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| **Report of the Evaluation Body on its work in 2021** |
| Sixteenth session, Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (Online – 13 to 18 December 2021) |

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary**At its fifteenth session, the Committee established a consultative body responsible for the evaluation in 2021 of nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List and to the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, proposals to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices and requests for International Assistance greater than US$100,000 ([Decision 15.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/15.COM/10)). This document constitutes the report of the Evaluation Body, which includes an overview of the 2021 cycle (Part A), observations and recommendations on working methods and several cross-cutting issues (Part B), an overview of recurring issues (Part C) and a draft decision for the Committee’s consideration (Part D).**Decision required**: paragraph 78 |

1. In conformity with paragraph 27 of the Operational Directives for the Implementation of the Convention, the evaluation of nominations for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List and Representative List, proposals for the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices and requests for International Assistance greater than US$100,000 is accomplished by a consultative body of the Committee established in accordance with Article 8.3 of the Convention, as well as Rule 20 of its Rules of Procedure, and known as the ‘Evaluation Body’.
2. By its [Decision 15.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/15.COM/10), the Committee established the present body at its fifteenth session. The Evaluation Body is composed of six experts qualified in various fields of intangible cultural heritage representative of States Parties non-Members of the Committee and six accredited non-governmental organizations. As indicated in [Decision 9.COM 11](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/9.COM/11), a system of rotation among the seats has been established, according to which the Committee reappointed nine continuing members and elected three new members – Mr Nigel Encalada (Belize), Mr Kirk Siang Yeo (Singapore) and the Syria Trust for Development. They were elected by the Committee taking into consideration equitable geographical representation and their qualifications in various domains of intangible cultural heritage. The twelve members, together with the country they represent in the case of experts, are:

**Expert representatives of States Parties non-Members of the Committee**

EG I: Mr Pier Luigi Petrillo (Italy)

EG II: Ms Ľubica Voľanská (Slovakia)

EG III: Mr Nigel Encalada (Belize)

EG IV: Mr Kirk Siang Yeo (Singapore)

EG V(a): Mr Lemeneh Getachew Senishaw (Ethiopia)

EG V(b): Mr Saeed Al Busaidi (Oman)

**Accredited non-governmental organizations**

EG I: Workshop intangible heritage Flanders

EG II: European Association of Folklore Festivals

EG III: Erigaie Foundation

EG IV: Korea Cultural Heritage Foundation (CHF)

EG V(a): Association pour la sauvegarde des masques (ASAMA)

EG V(b): Syria Trust for Development

1. Following the submission and presentation of the report on its work to the sixteenth session of the Committee, the present Evaluation Body shall cease to exist with the establishment of the next Body. Following the requirements described in [Decision 15.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/15.COM/10), a new Evaluation Body will be established at the sixteenth session of the Committee.
2. The report of the Evaluation Body consists of five working documents, as follows:
3. The present document LHE/21/16.COM/8 constitutes the general report of the Evaluation Body with an overview of all the 2021 files (Part A), general observations and recommendations on working methods and a number of cross-cutting issues (Part B), an overview of recurring issues in the 2021 cycle (Part C) and a draft decision for the Committee’s consideration (Part D);
4. Document [LHE/21/16.COM/8.a](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-16.COM-8.a-EN.docx) concerns nominations for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List as well as combined nominations for inscription on that List together with requests for International Assistance to support the implementation of the proposed safeguarding plan. It includes an assessment of the conformity of the nominations with the inscription criteria as provided in Chapter l.1 of the Operational Directives, including an assessment of the viability of the element and of the feasibility and sufficiency of the safeguarding plan and the risks of it disappearing, as provided in paragraph 29 of the Operational Directives, as well as recommendations to the Committee to inscribe or not to inscribe the nominated elements on the Urgent Safeguarding List or to refer the nominations to the submitting State(s) for additional information. For files that also include a request for International Assistance, the document includes an assessment of the conformity of the request with the selection criteria, as provided in Chapter l.4 of the Operational Directives, as well as recommendations to the Committee to approve or not to approve the requests or to refer the requests to the submitting State(s) for additional information;
5. Document [LHE/21/16.COM/8.b](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-16.COM-8.b-EN.docx) concerns nominations for inscription on the Representative List. It includes an assessment of the conformity of the nominations with the inscription criteria, as provided in Chapter l.2 of the Operational Directives, as well as recommendations to the Committee to inscribe or not to inscribe the nominated elements on the Representative List or to refer the nominations to the submitting State(s) for additional information;
6. Document [LHE/21/16.COM/8.c](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-16.COM-8.c-EN.docx) concerns proposals to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. It includes an assessment of the conformity of the proposals with the selection criteria, as provided in Chapter l.3 of the Operational Directives, as well as recommendations to the Committee to select or not to select the proposals or to refer the proposals to the submitting State(s) for additional information;
7. Document [LHE/21/16.COM/8.d](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-16.COM-8.d-EN.docx) concerns requests for International Assistance greater than US$100,000. It includes an assessment of the conformity of the requests with the selection criteria, as provided in Chapter l.4 of the Operational Directives, as well as recommendations to the Committee to approve or not to approve the requests or to refer the requests to the submitting State(s) for additional information.
8. As requested in [Decision 15.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/15.COM/10), the abovementioned nominations, proposals and requests are presented in their respective reports in the English alphabetical order, with the files of States whose names begin with the letter X. The files evaluated by the Evaluation Body for the 2021 cycle are available on the website of the Convention at: <https://ich.unesco.org/en/files-2021-under-process-01119>.

**A. Overview of the 2021 cycle**

1. In accordance with paragraph 54 of the Operational Directives, the deadline for the submission of files for the 2021 cycle was 31 March 2020. The Operational Directives provide that ‘the Committee determines two years beforehand, in accordance with the available resources and its capacity, the number of files that can be treated in the course of the two following cycles’ (paragraph 33). At its thirteenth session in Port Louis, Republic of Mauritius (2018), the Committee determined that in the course of the 2021 cycle a total of fifty files could be treated for the Urgent Safeguarding List, Representative List, Register of Good Safeguarding Practices and International Assistance greater than US$100,000 ([Decision 13.COM 15](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/15)).
2. Following the above-mentioned [Decision 13.COM 15](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/15) to have at least one file per submitting State processed over the two-year period 2020–2021 and applying the priorities set out in paragraph 34 of the Operational Directives, the Evaluation Body was informed that the Secretariat had treated a total of sixty files, as follows:

By level of priority:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Reference** | **Type of file** | **Number** |
| Decision 13.COM 15 – priority (0) | Files from States that did not have a file treated for the 2020 cycle  | 53 |
| Paragraph 34 of the Operational Directives – priority (i) | Files from States having no elements inscribed, good safeguarding practices selected or requests for International Assistance greater than US$100,000 approved | 2 |
| Nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List | 0 |
| Paragraph 34 of the Operational Directives – priority (ii) | Multinational files | 5 |
| Paragraph 34 of the Operational Directives – priority (iii) | Files from States with the fewest elements inscribed, good safeguarding practices selected or requests for International Assistance greater than US$100,000 approved | 0 |
| **Total** |  | **60** |

1. While the annual ceiling foreseen as per the above-mentioned [Decision 13.COM 15](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/15) was fifty files, the Evaluation Body was informed that the 2021 cycle included sixty files. Due to an unusually high number of nomination files received for the deadline of 31 March 2020, the number of national files under priority (0) alone exceeded the annual ceiling of fifty files. Recognizing the increasing commitment of the international community to safeguard living heritage through the listing mechanisms, the Secretariat consequently proposed on an exceptional basis to exercise flexibility and made extra efforts to treat the sixty files for the sixteenth session of the Committee.
2. The Secretariat processed each of the sixty files and contacted the submitting States in June 2020 about any further information required for the files to be considered as technically complete. Following this completeness check by the Secretariat, all sixty files were considered as technically complete.
3. A total of sixty files were completed by the submitting States in time for their evaluation by the Evaluation Body. These include two national files from States with no elements inscribed and five multinational files with at least one submitting State with no elements inscribed. Among the sixty files, three files were referred in a previous cycle and one file concerns the extension of an inscribed element. The breakdown of the sixty files by mechanism is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Urgent Safeguarding List | 6 |
| Representative List | 48 |
| Register of Good Safeguarding Practices | 5 |
| International Assistance | 1 |
| **Total** | **60** |

1. The Evaluation Body met for the first time under the 2021 cycle on 4 and 5 March 2021. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, the meeting was held online over three hours each day. The main objectives of the meeting were to get acquainted with the nature of the tasks, working methods of the Evaluation Body and timetable of the 2021 cycle, as well as to discuss cross-cutting issues observed through past cycles. After consultation among the twelve members, the Evaluation Body elected Ms Ľubica Voľanská (Slovakia) as Chairperson, Mr Pier Luigi Petrillo (Italy) as Vice-Chairperson and Mr Nigel Encalada (Belize) as Rapporteur.
2. The second meeting of the Evaluation Body in June was also organized online due to the ongoing sanitary situation. To this end, a preparatory meeting was held on 21 May 2021 to discuss the timeline and working methods for the June meeting.
3. As was the case for preceding cycles, the Secretariat established a password-protected, dedicated website through which members could consult the documents of the meetings as well as the files to be evaluated, together with any accompanying documentation. An email distribution list facilitated communication among members of the Evaluation Body. Every member of the Body evaluated each file online and prepared individual opinions and recommendations explaining whether and how it responded to the applicable criteria. Furthermore, in order to facilitate consultations among the members before and during the meeting and encourage consensus-building, the Secretariat built on existing features first developed for the 2020 cycle in the online interface. These additional features were fully operationalized during the 2021 cycle and allowed the Evaluation Body to exchange outside of the meeting, consult each other’s evaluation texts and engage in written discussions up to sixteen days before the online meeting.
4. The Evaluation Body met online from 7 to 12 June 2021. Considering the additional number of files to be examined in the present cycle, the meeting was held over six days, instead of the five-day online meeting that took place in the previous year. The Body met for three hours each day, from 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. Paris time, totalling eighteen hours. The working methodology for the meeting largely followed the same approach as in previous years. While the members did well to adapt to the online context, they also noted the challenges in this working modality, especially given the considerable time difference between its members. The members felt that the online modality was not conducive to the same level of quality and depth of interactions as in-person meetings. Nonetheless, the Body was successful in reaching a consensus in its recommendation for all sixty files and their criteria as well as for the cross-cutting issues. This was in large part made possible thanks to the intense preliminary work carried out by the members through the online interface, which they highlighted as a particularly useful and well-designed tool to facilitate their work. Based on the discussions held during the meeting and online, the Rapporteur prepared a draft decision for each file, as well as general observations and recommendations by the Body.
5. The 2021 cycle is the second cycle in which the dialogue process has been fully implemented. In this cycle, the dialogue process involved fifteen files. This included eleven nominations to the Representative List, two nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List, including one that combined a request for International Assistance, one proposal to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices and, for the first time, one request for International Assistance. In four cases, the Body asked questions on more than one criterion and on as many as three criteria, for a total of twenty-two questions. The questions from the Evaluation Body were sent to the submitting States concerned on 25 June 2021 with a four-week deadline to provide the information requested in the two working languages of the Convention. The questions from the Evaluation Body and the answers from the submitting States are attached to their respective nomination files on the [16.COM webpage](https://ich.unesco.org/en/16com).
6. The Evaluation Body met again from 14 to 17 September 2021 to validate the draft decisions for each file and adopt its reports. The Body finalized its recommendations on the fifteen files concerned by the dialogue process based on the answers provided by the States Parties concerned. In conformity with paragraph 55 of the Operational Directives duly amended, the outcome of the dialogue process has been directly included in the draft decisions presented to the Committee. As with the June meeting, the Evaluation Body members encountered similar challenges in holding the meeting online. The resulting sixty draft decisions presented in the five respective reports thus represent the consensus of the Evaluation Body.
7. Out of the sixty files examined by the Evaluation Body in this cycle, a total of forty-five files (75 per cent) are recommended for inscription, selection or approval, fourteen files (23 per cent) are recommended for referral, and one file (2 per cent) is not recommended for inscription. The dialogue process was initiated by the Evaluation Body for fifteen files, fourteen of which were recommended for inscription and one for referral:

1. Of the files concerned by the dialogue process, there was one file related to the combined mechanism of the Urgent Safeguarding List and International Assistance mechanism. Following the dialogue process, the Evaluation Body recommended to refer the nomination to the Urgent Safeguarding List, while approving the request for International Assistance.
2. Compared to the previous cycle (2020), the number of files recommended for referral has decreased from 38 to 23 per cent. The number of files recommended for inscription has increased from 58 to 75 per cent.
3. Files were referred or not recommended for inscription, selection or approval on the basis of not satisfying the criteria as follows:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Urgent Safeguarding List** | **Representative List** | **Register of Good Safeguarding Practices** |
| **Number of files referred or not recommended on only one criterion** | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| **Number of files referred or not recommended on multiple criteria** | 3 | 11 | 1 |

1. Among the files that were referred or not recommended for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List or the Representative List, the recommendations of the Evaluation Body were based on issues concerning the following criteria:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Number of files in which the criterion was referred or considered as not met** |
| U.1/R.1 | 4 |
| U.2 | 2 |
| R.2 | 11 |
| U.3 | 1 |
| R.3 | 10  |
| U.4/R.4 | 8 |
| U.5/R.5 | 15 |

1. **General observations and recommendations**
2. This part of the report explains the working methods of the Evaluation Body and outlines the main issues, observations and conclusions that arose during its work. Although some of these issues are recurrent, members of the Evaluation Body discussed them with the utmost attention and due diligence.

***Working methods***

1. **Neutrality of the members**. As has been custom, the members of the Evaluation Body did not participate in the evaluation of files submitted by their country of nationality or by a country where the non-governmental organization they represent is based. This approach ensured neutrality and equity in the discussions about the files and in drafting the recommendations. This rule was applied to seven files that were evaluated during the 2021 cycle.
2. **Collective decision-making**.The twelve members of the Evaluation Body, each representing different geographic areas and domains of expertise, evaluated each file individually, except for cases concerning their country of nationality or where their non-governmental organization they represent is based. In light of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, the members again shared their evaluations using the online evaluation monitoring interface. After sharing the individual evaluations, the Evaluation Body held wide-ranging discussions leading to consensus on each criterion for each file. It follows that the Evaluation Body speaks with one voice. The Evaluation Body has found the online tool useful and recommends its continued use for future cycles. However, while the online tool contributed to efficient collective decision-making during the 2021 cycle, the Evaluation Body is concerned about the quality and depth of the discussions given the time constraints associated with online meetings.
3. **Consistency of the evaluation within and across the files in the 2021 cycle**.The members of the Evaluation Body made a concerted effort not to send contradictory or inconsistent messages to submitting States Parties and to maintain the maximal degree of consistency in its evaluation of the files in the 2021 cycle. To this end, the Evaluation Body discussed and evaluated the files as unique cases and respected their individual circumstances as per the information contained within the nomination files.
4. **Consistency with previous Committee and Evaluation Body decisions**.The Evaluation Body was guided by the goal to maintain consistency with the decisions made by previous meetings of the Evaluation Body and Committee. The members endeavoured to maintain balance in its evaluation of each criterion and of each file as a whole, recognizing that the work of the Evaluation Body and of the Committee continues to evolve, and that experience is gained in the implementation of the Convention with the States Parties and with other relevant stakeholders. The members thus agreed that the Evaluation Body’s recommendations should not be bound by past recommendations in the case where its accumulated experience and jurisprudence lead the Body to make a different assessment from past evaluation bodies.
5. **Evaluation of content contained in the files**. Throughout its examinations, the Evaluation Body relied on the information provided by States Parties in the nomination files. In an effort to maintain consistency with past decisions and approaches, its recommendations were based strictly on the information provided, while omitting personal sympathies and external evidence. However, the matter of external evidence was the subject of considerable debate, with the Evaluation Body members discussing the possibility that the information provided in the nomination file presents only a partial description of the element and may omit potentially problematic aspects. This raises the broader issue of the potential usefulness of using external information during the evaluation process.
6. **Combined mechanism**. The following procedure was used to evaluate combined nominations for inscription on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding and requests for International Assistance to support the implementation of the proposed safeguarding plan: for the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding, when a single criterion was not satisfied, the decision was made to refer the entire file. However, for International Assistance requests, an overall appreciation was required. To maintain consistency with the procedure followed in the previous years, the nomination file and International Assistance request were evaluated separately.
7. **Multinational nominations**. During the evaluation of one multinational file in this cycle, five of the twelve members of the Evaluation Body were required to leave the discussion because the file was submitted by their country of origin or by a country where their non-governmental organization was based. In light of the increasing number of States Parties joining multinational nominations, and for the purpose of consensus-building, it is necessary to discuss the procedure for evaluating files when six or more members of the Evaluation Body are unable to participate.
8. **Use of the referral option**. The members of the Evaluation Body agreed that a recommendation to refer a nomination would only be made after thorough examination. They wish to emphasize to States Parties, and especially to the communities, groups and individuals concerned, that the recommendation to refer an element in no way constitutes a judgement on the merits of the element itself. The recommendation reflects only on the adequacy of the information presented in the nomination file. The referral option was used when the nomination file did not provide sufficient evidence for two or more criteria. The Evaluation Body also wishes to emphasize that referring a nomination creates an opportunity for the submitting State(s) Party(ies) to provide additional information and contribute to an improved presentation of the element. The Evaluation Body is aware that communities and submitting States Parties may be disappointed that possible inscription was postponed. However, the Evaluation Body does not perceive the referral as a negative outcome.
9. **Improvement in the quality of nomination files**. The Evaluation Body observed an overall improvement in the quality of nominations that were submitted for examination during the 2021 cycle. This improvement was noticeable both in the files submitted for the first time, as well as in the nominations that were resubmitted after a previous referral.
10. **Use of the ‘No’ option**.In one case, the Evaluation Body reached the conclusion that the information within the nomination file was sufficient to demonstrate that inscription or selection was not warranted. This decision is not intended as a value judgement on the proposed element. Rather, it indicates that criteria for inscription were not satisfied as required by the Convention and its Operational Directives. The Evaluation Body did not believe that additional information would change its recommendation.
11. **Experience with the dialogue process**. TheEvaluation Body used the dialogue process in more cases in this cycle compared to in previous cycles. Dialogue was also used for the first time in one case for an International Assistance request. Unlike in the case of the referral option, the dialogue was limited to questions requiring a specific response. Dialogue was only used when there was a minor lack of information or a confusing statement, which the Evaluation Body considered could be clarified through a simple question-and-answer exchange with the submitting State(s) Party(ies).
12. **Description of the questions**. Questions in the dialogue process concerned criteria R.3, U.3, R.4, U.4, R.5, U.5 and A.1. Questions about the R.3 and U.3 criteria requested responses about the role of the communities, groups and individuals concerned in the development and implementation of proposed safeguarding measures and plans. Questions about the R.4, U.4 and A.1 criteria requested more information about the role of the communities, groups and individuals concerned in the preparation of the nomination files as well as how free, prior and informed consent was achieved. Questions about the R.5. and U.5. criteria were more varied and requested more information about the characteristics of particular inventories, the process for updating inventories and the role of the communities, groups and individuals concerned in the updating process.
13. **Correspondence regarding ongoing nominations.** As in previous cycles, the Evaluation Body took note of correspondence received regarding nominations to the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. In accordance with the 2012 guidelines for the treatment of correspondence from the public or other parties concerned with regard to nominations ([Decision 7.COM 15](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/7.COM/15)), the Secretariat transmitted the letter(s) to the submitting State(s) Party(ies) and forwarded their response, if any, back to the original sender (see also [document LHE/21/16.COM/11](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-16.COM-11-EN.docx)). As per [Decision 14.COM 14](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/14.COM/14), the correspondence is summarized below, while the letters are made available to the Committee on the website of the sixteenth session of the Committee:
	1. *‘Hüsn-i Hat, traditional art of Islamic calligraphy’* (submitted by Turkey). In July 2020, the Iranian Ministry of Cultural Heritage, Tourism and Handicrafts sent a letter to UNESCO acknowledging Iran’s positive collaboration in the past with Turkey on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage (including in the submission of joint nomination files), while expressing concerns regarding the geographical range and over-inclusivity of the element as identified in the nomination file.
	2. *‘Truffle hunting and extracting in Italy, traditional knowledge and practice’* (submitted by Italy). In March 2021, members of the Evaluation Body received an email from the non-governmental organization ‘Associazione per la difesa dei diritti degli animali’ expressing concerns regarding the animal rights and overly stressed economic dimensions of the element. As the correspondence was addressed to the Evaluation Body members directly, the Secretariat did not apply [Decision 7.COM 15](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/7.COM/15). The Evaluation Body responded to the correspondence and recommended that the non-governmental organization presents its concerns to the Secretariat. However, no further correspondence was received from the non-governmental organization by the Secretariat. The exchange prompted the Evaluation Body members to discuss the possibility of using external evidence when evaluating nomination files and proposals. While it is evident nomination files cannot contain exhaustive information on the element concerned, this can lead to the omission of some information that may be important for evaluating the nomination.

***General comments***

1. The Evaluation Body congratulates the many communities, groups and individuals whose intangible cultural heritage was nominated, as well as those States Parties that submitted nominations that conform fully to the criteria outlined in the Operational Directives.
2. **Good examples**. The Evaluation Body is pleased to recommend the following nominations from this cycle as good examples:
3. **Register of Good Safeguarding Practices – Overall Files**

*‘The School of Living Traditions (SLT)’*, proposed by the Philippines, is an excellent example of a safeguarding model that involves the active engagement of indigenous peoples in the intergenerational transmission of their intangible cultural heritage. A distinct feature is its structured approach for transmission, including oral traditions. The holistic approach of the safeguarding practice promotes awareness raising about intangible cultural heritage, mutual respect, youth involvement and community empowerment.

*‘Success story of promoting traditional foods and safeguarding traditional foodways in Kenya’,* proposed by Kenya is a well-prepared file that can serve as a concrete, attainable example of a safeguarding model around traditional foodways that can be applied and adapted to other settings facing similar challenges around a decline in traditional foods.

‘*Nomad games, rediscovering heritage, celebrating diversity’*, proposed by Kyrgyzstan, is a well-written file demonstrating strong community engagement and support for the programme and for the proactive participation of the federations and practitioners in the safeguarding of their collective intangible cultural heritage at a large scale.’

1. **Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity – Overall Files**

*‘Kaustinen fiddle playing and related practices and expressions’*, nominated by Finland, is a well-prepared file that demonstrates the involvement of communities throughout the nomination process. The file also presented a comprehensive set of safeguarding measures, formulated by various associations and stakeholders and involving management and monitoring efforts.

*‘L-Għana, a Maltese folksong tradition’*, nominated by Malta, is an exemplary file in all aspects, including for proposing formal means of integrating the element into the school curriculum and for efforts to increase youth involvement.

*‘Pottery-related values, knowledge, lore and practices of the awajún people’,* nominated by Peru, is a well-elaborated file that can serve as an example to highlight the valuable role of living heritage in indigenous contexts related to living sustainably and creatively in and with the natural ecosystem.

*‘Flower carpets tradition for Corpus Christi processions’*, nominated by Poland, is a well-elaborated file in all aspects. The file notably includes a well-prepared video that demonstrates strong community participation.

*‘Nordic clinker boat traditions’*, nominated by Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, serves as a good example of a multinational nomination, demonstrating cooperation, dialogue and experience sharing. It also recognizes an element of living heritage that has been and is practiced by majority and minority groups and indigenous peoples alike.

1. **Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity – Specific Aspects**

*‘Congolese rumba’*, nominated by the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Congo, is a well-prepared file that demonstrates solidarity, coordination and friendship between the submitting States Parties and among the communities, groups and individuals associated with the element.

*‘Pasillo, song and poetry’*, nominated by Ecuador, is a well-prepared file that can serve as a good example of community involvement in the development of safeguarding measures.

*‘Corso culture, flower and fruit parades in the Netherlands’*, nominated by the Netherlands, is a well-elaborated file that features a strong community-led initiative in the practice of the element and in building safeguarding networks.

*‘Community festivities in Campo Maior’*, nominated by Portugal, included an excellent supporting video that demonstrates community participation.

*‘Arabic calligraphy: knowledge, skills and practices’,* nominated by Saudi Arabia, Algeria, Bahrain, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Palestine, Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates and Yemen, is an excellent example of cooperation among several countries in the preparation of a nomination file.

*‘Traditional craftsmanship of making Dumbara Ratā Kalāla’,* nominated by Sri Lanka, demonstrates a strong awareness of the links between intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development, as well as efforts to address the wellbeing and welfare of the community through proposed social security measures related to health and disability benefits.

1. **Multinational nominations**. The Evaluation Body was pleased to examine five multinational nominations in this cycle, highlighting the importance of shared intangible cultural heritage. This was a lower number of files compared to the 2020 cycle, which may be evidence of the time it takes for States Parties to coordinate efforts across borders. Members of the Evaluation Body were able to examine varying approaches to compiling and drafting multinational nominations. The Evaluation Body applied the same standard of evaluation for multinational nominations as for nominations submitted by a single State Party. Discussions on these files revolved around three key issues:
2. **Overall improvement in the quality of files submitted**. Multinational nomination files in this cycle demonstrated overall improvement in providing comprehensive information in response to the criteria. This was evident in their coordinated responses to criteria R.3, R.4 and R.5, in which States Parties made great effort to provide information regarding proposed safeguarding measures, the participation of communities, groups and individuals, and the inventorying framework and processes. The files also demonstrated international cooperation and dialogue among a variety of actors, such as museums and non-governmental organizations.
3. **Encouraging multinational nominations**. The Evaluation Body reminds States Parties that the Convention and its Operational Directives encourage multinational nominations for the inscription of intangible culturalheritage that is found on the territories of more than one State. Recognizing that it does not have the authority to require a State Party to submit a joint nomination with other States Parties, during this cycle the Evaluation Body encouraged States Parties nominating such an element to consider working towards an extended nomination with other States Parties that may be interested in the future.
4. **Extending a multinational file and its implications**.While international cooperation is encouraged with respect to the extension of existing nominations, the members of the Evaluation Body discussed the implications of multiple extensions of multinational nominations where there are no substantial improvements to the file. The Evaluation Body identified the threat of the nomination being overly general and inclusive without evidence of real cooperation among communities.
5. **Geographical imbalance**. The Evaluation Body was aware of the geographical imbalance between regions and countries in nominations and proposals to the Lists. However, it emphasizes that the issue of geographical distribution did not influence the decision-making process and that every nomination was evaluated on its own merits.
6. **Issues in the textual quality of nominations**.
7. **Linguistic quality**. The Evaluation Body was concerned about the persistence of poor linguistic quality for some nomination files. Bearing in mind that poor wording should not affect the substance of the examination of the file, sometimes the information was not understandable due to the poor linguistic quality. Moreover, good linguistic quality is necessary for the future public visibility of the element, if it were to be inscribed. States Parties may wish to seek ways to mitigate this issue before submitting nomination files.
8. **Information not in the appropriate place in the nomination form**.In some nomination files, information was not found in its appropriate place, but elsewhere. The members of the Evaluation Body decided to consider the file in totality when examining each criterion and did not rule against a nomination in these cases. However, to facilitate its work, the Evaluation Body reminds States Parties to provide the information requested in the appropriate place in the nomination form.
9. **Inappropriate vocabulary**. Although the members of the Evaluation Body agreed that a nomination should not be rejected as a result of inappropriate vocabulary and references to other UNESCO Conventions or programmes, such as the World Heritage List, it urges States Parties to pay special attention to the spirit and the letter of the 2003 Convention.
10. **Focus on promotion of the element**.In some instances, the Evaluation Body noted the proposal of safeguarding measures which focused mainly on the promotion of the element. States Parties are reminded that measures should also focus on other types of safeguarding measures, such as transmission, research and education.
11. **Issues regarding accompanying video**.
12. **Importance of the video**. The EvaluationBody underscored the importance of the video when evaluating files, which can enrich the information provided in the file and enhance the overall understanding of the element.
13. **Coherence between the video and the file**. The Evaluation Body took note of many files where the accompanying video was coherent and aligned with the information presented in the file. However, there were also some examples where the file gave one explanation whereas the video presented a contrary perspective. For the purpose of a fair and accurate evaluation, States Parties are reminded to ensure coherence between the video and what is presented in the file.

***Thematic issues***

1. **Links between intangible cultural heritage and the environment**. The Evaluation Body was pleased to examine several files that featured connections between intangible cultural heritage and the environment. States Parties are reminded to take note of how safeguarding measures or plans may account for the protection of the environment and for the sustainability of natural resources associated with the element. For example, safeguarding measures or plans may account for issues such as the use of fires related to the practice of an element, pollution in general and protecting natural ecosystems.
2. **Links with World Heritage**. The inscription of intangible cultural heritage elements that may be connected to UNESCO World Heritage sites may be mutually beneficial for their safeguarding and protection. However, the Evaluation Body emphasized that States Parties should not submit nominations to the Lists of the Convention solely for the purpose of promoting World Heritage sites.
3. **Religious practices as intangible cultural heritage.**
4. **Religious practices**. The Evaluation Body took note of several nominations during this cycle relating to religious practices. The members discussed and acknowledged that nominated elements concerning cultural practices or expressions drawn from religious traditions may be taken into account under multiple domains.
5. **Organized religions**. The Evaluation Body discussed the risks of framing an organized religion as an intangible cultural heritage element which falls outside the scope of the Convention as described in Article 2. While many elements of intangible cultural heritage may have spiritual aspects and be associated with religious traditions, the Convention does not recognize organized religions as constituting intangible cultural heritage in and of themselves.
6. **Involvement of the communities concerned**. The Evaluation Body highly appreciated the initiatives of some States Parties to involve marginalized groups and individuals in the safeguarding process. It wishes to recall that ensuring the most active possible participation of the communities concerned in every aspect of the element’s safeguarding aligns with the core spirit of the Convention. Given the difficulty of fully implicating communities in the safeguarding of their own heritage, the States Parties are encouraged to address the nature and quality of that participation more thoroughly in the nominations, in addition to enumerating the various groups and communities concerned.
7. **Over-commercialization**. The Evaluation Body took note of several files which focused on elements linked to increasing commercial activity. In this regard, the following observations and reminders were noted:
8. When examining nominations relating to crafts and products, the members of the Evaluation Body discussed the fact that some nomination files placed too much emphasis on elements as commercial products. The Evaluation Body invites States Parties to seek a balance in nomination files between the economic and the social and cultural functions of an element.
9. While recognizing that intangible cultural heritage can indeed often generate income crucial for household economies, the members of the Evaluation Body discussed the need for States Parties to provide descriptions of concrete measures to avoid over-commercialization or to withstand a significant increase in public attention and other unintended consequences of inscription. In some nomination files, the safeguarding measures seemed to be oriented almost exclusively towards increasing the commercial potential of an element. The Evaluation Body encourages States Parties to remember that all safeguarding measures should be aimed at enhancing the viability of the element.
10. Furthermore, the Evaluation Body discussed the importance of community involvement in the process of drafting the safeguarding measures. This is to ensure that the primary beneficiaries of any income generation will be the communities concerned rather than the State Party or private enterprises.
11. **Tourism**. Several nomination files presented elements as being associated with tourism or listed tourism as a component of the safeguarding measures and plans. While some safeguarding value may be derived from tourism, States Parties are reminded to take heed of the potential negative effects of increased tourism on communities, the element itself and the environment. The Evaluation Body strongly discourages files that are developed solely for the purpose of increasing tourism.
12. **Animal rights.** The members of the Evaluation Body evaluated nominations that describe elements involving animals. In one instance, the file was silent on the use of animals, although it was evident that animals were a part of the element as portrayed in the accompanying video. The Evaluation Body did not detect any violation of animal rights which could result in the file being rejected or referred. Nonetheless, the members of the Evaluation Body discussed the need for States Parties to remain aware of animal welfare throughout the file as well as when planning and implementing safeguarding measures.
13. **Culinary heritage and foodways**. The Evaluation Body reminds States Parties that when nominating food elements for inscription that attention should be given to the cultural functions, practices, traditions and meanings associated with the element. Similarly, safeguarding measures should be geared towards ensuring continued transmission and viability of the functions, practices and traditions associated with the food element and not the food itself.
14. **Gender**.The Evaluation Body discussed the ways in which gender roles were presented and described as regards the involvement of communities concerned with the element. Some files provided clear descriptions about how men and women were involved in the transmission of the element, in the preparation of the nomination file and safeguarding measures, and in inventorying. Some files described elements in which women were the primary bearers (specifying their roles) and others described efforts for greater involvement of women. However, some files were silent on gender roles. In this regard, the Evaluation Body thought it important to develop an understanding of the practice of elements within their respective cultural contexts. States Parties are reminded that a more thorough description of gender roles throughout files would benefit their evaluation.
15. **Patents and copyrights**. The Evaluation Body reminds States Parties that inscription does not constitute a patent for an element. This falls outside the purview of the Convention and of the work of the Evaluation Body.
16. **Claims of ownership**. In one instance, the Evaluation Body took note of a file that was unclear about the geographical location of the element. This clarification was deemed particularly necessary in this case because other countries have a similar practice. The Evaluation Body reminds States Parties that inscription of an element should not be used as a means of claiming authenticity or ownership of that element. They are likewise encouraged to acknowledge when an element exists elsewhere.

***Specific issues related to requests for International Assistance greater than US$100,000.***

1. When assessing the International Assistance requests, the Evaluation Body focused on the connection between the context of the element concerned, the justification of its status, the objectives of the safeguarding measures and plan, the planned activities and the expected results. These were expected to align with the proposed timetable and detailed budget. Unfortunately, in several files the safeguarding measures were not described specifically enough or were not explained at all, which made it difficult to evaluate their alignment with the stated safeguarding objectives.
2. **Monitoring of inscribed elements**. The Evaluation Body took note of a request for International Assistance for an element that is already inscribed on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding. The evaluation process prompted the question about whether an evaluation of the element itself should be considered. As there was no precedent, the request for International Assistance was reviewed on its own merits.
3. **Community participation**. The Evaluation Body took note of a request for International Assistance in which it was difficult to determine how communities were involved in the preparation of the request. There appeared to be only a few bearers of the element, which also made it difficult to assess how communities would be involved in the implementation of the proposed safeguarding measures. States Parties are encouraged to make every effort to ensure the widest possible participation of the communities, groups and individuals concerned with the element, including its bearers and practitioners.
4. **Feasibility of proposed plans**. The Evaluation Body reviewed one file in which there was concern about the suitability of the time allotted for the implementation of proposed activities. Similarly, attention was drawn to whether aspects of the project were over-budgeted. States Parties are encouraged to carefully consider time allotments and cost estimates associated with proposed projects so that they can be properly considered as a whole.
5. **Sustainability of proposed plans**. The Evaluation Body discussed the importance of proposing projects with the potential for long-lasting results. Depending on the context, proposed plans should seek to ensure the continued transmission of an element through sustainable activities that directly respond to the needs of the element and of the communities concerned.

***Specific issues related to criteria for selection for the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices***

1. **Geographical diversity of proposals**. During its previous cycles, the Committee has noted the lack of geographical diversity in proposals to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices, with submissions largely from upper-middle to high-income countries. However, the Evaluation Body was pleased to note two strong proposals to the Register submitted by low- and middle-income countries during the 2021 cycle.
2. **Purpose of the Register**. The Evaluation Body recalls that the purpose of the Register is to select and promote programmes, projects and activities for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage that best reflect the principles and objectives of the Convention and that such a programme, project or activity must be in line with the definition of intangible cultural heritage outlined in the Convention.

***Specific issues related to criteria for inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity and on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding***

1. **Diversity of nominations**.The Evaluation Body was impressed by the diversity of intangible cultural heritage that was nominated for inscription to the Lists of the Convention. This diversity is proof of human creativity and of the desire of States Parties and communities, groups and individuals to safeguard their intangible cultural heritage.
2. **Link between R.1 and other criteria**. The Evaluation Body encountered several files that did not fully satisfy criterion R.1 in accordance with Article 2 of the Convention. As a result, criteria R.2 and R.3 could not be met as these two criteria cannot be fully examined if an element is not clearly defined. Nonetheless, aspects of the responses to criteria R.2 and R.3, such as those dealing with community participation, were still acknowledged in the draft decision of the Evaluation Body.
3. **Issues concerning R.1/U.1**. The Evaluation Body made note of several issues related to criterion R.1 and U.1:
4. **Mutual respect and human rights**. Members of the Evaluation Body emphasized the importance of ensuring that definitions of intangible cultural heritage meet the principles of mutual respect and human rights under Article 2 of the Convention. States Parties should refrain from providing generic responses, but rather provide evidence that the element is compatible with human rights and mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals.
5. **Definition of community**. Despite applying a broad and flexible view of diverse forms that communities may have in different societies, regions and contexts and keeping in mind that the terms ‘community concerned’ or ‘group concerned’ are not defined in the text of the Convention, the Evaluation Body felt that some files did not clearly identify the communities, groups or individuals concerned with the nominated element. In some instances, it was necessary to ask whether government authorities could be considered part of the communities concerned. However, the Evaluation Body evaluated each nomination in its own terms, without applying a single standard or rule, with the goal of maintaining a flexible approach.
6. **Consistency within the file**. In one instance, the Evaluation Body observed a discrepancy in how the element was defined and how it was referenced throughout the file. States Parties are reminded of the importance of drafting a clear definition in line with Article 2 of the Convention and of ensuring consistency throughout the file.
7. **Approach for examining R.2**. The Evaluation Body recalled the recurring issue with States Parties having difficulty responding to criterion R.2. In the past, if States Parties made an effort to fill in this criterion about general visibility, the criterion was accepted. Thus, in the current cycle the Evaluation Body also agreed to accept the criterion if an attempt was made to respond to the questions. That said, the Evaluation Body did not refer or reject any file solely on the basis of criterion R.2, even if a file was clearly deficient in its response to this criterion.
8. **Link between U.2 and U.3**. For one file, it was difficult to determine whether the safeguarding plan presented in criterion U.3 addressed the threats outlined in criterion U.2, because the response to U.2 did not provide sufficient evidence on the need for urgent safeguarding. However, as criterion U.2 was not satisfied, the evaluation of criterion U.3 was compromised.
9. **Challenges with R.3**. The Evaluation Body encountered several issues in the evaluation of criterion R.3:
10. In some instances, proposed measures were stated without a clear commitment to implement them.
11. Similarly, the Evaluation Body encountered cases where there was lack of clarity about who would implement the proposed measures, or where stakeholders mentioned in the definition of the community concerned with the element were not stated as being involved in the implementation of the safeguarding measures.
12. In some instances, the implementation of the safeguarding measures was described as dependent on the inscription of the element. The Evaluation Body disagrees with this approach, recalls that it is essential that the State Party lists the measures it has put in place in the past and present to safeguard the nominated element, and encourages States Parties not to wait for inscription to implement the measures.
13. **Community participation in R.3**. The Evaluation Body took note of files where the extent of community participation in developing proposals for safeguarding measures was not stated or fully articulated. It also discussed the importance of community engagement in the implementation of safeguarding measures, while acknowledging the need to distinguish between a top-down approach and the important role some communities may grant to leaders to speak on their behalf, such as the role of a king. Nonetheless, the Evaluation Body reminds States Parties that wide community participation is a central aspect of the articulation and implementation of safeguarding measures.
14. **Contradiction between proposed safeguarding measures and the competent body involved in safeguarding**. The Evaluation Body noted that, in some instances, the ‘competent bodies’ indicated as responsible for the implementation of the proposed measures did not correspond with the proposed measures. In these cases, there is a contradiction between the proposed measures and the actors who should implement them. States Parties are reminded to pay attention to identify the effective competent body involved for implementing the proposed safeguarding measures.
15. **Specificity of safeguarding measures**. In some instances, the Evaluation Body noted that proposed safeguarding measures appeared to be generic actions for implementing the Convention in the country. States Parties are reminded that measures should be specific to the element itself in consideration of ensuring the viability of the element as a whole, including measures which address any threats to the element.
16. **Connection between past and current safeguarding measures**. When filling out the nomination form, it is important that States Parties reflect on the past and current measures linked to the safeguarding of the element concerned. This assessment is an indication of the willingness of the States Parties and of the communities, groups and individuals concerned to continue to safeguard the element.
17. **Duration of the safeguarding plan in U.3**. The Evaluation Body noted that, in one instance, the duration of the safeguarding plan proposed in the file seemed insufficient for ensuring the viability of the element. States Parties are encouraged to consider the development of safeguarding plans early, so as to raise awareness and train youth, even when threats to the element are not immediately evident.
18. **Definition and objectives of the safeguarding plan in U.3**. The Evaluation Body noted some instances where objectives were restated as activities within the safeguarding plans. States Parties are reminded that care should be taken to formulate such safeguarding plans with attention to distinguishing between the objectives and the corresponding activities.
19. **Issues concerning R.4/U.4**. The Evaluation Body stresses that communities, groups or, individuals concerned with the element are fundamental to the Convention. States Parties must therefore ensure their widest possible participation in the entire safeguarding process, from the initiation of the nomination and the identification of the element, to the elaboration of the safeguarding measures. Communities, groups or, if applicable, individuals must be involved in inventorying and must demonstrate their free, prior and informed consent. States Parties are also requested to describe clearly how the community, group or individuals concerned have actively participated in preparing and elaborating the nomination at all stages. Responses should describe the consultative processes leading to the nomination and how their perspectives and aspirations were integrated into the final draft of the nomination.
20. **Top-down approach**. The information provided in several files suggested a top-down approach in their preparation. States Parties are encouraged to set up mechanisms for the widest possible participation of the communities, groups and individuals concerned. The Evaluation Body also reminds States Parties that the practice and viability of an element requires the active involvement of communities, groups and individuals concerned. For this reason, States Parties should involve communities, groups and individuals throughout the nomination process, particularly in the planning and implementation of the proposed safeguarding measures.
21. **Free, prior and informed consent**. The free, prior and informed consent of the communities concerned is also essential to the fair evaluation of the files. However, there were several issues raised by the Evaluation Body during this cycle:
22. Communities, groups and individuals should be duly informed about the particular Lists to which nominations or proposals are being made.
23. In some instances, the Evaluation Body found it difficult to identify the relationship or the role of the signatories with regards to the nominated element.
24. In some files, the letters of consent provided were outdated. The Evaluation Body stresses the importance of providing up-to-date letters of consent when re-submitting or extending a file, while ensuring the widest possible participation of the respective communities.
25. The use of standardized letters of consent is discouraged, as it does not suggest a participatory approach to procuring the free, prior and informed consent of the communities, groups and individuals concerned.
26. In several instances, the letters of consent submitted appeared to be expert-driven. States Parties should seek to procure the consent of all communities, groups and individuals concerned, regardless of expert capacity. Similarly, if an element is practiced or used by women, it is expected that women provide their consent as well.
27. **Issues concerning R.5/U.5**. As indicated by Articles 10 and 11, inventories are an essential safeguarding measure. Therefore, the Evaluation Body did not consider policies or declarations that intend to name an element to an inventory as inventories in and of themselves. Additionally, some files referred to multiple inventories, sometimes making it difficult to determine whether the element was listed on one or more inventories. States Parties are encouraged to be specific and clearly explain the inventory in which an element is included. The Evaluation Body was also guided in its examinations by the understanding that a variety of inventories might exist and that some might yet be in progress. However, the nominated element must already have been included in an inventory at the time of nomination. Other issues raised by the Evaluation Body included:
28. Given the importance of updating inventories in the context of criterion R.5/U.5, the Evaluation Body used the same approach as in previous cycles to write a comment in the decision rather than refer a file solely on the basis of: (a) an unsatisfactory response regarding the updating of inventories; or (b) the absence of information about periodicity. In instances where it was mentioned that updating is planned, the Evaluation Body required an explanation about how the updating would be conducted.
29. In some files, the role of the communities, groups and individuals in inventory-making was not clearly explained. Insufficient or non-existent explanation creates doubt about the role of the communities, groups and individuals concerned with the element. States Parties are encouraged to ensure community participation and provide clear explanations in this regard.
30. In several nomination files, it was common for States Parties to provide hyperlinks with information on their inventory. However, in some instances the hyperlinks were no longer functional and could not be accessed. States Parties are encouraged to ensure that hyperlinks are current for the purpose of evaluating the files.
31. Regarding criteria R.4/U.4 and R.5/U.5,the Evaluation Body noted that in some instances the participation of the communities, groups and individuals in the inscription of an element on the national inventory was confused with the inscription of the element on the Convention’s Lists.
32. **Respect of customary practices**.States Parties are reminded that respect must be given to customary practices that may restrict access to some parts of the element.
33. **Nominations to the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding** **when the viability does not seem threatened**.Two files in the 2021 cycle seem to have opted for a nomination to the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding rather than to the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, even though the element concerned was not clearly presented as being in need of urgent safeguarding. States Parties should reflect carefully on which list best serves the safeguarding needs of the element. As there is no provision that allows the Evaluation Body to recommend the inscription of an element to a specific List, the Evaluation Body agreed to comment in its draft recommendation that the nomination may be more suitable for the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
34. **Different purposes and criteria of the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity and the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding**. After discussing the different purposes and criteria of the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity and the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding, the members of the Evaluation Body **came** to the conclusion that conformity with each criterion should be determined on its own merits. An endangered element could not, a priori, be excluded from the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity even if, in some cases, the Evaluation Body believed that a nomination to the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding would have been more suitable. The same occurred in the case of some elements for which the endangered status did not seem to be supported by the text of the nomination file. However, the Evaluation Body acknowledged that it is the sovereign right of each submitting State Party to decide to nominate an element to a particular list, if the element satisfies all of the necessary criteria.
35. **Overview of recurring issues in the 2021 cycle**
36. **Positive aspects**.Based on its evaluation of the sixty files in the present cycle, the Evaluation Body wishes to highlight several positive aspects that have already been mentioned in previous decisions and working documents of the Committee. These are as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issues** | **Most recent reference decisions or documents of the Committee** |
| Benefits of the referral option | [Decision 12.COM 11](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/12.COM/11) (paragraph 7) |
| Benefits of the dialogue process | [Decision 15.COM 8](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/15.COM/8) (paragraph 5) |
| Importance of multinational nominations and the need to further encourage nominations of shared intangible cultural heritage | [Decision 12.COM 11](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/12.COM/11) (paragraph 10)[Decision 14.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10) (paragraph 11) |
| Contribution of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage to sustainable development | [Decision 11.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/11.COM/10) (paragraph 21)[Decision 14.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10) (paragraph 12) |
| Progress made thanks to the use of Form ICH-01 and Form ICH-02 containing a revised Section 5 | [Decision 13.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10) (paragraph 7) |

1. **Recurring challenges**.The Evaluation Body would also like to point out that it identified several challenges faced by submitting States, to which previous decisions and working documents of the Committee have already referred on several occasions:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issues** | **Most recent reference decisions or documents of the Committee** |
| Use of inappropriate expressions or vocabulary that are not in line with the Convention in nomination files and titles of elements | [Decision 12.COM 11](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/12.COM/11) (paragraph 6) |
| Lack of coherence between information provided under different criteria for inscription in submitted files | [Decision 11.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/11.COM/10) (paragraph 14) |
| Importance of providing a clear identification and definition of the element | [Decision 14.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10) (paragraph 8) |
| Challenges related to criterion R.2 | [Decision 14.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10) (paragraph 9) |
| Lack of attention to gender considerations and to the diversity of gender roles in enacting and safeguarding intangible cultural heritage | [Decision 8.COM 8](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/8.COM/8) (paragraph 8) |
| Possible negative impacts of commercialization and increased tourism | [Decision 12.COM 11](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/12.COM/11) (paragraph 13) |
| Risk of the potential decontextualization and jeopardization of an element as a result of over-commercialization | [Decision 14.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10) (paragraph 13) |
| Confusion between inscriptions on the Lists and the establishment of a system of ownership | [Decision 12.COM 11](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/12.COM/11) (paragraph 9) |
| Absence of safeguarding measures to monitor the impact of inscription | [Decision 11.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/11.COM/10) (paragraph 18) |
| Concerns linked to a top-down and centralized approach in the elaboration of safeguarding plans and the preparation of nominations | [Decision 14.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10) (paragraph 15) |
| Importance of audio-visual materials to demonstrate consent from communities and illustrate the social and cultural values of an element without contradicting the rest of the file | [Decision 8.COM 8](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/8.COM/8) (paragraph 16)[Document ITH/17/12.COM/11](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-17-12.COM-11-EN.docx) (paragraph 26) |
| Confusion between the different purposes and criteria of the 2003 Convention and other programmes and Conventions of UNESCO | [Decision 13.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10) (paragraph 9) |
| Uncertainty regarding the representativeness of the communities | [Decision 13.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10) (paragraph 12) |
| Concerns regarding the participation of communities in the preparation and implementation of safeguarding measures  | [Decision 11.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/11.COM/10) (paragraph 19) |
| Community participation in inventory-making | [Decision 13.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/13.COM/10) (paragraph 12) |
| Concerns regarding the development and updating of inventories | [Decision 14.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10) (paragraph 10) |

1. **Draft Decision**
2. The Committee may wish to adopt the following decision:

DRAFT DECISION 16.COM 8

The Committee,

1. Having examined documents LHE/21/16.COM/8, [LHE/21/16.COM/8.a](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-16.COM-8.a-EN.docx), [LHE/21/16.COM/8.b](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-16.COM-8.b-EN.docx), [LHE/21/16.COM/8.c](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-16.COM-8.c-EN.docx) and [LHE/21/16.COM/8.d](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-16.COM-8.d-EN.docx), as well as the files submitted by the respective States Parties,
2. Recalling Chapter I of the Operational Directives,
3. Appreciates the measures taken by the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat to adapt their working methodology to the continued challenges arising from holding the Evaluation Body meetings online due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and to continue to ensure high-quality work;
4. Expresses its satisfaction with the Evaluation Body’s efforts to treat a higher number of files for the 2021 cycle and acknowledges that increasing the number of files to be evaluated beyond this number of sixty may not guarantee the same quality of evaluation;
5. Notes the observations and recommendations made by the Evaluation Body concerning the 2021 cycle, recognizes that many of the issues raised in the previous decisions continue to prevail in the 2021 cycle, as summarized in paragraphs 76 and 77 of document LHE/21/16.COM/8;
6. Further takes note that the dialogue process was applied to fifteen files in its second full cycle and encourages future submitting States to make effective use of this option to clarify the specific questions raised by the Evaluation Body and provide their answers by the deadline and within the word limit indicated;
7. Also takes note that for the first time through the ‘combined mechanism’ the decision was made to grant the International Assistance request while referring the nomination to the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding back to the submitting State and affirms that such a decision is coherent with the purpose of the listing mechanisms;
8. Congratulates those submitting States that presented nominations that could serve as good examples for future nominations and notes with satisfaction that a number of these files concerned the safeguarding of minority, marginalized or indigenous peoples’ living heritage, and demonstrated the links between living heritage and sustainable development in several important areas, such as education, the environment and gender;
9. Welcomes the increased number of proposals to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices, reflecting greater diversity and geographic representativeness;
10. Recommends that relevant issues, concerns and recommendations raised by the Evaluation Body in the 2021 cycle be taken into consideration, as appropriate, in the ongoing global reflection on the listing mechanisms of the Convention.