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

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

**Online**

**9.30 – 17.30 (Paris time / UTC+2)**

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

**Item 6 of the Agenda:**
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|  |
| --- |
| At the end of the Part I meeting (online, 8 and 9 July 2021), the Open-ended intergovernmental working group decided to further discuss, when convened again for Part II, the procedures for the transfer and removal of elements from the Lists of the Convention and the procedure for the inscription of elements on an extended basis. The present document provides proposals and additional information regarding these three issues. |

**Background**

1. The need for an overall reflection on the Convention’s listing mechanisms originally emerged from the examination by the Committee at is twelfth session in 2017 of a first request to transfer an element from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List (Decisions [12.COM 11](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/12.COM/11) and [12.COM 11.c](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/12.COM/11.c)), as well as from the first removal of an inscribed element from the Representative List at its fourteenth session in 2019 (Decision [14.COM 12](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/12) and [14.COM 14](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/14)). In Part I of its meeting (online, 8 and 9 July 2021), the Open-ended intergovernmental working group (hereafter ‘the working group’) identified several issues that shall be further discussed in the Part II of its meeting (see paragraph 12 of [Recommendations of Part I of the Open-ended intergovernmental working group](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/52249-EN.docx) as reproduced in the annex of the working document [LHE/21/16.COM WG/5](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-16.COM_WG-5-EN.docx)). Per the working group’s request, the present document provides additional information and proposals regarding the following three issues that the working group may wish to prioritize during Part II of its meeting (online, 9 and 10 September 2021):

* Section A: Simplified procedures for transferring elements between the Lists and for including in the Register those safeguarding experiences that have successfully improved the viability of elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List;
* Section B: A specific procedure for removing elements from the Lists of the Convention, including the introduction of interim measures; and
* Section C: Revised procedures for the inscription of elements on an extended basis.

Working document [LHE/21/16.COM WG/7](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-16.COM_WG-7-EN.docx) is devoted to other issues that also require further discussion.

1. The procedures that are proposed for discussion below are based on the debates of Part I of the working group meeting and on the outcomes of the Category VI meeting of experts that took place in May 2021 in the framework of the global reflection on the listing mechanisms of the 2003 Convention.

* For sections A and B, the proposals take into account Group 2’s report of the Category VI expert meeting, to which ‘Issues related to the follow-up of inscribed elements’ was assigned as a theme for discussion ([Report](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/52149-EN.docx)). They also take into consideration the debates of the General Assembly at its eighth session (Resolution [8.GA 11](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/8.GA/11)) and the debates of the Committee at its twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth sessions on the transfer of an element from one List to the other and the removal of an element from a List (Decisions [12.COM 14](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/12.COM/14), [13.COM 9](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/9) and [14.COM 14](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/14)).
* For section C, the proposals are made with reference to the outcomes of the expert meeting in the framework of the global reflection on the listing mechanisms of the 2003 Convention, in particular the report from Group 3, to which ‘Methodology for the evaluation of nominations’ was assigned as a theme for discussion ([Report](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/52151-EN.docx)). They also take into consideration the debates of the Committee on the extension of multinational nominations at its seventh, fourteenth and fifteenth sessions (Decisions [7.COM 14](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/7.COM/14), [14.COM 14](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/14) and [15.COM 8](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/15.COM/8)).

1. **Simplified procedures for transferring elements between the Lists of the Convention**
2. At their online meeting in May 2021, many experts stressed that transfer and removal should be seen as distinct and separate processes. They promoted a simplified approach to transferring elements between the two Lists, identifying an updated description of the element and community consent as crucial requirements in any transfer, while an appropriate process and format needed to be developed for seeking and expressing such consent. Linkages between the two Lists, the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices, and International Assistance were also proposed to maximize synergies between the different mechanisms, increase cooperation and make the so far underused Register more attractive to submitting States Parties.
3. Part I of the working group meeting highlighted the importance of following up on the evolving situation of elements inscribed on the Lists of the Convention considering the dynamic nature of intangible cultural heritage. It specifically stressed the need to facilitate financial and technical assistance to elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List and to ensure a link between the follow-up of inscribed elements and the periodic reporting mechanism (see paragraph 7 of [Recommendations of Part I of the Open-ended intergovernmental working group](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/52249-EN.docx)).
4. The working group advocated for the definition of clear and simplified follow-up procedures. In line with the Ethical Principles for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage, it underlined the need to guarantee the key role of communities concerned, including in procedures leading to the possible transfer or removal of elements of their intangible cultural heritage or specific safeguarding practices from the Lists of the Convention and the Register. While acknowledging that the roles of the different stakeholders should be clarified and evoking the possible relevance of an arm’s-length platform, the working group encouraged States Parties to ensure a participatory follow-up at the local level with communities, national authorities and civil society. In this regard, the use of the community’s language (or a language that is accessible to them) should be facilitated.
5. Responding to the need for simplification expressed by the working group and experts alike, it is proposed to:
6. Apply a reduced number of criteria with requirements focusing only on new or updated information;
7. Use transfer request forms, which are lighter than Form ICH-01 and Form ICH-02 and which require the participation of communities, groups and individuals at every step;
8. Create linkages between the Urgent Safeguarding List and the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices, as well as with International Assistance; and
9. Establish a link between the periodic reporting mechanism and the initiation of a transfer request, in particular for transfers between the Urgent Safeguarding List and the Representative List.
10. Considering the different natures and purposes of the two Lists, it is proposed that two different transfer procedures be established – one for transfers from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List and another for transfers from the Representative List to the Urgent Safeguarding List – according to the following rationales:

* The proposed procedure for transferring an element from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List would take place within the 21-month cycle currently in application for nominations. Given the importance of appropriate implementation of a safeguarding plan for elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List, sufficient time should be allocated to ensure that the safeguarding plan yields satisfactory and lasting results for the viability of the element. To this end, a direct link would be created between the periodic reporting mechanism – providing the opportunity to assess the outcomes of the safeguarding plan – and the submission of a transfer request. Namely, the submission of at least one periodic report following the regular reporting cycle would be required before initiating a transfer process.
* The proposed procedure for transferring an element from the Representative List to the Urgent Safeguarding List would take place within a fast-tracked 11-month cycle in order to respond as quickly as possible to the threats identified for the element and to allow communities to benefit from adequate support from the State Party and/or other sources of funding, including the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund.

1. The working group is invited to discuss the following proposals:

**Proposed procedures for transfers between the Urgent Safeguarding List and the Representative List and the inclusion of successful safeguarding practices in the Register**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Step 0** | **Upstream actions (optional)**   * If considered necessary by the State(s) Party(ies) and the community(ies) concerned, possibility to call upon the advice of experts (from the arm’s-length platform and/or ICH NGO Forum) through the Secretariat at any time prior to the possible submission of a transfer request. Requests for expert advice could also be made in the context of the periodic reporting mechanism. * Communities may submit letters or audio-visual materials to the Secretariat – directly or via accredited NGOs, the arm’s-length platform and/or the ICH NGO Forum – to express their wish to transfer an element from one List to the other. The Secretariat will transmit such expressions to the State Party concerned and report to the Committee accordingly. |
| Cost implications (overall costs will depend on the number of requests):   * Additional Secretariat time required for:   + Processing, registration and preparation of letters and communication to and from States Parties and communities as well as with experts, the arm’s-length platform and/or the ICH NGO Forum   + Identification of experts, contract establishment and follow-up * Additional resources (from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund) for:   + Advisory services provided by experts, the ICH NGO Forum and/or the arm’s-length platform * Costs related to the establishment and maintenance of the arm’s-length platform and/or costs for the work of the ICH NGO Forum |
| **Step 1** | **Preparation and submission** |
| *Transfer from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List (21-month cycle)*   * The process is initiated by the State(s) Party(ies). * Given the importance of the safeguarding plan and its regular assessment through the periodic reporting mechanism, the periodic report of the Urgent Safeguarding List becomes the mechanism by which State(s) Party(ies) can initiate a transfer to the Representative List. The State(s) Party(ies) shall indicate in its/their periodic report whether it/they intend(s) to submit a transfer request before the following periodic report for the element concerned. * If the State(s) Party(ies) declare in the periodic report its/their intent to submit a transfer request, it/they can submit a transfer file by the 31 March statutory deadline in any year until the submission of the next periodic report. * Upon submission, the transfer file is included in the 21-month nomination cycle currently in application and is evaluated by the Evaluation Body and examined by the Committee the year after its submission. * A light transfer form is created, focusing on: (a) an updated description of the element explaining any changes the element has undergone since its inscription; (b) the current level of viability and a description of threats; (c) the outcomes of the implementation of the safeguarding plan; and (d) community consent through written documents or audio-visual materials. |
| *Transfer from the Representative List to the Urgent Safeguarding List (11-month cycle)*   * The State(s) Party(ies) initiate(s) the process. * The State(s) Party(ies) submit the transfer request by a new 31 January statutory deadline. The Secretariat registers the request. * The transfer file is transmitted to the Evaluation Body on the same year of its submission, without a completeness check. * A light transfer form is created, focusing on: (a) an updated description of the element, including justification for the need for urgent safeguarding; (b) a safeguarding plan, including possible expression of the need for International Assistance to support its implementation; and (c) community consent through written documents or audio-visual materials. |
| Cost implications (overall costs will depend on the number of requests):   * Additional Secretariat time required for:   + Communication with States Parties intending to submit a transfer request   + Treatment of additional files (correspondence, completeness check, etc.) * Additional financial resources for:   + Translation of additional files |
| **Step 2** | **Evaluation**   * The transfer request is evaluated by: (a) the Evaluation Body as a whole following its current working methods, or (b) two members of the Evaluation Body (an accredited NGO and expert from the region concerned) who carry out an initial assessment which would then be collectively discussed by all members of the Evaluation Body. * For each type of transfer, the evaluation of the conformity of the transfer request is based on a reduced number of criteria, as follows: |
| *Transfer from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List (21-month cycle)*   * Criterion R.1: Updated description of the element addressing the changes in the viability of the element in relation to the original criterion U.2. * Criterion R.3: Assessment of the implementation of the safeguarding plan described under the original criterion U.3 and safeguarding measures planned for the future. * Criterion R.4: Consent from the same communities, groups and individuals that had initially agreed to the inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List. |
| *Transfer from the Representative List to the Urgent Safeguarding List (11-month cycle)*   * Criterion U.1: Updated description of the element, including justification for the need for urgent safeguarding. * Criterion U.3: Adequate safeguarding plan and conformity with criteria for International Assistance (if requested). International Assistance could include the revision of the safeguarding plan, if it is not considered fully adequate to respond to the threats identified. * Criterion U.4: Consent from the same communities, groups and individuals that had initially agreed to inscription on the Representative List. |
| *Inclusion in the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices*   * Following its evaluation of the request for transfer from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List, the Evaluation Body may recommend including in the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices the successful safeguarding experience described in the transfer request. In this case, an expert (from the Evaluation Body, the arm’s-length platform and/or the ICH NGO Forum) drafts the criteria-based justification to be confirmed by the State Party. |
| Cost implications (overall costs will depend on the number of requests):   * Additional Secretariat time required for:   + Additional meeting days to reach consensus on a higher number of files   + Identification of experts, contract establishment and follow-up regarding the advisory services for the drafting of the criteria-based justification for inclusion in the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices * Additional financial resources for:   + Meeting organization costs (interpretation, technicians, etc.) for additional meeting days * Additional resources (from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund) for:   + Evaluation Body’s work on additional files   + Evaluation Body members’ additional meeting days   + Advisory services provided by experts, the arm’s-length platform, and/or the ICH NGO Forum |
| **Step 3** | **Examination**   1. The Committee examines the request based on the Evaluation Body’s recommendations. |
| *Transfer from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List (21-month cycle)*   * The transfer request is examined by the Committee in the year following its submission by the State Party. |
| *Transfer from the Representative List to the Urgent Safeguarding List (11-month cycle)*   * The transfer request is examined by the Committee in the same year as it is submitted by the State Party. |
| *Inclusion in the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices*   * The criteria-based justification drafted by the expert (from the Evaluation Body, the arm’s-length platform and/or the ICH NGO Forum) and approved by the State Party concerned is examined by the Committee in the year following the submission of the transfer request by the State Party. |
| Cost implications (overall costs will depend on the number of requests):   * Additional Secretariat time required for:   + Additional meeting days to examine a higher number of files and additional items on the agenda   + Drafting additional meeting documents * Additional financial resources for:   + Meeting organization costs (interpretation, technicians, etc.) for additional meeting days   + Translation of meeting documents * Additional resources (from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund) for:   + Committee members’ additional meeting days |

1. To complete the procedure described above, the following questions must also be considered:
   1. Would transfer requests from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List be treated as part of the annual ceiling approved by the Committee? If not, how will the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body absorb the extra workload?
   2. What to do in case of multinational inscriptions, if only one or some of the community(ies) concerned in only one or some of the submitting States Parties request(s) a transfer?
2. **Procedure for removing elements from the Lists of the Convention**
3. At their Category VI meeting in May 2021, experts agreed on the need to define a clear procedure for the removal of elements when they no longer satisfy one or more criteria for inscription. However, given the impact that removing an element from a List could have on its viability and on its practising community, a clear and transparent decision-making process is important, ensuring proper communication and information-sharing with the community throughout the process. This would allow for the expression of possibly diverging perspectives from within the community. Raising similar concerns, the working group stressed the need for a cautious approach and a clear procedure.
4. The working group might base its discussion on the following proposals:

**Proposed procedure for removing elements from the Lists of the Convention**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Step 1** | **Removal request or other information received about developments affecting the situation of an inscribed element**  Correspondence from the submitting entity (i.e. State(s) Party(ies) concerned, community member(s) or a third party) is registered by the Secretariat. | |
| **Step 2** | **Transmission of information**   * The Secretariat transmits information to the State Party, the nomination contact person and community representatives (as identified in the nomination file), who may provide a response and complementary information. * If the submitting entity wishes to remain anonymous, the Secretariat transmits an edited version of the original correspondence. | |
| **Step 3** | **Preliminary check** | |
| If the removal request is submitted by the State Party concerned as identified in the nomination file:   * The Secretariat gathers information (from the arm’s-length platform and/or the ICH NGO Forum, if appropriate, through a fast-track preliminary advice option). * The removal request is then directly transmitted to the Committee, together with the reply from the State Party and communities, as well as preliminary advice from the arm’s-length platform and/or the ICH NGO Forum. | If the removal request or correspondence is submitted by the community concerned or a third party:   * The Secretariat gathers information (possibly from the arm’s-length platform and/or the ICH NGO Forum, if appropriate, through a fast-track preliminary advice option) and consults the Bureau of the Committee. * The Bureau recommends or not to include the case on the agenda of the next Committee session. |
| Regardless of the option selected above, all cases received by the Secretariat are brought to the attention of the Committee in the sense of Decision [14.COM 14](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/14) (paragraph 15). | |
| Cost implications (overall costs will depend on the number of requests):   * Additional Secretariat time required for:   + Processing, registration and preparation of letters and communication to and from States Parties, communities and third parties   + Information gathering, possibly from the arm’s-length platform and/or the ICH NGO Forum   + Preparation of Bureau documents and meetings * Additional financial resources for:   + Bureau meeting organization costs (interpretation, technicians, etc.)   + Translation of meeting documents * Costs related to the establishment and maintenance of the arm’s-length platform and/or costs for the work of the ICH NGO Forum | |
| **Step 4** | **Examination by the Committee**  Information received and the reply from the State Party and communities – as well as the preliminary advice from the arm’s-length platform and/or the ICH NGO Forum (if appropriate) and the decision from the Bureau (if the request went through the Bureau) – are brought to the attention of the Committee, which may decide to:   * Maintain the element on the List, if it considers that the information is complete and there is insufficient ground for removal (end of the procedure). * Remove the element from the List, if it considers that the information is complete and there is enough ground for removal (end of the procedure). * Place the element under ‘follow-up’ status as an interim measure, if it considers that additional information is needed (continue to Step 5). * Remove the element from the List, with the possibility of placing it in a ‘memory bank’ if the element is considered as no longer viable (end of the procedure). | |
| **Step 5** | **Enhanced follow-up (observation, exchange and dialogue)** | |
| **Option 5.a. Arm’s-length platform and/or ICH NGO Forum**   * Follow-up is carried out by the arm’s-length platform and/or the ICH NGO Forum. * On a case-by-case basis, follow-up can take the form of written correspondence and/or online consultation with the State Party and communities and/or a consultative mission. * A follow-up report is transmitted to the Secretariat with a recommendation to the Committee. | **Option 5.b. Evaluation Body**   * Follow-up is carried out by: (a) the Evaluation Body as a whole, or (b) two members of the Evaluation Body (an accredited NGO and an expert from the region concerned) who would carry out an initial assessment, which would then be collectively discussed by all members of the Evaluation Body. * On a case-by-case basis, follow-up can take the form of written correspondence and/or online consultation with the State Party and communities and/or a consultative mission. * A follow-up report is transmitted to the Secretariat with a recommendation to the Committee. |
| Cost implications (overall costs will depend on the number of requests): | |
| **Option 5.a. - Arm’s-length platform and/or ICH NGO Forum**   * Additional Secretariat time required for:   + Identification of experts, contract establishment and follow-up   + Communication with States Parties, communities and third parties, as well as with experts from the Evaluation Body, the arm’s-length platform and/or the ICH NGO Forum * Additional resources (from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund) for:   + Advisory services provided by the arm’s-length platform and/or the ICH NGO Forum * Costs related to the establishment and maintenance of the arm’s-length platform and/or costs for the work of the ICH NGO Forum | **Option 5.b. Evaluation Body**   * Additional Secretariat time required for:   + Identification of experts, contract establishment and follow-up   + Communication with States Parties, communities and third parties, as well as with experts from the Evaluation Body, the arm’s-length platform and/or the ICH NGO Forum * Additional resources (from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund) for:   + Advisory services provided by the Evaluation Body   + Evaluation Body members’ additional meeting days |
| **Step 6** | **Follow-up report to the Committee**  On the basis of the follow-up report and the recommendation, and paying particular attention to criteria R.1/U.1 and/or R.4/U.4, the Committee may decide to:   * Maintain the element on the List, if there is insufficient ground for removal (end of procedure). * Remove the element from the List, if there is enough ground for removal (end of procedure). * Continue to place the element under ‘follow-up’ for a period to be determined, if the issues persist. The Committee recommends the implementation of reconciliatory/mediatory measures and specifies a session of the Committee in which the issue will be reported back by the State Party for a final decision by the Committee. | |
|  | Cost implications (overall costs will depend on the number of requests):   * Additional Secretariat time required for:   + Additional meeting days to examine additional items on the agenda   + Drafting additional meeting documents * Additional financial resources for:   + Meeting organization costs (interpretation, technicians, etc.) for additional meeting days   + Translation of meeting documents * Additional resources (from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund) for:   + Committee members’ additional meeting days | |

1. **Simplified procedure for inscription on an extended basis**
2. The review of the procedures for inscription on an extended basis was one of the priority issues discussed during Part I of the working group meeting. The current system as provided in sub-chapter I.6 of the Operational Directives, which requires all States Parties participating in the nomination (whether newly joining or part of existing nominations) to take part in the preparation of a new nomination and to go through the 21-month nomination process, was considered cumbersome and may dissuade States Parties from pursuing international cooperation through multinational files. For instance, under the 2021 cycle, the Committee will discuss the third extension of an element involving 24 States Parties; for the eleven States Parties involved in the original inscription in 2010, this is their fourth time submitting a nomination for this element.
3. Part I of the working group therefore decided to recommend simplifying the procedures. The main objective is to spare the already included States Parties from the burden of preparing a full nomination dossier each time the nomination is extended to include additional States Parties. In other words, the system may be revised to only require newly joining States Parties to demonstrate that the element as practiced in their territory satisfies the inscription criteria. At the same time, the working group cautioned against excessive simplification of the criteria and procedure for extending multinational nominations, particularly with regard to the consent of the communities, groups and individuals. Furthermore, the working group requested that clarity be given to the procedure for the inscription on an extended basis to be undertaken at the national level.
4. Some delegations also wished that the mechanism of multinational nominations be used in a justified manner for elements of intangible cultural heritage shared by a community across geographical borders, and not solely as a means of ‘circumventing’ the annual ceiling of files for examination and the priorities of paragraph 34 of the Operational Directives.
5. The working group may discuss the following:

**Proposed revised procedure for inscription on an extended basis**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Step 0** | **Upstream actions (optional)**   * States Parties planning to extend existing multinational nominations are encouraged to announce their intentions, in the sense of Decision [7.COM 14](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/7.COM/14), ahead of time through the webpage of the 2003 Convention, using the dedicated online form. This would provide opportunities for other States Parties to be informed of and join in the initiative and thus reduce the number of times that the same nomination is extended. * If requested by the State(s) Party(ies) and the community(ies) concerned, expert advice may be sought prior to the possible submission of a request for inscription on an extended or reduced basis. |
| Cost implications (overall costs will depend on the number of requests):   * Additional Secretariat time required for:   + Processing, registration and preparation of letters and communication to and from States Parties   + Identification of experts, contract establishment and follow-up * Additional resources (from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund) for:   + Expert advisory services |
| **Step 1.a** | **Preparation: Extension of multinational files to communities in other States**   * The original lead State Party initiates the process to the Secretariat. * Newly joining State(s) Party(ies) is/are required to demonstrate that its/their inclusion in the extension satisfies all of the required criteria for inscription. * The State(s) Party(ies) included in the original inscription and any subsequent extension(s) shall demonstrate that the same community(ies) that gave their consent for the submission of the original nomination and subsequent extensions agree with the proposed extension and that the communities concerned are willing to participate in already approved and newly proposed (if any) safeguarding measures with the newly joining communities and authorities (in the sense of Decision [10.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/10.COM/10), paragraph 15). |
| **Step 1.b** | **Preparation: Extension of national files** **to other communities within the submitting State**   * The process is initiated by the State Party in consultation with the communities concerned, or by the communities in cooperation with the appropriate authorities. * The State Party concerned is required to demonstrate that the addition of newly joining communities in its territory satisfies all of the required criteria for inscription. * The State Party concerned shall also demonstrate that the same communities that carried the original nomination give their consent to the extension of the element and that they agree to safeguard the element with the newly joining communities. |
| **Step 2** | **Evaluation and Examination**  The nomination is evaluated by the Evaluation Body and examined by the Committee following the regular evaluation procedure and timetable described in paragraph 54 of the Operational Directives. |
| Cost implications (additional costs will be incurred only if extensions are not treated as part of paragraph 34 of the Operational Directives):   * Additional Secretariat time required for:   + Treatment of additional files (correspondence, completeness check, etc.)   + Additional meeting days to reach consensus on a higher number of files   + Additional Committee meeting days to examine additional items on the agenda   + Drafting additional Committee meeting documents * Additional financial resources for:   + Translation costs for additional files   + Meeting organization costs (interpretation, technicians, etc.) for additional meeting days   + Translation of meeting documents * Additional resources (from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund) for:   + Evaluation Body’s work on additional files   + Evaluation Body members’ additional meeting days   + Committee members’ additional meeting days |

1. To complete the procedure described above, the following question must also be considered:
2. Would the request for extension be treated as part of the annual ceiling of files for examination and the priorities as defined by paragraph 34 of the Operational Directives? If not, how will the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body absorb the extra workload?