversity and identity of Nigeria recognized by the communities that participate in this festival. In addition, the involvement of religious authorities from different confessions, from the Emir of the regions, to the Sultan of Sokoto and the traditional chief presented a very strong symbol in this northeast part of Nigeria that was under the threat of terrorism from Boko Haram. As a result, these communities were committed to defending and safeguarding this practice, involving fishermen, traditional wrestlers, poets, musicians and dancers. Ultimately, it is a democratic festival where everyone can freely express themselves through diatribes, satire and criticisms. The festival was currently at its 60th edition and is a regular festival that mobilizes both the communities and the State. It is registered in the cultural agenda of Nigeria and twinned with Nigeria's national arts and culture festival. The delegation drew the Committee’s attention to the fact that the festival celebrates what is known as ‘the civilization of the water people’, which could also be found in Côte d'Ivoire with Mami Wata [Mammy Water], in Senegal, Benin, and other countries of sub-Saharan Africa. The element was therefore an excellent representation of the sub-region. In fact, it was the only one representing this part of Africa. The delegation acknowledged the fairness of the Convention and that it did not have a character of exceptionality. However, it insisted on a very strong sense of justice and the need to inscribe this element for all of Africa, as it would send a strong symbol to Nigeria and all the regions of Africa affected by terrorism. This practice mobilized Muslim leaders, traditional leaders and all other religious authorities. Boko Haram had even tried to ban the festival in 2013, but the communities and the State had taken up the challenge and resumed the organization of the festival to the present day. The delegation asked the Committee to help Nigeria and Africa to meet the challenge of dealing with terrorism.
23. The **Chairperson** asked Zambia if it had a different opinion.
24. The delegation of **Zambia**,having consulted with Palestine, chose to withdraw.
25. The **Chairperson** proceeded to the adoption of the decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no objections, paragraph 1 was adopted. Criteria R.1 and R.5 in paragraph 2 were also adopted as proposed. The Chairperson then turned to criteria R.2, R.3, R.4, and the amendments proposed by Palestine, which were all duly adopted. Paragraph 2 was thus adopted as a whole. The Chairperson proceeded to paragraph 3 as amended by Palestine, which was duly adopted.
26. The delegation of **Palestine** had sought some clarifications from the submitting State, but was satisfied by the clarifications that had already been provided thanks to an earlier communication via mail dispatched to all delegations, including the Members of the Committee. Thus, all the Members supported the amendments. It took the opportunity to thank Senegal for its statement and joined in thanking the Evaluation Body for its work, which had been carried out thoroughly and correctly. The delegation agreed with the Body’s conclusions, but for the reasons advanced by Senegal, it requested the inscription of the element. Thus, this was not in contradiction with the recommendation of the Evaluation Body but took into account other considerations. The delegation concluded by proposing the inclusion of the standard paragraph.
27. The **Chairperson** asked the Secretary whether it was possible to proceed with this approach.
28. The **Secretary** explained that the provision of information by a letter sent to all Committee Members was considered as additional information, which was not allowed under the Rules of Procedure. As such, it could not accept the proposal by Palestine.
29. The delegation of **Palestine** accepted the explanation.
30. The **Chairperson** returned to the adoption of the decision as a whole. With no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.23 to inscribe ‘Argungu international fishing and cultural festival’ on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
31. The delegation of **Nigeria** heartily thanked the Government and people of Ethiopia for their warm hospitality, and expressed deep appreciation to the Members of the Evaluation Body and the Committee for the thorough assessment of its nomination file. Nigeria is a country of 170 million people, over 250 ethnic groups, 520 indigenous languages, and has an abundance of festivals. Nigeria has a diversity of cultures that have not been given due attention, and there are hundreds and thousands of edifying cultural practices and expressions demonstrating the diversity of the Nigerian people. Consequently, it was necessary to raise awareness about their importance through inscription on the Representative List. The Argungu international fishing festival was just one of the numerous fishing festivals in the country that had started as a community initiative. In the words of Ibrahim Hussein’s Kinjeketile, ‘a man gives birth to a word. It grows, and it grows bigger than the man who gave it birth’. Today, the Argungu fishing festival had grown beyond a village gathering, attracting and unifying people nationally and internationally. The delegation spoke of the many cultural elements in Nigeria that require urgent safeguarding measures for them to be sustained for future generations. It believed that the Convention was a veritable window to this in Nigeria, and indeed Africa, to bring to the fore its unique cultural endowments. The delegation recalled that so far Nigeria had three elements inscribed, one of which was a multilateral element shared with Benin and Togo, and it was making history with the addition of the Argungu fishing festival. It reiterated Nigeria’s commitment to carrying out the documentation of its rich and cherished ICH, and would further strategize to submit more nomination files to the Representative List in the future.
32. Congratulating Nigeria, the **Chairperson** informed the Committee of a request to examine the joint nomination submitted by Romania and the Republic of Moldova prior to the nomination by Romania.
33. The delegation of **Hungary** disagreed and wished to maintain the original order.
34. Noting the objection, the **Chairperson** maintained the original order, giving the floor to the Vice-Chairperson to present the nomination submitted by Romania.
35. The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the next nomination, **‘Whitsunday pilgrimage from Şumuleu Ciuc (Csíksomlyó)’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.25], submitted by Romania. The Whitsunday Pilgrimage of Şumuleu Ciuc in Romania attracts Roman Catholic communities and other religious communities every year. Thousands visit the Church of St Mary the Friday before, then the day after climb Şumuleu Mountain, passing four chapels symbolizing the hard road to everlasting life. Traditional songs are sung and an open air service is held with a communal meal afterwards. Reinforcing community connection, solidarity and educating people on other important social values, the cultural practice is transmitted by participating worshippers. The Evaluation Body had decided that, from the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.2, R.3 and R.4. The Whitsunday pilgrimage is a major ritual event that facilitates the free expression of religious and cultural values, and other important social and cultural functions. For this nomination, the file indicated that a diverse range of communities and institutions concerned had been involved from the beginning and provided evidence to this effect. The Evaluation Body had however decided that the information included in the file was not sufficient to determine whether R.5 was satisfied. The element had appeared in the Romanian Inventory of ICH since 2009. The file presented an extract of the register, but did not explain how the inventory was updated and how the communities concerned had participated in its preparation. The Evaluation Body decided to recommend a referral of the ‘Whitsunday pilgrimage from Şumuleu Ciuc (Csíksomlyó)’ for more information.
36. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chairperson for the detailed explanation, noting that no amendments had been presented, but there was a request for debate from Hungary.
37. Thanking Romania for its nomination, the delegation of **Hungary** noted that Romania had submitted two nominations, which bore testimony to its commitment to safeguarding the diversity of the ICH present in its territory. With regard to the nomination of the pilgrimage of Csíksomlyó, the delegation noted that only one criterion, R.5, was problematic. This issue was similar to files already covered during this session that had a similar problem. Nevertheless, the delegation described the nomination file as excellent. Criteria R.1, R.2, R.3 and R.4 were excellently written and well demonstrated, as confirmed by the Evaluation Body’s examination. In particular, criterion R.4 was a good example of community participation in the preparation of a nomination file. Indeed, the nomination process had begun in 2011 and included representatives of the Roman Catholic community, local administration, cultural institutions, NGOs, and professional associations who were all actively involved and had given their full consent, provided as written evidence. In addition, there were no customary practices that would restrict access to this element. In light of this, the delegation recognized that the file was well established, and it congratulated Romania for the professionalism behind the submission. With regard to R.5, the delegation referred to the other nomination from Romania [together with Moldova] in which R.5 also had a minor problem, but in this case, it was fully satisfied in Romania [but not in Moldova]. The Evaluation Body acknowledged that inscription on the national inventory in both countries had involved both the communities and NGOs concerned, and there was no problem identified in the updating mechanisms. The delegation thus felt that there may have been some misunderstandings in the file, and given that Romania had provided sufficient information in paragraph 5 on this issue, it considered R.5 to be sufficiently clear, i.e. that the national inventory of Romania had been prepared with the participation of the communities and was regularly updated. The delegation thus concluded that R.5 was fully met, and proposed an amendment to the draft decision in this regard. It fully supported the element’s inscription.
38. The **Chairperson** noted a point of order from Cyprus.
39. The delegation of **Cyprus** sought confirmation of the nomination file under examination, as this was not clear from the cited order.
40. The **Secretary** explained that a request had been made by one of the submitting States to reverse the order of files 25 and 26. However, there was an objection by Hungary and the original order was resumed, to first examine the file from Romania.
41. The delegation of **Cyprus** had not understood that the order had been maintained. In addition, Hungary’s intervention had referred to both nomination files.
42. The delegation of **Cuba** thanked Cyprus for shedding light on the file under examination, adding that it highlighted the importance of not referring to two separate nomination files at the same time. It asked Romania whether it objected to the recommendation by the Evaluation Body, adding that it was important for the Committee to understand the justification of the recommendation.
43. The **Chairperson** asked Cuba whether it had a specific question for Romania.
44. The delegation of **Cuba** wished to know whether Romania upheld the recommendation by the Evaluation Body to refer the nomination until the next cycle, given that it was the submitting State itself that was actually putting forward the nomination. The delegation noted that the Committee had been doing the opposite up until now.
45. The delegation of **Romania** thanked the Committee for its kind words on the two files. Considering that UNESCO procedures were of the utmost importance and in the best interests of the file, the delegation respected draft decision 10.b.25, and considered the recommendation by the Evaluation Body to be justified. Consequently, it accepted the advice and appreciated the time and opportunity to include the missing information, in accordance with the Evaluation Body, so that the element could be presented in the best possible way. The delegation added that the issues were not the same in its next submitted nomination, which required a brief clarification, whereas this file required more elaborate study.
46. Having listened attentively to Romania, the delegation of **Hungary** referred to its earlier intervention in which it alluded to a slight discrepancy in the two evaluations submitted by Romania with regard to its inventory, and it hoped that the Evaluation Body could elucidate this issue.
47. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Evaluation Body.
48. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** thanked Hungary for the opportunity to clarify how the Body worked, reiterating once again that it was very important to understand that the element itself was not being evaluated; it was always the file submitted by the State Party. He explained that when examining the files, the Body reached a consensus on each and every file, adding that inscription on the Representative List demanded that all the criteria be met. Thus, consistency in terms of the evaluation and treatment of the files was a principle of the utmost importance. In the case of the nomination in question, the Vice-Chairperson explained that during the evaluation it had been found that the information was not present in the file.
49. With due respect to Hungary, the delegation of **Philippines** did not understand why the two nominations files were being discussed at the same time, notwithstanding any similarities they might have, adding that files should be examined one at a time.
50. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** echoed the remarks by the Philippines in that the Committee should discuss and determine one file at a time, adding that an inconsistency in one would have consequences for the other. Moreover, the Evaluation Body had identified a problem in R.5 on the inventory, which should be clarified by Romania.
51. The delegation of **Hungary** agreed with the sentiment of the interventions made by the Philippines and Saint Lucia, adding that it only sought to save time in avoiding a question-and-answer session, but was happy to stick to one file only. The delegation sought an answer from Romania on how the communities were involved in the inventory process and how Romania updated its inventory.
52. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to Romania for the specific question by Hungary.
53. The delegation of **Romania** conceded that a more elaborate study was needed because although the inventory had been updated it had not received more recently updated information for a while. The delegation added that although the communities had been involved in preparing the file, this had not been described correctly in the file and required further elaboration. It therefore respected the decision by the Evaluation Body, as the highest authority in evaluating files.
54. The delegation of **Cyprus** did not understand why the Committee was continuing its discussion, as this was contrary to the decision of Romania, which preferred to re-submit an improved file in the next cycle.
55. The **Chairperson** proceeded to the draft decision, proposing its adoption as a whole.
56. Based on the information received, the delegation of **Hungary** proposed an amendment in the draft decision regarding R.5.
57. The **Chairperson** proposed proceeding on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. A point of order was called by Côte d’Ivoire.
58. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** remarked that based on the explanations given by the submitting State, Romania wished to withdraw its nomination and there was therefore no need to intervene.
59. The **Chairperson** asked Côte d’Ivoire whether it sought to ask Romania if it wished to withdraw its file.
60. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** confirmed that this was the case.
61. The **Chairperson** clarified that withdrawal and adoption were two different things. A point of order was called by Hungary.
62. The delegation of **Hungary** explained its understanding of the rules in that the submitting State could only be given the floor to answer specific questions and not on the procedure, adding that so far in the deliberations no other submitting State had had the right to intervene at the moment of the draft decision.
63. The **Secretary** noted that the question posed was whether or not Romania withdrew. From its intervention, Romania had not withdrawn its file but had accepted the Evaluation Body’s recommendation and wished to work further on its inventory. However, given that the debate had been opened, Romania could not at this stage withdraw its file.
64. The **Chairperson** remarked that the intervention by Côte d’Ivoire was thus a reminder to establish whether Romania did indeed withdraw. Agreeing with the Secretary, the Chairperson proceeded with the draft decision.
65. The delegation of **Cyprus** wondered about the procedure and why, since the file was closed, the decision was being adopted on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.
66. The **Secretary** explained that once the Committee had opened the debate on the draft decision and an amendment had been proposed, the Committee had to proceed on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis whether it agreed or not.
67. The **Chairperson** confirmed that Hungary had indeed requested an amendment and he turned to paragraph 1, which was duly adopted. Criteria R.1, R.2, R.3, R.4 in paragraph 2, with no amendments, were also adopted. The Chairperson gave the floor to Hungary for its possible amendment in R.5.
68. The delegation of **Hungary** proposed including R.5 in paragraph 2, and deleting the second sentence in R.5 to replace it with the standard paragraph, as previously adopted in other nominations, which would read, ‘The inventory is elaborated with the participation of communities and is regularly updated’.
69. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** strongly disagreed, adding that this situation was indeed very strange, as the submitting State had accepted the recommendation by the Evaluation Body, relating to problems in its inventory, and now another State was contradicting that decision. The delegation sought some clarification.
70. The delegation of **Cyprus** fully agreed with Saint Lucia, adding that this was ran counter to the decision of the submitting State as well as that of the Evaluation Body.
71. The delegation of **Austria** echoed the remarks made by Saint Lucia and Cyprus, adding that it too was confused about the situation.
72. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** was astonished at what was taking place: one submitting State had decided to accept the draft decision by the Evaluation Body while another country had sought inscription.
73. The delegation of **Philippines** was slightly flummoxed and shared the opinions voiced by Côte d’Ivoire, Saint Lucia, Cyprus and Austria.
74. The delegation of **Cuba** remarked that the Committee was creating precedence for future sessions, adding that it could not accept other States deciding to inscribe elements on behalf of submitting States. The delegation concurred that Romania had not withdrawn its nomination, but the Committee was not here to question the fundamental reasons behind the decisions of the submitting State. Nonetheless, it had to respect the procedures of the Committee as they currently stood, even though they might change in the future. At that moment in time, a submitting State had not withdrawn its nomination but had decided to accept the recommendations of the Evaluation Body. Thus, the Committee could not accept this very contradictory amendment, and although there might be reasons for it, the Committee should not confront them now. Indeed, they could be discussed in a later debate when these issues would arise again.
75. The delegation of **Senegal** reaffirmed the remarks by Cuba that the procedures had to be respected. It asked whether Hungary did indeed have the possibility or the right to propose an amendment, and it sought clarification from the Secretary. However, if Hungary had an opportunity to propose an amendment, then the Committee was also entitled to disagree and reject it. The delegation added that when Romania agreed to withdraw its nomination in one criterion, it should in reality receive a standing ovation.
76. The delegation of **Republic of Korea** expressed support for all the comments made.
77. The **Chairperson** noted that there was clearly no support for the amendment, and asked Hungary whether it would accept to withdraw its amendment.
78. The delegation of **Hungary** wished to respond to Members’ concerns. It noted that Romania had put forward a nomination, which had been duly evaluated by the Evaluation Body and been found excellent except for one criterion, R.5. Under the established procedures of the Committee, this criterion was clarified and the nomination now met all five criteria. This same criterion R.5 would also apply in the next file submitted by Romania. The delegation was unaware of a situation where this had happened before, i.e. a nomination that had met all five criteria being referred by the Committee. The delegation insisted that if this criterion were not met in this file, then it would not meet criterion R.5 in the upcoming file. The delegation believed that Romania’s nomination deserved to receive due consideration for its excellent nomination, having met all the criteria. Thus, in following its procedures, the Committee should inscribe the element.
79. The **Chairperson** noted that the amendment had not receivedbroad support, and with no objections, it was deleted and replaced with the original R.5 in paragraph 3, which was duly adopted. Hungary called for a point of order.
80. As this was the first time such an issue had occurred, the delegation of **Hungary** proposed a brief suspension of the meeting to allow for consultations.
81. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee if it would accept a suspension.
82. The delegation of **Algeria** endorseda suspension for further consultations, adding that the Committee was moving towards a dangerous politicization of the debates and that it would be wiser to consult before taking a decision.
83. The delegation of **Cyprus** recalled that both the Evaluation Body and the submitting State had agreed to refer the nomination, and thus there was no reason for a pause in the proceedings. The delegation explained that if indeed there was a political issue then the Committee was not the forum to resolve this, as it was discussing nominations of intangible heritage. It was thus better to move forward than continue on this point.
84. The **Chairperson** remarked that Rule 29 of the Rules of Procedure, regarding procedural motions, stated that during the discussion of any matter a State Member of the Committee could propose a procedural motion, suspension or adjournment of the meeting, adjournment of the debate or closure of the debate. Thus, under Rule 29, the Chairperson suspended the meeting for ten minutes.

*[A 10-minute suspension of the debate]*

1. The **Chairperson** returned to the adoption of paragraph 4, and with no objections, paragraph 4 ‘to refer’ was adopted. Turning to the adoption of the decision as a whole, and with no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.25 to refer ‘Whitsunday pilgrimage from Şumuleu Ciuc (Csíksomlyó)’ to the submitting State for more information**.
2. The delegation of **Romania** thanked the Chairperson and the Committee Members for its wise decision, adding that the professional technical procedures prevailed.
3. The delegation of **Hungary** agreed to go along with the consensus, even though it was surprised by the procedure. Nevertheless, it noted from its intervention that Romania had committed to the revision of its file and the reworking of R.5.
4. The **Chairperson** wished to make a slight change to the order of examination of files, as no Spanish and Arabic interpretation would be available in the extended session. He therefore proposed proceeding with the files submitted by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, followed by Switzerland and then Viet Nam. There were no objections.
5. The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the next nomination, **‘Carnival of El Callao, a festive representation of a memory and cultural identity’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.36], submitted by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. The Carnival of El Callao, practised in communities of Venezuela, is associated with emancipation celebrations in French-speaking islands of the Caribbean. Running from January to March, it features parades of people dressed as characters from history and fantasy, music, dancing and concerts throughout town streets with up to 3,000 people participating. The carnival highlights Callaoense history, reinforces its cultural identity, promotes unity and encourages younger generations to discover their heritage. Transmission occurs mainly within families and schools run by bearers. The Evaluation Body had decided that, from the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.2, R.3, and R.4. The Carnival of El Callao serves an important role for maintaining local memory and the sense of belonging and identity of the communities concerned. Various aspects associated with this carnival foster harmony and collective enjoyment, while showing respect for the diversity of other individuals, groups and communities. However, the Evaluation Body had decided that the information included in the file was not sufficient to determine whether R.5 was satisfied. The Carnival of El Callao was included in the Venezuelan Registry of Cultural Heritage, which had been prepared by the Institute of Cultural Heritage between 2004 and 2010, and evidence of this had been provided. However, the submitting State had not indicated how the community had participated in the inscription process and how regularly the inventory was updated. The Evaluation Body decided to recommend the referral of the ‘Carnival of El Callao, a festive representation of a memory and cultural identity’ to the submitting State for more information.
6. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chair for the detailed explanation, noting that no request for debate or amendment had been received.
7. The delegation of **Cuba** commended Venezuela for submitting its high-quality file, as reflected in the recommendation of the Evaluation Body for which it was thankful. However, it wished to put forward an amendment on criterion R.5 that, despite its evaluation, had shown that the element had been included in the Venezuelan inventory; evidence of community participation with the different legal processes had also been well documented. It noted that the Body had not found any specific indication of *how* the community had participated in the inscription process, and not that the community had not participated. The Committee should therefore reconsider the file.
8. The delegation of **Colombia** found that the El Callao carnival was crucial for the submitting State because it commemorated the French-speaking part of the country, which was an integral part of the country’s history. It believed that the evaluation should take into account certain elements with regard to R.5, for example, the very active participation of the community in the preparation of the file, and the fact that Venezuela had provided sufficient evidence of the work carried out between 2004 and 2014. With regard to the regular updating of the inventory, it also believed that the submitting State could respond to that issue. It thus wished to ask Venezuela to explain how exactly the community had participated in the inscription process and the inventory, and to provide information on the updating of the inventory.
9. The **Chairperson** noted thatColombia had addressed a specific question to Venezuela.
10. The delegation ofthe **Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela** began by thanking the Government of Ethiopia for its hospitality, as well as Cuba for requesting to open the debate and giving it the possibility to demonstrate that R.5 was satisfied, as outlined in the nomination file and mentioned by Colombia. The delegation spoke of the constant participation of the community both in the inscription process and in the inventory of the element, which had been carried out via a regular consultation process with community leaders. In addition, the administrative and legal reports and opinions drawn up by the Government were constantly updated, in conformity with Chapter 3 of the Operational Directives of the Convention. The registry file included in the nomination was the latest example of the regular updating process that had stemmed from local community research. These workshops were held with local bearers and practitioners, together with members of academia, which allowed the element to be characterized as absolutely crucial with regard to cultural identity. Thus, the nature of this registration had been highly participative since 2005 when it had been included in the Venezuelan Registry of Cultural Heritage, and in 2011, when the Madamas from Callao had also been included as part of the same inventory. A number of new research activities and documentation activities were carried out with regard to the bearers, which helped to further develop the descriptive elements of the carnival. As a result, in 2014, with the direct participation of 46 community bearers and leaders of this tradition, the submitting State had been able to provide the most updated version in the nomination file. With all these considerations, the submitting State requested that the Committee take a favourable view of the inscription of the Carnival of El Callao.
11. In the interests of time, the **Chairperson** wished to proceed to the adoption of the draft decision. With no objections, paragraph 1 was adopted. Criteria R.1, R.2, R.3 and R.4 in paragraph 2 were also adopted. The Chairperson turned to the amendment in R.5.
12. The delegation of **Cuba** proposed deleting paragraph 3 and moving paragraph R.5 to paragraph 2, deleting the sentences, ‘Further decides […]’, and, ‘However, the submitting State has not indicated […]’. Paragraph 3 would therefore read, ‘Decides to inscribe…’ and would include the standard paragraph ‘Thanks the delegation for the clarifications’, which would become the new paragraph 4.
13. The **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of criterion R.5, and with no objections, it was duly adopted. Paragraph 3 ‘to inscribe’ and the inserted standard paragraph 4 were also pronounced adopted. Turning to the adoption of the decision as a whole, and with no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.36 to inscribe ‘Carnival of El Callao, a festive representation of a memory and cultural identity’** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
14. The delegation of **Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela** warmly greeted the Chairperson, the Committee and all the delegates, and especially Ethiopia for its hard work in organizing this session. The delegation spoke of the value of its Constitution that extolled culture as a vehicle for peace in its very first pages, which defined the nation as a multi-ethnic and multicultural society. For this reason, it played an active part in the Convention in that every year it added an element of ICH to the Lists, which demonstrated the strength and the creativity of the people. The Carnival of El Callao embodied the memory of cultural identity that went beyond its geographical boundaries, to the Antilles and other areas of the Caribbean with African origins where English, French, Spanish, Creole and Patois were spoken. From those far-flung corners, this community was formed on top of the most famous gold mine in the country, and with the mining work that was done these people gradually built up ancestral customs that, over generations, enriched them, which President Hugo Chavez had defined as our *Americana*. The Americans, or ancestors, left the African continent and, because of historical circumstances, they suffered to give life in the Americas. The delegation asked whether it might be allowed to perform a tribute to the people of Africa, the people who struggled to achieve freedom, a song of joy and pain. The delegation concluded by thanking the Committee once again.
15. The **Chairperson** congratulated Venezuela for its kind words, adding that culture was indeed a vehicle for peace.

*[Musical performance]*

1. The **Chairperson** turned to the next nomination, submitted by Switzerland.
2. The **Vice-Chairperson** **of the Evaluation Body** presented the nomination **‘Winegrowers’ Festival in Vevey’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.32], submitted by Switzerland.The Winegrowers’ Festival is part of the living heritage of Vevey in Switzerland that recognizes the community’s winegrowers. Originally a pageant, it now features fifteen events over three weeks and 5,000 contributors. Based on a traditional theme with prizes for the best winegrowers, as well as music, food and processions to neighbouring La Tour-de-Peilz, the festival is run by the Vevey Brotherhood of Winegrowers with the help of additional volunteers. It encourages community spirit and artistic life and facilitates winegrower knowledge. The Evaluation Body decided that, from the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body was pleased that the proposed safeguarding measures include filmmaking, exhibitions, publications, training and projects in collaboration with the Lavaux World Heritage Association. The file also indicated that given the public nature of the element, the bearers had anticipated increased visibility and publicity and had devised means to manage this. The Evaluation Body had decided to recommend the inscription of the ‘Winegrowers’ Festival in Vevey’ on the Representative List.
3. Thanking the Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, the **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been put forward and thus proposed adopting the decision as a whole.With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.32 to inscribe ‘Winegrowers’ Festival in Vevey’** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
4. The delegation of **Switzerland** was very pleased to see the first Swiss element inscribed on UNESCO’s Lists of ICH. The Winegrowers’ Festival would now feature alongside the most diverse manifestations of human creativity throughout the world. It expressed its sincere thanks to the Evaluation Body for its in-depth analysis, and to the Committee for its decision. Having ratified the Convention in 2008, Switzerland had spent a great deal of time developing safeguarding measures and developing an inventory of intangible heritage on its territory. Today was thus the culmination of a long-term effort. It hoped that the element would soon be joined by other traditions that Switzerland intended to propose for inscription, and which were included in an indicative list validated in 2014. The originality of the Winegrowers’ Festival lay in its highlighting the links between tangible and intangible heritage. Recognizing this interdependence would thus strengthen the actors committed to preserving both the site and the culture associated with it. The success of Switzerland’s first nomination was attributed to the contributions made by the bearers. Through a video message, a representative of the **Confrérie des Vignerons** spoke of his honour and joy in accepting this decision, which was a tremendous joy for Switzerland, and an honour for the Vaud region, the Vevey commune and the entire population of the country. The representative spoke of the celebrations that would soon take place around the Winegrowers’ Festivalin 2019. The entire population was now celebrating in Vevey and applauded the decision for which it was eminently proud.
5. The **Chairperson** congratulated Switzerland. He informed the Committee that there might be a double extended session that evening, and that interpretation would be available throughout. He proceeded to the next nomination file, submitted by Viet Nam.
6. The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the next nomination, **‘Practices related to the** **Viet beliefs in the Mother Goddesses of Three Realms’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.37], submitted by Viet Nam.To meet spiritual needs, everyday wishes and gain help in achieving good health and success, communities in Viet Nam worship the Mother Goddesses of Three Realms: heaven, water, and mountains and forests. This includes the Mother of the World Lieu Hanh and other heroic spirits. The tradition involves daily worship, ceremonies, rituals and festivals. Transmitted by bearers such as temple priests, the activities provide a basis for social relations connecting the community and maintaining an aspect of its cultural heritage. The Evaluation Body had decided that, from the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. This practice is an important way for the communities concerned to express their historical memory, cultural identity, sense of togetherness and spiritual expectations. The file demonstrated that the open nature of the element promotes inter-ethnic and inter-religious tolerance. Since diverse ethnic groups in Viet Nam share the element, its inscription would also enhance dialogue and promote respect for cultural diversity locally. The Evaluation Body had decided to recommend the inscription of the ‘Practices related to the Viet beliefs in the Mother Goddesses of Three Realms’ on the Representative List.
7. Thanking the Vice-Chairperson, the **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been put forward and thus proposed adopting the decision as a whole.With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.37 to inscribe** ‘**Practices related to the** **Viet beliefs in the Mother Goddesses of Three Realms’** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
8. On behalf of its government, the delegation of **Viet Nam** offered its sincere thanks for this inscription, which had an important and multiple meaning. The community of believers had wished for this day for a very long time and the decision encouraged them for they were very proud of their cultural identity. The **Vice-Chair, People’s Council of Nam Dinh province** spoke on behalf of all people from Nam Dinh Province, lay people and followers of the beliefs in the Mother Goddesses who were watching the meeting and were immensely grateful for this inscription. This inscription has enormous significance; it testifies to the rich cultural identity of Viet Nam and its sense of togetherness, promotes cultural diversity, and encourages dialogue among individuals, communities and different ethnic groups. In conformity with UNESCO’s noble objectives of tolerance, compassion and grace, Viet Nam had long been giving importance to women and environmental protection, because the Mother Goddesses represent the Heaven Mother, Water Mother and Forest Mother. On behalf of the Nam Dinh People’s Committee and the local community, Vietnam was committed to carrying out the action plan on safeguarding these practices of the Việt beliefs. He expressed sincere thanks to the Evaluation Body, the Committee Members, and the Secretariat for its work and support.

*[A video of the element was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson** congratulated Viet Nam, and turned to the next nomination file, submitted by Romania and the Republic of Moldova.
2. The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the next nomination, **‘Traditional wall‑carpet craftsmanship in Romania and the Republic of Moldova’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.26], submitted by Romania and the Republic of Moldova. Traditionally, wall carpets produced by weaver communities of Romania and the Republic of Moldova were used for decoration, funerals, exhibitions and as part of a bride’s dowry. These days, they are mainly appreciated as works of art. Techniques have changed from vertical/horizontal looms practised in some parts to tight picking and other forms, with weavers now able to work from home. An expression of creativity and identity, and a tool for social cohesion, it is transmitted by families, craft centres and colleges. The Evaluation Body had decided that, from the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.2, R.3, and R.4. The file described the skill and art of wall-carpet weaving in Romania and the Republic of Moldova as an important element of community life and as a symbol of local and national identity, bringing together different sections of the communities concerned. The Body was pleased to learn that the communities concerned had launched initiatives in both countries to revive wall‑carpet craftsmanship. The Evaluation Body however decided that the information included in the file was not sufficient to determine whether R.5 was satisfied. The element had been registered since 2009 in the Romanian Repertory of ICH, and since 2012 in the National Inventory of the ICH of the Republic of Moldova. An updating mechanism had been initiated in Romania, but information on updating mechanisms in the Republic of Moldova was missing from the file. The Evaluation Body had decided to recommend a referral of the ‘Traditional wall-carpet craftsmanship in Romania and the Republic of Moldova’ to the submitting States for more information.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chair for the detailed explanation, and noted that a request had been received for debate as well as an amendment.
4. The delegation of **Bulgaria** had carefully studied the comments made by the Evaluation Body on the nomination, and thanked its Members for their extensive work. It believed that the nomination presented by the two countries was well constructed and complete, and that details on the mechanism for updating the national inventory in both Romania and Moldova were included and explained. Thus, the nomination file met the requirements of criterion R.5. That being so, it sought further details on the updating of the inventories from the submitting States.
5. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the submitting States for clarification.
6. The delegation of **Romania** remarked that further details was a matter of interpretation of the Moldavian legislation and preferred that Moldavia reply first.
7. Regarding the mechanism of updating the inventory, the delegation of the **Republic of Moldova** explained that this had been outlined in the nomination form on page 21 item 5, which underlined the statement by the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Moldova and its competent body. Regarding the draft decision on missing information on updating mechanisms, the delegation felt that this was a matter of wording, as it fully complied with the requirements of Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention and was also in line with the national legislation of the Republic of Moldova, and as such was complete. The inventory is managed by the Ministry of Culture and is permanently updated, often by the experts of the National Commission for Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage who remain in permanent contact with representatives of the communities, NGOs and local institutions. Consequently, as indicated in the file, the Moldavian national inventory Volume A is prepared by the National Commission for Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage, with contributions from experts, representatives of civil society and bearer communities. In addition, in line with national legislation, the Minister of Culture, through the National Commission for Intangible Cultural Heritage, is responsible for maintaining the inventory, approving regulation documents, the permanent updating of the files of each element included in the Registry with the participation of researchers, specialists, bearer communities and relevant NGOs, and the publication of paper and web resources. Maintaining the inventory implies, from the national and legal perspective, a *sine qua non* condition of permanent updating of the inventory. Based on this qualification, both the Republic of Moldova and Romania consider that the ‘missing information’ was more a matter of clarification and an accurate interpretation of the text.
8. The delegation of **Romania** kindly suggested and recommended that the Committee not refer this file as with the previous nomination, as things were totally different.
9. The **Chairperson** reminded Romania to answer the question only.
10. The delegation of **Romania** wished to underline the importance of this file, as had been manifested by the Ministers of Culture of Romania and the Republic of Moldova through a common letter brought to the Chairperson’s attention. Other than the technical remark by the Evaluation Body, both ministers agreed that all five criteria were completely fulfilled in accordance with national legislation, enabling the inscription of the element. The delegation remarked that this was the third common file with the Republic of Moldova, which clearly illustrated their common cultural values and national heritage.
11. The delegation of **Cuba** accepted the explanation presented by Moldova and thus supported inscription.
12. The delegation of **Armenia** was also in favour of inscription, especially given the clear explanation by Moldova.
13. The **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. The Chairperson noted that Austria was also in favour. With no objections to paragraph 1, it was duly adopted. Criteria R.1, R.2, R.3 and R.4 were also adopted without objection. Criterion R.5 with the proposed amendment by Bulgaria was duly adopted as amended. Paragraph 3 ‘to inscribe’, as amended by Bulgaria, was adopted with no objection. The standard paragraph 4 was inserted into the decision.
14. The delegation of **Palestine** indicated a correction in that there were two delegations.
15. The **Chairperson** remarked that the grammar would be corrected. With no further objections or comments, paragraph 4 was adopted. He then turned to the adoption of the decision as a whole.With no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.26 to inscribe ‘Traditional wall-carpet craftsmanship in Romania and the Republic of Moldova’ on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
16. The delegation of **Romania** remarked that UNESCO had come to a time when it was renewing its intangible heritage with new elements, adding that not only national but regional values had come to the fore and claimed importance on the world’s heritage map. Today’s inscription of the traditional wall-carpet craftsmanship was a step forward to fully understanding safeguarding and what it was necessary to share and to leave behind for generations to come. The day was made even more special by the fact that the Romanian people were joyfully celebrating their National Day. The delegation spoke of testimonial history that shows how culture, intangible or tangible heritage, and traditions were bonds and ties that brought people together to speak a common language and lead to common projects. It addressed thanks to the Committee and the States who fully acknowledged the importance of this adoption. Therefore, on behalf of the two governments, sincere and kind thanks were expressed for this recognition. The delegation also paid tribute to the efforts, understanding and dedication of the bearers and communities involved, and finally to the Ethiopian Government and all the bodies involved for their outstanding hospitality in hosting this important meeting. It assured the Committee that both Romania and the Republic of Moldavia would identify and present new elements of their culture to extend UNESCO’s heritage.
17. The delegation of the **Republic of Moldova** thanked all the delegates for their support and understanding, on behalf of the Ministry of Culture. It was very proud that the element had been inscribed on the Representative List, adding that it would contribute greatly to developing, evaluating and understanding the importance of its carpets, while offering greater visibility.
18. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Secretary for some practical announcements.
19. The **Secretary** drew the Committee’s attention to the fact that it was seriously behind schedule, adding that there were essential agenda items that required adoption and therefore had to be addressed for the evaluation cycle in 2017 to happen. It was thus imperative to finalize agenda item 10, and possibly suspend non-essential agenda items. The Secretary therefore proposed two extended evening sessions with an hour’s pause after the first evening session during which time the delegation of Turkey would be hosting a reception.

*[Thursday, 1 December 2016, evening session, Part I]*

1. The **Chairperson** proceeded to the next file, submitted by Slovakia and Czechia.
2. The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the next nomination, **‘Puppetry in Slovakia and Czechia’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.28], submitted by Slovakia and Czechia. Puppet theatre for communities in Slovakia and the Czech Republic is a popular form of traditional folk entertainment but also a way of conveying a vision of the world and teaching moral values. An integral part of local theatre and literary tradition, it contributes to socialization, creativity and participant identity. Featuring puppets mostly made of wood and animated using various methods, the traditional cultural practice is transmitted by performer communities and puppetry dynasties, not-for-profit organizations and music and arts schools. The Evaluation Body had decided that, from the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.2, R.3 and R4. The file indicated that the bearers of the element lay at the centre of past and current efforts to ensure its viability, with the support of the submitting States. The communities, groups and individuals concerned, through their representatives, associations and collaborating institutions from both submitting States, had actively participated in the nomination process. However, the Evaluation Body had decided that the information included in the file was not sufficient to determine whether R.5 was satisfied. The element had been registered on the Representative List of ICH of Slovakia since 2013, and on the List of Intangible Properties of Traditional and Folk Culture of the Czech Republic since 2014. Although the element had been included in these inventories with the active participation of the communities, groups and NGOs concerned, the file did not provide information on the updating mechanisms. The Evaluation Body had therefore decided to recommend a referral of the ‘Puppetry in Slovakia and Czechia’ to the submitting States for more information.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chair for this detailed explanation of the different issues, noting that a request for debate and an amendment had been presented.
4. The delegation of **Austria** commended both States Parties for submitting the multinational nomination file. It appreciated the fact that the file had been prepared in close cooperation at the level of the State, the institutions concerned, and especially the community. The Evaluation Body had found that, from the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1 to R.4. However, concerning R.5, the Evaluation Body had concluded that the information in the nomination file was not sufficient, because it had not found any clear mention of the regular updating of the national lists. The delegation appreciated the profound and in-depth analysis of the Evaluation Body. Nonetheless, it drew the Committee’s attention to the fact that an unfortunate technical inadequacy had resulted in a wrong impression. From the information and links provided in the nomination file, the inventory of Slovakia was indeed regularly updated. The information was also accessible on the webpage mentioned in the nomination file. In Czechia, the nomination stated that the list of intangible properties of traditional and folk culture of Czechia was updated annually. The safeguarding measures related to the inscribed elements were regularly evaluated according to the guidelines for maintaining the national list, and were available in English on the same webpage. Furthermore, the delegation recalled the periodic report of Czechia that was examined under agenda item 9.a. With this in mind, the delegation considered that the information contained in the nomination file was sufficient, and proposed an amendment to the draft decision as regards R.5. It also wished to ask the States Parties to clarify how the national lists were regularly updated.
5. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the submitting States to respond.
6. The delegation of **Czechia** thanked the Committee for the opportunity to speak, adding that it would do so on behalf of both submitting States. Firstly, it thanked the Evaluation Body, whose expertise it greatly appreciated, and also the Committee for its in-depth review of the nomination file. The delegation confirmed, without hesitation, that the national inventories of Slovakia and Czechia were updated annually and that the safeguarding measures were also regularly evaluated. It believed in good faith that the information on the updating of these inventories, provided in the relevant section of the nomination form, was sufficiently clear and evident, particularly the information contained on the webpages of the national inventories in English. In addition, the mechanisms for updating the two national inventories were identical to those for elements previously inscribed on the Representative List. The delegation had tried its best in section 5 to provide the most comprehensive response possible and to describe precisely how the inventories were administered, while focusing on the proposed element itself. This was made difficult owing to the strict word limit in the section concerned, for information concerning two submitting States. The delegation conceded that some confusion might have occurred when the entire website of the Ministry of Culture of Czechia had been updated in 2016. However, the link was automatically replaced with the updated version in the nomination file. The delegation spoke of the commitment by both countries to safeguard ICH and to comply with the provisions of the Convention, namely Article 12 on the development and regular updating of national inventories. It would have appreciated more precise instructions on how this information should be better communicated in the form, and it welcomed the changes to come in this regard. The delegation had found the preparation of a multinational file to be a great experience, especially with regard to the historical context of the two countries. Following the peaceful division of the Czechoslovak Federal Republic into two independent states in 1993, this joint nomination marked the first manifestation of the mutual relationship and respect for culture that was shared by both countries, as well as family links and the related language of both countries.
7. The **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraph 1, with no objections, was duly adopted. Criteria R.1, R.2, R.3 and R.4 in paragraph 2 were also pronounced adopted. The Chairperson turned to criterion R.5 and the amendment from Austria. With no objections, criterion R.5, and therefore paragraph 2, were adopted. Paragraph 3 ‘to inscribe’, as amended by Austria, was also adopted. The standard paragraph was adopted. He then turned to the adoption of the decision as a whole.With no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.28 to inscribe ‘Puppetry in Slovakia and Czechia’ on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
8. The delegation of **Czechia** was moved by this inscription and expressed deep gratitude to the Committee, the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat on behalf of the communities of bearers of the element on both sides of the Czech-Slovak border, as well as all those who had participated in the preparation of the joint nomination. The delegation assured the Committee of its commitment to the implementation of the safeguarding measures and the promotion of the Convention and ICH. The delegation reiterated its thanks for the support, with a special mention for Austria, and it took the opportunity to salute its Slovak colleagues and friends who had unfortunately been unable to attend.
9. The **Chairperson** congratulated Slovakia and Czechia, and turned to the next nomination file, submitted by Slovenia.
10. The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the next nomination, **‘Škofja Loka passion play’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.29], submitted by Slovenia. In Škofja Loka, Slovenia, a folk play procession takes place in the town’s medieval centre during Lent and Easter. The Škofja Loka Passion Play, based on the ancient works of a Capuchin monk, demonstrates twenty scenes of the stations of the cross and others from the Old Testament and New Testament involving 900 local performers and 400 additional volunteers. Performed every six years, it is considered to contribute to community identity and cohesion, transmitted by families, schools and local craftspeople. The Evaluation Body had decided that, from the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.2, R.3 and R.4. The file outlined the social and cultural functions of the element in respect to common activities, enhancing self-esteem and visibility and connectivity among communities and across generations. The proposed safeguarding measures focused on strengthening transmission, promotion and education, and attention was given to the transmission of the element to young people. Furthermore, local people, groups and communities had been actively involved in planning and implementing these measures. The Evaluation Body had decided that the information included in the file was not sufficient to determine whether R.5 was satisfied. In 2008, the element had been included on the National Register of Living Cultural Heritage of Slovenia. The bearers that create, maintain and transmit the element had actively participated in the process. However, information was lacking regarding its regular updating. The Evaluation Body had therefore decided to recommend a referral of the ‘Škofja Loka passion play’for more information.
11. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chair for the detailed explanation, noting that a request for debate and an amendment had been received.
12. The delegation of **Austria** expressed once again its appreciation for the work of the Evaluation Body. It noted the very positive report from the Evaluation Body that stated how the inscription of the element would enhance awareness and visibility of heritage in other parts of the country and Europe, as the element had already encouraged other passion plays in Slovenia and beyond. The Evaluation Body considered that only criterion R.5 was not satisfied owing to a lack of information on regular updating. The delegation felt that a technical error and unlucky timing had given the wrong impression. From the nomination form, it had found that the element had been included in the National Register of Living Cultural Heritage of Slovenia in 2008, maintained by the Ministry of Culture, and that the bearers had actively participated in the process of its inclusion in the register. After carefully examining the file, the delegation had found that the link provided to the inventory was inactive and therefore inaccessible to the Evaluation Body. However, it had since been informed that access to the register had been changed at the end of May 2016, following changes to the terminology of the Cultural Heritage Protection Act, but that the register was now publicly available. The delegation acknowledged that the Evaluation Body could only evaluate information provided in the file. However, it was clear from the website that the national inventory of Slovenia was indeed regularly updated. With this in mind, it proposed an amendment to the draft decision in criterion R.5. It also wished to hear from the State Party as to how the national list was regularly updated, and it sought to hear from the Evaluation Body whether it considered the clarification satisfactory.
13. The **Chairperson** proceeded to the draft decision, asking Austria if it had a clear question for the submitting State or the Evaluation Body.
14. The delegation of **Austria** reiterated that it wished to know from the submitting State how the national list was regularly updated, and whether the Evaluation Body found the clarification satisfactory.
15. The **Chairperson** first invited Slovenia to respond to the specific question.
16. Thedelegation of **Slovenia** thanked the Chairperson, the Committee, and especially Austria for the opportunity to provide an explanation on R.5. Thanking the Evaluation Body, the delegation noted that the Body’s report had found that criterion R.5 was not met, which it attributed to an unfortunate technical change in the file at the time of submission. However, the Committee had been officially informed about this change. It explained that the Convention had been formally transferred into Slovene legislation through its Cultural Heritage Protection Act of 2008. Since that year, in conformity with this Act, Slovenia has regularly kept an inventory of ICH in the Register of the ICH, which was regularly updated by the Ministry of Culture. At the end of May 2016, changes had been made to the terminology in the Cultural Heritage Protection Act that disabled access to the register online, though the correct website address had since been provided. In 2008, Škofja Loka Passion Play was the first element included in the register, which currently contains 56 elements. Representatives regularly report on the status of the register at annual regional UNESCO meetings of ICH experts and other professional gatherings where the Slovene register was often praised for the dynamic way in which bearers were inventoried. Thus, changing, reviving and regularly updating the register was incorporated into the system itself. This was also reported in the country’s first periodic report, which had been submitted to UNESCO in December 2014. These clarifications thus proved that the register was regularly updated and fully complied with R.5.
17. The **Vice-Chairperson** **of the Evaluation Body** thanked Austria for the opportunity to explain some of these challenges, adding that the Evaluation Body had really made an effort in this case. It had looked hard to find the information, and was unable to access the crucial information on the website. Moreover, this information was not in the text box. He recommended that in future submitting States always place crucial information in the text box in order to avoid misunderstandings and save time. The Vice-Chairperson was aware of the importance of the Representative List, underlining that the Body took its work very seriously. It was also aware that inscription called for all five criteria to be met, which was why consistency was important for the sake of fairness. Nevertheless, in the spirit of this meeting, it appreciated the clarification.
18. The **Chairperson** proposed proceeding to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraph 1, with no objections, was duly adopted. Criteria R.1, R.2, R.3 and R.4 in paragraph 2 were was also pronounced adopted. Criterion R.5, as amended by Austria, was also adopted, and thus paragraph 2 as a whole was adopted. With no objections to paragraph 3 ‘to inscribe’, amended by Austria, it was duly adopted. The standard paragraph was inserted as a new paragraph 4, and was duly adopted. The Chairperson then turned to the adoption of the decision as a whole.With no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.29 to inscribe ‘Škofja Loka passion play’ on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
19. The delegation of **Slovenia** spoke of its great pleasure in extending its gratitude to the Evaluation Body and to the Committee, particularly the Austrian delegation. It was very proud to see the first Slovenian element inscribed on the Representative List, which was the result of very extensive and excellent work by the many people involved in this process, above all the community of Škofja Loka where this event had been taking place for 300 years. [Another speaker] **A representative of Škofja Loka** spoke on behalf of the Municipality of Škofja Loka, its Mayor Miha Ješe, and the many generations of Škofja Loka citizens and volunteers who worked on and were involved in the performance of Škofja Loka Passion Play, to convey their thanks and gratitude to the Committee. The values of Škofja Loka Passion Play are strengthening community bonds, recreating the community itself and respecting the past. The representative explained that the Škofja Loka Passion Play was acted by people for the people with more than 900 actors performing in the procession, adding that the play revisited the eternal question about the essence of human existence at a time when, in the search for wealth and haste, we forget to take care of other people and to relax. The inscription therefore recognized the efforts of the local community and the performers. The delegates were invited to Škofja Loka in Slovenia in 2021, which would mark 300 years since the first script of Škofja Loka Passion Play had been written.
20. The **Chairperson** thanked Slovenia, and turned to the next nomination submitted by Sri Lanka.
21. The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the next nomination, **‘Traditional art of string puppetry in Sri Lanka’[[7]](#footnote-8)** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.31], submitted by Sri Lanka.String puppetry is a traditional practice of Gamwari communities in southern Sri Lanka designed to entertain and educate audiences with stories about folklore, history, religion and issues related to social injustice. Humour is also part of the narrative, as well as singing and music. Considered an important medium for communication, it also works to enhance socialization and educate young people in rural communities. Transmitted informally mainly within families, performances can be seen at public halls and temples, particularly during festivals. While the Evaluation Body had decided that the element constituted ICH as defined in Article 2 of the Convention, more information was required in order to determine whether criteria R.2, R.3, R.4 and R.5 were satisfied. As for R.2, the file did not adequately explain how inscription would increase the visibility of ICH in general. Also, it was thought that more attention should be given to the possible negative impacts of commercialization and the need to avoid any danger of de-contextualization of the element as a result of increased tourism. Concerning the safeguarding measures, they focused on protection, documentation, the training of young people, and dissemination to a large public through tourism. More details were however needed as to the ways in which the relevant community had been involved in the development of these measures, while ensuring that the element was not frozen in time but allowed to be constantly re-created. The possible negative effects resulting from tourism and commercialization needed to be addressed with preventive or mitigating measures. As for community participation, the evidence submitted to attest to the consent to the nomination was primarily from organizations/institutions rather than from the communities concerned. As for R.5, no information was provided regarding the participation of communities, groups and relevant NGOs in the preparation of this entry. Information was also required on the proposed future updates of the inventory. The Evaluation Body had decided to recommend a referral of the ‘Traditional art of string puppetry in Sri Lanka’ to the submitting State for more information.
22. Thanking the Vice-Chairperson, the **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been put forward and thus proposed adopting the decision as a whole.With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.31 to refer ‘Traditional art of string puppetry in Sri Lanka’ to the submitting State for more information**.
23. The delegation of **Sri Lanka** thanked the Government of Ethiopia and the Ethiopian National Commission for UNESCO for their hospitality, as well as UNESCO for its invitation as an Observer. When it had first attended the sessions, it had wished to request to open the file for debate. However, after seeing the extremely rigorous nature of the deliberations taking place in redressing the deficiencies in nominations, it had come to realize the difficulty of re-evaluating the four criteria not satisfied by its nomination. However, through UNESCO’s transparent, democratic and extremely vigorous procedure in terms of evaluations and adoption over the last few days, the delegation had learned and gained experience about the preparation of nominations, which it would use when preparing its re-submission, to satisfy all five criteria. It therefore humbly and sincerely accepted and honored the recommendation of the Evaluation Body, and looked forward to resubmitting the revised proposal and submitting many more proposals in the future. It thanked the Evaluation Body for its excellent feedback on its nomination file.
24. The **Chairperson** thanked Sri Lanka, and turned to the next nomination submitted by Tajikistan.
25. The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the next nomination, **‘Oshi Palav, a traditional meal and its social and cultural contexts in Tajikistan’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.33], submitted by Tajikistan.Oshi palav (pilaf) is a traditional dish of communities in Tajikistan recognized as a part of their cultural heritage. The ‘King of meals’ is based on a recipe using vegetables, rice, meat and spices, but up to 200 varieties exist. Considered an inclusive practice that brings people of different backgrounds together, it is prepared to be enjoyed at regular mealtimes, as well as social gatherings, celebrations and rituals. Skills associated with the practice are transmitted in families and cooking schools. The Evaluation Body had decided that, from the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. To safeguard Oshi palav, the submitting State proposed collaborating closely with NGOs, communities and individuals concerned in the implementation of further safeguarding measures. The involvement of communities, groups or individuals in the planning and implementation of the proposed measures appeared assured. The Evaluation Body had decided to recommend the inscription of ‘Oshi Palav, a traditional meal and its social and cultural contexts in Tajikistan’ on the Representative List.
26. Thanking the Vice-Chairperson, the **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been put forward and thus proposed adopting the decision as a whole.With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.33 to inscribe ‘Oshi Palav, a traditional meal and its social and cultural contexts in Tajikistan’ on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
27. The delegation of **Tajikistan** spoke on behalf of the Tajik people to express thanks to Ethiopia for its warm hospitality and for organizing this very important meeting. It also expressed its utmost gratitude to the Committee and the Evaluation Body for the decision to inscribe the element on the Representative List. The element was not the property of the Tajik people, but it was part of the cultural diversity of humanity. The most important task now was to put these elements into practice for new generations. Finally, it expressed special thanks to the Islamic Republic of Iran for coordinating the multinational file on ‘Nowruz’.
28. The **Chairperson** congratulated Tajikistan, and turned to the next nomination submitted by Turkey.
29. The **Vice-Chairperson** **of the Evaluation Body** presented the nomination, **‘Traditional craftsmanship of Çini-making’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.34], submitted by Turkey. Çini are traditional handmade glazed tiles and ceramics made in Turkey with colourful motifs found on building facades and in homes. The designs, representing local customs and beliefs, are drilled on paper, transferred to the surface with hand-drawn contours, then the work is dyed, glazed and fired. Practised formally and informally in traditional workshops, public education centres, universities and in the home, çini making is considered an outlet for self-expression, development, healing and a symbolic aspect of Turkey’s cultural identity. The Evaluation Body had decided that, from the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The file described the element’s cultural function as well as its social functions, and stated that it serves as a base for cultural continuity and a sense of identity. It emphasized that çini making is an example of aesthetic dynamism and human creativity. Its inscription would thus promote respect for human creativity and encourage çini craftspeople to safeguard and improve their traditional knowledge and skills against industrial production and imported products. The Evaluation Body decided to recommend the inscription of the ‘Traditional craftsmanship of Çini-making’ on the Representative List.
30. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for the detailed explanation, and noted that no requests for amendment had been received.
31. The delegation of **Armenia** found this nomination the most interesting, partly because of the fact that the delegate was one-quarter Kütahya Armenian and that his family had had a production of Kütahya Armenian pottery in the city until 1921. Nevertheless, the delegation found some inconsistencies and inaccuracies with regard to adjectives using history and references to the adjective ‘Turkish’. For example, in section 1, ‘the Turkish art of çini since the 12th century’ was indicated. Another inaccuracy was the fact that it neglected to mention other bearers of çini craftsmanship who continue their art and trade outside Kütahya or Iznik. It was said that reference should be made to the fact that after 1920, 1921 and 1922 the pottery craft of Kütahya also developed in three other centres. During the British occupation of Jerusalem, just before World War I, the British employed Armenian potters from Kütahya, who worked on the restoration of tile panels on the Dome of the Rock and the production of Kütahya ceramics had continued in Jerusalem since then. In this regard, the delegation recalled that Palestine had organized an exhibition at UNESCO Headquarters depicting the production of Kütahya ceramics, which was now based in Jerusalem. Another branch of this same production had moved to Athens in 1921. These Armenian and Greek craftsmen continued their craft in Greece. The third wave of these people moved to Armenia, where the trade still continues. So the bearers and practitioners of this element do not solely live in the territory of Turkey, as mentioned in the nomination. In addition, in section 2, it stated that çini-making is regarded as ‘unique to just those regions’, which the delegation considered as an incorrect statement. The delegation alluded to the oldest and most famous product of Kütahya ceramics, an Armenian-inscribed small ewer made by Master Abraham of Kütahya, which had been made in 1510 and was now in the British Museum catalogued under Kütahya Armenian ceramics. Notwithstanding these remarks, the delegation would go with the existing consensus.
32. Taking note of the statement, the **Chairperson** noted no further comments and thus proposed adopting the decision as a whole.With no objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.34 to inscribe ‘Traditional craftsmanship of Çini-making’ on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
33. In response to issues raised during the debate, the delegation of **Turkey** recalled that States Parties to the Convention submit nomination files on the basis of relevant criteria that are very clearly enshrined in the Operational Directives, based on which the Evaluation Body makes its assessment. The delegation then cited paragraph 51 of the aide-memoire and the ICH-02 Form for nominations to the Representative List, which states that ‘Nomination files need not address in detail the history of the element, or its origin or antiquity’. Thus, the historical development of the element of ICH concerned was not a yardstick in the assessment of nomination files by the Evaluation Body. The delegation also quoted from paragraph 34 of the Evaluation Body’s report, which stated that ‘Although making abstraction of the historical context in which an element is situated is both unrealistic and unhelpful, and considering that any attempt to freeze an element in time is discouraged, the Body evaluates its current practice and meaning rather than its past significance’. Therefore, the Committee is asked to discuss the current status of ICH elements rather than its historical context. On the other hand, in some elements, the practitioners may be groups, or individuals, rather than communities, as mentioned in Articles 1 and 2 of the Convention, and widely reflected in the Basic Texts of the Convention. With regard to this nomination, the practitioners are professionals who acquired their skills through the transmission of ICH, and thus ethnic or religious background was irrelevant. Çini-making is practised by craftspeople called Kâşiger, Kâşigerân, Çinici or Sırçacı, as mentioned in the file, whose names emanate from the art itself and it has no ethnic connotations. In order to clarify the state of the current practice of the element, the delegation cited from its file, ‘The art of çini is open to anyone regardless of his/her age, gender, religious belief or ethnic origin. Anyone who wants to learn the çini-making or express herself through the art of çini can freely perform this art.’ The Convention therefore did not restrict other countries from having a similar element. The delegation, speaking on behalf of the Turkish Permanent Delegation to UNESCO, the Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism and the Turkish National Commission for UNESCO, thanked the Committee for inscribing the element on the Representative List, adding that it would be welcomed by the wider public in Turkey, as çini-making is a well-known craft in the country. It would further encourage practitioners, craftspeople, trainers and lovers of the craftsmanship of çini-making in Turkey, increasing its visibility and strengthening the element. The delegation was fully committed to the safeguarding measures to sustain and further strengthen the traditional craftsmanship of çini-making as a living element of ICH. The increasing number of files from Turkey on the Representative List was seen as a reflection of the wealth of its culture and of the commitment of its authorities.

*[A film on çini-making was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson** congratulated Turkey, and turned to the final nomination file, submitted by Uzbekistan.
2. The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the next nomination, **‘Palov culture and tradition’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.b.35], submitted by Uzbekistan.There is a saying in Uzbekistan that guests can only leave the host’s house after palov has been offered. Prepared with rice, meat, spices and vegetables, the traditional dish is also enjoyed as a regular meal, to celebrate special occasions, help those in need or honour loved ones who have passed away. Transmitted from master to apprentice, within families, peer groups and community-based institutions, the practice acts to strengthen social ties, promote solidarity and is part of the community’s cultural identity. The Evaluation Body, after careful examination, had decided that the nomination satisfied all five criteria. Palov culture and tradition appears in many traditional rituals and conveys the values of solidarity, tolerance, hospitality, charity and respect for neighbours. Groups practising the element in each region of Uzbekistan were clearly identified, as well as the formal and informal mechanisms used to transmit associated knowledge and skills. The file clearly demonstrated that communities, municipalities, professional associations and State institutions had been involved in planning the safeguarding measures and would continue to participate in their implementation. The Evaluation Body had decided to recommend the inscription of the ‘Palov culture and tradition’ on the Representative List.
3. Thanking the Vice-Chairperson, the **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been put forward and thus proposed adopting the decision as a whole.With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.b.35 to inscribe ‘Palov culture and tradition’ on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
4. The **Chairperson** congratulated the delegation of Uzbekistan, which was not in attendance. He informed the Committee that it had completed the examination of all the nominations to the Representative List, and he thanked the Members for their support. He proceeded to the examination of agenda item 10.c and proposals to the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices, before returning to the examination of the overall draft decision 11.COM 10 that covered a number of cross-cutting issues common to the different mechanisms. The Committee had to examine seven proposals, and evaluate to what extent they best reflected the principles and objectives of the Convention, taking into account the special needs of developing countries. Before starting to examine the proposals, he wished to remind the Committee of the criteria that would guide the decisions, which were duly shown on the screen.

**ITEM 10.c OF THE AGENDA:**

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

**Document** [*ITH/16/11.COM/10.c*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-10.c-EN.docx)

**Proposals**[*7 proposals*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/10c-register-00892)

**Decision** *11.COM 10.c*

*[The Vice-Chairperson from Turkey chaired this session]*

1. The **Vice-Chair** recalled that the submitting State Party was requested to demonstrate that an element satisfied all the criteria: P.1, P.2, P.3, P.4, P.5, P.6, P.7, P.8 and P.9, and turned to the first proposal submitted by Argentina.
2. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the first proposal, **‘The Randas of time, a safeguarding model of textile art at El Cercado’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.c.1], submitted by Argentina. The Randa is an intricate, decorative craftwork mainly found in El Cercado, Argentina, and is part of the community’s cultural heritage. Seen in churches, homes and on garments, nowadays fewer than fifty practitioners exist due to inadequate buyer prices and access to supplies. Since 2012, they have implemented safeguarding measures in collaboration with Argentina's Ministry of Culture, municipalities and other bodies, such as: research and documentation on the practice; public workshops, including for tourists; a Randas Festival; and a Crafts Market. Although the file demonstrates that the randeras communities have been involved in the design of the programme from the beginning, the Evaluation Body had some difficulty in examining this nomination concerning many of the criteria. This was mainly due to the fact that the file presented a substantial part of the safeguarding measures as ongoing and ‘future’ activities. This was evident in the information provided in criteria P.1, P.2, P.4, and P.6. Consequently, this made it difficult to evaluate the effectiveness and replicability of the programme. In the description of the safeguarding measures, more information would have been welcome to justify all the measures and precisely how their need had been identified. This had also made it difficult for the Evaluation Body to clearly decide whether the programme reflected the principles and objectives of the Convention. As for P.6, the file also stopped short of demonstrating efficacy in strengthening the viability of the element beyond commercially-oriented production. In the light of these reasons, the Evaluation Body had decided to recommend not to select ‘the Randas of time, a safeguarding model of textile art at El Cercado’ for the Register.
3. The **Vice-Chair** thanked the Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for the detailed explanation, and noted that no requests for debate or amendment were presented.
4. The delegation of **Colombia** thanked the Evaluation Body for its evaluation, and Argentina for presenting its proposal that Colombia acknowledged as having the potential to become a recognized best practice. Bearing this in mind, it encouraged Argentina to continue working on improving its proposal. It asked the Committee to allow Argentina to take the floor to provide information on the next steps it would undertake in relation to its proposal.
5. Noting that there were no forthcoming speakers, the **Vice-Chair** gave the floor to Argentina.
6. The delegation of **Argentina** reiterated its commitment to intangible heritage, and thanked Colombia and the Committee for the opportunity to express how important this cultural practice was for the country. Randas is one of the recognized cultural practices in Argentina with more than two centuries of tradition. The practice has its roots in the family, where women and girls were fully involved in this textile art. The delegation spoke of the strong desire for the country and the communities concerned to inscribe this practice as an intangible best practice for humanity. The Ministry of Culture had been working very hard with the community to achieve this goal. However, it recognized that it needed to improve the process of documenting the participation processes that were ongoing. Finally, it welcomed the observations of the Evaluation Body and would continue its serious and committed work with the local communities in strengthening the strategies for the safeguarding of this important practice. Some time would be required to accomplish this goal, but the delegation hoped to bring the proposal back to the Committee in the near future.
7. The **Vice-Chair** turned to the draft decision and, noting that there were no amendments, proposed that the decision be adopted as a whole.With no comments or objections, the **Vice-Chair declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.c.1 not to select ‘The Randas of time, a safeguarding model of textile art at El Cercado’ to the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices**.
8. The delegation of **Argentina** conveyed thanks and appreciation for the decision.
9. The **Vice-Chair** thanked Argentina and turned to the next proposal, submitted by Austria.
10. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next proposal, **‘Regional Centres for Craftsmanship: a strategy for safeguarding the cultural heritage of traditional handicraft’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.c.2], submitted by Austria. For fifteen years, the Werkraum Bregenzerwald, Hand.Werk.Haus Salzkammergut, and Textiles Zentrum Haslach centres for craftsmanship in Austria, run by traditional craftspeople, had been working with international artists, educational and scientific bodies and craft businesses to help safeguard their practices for future generations. Governed by associations, the centres offer training programmes for the public and exhibitions involving local and international artists, as well as forums for exchange and partnerships between practitioners and industry to safeguard the practices important to community identity. The Evaluation Body had decided, from the information included in the file, that the programme satisfied all the criteria for selection as a best safeguarding practice, as described in paragraph 7 of the Operational Directives. This programme concerns three craft centres, initiated and governed by craftspeople. In cooperation with craft business and other institutions, the centres contribute to the continued practice of traditional knowledge and skills, while ensuring their ecological and economic sustainability through wide cooperation. The Evaluation Body had decided to recommend the selection of ‘Regional Centres for Craftsmanship: a strategy for safeguarding the cultural heritage of traditional handicraft’ to the Register.
11. Thanking the Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, the **Vice-Chair** noted that no amendments had been put forward and thus proposed that the decision be adopted as a whole.With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Vice-Chair declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.c.2 to select ‘Regional Centres for Craftsmanship: a strategy for safeguarding the cultural heritage of traditional handicraft’ to the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices**.
12. The delegation of **Austria** thanked the Chairperson and the Committee, remarking that the ‘regional centres for craftsmanship’ was Austria’s first element inscribed on the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. This instilled a sense of pride and satisfaction in being well on its way in the national implementation of the Convention. This is at the core of the Convention, particularly as sharing good safeguarding practices and international cooperation contribute most to achieving its aims. Traditional craftsmanship is characterized by liveliness and dynamism. However, over the last decades, craftsmanship in Austria has undergone constant change and an overall decrease in attractiveness. The three regional centres for craftsmanship had been established to promote cooperation and the exchange of ideas, to present a diversity of traditional craftsmanship and to educate and train the next generation of craftspeople. The delegation was delighted that the successful strategies of these regional initiatives could now be distributed and promoted among States Parties to support them in their own measures towards safeguarding traditional craftsmanship, an important part of the ICH of humanity. It thanked the Secretariat, the Evaluation Body and the Committee for their enormous work and dedication that help safeguard so many living traditions and strengthen so many communities’ identities.
13. The **Vice-Chair** congratulated Austria, turning to the next proposal, submitted by Bulgaria.
14. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next proposal, **‘Festival of folklore in Koprivshtitsa: a system of practices for heritage presentation and transmission’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.c.3], submitted by Bulgaria. The concept for the Festival of Folklore in Koprivshtitsa, where thousands of Bulgarians and the diaspora meet to perform living heritage practices, originated when local musicians saw that traditions were being endangered by factors such as urbanization and commodification. Involving the municipality, the Ministry of Culture, the Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Studies with the Ethnographic Museum, and the Institute for Art Studies and Bulgarian television and radio, it promotes the performance, transmission and documentation of community traditions attracting national and international audiences.The Evaluation Body had examined this file with some difficulties. While the file described the origin of the festival and its current activities, it did not fully explain the situation that had led to its creation nor the specific safeguarding needs that had been identified. A clearer description of the activities taking place in the festival would be useful. The file stated that the festival is a platform for cultural practices, but it should also discuss the risks of decontextualization of traditional folklore. Furthermore, the file needed to explain how the festival safeguards the social aspects of traditional practices. As for demonstrating the success of the project, the file presented the growing numbers of participants, visitors and audiences. However, the evidence was not sufficient to determine a deliberate transmission of the elements of intangible heritage highlighted at the festival. Furthermore, it was important to note that it may not be sufficient to perform elements of ICH in a festival in order to safeguard them effectively. The Evaluation Body had decided, based on the information in the nomination file, to recommend that ‘Festival of folklore in Koprivshtitsa: a system of practices for heritage presentation and transmission’ not be selected for the Register.
15. Noting the weariness of the Committee, the **Vice-Chair** proposedhaving a pause in the proceedings, and continuing with the inscriptions afterwards.
16. The delegation of **Ethiopia** wished to continue.
17. The **Vice-Chair** noted that an amendment had been received by Mongolia.
18. Having carefully examined the file, the delegation of **Mongolia** highly valued its quality, which succeeded in presenting in its complexity a very successful and sustainable system for the presentation, safeguarding and popularization of ICH in Bulgaria. This system of practices had been taking place for more than fifty years and involved hundreds of thousands of bearers representing different local communities, diverse forms of cultural practices and expressions, with different generations taking part in the presentation and transmission of heritage. The festival had received support from more than 20,000 community members, bearers and participants from Bulgaria and abroad, all of them indicating the efficiency of the system for safeguarding traditional cultural heritage in present-day circumstances. The delegation respected the expert opinion of the Evaluation Body, but at the same time considered that the significance of this system had not been reflected sufficiently in the draft decision. For this reason, it sought to open a discussion on this nomination file, proposing the following amendments to P.1, P.2, P.3, P.6 and P.9. With regard to the draft decision on P.1, the delegation explained that there were two paragraphs in the nomination file indicating the situation that had led to the creation of the festival and to the specific safeguarding needs identified.
19. With no other forthcoming speakers, the **Vice-Chair** suggestedproceeding to the draft decision during which time Mongolia could present its amendments.
20. The delegation of **Mongolia** agreed.
21. The delegation of **Ethiopia** was deeply impressed with the wide-reaching scope of the system of practices, which covered communities in towns and villages in all regions of the country, and which facilitated the transmission and promotion of different forms of ICH: singing, dancing, playing traditional musical instruments, verbal folklore, traditional crafts, and so on. In addition, it involved bearers and festival participants of different generations in the safeguarding and transmission of inherited traditions. Having greatly appreciated the efficiency of the Koprivshtitsa festival, the delegation asked the submitting State to further explain the rationale for organizing such a festival and the conditions that had led to its establishment and the successful safeguarding practice over the years.
22. The delegation of **Palestine** remarked that Ethiopia had raised the same question it had wished to address.
23. The delegation of **Cyprus** also wished to hear from the submitting State on R.2 and the coordination of efforts of all the participants in the safeguarding of ICH at the regional, sub-regional and national levels.
24. The delegation of **India** commended Bulgaria for proposing the Koprivshtitsa festival and expressed its congratulations for facilitating the organization of this efficient system of practices as part of the overall State policy for safeguarding ICH in Bulgaria. It was impressed by the participation of such large numbers of bearers and local communities participating in the festival and who maintain the safeguarding process between the different festival editions. The delegation noted the huge expression of support received for the nomination from local community members, with more than 20,000 letters from bearers and practitioners in more than 600 towns and villages in the country. Taking into account this enormous level of support from different locations and generations, the delegation wished to ask Bulgaria to explain how bearers and communities were involved in this system of practices, and how the festival contributed to enhancing their sense of local expression, belonging and continuity.
25. The **Vice-Chair** remarked that the session would adjourn owing to the interpretation.
26. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** was impressed with the proposal from Bulgaria. However, it voiced unease about the Evaluation Body’s report, which highlighted some serious concerns on almost every criterion. It added that it trusted the Evaluation Body and had been very impressed with its work, such that these concerns could not be ignored. Despite being impressed by the element, the many clarifications that would be required to overturn the decision would push the limit as to what was acceptable.
27. The **Vice-Chair** adjourned the session, and would return to give the floor to Bulgaria.

*[A one-hour pause]*

*[Thursday, 1 December 2016, evening session, Part II]*

*[The Vice-Chairperson from Algeria chaired this session]*

1. The **Vice-Chair** resumed the session with Saint Lucia, with a special thought for the Chairperson who was unwell.
2. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** reiterated its concerns about the many criteria that were not met, and wished to ask Bulgaria whether it could provide any clarification that would help understand the negative recommendation concerning so many of the criteria.
3. The delegation of **Bulgaria** asked whether it should answer the questions posed before or after the break.
4. The **Vice-Chair** noted that Saint Lucia was recalling the same question.
5. The delegation of **Bulgaria** referred to P.1, which in its opinion was a very crucial turning point because it contained a point of possible misunderstanding or lack of clarity that affected the evaluation and understanding of the nomination file in general. The delegation referred to the title of the nomination, which stated clearly that it was a festival of heritage transmission, and that the festival was a system of practices, as pointed out in many parts of the nomination file. However, already during the preparation of file, the communities and the drafting team had had difficulty in clearly translating and conveying this specific system of practices called *събор*; a word which is untranslatable in English and proved difficult to clarify. In French, the word *kermesse* is close to this meaning. However, in English such a word does not exist, and the team had suggested ‘gathering’, ‘feast’ or ‘fair’. Finally, the team had focused on ‘festival’, and the delegation accepted that this may have been a stumbling point when reading the nomination file, as it conveyed various aspects related to an expected festivalization. The delegation explained that the practices presented in the file did not just constitute a festival that takes place once in a while, as the Koprivshtitsa festival takes place every five years and is part of a steady and sustainable process of heritage transmission over the years, all year round. Thus, it was not an isolated event in the form of a festival, but a steady and continuous process of safeguarding and transmission. The delegation further explained that the event gathers more than 200,000 participants, bearers and practitioners who go through a process of safeguarding, maintaining and transmitting the cultural heritage traditions of their local settings all over Bulgaria. They gather together once every five years in Koprivshtitsa to present what they have safeguarded and continue to transmit this to their children and grandchildren, sharing their experiences of safeguarding traditions once every five years. Thus, the use of the term ‘festival’ in place of *събор* might be the source of misunderstandings in several of the criteria in the draft decision, which levelled criticisms relating to the risk of festivalization or decontextualization. The delegation stressed that the nomination file did not focuse on an isolated event in the form of a festival, but on a steady process involving hundreds of thousands of bearers and practitioners of various safeguarded forms of ICH from music to dancing, instrumental performances, verbal folklore, legends, rituals, customs and so on, from all parts of the country. The delegation believed that this point had negatively affected the file and was the source of most of the criticisms in the draft decision.
6. The delegation of **Colombia** sought an explanation on criterion P.6 as to how the State considered that its best practice could be applied to an international context.
7. The delegation of **Bulgaria** explained that the aspects of the Koprivshtitsa festival that could possibly apply at an international level in the promotion of safeguarding efforts at the regional, sub-regional and international levels had been touched upon in several sections of the nomination file. This international aspect was testified to by the numerous singing, dancing and instrumental groups that participated and presented vivid, viable traditions during the days of the festival in Koprivshtitsa from all over the world. So, visitors from abroad join the festival, not only as spectators but also as performers of Bulgarian folklore. They learn from the traditions presented during their visit to the festival and are part of the transmission process. Since the eighth festival in 2000, a separate space in the town of Koprivshtitsa had been dedicated to performers of Bulgarian folklore from abroad, where singing and dancing and instrumental groups from Eastern and Western Europe, North America, Asia and Australia have performed. The festival is also a forum in which Bulgarian diaspora communities actively take part, showing the continued maintenance of traditions in foreign settings. The delegation further explained that the festival in Koprivshtitsa, which had been functioning successfully and efficiently for more than fifty years, was a very good example of coordination among the various institutions within Bulgaria such as NGOs, local community centres, institutes, and bearer communities in an individual or group form. This efficient practice could thus be very successfully applied by encouraging both State institutions and the local community to present and perform safeguarded traditions with the widest possible participation of communities. It concluded by assuring the Committee that these aspects made it possible to apply this extremely successful model, which had formed the background of Bulgaria’s safeguarding system for more than half a century, to other countries as well.
8. The **Vice-Chair** wished to move ahead with the adoption of the draft decision.
9. The delegation of **Cuba** thanked Bulgaria for its explanations, which allowed the Committee to take a decision with more legitimacy.
10. The delegation of **Austria** alsothanked Bulgaria for the clarification, adding that it was very important to share more of the good practice examples. It wished to ask the Evaluation Body whether it now considered the criterion to be satisfied. It also wished to know on what basis the Evaluation Body had decided not to inscribe an element on this Register rather than refer it.
11. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** remarked thatit was up to the Committee to decide whether the proposal was a ‘no’ or if it should go to a referral. With regard to the information contained in the file, the Evaluation Body felt that it was a ‘no’, adding that the Committee should also consider that there were many festivals, and ask itself how this festival differed from others, i.e. should all craft and ICH festivals be considered as best safeguarding practices? Despite the clarifications, the Vice-Chairperson concluded by reaffirming his ‘no’ position, which was based on the information contained in the file.
12. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** wished to emphasize thatthe decision was not an inscription but a selection of a proposal based on best practices, i.e. it did not reflect on the element itself, in this case, the festival. It believed that the Evaluation Body had fully understood and appreciated the festival but that the focus was on best practices. The delegation recalled that there were problems in every criterion and that even after the clarifications from the submitting State, the Evaluation Body stood by its recommendation. The delegation reminded the Committee that the Evaluation Body was made up of experts whose integrity, competence and hard work had been greatly appreciated by the Committee, and it thus stood by its previous statement.
13. Following the clarification, the delegation of **Cyprus** was convinced that the practices and methods applied, as explained, constituted ICH and therefore satisfied P.1, in which all the other criteria would follow.
14. The delegation of **Lebanon** felt that there were questions that remained unclear. It wished to hear from the Evaluation Body on whether it felt that the clarifications provided had satisfied its concerns about transmission and viability, decontextualization and folklorization.
15. The **Rapporteur of the Evaluation Body** remarked on the apparently new interpretation of ‘clarifications’, conceding nonetheless that some elements of the answer provided by Bulgaria could result in a review of some of the Body’s remarks. However, these were new elements that had not been part of the nomination file at the time of its evaluation. The Rapporteur agreed that it would be interesting to have a more in-depth discussion on these new pieces of information, but that the current system did not allow for it. The Evaluation Body therefore maintained its position, encouraging the submitting State to add new information to a later submission.
16. The **Vice-Chair** turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no objections, paragraph 1 was duly adopted. The Vice-Chair noted amendments to P.1 in paragraph 2.
17. The delegation of **Ethiopia** remarked that it was satisfiedwith Bulgaria’s reply to its question and therefore joined Mongolia as a co-sponsor.
18. The delegations of **India** and **Cyprus** supported the amendment by Mongolia.
19. With no further comments or objections, the **Vice-Chair** declared P.1 adopted as amended. P.2 and P.3, as amended by Mongolia were also adopted. Criteria P.4 and P.5, as proposed, were adopted. Criterion P.6 was adopted as amended. Criteria P.7 and P.8, as proposed, were adopted. Criterion P.9, as amended by Mongolia, was adopted. The Vice-Chair moved to paragraph 3, turning to Mongolia to ask whether it wished to amend paragraph 3 ‘to select’, in line with its amendments.
20. The delegation of **Mongolia** apologized for the omission, which should indeed read ‘decides to select’.
21. The delegation of **Saint Lucia**wished to explain that its silence during the adoption of the amendments did not mean consent. It simply did not want to be the lone voice standing in the way of Bulgaria’s success for its very important tradition.
22. The **Vice-Chair** thanked the Committee for its constructive spirit at such a late hour.
23. The delegation of **Lebanon** did not wish to go against the consensus, but strongly supported the remarks by Saint Lucia.
24. The **Vice-Chair** proposed including a paragraph in the decision – similar to those created for the Representative List – that recognized the explanations and clarifications heard in the room.
25. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire**wondered whether the element was being referred or inscribed.
26. The **Vice-Chair** clarified that the element would indeed be inscribed upon adoption.
27. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** noted that the Committee had moved from a ‘no’ to an inscription without passing through the intermediate phase of referral.
28. The **Vice-Chair** explained that the Committee had adopted the paragraphs one by one, which predisposed inscription brought about by the consensus in the room. The Vice-Chair returned to the proposal of the additional paragraph.
29. The delegation of **Ethiopia** supported paragraphs 3 and 4 and, in that logic, wished to return to P.4 as it wanted to present an amendment.
30. The **Vice-Chair** explained that P.4 had already been adopted. A point of order was called from Cyprus.
31. The delegation of **Cyprus** confirmed thatall the paragraphs had been adopted and could not therefore be re-opened.
32. The **Vice-Chair** concurred, and it was accepted by Ethiopia.
33. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** co-sponsored the last paragraph 4 that thanked Bulgaria for the clarification provided.
34. The **Vice-Chair** returned to the adoption of paragraph 3, which was adopted as amended by Mongolia. The standard paragraph 4 was also adopted. With no further comments or objections, the **Vice-Chair declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.c.3 to select ‘Festival of folklore in Koprivshtitsa: a system of practices for heritage presentation and transmission’ to the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices**.
35. The delegation of **Bulgaria** thanked the Committee for its difficult but wise and justified decision on behalf of the seven million participants who, in one way or another, partaken in this living laboratory, which was greater than the festival itself. It embodied the essence of living and working together of bearers, transmitters and researchers who would, at this very moment, be cheering and celebrating. The delegation thanked the Committee again for its wisdom and constructive attitude, inviting everyone to Koprivshtitsa to celebrate together.
36. The delegation of **Cyprus** wished to ask the Evaluation Body a question regarding its advice and whether it agreed with the Committee, adding that dialogue between the Evaluation Body and the submitting States should involve the entire Body, composed of its twelve members, and should not rely solely on the opinion of the Chairperson and the Rapporteur.
37. The delegation of **Switzerland** congratulated Bulgaria on its inscription, adding that it undoubtedly respected the Committee's decision. Nevertheless, it was astonished by the direction the discussion had taken, as it raised some questions about the weight of the recommendations by the Evaluation Body.
38. Noting no further speakers, the **Vice-Chair** proceeded to the next proposal submitted by Croatia.
39. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next proposal, **‘Community project of safeguarding the living culture of Rovinj/Rovigno: the Batana Ecomuseum’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.c.4], submitted by Croatia.The batana, a traditional fishing boat important to Rovinj’s trade and heritage, had become scarce with the popularity of industrial models but in 2004, a not-for-profit House of Batana decided to help safeguard it and its associated practices by opening the Batana Ecomuseum. With support from the municipality, the Italian Community of Rovinj, the Heritage Museum of the City of Rovinj, the Rovinj Historic Research Centre and an eco-museology expert it held a permanent exhibition on batana culture, a shipyard, and hosted workshops and regattas. The Evaluation Body had decided, from the information included in the file, that the programme satisfied all of the criteria for selection as a best safeguarding practice. The information provided in the nomination file adequately outlined the community initiatives that had led to this project, the implementation of the project and the safeguarding actions. It highlighted the successful link between revitalizing an element of ICH and sustainable development with an impact on an entire community. The Evaluation Body had decided to recommend the selection of the ‘Community project of safeguarding the living culture of Rovinj/Rovigno: the Batana Ecomuseum’ to the Register.
40. Thanking the Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, the **Vice-Chair** noted that no amendments had been put forward and thus proposed that the decision be adopted as a whole.With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.c.4 to select ‘Community project of safeguarding the living culture of Rovinj/Rovigno: the Batana Ecomuseum’** **to the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices**.
41. The delegation of **Croatia** expressed greetings to all the delegates, adding that it was happy to have the element inscribed on the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices. The local community of the town of Rovinj had worked hard to ensure the viability of the element. The Rovinj community, as well as Croatia, was open to international cooperation and the exchange of its good practices on the safeguarding of intangible heritage. The delegation was convinced that this session would be a celebration of living heritage, as witnessed over these last days. [Another speaker]. The speaker spoke on behalf of the Ecomuseum Batana project and the community of Rovinj, her hometown, to express gratitude to the Committee for its support and the acknowledgement of the efforts undertaken by Croatia over the last twelve years to safeguard its ICH connected with Batana boats. The inscription would encourage continued good practice, especially in the transmission of knowledge to younger generations, and the sharing of experiences with those interested in collaboration and dialogue. She thanked Ethiopia for its warm welcome.

*[A film was projected]*

1. The **Vice-Chair** thanked Croatia and proceeded to the next proposal, submitted by Fiji.
2. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next proposal, **‘Cultural mapping, methodology for safeguarding of iTaukei intangible cultural heritage’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.c.5], submitted by Fiji. In 2004, a programme to safeguard the traditional knowledge and expressions of Fiji’s iTaukei population had begun in response to concerns they could be lost indefinitely. The iTaukei Institute of Language and Culture’s Cultural Mapping Programme works in collaboration with chiefs, elders and bearers to identify, document and register elements that were important to community identity and sustainability and whose viability had been weakened by economic and climatic factors, as well as the mass media. So far, eleven of the fourteen provinces had been mapped. This programme aims to provide methodological guidance for mapping the ICH of the iTaukei community in Fiji, and to safeguard traditional knowledge and cultural expressions of all domains of its ICH. The Evaluation Body had found that while the file stated that the programme had been coordinated with various organizations such as the Center for Intangible Cultural Heritage in Asia-Pacific Region and the iTaukei Institute of Language and Culture, and so on, it appeared to be run mainly by the government. Also, the file did not sufficiently explain how the community had been involved in all stages of its planning and implementation. For the dissemination of their knowledge and experience, additional information would be useful to fully assess the willingness of the communities concerned to disseminate the programme as a best safeguarding practice. Also, the effectiveness of these measures in contributing to the viability of ICH was not clearly demonstrated. Additional information was needed regarding what concrete effects the programme had among the communities, groups and individuals concerned and the effectiveness of the inventory activities. The Evaluation Body had decided to recommend the referral of the ‘Cultural mapping, methodology for the safeguarding of iTaukei intangible cultural heritage’ to the submitting state for more information.
3. Thanking the Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, the **Vice-Chair** noted that no amendments had been put forward and thus proposed that the decision be adopted as a whole.With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.c.5 to refer** ‘**Cultural mapping, methodology for safeguarding of iTaukei intangible cultural heritage’ to the submitting State for more information**.
4. The delegation of **Fiji** was not present in the room.
5. The **Vice-Chair** proceeded to the next proposal submitted by Hungary.
6. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next proposal, **‘Safeguarding of the folk music heritage by the Kodály concept’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.c.6], submitted by Hungary. Over the past century, the Kodály concept of safeguarding traditional folk music had helped to promote, transmit and document practices in Hungary and assist countries abroad for similar purposes. Devised by Zoltán Kodály and supported by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, it advocates making folk music accessible, encouraging its everyday use, and researching, documenting and teaching it. Used in schools since 1945, it has also been applied by culture institutes to document music, and to export the concept and inspire artists. This file was a re-submitted file, originally submitted in 2014. The Evaluation Body had faced similar problems to the previous Body. That is, the precise nature of the programme or project to be considered as a best practice remained somewhat vague; the focus of the file seemed to be on the documentation, preservation and publication of folk music and on some aspects of the Kodály concept rather than on a set of safeguarding measures directly designed to ensure the viability of folk music heritage. Therefore, it was not clear how it contributed to safeguarding folk music within its bearer communities. More information was needed to demonstrate how the project ensured the transmission of skills and knowledge within these communities. The Evaluation Body had decided that more information was needed to demonstrate the participation of local communities, including letters of consent. It also needed to demonstrate the impact assessment of the programme, as required in P.8. The Evaluation Body had decided to recommend the referral of the ‘Safeguarding of the folk music heritage by the Kodály concept’ to the submitting State for more information.
7. The **Vice-Chair** thanked the Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, noting that a request for debate had been received from the Republic of Korea for this file.
8. The delegation of **Palestine** reiterated its appreciation of and confidence in the Evaluation Body, whose work was entirely coherent. The delegation spoke of the Kodály system and the well-known Hungarian composer, Zoltán Kodály, as being more than Hungarian in that the composer was well-known throughout the world. Before committing to a decision, it sought an explanation from the submitting State to help clarify why the Body had found the safeguarding measures unclear and vague.
9. The **Vice-Chair** wished to remind the Committee that a request for debate had been received from the Republic of Korea, as well as three amendments: one from Bulgaria in P.1 and P.3; one from Turkey in P.2; and one from India in P.8.
10. In an effort to save time, the delegation of **Hungary** proposed grouping all the questions together so that they could be answered at the same time.
11. The **Vice-Chair** took note that Hungary wished to hear from other Members, noting the speakers on the list: Turkey, Ethiopia, India, Bulgaria, Algeria and Afghanistan.
12. The delegation of **Turkey** spoke of his personal experience as a cultural anthropologist and the links between the nomination file and his own field of work, as well as the relationship with Turkey and the personalities of the subject. The delegation was confident that, in the case of the Kodály concept, it was a method of preserving the tradition of folk music, dating back several decades, which was an important basis professionally and institutionally. As was well known, Zoltán Kodály, a composer, ethnomusicologist and pedagogue of Hungarian music, was President of the International Council of Folk Music of UNESCO in the 1960s. Together with Béla Bartók, his professional companion, spiritual partner and collaborator he and his disciples conducted comparative international research in the field of folk music in countries such as Turkey in order to promote its further development and international character. The Kodály method is a world-renowned and practised method of musical pedagogy, the main aim of which is to preserve the folk music tradition with the participation of communities and bearers. To conclude, having heard the opinion of the Evaluation Body, the delegation wished to ask Hungary to explain how the Kodály concept had promoted the coordination of efforts to safeguard ICH at the international level.
13. The delegation of **India** commended Hungary for its nomination of the Kodály concept. It noted that under criterion P.8, the Evaluation Body had found that the file presented quantitative information to demonstrate how widely it had been promoted and applied. The only remark made by the Evaluation Body was that further information on systematic evaluations and impact assessments, if any, would have been welcomed. In this regard, the delegation requested that Hungary provide clarifications about the systematic evaluations and impact assessments.
14. The delegation of **Ethiopia** believed that this nomination should be inscribed, given that Ethiopia, as briefly mentioned in the file, had had first-hand experience with the Kodály method. This exercise had actually been conducted within the framework of a documentation expedition on folklore in Ethiopia in 1965, carried out by Hungarian experts, at the time under the auspices of an NGO associated with UNESCO through the International Folk Music Council (IFMC). The initiator of the expedition at the time was Emperor Haile Selassie I, who had requested that Zoltán Kodály, President of the IFMC at the time, assist Ethiopia in identifying its musical traditions. A considerable quantity of films, sound recordings, photographs and field notes made during the expedition were now preserved in the Folk Music and Folk Dance Archives of the Institute for Musicology of the Hungarian Academy of Science in Budapest. A copy of the collection had been given to Ethiopia, on the basis of which Ethiopia had established a system of music and dance education at the higher education level in the 1960s. However, this documentation and educational structure had unfortunately been lost. Hungary was in the process of digitizing and making this collection available to Ethiopia again, so that it might base its music curricula on this traditional musical treasure, which is an integral part of Ethiopian identity. Government organs, cultural institutions, universities, NGOs and local communities, both in Ethiopia and Hungary, are about to create a joint project related to ICH aimed at presenting this invaluable material, making it widely available, and using it as catalyst for safeguarding activities in both countries. This could serve as the catalyst for UNESCO’s endeavours to enhance and promote capacity building and awareness raising in Africa in safeguarding ICH. The delegation believed that the programme nominated, if inscribed on the Register, would undoubtedly draw international attention to folk music heritage and create awareness of the importance of safeguarding, while contributing to capacity building in each of the participating partners. The delegation wished to ask Hungary for some more information regarding the growth in the uptake of safeguarding measures.
15. The **Vice-Chair** asked Members to be brief in view of the time.
16. The delegation of **Afghanistan** spoke in favour of the inscription, adding that by definition and nature, it is a method, a voice of an instrument. From the appendix to the document, the delegation noted a passage that read, ‘The concept is flexible, it does not focus on the safeguarding of the heritage of one particular community […]’. It wondered whether this system was nevertheless more conducive to the transmission of a particular system.
17. The delegation of **Algeria** wished to add to the testimony presented by Turkey and Ethiopia on the internationalization of this method and the contributions it had made. As is known, Béla Bartók was the contemporary of Kodály, as well as his collaborator and friend. Béla Bartók came to Algeria in 1913, to the Saharan Atlas in a town called Biskra where he made recordings on cylinders of wax, as well as transcripts of music and songs from the region at the end of the nineteenth century. Algeria was now very happy to have the recordings, transcripts and notes of this heritage, which would have irrevocably disappeared without the efforts of these safeguarding pioneers.
18. The delegation of **Bulgaria** supported the nomination and was strongly convinced that the criteria for inscribing the Kodály concept were fully satisfied. However, to avoid any hesitation, it wished to ask the submitting State two questions: i) on P.1: how did the project contribute to the contextual safeguarding of folk music within its bearer communities and ensure the transmission of skills and knowledge within these communities; and ii) on P.3: how had the communities concerned participated in the nomination of the project and the preparation of the nomination file.
19. The delegation of **Colombia** welcomed the proposal from Hungary for the safeguarding of the folk music heritage by the Kodály concept. The report made by the Evaluation Body pointed to the fact that this proposal had a high potential for success. In addition, Hungary had submitted extensive data. For this reason and others, as expressed by earlier speakers, Colombia fully supported the inscription of this best practice, as it was also clear that this practice had been part of the culture of other countries with very positive effects.
20. The delegation of **Cuba** supported the nomination of Kodály but felt it was important that the Evaluation Body improve their recommendations of best practices somewhat. For, during the examinations by the Committee it was difficult to fully grasp the findings when all the criteria were found to be positive, which admittedly was particularly difficult in this type of nomination. Moreover, the delegation noted the same wording used in the recommendation for Argentina. It was thus clear from the outset that the Kodály concept should be inscribed.
21. The delegation of **Palestine** found that Turkey, Ethiopia and Algeria had partially, or even completely, responded to the concerns of the Evaluation Body. The important information to retain on the Kodály concept was that it was not reserved solely for Hungary. Indeed, NGOs worldwide applied this method of safeguarding and transmitting ICH. In this regard, the delegation referred to very active NGOs in Lebanon and in Great Britain, but noted that there were also active NGOs around the world, which was important to take into account. The delegation reiterated that the Members who had spoken earlier had given very convincing answers on how this concept contributed towards safeguarding and transmission.
22. The delegation of **Turkey** wished to know from Hungary how the Kodály system would contribute to the viability of musical heritage.
23. The **Vice-Chair** noted the questions and the positive comments addressed to the submitting State, and asked Hungary to respond succinctly.
24. The delegation of **Hungary** thanked the Committee for the many questions, explaining that the essence of the concept was based on the fact that, in the field of musical heritage, traditional forms of transmission were less effective and had disappeared in modern societies. The Kodály concept therefore sought to strengthen the transmission of traditional music by integrating it into the education system with the involvement of the participating community. With regard to the question in P.1: in what sense is transmission part of safeguarding and contextualized safeguarding within the bearer communities concerned? The delegation explained that teaching methods existed for every Hungarian school, including the schools of the local communities where the bearers of the folk music tradition themselves live. There were also local curricula enabling the dissemination of the local musical heritage alongside the general teaching material. In this way, the teaching of folk songs within the education system directly goes back to the communities; it helps transmit traditional musical forms and strengthens active musical practice within the communities. With regard to P.3, the communities concerned participated in the project, including professional musicologists, music teachers and institutions. As for the concept, music educators and teachers from the local communities also participated in the implementation of the method, including the development of local and general nationwide curricula. This helped to recycle local musical heritage. The communities concerned were, however, not restricted to the bearers of the heritage; they also included the people who designed and implemented the safeguarding programmes, such as children in the kindergarten, pupils and teachers in schools, various folk singing groups, and participants in musical competitions and festivals. Furthermore, many local, regional and national NGOs work on safeguarding folk music heritage. Responding to Turkey’s question about the coordination of efforts, the delegation explained that the Kodály concept contributed to this, and that particularly strong cooperation had been developed with Australia, Japan, the Republic of Korea, China, Singapore, other Southeast Asian countries, certain universities of the United States through the Organization of American Kodály Educators, and also in Great Britain, Ireland and the Scandinavian countries. Thanks to this cooperation over the past fifty years, the Kodály concept and its method had become a widespread model of safeguarding musical heritage. On the point raised by Ethiopia, the delegation attested to the effectiveness of the growth and updating of the Kodály concept through such activities as yearly national and regional folk song competitions organized for school-age groups, as mentioned in the file. Since the 1970s, folk music summer camps had also been organized. The Clear Source Settlement title had been awarded to twelve local communities since 2012. Once again, this returns to the musical heritage of the local community, documenting it, and returning it to the education system. Moreover, there was another register of folk music, the Local Value Store. The delegation spoke of the growing number of settlements in Hungary that had used the national education law to create local curricula for music education. With regard to India’s question on P.8, the delegation referred to information in the file in the result indicators, which outlined the considerable increase in the number of music-making communities, singers, choirs, instrument and music bands, as well as the growing public interest in folk music. These attest to the fact that there were experiences susceptible to an assessment of results, as required by the criterion, which was therefore satisfied.
25. The **Vice-Chair** thanked Hungary for its clear and concise explanations, and hoped that the Committee was fully satisfied with the answers.
26. Following the clarifications, the delegation of **Cyprus** strongly supported inscription.
27. The **Vice-Chair** proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision paragraph by paragraph. Paragraph 1, with no objections, was duly adopted. Criterion P.1 in paragraph 2 was adopted, as amended by Bulgaria. Criterion P.2 was adopted as amended by Turkey. Criterion P.3 was adopted as amended by Bulgaria.
28. The delegation of **Palestine** proposed an amendment in P.4 to delete the last sentence, which read, ‘However, more detailed information would have to be taken to better establish the effectiveness […]’.
29. The delegation of **Ethiopia** proposed another sentence to replace the deletion, which would read, ‘This attests to the widespread public and professional interest in traditional music, there is sufficient information about the effectiveness of growth in the uptake of Kodály concept safeguarding measures’.
30. The **Vice-Chair** noted no objections to the amended P.4, which was duly adopted. Criteria P.5, P.6 and P.7 were adopted as proposed. Criterion P.8 was adopted as amended by India. Criterion P.9 was adopted as proposed. Paragraph 3 ‘to select’ was adopted, as amended by India. The standard paragraph 4 was inserted into the decision, and with no objections, was duly adopted. The Vice-Chair turned to the adoption of the decision as a whole.With no comments or objections, the **Vice-Chair declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.c.6 to select** ‘**Safeguarding of the folk music heritage by the Kodály concept’ to the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices.**
31. The delegation of **Hungary** conveyed great thanks and was moved that the Kodály method had now been inscribed on the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices. A lot of work had gone into this second submission and the delegation wished to acknowledge those who had actively participated, including the Institute of Musicology of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the Kodály Institute in Hungary, the Hungarian Kodály Society, primary schools where the Kodály method is applied in Hungary, the Hungarian Academy of Music, the Alliance of Choir Singers in Hungary, the Hungarian Heritage House and the Association of Folk Music in Hungary. It conveyed special thanks to the widow of Kodály for her genuine support in this process. The idea behind this nomination was to share experience with other States Parties, and the delegation was convinced that the Kodály method, when adapted to other countries and different social contexts, would also benefit the Kodály method itself. This was a win-win situation by which traditional cultural heritage could be better safeguarded, and by which the method would grow. It noted that in 2017 UNESCO had agreed to include the anniversary of the death of the composer Zoltán Kodály among its list of anniversaries. Thus, there would be a lot more information about Kodály awaiting delegates at UNESCO HQ. The delegation hoped that the Kodály method would continue to prove a fruitful and efficient method of safeguarding the traditional musical heritage of communities worldwide.
32. The **Vice-Chair** thanked Hungary for its kind words and for the spirit shown during the examination of the file. The Vice-Chair proceeded with the proposal submitted by Norway, informing the Committee that a member of the Body, Mr Eivind Falk, had not participated in its evaluation owing both to the fact that the NGO he represents is based in Norway and to his Norwegian nationality.
33. The **Rapporteur of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next proposal, **‘Oselvar boat-reframing a traditional learning process of building and use to a modern context’** [draft decision 11.COM 10.c.7], submitted by Norway. Previously Western Norway’s main mode of transportation, also used for recreation, the wooden oselvar boat had almost become obsolete with the introduction of modern boats in the 1940s, as well as with government price restrictions and greater road transport. To help safeguard the practice, the non-profit boatyard and workshop foundation Oselvarverkstaden had been opened in 1997. It recruits apprentice boat builders, facilitates know-how on building techniques and attracts active builders providing them with infrastructure. So far, 85 boats had been built and 40 repaired. This programme involves reframing the traditional boat-building and boat-using processes through the recruitment of younger boat-builders as apprentices, bringing them together with older craftspeople. Different oselvar communities, groups and individuals had been fully engaged in the programme at all stages of its planning and implementation. The Evaluation Body had decided, from the information included in the file, that the programme satisfied all of the criteria for selection as a best safeguarding practice. The Evaluation Body had decided to recommend the selection of the ‘Oselvar boat – reframing a traditional learning process of building and use to a modern context’ to the Register.
34. Thanking the Rapporteur of the Evaluation Body, the **Vice-Chair** noted that no amendments had been put forward and thus proposed that the decision be adopted as a whole.With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Vice-Chair declared adopted Decision 11.COM 10.c.7 to select ‘Oselvar boat-reframing a traditional learning process of building and use to a modern context’** **to the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices.**
35. The delegation of **Norway** thanked Ethiopia for its warm welcome and mentioned that an Oselvar boat had been given to Ethiopia by the Norwegian State in the 1950s. It expressed its sincere gratitude to the Committee and to the Evaluation Body for accepting and including the Oselvar boat in the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices, which was a great honour. The delegation was especially grateful, as it considered the Register as an especially important and essential instrument for safeguarding ICH around the world. This acknowledgement was also of great importance for the community behind the nomination, who had worked hard to safeguard and develop knowledge of building boats in general and the Oselvar boat in particular. The inscription was therefore a credit to the local community, the municipality and the country for having actively supported and promoted this work. This also significantly acknowledged everyone working with traditional craftsmanship and with cultural heritage in Norway. Through its work, the Oselvarverkstaden community had not only built up good working methods to safeguard the knowledge of boat-building processes but their efforts had also led to an increased awareness of the importance of local community participation and the environment around the Oselvar workshop, thereby ensuring that this living tradition, its history and heritage were kept alive. The delegation was honoured to have received this acknowledgement, and it sincerely hoped and believed that this would inspire people, practitioners, communities and governments to safeguard ICH worldwide.

*[A film on Oselvar boat-reframing was projected]*

1. The **Vice-Chair** thanked the Committee for the prevailing spirit of compromise, as well as the interpreters and clerks, and the Secretariat for its relentless work over the past month.
2. The **Secretary** informed the Committee of the last Bureau session the following morning and – in an effort to save time, given the critical items that still needed to be discussed during the day – reminded members once again to identify a new member of the Bureau from within their own Electoral Group and a new Rapporteur.
3. The **Vice-Chair** adjourned the session.

*[Friday, 2 December 2016, morning session]*

**ITEM 10 OF THE AGENDA (CONT.):**

**REPORT OF THE EVALUATION BODY ON ITS WORK IN 2016**

1. The **Chairperson** greeted the delegates on this final day, and thanked Turkey and Algeria for taking up the chairmanship the previous evening. He updated the Committee about the discussions that had taken place during the meeting of the Bureau and spoke of the progress made during the extended evening sessions that completed the examination of all nomination files. However, the Committee was still very much behind schedule, and there were some urgent items that still needed to be covered according to a revised timetable: the Establishment of the Evaluation Body for the 2017 cycle; the Number of files submitted for the 2017 cycle and number of files that can be treated in the 2018 and 2019 cycles; the Date and venue of the 12th session of the Committee; the Election of the members of the Bureau; and the Adoption of the list of decisions. He informed the Committee that items 13, 14 and 15 would not be treated if the Committee ran out of time.
2. In light of the revised schedule, the **Secretary** informed the Committee that the session would begin with a general debate and adoption of the decision under item 10, followed by items 11, 12, 16 and 17, which were essential for the next Committee session. After the lunch break, the Secretariat would prepare the list of all the decisions in both English and French. In the afternoon, the Committee would be invited to proceed with item 19. He specified that the Rapporteur might be asked to validate all the remaining decisions. Depending on time, the session would close with agenda items 14, 15, and 13, in that order.
3. The **Chairperson** noted that the Committee had completed its examination of the individual files under items 10.a, 10.b and 10.c, and he opened the floor to the general debate on item 10.
4. The delegation of **India** spoke of the great importance of this item in that it covered the more substantive issues that concerned everyone. Firstly, despite the work of the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body, which it appreciated, the entire cycle needed to be improved. The delegation strongly felt that the 18-month cycle needed at least one window in which the Secretariat or the Evaluation Body could get back to submitting States to inform them of whether additional information was required in the nomination file, which would lead to a system whereby most States would succeed. Evidently, nominations were very important to States Parties, and it felt that there was consensus on that. Secondly, related to the first point, the delegation noted that the decision-making process in this particular session had been amended on the first day, adding that there was still room for improvement. It acknowledged that the system employed in this session, as well as that inherited from previous years, was also not perfect. The delegation reiterated that there was a need for dialogue and consultation, and to reach an optimal decision-making process that would lead to inscription. The delegation recalled its observation from the first day, according to which the Committee should move towards a detailed discussion of these issues in an intersessional, open-ended, ad hoc working group open to all Member States to brainstorm and discuss these issues so as to establish an improved system that might procedurally move on to the Committee and eventually the General Assembly. It was happy to note that the Republic of Korea had agreed to chair this working group, adding that it would surely do an excellent job, and that all the Member States would work very hard to improve and come up with a better system.
5. The delegation of **Algeria** spoke of the exceptional conduct of the session owing to the sagacity and dynamism of the Chairperson, as well as the competence of the Secretariat. It noted that this was the first time that so many elements had been inscribed on the various lists, which was in line with the spirit of the Convention and of UNESCO, i.e. to recognize the humanity of the different forms of heritage by inscribing the maximum number of elements and referring the least. The excellence of this session had been to find a way of distinguishing the nomination file from the element, taking into account that the texts recognized that all cultural elements deserve recognition, respect, friendship, admiration and deference. It acknowledged that the rigorous analysis carried out by the Evaluation Body had allowed the Committee to apprehend differently the file and the element, allowing it to separate the expert work of the States on the one hand from the cultural element on the other. This was reflected in the decisions in which a standard paragraph had been assigned to underline that files were deemed unsatisfactory by the Evaluation Body. The difference was that the element exists, while the nomination file is created. With this in mind, the delegation believed that this experience deserved to be enhanced through the introduction of a phase of communication between the Evaluation Body and the submitting State prior to the publication of the report of the Evaluation Body. This would help reduce the number of requests for clarification.
6. The delegation of **Cuba** endorsed the proposal to create an informal working group to continue the work between sessions, as well as parallel sessions where work could be favourably carried out in a formal way such that more well-formulated proposals could be brought to the actual session itself. The delegation believed that this session had been particularly special, and it agreed that the Committee needed to review the way files were evaluated. There was not only a need for communication between the Evaluation Body and the submitting States but also to re-focus or highlight certain questions that go beyond the issue of communication. The delegation believed that the technical work carried out by the Secretariat in the first phase of the submission of files could be strengthened because some files, due to methodological issues, did not fulfil the requirements in place. The delegation also felt that the composition of the Evaluation Body should be discussed. The fact that it comprised six NGOs and six State representatives did not represent the intergovernmental character of the Committee, as NGOs and States Parties could not speak with exactly the same voice under the same status. It surmised that other types of actors or stakeholders, such as research centres or other experts in ICH could be involved, adding that these issues could be discussed in the working group. The delegation also believed that certain regional groups were finding it difficult to identify an expert or an NGO in their region. Indeed, there should be clear shortlists from which members could be selected. It thanked the Secretariat for its work in moving the Convention forward, and the Evaluation Body, which of course responded to the needs of the Committee. Nevertheless, it was fundamental to take into account these different issues, as it was more urgent than ever to change this process, especially criterion R.5, but also R.1 when experts decide that R.1 is not fulfilled, and are later contradicted. It concluded by affirming its will to participate actively in the working group to improve the working methods of the Committee.
7. The delegation of **Palestine** echoed the remarks by India, Algeria and Cuba, adding that there was a general consensus for an ad hoc working group. However, there was no need at this stage to enter into the details of the mandate of the working group, as the Committee was aware of the issues that required attention. For the sake of time, the delegation proposed going to the draft decision.
8. The **Chairperson** noted a point of order from Austria.
9. The delegation of **Austria** wished to continue the debate, and to hear from the Observers before going to the draft decision.
10. The delegation of **Cyprus** concurred that there was general agreement among theMembers of the Committee that, to avoid some of the problems encountered in this session, the process of evaluating nominations could be changed to allow for a dialogue between the submitting States and the Evaluation Body. The Secretariat could assist in this regard with the dates of the Evaluation Body meetings in order to allow time for this dialogue to take place. The working group could examine the conditions under which a file would be submitted for the examination of the Committee and could, for example, discuss whether a file in which R.1 was not met would indeed be submitted to the Committee. The delegation did not believe there was a problem with the Evaluation Body, but rather its working process.
11. The delegation of **Republic of Korea** expressed its deep appreciation to Ethiopia for hosting the session, and the Chairperson for his able leadership. It was noted that the Committee had examined fifty files, and out of the nineteen referrals recommended by the Evaluation Body, fifteen had been overturned. By comparison, last year, the Committee changed four out of the fifteen referrals to inscription on the Representative List. The delegation congratulated all the States whose nominations had been inscribed, but at the same time, it was very concerned by the result. Notably, the delegation was confused by the reversals of nominations referred on criteria R.1, R.3 and R.4, which were deemed essential. Regardless of whether the reversed decision derived from the strict evaluation of the Evaluation Body or the indulgence of Committee Members, the situation was neither ideal nor sustainable, and seriously undermined not only the authority of the Evaluation Body but also the basic principles of the Convention. The delegation noted that some Members cited the World Heritage Convention as a reference. However, it believed that there was good reason to distinguish the 2003 Convention from the 1972 Convention, even though there were certainly lessons to be learned from the experience of implementing the World Heritage Convention, some positive and others not. For example, these included an excessive decision-making process based on political considerations rather than merit, as well as the inflation of the World Heritage List. To prevent the 2003 Convention from following in the same footsteps, the delegation urged all the delegates to come together in their wisdom to find an agreeable solution.
12. The delegation of **Turkey** commended the Evaluation Body for its comprehensive and well-structured report, which explained the principles of evaluation and addressed the good practices and challenges regarding the nomination files. In this respect, the report could serve as guidance on measures that might help States Parties submit more complete nominations. It also appreciated the support of the Secretariat for the smooth work of the Evaluation Body, and welcomed the Body’s findings, namely that the overall quality of the files had improved compared to previous cycles, and that multinational files had increased, as had the number of proposals to the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices. These were all encouraging developments. The report showed that the Lists would be enriched with nomination files that brought new perspectives on social organization, socio-political governance systems, forms of ancient cultural heritage, and recent forms of cultural heritage rooted in educational institutions. This would further increase the diversity of elements and strengthen the emphasis on the living nature of ICH. The delegation commended Cambodia for submitting a file to the combined mechanism of nomination to the Urgent Safeguarding List with a request for International Assistance. As the first of its kind, it might foster new nominations, thus contributing to an improved implementation of urgent safeguarding measures, as well as the better utilization of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund. The delegation understood from the Evaluation Body’s report that this mechanism was open to improvement in the coming cycles. At this stage, the revision of the form ICH-01bis by the Secretariat would help eliminate the discrepancies identified by the Evaluation Body, and in this regard it wished to ask the Evaluation Body which ‘discrepancies’ it was referring to. The delegation also welcomed the submission of two nomination files by Kenya and Uganda to the Urgent Safeguarding List as a result of the preparatory assistance granted, illustrating once again the contribution of technical assistance projects under the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund and the importance of strengthening this facility. It supported the recommendation by the Evaluation Body to modify the title of the Register to ‘Register of Good Safeguarding Practices’, which would better reflect its purpose, as defined in the Convention, while amending the restrictive nature of the ‘best’ title and perhaps encouraging more submissions. Turkey welcomed the ongoing effort by the Secretariat to develop a guidance note in line with paragraph 20 of Decision 10.COM 10 related to inventories and their updating mechanism, adding that this might help States prepare more complete nomination files, meeting R.5 and U.5. It also noted that out of the fifty submitted files, only twenty-five had received positive recommendations, adding that it had favoured continuing the previous practice of the Committee regarding the decision-making procedure, as previously mentioned under agenda item 8. At the same time, it favoured establishing a dialogue mechanism between the Evaluation Body and the State Party, possibly through the Secretariat. However, noting the change in the Committee’s decision-making system and the current conduct of its work, the delegation fully supported the creation of an ad hoc working group to find ways to allay concerns with regard to the Committee’s working methods. An **expert from the delegation** also thanked the Secretariat, the Evaluation Body and the Committee for its meticulous work. As an expert working with the Convention for fourteen years, he was convinced that the referral option in all mechanisms would have a positive effect on the value of the Lists and the Convention. It was important to heed the recommendations of the Evaluation Body, which comprised six experts in the field of ICH and six experts from accredited NGOs.The delegation found the recommendations of the Evaluation Body particularly important, noting that they were the result of multiple meetings and consensus and that, for the sake of the credibility of the Lists, they should not be discredited. In addition, it should be determined whether the elected experts had a problem in terms of work capacity. The delegation reaffirmed that the Evaluation Body did not examine the element itself, but rather the nomination file. It congratulated the submitting States for their efforts to reduce inappropriate wording in certain nominations, as highlighted in the recommendations of the Evaluation Body. The Committee could thus initiate a new process that would eliminate these words from the files. Elements of ICH are varied and vast and therefore do not follow either State or community borders. Examples included falconry, Nowruz, and the Mediterranean diet. States Parties should therefore be encouraged to submit multinational files. The delegation was happy for the notable increase in the number of requests for International Assistance, nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List and multinational files. Multinational nominations were particularly important in achieving UNESCO's main objectives: building and maintaining peace and strengthening intercultural dialogue and cultural rapprochement. It was noted that the vast majority of the referrals were due to the recurrent problem of criteria U.5 and R.5 related to inventories. This underlined the importance of resolving misunderstandings concerning inventories by introducing some relevant articles to the Operational Directives. The delegation proposed that as an appropriate first stage, the Secretariat could introduce explanatory notes in this regard. The delegation concluded by reminding the Committee and States Parties that the objective of the Convention was not to inscribe elements on the Lists, but rather to safeguard ICH by taking into consideration the text of the Convention, namely, i) to establish local and national inventories with the participation of the communities; ii) to carry out research; iii) to document; iv) to assist communities and living human treasures in safeguarding their heritage; v) formal and non-formal education; vi) transmission from generation to generation; and vii) to integrate ICH as a vehicle for sustainable development, among others.
13. The **Chairperson** urged the Committee to keep arguments brief.
14. The delegation of **Senegal** thanked the Secretariat, the Evaluation Body, and Members of the Committee, adding that there were shared moments of emotion and joy during the session, but doubts and serious fears were also raised about the future of the Convention. It believed that a diagnosis and awareness were absolutely necessary to restore the credibility of culture and of this shared ideal for which everyone was responsible: Members of the Committee, States Parties and Observers. The Africa Group had expressed this concern during its meetings, which was why it fully adhered to the proposal to convene a working group. Without going into details, this working group should define terms of reference and guiding principles to help shape a better mechanism in examining and evaluating files, which would prevent awkward situations during sessions of the Committee. The Evaluation Body would be given full weighting and due respect in its competence and expertise to ensure that, once the nominations reached the Committee, its Members could work without awkwardness. For this to occur, the mechanisms clearly needed to be revised. The delegation referred to the issue of consultation, recalling that from day one, the Committee had discussed the need for synergy and harmonization with the other Conventions. Indeed, with regard to consultations, in the 1972 Convention for example, not only was additional information possible but interim reports and occasionally face-to-face meetings with the State Party could also be arranged to obtain clarifications. Currently, not only had the Committee lost a lot of time, but it had also started questioning the principles that guided the work of the Evaluation Body. The delegation associated with the position of the Africa Group, which called for greater clarity, transparency, fairness, and above all, operational and functional mechanisms. It conceded that during this session, the Africa Group sought to ask certain States to withdraw their nominations, which were eventually maintained in light of the climate of the present session. Nevertheless, the Africa Group endorsed the proposal to review the mechanisms.
15. The delegation of **Austria** remarked that it was the first time it had participated as a Member of the Committee and thus, in addition to carefully examining the nominations, had studied the working methods of the Committee through its previous decisions so that it could make a valuable contribution to the decision-making process. The ultimate goal of the Committee had always been to make an informed decision based on consistency and equity, as was the mandate of the Evaluation Body. However, the actual experience was somewhat surprising, as mentioned by the Republic of Korea. Based on the decision-making process adopted for this meeting, it seemed that the ultimate goal was to inscribe all or most of the submitted elements. In this case, the proposal to create a global inventory in the form of an online database open to entries from all States Parties could be considered, as had already been proposed by Committee Members in previous sessions. In this way, time and resources could be better dedicated to a number of urgent matters, as raised by the Secretariat, such as capacity building, periodic reporting, ICH in emergencies, or the role of ICH for sustainable development. The delegation noted that the Committee, as well as the Secretariat, had already spent considerable time and resources on this nomination process; the rising quality of the submitted files, and the detailed and valuable recommendations of the Evaluation Body illustrated these efforts. It also noted that it was the second round of inscriptions by this Evaluation Body. Thus, its report represented the outcome of an extensive exchange of expertise, and it strongly supported the Evaluation Body in its current composition, as mentioned by Cyprus, and it trusted its expertise in assisting the Committee in making informed decisions based on a consistent approach. The delegation agreed that criterion R.5 and the referral on technical grounds were unsatisfactory for everyone. However, the revised nomination forms now online, together with their precise guidance on R.5, would further assist submitting States and the Secretariat in checking the technical completeness of the files. Further guidance notes were also expected for criterion R.2. The delegation supported the proposal of an informal working group to foster dialogue between submitting States and the Evaluation Body with a view to adopting the recommendations of the Evaluation Body during the Committee session and thus preventing long debates. With regard to the diverse range of actors involved in the decision-making process, the delegation wished to invite the Members of the Evaluation Body to reflect on their experience in the nomination and decision-making process, to see how their role could best fit into this process.
16. The **Rapporteur of the Evaluation Body** noted that the question from Turkey referred to paragraph 55 of the report concerning Form ICH-01bis, adding that some minor tweaking of the wording in this form was necessary because it was not entirely consistent. He gave the example of how the results and objectives were described and defined in one part of the form, which did not quite tally with how they were described in another part of the form. The second point made was that the Body believed that it needed to avoid the situation wherein it was asked to use certain criteria that were not explicit in the form. The Rapporteur gave the example of consideration 10(a), which requests cooperation at the bilateral, regional and international levels, but was actually not requested in the form. So the Body was being asked to use a criterion that the submitting State had not been asked to respond to, which put the submitting State at a disadvantage. Responding to Austria, the Rapporteur recognized that there was indeed a big gap between the recommendations made by the Body and the decisions eventually taken by the Committee. In fact, about 80 per cent of the recommendations had been overturned. The Body recognized that in some cases perspectives might be different, but also that some differences went beyond the level of technical clarification. The inescapable conclusion for the Rapporteur of the Evaluation Body was therefore that either the Body was of limited competence, that it did not apply the criteria that the Committee had wisely defined, or that it had become somewhat irrelevant. In this light, the Rapporteur had asked its NGO to relieve him of his duty on the Evaluation Body. He encouraged a reflection on what would then become a waste of very valuable resources in enabling the Evaluation Body to come together and spend many months examining the files to then arrive at a situation where most of the recommendations were overturned. The Rapporteur further encouraged reflecting on ways in which the gap between the Body’s recommendations and the eventual decisions could be reduced. He believed it to be imperative, both for the good functioning and efficient use of the resources, as well as for making the work worthwhile. Otherwise, the Body would feel that it had become increasingly irrelevant.
17. Noting the requests for an explanation on the principles applied by the Body, the **Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** underlined that evaluations were not made on the element itself but on the nomination file. Some elements might appear wonderful but then their file revealed limitations, and it was thus the Body’s job to point that out. In addition, the twelve Members of the Body had reached a consensus on every file on every criterion, having worked very hard for almost a year to formulate the recommendations. The Vice-Chairperson spoke of how fortunate he had been to work with some of the finest experts in the field of ICH. The Body had tried to be consistent by seeing the files as connected to each other so as to treat all the files in the same way, which the Body considered extremely important. In terms of room for improvement, the Vice-Chairperson believed that a better outcome would come from better communication. Nevertheless, there were some measures that he believed could already be implemented, such as the revision of the forms, which the Secretariat had been working on, and criterion R.2, which required some work in the same way as had been carried out for R.5. These measures would help ensure that all the questions were answered by the submitting State, through the use of multiple separate boxes. Regarding the point made of a possible window of communication between the Body and submitting States, the Vice-Chairperson conceded that after the second meeting of the Body, when conclusions had been drawn, it would indeed be very easy to see where some minor problems could be avoided and easily fixed.
18. The delegation of **Ethiopia** commended and congratulated the Evaluation Body for the work accomplished. As was known, the Evaluation Body meets twice a year, with the first meeting taking place almost a year after the submission of the nomination files. The delegation suggested that the meeting take place slightly earlier to allow for dialogue. As a Member of the Committee for the last three years, it noted that a significant number of files were referred or had only been referred owing to a slight misunderstanding. Thus, allowing for dialogue would save time that was otherwise spent on minor issues, and which could be used to concentrate on the more substantive issues of the Convention, i.e. to ensure the viability of ICH. The delegation thus proposed establishing a better working relationship between the Evaluation Body and the submitting State in order to clarify ambiguities and provide for a more informative and participatory nomination process. The establishment of an ad hoc working group open to all Members was thus considered essential to discuss this topic.
19. The **Chairperson** took note of the issues raised, and proposed opening the floor to Observers before adopting the draft decision.
20. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** wished to speak as an artist and culture worker, not as a politician, adding that he came in the place of the original representative who was unable to attend. The delegation began by expressing appreciation for the informative and enriching session, and for the intellect and knowledge exhibited by the Members of the Committee. It appreciated the work of the Chairperson, the tremendous work of the Secretariat, and particularly the Members of the Evaluation Body. It thanked the Rapporteur of the Evaluation Body, adding that it empathized with his remarks. Nevertheless, the delegation had some concerns on the procedures, and wondered how things could be improved. With regard to the issues of the files, he expressed support for a window of communication between the State Party and the Body, as well as the creation of the ad hoc working group. He called for greater awareness of the technical assistance available for submitting States, especially for developing countries that did not necessarily have the capacity to prepare files. However, despite the formal structures in place and proposals for improving procedures, the delegation spoke of the observed hidden processes and agendas from States Members of the Convention. The delegation expected that cultural experts always set an example for politicians and other leaders because they represent the soul and spirit of the people, bringing their values to the way they operate. He therefore expected this Convention to be very different from other Conventions in its ability to set an example in the way it operates.
21. The **Chairperson** noted a point of order from Cyprus.
22. The delegation of **Cyprus** remarked that the Committee would not complete its agenda if Members spoke for twenty minutes, proposing a two-minute limit.
23. The delegation of **Palestine** supported the point of order.
24. The **Chairperson** noted support from India, Lebanon and Algeria, adding that Committee Members would be given two minutes, and Observers one minute to speak.
25. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** continued by noting that it did not appreciate certain observations and behaviours during the session that revealed hidden processes that were undermining the work of the Evaluation Body, a committee of experts. The delegation added that many of the decisions made were not based on the criteria put in place to evaluate the files and, as such, true and valid examples of ICH inscribed were made visible to the world based on other criteria, which would have repercussions later on. Finally, the delegation appealed on behalf of NGOs. It understood the intergovernmental nature of the Committee but that NGOs were more representative of the communities and closer to the reality on the ground than government representatives and should therefore be treated respectfully.
26. The delegation of **Afghanistan**began by thanking and congratulating the Secretariat, the Evaluation Body and the Committee, adding that all the delegations wished to avoid extremes: they neither sought to ignore the Evaluation Body nor to become a registration chamber for the recommendations, which in both cases would waste everyone’s time. To create a balance, the delegation called for more robust means and ways of working, as well as a better definition of the different phases of interaction and exchange with the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body, and the introduction of a window for interaction. It also sought better working tools such as checklists, glossaries, terms of reference and codes of ethics.
27. The delegation of **Hungary** confirmed its strong commitment to the successful implementation of the Convention. In this spirit, it spoke of the change in climate of the Committee compared to previous sessions with regard to the way the decisions had been reached. The delegation could not recall any previous session in which the Committee had overturned the recommendations of the Evaluation Body to the same degree. It therefore suggested that the Committee consider the possibility of carrying out an evaluation of the decisions taken under agenda item 10.a, b and c. on how these decisions would advance the safeguarding of ICH. This evaluation was suggested to ensure that the different Lists and the Committee’s decisions remain and become a reliable reference point as to what constituted ICH and how it should be safeguarded by and for all stakeholders and partners. As the delegation considered that to be the aim of the Convention, the Committee must therefore adhere more consistently to its own adopted criteria for inscription and the selection of an element to the different Lists, which are means to achieve the ultimate aim of celebrating and safeguarding ICH. The Lists were notable in their ability to raise awareness, enjoying a certain symbolic capital, but if they lose their prestige, then they lose the power of visibility and the symbolic capital that attracts people to ICH and its safeguarding.
28. The delegation of **Colombia** believed it was important to maintain the technical spirit of the Committee and indeed to try and foster dialogue between the submitting States and the Evaluation Body. It therefore supported the proposal to create a working group to discuss the current methodology, as well as other issues, in order to avoid the conflicts that had arisen during this session between the recommendations of the Evaluation Body and the decisions of the Committee.
29. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire**described the session as peculiar in view of the decisions taken. It congratulated the Evaluation Body for its excellent and remarkable work with its recommendations. However, it noted some shortcomings in some of the recommendations made, which it hope would be addressed in the near future. For example, when an element in the nomination file had not been able to meet criterion R.1, with regard to the definition of the element under the Convention, then logic would dictate that it should not be further considered under the other criteria. Unfortunately, it recognized, for example, the separation of criterion R.5 in this regard. With regard to the interpretation of silence by Members of the Committee when taking decisions, the delegation surmised that it might be necessary to reflect and reverse the decision that had been taken at the beginning of the session, as mentioned by India and the Republic of Korea. This silence risked the credibility of the Committee. For this reason, the delegation supported the creation of an ad hoc working group to reflect on all aspects of the decision-making process and to prevent lobbying from taking over the Convention, as the survival of the Convention was at stake.
30. The delegation of **Philippines** recalled Switzerland’s surprise at the pattern of decision-making that had resulted in fifteen recommendations being overturned. These patterns rendered the Evaluation Body’s recommendations moot and it was of the view that the Evaluation Body is an important entity that can ensure the technical credibility of the Committee’s decision-making process. During the proceedings, it almost seemed as if asking the Evaluation Body for comments was ultimately just lip service, which is obviously problematic. The delegation spoke of how sometimes being an insider in the Committee could be a limitation in that one becomes tone-deaf to its own processes and procedures. In this spirit, the delegation welcomed Observers on this issue to guide the Committee in its reflection process and help build up the credibility of the Convention. It also supported Palestine and India in the formation of the working group. Finally, the delegation commended Saint Lucia for its advocacy in upholding the standards of this Convention. In the final analysis, the Committee should focus on the moral and intellectual spirit of its work and not on other considerations.
31. The **Chairperson** then opened the floor to Observers.
32. The delegation of **Belgium** concurred that there was indeed discontinuity with the previous Committee meetings, including a new interpretation of ‘clarification’ and a new style of dealing with the analysis of information contained in nomination files and the excellent work of the Evaluation Body. In its opinion, the Committee had also experimented with new forms of consistency. Although regrettable, the delegation completely understood the resignation of one or more Members of the Evaluation Body following this session. In the light of this, the delegation believed it was opportune to start considering a Wikipedia-style solution instead of the present form of the Representative List and the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. Wikipedia lists would organize the work in a different way, and involve the communities, groups, and stakeholders, which would inject energy and new credibility into the system. It hoped that this alternative mechanism could be discussed at the next General Assembly.
33. The delegation of **Belize** endorsed the position presented by Saint Lucia, adding that the debate had not really been about the quality of the work of the Evaluation Body but rather about the quality of the files submitted. In light of this fact, the delegation reminded the delegates that last year the Secretariat had pointed out that one of the things overlooked in the past was the emphasis on the ability of States to request assistance in the preparation of nomination files, as described in paragraph 21 of the Operational Directives.
34. The delegation of **Norway** highlighted two points. Firstly, as mentioned by Austria, time spent focusing on the Lists meant time lost on other important and probably more valuable issues in the implementation of the Convention, such as capacity building and ICH in emergencies. Secondly, with regard to the Evaluation Body, the delegation felt that it was important to respect the professional assessment and see this work as a process. It therefore commended the States that actually accepted and respected the Evaluation Body’s decisions.
35. The delegation of **Poland** expressed gratitude to Ethiopia for its warm and professional hosting of the session, and congratulated the Chairperson for his wise leadership. As a country that had recently ratified the Convention, it observed with great attention how the Convention worked and the values it transmitted to the international community, as well as its own communities. It believed that the hard work of the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body was valuable and essential to maintain the professional and politically-neutral sharing of values of mutual respect, and the visibility of ICH in the world. It also joined in the concerns raised, even by the Committee Members, on the current trend in the final decisions with regard to the files. The delegation expressed its hope and trust in future Committee decisions to adhere to the spirit and values of the Convention.
36. The delegation of the **Netherlands** supported the remarks by Norway and Austria, adding that it was very disappointed that amendments to the nominations had taken so much time, time that could have been better spent on other very important issues. The delegation also believed that it was very important to respect the recommendations of the Evaluation Body, and to be very careful about the credibility of the Convention, as it was about more than Lists and nominations, and involved capacity building, ICH in emergencies, and community involvement. It hoped that these issues would be discussed in an open-ended working group.
37. The delegation of **Viet Nam** spoke of having been part of the drafting Committee of the Convention fifteen years ago, adding that the purpose of the Convention was to please everybody. However, this Committee had made a lot of submitting States and the Evaluation Body unhappy, noting the paradox in which more than 52 per cent of the proposals were recommended for referral by the Evaluation Body, while 80 per cent of the recommendations by the Evaluation Body were overturned. The delegation believed that the problem lay in communication, and it did not doubt the quality of the experts.
38. The delegation of **Switzerland** remarked that Lists of this Convention might not be the most important but certainly the most visible element of the Convention. They therefore deserved to be managed carefully and in all seriousness. It spoke of its incomprehension, joining the sentiment expressed by the Republic of Korea and Saint Lucia in that far too much time had been spent on a discussion that ultimately did not satisfy anyone. It felt that procedures needed to be improved and attitudes changed. Having heard a lot of ideas, the delegation was ready to contribute to further reflection in a working group.
39. The **Chairperson** noted some common themes, and given the long list of speakers, proposed proceeding to the adoption of the decision, since most of the issues would be discussed in the working group that the Committee was talking about.
40. The delegation of **South Sudan** thanked the Government of Ethiopia for hosting this session, and the Secretariat for allowing South Sudan to be part of this Convention. It spoke of the crisis in its country, and hoped its 64 communities, who live in harmony and reconciliation, would join in safeguarding efforts.
41. The delegation of **Morocco** retained two words during this session: i) ‘coherence’, whose interpretation implied coherence across all sessions of the Committee and not just within one session, and ii) ‘clarification’, which appeared to be a vague notion. In this regard, it believed that the Committee did not have enough time or retrospect to assess whether the information provided as ‘clarification’ was indeed appropriate to conclude whether or not the criteria recommended for referral had in fact been met.
42. The delegation of **China** believed that due respect should be paid to the tremendous efforts of the Evaluation Body in its professional recommendations. It was convinced that the work of the Evaluation Body should remain neutral, independent and consistent, recalling how this new Evaluation Body had been established two years ago, and underlining that its work should be based on previous Committee decisions and recommendations. The delegation cautioned against attempts to adopt new practices or new working methods, as previously mentioned by India. It also highlighted the need for submitting States to be very careful with the use of inappropriate expressions in nomination files.
43. A **Representative of the ICH NGO Forum** reaffirmed its confidence in the important contributions of the Evaluation Body in its rigorous evaluation of files to all mechanisms. The NGO Forum was concerned that recommendations had been almost systematically overturned, recalling the essential role of the Body in respecting the values and spirit of the Convention. The Forum understood that the success of the Convention should not be measured solely based on the diplomatic success of listings but rather on the real impact of actions on the many knowledge systems and practices transmitted from generation to generation, especially those at risk. He wondered why we should invest so many human and financial resources in the work of an Evaluation Body if its conclusions were so discretionary. The Representative surmised that the solution to the imbalance observed during this session was likely to be through alternative procedures in the future, to which NGOs would be happy to contribute.
44. The delegation of **Greece** echoed the remarks made by Norway, Austria, Netherlands and Belgium on the need to resolve the overuse of resources by the Committee in the treatment of nomination files. It appealed to the Secretariat, as the institutional memory of the Convention, to more actively intervene and uphold the rules and principles of the Convention. The delegation added that it did not appreciate seeing flags of countries during the session when the Convention was about communities, not States.
45. The delegation of **Mexico** remarked that the Committee was dealing with an extremely important issue right now… [Interrupted].
46. The **Chairperson** noted a point of order from Cuba.
47. The delegation of **Cuba** wished to clarify thatthe Committee was made up of countries that were Members of the Convention and as such entitled to bring flags, and it was unacceptable to hear criticisms from delegations on this point.
48. Noting that this was not a point of order, the **Chairperson** returned the floor to Mexico.
49. The delegation of **Mexico** continued by noting that the Committee had reached a significant point in the development of the Convention and that it was important to reflect long and hard on past experiences, as well as hindsight, not just on the mechanisms in this Convention but on the mechanisms and tools developed by other Conventions. It also felt that the Convention was subject to greater interpretation than other Conventions. It added that the true commitment lay in the process of evaluations that attach greater importance to the interests of communities in a spirit of cooperation and dialogue.
50. Addressing all the delegates, the delegation of **United Arab Emirates** spoke of the part they play in a democratic dialogue, adding that it totally disagreed with criticizing one another. The delegation called for a positive attitude for the good of the Convention as well as the need to ensure that dialogue prevails in the relationship between the Evaluation Body, the States Parties, and the Committee Members.
51. The **Chairperson** thanked the delegates for their interventions that sought to improve the working methods. He then proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.With no comments or objections, paragraphs 1 to 5 were duly adopted. Paragraph 6 was adopted as amended by Turkey. With no objections to paragraphs 7 to 12, they were duly adopted.
52. The delegation of **Algeria** remarked that the adoption of the paragraphs went too fast, as it had submitted an amendment in paragraph 11. While the amendment was intended to be a paragraph 10bis, the delegation proposed inserting it as paragraph 13 in order to maintain the order of the adopted paragraphs.
53. While the Secretariat was rearranging the paragraphs, the **Chairperson** noted that the proposed amendments from Algeria, Cyprus and India, despite different wording, were similar in spirit and suggested treating them together for the purpose of adoption.
54. The delegation of **Palestine** announced that after consultation with Cyprus and other co-sponsors of the amendment, the amendment could be withdrawn.
55. The **Chairperson** confirmed with Cyprus that the amendment was indeed withdrawn andasked India about the position of its amendment.
56. The delegation of **India** clarified that since it was the final part of the decision, it could come towards the end.
57. The **Chairperson** asked Hungary the same question.
58. The delegation of **Hungary** wished to insert its amendment after the original paragraph 12, and therefore before the proposal by Algeria.
59. The **Chairperson** asked Algeria whether it could agree.
60. As the paragraph related to the Secretariat, the delegation of **Algeria** explained that it should be positioned just after the paragraph that mentioned the Secretariat.
61. Speaking about its amendment, the delegation of **Hungary** explained that it was a reminder to States Parties and therefore it wanted to include it after paragraph 12.
62. The **Chairperson** askedAlgeria if it could agree with the proposal.
63. The delegation of **Algeria** agreed. However, before adoption of its amendment, it wished to ask the Secretariat whether it would be comfortable and able to meet the request.
64. The **Secretary** confirmed that the Secretariat would be able to meet this request. In addition, it did not see any contradiction with the other request from India, as they both complemented one another.
65. The delegation of **Palestine** felt that the amendment by India on the working group, supported by all the Members, should come right after Algeria’s amendment.
66. The delegation of **India** had no objection to Palestine’s proposal.
67. The **Secretary** suggested that the amendment by India, which aimed to establish an informal ad hoc working group in Paris, where States Parties would discuss various issues, would perhaps be better placed before the amendment by Algeria since the discussions within the ad hoc working group would also influence the proposal that the Secretariat was requested to make.
68. The delegation of **Palestine** was of the understanding that the working group would discuss the draft proposal by the Secretariat during the meeting, which – after adoption – would go back to the Secretariat.
69. The delegation of **Cuba** understood Algeria’s proposal, adding that it did not contradict the work by the working group. The delegation explained that the working group would work informally or intersessionally because there were no resources for a formal working group. However, there should be at least one formal meeting held within the framework of the next Committee session, for example, as a parallel or side event in both working languages, or before the start of the Committee session, which would allow Committee Members to reach a consensus on the issues discussed.
70. The delegation of **Cyprus** wished to add to India’s amendment that the meeting beopen to all Members of the Committee and to all States Parties as Observers.
71. The delegation of **Palestine** agreed with Cuba, and suggested that it could take the form seen in other Committees, which was to convene, at the opening of the next session, a limited working group composed of Committee Members to review the recommendations prior to the eventual presentation to the Committee. This would be the formal meeting requested by the delegation of Cuba. With regard to the amendment by Cyprus, the delegation felt that the actual wording was non-specific such that there was no impediment to allowing for Observers. Inspired by the 1972 Convention, the delegation further explained that the informal working group composed of Committee members, once it had reached a common understanding, would move into the larger group with all the Observers. The delegation also flagged a concern raised by some Observers concerning the amendment by India in paragraph 13, adding that it was unclear that this would lead to amendments to the Operational Directives, which, although not explicit, was implied. The delegation wished to make clear in the text of the decision that the purpose of the working group and the consultation process would ultimately be to amend the Operational Directives.
72. The delegation of **Republic of Korea** spoke of how a working group was often seen as a panacea when in fact it is witnessed that working groups do not function as well as expected. However, on the understanding and on the condition that the proposed… [Interrupted].
73. The **Chairperson** noted a point of order from Algeria.
74. For the clarity of work, the delegation of **Algeria** asked the Chairperson to proceed with the adoption of the paragraphs one by one instead of discussing paragraphs that did not follow each other sequentially, as each paragraph had an influence on the other.
75. The **Chairperson** explained that the Secretariat had been establishing the order of the paragraphs, as the position of the amendments had not been clearly indicated.
76. The **Secretary** concurred that the Secretariat was indeed trying to establish the order of the amendments. The amendment from Austria, for example, was still to be placed. The Secretary suggested organizing the amendments first before returning to the adoption of the paragraphs one by one.
77. The delegation of **Austria** suggested placing its amendment after Hungary’s proposal. It also noted a grammatical error in India’s amendment.
78. The **Chairperson** confirmed that linguistic and grammatical errors would be corrected, and turned to paragraph 12.
79. The delegation of **Turkey** also noted a small correction in the French version of Algeria's amendment.
80. The **Chairperson** assured the Committee that the Secretariat would work on harmonizing the two language versions.
81. The delegation of **Cuba** found it difficult to follow the debate and the adoption of amendments, adding that it might be easier to proceed paragraph by paragraph.
82. The **Chairperson** returned to paragraph 12 as proposed by Algeria. With no objections, it was duly adopted. He moved on to paragraph 13 as proposed by India.
83. The delegation of **Palestine** noted a potential legal issue in paragraph 13 [on the establishment of a working group] and regretted that the Legal Advisor was not present. The delegation explained that paragraph 13 did not clearly indicate the idea of the working group, which was to begin the process of consultations that would eventually lead to recommendations and amendments to the Operational Directives. With this in mind, and following consultations with Members of the Committee and with India, the delegation proposed a small amendment at the end of paragraph 13, which would read ‘in order to strengthen the implementation of the Convention by amending the Operational Directives’.
84. The **Secretary** explained that the amendment in its current form gave the impression that the ad hoc working group was allowed to amend the Operational Directives, which was not the case. He surmised that the amendment rather sought to submit the [outcome of the working group] to the Committee, which in turn would submit recommendations to the General Assembly that might consider revisions to the Operational Directives.
85. The delegation of **Palestine** fully concurred with this interpretation.
86. The delegation of **Cuba** believed that this was linked to the future debate on governance mentioned in a previous session and that would need to be brought to the General Assembly. It fully understood the clarification by the Secretary, adding that ultimately the outcomes of the working group would need to go to the Committee before going to the General Assembly, which could then change the Operational Directives.
87. The delegation of **Cyprus** concurred that the amendment by Palestine was not very clear because it did not indicate how the informal working group would be formed, which is why it sought to include ‘open to all Member States and Observers’ instead of ‘and to other States Parties as Observers’. The delegation fully agreed with the Secretary regarding the Operational Directives.
88. The delegation of **Republic of Korea** questioned the necessity of setting up a working group to address these very important issues because it had witnessed in the past that these working groups do not work as well as expected. However, on the understanding and condition that the proposed working group would address all the daunting and challenging issues in an appropriate and constructive way, and thus live up to the wishes of all the States Parties, the delegation – as probable incoming Chairperson – could go along with the amendment proposed by India and supported by Palestine. The delegation also felt that the working group – for the sake of efficiency – would be better without being open-ended at this stage. If indeed some progress was made then it could be extended to an open-ended forum with a formal information-sharing meeting.
89. The delegation of **Hungary** remarked that this was indeed a very important point. The working group would address issues of the utmost importance to the Committee and should thus be open to the broadest possible consensus already at this stage. It was therefore in favour of an open-ended working group to ensure that all Committee Members could participate, as well as other States Parties as Observers. With regard to the issue raised by Palestine on legal advice during the discussions, the delegation explained that it understood that the recommendation was not to modify the Operational Directives within this working group, but that in order to be able to fully discuss the issues at hand, legal advice might be required. Thus, the delegation supported the need for legal assistance during the working group and proposed including ‘assisted by the Legal Advisor’ in the amendment.
90. The **Secretary** clarified that an informal ad hoc working group was not a working group of the Secretariat and the meeting would therefore have to be organized by the delegations themselves. The Secretariat could be invited to attend to respond to questions, if the informal ad hoc working group so wished, but at this stage the Secretariat could not commit personnel or provide services to intersessional sessions.
91. The delegation of **Hungary** acknowledged the reality of UNESCO’s budgetary constraints and withdrew its amendment, although it insisted on the open-ended nature of the working group.
92. The delegation of **India** wished to outline two points. Firstly, with regard to the nature of the group itself, the delegation agreed with the Secretary that the privilege of organizing the working group belonged to the incoming Chair. The onus was not on the Secretariat to organize the meeting or its logistics, adding that the remarks by the Republic of Korea in this regard were noteworthy, particularly as it was likely to chair the group. In addition, the Republic of Korea had given assurances that the working group could possibly open up at a later stage. Secondly, the delegation fully concurred with the remarks by Palestine in that the objective of the entire discussion on item 10 was to come up with a better system, which would eventually involve amending the Operational Directives. In this way, the amendments would lead to better procedures that could be codified thereafter.
93. Having listened to the second amendment by Palestine and the comments by India, the **Secretary** understood that the objective of establishing the ad hoc working group was to eventually amend the Operational Directives. However, the current wording implied that the working group itself was capable of doing that. He therefore proposed instead, ‘submit its recommendations to the Committee at its next session with a view to presenting revisions of the Operational Directives to the General Assembly’.
94. The delegation of **Palestine** thanked India and the Secretary for the clarifications, adding that it strongly supported the amendment by the Secretariat. It therefore withdrew its amendment. It also supported the intervention by the Republic of Korea in that the Chairperson would convene the ad hoc working group, as well as the Members and Observers at a stage deemed appropriate. The delegation therefore suggested deleting the amendment added by Cyprus.
95. The delegation of **Austria** supported the amendment by Cyprus because it believed that the working group should include all States Parties and Observers.
96. The delegation of **Algeria** returned to the remarks by the Republic of Korea, as Chair of the next Committee session, noting that the Republic of Korea did not really believe in the ad hoc working group to move forward. It was therefore a matter of concern that if the Chair did not have faith in the process, then the results of the working group would be doubtful. With regard to the nature of the working group, the delegation believed it should be open to all States Parties, as the revision of Operational Directives required the support of everyone. The delegation explained that any outcomes or recommendations would have to wait until the next General Assembly, i.e. they could only be made operational in two years’ time at best. The delegation further explained that the Committee would rely until then on the goodwill of everyone to function, and therefore to respect this moral contract; all States Parties, Members of the Committee and Observers had to be involved.
97. The delegation of **Turkey** fully endorsed the comments raised by the Republic of Korea and – as the incoming Chair – it would be chairing the ad hoc working group, which should therefore remain informal. The delegation also believed that the working group should not be open to all States Parties and Observers. It spoke of a similar experience chairing an ad hoc working group under the 1972 Convention, which was open to all Committee Members and had proved to be efficient. The delegation was concerned that by opening the meeting to all States Parties it would fail to come up with concrete recommendations. From the World Heritage experience, the delegation suggested that one State Party could attend as an Observer representing its Regional Group and thus coordinate the regional members’ views. In this regard, it fully endorsed the remarks by India. In addition, the delegation found the Secretariat’s proposal to be better formulated than Palestine’s, noting that the Committee should first endorse the recommendations.
98. Noting the informal nature of the working group, the delegation of the **Republic of Korea** suggested leaving some details in the hands of the incoming Chair so as to expedite the work schedule.
99. The delegation of **Cyprus** agreed with the Republic of Korea to begin with an informal working group comprising Committee Members, followed by a second meeting in which the Chair could also invite Observers.
100. The delegation of **Senegal** remarked that there was a habit within UNESCO to convene working groups, adding that practical aspects should also be considered. It noted that working groups often focused on false debates, i.e. whether it should be an open or closed group. Generally speaking, once the working group begins its work, it always ends up with a small number of Member States following the work to the end. Thus, whether a meeting was open or closed did not, in practice, change much. Moreover, for the country convening the meeting, there was also the question of room capacity, notwithstanding the fact that inviting everyone would render a serious discussion of the issues practically impossible. It therefore preferred a situation in which Committee Members would designate a representative from their Regional Groups, which could also include Observers, as had been the experience in the World Heritage Committee. In this way, the organization of the meeting would remain flexible and left to the wisdom of the incoming Chair who would determine the best formula in terms of principle and practicalities. With regard to the point on the Operational Directives, the delegation voiced reservations in that this was only an informal working group that would formulate recommendations on whether or not to amend the Operational Directives, and that there were already specific procedures in place for this purpose. Thus, the Committee should focus on the mandate and not overburden the amendment with unnecessary details and practicalities that would be best entrusted to the incoming Chair.
101. The **Chairperson** noted a point of order from Palestine.
102. The delegation of **Palestine** understood from the intervention by Cyprus that it wished to withdraw its proposal, in which case it should be reflected on the screen.
103. The delegation of **Cyprus** confirmed that it had withdrawn its amendment.
104. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** was satisfied with the withdrawal.
105. Referring to the point made by Turkey, the **Secretary** was of the understanding that the sentence ‘and to submit its recommendations to the Committee at its next session with a view to presenting […]’ already implied that it had to first go through the Committee.
106. The delegation of **Austria** did not wish to go against the consensus. However, it felt strongly that these issues, and any revision to the Operational Directives, would deeply affect the implementation of the Convention and have far-reaching consequences. In this regard, the meeting should be as inclusive as possible and allow for the broadest possible sharing of ideas that would contribute to the working group’s success.
107. The **Chairperson** explained that the Republic of Korea had proposed sorting these details out after the session.
108. The delegation of **Hungary** supported the remarks by Austria as well as Algeria. However, it would not go against the consensus, though it wanted its concerns to go on record regarding the risks of not allowing Observers to participate in this working group when very important issues would be discussed.
109. The **Chairperson** asked that the Committee take note of the earlier remarks by the Republic of Korea.
110. The delegation of **Algeria** also did not wish to go against the consensus, and would accept the amendments as presented on the screen. However, it wished to recall that the Committee was at a crossroads, as Member States were calling for greater transparency and inclusiveness at UNESCO to ensure that decisions were made as consensually as possible.It reminded the States Parties, and those present at the last General Assembly, of the difficulties encountered during the discussions and the adoption of the Operational Directives that had previously been discussed at the Committee session in Windhoek. The delegation called for their wisdom, inclusion and participation in this regard.
111. The **Chairperson** suggested that the details would be discussed in the ad hoc working group.
112. The delegation of **Cuba** proposed moving forward, underlining the long time spent on this issue when there were still many agenda items left to cover. It noted that there were Chairs from the different Regional Groups present who would coordinate a consultation process within their own groups. This method was common in UNESCO and there was still time to make amendments and bring topics forward positively via the Chairs who could pull together a consensus from within their groups.
113. The delegation of **Cyprus** wished to respond to Austria and Algeria, considering that it had withdrawn its amendment in light of the fact that the incoming Chair would first convene an informal group and, at the second meeting, would invite States Parties, Observers and all Members of the Committee. Hence, it could be specified if necessary that this paragraph related to the first informal group meeting.
114. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** supported the proposal by the Republic of Korea and echoed the remarks by Senegal that once the working group had been put in place, all the other countries would have the opportunity to intervene at the General Assembly.
115. The delegation of **Turkey** endorsed the remarks by the Republic of Korea that the informal ad hoc working group was under the charge of its chairmanship and therefore the modalities should be left to the incoming Chair. It was of the understanding that the ad hoc working group would be open to all Committee Members, and the necessity for an open-ended group would be decided at the ad hoc working group.
116. The delegation of **Hungary** thanked the Chairperson for the clarifications regarding the different modalities of the working group. He added that verbal agreement should be sufficient concerning the fact that all Committee members would be invited for the first meeting and that a second meeting would be open to all States Parties as Observers. In this regard, the delegation did not feel this needed to be reflected in the text and that consensus could be found.
117. The delegation of **India** spoke with the greatest respect for Hungary and others, but believed that this issue had gone too far. After all, the Republic of Korea had graciously offered to host the meeting and should therefore be left to organize the details. Moreover, it was common practice within UNESCO to have working groups in which each Regional Group served as a channel for comments from its own Members. So there was no question of exclusion, as the Committee was clearly fighting every day for transparency and inclusion.
118. The delegation of **Republic of Korea** thanked India for voicing what it wanted to state. The delegation wished to make clear that it was not seeking exclusivity; it sought multilateral openness and transparency, which were of paramount importance for any working group to be successful. It explained that the gathering would begin informally until some progress had been made, after which an open-ended meeting could be convened if it was considered necessary. It added that information sharing and outreaching activities were very important.
119. Following the intervention by India and Korea, the delegation of **Palestine** raised a point of order, suggesting closing the debate on this paragraph and going to its adoption.
120. The delegation of **Algeria** had full confidence in the chairmanship of the Republic of Korea. Nevertheless, it wished to have on record that some Members of the Committee were of the opinion that the working group should be open to everyone.
121. The **Chairperson** proceededto theadoption of paragraph 13, and with no objections, it was duly adopted. Paragraph 15 as proposed by Hungary was also adopted. He then turned to paragraph 16 and Austria’s amendment.
122. The delegation of **Palestine** asked Austria to clarify the logic behind its amendment that, ‘Reminds itself that decisions on nominations, proposals or requests need to be made with utmost care […]’.
123. The delegation of **Austria** felt it was necessary to make clear to the Committee, particularly when revising recommendations by the Evaluation Body, the need to allow for clarifications but not to take into account any new information, as stated earlier. Therefore it wished to confirm this established working method, which had proven successful over the years.
124. The **Chairperson** felt that the rule was already there and this was simply a reminder.
125. The delegation of **Cuba** believed that this was important and could perhapsbe discussed at the working group from which it could be a recommendation to the General Assembly. However, it wondered whether it was appropriate here, though it could be reflected in the summary records of the present meeting. In any case, the delegation believed that the Committee was getting ahead of itself and was actually going beyond the framework of its mandate, as this was a preamble-form of reminder of a specific Article and therefore not a decision as such. It therefore proposed deleting the paragraph.
126. The **Chairperson** asked the Secretariat whether the paragraph related to the working group.
127. The **Secretary** was of the understanding that the paragraph did not relate to the working group. It was a reminder of past practices.
128. The delegation of **Cuba** insisted thatthis was not the place for the paragraph, as this was not a decision but a reminder of the Committee’s mandate. The issue could be reported in the summary records and taken up by the working group.
129. The delegation of **Palestine** did not feel it was necessary to remind the Committee of a rule that was already in the Rules of Procedure, which would only open up to many other reminder paragraphs. The delegation agreed with Cuba.
130. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** remarked that the paragraph was a reminder of the working method of the Committee, which the Chairperson recalls at the beginning of the Committee’s deliberations. It was therefore unnecessary and could be deleted.
131. Concerned about the time, the **Chairperson** sought a consensus on the paragraph.
132. The delegation of **Senegal** agreed with the Chairperson that the debate was unnecessarily drawn out, and supported Cuba's proposal.
133. The delegation of **Austria** withdrew its amendment.
134. The **Chairperson** proceeded one by one through paragraphs 16 to 26, which were duly adopted. Turning to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, and with no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision 11.COM 10 adopted**.
135. The **Secretary** drew attention to the very critical items that still needed to be adopted, including the election of Members of the Evaluation Body. The Secretary suggested moving to vote now so that the votes could be counted during lunchtime.

**ITEM 11 OF THE AGENDA:**

**ESTABLISHMENT OF THE EVALUATION BODY FOR THE 2017 CYCLE**

**Document** [*ITH/16/11.COM/11*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-11_Rev.-EN.docx)

**Decision** *11.COM 11*

1. Presenting the item, the **Secretary** invited the Committee to adopt the terms of reference of the Evaluation Body, in Annex 1 of working document 11, which reflected the fact that the Committee was now tasked with examining International Assistance requests greater than US$100,000. The referral option applied to the Urgent Safeguarding List, the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices, and International Assistance requests, in addition to the Representative List. In addition, the Evaluation Body would evaluate a special case, pursuant to Decision 10.COM 19, relating to a request from Viet Nam to transfer an element on the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List. The Committee was therefore invited to appoint: two experts and one NGO, as per Decision 9.COM 11, one expert from Electoral Group III, and one expert from Electoral Group IV, as well as one NGO from Electoral Group V(b). It was also asked to re-appoint the nine Members elected in previous years; candidates were proposed to the Chairperson of each Electoral Group. According to decision 9.COM 11, States were encouraged to ensure that at least two candidatures were proposed, and a maximum of three. The Secretary informed the Committee that one candidate from Electoral Group III had withdrawn on 1 December, which was reflected in the revised document 11. The list of candidates was found in Annex 2 of document 11, with online CVs for the experts and applications for accreditation in the case of NGOs.
2. The **Chairperson** proposed proceeding in the order in which the Secretary introduced its work by first looking at the terms of reference, and then proceeding to the appointment of the three new Members of the Evaluation Body. He reminded the Committee that in 2015 it had adopted amendments to its Rules of Procedure to include provisions governing voting by secret ballot, notably Rule 39. With reference to section B of Rule 39, the vote would be by secret ballot. The Chairperson proceeded to the adoption of the Terms of Reference of the Evaluation Body in Annex 1. With no objections, all seven paragraphs, and the Terms of Reference as a whole, were adopted.
3. The **Secretariat** explained the procedure of voting by secret ballot. The Secretariat would distribute three ballots to all Committee Members: one for each vacancy and one envelope. Each Member had to make its intention clear for each of the three vacancies, and not only the vacancy concerning its own Electoral Group. The candidate with the highest number of votes would be elected. Each ballot carried the names of all the candidates for each seat. Members were asked to circle the names of the candidates, fold the ballot papers, place them in the envelope provided and seal the envelope. Any departure from the instructions would render the ballot invalid. A roll call of Members would be made when the envelopes could be deposited in the ballot box on the podium.
4. The delegation of **Cuba** asked about the tellers.
5. The **Chairperson** invited two volunteers to assume the role of tellers.
6. The delegation of **Cuba** asked that the volunteers not be representatives of Regional Groups with candidates in the vote, to avoid any conflicts of interest.
7. The **Chairperson** understood that to be the case.
8. The delegation of **Palestine** proposed that Hungary and Ethiopia serve as tellers.
9. With no objections, the **Chairperson** invited Hungary and Ethiopia to the podium, and asked the Committee Members to confirm they had received the ballots and envelopes.
10. The delegation of **Cuba** wished to thank Mexico for withdrawing its nomination in its Regional Group; its gesture allowed for consensus within the group regarding the names put forward.
11. The delegation of **Colombia** echoed Cuba’s thanks to Mexico for maintaining the good feeling in the group.
12. The delegation of **Guatemala** also wished to thank Mexico for maintaining unity within the region of Latin America and the Caribbean.
13. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** echoed the gratitude to Mexico.
14. The **Chairperson** gave Members five minutes to circle the names of the candidates for whom they wished to vote before the call to deposit the ballots.

*[5-minute pause]*

1. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to conduct the roll call so as to collect the ballots from each Member.
2. The **Secretariat** recorded the votes of the following Committee Members:Afghanistan, Algeria, Armenia, Austria, Bulgaria, Colombia, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Lebanon, Mauritius, Mongolia, Palestine, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Saint Lucia, Senegal, [Turkey](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/state/turkey-TR) and Zambia.
3. With all the envelopes collected, the **Chairperson** adjourned for lunch.

*[Friday, 2 December 2016, afternoon session]*

**ITEM 11 OF THE AGENDA (CONT.):**

1. The **Chairperson** was pleased to announce that the counting of ballots for the new Members of the Evaluation Body had been completed. Twenty-four Committee Members were present and had voted. The following candidates received votes as follows:
2. **Electoral Group III**: The expert MrNigel Encalada from Belize had received eleven votes. The expert **Ms Sonia Montecino Aguirre from Chile had received thirteen votes and was elected**.
3. **Electoral group IV**: The expert Ms Mina Amidzadeh from the Islamic Republic of Iran had received two votes. The expert Ms Savitri Suwansathit from Thailand had received one vote. The expert **Ms Hien Thi Nguyen from Viet Nam received twenty-one votes and was elected**.
4. **Electoral Group V(b):** The NGO Association of the Laureates of the National Institute for Archaeology and Heritage Sciences (ALINSAP) had received ten votes. The NGO **Egyptian Society for Folk Tradition had received fourteen votes and was elected**.
5. The **Chairperson** congratulated the three new Members of the Evaluation Body, and thanked the other candidates. He turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no comments or objections, paragraphs 1–5 were duly adopted. Turning to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision 11.COM 11 adopted**.
6. The **Chairperson** remarked that according to Rule 43 of the Rules of Procedure, the Committee shall adopt its report of this session in the form of a list of decisions. The Secretariat had compiled the decisions adopted during the week on decisions concerning items 2–10 including sub-items 10.a, 10.b and 10.c. The Rapporteur of the Committee was tasked with validating the decisions prior to their adoption later in the day. The Chairperson had proposed breaking for half an hour to allow Members to read the decisions, as was customary. However, given the time constraints, he proposed continuing, and with no objections, asked the Secretary to introduce the next item.

**ITEM 12 OF THE AGENDA:**

**NUMBER OF FILES SUBMITTED FOR THE 2017 CYCLE AND NUMBER OF FILES THAT CAN BE TREATED IN THE 2018 AND 2019 CYCLES**

**Document** [*ITH/16/11.COM/12*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-12-EN.docx)

**Decision** *11.COM 12*

1. The **Secretary** presented thedocument, which addressed two issues: i) the implementation of Decision 10.COM 13 for files in the 2017 cycle, and ii) the number of files that can be treated in the next two cycles (2018 and 2019). Regarding the 2017 cycle (from 31 March 2016), in principle, the Committee had decided to treat **fifty files** per year (Decision 8.COM 10, reconfirmed by Decision 9.COM 12 and Decision 10.COM 13), and **at least one file per submitting State** during the two-year period, i.e. in the biennium 2016–2017. The files treated in the 2017 cycle would fall into four categories: i) files from States whose national files could not be treated in 2016; ii) files from States with no elements or programmes or International Assistance +Urgent Safeguarding List candidatures; iii) multinational files; and iv) files from States with the fewest elements inscribed, in ascending order. There were 174 receivable files for the 2017 cycle (42 new and 132 backlog files) of which 52 had been selected in accordance with the priorities established by paragraph 34 of the Operational Directives. Fifty-two files had been selected instead of fifty because two files were at the same level of priority, with the Secretariat exercising flexibility, according to Decisions 10.COM 13 and 9.COM 12. According to Decision 10.COM 19, the Committee had decided to examine the element ‘Xoan singing of Phú Thọ Province, Viet Nam’ above the adopted overall ceiling for the 2017 cycle in order to take a decision on the requested transfer from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List. The Annex thus provided a summary of the results of the application of these priorities: i) eleven files from States that had not been treated in 2016; ii) eight files from States having no element inscribed including four nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List, one of which was a multinational file; and iii) three multinational files, which brought the total to twenty-six files. The remaining files were prioritized in the ascending order of the number of previously recorded items. The ceiling of fifty-two files thus represented fifty-one submitting States, plus the candidacy of India (with ten elements inscribed); five states would thus have their files reviewed as a matter of priority for the 2018 cycle.
2. Regarding the 2018 and 2019 cycles, the **Secretary** explained that the Committee was called upon to decide on the overall number of files, taking into consideration the limited available resources of the Evaluation Body, the Committee and the Secretariat. In particular, the Committee might consider the capacity of the Evaluation Body and the financial resources allocated to it to carry out its work, the process of which had been discussed previously. This process ensured against any potential individual bias, and even geographical representation. Experience showed that even with more people added to the Evaluation Body, the time available during a cycle was enough to evaluate only around fifty files following this method. The Secretariat thus proposed keeping the ceiling of fifty files per cycle. Paragraph 8 of the draft decision contained the text of Decisions 10.COM 13 and 9.COM 12 to confirm the principle that ‘at least one file per submitting State should be processed during the two-year period 2018-2019.’ It was noted that the ceiling applied to all combined mechanisms.
3. Thanking the Secretary, and with no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** proposed moving directly to the adoption of the decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.With no objections to the proposed paragraphs, the **Chairperson declared Decision 11.COM 12 adopted**.

**ITEM 16 OF THE AGENDA:**

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

**Document** [*ITH/16/11.COM/16*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-16-EN.docx)

**Decision** *11.COM 16*

1. The **Chairperson** proceeded to the decision on the date and venue of the twelfth session of the Committee in 2017, referring to document 16 and its corresponding draft decision. He informed the Committee that on 25 August 2016, the Secretariat had received a proposal from the Republic of Korea to host the Committee’s twelfthsession in 2017.
2. The **Chairperson** suggested that the Committee accept its kind offer by acclamation.

*[The offer was accepted by acclamation]*

1. The **Chairperson** thanked the Republic of Korea for this kind offer, and invited the Secretary to provide some additional information on the dates.
2. The **Secretary** advised the Committee that Rule 4.1 of the Rules of Procedure stipulated that the Committee shall determine at each session, and in consultation with the Director-General of UNESCO, the date and place of the next session. He informed the Committee that he had been able to confirm with the Director-General and the Republic of Korea authorities that the twelfth session could be held from 4 to 8 December 2017. The Secretariat had amended the draft decision accordingly, and his team was now displaying it on the screens.

*[The dates were accepted by acclamation]*

1. The **Chairperson** thenturned to the adoption of the decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no comments or objections, **the Chairperson declared Decision 11.COM 16 adopted as amended**.
2. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** expressed its profound gratitude to the Chairperson, the Committee and the Secretariat for their hard work, and for the opportunity to invite the Committee to its country for its twelfth session. This opportunity was even more significant as it was the first meeting of the Convention to be held in the Republic of Korea, which would draw upon its experience as the host of several international conferences and world summits, including the G20, the Summit on Nuclear Security and the World Education Forum. It would do its utmost to make the next session an enriching and memorable experience for all participants. The Republic of Korea has always been loyal to UNESCO's heritage programmes and it would continue to collaborate with international partners and stakeholders within the framework of UNESCO’s culture conventions. Republic of Korea is a country of high civilization and millennial history, which has a great wealth of tangible and intangible cultural heritage to share with the rest of the world. The delegation was pleased that the next session would allow delegates to directly experience the rich and dynamic culture of Korea, and to discover Seoul, a blend of modernity and tradition. It looked forward to welcoming everyone.

*[A film on the Republic of Korea was projected]*

**ITEM 17 OF THE AGENDA:**

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

**Document** [*ITH/16/11.COM/17*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-17-EN.docx)

**Decision** *11.COM 17*

1. With the date and venue now decided, the **Chairperson** turned to the election of the next Bureau, referring to document 17. He recalled that, in accordance with Rules 12 and 13 of its 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 for equitable geographical representation and, inasmuch as possible, a balance among the various fields of ICH. The Members of the Bureau would also need to be Members of the Committee.
2. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** proposed the Chairperson of thetwelfth session, His Excellency Mr Byong-hyun Lee, the permanent delegate of the Republic of Korea to UNESCO.

*[Approval by acclamation]*

1. The **Chairperson** congratulated H.E. Mr Byong-hyun Lee on his election, noting that he would represent Group IV. The Chairperson invited a proposal for the Rapporteur.
2. In the meantime, the **Chairperson** also sought proposals for the Vice-Chairpersons.
3. On behalf of Electoral Group I, the delegation of **Austria** proposed Turkey.
4. On behalf of Electoral Group V(b), the delegation of **Algeria** proposed Palestine.
5. On behalf of Electoral Group III, the delegation of **Guatemala** proposed Colombia.
6. On behalf of Electoral Group V(a), the delegation of **Senegal** proposed Côte d’Ivoire.
7. On behalf of Electoral Group II, the delegation of **Hungary** proposed Bulgaria.
8. The **Chairperson** returned to the name of the Rapporteur.
9. The delegation of **Palestine** proposed Mr Gábor Soós from Hungary.
10. Noting the name, the **Chairperson** congratulated Mr Soós.

*[Approval by acclamation]*

1. The **Chairperson** thenturned to the adoption of the decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no comments or objections, **the Chairperson declared Decision 11.COM 17 adopted**.

**ITEM 14 OF THE AGENDA:**

**PRELIMINARY EXPERT MEETING ON DEVELOPING AN OVERALL RESULTS FRAMEWORK FOR THE CONVENTION**

**Document** [*ITH/16/11.COM/14*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-14-EN.docx)

1. The **Chairperson** turned to the next agenda item, remarking how it was very important for the future of the Convention and for measuring its impact and drawing lessons.
2. Elaborating on the context, the **Secretary** explained that the wish to develop an overall framework for the 2003 Convention stemmed from 2013 when the findings of the Internal Oversight Service (IOS) evaluation of the standard-setting work of UNESCO’s Culture Sector were brought to the Committee’s attention. The evaluation concluded that an overall results framework at the level of the Convention was needed to draw ‘conclusions about the progress made with regard to the implementation of the Convention’. The Committee fully shared that view, while stressing that the process of developing an overall results framework should fully involve and be led by States Parties. The way to ensure this participatory process chosen by the Committee was to convene an open-ended intergovernmental working group during 2016. However, this should be subject to the condition that voluntary supplementary contributions to the ICH Fund were received in order to cover all the costs of organizing the meeting as well as the participation of ICH experts from developing countries that are parties to the Convention. Although no donors came forward in time to permit such a meeting in 2016, at its last session the Committee accepted the generous offer of the National Commission of the People’s Republic of China for UNESCO to support a smaller meeting of experts that could elaborate a preliminary framework. This would be submitted to a subsequent intergovernmental working group so that it could benefit from the perspectives and experience of a diverse and geographically representative group of experts, ensuring from the beginning that the framework reflected the desired ‘inclusive process of consultation and discussion.’ The meeting was thus held from 7 to 9 September 2016 in Beijing, China, as a category VI meeting, meaning a meeting of a non-representative character of experts appointed by the Director-General who shall serve in their private capacity. It brought together twenty-one experts from different UNESCO Member States and Associate Members working in governmental and non-governmental institutions, in communities or practitioner groups.
3. The **Secretary** was pleased to inform the Committee that once again China, through its Ministry of Culture, had offered to financially support, organize and host this open-ended intergovernmental working group in Chengdu in early June 2017. The present debate, particularly on the results map proposed in the Annex of [working document 14](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-14-EN.docx), would therefore be crucial for the preparation of the working documents of the June meeting.Referring to the results map in the annex,the Secretary further explainedthatwhen preparing for the preliminary expert meeting, the Secretariat soon realized that it would be impossible to achieve a results framework, even a preliminary one, in three days. It therefore opted to focus the meeting on the first steps necessary for the development of a results framework, in line with the Results-Based Management (RBM) approach adopted by the United Nations. The meeting therefore focused on: i) developing a common vision of what constituted success when implementing the Convention; and ii) elaborating a possible results map for the Convention. What was understood as a ‘results map’, rather than a results framework, was a flow chart or logical sequence that described the relationship between inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts. For the ‘results map’ to be developed into a full-fledged results framework, further work was needed to identify assumptions and risks, identify relevant existing indicators, develop new ones, and so on. Although this work was ongoing, the Secretariat hoped that by June [2017], thanks to China’s contribution to the ICH Fund, it would be able to carry out this work and present a draft results framework for discussion by the open-ended intergovernmental working group. What it could already affirm was that developing an overall results framework for an international normative instrument such as the 2003 Convention was not typical of the kind of organizations and programmes on which monitoring and evaluation work typically focused. A Convention involves numerous actors, many potential causes and just as many possible effectsand ‘success’ may not look the same to each actor. Implementing the Convention was thus not a single programme carried out by one organization, but a number of actions undertaken under the umbrella of a normative instrument by different stakeholders at international, national and local levels. The results map in the Annex therefore only provided a basic structure, reflecting the comments of the participants in the preliminary expert meeting. Certain participants deemed that achieving the purposes of the Convention set out in Article 1 should be considered as the Convention’s ultimate impact, while other participants saw the achievement of these purposes as long-term outcomes, contributing in turn to larger impacts as set out in the Preamble. The results map tried to accommodate both perspectives. The Secretary was very interested in the present debate on this item, as the Committee’s remarks would provide valuable guidance for the continuation of this work.
4. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for his brief but accurate introduction, remarking that the discussion required the Committee’s attention and ability to reflect beyond immediate realities so as to draw the framework against which it wished to measure the changes it believed the Convention could bring. The Chairperson opened the floor to debate.
5. The delegation of **Turkey** thanked the Secretariat for the comprehensive working documents that provided food for thought at this initial stage of the development of an overall results framework for the Convention. It also thanked China for its contribution to organizing the preliminary expert meeting in September 2016. The discussions and the logical sequence and the results map drafted at the Beijing meeting set a solid starting point for discussions in the open-ended intergovernmental working group meeting. It found it appropriate to distinguish between the short-, medium- and long-term outcomes, which were very pertinent to the targets, goals and general purposes of the Convention, providing a better focus on the expected outcomes of the activities according to certain time frames. The impact of the activities fitted well with the broader goals of the Convention, in particular with the concept of sustainable development and the 2030 Agenda. The development of the framework would no doubt improve the general monitoring of the Convention with a narrowed focus on outcomes and impacts. It would also introduce the modern approach of results-based management adopted by the UN system in the governance of the 2003 Convention. Last but not least, the overall results framework would also provide a valuable input for States Parties, the Secretariat, NGOs, communities and other stakeholders in their advocacy efforts for funding at different levels.
6. The delegation of the **Philippines** appreciated the preliminary work done and China’s generous offer to host an intergovernmental working group meeting to continue discussions on an overall results framework for the Convention. It noted the complexity of the task and suggested an incremental and inclusive approach. The Convention already had many reporting procedures that still needed to be optimized. The delegation sought a cautious approach in creating new obligations and mechanisms, adding that results on ICH could be difficult to quantify, as it was important not to de-contextualize living and dynamic elements from their communities. In the end, it was the communities themselves that would be in the best position to determine the success of such collective efforts.
7. The delegation of **Colombia** thanked China for providing a space and budget to enable the discussions on one of the most important components of the Convention in order to make ICH part of sustainable development processes, beyond the mere recognition of its manifestations. The delegation brought up three areas that, although addressed in general in the activities and outputs, it would like to see addressed specifically within the results framework. One of the priority areas would be endogenous research. The delegation believed that the internal strengthening of these communities should also be a priority. The delegation considered that, although efforts are being made to strengthen ICH manifestations, such work should start with the strengthening of the communities themselves. Finally, it also believed it was very important to continue to explore how ICH could be integrated into sustainable development. Indeed, there was a need to move from theory into practice and to see how ICH becomes a practice in more specific areas of sustainable development.
8. The delegation of **India** thanked the Secretariat for its report on this important issue, adding its support in principle to the development of an overall results framework. It thanked China for hosting the initial meeting of selected experts who carried out the preparatory work. Moreover, as ICH primarily concerned communities, any results framework should focus on ascertaining how much change the Convention had brought to the safeguarding of elements by the communities concerned. In addition, it was important to recognize that the implementation of any new mechanism measuring results at the national level would need further capacity-building efforts for many countries. Countries had different capacities to measure the effectiveness of safeguarding measures. It looked forward to participating in the working group meetings on this issue.
9. The delegation of **Austria** thanked China for hosting this important meeting on developing an overall results framework, which provided an excellent starting-point for the inclusive process that would help monitor the implementation of the Convention. It agreed that the process would take time, adding that the process was as important as the product. The aim was to develop a clear, credible and evidence-based vision for the future implementation of the Convention. The elements for this common vision could be found in the Convention and related documents, such as the concept of safeguarding, community participation, mutual appreciation and respect, as well as international cooperation. Like very often in the cultural sector, identifying indicators would be a challenge, both nationally and internationally. However, the delegation felt that it could be very useful to look at the impact of ICH on the 2030 Agenda, using synergies with these indicators. It looked forward to the next step in the process and thanked China for establishing an open-ended intergovernmental working group.
10. With no other Members taking the floor, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to Observers.
11. The delegation of **Finland** thanked the Chairperson, the Secretariat and the host country of Ethiopia, expressing its thanks for the initiative of the overall results framework. The delegation had taken part in the meeting in Beijing, and it thanked China for hosting the meeting. It believed that the framework had great potential for States Parties to further develop their work with regard to the Convention, safeguarding and working closer with communities. It could be developed as a tool to assist work internationally, nationally or even in local contexts, and help reveal connections on a broader level, on the global United Nations agenda. The annual reports produced every six years could be used to showcase the results established in countries, but this tool could help do even better, to dig deeper on what the Convention was really about; not only to report to UNESCO but to fulfil the spirit of the Convention, its obligations and recommendations in measurable ways. It looked forward to the development of the tool.
12. Having just joined the debate, the delegation of **Cuba** remarked that UNESCO was in this process of preparing indicators to be able to measure results. However, it was important to take into account that not all Conventions, all sectors and all programmes were measurable in the same way. It was very easy to discuss eradicating illiteracy for example, but in the case of ICH, more flexible indicators – qualitative and not just quantitative indicators – were required to provide a certain leeway and flexibility in their implementation and application in different regions. The delegation understood that it was a complicated process, adding that in different sectors of UNESCO it was much easier to measure expected results, but in areas such as culture, which was more intangible and qualitative, it was much more complex. The delegation therefore felt strongly that the Convention and the Committee should defend the fact that these indicators, because of the nature of the Convention, were invariably different. The Committee should therefore move forward in this process with caution, particularly in the framework of the financial crisis within UNESCO.
13. The delegation of **Zimbabwe** congratulated the Chairperson for his sterling work, the Secretariat for its support and assistance during the session, and Ethiopia for its wonderful hospitality, adding that it looked forward to the next session in the Republic of Korea in 2017.The delegation commended the initiative to establish a results framework for ICH, which was a very important step towards making progress in establishing and building a good strategy with sustainable targets for ICH. It was keen to see how the results would assist Zimbabwe internally in building its own processes. In this regard, it thanked China for offering to host the next session of the results framework meeting in June in 2017, and it looked forward to the results.
14. The **Representative of the ICH-NGO Forum** commended the initiative for the development of an overall results framework for the Convention, reiterating the need to measure the success or impact of the actions put in place in the name of safeguarding ICH. This study of measurements, methodologies and relevant indicators was at the heart of change elicited by sustainable safeguarding. It also represented an opportunity for greater accountability within the Convention. Some NGOs within the Forum were already involved in impact assessments at the national or local level, often at the request of the groups and communities themselves. The Forum and NGOs concerned wished to participate actively in any future working groups in establishing the overall results framework.
15. The **Chairperson** thanked the delegates for their interventions, and he proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no objections or amendments to paragraphs 1–6 were duly adopted. It was noted that Turkey had proposed a new paragraph 7.
16. The delegation of **Turkey** explained that the initial idea was that this would help capacity-building, but the amendment was found not to fit this particular decision, so it was withdrawn.
17. The **Chairperson** then proceeded to the original paragraph 7, with a minor amendment by Turkey, which was adopted as amended. With regard to paragraph 8, the Chairperson remarked that the Fund had not yet received the necessary contribution to organize the open-ended intergovernmental working group called for by the Committee but he suggested an amendment to reflect the commitment by the Ministry of Culture of China. With no objections, paragraph 8 was adopted as amended. Paragraph 9 was also adopted. Turning to the adoption as a whole, and with no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision 11.COM 14 adopted**.
18. The delegation of **China** warmly welcomed the decision adopted on the overall results framework of the Convention. It shared the strong sentiment that the overall framework was of great significance to the implementation of the Convention, especially with regard to its integration with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Hence, China’s formal invitation to host the inter-governmental working group in June 2017, to which all delegates were invited. The meeting would take place at the same time as the sixth International Festival of ICH in Chengdu, China.
19. The **Chairperson** thanked China for its kind invitation, inviting the Secretary to introduce the next agenda item.

**ITEM 15 OF THE AGENDA:**

**INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE IN EMERGENCIES**

**Document** [*ITH/16/11.COM/15*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-15-EN.docx)

1. The **Secretary** explained thatthe objective of this item was for the Committee to engage in a general reflection on the role of the Convention in response to emergency situations, which was understood to cover both conflicts and natural disasters. This item had come about because of the international context of the past years that had unfortunately witnessed an escalation of conflicts and natural disasters, which had damaged cultural heritage as a whole and ICH specifically. The Secretary recalled that at the General Assembly session in June 2016 Greece had appealed for further deliberations on the value of safeguarding ICH in cases of armed conflict, and for its role in reconciliation. This was in the context of the examination of the new chapter of the Operational Directives on sustainable development, which included various references to emergencies, as mentioned in [working document 15](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-15-EN.docx). In fact, the Committee had already addressed the issue of emergency in the framework of other topics, and had made substantial advancements in the normative specifics to this end. For instance: i) in the definition of ‘emergency’ in the context of the International Assistance mechanism, which had been used three times so far; ii) in the criteria of extreme urgency under the Urgent Safeguarding List, which had yet to be activated; and iii) more recently, in the new chapter on sustainable development. In parallel, UNESCO had been increasingly called upon to be part of the emergency response on the ground in all phases, and had made decisions to facilitate this task. In particular, regarding conflicts, at its 38th session in November 2015, UNESCO’s General Conference had adopted the ‘Strategy for the Reinforcement of UNESCO’s Actions for the Protection of Culture and the Promotion of Cultural Pluralism in the Event of Armed Conflict’[[8]](#footnote-9).In this context, the ICH Section was increasingly solicited to contribute under the 2003 Convention and to propose operational actions. However, although the normative provisions to legitimate such action exist, it was neither easy nor straightforward to move forward as ICH concerns communities and individuals. Therefore, the time was ripe for the Committee to devote a full discussion to the role of ICH in emergencies but also, more specifically, to the role of the Convention in such situations. The Secretarywished to underline that the document provided some preliminary considerations for the debate regarding the dual approach of ICH in relation to access to communities and their role, and the question of displaced persons. However, it was by no means meant to be exhaustive. The draft decision mainly asked the Secretariat to continue to gather knowledge and gain experience on this issue, and it proposed continuing the discussion at its next session in 2017 with a view to exploring more operational modalities for the implementation of the Convention in situations of emergencies.
2. The **Chairperson** opened the floor for debate.
3. As a country often affected by natural disasters, the delegation of the **Philippines** welcomed the inclusion of this topic on the agenda. Growing instability in the world due to conflict placed ICH increasingly at risk. However, it noted that most attention was afforded to tangible heritage in situations of armed conflict or natural disasters. In this regard, it would be important to include ICH considerations in the UNESCO action plan currently being discussed by the Executive Board. Identifying potential ICH at risk in emergency situations could be a necessary initial step to take this issue forward in a concrete way. Thus, some type of mapping exercise might be considered in consultation with States Parties, particularly those experiencing emergencies. The provision of International Assistance and capacity building must be the priority when it comes to ICH in emergencies. In fact, some of the ICH Fund could eventually be earmarked solely for safeguarding intangible heritage in emergencies. Pilot projects could be presented to the Committee, the Secretariat and the General Assembly for further consideration. The Committee might however have to differentiate between support during crisis situations and post-conflict or post-emergency support. It looked forward to deepening understanding and activities on this important matter.
4. The delegation of **Palestine** thanked the Philippines for its intervention, having partially covered its concern, and it thanked the Secretariat for the document and proposed draft decision. It found the topic very important, although complicated, and deserving greater attention. Emergencies covered a vast number of situations, but for the delegation and its region it was most concerned with armed conflict and terrorist attacks. In this regard, it wished to thank the Secretariat for its intention to continue the reflection on this issue so as to propose concrete measures in the future. The delegation found that the draft decision was very accurate, perhaps requiring a minor amendment. It added that it hoped the Evaluation Body was still present so that it could thank its Members and ask them to sometimes take into account these special cases.
5. The delegation of **India** welcomed the discussions on this important issue in the light of present-day armed conflicts, natural disasters and migration issues. It found that the International Assistance mechanism under this Convention was important and could assist Member States in building their capacities to safeguard their ICH. It took note of the Secretary’s presentation on the strategy for reinforcing UNESCO’s action plan for the protection of culture and the promotion of cultural pluralism in the event of armed conflict, and noted that this strategy and action plan would be discussed at the Executive Board level. The delegation agreed with the statement by the Philippines that much of the attention was focused on tangible and not intangible heritage. In this regard, it wished to ask the Secretariat to explain how far the 2003 Convention had been involved in the development of the action plan and its proposed implementation.
6. Noting the direct question, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Secretary.
7. The **Secretary** replied that it had not been as involved as it could have been, explaining that it was a question of the Secretariat’s ability to respond to calls to get involved, hence the current forum to discuss this issue. The Secretary remarked that it had been said all along that ICH in these kinds of contexts could not be treated in the same way as built heritage, as it was a completely different kind of phenomenon. Thus, the same context could not be applied, hence the need to reflect on strategies focused on intangible heritage.
8. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for his explanation.
9. The delegation of **Cuba** was also extremely happy to note the inclusion on the agenda of this topic on a strategy to reinforce UNESCO’s role in protecting heritage in situations of armed conflict. It noted that the underlying premise of this initiative was to safeguard heritage regardless of the context, as – in addition to armed conflict – it also made reference to natural disasters. The delegation explained that the small island of Cuba was affected by natural phenomena that hit such islands very hard, a priority for UNESCO. One of the questions that always comes up in discussions at UNESCO is the need to add the protection of heritage to all the other discussions to be held at the next General Conference. The fundamental mechanism and established legal framework to protect heritage was the Convention, and as such new proposals for emergency action must always be within the context of this framework because this work was preventive and educational. The delegation believed that it was the purpose of the Convention to help humanity face these new challenges, such as migration. Indeed, it had a crucial role to play in safeguarding tangible and intangible cultural heritage when hundreds and thousands of people were being displaced, and with them, their intangible heritage and traditions. There was thus a need to reflect on the best way this Convention could help contribute to UNESCO’s strategy, to reinforce the protection of heritage in situations of emergency within the framework of the General Assembly and the Committee. The delegation understood that this was a relatively new discussion, but it was an important one to have within the Convention, and it was not enough to simply ask the Secretariat to provide information. A collective reflection was required to examine how the Committee could contribute to UNESCO’s strategy of safeguarding ICH within the legislative structures open to it, rather than involving any other organ, such as the Security Council.
10. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** congratulated the Secretariat on the addition of this item to the agenda with regard to the numerous armed conflicts and natural disasters that have a negative impact on heritage in general. The delegation took the opportunity to reiterate its thanks to the Committee for granting International Assistance to help with inventorying its national heritage in the aftermath of conflicts affecting the country.
11. The delegation of **Austria** remarked that this was probably one of the most important and urgent topics in which conflict and natural disasters affected many parts of the world, and where tangible and intangible heritage was under threat, requiring a comprehensive response. In this context, it appreciated the dedicated efforts of the international community to condemn the increasing number of deliberate acts of destruction of cultural heritage all over the world. UNESCO, the European Union, the Council of Europe, as well as the United Nations have unanimously appealed for the recognition of universally recognized standards. The delegation recalled the Strategy for the Reinforcement of UNESCO’s Actions for the Protection of Culture and the Promotion of Cultural Pluralism in the Event of Armed Conflict adopted by UNESCO at its General Conference in 2015, in addition to a number of actions by UNESCO on the illicit trafficking of cultural goods, the protection of World Heritage, the promotion of cultural diversity, and the [#Unite4Heritage](http://www.unite4heritage.org/en/unite4heritage-celebrating-safeguarding-cultural-heritage) initiative. Furthermore, it referred to the [Namur Declaration](http://www.coe.int/en/web/culture-and-heritage/strategy-21) by the Ministers of Culture of the Council of Europe in 2015 and the measures adopted by the European Union on cultural heritage as a strategic resource for a sustainable Europe. It fully agreed with UNESCO in considering actions against cultural heritage, tangible or intangible, as crimes against humanity. International solidarity and the reinforcement of international cooperation were required to prevent and suppress such acts of destruction involving not only institutional stakeholders but also representatives of professionals and civil society at international, national and local levels. On a more positive note, the delegation spoke of the potential of ICH to overcome conflict, enhance social cohesion and facilitate dialogue. In its amendment, the delegation requested that the Secretariat prepare operational guidelines on the implementation of the principles of the Convention in emergency situations for discussion at its next session in 2017.
12. The delegation of **Turkey** thanked the Secretariat for the succinct working document. It spoke about the increasing number of communities and countries faced with serious emergencies to protect the viability of their ICH practices, which made it critically important that the Convention be better placed to provide responses to these situations. While the viability of ICH practices and traditions of communities were being threatened in emergency situations, these practices could also be utilized to mobilize the communities for further resilience against the challenges facing them. By fostering cultural pluralism and strengthening social cohesion, ICH had the potential to contribute towards peace-building and conflict resolution efforts. The delegation was pleased to see that emergency assistance projects in Mali and Côte d’Ivoire had been implemented with such an approach. As a recent issue of the culture Conventions, case studies seemed to show a vacuum of experience with regard to ICH in emergencies. The delegation expected the Secretariat to continue its efforts to further gather data and present them to the next sessions of the Committee. Procedures for expedited emergency assistance should also be discussed with a view to facilitating and accelerating assistance during emergencies, particularly in the form of a rapid emergency response mechanism, rather than post-emergency assistance. The delegation wished to hear from the Secretariat on this subject. Lastly, challenges regarding cases of armed conflict, particularly in its region, were imperative but emergencies were limited neither to armed conflicts nor one region. A global approach should therefore be adopted. In this framework, attention should be paid to ensuring the viability of the ICH of displaced persons. In this context, the delegation had a new project developed by its National Commission. [Another speaker] The **President of the National Commission of UNESCO** spoke of three million Syrian refugees in Turkey since the beginning of armed conflict in Syria. The National Commission had conducted research in the refugee camps with the participation of committees of experts on education, gender equality, MOST[[9]](#footnote-10), cultural diversity and ICH. Following the field research, the Commission had a general knowledge of the heritage of the people concerned and was able to advise the Directorate Office of Refugees. The Directorate had made certain facilities available to the refugees so that they could practise their own ICH in the camp. However, many refugees had moved on to other countries in Europe. The experience from this project had helped prepare the discussion of this topic in this current session.
13. The **Chairperson** noted a specific question to the Secretariat for clarification.
14. The **Secretary** asked Turkey if it had a question on International Assistance.
15. The delegation of **Turkey** sought an explanation on the rapid reaction mechanism in the event of an emergency, and whether there was indeed a proposal similar to the one applicable within the framework of cultural heritage.
16. The **Secretary** explained that there was a mechanism within International Assistance for emergency situations and the limit of US$100,000 for going to the Bureau was not required, unlike with other mechanisms. Thus, there was already a provision to mobilize International Assistance quickly though it had not yet been activated. With regard to some of the issues raised by the Philippines and Cuba in response to Austria’s proposal to have draft Operational Directives by the next session, the Secretary believed that, because this was new territory, it was very important to first have in-depth discussions before setting Operational Directives, and the Committee needed time to accomplish that. The Secretary believed that the cases of natural disasters and conflict were indeed complicated issues and that the Committee should have realistic expectations on what it could achieve in the next twelve months, even though it was a great idea. The Secretary was not convinced that the Committee would be fully informed on the issues, for which it required further reflection and more case studies to better understand the specificity of ICH, before introducing permanent directives into the Convention.
17. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for the clarification.
18. The delegation of **Lebanon** recognized the importance of this issue and thanked UNESCO and the Secretariat for providing this opportunity. It accepted that the Committee was at the very beginning of this reflection and that the strategy to protect ICH was in the process of being established. Nevertheless, it believed that the emphasis should be placed on the development of capacity-building materials for emergency situations and the establishment of normative instruments to protect communities, groups and individuals, particularly intellectual property. In this regard, the delegation wished to know how the Secretariat sought to gather knowledge and gain experience on the role of communities and the compilation of data generally.
19. The **Secretary** explained that the aim going forward was to have more case studies and projects, with real implications. The Secretariat had started looking into the Syrian refugee situation and work in countries such as Jordan and Lebanon, where there were large numbers of refugees, in the context of ICH. Natural disasters in Small Island Developing States (SIDS) was also an area of interest, and thus it was important to bring together lessons learned from real experiences as much as possible. A next step could be an expert meeting to discuss these diverse situations as well as project implementation. This was why the Secretary exercised caution in rushing too quickly into amending the Operational Directives to allow enough time to fully grasp the complexity of the issues in these diverse situations. More operational experience was needed to develop an expert reflection in order to establish a framework for understanding ICH in these situations before presenting it at some stage for adoption as part of the Committee’s procedures.
20. The delegation of **Cuba** thanked the Secretariat for the clarification, adding that it shared the observation that more time was needed to move the process forward with the establishment of a response mechanism. An action plan first needed to be adopted in the 2017 session before it could introduce a mechanism. The Committee could already begin to think about the possible contributions that the Convention could make to UNESCO’s strategy in terms of an action plan, which was going to be important. The delegation also spoke about the financial contributions related to these actions and that, in addition to a regular budget, voluntary contributions would be needed. It was therefore important to know exactly how much of the regular budget would be dedicated to such actions and creating the action plan.
21. The **Secretary** wished to point out that these actions could only be carried out using extrabudgetary funds, as there were no Regular Programme funds for this at this stage within the Convention, and this was how the Secretariat envisaged going forward.
22. The delegation of **Hungary** also recognized the importance and gravity of the issue, adding that it was a very appropriate issue for the Committee. The delegation concurred with the interventions so far, but felt that the specificity of ICH, and how to safeguard it in emergency situations, was insufficiently covered in the document or in the debate. Moreover, when people found themselves in difficult situations tangible heritage is also in danger in addition to ICH. Thus, the two come together. So in these situations, one should really think about heritage as a whole, holistically, in terms of both intangible and tangible forms. In this regard, the delegation referred to the Decision of the 38 C/Resolution 48 of the Executive Board on UNESCO’s Action and Strategy for the Reinforcement of the Protection of Culture and the Promotion of Cultural Pluralism in the Event of Armed Conflict, encouraging the Committee not to go in a divergent way for ICH. Of course, there had to be specificity in the approach because ICH is very different from tangible heritage, but at the same time, when it comes to action on the ground these actions should work in synergy and reinforce each other. The delegation therefore encouraged synergies and cooperation among the different culture Conventions of UNESCO, to work together on these issues so as to develop a common platform or common survival tool for heritage as a whole, while at the same time reinforcing heritage protection and safeguarding in diverse situations. The delegation concluded by encouraging a specific reflection on ICH, but also stressed – at the operational level – the need to encourage synergies, cooperation and integration of approaches.
23. The **Secretary** agreed with the intervention by Hungary that the lines moving forward were not always so clear. Indeed, the Convention was, in a sense, catching up with colleagues who had been intervening on built heritage situations for a long time, but the issues [regarding ICH] were more complex. Therefore, it was important not to rush into situations and to find the time to properly understand the scope, to test cohesive, comprehensive, interconnected approaches to cultural heritage in these situations, and to understand the specificities as well as the convergences.
24. The delegation of **Cuba** wished to clarify a couple of points. Namely, with regard to the discussion within the General Assembly and the Committee, the delegation referred specifically to reflections within the framework of UNESCO’s strategy, i.e. not a new, distinct strategy. The question was how the 2003 Convention could contribute to this action plan and to the overall strategy. With regard to the budget, the delegation was not referring to the programme funds of the Convention and the contributions of Member States to the regular budget, but rather to the three heritage funds [under the 1972, 2003 and 2005 Conventions], which could provide resources for safeguarding heritage in these situations.
25. The **Chairperson** noted that some Observers had requested the floor.
26. The delegation of **Azerbaijan** began by commending the Secretariat for introducing the issue of ICH in situations of emergency, adding that more and more countries were unfortunately facing the urgency of safeguarding their living heritage. It supported the approach of dealing with both natural and human disasters within the term of emergencies, as it deserved to be considered from a larger perspective with due consideration for the existing normative framework of the Convention, including the recently adopted Operational Directives on ICH and sustainable development. It believed that this issue should also be considered within the framework of the UNESCO strategy for reinforcing UNESCO’s action for the protection of culture and the promotion of cultural pluralism in the event of armed conflict, as well as the framework disaster risk reduction mechanisms where culture and intangible heritage had already been integrated. It also believed that further developments were perhaps needed at the level of international humanitarian law. For instance, better synergies and the exchange of experiences could be explored within the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, with a special emphasis on the situation regarding the ICH of displaced persons. The delegation supported this point, as it believed that the ICH of displaced persons should be taken into account by introducing relevant mechanisms, including International Assistance. It also believed that this issue required further reflection to fully understand the types of actions, measures and policies that could be undertaken to strengthen the resilience of States with a view to preventing and mitigating the damage inflicted by such situations upon intangible heritage and its practising communities.
27. The delegation of **Greece** congratulated the Secretariat for its thorough work and for taking up the points raised at the last Committee session in Namibia and the General Assembly in Paris, emphasizing the role and importance of ICH in cases of armed conflict and natural disasters in general. The report was described as very coherent and well-presented. The delegation believed the way forward, as presented in the report and the amendment proposed by Austria, was correct in that the Committee should work very closely with other Conventions that deal with cases of conflict or disasters, namely the Second Protocol to the Hague Convention, as well as other UNESCO instruments and Conventions. The delegation concurred with the Secretary, who proposed not rushing into things and studying cases and the application of ideas to see how to move forward with a clear view. In addition, whether heritage implied built heritage or ICH, it was important to first document ICH before situations of emergency arose so that action plans could be put forward on an axis of coherence vis-à-vis the communities.
28. Speaking as a new State Party to the Convention, the delegation of **Thailand** had listened to the discussions and debates with great interest, particularly on ICH in the case of emergencies. Although it had taken Thailand some time to ratify the Convention, owing to its internal regulations concerning the signing of international Conventions, the delegation assured the Committee of Thailand’s continued and deep interest in UNESCO’s programme on the protection of cultural heritage, especially the safeguarding of ICH, which was seen as an important strategy for achieving the sustainable development goals. It also recognized the huge potential of ICH in terms of conflict resolution, post-emergency reconstruction, peace-building and sustainable development. Thailand remained committed to working in close collaboration with the Committee, as well as with all the States Parties to the Convention and UNESCO.
29. **A representative of the NGO *Traditions pour Demain*,** Ms Christiane Johannot-Gradis, spoke of her work for thirty years in Latin America, and especially in situations of armed conflict or post-conflict. She explained, as everyone knows, that war produces chaos and that in these circumstances cultural heritage is particularly endangered whether tangible or intangible. This is particularly the case when cultural heritage itself is the subject of conflict. The ongoing conflicts, on every continent, unfortunately demonstrated this on a daily basis. In order to preserve cultural heritage when conflict first erupts, measures needed to be taken very quickly. For this to occur, preliminary preparation work had to be in place. Although anticipated measures were already in place in many countries, the situation with ICH was not the same, and thus the sense of urgency persisted. It was particularly critical, as pointed out by Palestine and Austria, that measures be adopted without delay to preserve ICH under these circumstances. However, in order for States Parties to develop and implement such regulations, it was necessary for the Committee to adopt Operational Directives specifically addressing these issues. Ms Johannot-Gradis therefore considered it important that the discussion of such guidelines be placed on the agenda of the twelfth or, at the latest, the thirteenth session of the Committee, and that an ad hoc working group be convened to work on the issue of synergies between the UNESCO culture Conventions, which was already under way. She emphasized that a lot of evidence had already been gathered on past conflicts, which could feed into the work of this working group.
30. The **Chairperson** wished to proceed to the draft decisions on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no objections of comments in paragraphs 1–3, they were duly adopted. The Chairperson noted an amendment in paragraph 4 from Austria.
31. The delegation of **Austria** wished to make reference to the Resolution of the Human Rights Council of September 2016.
32. With no objections, the **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 4 adopted, as amended. Austria’s amendment in paragraph 5 specifically highlighted ‘armed conflicts’.
33. The delegation of **Turkey** understood Austria’s concern, but it did not think that armed conflicts should be singled out because natural disasters and displaced persons were also equally important, in which case, all situations should be included.
34. The delegation of **Armenia** had no problem with Austria’s amendment or any other addition, but the problem with enumerating everything was the risk of omission.
35. The delegation of **Algeria** was in favour of deleting the amendment because there were indeed emergencies that were not specifically related to armed conflicts. Returning to paragraph 4 just adopted, and the specific reference to a document or text, the delegation added that it would be preferable to make these references known so that the subject of adoption was clear.
36. The delegation of **Austria** agreed to withdraw its amendment.
37. The delegation of **Cuba** also referred to the adoption of paragraph 4, adding that the Committee could not adopt references to documents in their entirety because they may not deal with issues that come under its mandate. The document in question concerned cultural rights, which are broad reports, and although Cuba did not have a problem with this (in fact, it had even contributed a special report to it), the Committee had to be extremely careful when referring to resolutions or actions that were not in its remit. With regard to Austria’s proposal, it would be concerned about leaving out situations of displaced persons, natural disasters and so on. Alternatively, all the situations could be enumerated.
38. Responding to the issue raised by Algeria and Cuba, the **Secretary** clarified that references to both documents were contained in [working document 15](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-15-EN.docx).
39. The delegation of **Palestine** understood that situations of emergency covered armed conflict, natural disasters, displaced persons, terrorism and so on. However, it noted that there should be a special consideration in the case of armed conflict, adding that it was not against the proposal of Cuba to enumerate all the situations. It noted that Austria’s amendment had highlighted ‘in particular’, which placed special emphasis on armed conflict because it was currently affecting some countries. This did not therefore exclude the other emergency cases. The delegation therefore supported the proposal by Austria, which read, ‘in particular armed conflict’. It proposed enumerating the other situations of emergency.
40. In line with Palestine’s intervention, and with equal weight, the delegation of **Turkey** wished to include displaced persons and natural disasters, which it considered equally important.
41. Referring to the background material provided by the Secretariat, the delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire**noted that the emergencies were all enumerated. The amendment by Austria sought to highlight armed conflict in particular, which it supported. However, enumerating all the situations defeated the purpose. It therefore suggested keeping the paragraph vague, in which case all emergency cases would be taken into account.
42. The delegation of **Senegal** supported the deletion of Austria’s amendment, adding that there were many cases of emergencies and that it was not desirable to accord priority to any. It therefore preferred to retain the original paragraph.
43. The **Secretary** noted some technical glitches on the screen, but the paragraph would include natural disasters and displaced persons, as mentioned by Turkey.
44. The delegation of **Palestine** agreed with Turkey that ‘in particular’ was a form of prioritization, in which case ‘in particular’ could be replaced with ‘including’.
45. The delegation of **Cyprus** agreed with the original amendment by Austria, adding that there was a risk of omission in enumerating the situations otherwise; the amendment highlighted the special case of armed conflict.
46. The delegation of **Armenia** insisted on its earlier comment that other situations would then have to be enumerated, such as man-made or industrial catastrophes, and the list would not therefore be exhaustive. All these situations could be considered emergencies. Thus, it was more appropriate to retain the simple term ‘emergencies’.
47. For the sake of time, the delegation of **Zambia** had refrained from this debate, but it now wished to add its voice to the comments by Armenia and Cuba, adding that there was no need for the Committee to complicate matters and list all the emergencies. It would therefore be more judicious to leave the original paragraph intact; it would limit the scope of the provision otherwise if the emergencies were listed.
48. The delegation of **Philippines** proposed a compromise to Palestine’s amendment, which read, ‘including but not limited to cases of armed conflict, natural disasters and displaced people’.
49. The **Secretary** clarified that the Secretariat would continue to work on the issue of ICH in emergencies, adding that this was the first opening and not the tying up of the issue, and it would return to the issue at the next Committee.
50. The **Chairperson** remarked on the importance of the Secretary’s comment, urging the Committee to come up with terminology that reflected the spirit of what was implied in the paragraph in an inclusive manner.
51. The delegation of **Turkey** insisted that it was very important to include the case for natural disasters and displaced persons, particularly as situations differed depending on the region and they therefore carried equal weight. However, it would prefer to keep the original text if both Austria and Palestine could go along with its proposal.
52. The delegation of **Austria** was willing to go along with the consensus and withdraw.
53. The delegation of **Palestine** returned to the proposal by the Philippines; it seemed to address the issue, and could be accepted since it was neither restrictive nor exclusive, i.e. it simply highlighted the three emergencies considered the most important.
54. The delegation of **Cuba** believed that natural disasters for some countries was more important, adding that the Philippines’ solution, as supported by Palestine, could be the way forward. In any case, the Committee had to wait upon the decision by the General Conference on the subject, as it would ultimately have to cover the strategy once the title had been decided. Hence, the debate was a little pointless and premature.
55. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee whether it could accept the Philippines’ proposal.
56. The delegation of **Armenia** fully agreed with Turkey’s position, adding that there could never be an exhaustive enumeration even with the addition of ‘in particular’ or ‘not limited to’. With regard to emergency situations, the delegation spoke of climate change, which was not a disaster as such but could be considered an emergency. There were also many issues affecting SIDS that could fall under ‘emergencies’ and not necessarily be covered by an ‘in particular’ enumeration. Thus, by leaving ‘emergencies’ vague, it remained open to a wider field for work for future consideration that would include an exhaustive list of all possible emergencies. The delegation therefore preferred to delete all the amendments.
57. The delegation of **Colombia** respected the position of countries that proposed specific emergency situations. However, the delegation saw all emergency situations as a priority, even though different emergencies affected different regions. It therefore supported the remarks by Armenia to simply retain the reference to ‘emergency situations’. It did not exclude armed conflict, natural disasters, or situations of displaced persons, but it would allow for the inclusion of other emergency situations that might arise. It therefore preferred to leave the paragraph open-ended.
58. The delegation of **Palestine** was ready to withdraw its proposal, adding that it was encouraged by the unanimity of both Armenia and Turkey.
59. The **Chairperson** deleted theamendment by Austria, and proceeded to the adoption of paragraph 5. With no objections, it was duly adopted. Paragraph 6 was also adopted. Paragraph 7 was adopted as amended by Austria.
60. The delegation of the **Philippines** returned to Austria’s amendment in paragraph 7, adding that it was inconsistent in view of the lengthy discussion that had just taken place.
61. For the sake of consistency with the earlier debate, the **Chairperson** asked Austria if it would agree to withdraw its amendment.
62. The delegation of **Austria** agreed.
63. The **Chairperson** proceeded to paragraph 8, as amended by Austria and Turkey.
64. The delegation of **Cuba** did not fully understand the amendment by Austria, adding that it was always good to encourage States Parties to submit emergency requests for International Assistance, but it was unclear whether States Parties could be asked to adopt preparatory measures to that effect, which was not in the spirit of the Convention. Moreover, the Committee did not have the authority to made demands on a sovereign State.
65. With the consensus, the delegation of **Austria** was willing to withdraw its amendment.
66. The delegation of **Algeria** wanted to thank Austria for its flexible spirit and consensus.
67. The **Chairperson** deleted Austria’s amendment. With no further objections, paragraph 8 was adopted as amended by Turkey. He proceeded to paragraph 9.
68. The delegation of **Zambia** supported the amendment by Turkey. However, it proposed replacing ‘continues’ with ‘enhance’, as ‘continues’ simply stated the obvious, which would read, ‘encourages the Secretariat to enhance gathering knowledge and gaining experience’.
69. The delegation of **Algeria** was comfortable with both amendments from Zambia and Turkey. However, with Turkey’s permission, it proposed deleting the adjective ‘good’, which was a value judgment.
70. The delegation of **Turkey** was flexible and agreed to delete ‘good’.
71. With no further objections, the **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 9 adopted. He turned to paragraph 10 with two amendments by Austria.
72. The **Secretary** noted that there was a slight revision to the proposed amendment, also from Austria.
73. The delegation of **Austria** explained that the revision to the amendment was due to the fact that it would not be feasible to discuss draft Operational Directives at the next Committee session in 2017 for adoption at the General Assembly in 2018 due to timing. Therefore, it proposed discussing this issue at the 13th session in 2018.
74. The delegation of **Philippines** noted the clause ‘in the case of armed conflict’ and, in the spirit of consistency with the earlier discussion, proposed deleting it.
75. The delegation of **Palestine** was about to support Austria’s amendment with the special mention of ‘armed conflict’, but would remain flexible and open to consensus.
76. The delegation of **Turkey** was uncomfortable with making rash decisions, as this issue required thorough discussion. In paragraph 9, just adopted, the Committee encouraged the Secretariat to gather knowledge, experience and examples for analysis and discussion in the next session. The delegation therefore felt that the Committee had to first have these discussions before adopting decisions that would have repercussions on the Operational Directives. Thus, it did not support Austria’s amendment regarding the draft Operational Directives, or the amendment ‘especially in case of armed conflict’.
77. The delegation of **Cuba** also preferred to revert to the original text, adding that it was risky to start a process for which it had already been said that all Member States should be involved, which could only occur after the General Conference in November 2017. The Committee should therefore not get ahead of itself and wait until the next Committee session to have these discussions. It therefore wished to revert to the original wording.
78. The delegation of **Cyprus** strongly supported Austria’s amendment not to delete ‘especially in cases of armed conflict’.
79. The **Chairperson** asked Austria whether it could withdraw its amendment.
80. The delegation of **Austria** agreed with the consensus.
81. The **Chairperson** noted that Algeria, India and Armenia supported reverting to the original text.
82. The delegation of **Palestine** asked the Secretariat to ensure that the discussion of this issue be reflected in the summary report, and to take into consideration all the situations mentioned, as well as others, such as cases of post-conflict and terrorism, for example in Nigeria and Iraq.
83. The **Chairperson** returned to the original paragraph 10 and with no further objections, it was duly adopted. Turning to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, and with no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision 11.COM 15 adopted**.
84. The **Chairperson** recognized the presence of the Minister of the Renaissance of Culture, Arts and Social Modernization of Niger, who wished to take the floor.
85. The **Minister from the Ministry of the Renaissance of Culture, Arts and Social Modernization of Niger** congratulated UNESCO and Ethiopia for their success in organizing this session. The Minister wished to address an atypical situation in Niger that posed a dangerous threat to ICH. It concerned the situation on the border with Nigeria, Cameroon and Chad that was controlled by Boko Haram who had killed more than 30,000 people and caused considerable damage, resulting in more than 200,000 displaced persons who now lived in precarious camps in miserable situations.The second situation was found in North Niger, together with Mali, where a similar situation unfortunately prevailed, caused by terrorist organizations such as Aqmi or MUJAO, who were making cowardly and barbaric incursions, causing destabilizing damage and major disruption. Niger was therefore doubly affected by these armed conflicts, and the persistence of these conflicts had unfortunately resulted in the disruption of cultures and traditions, and the destruction of cultural practices and expressions, as well as upsetting the social order in areas where displaced persons were living and were being forced to re-learn and rebuild their lives. It was therefore within this framework that Niger planned to submit two emergency assistance projects whose principle, the Minister hoped, the Committee would adopt. On a more positive note, the Minister informed the Committee that the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) had recently organized in Niger an extremely important Forum on Education of the Culture of Peace through Intra and Interreligious Dialogue.[[10]](#footnote-11) This meeting brought together fourteen countries (fourteen out of the fifteen countries that make up the Community), with each country represented by a Muslim, a Christian and a representative of the Orthodox religion. This was an opportunity to adopt the Niamey Declaration, which committed each State to organizing a national forum, and the organization of the Forum in 2018. This was a very good example for countries to follow, as today religious tensions were at the heart of the many disruptions and real threats to ICH. The Minister concluded by once again congratulating the Chairperson and the Committee, while renewing the country’s interest in participating in these meetings; a real crossroads of giving and receiving.

**ITEM 19 OF THE AGENDA:**

**ADOPTION OF THE LIST OF DECISIONS**

1. The **Chairperson** advised the Committee that there was insufficient time to examine agenda item 13, and suggested moving to agenda item 19: the adoption of the list of decisions, which had been distributed before lunch. He explained that the Secretariat had compiled the decisions adopted during the week, and up to the lunch break of that day, that is, decisions concerning items 2 to 10, including 10.a, 10.b and 10.c. He sought the agreement of the Committee in delegating the responsibility of validating the decisions concerning items examined on the afternoon of that day to the rapporteur of the eleventh session. He clarified that the Secretariat would incorporate those decisions into the report before publishing it online. He further clarified that it was not the time to re-open discussions that had already been closed but to check that the Secretariat had not made a technical error.
2. The Chairperson proposed adopting the decisions as a whole, subject to linguistic revisions by the Secretariat. The [final version](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-Decisions-EN.docx) was to be made available online on December 2016. With no forthcoming comments or objections, **the Chairperson declared Decision 11.COM 19 adopted**.

**ITEM 20 OF THE AGENDA:**

**CLOSURE OF THE SESSION**

1. The **Chairperson** introduced the final agenda item at the end of an intense week of work. He began by thanking the Committee, as well as all the delegates and representatives present, for their positive and productive contributions during the session, which had enabled the Committee to accomplish the major items foreseen on the agenda. He stressed that the success of the Committee was thanks to the dedicated work and spirit of consensus that prevailed, adding that ICH was meant for consensus, which was always sought. Summarizing the achievements, the Chairperson announced that there were 708 registered participants from 121 different countries. The Committee had examined 49 files for inscription, resulting in very rich and fruitful discussions: 4 had been inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List; 33 had been inscribed on the Representative List; 5 programmes had been selected on the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices; and 1 important International Assistance request had been granted, which had been examined with a nomination to the Urgent Safeguarding List to support the implementation of the proposed safeguarding plan. The Committee had also had an intense debate on the inscription process and the respective roles of each actor in undertaking these tasks. As a result, it had decided to create an informal ad hoc working group to continue its reflection on the inscription mechanism process; the outcome of this reflection would be reported to the Committee in 2017. The Committee had also examined 12 periodic reports, which clearly demonstrated the active commitment for the implementation of the Convention by States Parties. A new Evaluation Body had been established for the 2017 cycle with the appointment of six qualified experts in ICH, representatives of States Parties, non-members of the committee, and six accredited NGOs. The Chairperson took this opportunity to welcome the three new Members.
2. The **Chairperson** recalled the discussion on the importance of developing an overall results framework for monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the Convention, leading to the conclusion that the Committee should continue working towards this development through an inclusive process of consultation and discussion. Timely reflections on the specific role of ICH and the communities concerned in situations of both conflict and natural disasters were also made. The necessity of exploring operational modalities in the context of the implementation of the Convention in emergency situations was also raised. The Chairperson strongly believed that through these achievements the Committee would continue to reflect on these important points, thus shedding light on the fruits and challenges of the future implementation of the Convention. The session was described as challenging with some animated debates, but the Chairperson was pleased that the Committee had been successful in finding consensus and constructive solutions. He paid particular tribute to the Members of the Bureau for their extraordinary support and confidence. He thanked the Vice-Chairs who had replaced him during his absence, and he expressed thanks to the Secretariat, under the leadership of its Secretary, whom he warmly thanked, for having delivered excellent work; the outcome achieved was to their great merit. Last but not least, he thanked the interpreters, translators, technicians, and all those who had contributed to ensuring the Committee’s success.
3. The **Director of the Division of Creativity, Ms Jyoti Hosagrahar** expressed her gratitude to the Chairperson for his effective leadership, which had enabled the session to run smoothly and allowed the Committee to examine an important number of crucial issues. Despite having been unwell, the Chairperson had persevered and worked very hard, for which she was grateful. Sincere thanks were conveyed to the Government of Ethiopia for hosting this session, as well as for its hospitality in the land of origins. Ms Hosagrahar conveyed her gratitude to the Committee Members for their shared determination to achieve consensus, as well as all the States Parties for their reflections and contributions, and for continuing to reflect on an array of important points for the future of the Convention. This reflection will have a direct impact on the way in which ICH is safeguarded in today’s rapidly changing and increasingly complex world, which had seen increasing conflicts and natural disasters around the world affecting both cultural heritage and its communities. The Convention and ICH clearly have a role to play. ICH holds a rich source of creative knowledge and traditional experience that would help shape a better future for all. ICH is first and foremost about people, the communities, bearers, practitioners, community elders and youth alike, and their fundamental well-being. It clearly demonstrates that no society can flourish without creativity, culture and people, which underscores the great responsibility of ICH to spearhead actions of diversity, dialogue, inclusiveness, solidarity and peace building. Ms Hosagrahar spoke about the number of times that traditional foodstuffs had shown ways to deliver adequate nutrition and ensure food security. She also stressed how the diversity of health-related knowledge provides quality health care for communities, social cultural practices and events that transcend differences of class, gender and age, strengthening the social fabric of communities. Local productive activities maintained and enhanced through generations provided subsistence livelihoods for many, while social practices of dialogue were central to preventing and resolving conflict, and playing a determining role in reconciliation. There was no doubt that ICH was at the forefront of the international sustainable development agenda whose engagement with the SDG goals of the 2030 Agenda was evident and needed to be reinforced. Ms Hosagrahar was convinced that everyone present shared the same belief that ICH directly addresses current concerns, meets the challenges, and promotes sustainable and meaningful transformation for future generations. She concluded by once again thanking the Committee, the Government of Ethiopia, and the Republic of Korea for its generous offer to host the next meeting.
4. The **Chairperson** thanked Ms Hosagrahar for her kind words on the work of the Committee, and opened the floor for closing statements.
5. The delegation of **Palestine** reiterated its deep gratitude and thanks to the host country, the land of origins, and to the helpful volunteers. It conveyed further thanks to the interpreters, the Secretariat for its very hard work, and the Evaluation Body, adding that even when the Committee adopted decisions that went against its recommendations, it did not mean that it did not agree with its objective work. Indeed, the delegation commended and respected the work of the Evaluation Body, but there were other considerations beyond the information contained in the files. Finally, it wished to thank and congratulate the Republic of Korea and the next Chairperson, Mr Lee. Finally, the delegation commended the Chairperson for his outstanding conduct of the session, which had been successfully held in a smooth and diplomatic manner; it was much appreciated by all.
6. The delegation of **Senegal**spoke in the name of Africa to express its pride in Ethiopia, following Namibia in 2015, for having honoured Africa with dignity in taking up the challenge of participating, organizing and hosting this session. The delegation spoke of having discovered the other heritage of Ethiopia: its culinary and gastronomic heritage encountered in the streets of the city, in Abyssinia and elsewhere, and of an historic Africa, the capital of cultural Africa. It congratulated the Secretariat for its successful and extraordinary work that included all those who had worked behind the scenes in the preparation of this session. Special thanks went to the Secretary for having succeeded in his first Committee session, and all his team. The delegation also congratulated the Members of the Committee for their great work. Congratulations were also conveyed to the NGOs, whose fieldwork and cultural mediation contributed to the Convention’s success. The delegation thanked the Evaluation Body, echoing the remarks made by Palestine in this regard, and the volunteers for guiding and facilitating the logistics, as well as the interpreters. The delegation concluded with final congratulations to Ethiopia and Nigeria for honouring Africa with their inscriptions.
7. The delegation of **Lebanon** joined in the sentiment expressed by Palestine and Senegal, conveying sincere thanks to the Government of Ethiopia for having ensured the wellbeing of the delegates. Thanks went to the Chairperson for his patience and diplomacy, and to the Secretariat.
8. The delegation of **Turkey** thanked the Ethiopian Government and people for the warmest hospitality, adding that it had been a pleasure to discover its wonderful city and people in the land of origins. The delegation praised the Chairperson for his leadership despite the difficulties. It also thanked the Secretariat for its hard work, as well as the interpreters and the logistics staff for their contributions. It thanked the Evaluation Body for its important and valued work, in which it had full trust, and it hoped to be able to work with the experts more closely in the future. Finally, the delegation congratulated the Republic of Korea as the host of the next Committee session, with whom it would work throughout the year until the session.
9. The delegation of **India** commended the Chairperson for his excellent leadership; despite some health concerns he would be remembered for his smile and excellent management of the work. The delegation also thanked the Government of Ethiopia for its warm hospitality and excellent hosting of the meeting, as well as all those involved in its organization. The delegation also commended the hard work of the Secretariat, including the interpreters, adding that the small team of the Secretariat had managed the meeting in the best possible manner. Finally, it thanked the Republic of Korea for hosting the next session of the Committee, wishing them all the best in this endeavour.
10. The delegation of **Cyprus** congratulated the Chairperson on his patience and for the warm welcome extended by the host country. It also thanked the Evaluation Body, with whom it hoped to work again in 2017. Above all, the delegation thanked the Secretariat for its tireless work, and the Republic of Korea for hosting the meeting next year.
11. The delegation of **Afghanistan** joined in the remarks of the previous speakers to express gratitude to the host country, the Chairperson, the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body, as well as everyone else mentioned earlier.
12. The delegation of **Cuba** thanked the Secretariat, the Chairperson for his understanding and tolerance, all the NGOs, the Evaluation body and UNESCO, adding that this was a coming together of one big family working for ICH.
13. The delegation of **Colombia** thanked the Secretariat for its hard work, and the Chairperson for his extreme patience and excellent chairmanship. It also thanked the Government of Ethiopia for its warm welcome, as well as the Republic of Korea for its offer to host the next session. The delegation spoke of the importance of this work for so many communities all over the world, and as this was its first time as Member of the Committee, it was grateful for the very enriching experience.
14. The delegation of **Bulgaria** expressed its gratitude to Ethiopia for its warm hospitality and organization, as well as the Secretariat for its dedicated and efficient work in a climate of cooperation and a spirit of consensus that prevailed throughout this session. It wished the Committee success in its forthcoming session in the Republic of Korea.
15. The delegation of **Hungary** warmly thanked Ethiopia for its warm hospitality and attention to detail, and particularly the Chairperson for his guidance and leadership in the sometimes difficult and challenging situations, and for facilitating consensus. It also thanked the Secretary and his team, as well as the Evaluation Body for its excellent work, and final thanks were expressed to the translators and interpreters.
16. The delegation of **Algeria** congratulated the Chairperson and thanked Ethiopia for the typically warm African welcome, noting that Ethiopia was the fourth African country to have organized a Committee session following Algiers, Nairobi, Windhoek and now Addis Ababa, which only emphasized the importance of the continent for the Convention. The delegation also congratulated and thanked the Secretariat for its brilliance and high level of competence. It also wished to thank the Evaluation Body for its remarkable analytical and thorough work that had helped the Committee make its decisions, as well as all the Members of the Committee for their contributions.
17. The **Chairperson** thanked Algeria and all the speakers for their good words. Finally, he reminded the delegates of the closing party to be held that evening, and he looked forward to seeing everyone there. He wished everyone a safe journey home, before declaring the eleventh session of the intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage officially closed.
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