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# Executive summary

|  |
| --- |
| The UNESCO 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage provides in Article 29 that States Parties ‘shall submit to the Committee, observing the forms and periodicity to be defined by the Committee, reports on the legislative, regulatory and other measures taken for the implementation of this Convention’. Periodic reporting enables States Parties to assess their implementation of the Convention and take stock of their measures for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage at the national level. It is also one of the Convention’s key mechanisms for international cooperation, allowing States and communities to benefit from the experience gained in other States Parties and to exchange information on effective safeguarding measures and strategies. |

Between 2017 and 2019, the Intergovernmental Committee and the General Assembly took a set of decisions and resolutions to reform periodic reporting on the implementation of the Convention and on the elements inscribed on the Representative List. The purpose of the reform was to: (i) align the periodic reporting system with the Convention’s Overall Results Framework; (ii) allow for a more effective results-based self-reporting system for States Parties on their implementation of the Convention; and (iii) address the severely low submission rate within the previous reporting cycles.

As a result of the reform, the periodicity of reports was re-established so that States Parties may submit their reports on the implementation of the Convention every six years on the basis of a regional rotation system. In the reformed system, the periodic reporting Form ICH10 has also been aligned to the Overall Results Framework, reflecting its structure of the twenty-six core indicators and the eighty-six assessment factors. Each State Party is asked to monitor and report on the existence or absence of these assessment factors by responding to each question in the form. The novel method of results-based online reporting helps States determine the extent to which the indicator is satisfied, creating a baseline for monitoring the indicators, and establish their own targets for safeguarding in six years’ time.

Based on the calendar established by the thirteenth session of the Committee in 2018 for the first regional cycle of reporting, States Parties in Latin America and the Caribbean region (2021 cycle) were the first to submit their periodic reports in 2020, to be followed by Europe (2022 cycle), Arab States (2023 cycle), Africa (2024 cycle), Asia and the Pacific (2025 cycle), and then a separate year for reflection in 2026.

The implementation of the first regional cycle of periodic reporting in Europe yielded inspiring results in spite of the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic, with all forty-four (100 per cent) States Parties submitting their periodic report, thus highlighting the resolute commitment of the region towards the safeguarding of living heritage. The Secretariat, in cooperation with the Regional Centre for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage in South-Eastern Europe under the auspices of UNESCO (Category 2 Centre), rolled out an overarching and tailored capacity building programme that encompassed training and peer-to-peer learning sessions through which national focal points and facilitators from the region were equipped with the knowledge and skills to undertake the periodic reporting exercise.

A team of experts was established to undertake a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the periodic reports. The team was formed by Ms Harriet Deacon, the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology – Slovak Academy of Sciences, Ms Gabriele Detschmann, and Ms Marina Calvo, three experienced facilitators for the UNESCO global capacity-building programme of the 2003 Convention, and Mr Jesús Mendoza Mejía, doctorate student in Political and Social Sciences from the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM). The team collaborated closely with a data specialist from Stats sans limites, Ms Ioulia Sementchouk.

The ‘analytical overview’ of the reports was examined by the Committee at its seventeenth session (Decision [17.COM.6.b](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/17.COM/6.b) and Annex I of the document [LHE/22/17.COM.6.b Rev.](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-22-17.COM-6.b-_Rev.-EN.docx)), during which the Committee took note with interest of the common trends, challenges, opportunities and priority areas related to intangible cultural heritage safeguarding, as well as the different safeguarding approaches and methodologies adopted by States Parties in Europe to implement the Convention.

In-depth findings from the reports are shared in the present document according to the following eight thematic areas in the Overall Results Framework: I. Institutional and human capacities; II. Transmission and education; III. Inventorying and research; IV. Policies as well as legal and administrative measures; V. The role of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding in society; VI. Awareness-raising; VII. Engagement of communities, groups and individuals as well as other stakeholders; and VIII. International engagement. In addition, a brief analysis is provided on key aspects related to the status of the hundred and seventy-nine elements on the Representative List in the region, such as the assessment of their viability and efforts to promote or reinforce the elements. Key findings from the reports include the following:

* In many reporting countries, intangible cultural heritage has been integrated into sustainable development policies and programmes across different sectors (including in education), in synergy with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its 17 Sustainable Development Goals.
* Significant investments in institutions, education, awareness raising, and policy development have been made to better assist communities, groups and individuals concerned in the safeguarding of living heritage.
* Inclusive community participation in inventorying, education, research, awareness raising and safeguarding mechanisms has been enhanced through non-discrimination policies, multilingual education, consent-based ethical frameworks and consultative processes, as well as the creative use of digital tools.
* The region shows significant multi-stakeholder engagement, facilitated by a vibrant group of well-established regional, national and local institutions, and a large number of civil society organizations working in the area of culture and heritage.
* While States Parties report considerable investment in research and documentation with many opportunities for utilization for policymaking, this potential could be further harnessed.
* Major threats to the viability of living heritage include reduced youth interest, youth rural-to-urban migration, ‘over-commercialization’, and environmental sustainability.
* The safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage is fostering cross-cutting collaboration for sustainable development in the region, with its explicit integration in local and national development plans and foreign policy strategies. Successful examples were identified in the areas of foodways, handicrafts and cultural tourism, which enabled continued practice and transmission of the intangible cultural heritage and supported decent work and livelihoods.
* Activities that contributed to intangible cultural heritage safeguarding under UNESCO frameworks other than the Convention were shared in the reports. These activities particularly related to the 1972 Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage and the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions.
* Improved data collection, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are needed to better monitor and assess the role of living heritage in social, environmental, and economic spheres, in order to inform policymaking and strategic planning.

# Introduction

## General observations

### Overview of reports completed

Forty-four countries submitted their periodic reports, representing all the countries in UNESCO Group I and II that have ratified the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (hereafter, the Convention). A summary of the reports tabled for examination at the sixteenth session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage (hereafter, the Committee) is presented in Table 1 below, with the date of ratification.

**Table 1: States Parties submitting periodic reports in the 2022 cycle, with date of ratification**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **State Party** | **Date of ratification** |
| Albania | 04/04/2006 |
| Andorra | 11/08/2013 |
| Armenia | 18/5/2006 |
| Austria | 04/09/2009 |
| Azerbaijan | 18/1/2007 |
| Belarus | 02/03/2005 |
| Belgium | 24/3/2006 |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | 23/2/2009 |
| Bulgaria | 03/10/2006 |
| Croatia | 28/7/2005 |
| Cyprus | 24/2/2006 |
| Czechia | 18/2/2009 |
| Denmark | 30/10/2009 |
| Estonia | 27/1/2006 |
| Finland | 21/2/2013 |
| France | 07/11/2006 |
| Georgia | 18/3/2008 |
| Germany | 04/10/2013 |
| Greece | 01/03/2007 |
| Hungary | 17/3/2006 |
| Iceland | 23/11/2005 |
| Ireland | 22/12/2015 |
| Italy | 30/10/2007 |
| Latvia | 14/1/2005 |
| Lithuania | 21/1/2005 |
| Luxembourg | 31/1/2006 |
| Malta | 13/4/2017 |
| Monaco | 06/04/2007 |
| Netherlands | 15/5/2012 |
| North Macedonia | 13/6/2006 |
| Norway | 17/1/2007 |
| Poland | 16/5/2011 |
| Portugal | 21/5/2008 |
| Republic of Moldova | 24/3/2006 |
| Montenegro | 14/9/2014 |
| Romania | 20/1/2006 |
| Serbia | 30/6/2010 |
| Slovakia | 24/3/2006 |
| Slovenia | 18/9/2008 |
| Spain | 25/10/2006 |
| Sweden | 26/1/2011 |
| Switzerland | 16/7/2008 |
| Türkiye | 27/3/2006 |
| Ukraine | 27/5/2008 |

In this cycle the 44 reporting countries have participated in the mechanisms of the Convention in the following ways since ratification (i.e. covering up to but not including inscriptions at [16.COM](https://ich.unesco.org/en/16com) in 2021):

* Twelve elements inscribed on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding (hereafter, the Urgent Safeguarding List);
* 179 elements inscribed on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity (hereafter, the Representative List), of which 28 were multinational;
* Sixteen programmes selected for the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices (hereafter, the Register), of which one was multinational;
* Eight projects, benefiting five countries, financed through International Assistance (provided by the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund); and

Ninety-nine non-governmental organizations (NGOs) from reporting countries have been accredited under the Convention.

Reports often covered the full period since ratification even if this was longer than six years, because they were intended to set a baseline for further reporting.

# Key analytical findings

This section provides some key analytical findings on common trends and progress or challenges in the UNESCO priority areas on indigenous peoples, youth and gender, as well as on sustainable development.

## Key strategic insights

In responding to the questions on the periodic reporting form, States Parties provided information on activities being undertaken to implement the Convention in their territories. This section will examine the activities across different Thematic Areas to identify key strategic insights on what has been done and any cross-cutting priorities identified for future action.

The countries reporting in this cycle have made significant investments in institutions, education, awareness raising and the development of policy frameworks assisting communities, groups and individuals concerned, as well as other stakeholders, in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage within the framework of the Convention. The majority of countries reported high levels of inclusive community participation in educational programmes about their intangible cultural heritage, inventorying, research, awareness-raising and safeguarding. Inclusive community participation has been fostered in general by implementation of non-discrimination policies, multilingual educational provision, consent-based ethical frameworks and consultative processes, as well as creative use of digital tools.

Between 2008 and the end of this reporting cycle, just short of 200 elements were inscribed on the two international Lists of the Convention across the 44 reporting countries, and 16 programmes were selected for the Register. Only four of the reporting countries did not yet have inscriptions on any of the Lists or the Register. About 160 competent bodies, across 42 reporting countries whose reports were analyzed quantitatively,[[1]](#footnote-1) have been appointed to coordinate implementation of the Convention. Formal and non-formal educational programmes included intangible cultural heritage in almost all these countries, even at the post-secondary level. The reports documented 113 inventories elaborated in reporting countries, with over 42 000 elements inscribed across all of them. Multi-stakeholder engagement was facilitated within and between reporting countries by the presence of many well-established regional organizations and national or local institutions, and a large number of NGOs, researchers and civil society organizations working in the field of culture and heritage.

Inventorying and research have created a structure and focus for many intangible cultural heritage-related activities. These have been supported by government agencies within States Parties and by regional organizations. While most inventories were reported to be oriented towards safeguarding, for example by including information on viability and safeguarding measures, or regular updating, only about a quarter of the countries reported that inventories were fully utilized for safeguarding. The reports showed how inventorying processes can be linked to systematic monitoring and evaluation of safeguarding work in regard to specific elements. Comprehensive safeguarding plans might more frequently be shared publicly, where appropriate, as good practice examples. Better monitoring and evaluation of safeguarding activities can inform both safeguarding efforts and policy-making. More research is needed about intangible cultural heritage safeguarding methods and challenges. Funding is also needed to maintain free, permanent access to documentation in line with ethical requirements, including updating databases and providing translation and interpretation to enable broad community access.

While there was considerable investment in research and documentation, and strong ethical regulation of it, less than a third of the countries reported high levels of its use for safeguarding. Only a third of the countries reported high levels of community participation in regard to culture sector policy-making, and even fewer reported high levels of the use of research in policy-making relating to intangible cultural heritage. This underlines the importance of bridging the gap between generating information about intangible cultural heritage through research or inventorying, and its access and use, particularly by communities concerned or to serve their needs. Many countries noted that improved systems of data collection are needed to effectively track and monitor intangible cultural heritage-related activities in various sectors, to evaluate the role of intangible cultural heritage in social, cultural, environmental and economic spheres and thereby to inform policy-making and strategic planning. A few countries gave examples of systematic data collection on culture sector needs, centralized research or information hubs, that could inform strategic planning for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding in general, and target interventions to specific areas and issues. In regard to awareness-raising activities, the reports also demonstrated the potential advantages of comprehensive communication and long-term outreach strategies, beyond events linked to inscriptions or awards. Specifically, more data is needed on private sector engagement in safeguarding, and how it can be encouraged in line with the [Ethical Principles for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage](https://ich.unesco.org/en/ethics-and-ich-00866) (hereafter ‘the Ethical Principles’).

The reports showed that intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management is being recognized as an opportunity for cross-sectoral collaboration on sustainable development. The reports gave examples of safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage being explicitly integrated into strategic plans for local, sub-national or national development, as well as foreign policy strategies. Many reporting countries implemented successful cross-sectoral initiatives in the areas of traditional foodways, handicrafts and cultural tourism, linked to both tangible and intangible heritage. This provided networking opportunities, training, collective marketing platforms and support for practitioners that enabled continued practice and transmission of the intangible cultural heritage and supported decent work and livelihoods. Further dialogue is needed on integration of intangible cultural heritage in other kinds of development policies, and on how to support communities in accessing legal and administrative mechanisms to ensure equitable benefit from use of their intangible cultural heritage.

The reports demonstrated that ensuring inclusiveness in safeguarding work often requires interventions targeted to the needs of specific excluded or marginalized groups. In doing so, some challenges were identified. Older people, marginalized groups and those with disabilities, often struggle to access digital platforms and consultative mechanisms. For various reasons, younger people in many countries were reported to be losing interest in certain intangible cultural heritage practices. Many safeguarding activities depend on active volunteer participation, which may be threatened by funding constraints or reduced youth engagement. While teachers often have the freedom to include aspects of intangible cultural heritage in the curriculum, they sometimes require assistance to identify practitioners or bearers from different communities who could be involved in that process. Several reports noted the importance of developing mechanisms for managing and resolving conflicts relating to intangible cultural heritage practices. Collaborative dialogue across States Parties and sharing of experiences may help identify effective ways of preventing, regulating and responding to such situations.

## Common trends across the thematic areas

### Participation of communities, groups and individuals concerned

Countries reporting in this cycle noted the strong participation of communities, groups and individuals concerned in teaching and learning about their intangible cultural heritage (B2.3, B4.1, B5.2), inventorying (B8.1, see Figure 1 below), research and documentation (B9.3), and awareness-raising activities (B17.1). About three quarters of the 42 countries whose submissions were analyzed statistically reported high levels of inclusive participation of communities, groups and individuals concerned in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding (B21.1); about a third reported high levels of community participation in policy-making in the culture sector relating to intangible cultural heritage (B11.4). Communities were also involved in various ways in preparation of the periodic reports, for example by submitting information, including on elements inscribed on the Representative List, and reviewing draft reports.
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Description automatically generated **Figure 1: Extent of inclusive participation of communities, groups and relevant NGOs in inventorying (n=42) (B8.1)**

Community participation in safeguarding was supported by policy frameworks, participative research and inventorying processes and, in many reporting countries, a culture of participating in community organizations.

Some community organizations have been established as NGOs, whether or not accredited under the Convention. For example, in Montenegro, the NGO “Boka Navy”[[2]](#footnote-2) is a voluntary community organization representing a community of seafarers in Kotor and promoting the values of multiculturalism, diversity and mutual understanding. Boka Navy, working with the Maritime School and Faculty of Maritime Affairs, organized education programmes for students of elementary and secondary schools as well as non-formal educational activities. In Ukraine, the NGO “National Union of Folk-Art Masters of Ukraine”, with branches in most parts of the country, was set up to raise awareness of traditional crafts, safeguard intangible cultural heritage and support its bearers. It became active on the “Platform ICH-Ukraine” in 2019, an initiative of the Development Center “Democracy through Culture” (accredited as an NGO in 2020), bringing together professional, public and non-governmental organizations working towards intangible cultural heritage safeguarding through research, training, awareness raising and community engagement.

In most reporting countries, the participation of minorities and/or indigenous peoples in safeguarding of their intangible cultural heritage received specific attention. This will be discussed further below.

### International and regional cooperation for safeguarding

As indicated above, the 44 reporting countries have engaged extensively with the various international mechanisms of the Convention, such as the Lists and Register. Most countries also reported high levels of international cooperation on intangible cultural heritage safeguarding, both in general and in regard to specific elements of intangible cultural heritage (B24.1 and B24.2). This will be discussed further under Thematic Area VIII.

Much of this cooperation was at the regional level, facilitated by the presence of a number of different multilateral organizations and frameworks in Europe and Central Asia, including the Commonwealth of Independent States ([CIS](https://e-cis.info/)), the [Council of Europe](https://www.coe.int/en/web/portal/home), the European Union ([EU](https://european-union.europa.eu/index_en)) and the International Organization of Turkic Culture ([TURKSOY](https://www.turksoy.org/en-US)). Such organizations set policy priorities, establishing programmes for heritage days, cultural capitals, cultural routes and supporting various funding schemes. A number of countries have also incorporated intangible cultural heritage into foreign policy agendas. For example, the Netherlands’ international cultural policy framework (2021–2024) expressed a commitment to internationalizing the cultural field, linking culture, including intangible cultural heritage, to foreign policy priorities.

Expert networks of practitioners and academics, including [UNESCO Chairs](https://www.unesco.org/en/unitwin) and [accredited NGOs](https://ich.unesco.org/en/accredited-ngos-00331?accredited_ngos_name=&accredited_ngos_countryAddress=all&accredited_ngos_geo=all&accredited_ngos_ga=all&accredited_ngos_domain=all&accredited_ngos_inscription=any&accredited_ngos_safe_meas=all&accredited_ngos_term=all&accredited_ngos_full_text=&pg=00331), supported international cooperation for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management, both between reporting countries, and with those outside the region. UNESCO [Category 2 Centres](https://en.unesco.org/partnerships/culture/Category-2-Centres) on intangible cultural heritage, in particular the [Regional Centre for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage in South-Eastern Europe under the auspices of UNESCO](https://www.unesco-centerbg.org/en/), based in Sofia, Bulgaria, have also supported international cooperation among reporting countries. A large number of accredited NGOs (99 in all, across the 44 countries) were based in countries reporting in this cycle, representing about half of all NGOs accredited under the Convention by 2021. Some of these NGOs have regional or international mandates, enabling easier cooperation across borders. The International Council for Traditional Music ([ICTM](http://ictmusic.org/)), for example, whose headquarters were based in Austria from 2017 to 2021, supported safeguarding of traditional music and dance internationally.

### Digital tools for safeguarding

Countries reporting in this cycle provided evidence of the important role played by digital tools in the implementation of the Convention. The use of digital tools for safeguarding increased during the COVID-19 pandemic (discussed in the following section).

Reporting countries frequently provided online access to intangible cultural heritage inventories and related research data; some have had policies and programmes supporting this for many years. In France, an [ICH lab](https://www.pci-lab.fr/) with a database, data visualization and relational mapping, and an [aggregator site](https://www.pop.culture.gouv.fr/) for data from multiple different sources, were developed to provide public access to inventoried elements and assist in data analysis. Specific access to digitized collections has been provided for Wayana and Apalaï communities in French Guiana through the [SAWA project](https://watau.fr/s/watau-fra/page/projet-SAWA) and its digital portal (WATAU).

Digital platforms have allowed broader and more cost-effective information sharing and collaboration, especially where internet access was made widely available, and where provisions were made for users with disabilities or access difficulties. Digital access has promoted greater community involvement in inventorying, especially with the use of easily updated wiki inventories, search tools, multimedia information and social media links. In Switzerland, the online prevention platform [White Risk](https://whiterisk.ch/en/welcome), run by the bearers of the element "[Avalanche Risk Management](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/avalanche-risk-management-01380)”, has been used both for awareness raising and training in avalanche risk management, particularly in the field of snow-sport. Creation of online repositories of intangible cultural heritage-related information has also allowed for greater synergies with environmental and tangible heritage planning, for example in Slovakia, where the [Slovakian Cultural Heritage Web Portal](http://www.slovakiana.sk/) incorporates information on both tangible and intangible cultural heritage.

Various reports acknowledged the importance of considering issues such as community consent, mutual respect and intellectual property rights in the provision of digital access to intangible cultural heritage-related information. Teachers in charge of ethnic culture education in Lithuania have access to the educational portal [E-mokykla](http://www.e-mokykla.lt/) with good practice examples and methodological recommendations for the integration of ethnic culture and intangible cultural heritage into formal and non-formal education. In 2017-2018, the Martynas Mazvydas National Library of Lithuania created an [interactive tool](https://cc.lnb.lt/) on the labelling of digital content and a [guideline](https://cc.lnb.lt/ar-tai-autorinis-kurinys/) about the use of folklore and derivative works.

## Challenges and opportunities

### The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic

The COVID-19 pandemic affected both the practice of intangible cultural heritage and safeguarding activities in reporting countries from March 2020 onwards. While some home-based activities, such as knitting, manual trades, crafts and cooking traditional foods, became more popular and thus supported intangible cultural heritage safeguarding, many festivals, gatherings, education and safeguarding activities were reduced, suspended or otherwise negatively affected. In Türkiye, most of the large [Hidrellez Spring celebrations](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/spring-celebration-hdrellez-01284) were cancelled in 2020. Practitioners celebrated it at their homes with close family members and via organized events on social media. Some countries (about a fifth of those reporting in this cycle) provided special funding to address intangible cultural heritage endangerment associated with the COVID-19 pandemic. In 2020, for example, some German states provided compensation to community associations or practitioners affected by financial hardship caused by the pandemic.

Many forms of intangible cultural heritage practice, transmission and awareness raising were able to adapt fairly quickly to pandemic restrictions by moving online. Communities and other stakeholders created or expanded social media forums for transmission of their intangible cultural heritage during the pandemic. The Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb (Croatia) used its online educational platform “Museum from the Couch” to provide information to primary and secondary school students, families and older adults about the Croatian elements inscribed on the Representative List. Increased use of digital tools such as these has continued to promote new ways of participation and more diverse audiences in some contexts. In Romania, an [online platform](https://iarmaroc.com/) was created for inventorying and selling traditional crafts; in the “Museums in villages” project, young people created newsletters about rural culture and a platform for raising awareness about it through [3D museum tours](https://muzeedelasat.ro/).

The longer-term impact of the pandemic on the viability of some intangible cultural heritage elements remains uncertain. Practitioner numbers have decreased in some cases; tourism economies and other sources of income remain badly affected. Studies were done in several countries in order to assess the impact of the pandemic on intangible cultural heritage practice and transmission, and on the cultural or creative industry sectors. The study “Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the Cultural Sector” conducted by the Latvian Academy of Culture in 2020, for example, showed that cultural consumption decreased significantly during the pandemic and that this affected intangible cultural heritage practitioners.

**Safeguarding in a context of cultural diversity**

The countries in this reporting cycle are culturally and linguistically diverse. Migration is a common phenomenon across reporting countries and some countries have large diaspora communities living abroad. Thus, it is not surprising that almost all countries involved people of different ethnic groups in safeguarding plans; three fifths of reporting countries said that intangible cultural heritage safeguarding plans involved migrants and refugees (B16.1, see Figure 3 below). Travelling was (or is) a way of life for certain communities and groups, including the Roma, Romani or Traveller communities, who still experience discrimination linked to this in some contexts. Conflict, climate change and economic hardship have also led to movements of people into and between reporting countries. Several reports emphasized the importance of intangible cultural heritage in maintaining connections between local and diaspora communities, and including diaspora communities in safeguarding efforts. In Georgia during the COVID-19 pandemic, a special educational channel broadcast a number of films dedicated to the traditions, customs, and practices of various regions and communities in Georgian, Armenian and Azerbaijani languages.

##### Chart, bar chart, waterfall chart Description automatically generatedFigure 2: Mechanisms for inclusion of intangible cultural heritage in primary and secondary education curricula in reporting countries (n=41) (B5.3)

The National Agency for Cultural Heritage worked with the Shota Rustaveli Institute of Literature of Georgia to identify less well-known Georgian folktales for a book collection illustrated by children in the diaspora. Various policies and programmes supported education about cultural and linguistic diversity within countries as a way of promoting intangible cultural heritage safeguarding. In primary and secondary education settings, almost all countries reported that students learned to respect and reflect on the intangible cultural heritage of their community and others through educational programmes and curricula (B5.2). Intangible cultural heritage was included in the school curriculum via mother-tongue education, multilingual education and local content in almost all countries (B5.3 in Figure 2 below, B6.1, B12.3). For example, in Serbia, members of national minorities have the right to mother-tongue education in eight different languages at preschool, primary and secondary levels, depending on local enrolment numbers.

Aside from schools, other institutions also supported multilingual education. The [Vigdís International Centre for Multilingualism and Intercultural Understanding](https://vigdis.hi.is/en/vimiuc/about-vimiuc/) in Iceland, for example, promoted multilingualism, did research into mother-tongue language access as a human right and engaged in awareness raising about the importance of language as a core aspect of the cultural heritage of humanity. The reports shared examples of intercultural approaches to addressing the question of cultural diversity more generally in the heritage sector, too. In Italy, for example, the Fondazione ISMU (Initiatives and Studies on Multiethnicity) created an on-line resource [Heritage and Interculture](http://patrimonioeintercultura.ismu.org/en/about-us/) to support cultural heritage professionals promoting intercultural engagement and inclusion in Italian museums and heritage institutions. The project aimed to explore innovative methodologies and tools, develop guidelines and disseminate good practices for intercultural heritage education.

**Balancing safeguarding, environmental conservation and human rights considerations**

The Convention only takes intangible cultural heritage into account that is “compatible with existing international human rights instruments, as well as with the requirements of mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals, and of sustainable development” (Article 2.1). Most countries reported that communities, groups and individuals used their intangible cultural heritage for dialogue promoting mutual respect, conflict resolution and peace-building (B15.2). They also reported that safeguarding plans and programmes promoted self-respect within, and mutual respect between, communities, groups and individuals (B16.2).

In Ukrainian society, intangible cultural heritage has been perceived as a source of resilience. Ukraine cooperated with Colombia on the campaign "Protection of traditional crafts and arts as a guarantee of peace" in 2019, based on the Colombian Good Safeguarding Practice "[Safeguarding strategy for the protection of traditional crafts for peacebuilding](https://ich.unesco.org/en/BSP/safeguarding-strategy-of-traditional-crafts-for-peace-building-01480)". The campaign included an exhibition and discussions held in various Ukrainian cities.

In some cases, however, the reports suggested the need for further dialogue on certain intangible cultural heritage practices and how they relate to questions of human rights and environmental management. Several reports noted the existence of community disputes around the compatibility of some intangible cultural heritage practices with human rights and mutual respect. In Belgium, a day of citizen consultation was held during the reporting cycle to discuss issues relating to culture, human rights and anti-racism, regarding the “Savage” of the Ducasse de Ath[[3]](#footnote-3), a character then associated with the element “[Processional giants and dragons in Belgium and France](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/processional-giants-and-dragons-in-belgium-and-france-00153)” inscribed on the Representative List. The discussion highlighted the need for further dialogue and information exchange between affected parties. The reports mentioned additional mechanisms that were used to address human rights issues in other contexts, as will be discussed further below. These mechanisms included courses on diversity, human rights committees, awareness-raising, guidelines and policies. Ireland’s “[Vision, Mission and Principles for Intangible Cultural Heritage](https://nationalinventoryich.chg.gov.ie/about/)”, for example, includes the principle that “recognition of intangible cultural heritage practices is based on a policy of respect, inclusivity and diversity”.

Development interventions in over four fifths of countries recognized intangible cultural heritage as a resource for sustainable development (B15.3). Just over two thirds of reporting countries said that their policies recognized the importance of “protecting the customary rights of communities and groups to [access] various ecosystems necessary for the practice and transmission” of intangible cultural heritage (B14.2). However, there are sometimes tensions between different approaches to environmental management in protecting such access. Community norms regarding the management of agriculture, forests and access to wild foraging, fisheries or water resources may sometimes be in conflict with current laws on environmental conservation and private property rights. In Sweden, for example, the public has a constitutionally-protected right to pick berries and mushrooms in nature. This right is balanced against the obligation to consider issues of environmental conservation and the rights of other people. Sámi stakeholders emphasized in Sweden’s report that dissemination of knowledge about their intangible cultural heritage could highlight alternative approaches to the use of natural resources, and assist in dialogue on balanced approaches.

## Priority areas

The reports indicated some trends in regard to intangible cultural heritage safeguarding activities that relate to UNESCO priority areas on indigenous peoples, youth and gender equality. Most countries reported the involvement of people of different genders, ethnic identities and ages in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding plans and programmes (B16.1, see Figure 3 below). Only about a third reported the involvement of indigenous peoples in these plans and programmes; this was partly because most countries did not report about any indigenous peoples in their territory. Inclusivity of people with disabilities, members of vulnerable groups and migrants, immigrants and refugees was reported by over three fifths of countries, but this will be discussed in greater detail under Thematic Area V.
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**Indigenous peoples**

The Preamble of the Convention recognizes that “communities, in particular indigenous communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals, play an important role in the production, safeguarding, maintenance and recreation of the intangible cultural heritage”. In some countries reporting in this cycle, significant attention was paid to the role of indigenous peoples in safeguarding their intangible cultural heritage, and ways of supporting them. Indigenous peoples specifically mentioned in the reports included, among others, the Greenland Kalaallit or Inuit (Denmark), the Livonian people (Latvia) and the Sámi (Norway, Finland and Sweden).

Various policy mechanisms supported the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage by indigenous communities concerned. Ukraine’s report mentioned a number of projects for the documentation and safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage of Crimean Tatars, Krymchaks and Karaites. This, and the teaching of indigenous languages and culture in schools, was supported by laws on minority language instruction and indigenous peoples. The Sámi Parliaments in Finland, Norway[[4]](#footnote-4) and Sweden have worked with the Saami Council, a community-based NGO, to coordinate work with Sámi intangible cultural heritage across Sápmi (the land of the Sámi). In Norway, nineteen Sámi language centres, administered by the Sámi Parliament, have been established for the safeguarding of Sámi languages. Activities included courses, targeted information campaigns and various projects, including the documentation of place names. In Greenland (Denmark), most of the population is indigenous Kalaallit, and the safeguarding of their culture (including intangible cultural heritage) has thus been a focus of their country’s policies and programmes.

Some of the indigenous peoples mentioned in the reports have worked closely with international indigenous forums, such as the Inuit Circumpolar Council ([ICC](https://www.inuitcircumpolar.com/)). Latvia has actively participated in the work of the United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names ([UNGEGN](https://unstats.un.org/unsd/ungegn/)), providing information on Livonian toponyms through the Livonian Institute of the University of Latvia. Building on the commitment to safeguard indigenous Livonian culture in Latvia, an educational website called “Your Class” ([Tava klase](http://www.tavaklase.lv/)) was designed for teachers and pupils, providing access to materials on the traditions, language, and culture of the Livonians.

**Youth**

Youthengagement in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding received considerable attention in reporting countries. Ten of the countries were involved in a joint project with UNESCO and the European Commission entitled “[Engaging Youth for an Inclusive and Sustainable Europe](https://ich.unesco.org/en/engaging-youth-for-an-inclusive-and-sustainable-europe-01051)”, in the context of the European Year of Cultural Heritage (EYCH2018), aimed at encouraging and stimulating young people to explore their cultural heritage and actively participate in its safeguarding and transmission.

Primary and secondary school curricula incorporated intangible cultural heritage as a way of teaching other subjects in four fifths of reporting countries (B5.1). All the countries reported that communities, NGOs and heritage institutions were actively involved in formal or non-formal intangible cultural heritage education programmes (B4.3), many of which were aimed at young people. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, for example, the project “Cultural Heritage - the Future of Youth”, led by the Association "Sahan" and supported by the Ministry of Science, Higher Education and Youth, ran workshops on embroidery and wool felting, and staged a fashion show with people of different ages wearing folk costumes.

Many reports noted that the future viability of intangible cultural heritage elements was threatened by reduced youth interest. This was related to other threats frequently mentioned in the reports (A6.m), such as changing uses of leisure time, urbanization, low practitioner incomes, problems accessing materials and spaces for intangible cultural heritage practice and, in some cases, increased concern among young people about the environmental sustainability of intangible cultural heritage practices. Addressing reduced youth interest in intangible cultural heritage may thus require going beyond the provision of information and encouragement to young people, to develop a broader systematic approach addressing questions of access, interests and livelihoods.

**Gender equality**

UNESCO believes that all forms of discrimination based on gender are violations of human rights, as well as a significant barrier to the achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.[[5]](#footnote-5) Reporting countries noted increasing gender sensitivity on the part of various stakeholders engaged in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding, driven in part by broader policy priorities around gender equality and inclusion at the national and regional levels.

Some intangible cultural heritage practices do remain gender-specific, but social activism, threats to the viability of some traditions, or changes in social norms, have resulted in greater gender inclusivity over time. Bulgaria’s report, for example, remarked that while some “Lazaruvane” traditions were still performed only by young girls of marriageable age, masquerade rituals that are part of the “[Surova folk feast in Pernik region](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/surova-folk-feast-in-pernik-region-00968)”, previously performed only by young unmarried men before their marriage, have been characterized by increasing female participation. Belarus reported, too, that men have recently started doing more weaving, embroidery and straw plaiting, previously mainly practiced by women.

A number of reports acknowledged that further progress on gender inclusivity and equality was needed, and gave examples of strategies that could be adopted to achieve this. In Türkiye the Strategy Paper and Action Plan on Women’s Empowerment (2018-23) aims at promoting women’s participation in economic and social life, ensuring women’s equal access to rights and opportunities and mainstreaming the principle of equality between women and men into all key government plans and programs. Under this rubric, the 4th National Action Plan and Strategy Document for Combating Violence Against Women (2021-2025) proposed research to understand how intangible cultural heritage such as idioms and folk tales related to increased or reduced violence against women. The Gabeiras Foundation NGO in Spain implemented a project called “[Intangible Heritage and Gender](https://fundaciongabeiras.org/patrimonio-inmaterial/)” that conducted research on gender inequalities in participation at festivals. The project made recommendations on how to address these challenges, for example by taking steps to reduce harassment of women at the gatherings, including designating “safe areas” and providing training to reduce the risk of violence.

Some reporting countries have begun to consider inclusivity based on sexual orientation, as well as equality of different genders, as part of intangible cultural heritage safeguarding programming. The Norwegian government presented a new action plan in 2021 to combat discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression and gender characteristics. Initiatives included ensuring diversity competence in the appointment of government representatives to cultural institutions, collaboration with civil society, and dissemination of queer history and culture during a Queer Culture Year in 2022. In Finland, the cultural heritage of LGBTIQA+ “rainbow” sexual and gender minorities (including lesbian, gay, bi-sexual, trans, intersex, queer/questioning, or asexual people, and others) has enjoyed a higher profile in recent years, with safeguarding initiatives such as the development of archives, provision of school education materials and the designation of a Rainbow History Month in 2018.

## Contributions to sustainable development

The current United Nations (UN) framework for sustainable development is [Agenda 2030](https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda), monitored through 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). UNESCO’s [Culture 2030 framework](https://whc.unesco.org/en/culture2030indicators/) assists culture sector actors in linking their work to Agenda 2030. The [Operational Directives](https://ich.unesco.org/en/directives)’ Chapter VI contains guidance for States Parties on encouraging synergy between intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and sustainable development objectives. Practising and transmitting intangible cultural heritage in the usual way can contribute to sustainable development in various ways. The Convention, in fact, only takes into account those elements of intangible cultural heritage that are compatible with the requirements of sustainable development (Article 2.1). Thus, many countries mentioned the relationship between intangible cultural heritage practice, safeguarding and sustainable development.

The high level [Overall Results Framework](https://ich.unesco.org/en/overall-results-framework-00984) for the 2003 Convention, on which the Periodic reporting mechanism is based, mentions the contribution of safeguarding activities to sustainable development as one of the possible impacts of implementing the Convention. In this analytical report, therefore, the focus will thus be on understanding specifically how implementing intangible cultural heritage safeguarding actions in the context of implementing the Convention have contributed to sustainable development, and not just how its usual practice and transmission might do so. Specific attention was given to examples that illustrated outcomes and impacts of safeguarding actions on either more general areas of sustainable development identified in the Operational Directives, or on specific SDGs and Targets identified under Agenda 2030.

In synergy with Agenda 2030, many reporting countries integrated culture and heritage into sustainable development policies and programs across different sectors. In Belarus, the importance of involving intangible cultural heritage bearers in educational initiatives was recognized under the Education for Sustainable Development programme initiated by the Minister of Education. Romania’s Sustainable Development Strategy 2030, drafted in 2018 as the national strategy for implementing UN Agenda 2030, acknowledged the positive impact of traditional small-scale farming based on ecological principles on the national agricultural system and food security. It also aimed to support the use of traditional knowledge on medicinal plants and forest fruits. In the context of the [Framework Convention on the Protection and Sustainable Development of the Carpathians](http://www.carpathianconvention.org/the-convention-17.html), Czechia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia and Ukraine have promoted the link between sustainable development and intangible cultural heritage safeguarding. Several international projects on intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development have been initiated. These included the [LIVIND](https://www.aineetonkulttuuriperinto.fi/en/livind) project involving nine countries in the Northern Dimension region, and the [Atlantic CultureScape](https://atlanticculturescape.eu/) and [LIVHES](https://livhes.eu/) projects involving various countries in south and western Europe.

The reports provided some evidence demonstrating the contributions of safeguarding activities to sustainable development. The examples below have been organized according to the themes outlined in the Operational Directives: inclusive social development, inclusive economic development, environmental sustainability, and social cohesion and peace. There is, of course, some overlap between these categories.

In regard to **inclusive social development**, many countries reported how the implementation of the Convention contributed to quality education promoting mutual respect and global citizenship. In France, the Centre for Traditional Music in the Rhône-Alps (CMTRA) worked with Le Rize, the Centre for Memories and Society in Villeurbanne, helping a class of fifth grade students in 2021 to compose the city's intercultural anthem using documentation of the music of migrant communities in the city that had been collected in 2008. Such projects supported SDG Target 16.7 on participatory decision making and Target 4.7 on cultural diversity and cultural contributions to sustainable development. Enabling increased digital access to cultural resources has both increased awareness of intangible cultural heritage and increased access to information and communications technology, furthering the realization of SDG Target 9.c. In Armenia, for example, young people from the programming centre “Annaniks” developed “Sasunci Davit”, a digital application for Android and IOS systems based on the themes of the epic poem [David of Sassoun](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/performance-of-the-armenian-epic-of-daredevils-of-sassoun-or-david-of-sassoun-00743). From 2018, the application was used in the school curriculum as a resource for teaching the epic and has generated considerable interest in the country and abroad. Many reports noted that female participation in and leadership of intangible cultural heritage activities was increasing, thus furthering SDG Targets 5.5 and 5.a on equal representation in leadership and equal rights and access to economic resources. Some activities, such as the Gabeiras Foundation project mentioned above, promoted gender equality and also furthered SDG Target 5.2 on the elimination of violence against women.

In regard to **inclusive economic development**, many projects mentioned in the reports aimed to transmit intangible cultural heritage-related skills within communities as a means to support livelihoods, fostering community cooperation and earning potential. For example, a project in the area of Pakiršinys in Lithuania provided training in heritage food preparation and blacksmithing to socially excluded or unemployed youth and adults. As in many other countries, projects on sustainable tourism in Serbia promoted safeguarding as well as sustainable development by supporting organizers of festivals and events, assisting practitioners of traditional crafts and foodways to earn a living, creating jobs and promoting local culture and products (SDG Targets 8.9 and 12b). Several countries also mentioned projects helping people with disabilities to make a living from intangible cultural heritage-related skills. The Sheki Disabled People Care Association in Azerbaijan, for example, helped people with disabilities to earn money selling traditional crafts. Such projects contributed to several SDG Targets for Goal 4 on education and training, as well as SDG Target 10.2 on social inclusion.

In regard to **environmental sustainability**, reporting countries were well aware that culture and environmental issues are intertwined so that safeguarding intangible cultural heritage also means maintaining and reinvigorating ecosystems. For example, in Estonia, encouraging sustainable local farming practices based on traditional grazing knowledge helped to restore alvar grasslands (thinly soiled limestone plateaux) in the LIFE+ project (2014-2019), thereby supporting the realization of SDG Target 15.1. Promoting traditional building skills enabled the sustainable reuse of existing buildings and agricultural structures and thus contributed to SDG Target 11.c. The Romanian Order of Architects, for instance, offered advice and developed guidelines for builders and house owners who wanted to use traditional building methods to maintain buildings and retain vernacular cultural landscapes in rural areas. The reports also gave a number of examples of awareness raising about environmental sustainability. In Belgium, the “Windmill your way” (Molen je mee) programme at the [Arbeid Adelt mill](https://ruraalnetwerk.be/projecten/rosmolen-arbeid-adelt-van-zaad-tot-olie) in Weelde created opportunities for schoolchildren to visit windmills and learn about both sustainable agriculture and renewable energy through the lens of the miller’s craft (supporting SDG Target 4.7).

In the Caribbean region of the Netherlands, safeguarding intangible cultural heritage has helped to increase capacities for effective climate change-related planning, helping to realize SDG Target 13.b. The research programme “[Island(er)s at the Helm](https://www.kitlv.nl/islanders-at-the-helm/)” focused on the ecological and social impact of natural disasters, on both living conditions (access to shelter, food and water) and intangible cultural heritage. Two UNESCO regional pilots in the area focused on intangible cultural heritage and emergencies: “Enhancing the Culture Sector's Disaster Preparedness for Effective Response” and “Updating of the Disaster Risk Management component of the Management Plan of the Historic Area of Willemstad, Inner City and Harbour World Heritage property”. Both projects took into account the [Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction](https://www.undrr.org/publication/sendai-framework-disaster-risk-reduction-2015-2030), and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change ([IPCC](https://www.ipcc.ch/)) assessments and reports.

In regard to **social cohesion and peace**, intangible cultural heritage has been mobilized through safeguarding actions to resolve local disputes or to bring together diverse social groups. Safeguarding activities contributed to SDG Target 10.2 on social, economic and political inclusion by increasing understanding of cultural diversity and raising awareness of elements of shared culture. The Ukrainian Cultural Center offered intangible cultural heritage training courses for different target groups in Estonia, for example, including Ukrainian migrant communities, thus building social inclusion and mutual understanding. In Greece, the intangible cultural heritage inventory reflects a diversity of groups with different national, ethnic, religious backgrounds. The “[Amoli](https://synergasia.wixsite.com/synergasia/about-2021)” (furrow) project in the multicultural town of Aspropyrgos, near Athens, used art and walking routes to explore intangible cultural heritage such as agricultural and food traditions as a shared experience of diverse local communities, including several Greek communities, Roma and groups recently arrived in the country. This project challenged stereotypes and promoted social cohesion, helping to realize SDG Target 10.2 on social, economic and political inclusion and SDG Target 10.7 on well-managed migration.

Safeguarding actions also helped reduce conflict and discrimination. For example, the Gaelic Athletic Association (GAA) in Ireland implemented a “Responding to Racism” programme, offering workshops for referees, coaches and administrators raising awareness about discrimination, including racism and homophobia, and how to address it. The association collaborated on the “All Against Racism” awareness campaign with the Irish Human Rights Equality Commission, and the Leitrim hurler, Zak Moradi, originally from Iraq. Five hundred free places were offered to vulnerable children to encourage attendance at Gaelic Games summer camps between 2017 and 2019. This contributed to achieving SDG Target 10.3 on equal opportunities and eliminating discrimination.

# Thematic areas

Thematic area I - Institutional Capacities

To assist in implementing the Convention and intangible cultural heritage safeguarding, the Convention strongly recommends in Article 13(b) that State Parties “designate or establish one or more competent bodies for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage present in [their] territory”. Some bodies have functions relating to intangible cultural heritage in general (see OD 154(a)), others are focused on specific intangible cultural heritage elements (see ODs 158(a) and 163(a)). States are encouraged to establish consultative bodies or coordination mechanisms to promote the involvement of communities and other stakeholders in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding, in line with Article 15 and OD 80. The Convention also encourages States Parties to support other institutions such as cultural centres, centres of expertise, research and documentation institutions, museums, archives and libraries that can contribute to intangible cultural heritage safeguarding (ODs 80 and 109, Article 13(d)(iii)).

The periodic report thus contains a number of questions about competent bodies and other institutions that support intangible cultural heritage safeguarding at the national or local level. These are as follows:

##### List of core indicators and assessment factors on institutional capacities (B1)

| **Core Indicators** | **Assessment according to the following** |
| --- | --- |
| B1. Extent to which competent bodies and institutions and consultative mechanisms support the continued practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage | * 1. One or more competent bodies for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding have been designated or established. |
| * 1. Competent bodies exist for safeguarding specific elements of intangible cultural heritage, whether or not inscribed.[[6]](#footnote-6) |
| * 1. Broad and inclusive[[7]](#footnote-7) involvement in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management, particularly by the communities, groups and individuals concerned, is fostered through consultative bodies or other coordination mechanisms. |
| * 1. Institutions, organizations and/or initiatives for intangible cultural heritage documentation are fostered, and their materials are utilized to support continued practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage. |
| * 1. Cultural centres, centres of expertise, research institutions, museums, archives, libraries, etc., contribute to intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management. |

### Overview of core indicator B1

Reporting countries have invested significantly in institutions such as competent bodies for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding. At least one competent body for managing the implementation of the Convention has been established in every reporting country, comprising 160 bodies altogether, usually under the direction of government agencies (B1.1). Three quarters of reporting countries also have at least one competent body for safeguarding a specific element of intangible cultural heritage (B1.2), sometimes established by community-led organizations and/or NGOs at the local level. Over four fifths of countries reporting in this cycle also have consultative bodies or coordination mechanisms for supporting the continued practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage (B1.3). Some of these consultative processes, whether NGO-led, managed by government agencies, professional heritage organizations or self-organized multidisciplinary networks, have made a significant contribution to community engagement in safeguarding activities, often expanding their reach by moving online during the COVID-19 pandemic.

All reporting countries have also established institutions, organizations and/or initiatives for documenting intangible cultural heritage, including its digitization (B1.4). Such documentation was used in almost all countries for awareness-raising about intangible cultural heritage and its practitioners, enabling appropriate access to information, and developing educational and training material. It was also used to identify current or future threats concerning the viability of intangible cultural heritage elements, and to develop appropriate safeguarding measures. Almost all countries reported that museums and research institutions contributed towards intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management. The contribution of archives and cultural centres was mentioned by over four fifths of countries. The role of libraries and centres of expertise was highlighted by nearly three quarters of countries (B1.5).

Most reporting countries thus fully (86%) or largely (14%) satisfied the core indicator B1 at the baseline on the extent to which competent bodies, institutions and consultative mechanisms support the continued practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage.

### Challenges and opportunities

The significant and continuing investment in competent bodies as well as in consultative and coordinating mechanisms for safeguarding implies that these institutions and organizations are considered by reporting States to be effective mechanisms for implementing the Convention. In many reporting countries, intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management has been recognized as an opportunity for cross-sectoral collaboration, especially on broader sustainable development platforms. Reporting countries have also allocated considerable support to consultative bodies or networks, and the development of participatory methodologies and policies. The reports shared several good practice examples showing how public institutions, and museums in particular, have assisted communities and practitioners to lead documentation activities on their own intangible cultural heritage.

Nevertheless, some challenges and opportunities were identified in this Thematic Area. Considering the diverse range of institutions, organizations and initiatives contributing towards intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management, some reports noted the possible benefits of more centralized funding structures and systematic planning in the sector to coordinate actions to meet identified needs. Community-led organizations may benefit from increased assistance. Systematic record-keeping about intangible cultural heritage-related activities in the reports of institutions such as museums and archives could be a possible aid to reporting in the next cycle.

### Competent bodies[[8]](#footnote-8)

All of the reporting countries established or designated at least one competent body for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding in general. The number of competent bodies per country ranges between one and 23 (B1.1), making a total of 160 competent bodies. Countries with federal systems of governance tended to have multiple such bodies. Overall, 25 of the reporting countries had more than one competent body.

Government ministries responsible for culture frequently delegated the responsibilities of a competent body for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding to sub-departments, such as the Culture Directorate in Malta, or to specific government agencies, such as the National Center of Traditional Activities (NCTA) in Albania, which operates under the Ministry of Culture. Some of the competent bodies had local satellite structures. For example, Poland’s National Institute of Cultural Heritage, the designated competent body for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding, had 16 offices at the local level to facilitate research, awareness-raising and community engagement, as well as collaboration regarding safeguarding of similar elements in different regions of the country. National Commissions for UNESCO have been assigned specific roles in the implementation of the Convention in certain countries. In Austria and Germany, for example, the National Commissions for UNESCO were designated as competent bodies, with responsibilities to organize and coordinate the national inventorying processes in partnership with competent bodies in the various states that are part of these federal systems.

In several countries, NGOs or other institutions (some of which were established before the ratification of the Convention) have been allocated key responsibilities for its implementation. For example, the main competent body in Lithuania, the Lithuanian National Culture Centre, is a State institution under the Ministry of Culture. It is assisted in its work by other competent bodies including a State-funded NGO, the Centre of Folklore and Ethnography of Ethnic Minorities in Lithuania. Museums or archives have also been designated as competent bodies in some countries, or given specific tasks in the implementation of the Convention. The Centre for the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Serbia, for instance, was set up at the Ethnographic Museum in Belgrade in 2012, two years after Serbia’s ratification of the Convention. The Centre has been tasked with the maintenance of the national inventory and the coordination of the intangible cultural heritage network in Serbia.

##### Example: NGOs assisting the implementation of the Convention as competent bodies (Netherlands)

NGOs accredited under the Convention, such as the Dutch Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage (KIEN), have been designated as competent bodies in their own right in some countries. KIEN is responsible for implementing the Convention in the Netherlands, coordinating the intangible cultural heritage inventory, supporting intangible cultural heritage bearers in their safeguarding efforts, developing safeguarding methodologies, and research and development. KIEN has developed methods for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, including in a highly diverse environment, as well as methods for transmitting intangible cultural heritage in schools and for dealing with disputed intangible cultural heritage. It has offered courses to communities and other stakeholders on developing safeguarding plans for intangible cultural heritage. KIEN also provided training and toolkits to local government officials responsible for heritage, planning and public participation and to professionals working in the heritage sector who want to integrate intangible cultural heritage in their work and policies. KIEN is developing training courses on intangible cultural heritage and tourism, and on intangible cultural heritage and the Environment and Planning Act.

Three quarters of the reporting countries (32 out of 42, or 76%) reported having competent bodies for safeguarding specific elements as well as a more general body (B1.2). Countries reported 184 such bodies altogether, although this number is likely an underestimate as bodies established at local levels were not routinely included in the reports. One example of such a body is the International Mugham Center of Azerbaijan, a centre of Azerbaijani arts and music established in 2005, aiming to promote, preserve and popularize the mugham genre of Azerbaijani music, inscribed in 2008 as “[Azerbaijani Mugham](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/azerbaijani-mugham-00039)”. The centre organizes regular concerts and awareness-raising programmes, hosting the final stage of the annual World of Mugham International Festival.

Some competent bodies mentioned in this section focused not on a specific element alone, but on a specific intangible cultural heritage domain, such as crafts or music. In several reporting countries, competent bodies for safeguarding specific elements or domains were community-led organizations and/or NGOs. The cultural NGO "Ruben Nalbandyan - Khachkareri Varpetats Dprots", named after the master khachkar maker Ruben Nalbandyan, was listed as a competent body for safeguarding of “[Armenian cross-stones art. Symbolism and craftsmanship of Khachkars](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/armenian-cross-stones-art-symbolism-and-craftsmanship-of-khachkars-00434)” in Armavir marz, Armenia.

### Consultative bodies or coordination mechanisms[[9]](#footnote-9)

More than four fifths of the countries (37 out of 42, or 88%) established consultative bodies or coordination mechanisms for supporting the continued practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage, including advisory or consultative bodies and networks (B1.3). The nature and functions of the consultative bodies or coordination mechanisms varied considerably, some being managed by competent bodies or heritage institutions, while others were NGO-led or organized by academics or community members. Their activities ranged from providing direct advice to competent bodies on inventories or nominations, encouraging networking between stakeholders, to less formal kinds of engagement.

Some consultative bodies were formally constituted, such as intangible cultural heritage committees, expert councils or advisory bodies, with a mandate to support the implementation of the Convention at the national or sub-national level. One example given in the reports was the Advisory Committee to the Arts Council Norway, the country’s designated competent body for the implementation of the Convention. The Advisory Committee provides an opportunity for community representatives, including indigenous peoples and national minorities, to participate in decision making about the implementation of the Convention, including the assessment of national and international nominations.

Advisory bodies could play a role in intangible cultural heritage strategy, as well as policy evaluation and development. For example, in Estonia, the Council for the Intangible Cultural Heritage offered strategic advice on intangible cultural heritage safeguarding, and on the inclusion of new entries on the national inventory. The Cultural Heritage Assessment Council ([Consell Assessor del Patrimoni Cultural](https://www.cultura.ad/consell-assessor-del-patrimoni-cultural)) in Andorra, an advisory body to the government, was tasked with evaluating and guiding the implementation of cultural policies and actions in the field of cultural heritage. In North Macedonia, heritage experts on the National Council for Cultural Heritage were appointed to advise the government on issues and challenges in the field of intangible cultural heritage and make policy recommendations.

Some consultative bodies or coordinating networks played a role in inventorying, which will be discussed in greater detail below. In Ukraine, for instance, the Expert Council on Intangible Cultural Heritage, established as a permanent advisory body of the Ministry of Culture and Information Policy, was comprised of representatives of public, non-governmental, educational and scientific organizations. The Expert Council assisted the Ministry in making decisions on the inclusion or exclusion of elements to the National Register of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Ukraine, monitoring and safeguarding of inscribed elements, and in amending relevant legislation. In Türkiye, Local Intangible Cultural Heritage Boards have been established in 81 provinces across the country. They prepared and updated the forms necessary for the inclusion of elements on the national inventory of intangible cultural heritage and the Living Human Treasures inventory. Members of the boards included representatives from institutions, NGOs, bearers and practitioners.

Consultative mechanisms and networks enabled public consultation, ensured the active involvement of communities, and coordinated the work of different stakeholders in their safeguarding actions. Examples included the coordinating network established in 2013 in Flanders (Belgium) by the [Intangible Cultural Heritage Platform](http://www.immaterieelerfgoed.be), which also promoted community participation in inventorying and safeguarding using the concept of “Heritage Cells” at the local level. Multistakeholder networks, called “[Circles of Living Heritage](https://www.aineetonkulttuuriperinto.fi/en/sopimus-suomessa/el%C3%A4v%C3%A4n-perinn%C3%B6n-ringit)” set up and funded by the Finnish Heritage Agency (FHA) for most intangible cultural heritage domains in Finland assisted communities and practitioners to participate actively in implementing the Convention and to share good practices. Each circle was coordinated by one of its member organizations (an NGO or a museum) using the same [operating model](https://www.aineetonkulttuuriperinto.fi/assets/THE-ABC-OF-CIRCLE-ACTIVITIES.pdf).

### Other institutions or initiatives relating to intangible cultural heritage safeguarding, documentation and research[[10]](#footnote-10)

In all reporting countries, the State, including regional or municipal authorities, fostered and supported both new and existing institutions, organizations and/or initiatives for documenting intangible cultural heritage (B1.4). Significant support was given to archives and museums, and cultural documentation in general, particularly through inventories. Nevertheless, relatively few institutions seem to have been established exclusively for intangible cultural heritage documentation. In the Autonomous Community of Navarre (Spain), for example, [The Archive of the Intangible Heritage of Navarre](https://www.navarchivo.com/es/testimonios) (Navarchivo) collects testimonies and records of the collective memory, including videos, audio recordings, music manuscripts, publications, unpublished texts, photographs, etchings. The archive also includes records of intangible cultural heritage that was lost or is on the point of disappearing.

In most countries (40 out of 41 reporting countries, or 98%), documentation was used to support the continued practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage (B1.4). This was generally done by promoting appropriate access (often digital access) and by developing awareness-raising, education and training material based on the documentation. The use of research and documentation for safeguarding will be discussed further below.

Overall, nearly all countries (41 out of 42 countries, or 98%) reported that museums (including local, open-air and eco-museums as well as national or regional institutions) contributed towards intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management (B1.5, see Figure 4 below). Stimulated by a series of national and EU pilots on the role of museums, such as the [ICH and Museums Project](https://www.ichandmuseums.eu/en) (2017-2020), which explored different approaches to intangible cultural heritage in museums in Belgium, France, Italy, the Netherlands and Switzerland, countries reported a broad and increasing engagement of museums in the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage, in close collaboration with communities, groups and individuals, and other stakeholders. Many of the reporting countries gave examples of projects in museums and other institutions that helped to create inclusive environments by engaging with migrants, refugees and other marginalized and vulnerable groups through intangible cultural heritage.

The majority of countries (39 out of 42, or 93%) reported that research institutions, followed by archives (36 out of 42, or 86%), contributed towards intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management (B1.5). For example, by the end of this reporting cycle, the Audiovisual Institute of Monaco had collected more than 15,000 documents including short and feature films, fiction, documentaries, reports, advertisements, radio broadcasts, recordings of shows and festivals as well as family and amateur films. In Sweden, the Institute for Language and Folklore, a government agency and one of Sweden’s competent bodies for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding, manages a [knowledge bank on traditional small-scale food culture](https://www.matkult.se/). This has raised awareness of locally- and historically-rooted knowledge and experience, for example by increasing the number of food-related elements on Sweden's national inventory.

Cultural centres supported intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management in over four fifths (35 out of 42, or 83%) of reporting countries (B1.5, see Figure 4 below). Cultural centres can foster cultural exchange and dialogue between people from different backgrounds, while helping to safeguard intangible cultural heritage through community engagement. In Bulgaria, there are almost 4,000 community cultural centres, called “[Chitalishta](https://ich.unesco.org/en/BSP/bulgarian-chitalishte-community-cultural-centre-practical-experience-in-safeguarding-the-vitality-of-the-intangible-cultural-heritage-00969)”, supported financially by the State. Some of the centres encouraged diverse religious, minority and migrant groups to engage in local cultural activities. The “Lyuben Karavelov – 1897” centre in Kurtovo Konare, for example, used exhibitions, intercultural dialogue festivals, and “Let’s get to know each other!” evenings to bring local communities, migrants and refugees from different nationalities together.

**Figure 4: Contribution of different kinds of institutions towards intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management in reporting countries (n=42) (B1.5)**
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Just under three quarters of reporting countries (29 out of 42, or 69%) emphasized the role of libraries and centres of expertise for the safeguarding and management of the intangible cultural heritage (B1.5, see Figure 4 above). Aside from their role in providing access to documentation or objects relating to intangible cultural heritage, these institutions were used for gatherings, lectures and exhibitions that brought communities together, transmitted information and raised awareness. The “National Costume Rental and Manufacture” institution in Zagreb, Croatia, for example, contributed to the safeguarding of knowledge and skills associated with traditional clothing by maintaining and restoring collections and co-organizing events with other organizations, including exhibitions, seminars, workshops and shows. The National Library of the Republic of Moldova “Ion Creanga” houses a large collection of children’s books related to intangible cultural heritage, including fairy-tales, stories and legends. It organized exhibitions and special events for children to awaken their curiosity about intangible cultural heritage. Some countries highlighted the role of language centres for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage. On the Faroe Islands (Denmark), for example, the Faroese Language Council (under the Ministry of Culture) supported the safeguarding of the oral traditions of the Faroese language, including old ballads and folktales.

A significant number of countries (27 out of 42 reporting countries, or 64%) reported on the contribution of “other” institutions towards intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management including foundations, cultural institutes, film festivals, tourism information centres, and civil society associations (B1.5).

### Baselines and targets

Using the automatic calculator, more than four fifths of reporting countries fully satisfied the core indicator B1 at the baseline (36 out of 42, or 86%), i.e. the extent to which competent bodies and consultative mechanisms support the continued practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage. The remainder largely met the baseline (6 out of 42, or 14%), see Table 2 below.

Nearly all reporting countries that set a target, set their targets as equal to their baseline for B1 (33 out of 36, or 92%). This is not very surprising because more than four fifths of countries fully satisfied the core indicator, according to the automatic calculation. Three countries (out of 36, or 8%), set their targets below their automatically calculated baseline. Six countries likely did not set a target (6 out of 42, or 14%).[[11]](#footnote-11)

##### Table 2: Attainment scores on the baseline for indicator B1 in reporting countries (n=42)

| **Indicator** | **Not satisfied** | **Minimally** | **Partially** | **Largely** | **Satisfied** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. Extent to which competent bodies and institutions and consultative mechanisms support the continued practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage | 0 / 42 | 0 / 42 | 0 / 42 | 6 / 42 | 36 / 42 |

Thematic areas I and II - Education, building human capacities and transmission

In the Convention, education is given a prominent place among a State’s safeguarding responsibilities at the national level. Article 14(a)(i) stresses the importance of educational programmes aimed at the general public, and youth in particular, while Article 14(a)(ii) concerns educational programmes within the communities and groups concerned. The relevance of non-formal means of transmitting knowledge is emphasized in Article 14(a)(iv). Education can raise awareness and strengthen transmission mechanisms for intangible cultural heritage, especially where communities, groups and individuals concerned are involved in designing and delivering educational programmes, in line with Article 15, which refers to their “widest possible participation” in safeguarding activities. The principles of inclusiveness and non-discrimination are fundamental values of the United Nations, as of UNESCO, and are reiterated in the Operational Directives and Ethical Principles.

The periodic report thus contains a number of questions about how intangible cultural heritage is included in educational programmes and curricula, how communities and bearers of intangible cultural heritage (and other stakeholders) are involved in these efforts, and what the impact of these initiatives is on intangible cultural heritage safeguarding. These questions, under Thematic Areas I and II, are as follows:

***List of core indicators and assessment factors on education, building human capacities and transmission (B2-B6)[[12]](#footnote-12)***

| **Core Indicators** | **Assessment according to the following** |
| --- | --- |
| B2. Extent to which programmes support the strengthening of human capacities to promote safeguarding and management of intangible cultural heritage | * 1. Tertiary education institutions offer curricula and degrees in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management, on an inclusive basis. |
| * 1. Governmental institutions, centres and other bodies provide training in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management, on an inclusive basis. |
| * 1. Commuity-based or NGO-based initiatives provide training in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management, on an inclusive basis. |
| B3. Extent to which training is operated by or addressed to communities, groups and individuals, as well as to those working in the fields of culture and heritage | * 1. Training programmes, including those operated by communities themselves, provide capacity building in intangible cultural heritage addressed on an inclusive basis to communities, groups and individuals. |
| * 1. Training programmes provide capacity building in intangible cultural heritage addressed on an inclusive basis to those working in the fields of culture and heritage. |
| B4 Extent to which both formal and non-formal education strengthen the transmission of intangible cultural heritage and promote respect for intangible cultural heritage | * 1. Practitioners and bearers[[13]](#footnote-13) are involved inclusively in the design and development of intangible cultural heritage education programmes and/or in actively presenting and transmitting their heritage. |
| * 1. Modes and methods of transmitting intangible cultural heritage that are recognized by communities, groups and individuals are learned and/or strengthened, and included in educational programmes, both formal and non-formal. |
| * 1. Educational programmes and/or extra-curricular activities concerning intangible cultural heritage and strengthening its transmission, undertaken by communities, groups, NGOs or heritage institutions, are available and supported. |
| * 1. Teacher training programmes and programmes for training providers of non-formal education include approaches to integrating intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding into education. |
| B5. Extent to which intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding are integrated into primary and secondary education, included in the content of relevant disciplines, and used to strengthen teaching and learning about and with intangible cultural heritage and respect for one’s own and others’ intangible cultural heritage | * 1. Intangible cultural heritage, in its diversity, is included in the content of relevant disciplines, as a contribution in its own right and/or as a means of explaining or demonstrating other subjects. |
| * 1. School students learn to respect and reflect on the intangible cultural heritage of their own community or group as well as the intangible cultural heritage of others through educational programmes and curricula. |
| * 1. The diversity of learners’ intangible cultural heritage is reflected through mother tongue or multilingual education and/or the inclusion of ‘local content’ within the educational curriculum. |
| * 1. Educational programmes teach about the protection of natural and cultural spaces and places of memory whose existence is necessary for expressing intangible cultural heritage. |
| B6. Extent to which post-secondary education supports the practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage as well as study of its social, cultural and other dimensions | * 1. Post-secondary education institutions offer curricula and degrees (in fields such as music, arts, crafts, technical and vocational education and training, etc.) that strengthen the practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage. |
| * 1. Post-secondary education institutions offer curricula and degrees for the study of intangible cultural heritage and its social, cultural and other dimensions. |

### Overview of core indicators B2-B6

Programmes strengthening human capacities to promote safeguarding and management of intangible cultural heritage were offered in almost all reporting countries (B2.1). A number of UNESCO Chairs with mandates relating to intangible cultural heritage were appointed in reporting countries. Training on intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management was also offered outside tertiary educational institutions in most countries, whether by governmental institutions, centres and other bodies or by community- and/or NGO-based initiatives (B2.2 and B2.3). These educational programmes in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management were reported by most countries to be inclusive (B2.1 and B2.2), generally because of the existing equality, diversity and inclusion policies of training providers. Overall, over four fifths of reporting countries (83%) thus fully satisfied the core indicator B2 at the baseline, regarding educational and training programmes strengthening human capacities to promote safeguarding and management of intangible cultural heritage.

Communities, groups and individuals and those working in the fields of culture and heritage benefited from this training. Training programmes that provide capacity building in intangible cultural heritage addressed inclusively to communities, groups and individuals were offered in almost all of the countries. Over four fifths of the countries reporting such programmes noted that some of the programmes in question were operated by communities themselves (B3.1). Capacity building on intangible cultural heritage addressed inclusively to people working in the fields of culture and heritage was also reported by most countries (B3.2). Thus, 86% of reporting countries fully satisfied the core indicator B3 at the baseline, on the extent to which training is operated by or addressed to communities, groups and individuals, as well as to those working in the fields of culture and heritage.

Formal and non-formal education supported transmission in most countries. Almost all countries reported that intangible cultural heritage was transmitted through or used as a medium of teaching and learning in formal or non-formal education during this reporting cycle (B4). A variety of educational approaches were mentioned including formal curricula, online open-access education, informal workshops and camps, training sessions, amateur clubs, festivals, exhibitions, and competitions. All the countries reporting in this cycle stated that practitioners and bearers were involved in designing and developing formal or non-formal intangible cultural heritage education programmes and/or actively presenting and transmitting their heritage (B4.1). All countries also reported that formal and non-formal education included or strengthened modes and methods of transmitting intangible cultural heritage that are recognized by the communities concerned (B4.2). Nearly all reporting countries noted that communities, groups, NGOs and heritage institutions offered educational programmes and/or extra-curricular activities concerning intangible cultural heritage and the strengthening of its transmission (B4.3).

Many reports emphasized the flexibility of educational curricula, allowing teachers to design their lessons to serve local needs. More than four fifths of reporting countries offered teacher training programmes and programmes for training providers of non-formal education, which included methods for integrating intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding into education (B4.4). Thus, more than four fifths of reporting countries (86%) fully satisfied the core indicator B4 at the baseline, relating to education strengthening the transmission of intangible cultural heritage and promoting respect for intangible cultural heritage. Another 12% largely satisfied the core indicator at the baseline.

Most reporting countries integrated intangible cultural heritage into primary and secondary education to some degree. Intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding has received increasing attention in formal education. School curricula in about four fifths of reporting countries accommodated intangible cultural heritage-related content as a means of explaining or demonstrating other subjects; about three fifths included it as a stand-alone subject (B5.1). Most countries reported that intangible cultural heritage was included in school curricula in mother tongue or multilingual education, sometimes as part of bilingual intercultural education or multicultural education. More than four fifths of reporting countries said it was also included as part of “local content” (B5.3). School students learned to respect and reflect on the intangible cultural heritage of their own community and others due to inclusion thereof in educational programmes and curricula in primary and secondary education, as reported by almost all countries (B5.2). Educational programmes were reported to teach about the protection of natural and cultural spaces and places of memory in most countries (B5.4). Overall, just under half of the reporting countries fully (45%) or largely (48%) satisfied core indicator B5 at the baseline, on the extent to which primary and secondary education integrate intangible cultural heritage and use it to promote learning and respect.

At the post-secondary level, countries reported significant levels of training contributing to the practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage (B6.1). Almost all countries reported specific post-secondary educational programmes strengthening the practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage in the fields of music and arts, with just over three quarters offering such programmes in crafts. These programmes included well-established systems of professional training as well as non-formal programmes for adults, in the context of life-long learning. Most countries reported that at least some educational institutions offered curricula and degrees for the study of intangible cultural heritage and its social, cultural and other dimensions (B6.2). Overall, almost two thirds of countries (67%) fully satisfied, and another quarter (24%) largely satisfied the core indicator B6 at the baseline, regarding the extent to which post-secondary education supports the study, practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage.

### Challenges and opportunities

Long-standing efforts to include intangible cultural heritage in educational provision, whether or not specifically named as such, are evident in the reports. The reports gave many examples of integrating intangible cultural heritage in primary and secondary education. Several countries indicated that they aimed to further expand intangible cultural heritage-related training, especially where existing provision was not sufficiently inclusive. Many countries already provided good support for teachers, offering training, additional resources and access to practitioners. The significant and rising number of educational programmes and professional training opportunities implies that education is considered by reporting States to be an important part of intangible cultural heritage safeguarding.

Different modes and methods of including intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding in formal education could be explored in the future through collaborative projects such as those mentioned in the reports. A few countries noted a shortage of teachers and educational material for the teaching of minority languages and culture. More systematic approaches to teacher training across both formal and non-formal education sectors might also be beneficial for safeguarding. A number of countries noted that monitoring efforts could be expanded in order to obtain comprehensive data on the nature and extent of educational programmes from different providers from kindergarten through tertiary and adult education. This could include specific information on how educational programmes can both be gender inclusive and foster further reflection on gender equality and intangible cultural heritage safeguarding.

Countries shared many examples of multi-stakeholder involvement in non-formal education around intangible cultural heritage. Educational programmes offered by volunteers from communities and NGOs may require targeted support. Several countries intended to improve the dialogue between communities and practitioners, education providers, government agencies, cultural heritage institutions and NGOs in designing and delivering educational programmes. Collecting good practices, strategic planning to identify specific needs and challenges, and setting up programmes to encourage structured engagement could aid such cooperation.

### Inclusion of intangible cultural heritage in formal and non-formal education at different levels[[14]](#footnote-14)

Almost all of the countries reported that the transmission of intangible cultural heritage has been strengthened through both formal and non-formal education during this reporting cycle (41 out of 42, or 98% for formal education, 42 out of 42, or 100% for non-formal education) (B4).[[15]](#footnote-15) From the reports, intangible cultural heritage seems to be receiving increasing attention in formal education. Curriculum flexibility to include local content and the interests of teachers influenced whether and to what extent intangible cultural heritage was integrated in formal education.

Some reports noted that cultural heritage education was gaining attention as a concept and practice in this reporting cycle. Almost three fifths of countries (25 out of 42, or 60%) reported that intangible cultural heritage was included as a stand-alone subject in primary and secondary education (B5.1). In Albania, for example, “Cultural Heritage” was introduced in the curriculum of upper secondary education as an elective module covering a broad range of topics and areas of learning. Digital tools were increasingly being used in these contexts.

School curricula in about four fifths of reporting countries (34 out of 42, or 81%) accommodated intangible cultural heritage-related content as a means of explaining or demonstrating other subjects, whether integrated in language, music, and art classes or as a means of explaining or demonstrating aspects of history, health and religion, geography, mathematics and natural sciences (B5.1). In Cyprus, primary and secondary school teachers placed Cypriot intangible cultural heritage within the context of the Mediterranean and south-eastern Europe. Popular poetry and the art of “[Tsiattista poetic duelling](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/tsiattista-poetic-duelling-00536)” were included in several classes on Cypriot literature in secondary schools. Renowned tsiattista performers performed in schools and discussed aspects of this poetic tradition with the students afterwards. In Slovenia, students of secondary education programmes on gastronomy and tourism learned about intangible cultural heritage through the module “Natural and Cultural Heritage”. This covered ways of integrating intangible cultural heritage in the tourism offer, for example the preparation of a traditional meal from Idrija (idrijski žlikrofi), lace making and carnival customs. Intangible cultural heritage was integrated in the curricula of vocational tourism courses in several other countries.

A number of reports emphasized that intangible cultural heritage can be a useful resource to develop skills and competences related to general learning outcomes across the curriculum, such as co-responsibility, collaboration and ethical awareness. The UNESCO Networks of Associated Schools included intangible cultural heritage-related content and activities in different subjects, often in relation to sustainable development and global citizenship education.

##### Example: Integrating intangible cultural heritage across the curriculum (Greece)

Intangible cultural heritage education can contribute to achieving a range of learning outcomes. In Greece, the musical and cultural expression linked to “[Rebetiko](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/rebetiko-01291)” song and dance (inscribed on the Representative List in 2017) was integrated into several subjects, including English language (using translated texts), physical education, creative writing, and computer classes. The cross-curricular educational programme was called "[Rebetiko: Integration of Living Tradition in the daily teaching practice of Curriculum subjects](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/50957-EN.pdf)". It was included in UNESCO’s [Resource Kit for Teachers](https://ich.unesco.org/en/resources-for-teachers-01180) (2021), and piloted in a school in Piraeus. Through the programme, students learned about the historical, cultural and social background of the growth of rebetiko song as a musical-cultural expression. They also studied gender representations and stereotypes by analyzing the lyrics of well-known rebetika songs with female protagonists. Students enhanced their computer skills by developing a rebetiko mobile application to document and disseminate information about the tradition. The programme helped students to connect academic study with their daily life, stimulating their desire to learn. It also strengthened the relationships between schools, families and communities.

Intangible cultural heritage was also linked to global citizenship education through, for example, the secondary education programme “An experience with and for refugees”, implemented by a school in Patras, Western Greece. The students had exchange visits with students from other countries and learned about dances, songs and culinary practices from different communities. They identified similarities and differences between the heritage of their own communities and others, relationships and interactions of different cultures as well as common values and rights. At the same time, they met with refugees in reception facilities and exchanged thoughts and experiences about the culture and cultural heritage of their places of origin.

Intangible cultural heritage was included in the curriculum via mother tongue education (40 out of 41, or 98%), multilingual education and local content (36 out of 41, or 88%) in almost all countries (B5.3, see Figure 2 above). In the Andorran education system, multilingual education was carried out within the framework of an integrated linguistic project, aimed at building multilingual and multicultural competencies. For each grade level, the teaching language was defined in the curriculum, ensuring a balance between Catalan, French and Spanish. Educational curricula in several countries integrated the language of minorities or indigenous peoples. In New Caledonia, an autonomous overseas territory of France, the Nouméa Accords provided for the compulsory teaching of the fundamental elements of Kanak culture. Teaching was offered in the four main Kanak languages from pre-school to high school, in decreasing amounts.

In most reporting countries (40 out of 42, or 95%), educational programmes taught about the protection of natural and cultural spaces and places of memory whose existence is necessary for expressing intangible cultural heritage (B5.4). The connection between natural and cultural spaces and intangible cultural heritage could be established through the teaching of oral traditions, interlinked histories of places and practices, and through environmental education. In Luxembourg, for example, the "[Naturparkschoul](https://naturparkschoul.lu)", an informal educational institution run by three nature parks, offered training courses and educational tools on intangible cultural heritage related to nature, such as the cultivation of orchards.

Some countries mentioned World Heritage-related education programmes that related to intangible cultural heritage. In Spain, a Service Learning Programme was designed for schools in Mallorca to raise awareness about the [Cultural landscape of the Serra de Tramuntana](https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1371/). It offered students the opportunity to practice [dry stone walling](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/art-of-dry-stone-walling-knowledge-and-techniques-01393), for example, thus contributing to the safeguarding of the landscape and associated intangible cultural heritage. Shepherd schools from the Sierra de la Tramuntana, together with the Guild of Dry Stone Wallers, also offered courses to arts, landscape architecture and education professionals. The courses raised awareness of the loss of the tangible and intangible heritage caused by mass tourism in rural areas, and increasing barriers to entry affecting farming as a profession.

In most countries, educational frameworks did not contain specific goals or instructions how to include intangible cultural heritage in school-based teaching. Schools and teachers could decide themselves how to design their lessons in order to achieve the learning outcomes and attainment targets of primary and secondary education curricula. This means that teacher training, interest and engagement with practitioners as well as the visibility of intangible cultural heritage elements at the local level affected how intangible cultural heritage was utilized and integrated in formal education. The pilot project "Teaching and Learning with Living Heritage in European Schools", under the project [Engaging Youth for an Inclusive and Sustainable Europe](https://ich.unesco.org/en/engaging-youth-for-an-inclusive-and-sustainable-europe-01051), created a [resource kit](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/52066-EN.pdf) for teachers that has already been used in several reporting countries including Greece, as mentioned above. Many reports mentioned the importance of teacher training in formal education. In Azerbaijan in 2019, teacher training activities were held in vocational schools in Baku and Lankaran, integrating culinary practices and traditional foodways into the curriculum. This included diverse ways of preparing the traditional meal “[dolma](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/dolma-making-and-sharing-tradition-a-marker-of-cultural-identity-01188)”. Some teacher training programmes offered courses in the language and culture of minorities and/or indigenous peoples. In Estonia, the University of Tartu offered training on how to assess and develop competences for teaching in multicultural kindergartens, and how to implement culturally and linguistically sensitive tuition methods.

At the post-secondary level, most reporting countries (39 out of 42, or 93%) said that tertiary education institutions offered curricula and degrees in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management on an inclusive basis (B2.1). France reported that training in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding had increased significantly since the previous report and was provided through dedicated courses at 13 universities by the end of the reporting cycle. [UNESCO Chairs](https://en.unesco.org/sites/default/files/list-unesco-chairs.pdf) had been established in several countries, many of which offered training on intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management. For example, the UNESCO Chair on Intangible Cultural Heritage in Formal and Informal Education located in Türkiye, has organized capacity building programmes since 2017 in cooperation with the Turkish National Commission for UNESCO and the Association of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Institute. The programme “ICH Winter/Summer School*”* was aimed at intangible cultural heritage experts and postgraduate students and covered topical issues related to intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development as well as to the role of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies.

Most countries (40 out of 42, or 95%) reported that post-secondary educational institutions offered curricula and degrees for the study of intangible cultural heritage and its social, cultural and other dimensions (B6.2).[[16]](#footnote-16) These curricula and degrees tended to be in broader areas including ethnography, anthropology, cultural heritage, cultural studies, tourism and development. Students of the Cultural Studies Chair at the State University in Belarus carried out research in 2018 that resulted, for example, in a publication on culinary traditions in Mstislavl (Mogilev region). In Croatia, both the Academy of Music at the University of Zagreb and the Arts Academy in Split offered courses in ethnomusicology, ethnomusicological research and traditional music. Students learned about the knowledge and values associated with traditional music and dance forms, some of which had been included in Croatia’s national inventory. As the report from Germany noted, an interdisciplinary perspective can give broader insights into present-day cultural policies, for example the historical instrumentalization of “traditions” under the Nazi and East German regimes.

Funding schemes of the EU were utilized by several reporting countries for the promotion of intangible cultural heritage education at the tertiary level. For example, with the support of the Erasmus+ Programme of the EU, the [CHOREOMUNDUS Master of Arts in Dance Knowledge, Practice and Heritage](https://choreomundus.org/intangible-cultural-heritage/) provided an opportunity for student education in dance and other movement systems as intangible cultural heritage within the broader contexts of Ethnochoreology, the Anthropology of Dance, Dance Studies, and Heritage Studies. The joint master’s degree was delivered by an international partnership of higher education institutions from Norway, France, Hungary and the UK.

Intangible cultural heritage was incorporated into non-formal education too, perhaps more than in formal education (see B4 above), but in ways that were often less well documented in the reports. A number of countries reported that the majority of non-formal or informal educational programmes and extra-curricular activities was conducted by volunteers. Almost all of the countries (41 out of 42, or 98%) reported that communities, groups, NGOs or heritage institutions offered educational programmes and/or extra-curricular activities concerning intangible cultural heritage and strengthening its transmission (B4.3). More than four fifths (37 out 42, or 88%) of reporting countries offered teacher training programmes and programmes for training providers of non-formal education, which included methods for integrating intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding into education (B4.4).

In Latvia, nearly three fifths of children were involved in non-formal cultural education programmes in this reporting period, facilitated by NGOs such as the traditional culture society “[Aprika](https://www.aprika.lv/en/projekti/)”. Their heritage programme “Pulka eimu, pulka teku” developed training materials, trained teachers, and offered educational events including folklore, storytelling and traditional dance contests for children across the country. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Homeland Museum Travnik in cooperation with the Center for Youth Education Travnik (CEM) organized pottery and weaving workshops as part of the project "Unity in Diversity" for high school representatives and students from the Central Bosnia Canton. Formal and non-formal education were often combined to aid transmission, especially where older transmission mechanisms were under threat. In Sweden, for instance, [oral storytelling](https://ich.unesco.org/en/BSP/land-of-legends-programme-for-promoting-and-revitalizing-the-art-of-storytelling-in-kronoberg-region-01392) was transmitted in different informal contexts, as well as through more formalized storytelling networks, which organized encounters and courses involving children all over the country.

### Community involvement in educational programmes on intangible cultural heritage[[17]](#footnote-17)

Community involvement is essential for educational programmes to contribute to safeguarding, since communities are the ones who will continue practising and transmitting their intangible cultural heritage. All the countries reporting in this cycle stated that practitioners and bearers were actively involved in designing and developing formal or non-formal intangible cultural heritage education programmes and/or actively presenting and transmitting their heritage (B4.1). Most countries (40 out of 42, or 95%) reported that training in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management was provided by communities and NGOs (B2.3), as will be discussed further below under Thematic Area VII on Safeguarding.

The reports gave examples of programmes that provided systematic links between practitioners and teachers to aid in the integration of intangible cultural heritage in the curriculum. This included programmes identifying bearers and practitioners who could provide cultural education services in schools, or programmes bringing practitioners, workshops and materials to schools. In Switzerland, the "Spirit of the Mountains" (Esprit Montagne) programme has been offered annually to secondary schools in the canton of Valais. Practical workshops were led by local mountain guides who taught students about avalanche dangers based, for example, on the observation of the weather and snow conditions. The [Heritage in Schools Scheme](https://www.heritageinschools.ie/)in Ireland, an initiative of the Irish Heritage Council, provided a panel of heritage specialists, including intangible cultural heritage practitioners, who visited primary schools throughout the country. Practitioners listed on their website profile page the curriculum strands under which their intangible cultural heritage fell, enabling teachers to link the content to the curriculum subjects. Practitioners also visited primary schools in-person and virtually, encouraging both students and teachers to engage with local heritage in practical, interactive and meaningful ways. Visits were part-funded by the schools and the Heritage Council.

The majority of countries (34 out of 40, or 85%) reported that some training programmes were operated by communities themselves (B3.1), often through community organizations. In Montenegro, Dobrota Lace making training programmes were organized by bearers, supported by the local community in Kotor and the Association of Italians in Montenegro, a NGO. In the Netherlands, various communities and groups developed teaching materials linked to the curriculum, for example through the “High-Quality Cultural Education” programme (Cultuureducatie met Kwaliteit). This included teaching materials on intangible cultural heritage elements such as forging, circus culture, short-track harness racing and the carnival celebrations in northeast Twente. In the 2017-2018 period, 46 cultural organizations worked in the framework of the programme with just over half of the primary schools in the Netherlands. On the island of St. Martin and Saba, cultural education programmes in schools covered intangible cultural heritage elements such as the Ponum Dance, the Maypole Dance and traditional and alternative agricultural practices.

Most reporting countries (40 out of 42, 95%) stated that capacity building programmes on intangible cultural heritage were addressed to communities, groups and individuals concerned as participants (B3.1). For example, the General-Directorate for Cultural Heritage in Portugal, together with the Open University in Portugal, offered an e-learning course for communities on the inventorying of intangible culture heritage and administrative safeguarding measures such as the forming of safeguarding committees. This enabled capacity building, participation and exchange between communities from all regions of the country. In Ukraine, community representatives attended an online workshop in 2020, called "Community-Based Inventorying at the Local and National Level". This workshop was organized by the Regional Center for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage in South-Eastern Europe under the auspices of UNESCO in Sofia (Bulgaria) in partnership with the Development Centre “Democracy through Culture”, the National Academy of Arts of Ukraine, the National Union of Folk-Art Masters of Ukraine and the Odesa Regional Center for Ukrainian Culture. The online training was followed by workshops with diverse representatives of communities in Odesa, Cherkasy, Sumy, and Luhansk districts (oblasts) and with representatives of regional branches of the National Union of Folk-Art Masters of Ukraine, an NGO.

### Vocational or technical training on intangible cultural heritage management[[18]](#footnote-18)

Countries reported significant levels of professional training at the post-secondary level (B6). As mentioned above, almost all of the countries also reported training on intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management being made available through tertiary institutions (39 out of 42, or 93%, B2.1), governmental institutions, centres and other bodies (40 out of 42, or 95%, B2.2) or communities and NGOs (40 out of 42, or 95%, B2.3). Communities, NGOs and heritage institutions offered educational programmes and/or extra-curricular activities concerning intangible cultural heritage and strengthening its transmission in almost all of the countries reporting in this cycle (41 out of 42, or 98%, B4.3). For example, the Icelandic Lighthouse Society (Icelandic Coastal Culture) and Herring Era Museum worked with boatbuilders to develop courses in clinker boat building in Iceland. Most countries (39 out of 42, or 93%) reported that training programmes provided capacity building in intangible cultural heritage addressed to those working in the fields of culture and heritage (B3.2). In France, various ethnopôles[[19]](#footnote-19) and associations, such as the French Ethnological Society (SEF), organized training courses for cultural and research professionals, as well as the general public.

Although the reports showed that a broad variety of educational programmes were offered by community groups and cultural organizations, finding resources to support these community- or NGO-led programmes remained challenging in some contexts. A few countries reported a systematic capacity-building programme on intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management for communities; some provided tailored training for communities on request. In Italy, for example, tailored training was provided to communities supporting the development of safeguarding plans for inscribed elements, including “[Traditional Violin Craftsmanship in Cremona](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/traditional-violin-craftsmanship-in-cremona-00719)”, “[Opera dei Pupi](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/opera-dei-pupi-sicilian-puppet-theatre-00011)” and the “[Celestinian forgiveness celebration](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/celestinian-forgiveness-celebration-01276)”. In Flanders (Belgium), communities could request coaching on intangible cultural heritage safeguarding from different heritage service organizations. The NGO and competent body, Workshop Intangible Heritage Flanders (WIE), offered practitioners a basic introduction to safeguarding and management twice a year, tailored to the needs of the participants.

Some countries also offered training for government officials in management of intangible cultural heritage, which was important given the extent of State involvement in supporting safeguarding. In Türkiye, the Directorate General of Research and Training of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism organized annual in-service training on the 2003 Convention and its lists for public officers from different units of the Ministry. Moreover, experts in the Ministry’s Department of Intangible Cultural Heritage, with researchers, trained officers from different state authorities in 81 cities on intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management. In 2020, a distance education portal was opened in order to continue the in-service training of public officers through digital channels.

### Inclusivity of learner profile in educational programmes in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management[[20]](#footnote-20)

Reporting countries have made significant efforts towards achieving non-discrimination and gender equality in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management education, usually through equality, diversity, and inclusion policies of different providers. Most countries reporting in this cycle noted the inclusivity of educational programmes in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management (B2, B3).

Inclusion was enabled in various ways, for example through non-discrimination policies, the provision of special support measures, and the participation of communities in the design and implementation of educational programmes. Many countries reported specific measures to ensure equitable educational access for persons with disabilities, migrants or vulnerable groups, including student loans, scholarships, counselling and support services, and/or by offering open access, online, free or low-cost training. Other strategies included approaching underrepresented groups, using the language and communication channels of specific target groups, and offering inclusive modalities tailored to needs of participants (including translation, accessibility of spaces, digital support). As the report from Austria noted, however, special measures may require budgetary allocations, and communities, in particular, do not always have the resources to make their programmes fully accessible to different audiences and their needs, for example by providing sign language interpretation.

The reports provided examples of formal and non-formal educational programmes focusing on the social and cultural integration of minority groups such as the Roma and Romani. In Hungary, for example, the curriculum of Gandhi High School, a Roma public education institution, covers all Roma languages spoken in Hungary and research on Roma culture. Roma intangible cultural heritage is included in subject curricula such as history, literature, geography and art. Regular programmes were also put in place to encourage respectful interaction with students from non-Roma schools, alongside instruction on cultural diversity and other aspects of the cultural heritage of Hungary. In Sweden, the “Gipsy Queens Örebro-association” helped the older generation of Roma living in the county of Örebro to record their stories, information about Roma history and Roma family trees. The association hosted “language baths” and language circles to increase community engagement with written material about the Roma.

Vocational training in the craft sector was frequently used to promote employment opportunities for people with disabilities, for example in crafts such as basket or cane weaving. In Georgia, several NGOs established specialized intangible cultural heritage-related teaching programs for people with disabilities. The folk song ensembles "Relikvia" and "Krtsanisi" were established for sight-impaired adults and boys respectively, and a choreographic ensemble was set up for hearing- and speech-impaired people. As the report from Finland noted, people with disabilities (and other underrepresented groups) should be key actors in deciding how their heritage will be represented and safeguarded through educational programmes, including the implementation of inclusive programmes and the identification of specific barriers to their participation. The Finnish Association of the Deaf (Kuurojen Liitto), in cooperation with local associations of the deaf, has organized the National Culture Days of the Deaf since 1956, featuring stage performances, visual arts, crafts, photography and digital art. This event provided opportunities for sign language users to network and discuss their language, identity and culture.

Some examples of intangible cultural heritage-related education promoting gender equality have already been mentioned above. Reporting countries may benefit from sharing further work in this area in future cycles. For example, in Armenia, the NGO "Council of Women" has organized on-site and online craft courses for more than 100 Syrian-Armenian and local women between 2019 and 2021. The courses strengthened the practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage and also fostered exchange and cross-cultural dialogue among women.

### Education promoting respect and supporting transmission of intangible cultural heritage[[21]](#footnote-21)

Many festivals and other events had to be cancelled during the COVID-19 pandemic, but formal curricula, online open-access education, informal workshops, training sessions, amateur clubs, festivals, exhibitions, and competitions were all used to supplement usual transmission methods. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, folklore ensembles organized festivals at regional and national level to present intangible cultural heritage elements from their local communities. The presentations were followed by a round table, where representatives of performers, artistic directors, researchers, experts and bearers discussed each of the elements presented, methods of knowledge transfer and best practices for their safeguarding. Non-formal activities were generally less well documented than more formal methods of transmission. In Croatia, for example, the [silent circle (nijemo kolo) dance](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/nijemo-kolo-silent-circle-dance-of-the-dalmatian-hinterland-00359) was performed at carnivals, celebrations of patron saints at the parish level and at weddings, where people learned by watching rather than through a formal process.

Transmission of intangible cultural heritage thus continued within bearer communities, but almost all countries reported that formal and non-formal education strengthened the transmission of intangible cultural heritage and promoted respect for intangible cultural heritage during this reporting cycle (B4). Modes and methods of transmitting intangible cultural heritage recognized by communities, groups and individuals were included or strengthened in formal and non-formal educational programmes in all reporting countries (B4.2).

Countries reporting in this cycle frequently mentioned the importance of language as a way of transmitting intangible cultural heritage. Direct contact with bearers and practical experience of intangible cultural heritage was achieved through collaborations between schools, heritage institutions and community practitioners or organizations. Tailored programmes aimed at children and youth were offered both as extra-curricular and out-of-school activities, including clubs, summer schools and camps. In Romania, more than 60 schools were involved in the project “Let’s learn from our grandparents” (Sa invatam de la bunici). For a year, students sewed, painted and danced together with their parents and grandparents. The results of the project were presented in exhibitions organized by the schools. The reports also gave examples of how bearers and practitioners were employed by educational institutions or centres as experts teaching in both formal and non-formal settings, as indicated above.

Inclusion of intangible cultural heritage in educational programmes in schools reportedly promoted awareness and respect both within and between communities in the majority of countries. In primary and secondary education settings, almost all countries reported that students learned to respect and reflect on the intangible cultural heritage of their own community (42 out of 42, or 100%) and others (41 out of 42, or 98%) through educational programmes and curricula (B5.2). In Poland, for example, schools are required to teach their students a national or ethnic minority language, such as Kashubian. Volunteering projects as well as practitioner interviews and research and reflection on Kashubian family rituals, food traditions, games and craftsmanship have helped to promote linguistic and cultural awareness, engagement and self-identity among Kashubian students.

##### Example: Respecting and reflecting on cultural heritage through educational programmes and curricula (Republic of Moldova)

In the Republic of Moldova, educational curricula contained detailed study units on the intangible cultural heritage of students’ own communities at all levels, which were implemented during the reporting period. In primary school, students learned about the history and present forms of the cultural heritage of their own community, reflecting on their own role in its safeguarding. In the sixth grade, students researched and wrote about specific community traditions or holidays, exploring their own cultural identity in relation to these traditions. They reviewed the history, similarities and differences between their own and other cultural traditions in the country. They also completed a project called “Rediscover the tradition of your community”. In seventh grade, students conducted interviews with craftspeople and produced a short essay about the role of traditions in their communities. Ninth-grade students developed safeguarding projects, did further interviews and produced awareness-raising materials, such as tour brochures and guides, podcasts and social media pages. They could also compose letters addressed to public authorities about the need for safeguarding specific elements of their intangible cultural heritage.

At the post-secondary level, most countries reported specific educational programmes strengthening the practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage in the field of music (40 out of 41, or 98%), and around four fifths in the field of arts (34 out of 41, or 83%) or crafts (32 out of 41, or 78%). Around three quarters of countries reported offering technical (29 out of 41, or 71%) and vocational education (31 out of 41, or 76%) including well-established systems of professional training such as “dual education”[[22]](#footnote-22) (B6.1, see Figure 5 below).

##### Chart, bar chart, waterfall chart Description automatically generatedFigure 5: Educational programmes at the post-secondary level in specific subject areas strengthening the practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage in reporting countries (n=41) (B6.1)

In many countries, education and training in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management at the post-secondary level was offered through adult education programmes. The College for Arts, Science and Technology in Malta offered a diploma course in practical and theoretical masonry restoration, for example. In Slovakia, the Centre for Folk Art Production ([ÚĽUV](https://uluv.sk/en/about-us/regional-craft-centre-of-uluv-bratislava/)), through its three Regional Craft Centers, implemented hobby and accredited training programmes for adults and professional lectures for the general public. This included courses on glass painting, Easter egg decoration, ceramics, pottery, woodcarving and lace making. Non-formal programmes for the transmission of traditional craftsmanship were sometimes linked to professional training. In Lithuania, the Ministry of Agriculture certified non-formal training programmes in traditional crafts that are developed and offered by craft practitioners. Fifty-five certified programmes were offered by the end of the reporting cycle. Funding was sometimes provided for apprenticeship schemes. The Master and Apprentice-programme in Hungary, for example, financially supported practitioners who wished to train apprentices at their workshops.

### Baselines and targets

Over four fifths of reporting countries fully satisfied the core indicators B2 and B3 at the baseline, on the extent to which programmes support the strengthening of human capacities to promote safeguarding and management of intangible cultural heritage, and are operated by or addressed to communities, groups and individuals, as well as to those working in the fields of culture and heritage respectively (35 out of 42, or 83% for B2 and 36 out of 42, or 86% for B3), see Table 3 below. More than four fifths of reporting countries (36 out of 42, or 86%) also fully satisfied the core indicator B4, relating to both formal and non-formal educational programmes strengthening the transmission of intangible cultural heritage and promoting respect for intangible cultural heritage respectively. Less than half of reporting countries (19 out of 42, or 45%) fully satisfied core indicator B5 at the baseline on the extent to which intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding are integrated into primary and secondary education. Two thirds of reporting countries (28 out of 42, or 67%) fully satisfied the core indicator B6 at the baseline, relating to the role of post-secondary education in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding.

In this Thematic Area, about three quarters of the 35 countries that set targets, set them at the same level as their automatically calculated baselines for core indicators B2-4 and B6. This is not very surprising because a majority of countries fully satisfied these core indicators, according to the automatic calculation. Just over a quarter of the countries were optimistic on opportunities for future progress in regard to B5, where fewer countries had fully satisfied the core indicator at the baseline: nine countries (out of 35, or 26%) set targets above their baselines. Seven countries likely did not set a target for these indicators (7 out of 42, or 17%).[[23]](#footnote-23)

##### Table 3: Attainment scores on the baseline for indicators B2-B6 in reporting countries (n=42)

| **Indicator** | **Not satisfied** | **Minimally** | **Partially** | **Largely** | **Satisfied** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B2. Extent to which programmes support the strengthening of human capacities to promote safeguarding and management of intangible cultural heritage | 0 / 42 | 1 / 42 | 3 / 42 | 3 / 42 | 35 / 42 |
| B3. Extent to which training is operated by or addressed to communities, groups and individuals, as well as to those working in the fields of culture and heritage | 2 / 42 | 0 / 42 | 0 / 42 | 4 / 42 | 36 / 42 |
| B4. Extent to which both formal and non-formal education strengthen the transmission of intangible cultural heritage and promote respect for intangible cultural heritage | 0 / 42 | 0 / 42 | 1 / 42 | 5 / 42 | 36 / 42 |
| B5. Extent to which intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding are integrated into primary and secondary education, included in the content of relevant disciplines, and used to strengthen teaching and learning about and with intangible cultural heritage and respect for one’s own and others’ intangible cultural heritage | 0 / 42 | 0 / 42 | 3 / 42 | 20 / 42 | 19 / 42 |
| B6. Extent to which post-secondary education supports the practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage as well as study of its social, cultural and other dimensions | 1 / 42 | 0 / 42 | 3 / 42 | 10 / 42 | 28 / 42 |

Thematic area III - Inventories

In Article 11(b), the Convention requires that a State Party “identify and define the various elements of the intangible cultural heritage present in its territory, with the participation of communities, groups and relevant non-governmental organizations”. Article 12.1 specifies that the purpose of inventorying is “To ensure identification with a view to safeguarding”. It indicates that each State Party “shall draw up, in a manner geared to its own situation, one or more inventories of the intangible cultural heritage present in its territory. These inventories shall be regularly updated.” The Convention encourages States Parties to endeavour to ensure access to information about the intangible cultural heritage in such inventories, while respecting customary practices governing such access (Article 13(d)(ii)). In order for elements to be inscribed on one of the Lists of the Convention, they need to be included on an inventory of intangible cultural heritage within the State Party.

The Periodic report contains a number of questions about the design and format of inventories of intangible cultural heritage, how communities, groups and individuals and other stakeholders participate in inventorying and how inventories contribute to safeguarding, for example by recording intangible cultural heritage viability or being updated. These are as follows:

***List of core indicators and assessment factors on inventories (B7-B8)[[24]](#footnote-24)***

| **Core Indicators** | **Assessment according to the following** |
| --- | --- |
| B7. Extent to which inventories reflect the diversity of intangible cultural heritage and contribute to safeguarding | * 1. One or more inventorying systems oriented towards safeguarding and reflecting the diversity of intangible cultural heritage have been established or revised since ratification. |
| * 1. Specialized inventories and/or inventories of various scopes reflect diversity and contribute to safeguarding. |
| * 1. Existing inventory or inventories have been updated during the reporting period, in particular to reflect the current viability of elements included. |
| * 1. Access to intangible cultural heritage inventories is facilitated, while respecting customary practices governing access to specific aspects of intangible cultural heritage, and they are utilized to strengthen safeguarding. |
| B8. Extent to which the inventorying process is inclusive, respects the diversity of intangible cultural heritage and its practitioners, and supports safeguarding by communities, groups and individuals concerned | * 1. Communities, groups and relevant NGOs participate inclusively in inventorying which informs and strengthens their safeguarding efforts. |
| * 1. Inventorying process respects the diversity of intangible cultural heritage and its practitioners, including the practices and expressions of all sectors of society, all genders and all regions. |

### Overview of core indicators B7-B8

The process of inventorying is well underway across most reporting countries. A total of 113 inventories of intangible cultural heritage were reported on by countries in this cycle. The inventories contained information about more than 42,000 intangible cultural heritage elements (A6.g), according to the reports; this number is likely an underestimate as the number of elements was not reported for every inventory. All of the countries reported on at least one intangible cultural heritage inventory in their territory, with one third reporting on more than one such inventory. Two countries (Spain and Czechia) reported more than ten inventories, while a few countries were early in the process of developing their first inventory. Many countries reported on inventories at both national and sub-national levels, or on thematic or specialized inventories, where considerable diversity can be found in inventorying approaches. Several trans-border inventories have been developed through international cooperation projects.

Overall, more than four fifths of the countries stated that inventories in their territory were fully or largely oriented towards safeguarding (B7.1a), but only about a quarter of the countries reported that inventories were fully utilized for safeguarding (B7.4b). Just over two thirds of the countries reported that the inventories fully or largely reflected the diversity of intangible cultural heritage in their territory (B7.1b). Most countries reported that the inventories were fully or largely accessible to relevant stakeholders, while respecting customary practices governing access (B7.4a). Only a fifth of the reporting countries (21%) fully satisfied the core indicator B7 at the baseline on the extent to which inventories reflect the diversity of intangible cultural heritage and contribute to safeguarding, while a further three fifths (60%) largely satisfied the indicator.

The process of inventorying in reporting countries was reported to be generally in line with the Convention and its Ethical Principles, being participatory and largely oriented to safeguarding. In more than four fifths of countries, communities, groups and relevant NGOs were reported to have participated inclusively in inventorying, supporting safeguarding (B8.1). About three fifths of the countries reported that inventorying processes fully respected the diversity of intangible cultural heritage and its practitioners, including the practices and expressions of all sectors of society, all genders and all regions (B8.2). Most of the remaining countries reported that their inventorying processes largely respected this diversity. Thus, over four fifths of countries (83%) fully satisfied the core indicator B8 at the baseline, on the extent to which the inventorying process is inclusive, respects the diversity of intangible cultural heritage and its practitioners and supports safeguarding.

### Challenges and opportunities

Inventorying is always a work-in-progress. Although many countries made important efforts to ensure that inventories reflect the diversity of intangible cultural heritage in a country, the reports noted challenges in doing so. In some cases, reports noted an imbalance between the domains of intangible cultural heritage included in the inventory, and in others insufficient cultural, gender or age diversity. Several countries collected data on gender representation and regional characteristics of inventoried intangible cultural heritage, but diversity in inventories was not always specifically monitored. Diversity was also understood in different ways across the reports. The reports provided some examples of effective strategies to ensure diversity and inclusion in the inventorying process, including giving special consideration to underrepresented groups, especially minorities, migrants or specific age groups, when identifying intangible cultural heritage elements.

In the process of inventorying intangible cultural heritage, many countries have taken steps to ensure that inscription of elements in the inventory is not an end in itself, but rather a first step to develop collaborative actions for safeguarding. For example, inscription was linked to requirements for safeguarding plans and updating in many inventories. When inventorying was aimed primarily at developing nomination files for national or international lists of intangible cultural heritage, creating a strong link to safeguarding was more of a challenge. For this reason, some reports noted the need to ensure that safeguarding activities remained locally oriented after elements were included on an inventory.

Most reporting countries increased access to inventories through digitization and the establishment of online access portals, but noted limitations in use of this information for safeguarding. Enabling more effective community use of inventories for safeguarding purposes may require exploring in greater detail what makes inventories useful to communities, how they are being used and what barriers exist to their more effective use for safeguarding. While many inventories recorded specific threats and risks to safeguarding specific elements and proposed safeguarding measures, several reports noted the absence of comprehensive strategies addressing multiple common threats to intangible cultural heritage across the territory of reporting States.

### Description of the inventories[[25]](#footnote-25)

As already mentioned above, the countries reporting in this cycle described 113 inventories of diverse scopes and scales, variously named inventories, registers, archives, atlases or lists. Together, these inventories contained details of 42,684 intangible cultural heritage elements (A6.g). About half the inventories reported on were identified as a specialized inventory or an inventory of specific scope (62 out of 112, or 55%) (A6.n). Many countries reported on inventories at the national level, but also included inventories at local, regional or transnational levels. One transnational specialized inventory, for example, documented the “Masks of the Iberian Raya in the Former Zoela Territory” across the Trás-os-Montes (Portugal) and the provinces of Zamora and Salamanca (Spain), through a project undertaken by the European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation-[ZASNET](https://www.zasnet-aect.eu/es/node) and tertiary institutions in Valladolid and Bragança. In Italy, the Lombardy Intangible Heritage Register ([REIL](http://www.intangiblesearch.eu/)) was opened up to include elements of Alpine intangible cultural heritage, both in other areas of Italy and also in Austria, France, Germany, Slovenia and Switzerland.

Most inventories followed the approach of the Convention in defining intangible cultural heritage according to Articles 2.1 and 2.2 (see A6.h and i). Compliance with human rights, mutual respect and sustainable development were important considerations in many cases as criteria for inclusion of elements on intangible cultural heritage inventories (A6.j). Countries used different kinds of ordering principles for their inventories, although most organized them by domain or sub-region (A6.i). In the Republic of Moldova, the National Intangible Cultural Heritage Inventory has been structured into three volumes. The first two volumes organized elements according to cultural or ethnic groups, while the third volume organized elements by domain. Some inventories included information on both the intangible heritage elements and on the bearers and communities themselves; or on both tangible and intangible heritage. Armenia reported on an inventory in which intangible heritage elements, particularly rituals and traditions of worship, were linked to cultural and natural spaces. This helped to integrate safeguarding actions for both tangible and intangible heritage.

In four fifths of reporting countries (33 out of 41, or 80%), establishment of the first inventory of intangible cultural heritage occurred alongside or after ratification of the Convention (A6.d, see Figure 6 below).

##### A graph of the number of countries/regions Description automatically generatedFigure 6: Date of ratification compared to date of establishment of the first inventory of intangible cultural heritage in the country (n=41) (A6.d)

### Involvement of communities and other actors in the inventorying process[[26]](#footnote-26)

Over four fifths of the countries (37 out of 42, or 88%) reported that communities, groups and relevant NGOs participated inclusively in inventorying to a large extent, thus informing and strengthening their safeguarding efforts (B8.1). Almost all of the inventories mentioned in the reports (111 out of 113, or 98%) were reportedly compiled with inclusive participation of communities, groups and NGOs (A6.p). A number of countries included information about bearers and communities concerned as well as intangible cultural heritage elements in their inventories. Ensuring community participation was particularly challenging during the COVID-19 pandemic, however, as indicated above.

In most cases, inventorying was the result of a collaborative process including bearers, researchers, national or regional cultural institutions, advisory bodies, independent experts, intangible cultural heritage curators, museums, NGOs and even specialist private companies. In Ukraine, for example, inventorying was usually initiated by communities or NGOs that either prepared submissions to the National Register on their own, or with assistance from cultural organizations and experts. A working group was created to prepare the submission by doing research, obtaining informed community consent and collecting audio-visual material. In the region of Navarre (Spain), a private company was commissioned to identify intangible cultural heritage elements on the basis of a bibliographical survey and questionnaires. Elements were validated with local authorities, and remain open to public review by citizens, community members and bearers. The inventory will subsequently be managed by the local authorities.

NGOs played an important role in inventorying, for example in Portugal. The “Cultural Cooperative on Intangible Memory” (Memoria Imaterial Cooperativa Cultural), accredited as an NGO under the Convention, gave advice to municipalities and local associations on the concept of intangible cultural heritage and organized informational sessions during the inventorying process. The [MEMORIAMEDIA](https://memoriamedia.net) e-Museum of Intangible Cultural Heritage is an initiative of the cooperative, providing access to information in the inventory. A number of Portuguese NGOs accredited under the Convention were also included as members of a working group set up by the Portuguese National Commission for UNESCO, examining nominations to the Convention’s Lists and Register, and advising on safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. In North Macedonia, the NGO Macedonian Research Society (MID) conducted field research and maintained an extensive inventory about knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe (including ethno-astronomy and weather knowledge). This inventory has been used for education and safeguarding purposes.

Not every community or group wished to have (all) their intangible cultural heritage elements included in a national inventory. As the report from Norway noted, the Sámi have had difficulty including elements on the national inventory which may not suit their needs, or indeed in a database. The Sámi Parliament in Norway is considering whether to set up a separate inventory of Sámi intangible cultural heritage in the Sápmi region, which would have to be done in partnership with the Sámi Parliaments in Finland and Sweden.

### Accessibility of information in inventories[[27]](#footnote-27)

Almost all countries (38 out of 41, or 93%) reported that the inventories in their territory were fully or largely accessible to relevant stakeholders, while respecting customary practices governing access (B7.4a, see Figure 7 below). Icelandic policies, for example, specifically promoted digitization and increased public access for all to cultural heritage.[[28]](#footnote-28) The Árni Magnússon Institute for Icelandic Studies welcomes public contributions to the Living Traditions project, an online inventory of intangible cultural heritage in Iceland that the institution manages. The Living Traditions project webpage has been used for awareness raising, as well as in teaching at the University of Iceland.

##### Chart, pie chart Description automatically generatedFigure 7. Extent of facilitation of access to inventories in general, respecting customary practices governing access (n=41) (B7.4a)

Online open platforms such as Wiki inventories can promote public access, consultation and participation by communities concerned, if they are well moderated, tailored to audience needs and respect ethical considerations such as free, prior and informed consent for information sharing. The Finnish Heritage Agency (FHA) in Finland, for example, maintained a Wiki-inventory for Living Heritage, on which a diverse range of NGOs, institutions, communities and practitioner groups have submitted information about their intangible cultural heritage, which they can manage and update. The Wiki-inventory has been translated into three languages (Finnish, Swedish and English), but additional languages can be used as well (North-Sámi and Roma languages have been used so far). The FHA moderated the Wiki and reserved the right to request adjustments to submissions and remove inadequate or inappropriate submissions.

Strategies used to promote access to inventories in line with the Ethical Principles included requirements for community consent, translation of inventory entries and the adaptation of texts for general readers. Some countries followed EU legislation on Accessibility of Digital Public Services as a general framework in promoting the accessibility of online inventories. Not all information should be available for open public access. In Greece, communities concerned may identify aspects of their heritage that they do not wish to share publicly in the National Inventory. In the inscription of the "Patouni Soap Factory" on the island of Corfu, for example, which had been producing soaps and other personal hygiene items made from olive oil since 1850, soap makers decided not to share the secret methods they use to make the soap. The inventory thus lists the ingredients, but not the method of preparation of the soaps.

### Reflecting and respecting diversity in inventorying[[29]](#footnote-29)

Just over two thirds of the countries reported that inventories fully or largely reflected the diversity of intangible cultural heritage in their territory (B7.1b). Diversity in inventorying was understood in various ways by reporting countries, in terms of territorial inclusiveness, representation of groups characterized by factors such as age, gender, or disability, or the inclusion of diverse cultural groups and practices or domains.

Different strategies were used to achieve diversity in inventories. Migrant groups and minorities identified as underrepresented in the national inventory were specifically encouraged and assisted to nominate elements in several countries. The inventory in Andorra included information on territorial distribution of intangible cultural heritage elements in order to better monitor and achieve geographical balance, as well as information on gender of practitioners, involvement of migrant communities and intergenerational transmission. Decentralized inventorying processes were sometimes used to ensure diversity. In Belarus, locally-based participatory inventorying processes helped to ensure a proper balance between domains, sub-regions, rural and urban places and ethnic groups in the inventory. In Serbia, a network of individual coordinators in different parts of the country cooperated with the Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage, the competent body for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding, to identify, document and monitor the intangible cultural heritage at the local level, submitting nominations for inclusion of elements in the national inventory.

Almost all inventories (112 out of 113, or 99%) reportedly included the practices and expressions of all genders (A6.r). Ensuring gender diversity in inventorying was understood in different ways, however. Some countries noted the inclusion of elements practised by different genders in inventories. Others reported that practice of inventoried intangible cultural heritage elements was open to all genders, and/or that all genders participated in their practice. In Austria, the nomination form for the national inventory included a question about whether all genders were included in the practice of the proposed element. As the Austrian report noted, gender inclusiveness is a complex topic: even where intangible cultural heritage practices do not specifically exclude women, for example, they might not actively include them, or they may include women in a servile role. Of course, the practice of some domains or elements of intangible cultural heritage may be more gendered than others, and this may change over time, as indicated in the introductory section on Gender Equality. Such nuances and changes can be recorded in inventory entries, if regular updating happens.

### Criteria for inclusion and domains used in inventories[[30]](#footnote-30)

As noted above, most inventories classified and organized elements by domain or sub-region, generally following the domains identified in the Convention’s Article 2.2 (A6.h and A6.i). Additional domains used in the inventories included sports, games, foodways, festive events, musical events and systems of social organization. Several countries reported that there remained an imbalance between intangible cultural heritage domains in their inventories at the time of reporting. In some countries, traditional craftsmanship, foodways, performing arts, events and festivities were better represented than other domains in inventories.

Inventories used different criteria for selecting elements suitable for inclusion, but many relied on the definition of intangible cultural heritage in Article 2.1 of the Convention and evidence of community participation and consent to inventorying (A6.j). Additional criteria included requirements for safeguarding planning, which will be discussed further below. Inclusion of intangible cultural heritage elements on an inventory was also subject to legal or ethical considerations in some cases. For example, to qualify for inclusion on the national inventory in Denmark, an open-access Wiki, intangible cultural heritage elements proposed by communities were required to comply, following the Convention’s Article 2.1, with existing international human rights instruments as well as with the requirements of mutual respect among communities and of sustainable development. In Czechia, elements of intangible cultural heritage included on the inventory also had to be compatible with certain “rights and obligations arising out of international legal instruments which [the country] is a party to, concerning intellectual property rights and the use of biological and ecological resources”.

A few inventories required deeper reflection on the history and role of the elements nominated for inclusion. Germany reported that for inclusion in the Nationwide Inventory of Intangible Cultural Heritage, particular importance was attached to an open, inclusive and participative approach to safeguarding. Applicants were asked to engage in a nuanced reflection on how practices came about historically, how the intangible cultural heritage was embedded in society, evidence of its adaptability and (where applicable) any links with other forms of cultural expression in Germany, Europe and beyond. A proposal for inclusion of an element in the inventory had to be submitted together with a “sustainable development plan” for the element. In Germany, inventories not only included intangible cultural heritage elements, but also examples of good safeguarding practices. Communities could withdraw their nomination for inclusion in the national inventory at any point, and in such cases all data related to the element would be deleted.

For these reasons, while processes for determining the inclusion of an intangible cultural heritage element in the inventory varied, they usually involved some process of independent review of the chosen criteria. In Malta, for example, the inscription process was divided into two phases. First, communities submitted an expression of interest. Second, on the basis of more detailed information, a National Board made the decision on whether the intangible cultural heritage element could be inscribed in the National Inventory. Even in the case of Wiki inventories, as indicated above, a moderation process was usually applied.

In spite of significant commonalities between inventories, the reports indicated how diverse inventorying processes and procedures could be, even in the same country, as the example from Belgium demonstrates below.

##### Example: Criteria for inclusion on multiple inventories in a federal state (Belgium)

Belgium is a federal State with several different intangible cultural heritage inventories covering its three autonomous regions (the Flemish Region (Flanders) in the north, the Walloon Region (Wallonia) in the south, and the Brussels-Capital Region) and three linguistic groups (the Flemish, French and German Communities). Using separate platforms and different criteria for inclusion of elements, inventorying was adapted to the needs of the different Communities and regions of the country. In Flanders, for example, communities wishing to submit an element for inclusion on the Inventory of Flanders on the [Intangible Cultural Heritage Platform](http://www.immaterieelerfgoed.be) were required to endorse a specific Declaration of Ethical Principles. The Declaration built on the 2003 UNESCO Convention as well as on policies about the implementation of this Convention in the Flemish Community. Elements in conflict with this Declaration can be removed from the inventory, following the advice of an expert committee. The platform moderator, Workshop Intangible Heritage (WIE), considered the diversity of elements, and ensured that the principles of free, prior, sustained and informed consent and appropriate involvement of all stakeholders were respected when information was disseminated. After inscription, community representatives were able to use their own logins to update online dossiers about their element and its safeguarding. In another part of Belgium, the [Register](https://ostbelgienkulturerbe.be/desktopdefault.aspx/tabid-3906/7007_read-40598/) of the intangible cultural heritage of the German-speaking Community applied the criteria in Article 2 of the Convention to guide a jury of experts in selecting elements for inclusion. The “[Inventory of Masterpieces of Oral and Intangible Heritage](http://www.patrimoineculturel.cfwb.be/)” of the French Community used a separate online platform and different criteria, set by a Decree of 2003, including history, current situation, transmission, safeguarding measures, sociological and human aspects, geographical extent, legality and socio-cultural functions. The “[Inventory of the intangible cultural heritage of Brussels](http://patrimoine.brussels/decouvrir/inventaires-du-patrimoine-bruxellois/inventaire-du-patrimoine-culturel-immateriel/inventaire-du-patrimoine-culturel-immateriel)” covers the practices present on the territory of the Brussels-Capital Region. Criteria for inclusion on this inventory included compliance with the Convention and its values, and evidence that the element had been transmitted over generations for at least 50 years, and was of regional interest (bicultural), rather than belonging exclusively to one community (French or Flemish).

### Orientation towards safeguarding, updating and recording of viability [[31]](#footnote-31)

Overall, more than four fifths of reporting countries stated that inventories in their territory were fully or largely oriented towards safeguarding (B7.1a). Over four fifths of the inventories (98 out of 113 inventories, or 87%) reportedly included information about the viability of elements (A6.k). By identifying risks to the viability of the intangible cultural heritage, inventorying was able to inform safeguarding actions as well as broader community development policies and activities. Nearly as many inventories (94 out of 111, or 85%) updated the viability of the element when the inventory entry was updated (A6.l). However, only about a quarter of the countries reported that inventories were fully utilized for safeguarding (11 out of 41, or 27%), and nearly a third of the countries said that inventories were used for that purpose only partially, minimally or not at all (12 out of 41, or 30%) (B7.4b).

Inventorying processes incorporated requirements for information on viability in different ways. Three quarters of the inventories reported on (85 out of 113, or 75%) identified threats to the intangible cultural heritage elements included in them (A6.m). Among the common threats mentioned in the reports were over-commercialization, touristification, and lack of transmission of the element due to changing habits or dispersion of communities. Many countries took steps to ensure that inclusion of an element on an inventory was used as the basis for developing and monitoring collaborative safeguarding programmes to address threats or risks. Some thus required safeguarding information as a criterion for inscription. A decision to include an intangible cultural heritage element on the National Register of Cultural Properties of Montenegro, for example, depended on identification of specific safeguarding measures to be taken by different stakeholders. In Norway, contributors to the intangible cultural heritage inventory ([Immateriell kulturarv](https://www.immateriellkulturarv.no/)) were asked to provide information about the historical background, changes in the practice over time, highly skilled practitioners, and the transmission process, as well as a safeguarding plan. In other contexts, safeguarding measures could be included in an inventory, but a comprehensive safeguarding plan was not required.

Updating sometimes served as a springboard for the design and implementation of safeguarding actions. In Cyprus, the National Inventory of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Cyprus (NIICHC) was updated annually with the addition of new elements and inclusion of more communities or relevant stakeholders in regard to existing entries. Every five years after inscription on the inventory, a Committee reviewed safeguarding actions and an element’s state of viability in collaboration with the community concerned. Although most inventories were updated on a regular basis, usually at intervals between one to five years, the reports revealed considerable diversity in updating methods (A6.e).

Development of general strategies for addressing risks to viability identified in the inventorying process that affected multiple elements was not frequently reported. Like many others, Ireland’s report identified some generally-applicable threats to some of the elements in the national inventory including social changes, rural depopulation, and the need to access physical spaces for practice. In regard to one element inscribed on Ireland’s inventory, however, the lack of an overarching territorial framework for collection, collation, documentation and safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage was also mentioned as a risk. Romania’s report also pointed to the need for a national strategy for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage that could be used to address common risks associated with inventoried intangible cultural heritage elements. Such an approach could assist in developing more general safeguarding actions across different elements and domains of intangible cultural heritage. Information from inventories could be included in general government monitoring processes, for example. In the Netherlands, work on intangible cultural heritage safeguarding is included by Statistics Netherlands in monitoring and impact measurement within the cultural sector. This issue will be further discussed under Thematic Area VII on research and monitoring for safeguarding.

The reports gave many examples of how inventorying helped to raise awareness about intangible cultural heritage and promoted cooperation between different stakeholders for safeguarding, for example through exhibitions and events about inventoried elements. Inclusion of an element was in many cases followed by a press release and interviews in the national media. It was often also the basis for State funding and support at the local level. In Lithuania, an action plan with safeguarding measures was required for inclusion of an element on the National Inventory. Community members committed to safeguard the element through the measures defined in their action plan. They then received funding to implement the action plan.

Inventorying processes sometimes formed the basis for development planning that took intangible cultural heritage into account (this will be discussed further under B15.3).

##### Example: Using inventories of intangible cultural heritage in spatial development plans (Georgia)

In Georgia, inventorying has been conducted according to thematic or geographic principles, focusing for example on different wine-making methods, and on heritage in the Vardzia-Khertvisi cultural landscape or Tusheti Mountain historic settlements. The aim was to support the sustainability of communities and the safeguarding of their heritage by ensuring the transmission of the knowledge and preservation of the relevant cultural spaces needed for particular practices. Since 2015, the Georgian Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure and the Ministry of the Economy and Sustainable Development have been using information about intangible cultural heritage to inform spatial development planning. This has helped to promote the documentation of intangible cultural heritage and associated spaces in some areas, although much inventorying work remains to be done. The report noted that broader inventorying efforts could enable further integrated spatial development planning across different parts of the country. For this, investment was needed in awareness raising, staffing capacity and the development of local digital databases at the municipal and regional level.

Countries noted some challenges in using inventories for safeguarding, however, especially where inventories were born out of temporary projects focused on nomination of an element (whether at national or international level), and other forms of short-term awareness-raising or dissemination. Bosnia and Herzegovina’s report pointed out the need to balance processes of local and national inventorying to ensure that safeguarding measures are implemented at the local level, even where inscription happens at a national level. Further support is needed to ensure that inventories are updated and reoriented towards safeguarding measures in some contexts.

### Baselines and targets

Table 4 below shows that, using the automatic calculator, only a fifth of the reporting countries (9 out of 42, or 21%) fully satisfied the core indicator B7 at the baseline on the extent to which inventories as such reflect the diversity of intangible cultural heritage and contribute to safeguarding. A further three fifths largely satisfied the indicator (25 out of 42, or 60%). Over four fifths (35 out of 42, or 83%), fully satisfied the core indicator B8 at the baseline, on the extent to which the inventorying process is inclusive, respects the diversity of intangible cultural heritage and its practitioners, and supports safeguarding.

Two fifths of reporting countries that set targets, set their targets as equal to their baseline for B7 (21 out of 35, or 60%); none set it lower than the baseline. More countries (29 out of 35, or 83%) set a target at the baseline for B8, and another four countries set their target above the baseline (4 out of 35, or 11%). Seven countries likely did not set a target (7 out of 42, or 17%) for B7 or B8.[[32]](#footnote-32)

##### Table 4: Attainment scores on the baseline for indicators B7 and B8 in reporting countries (n=42)

| **Indicator** | **Not satisfied** | **Minimally** | **Partially** | **Largely** | **Satisfied** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B7. Extent to which inventories reflect the diversity of intangible cultural heritage and contribute to safeguarding | 1 / 42 | 0 / 42 | 7 / 42 | 25 / 42 | 9 / 42 |
| B8. Extent to which the inventorying process is inclusive, respects the diversity of intangible cultural heritage and its practitioners, and supports safeguarding by communities, groups and individuals concerned | 0 / 42 | 0 / 42 | 3 / 42 | 4 / 42 | 35 / 42 |

Thematic area III - Research and Documentation

The Convention encourages States Parties to “foster scientific, technical and artistic studies, as well as research methodologies, with a view to effective safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage, in particular the intangible cultural heritage in danger” (Article 13(c)). States Parties are also encouraged to adopt appropriate legal, technical, administrative and financial measures aimed at “ensuring access to the intangible cultural heritage while respecting customary practices governing access to specific aspects of such heritage” (Article 13(d)(ii)). Of course, under Article 15 and the Ethical Principles, communities, groups and individuals concerned are central to the safeguarding process, they should be involved in undertaking or guiding research and documentation and be able to use its results.

The periodic report thus contains a number of questions about support for research and documentation, community and other stakeholder participation in it, accessibility and utilization. These are as follows:

***List of core indicators and assessment factors on research and documentation (B9-B10)***

| **Core Indicators** | **Assessment according to the following** |
| --- | --- |
| B9. Extent to which research and documentation, including scientific, technical and artistic studies, contribute to safeguarding | * 1. Financial and other forms of support foster research, scientific, technical and artistic studies, documentation and archiving, oriented towards safeguarding and carried out in conformity with relevant ethical principles. |
| * 1. Research is fostered concerning approaches towards, and impacts of, safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in general and specific elements of intangible cultural heritage, whether or not inscribed. |
| * 1. Practitioners and bearers of intangible cultural heritage participate in the management, implementation and dissemination of research findings and scientific, technical and artistic studies, all done with their free, prior, sustained and informed consent. |
| B10. Extent to which research findings and documentation are accessible and are utilized to strengthen policy-making and improve safeguarding | * 1. Documentation and research findings are accessible to communities, groups and individuals, while respecting customary practices governing access to specific aspects of intangible cultural heritage. |
| * 1. The results of research, documentation, and scientific, technical and artistic studies on intangible cultural heritage are utilized to strengthen policy-making across sectors. |
| * 1. The results of research, documentation, and scientific, technical and artistic studies on intangible cultural heritage are utilized to improve safeguarding. |

### Overview of core indicators B9-B10

Often over many decades, most reporting countries in this cycle have made significant investments in research on the broad topic of intangible cultural heritage, primarily in academic fields such as anthropology and folklore. Research in the field of intangible cultural heritage has been carried out, mostly by universities and research centres, followed by archives, libraries, museums, associations or independent researchers. This work has involved documentation, publications, seminars, workshops, lectures and community projects. Communities and NGOs have also conducted their own research activities.

Research activities were generally financed from State and local government budgets, but intangible cultural heritage-related research in countries in this reporting cycle also benefited from regional funding programmes such as [Erasmus+](https://erasmus-plus.ec.europa.eu/) and [Creative Europe](https://culture.ec.europa.eu/creative-europe) (B9.1). There was support for research or documentation oriented towards safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in almost all reporting countries (B9.2). Intangible cultural heritage practitioners and bearers were reportedly involved in the management, implementation and dissemination of research findings and scientific, technical and artistic studies, with their free, prior, sustained and informed consent in almost all countries (B9.3). Requirements for community consent were often ensured through research ethics frameworks rather than through specific reference to the Ethical Principles. Legal and ethical issues related to confidential or sensitive data and protection of intellectual property were frequently considered in the dissemination of research and documentation. Almost four fifths of reporting countries (79%) thus fully satisfied the core indicator B9 at the baseline, in respect to the contribution of research and documentation to safeguarding.

Most countries reported that communities, groups and individuals concerned had some degree of access to documentation and research findings, although only just over half reported that this was true to a “high” extent (B10.1). Participatory research and documentation were used for safeguarding to some extent in most countries, whether in strengthening policy-making or designing safeguarding measures (B10.2, B10.3), although no more than a third of the countries in each case reported that this was true to a “high” extent. Thus, three fifths of reporting countries (60%) fully or largely satisfied the core indicator B10 at the baseline, regarding the accessibility of research and documentation findings and their utilization to strengthen policy-making and improve safeguarding.

### Challenges and opportunities

In spite of an increasing number of research and documentation initiatives relating to intangible cultural heritage, some reports mentioned the need for more dedicated funding, especially for research undertaken by community actors. As noted above, digitization presents an opportunity to increase public and community access to research materials, but only if attention is paid to issues such as ensuring community consent for dissemination, promoting community access, for example through translation or adaptation of the content, and updating and maintenance of digital platforms. A few communities have created their own digital archives containing information on intangible cultural heritage elements and on events, activities and projects.

According to the reports, a clearer articulation between research and intangible cultural heritage safeguarding or policy-making also seems to be required. Folklore and anthropology as academic disciplines frame the context for much intangible cultural heritage-related research. Data, archives and research findings are frequently funded through academic institutions and disseminated to academic audiences. This has created an important source of data and perspectives on intangible cultural heritage, but it is not always accessible to or used by communities for safeguarding. More practical management-related research on the effects of safeguarding activities on intangible cultural heritage may be needed. Also, access to and use of research results by policy makers, civil society and communities concerned could be further promoted. The reports shared some good examples of advisory processes and mechanisms that could enhance the use of research in policy-making.

### Support for research and documentation promoting safeguarding[[33]](#footnote-33)

Almost all countries supported research, scientific, technical and artistic studies (39 out of 41, or 95%) or documentation and archiving (38 out of 41, or 93%) oriented towards safeguarding intangible cultural heritage (B9.1). Also, almost all of them (41 out of 42, or 98%) supported research on approaches towards, and the impacts of, safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, whether in general or specific elements thereof (B9.2).

Documentation and research in the field of intangible cultural heritage have been carried out by various research institutions and museums, often even before ratification of the Convention, or as part of inventorying processes, as discussed above. Institutions and projects involved in documentation of intangible cultural heritage frequently depended on public funding to support their research. The Minor Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, for example, enabled its students to conduct local history research through the All-Ukrainian Summer School on Crimean Tatar Humanities.

##### Example: State support for research and documentation on intangible cultural heritage (Cyprus)

In Cyprus, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sport and Youth (MOECSY) has created special funding schemes and institutions to support research and documentation on topics related to intangible cultural heritage. The Cyprus Research Centre, operating under the Ministry of Education and Culture, Sports and Youth since 1962, undertakes and publishes research on the history, cultural heritage, literature, linguistics, ethnography, and sociology of Cyprus. It has established a Folklore Archive and Oral Tradition Archive specializing in Cypriot studies. Various projects organized by the Centre have raised awareness about local cultural expressions, particularly those on inventories or international Lists, through documentary films, workshops and publications. The digitization of the Oral Tradition Archive is in progress. The [Cyprus Handicraft Service](http://www.cyprushandicrafts.gov.cy/), under the Ministry of Energy, Commerce and Industry also plays a role in research. The Service maintains an inventory of motifs and other information related to traditional crafts as well as a database of craft makers in Cyprus. In the reporting period, it undertook research on traditional crafts, offered training programmes to local artisans in embroidery, weaving, woodwork, pottery, metalwork, leatherwork, and traditional costume making, and provided incentives and support to artisans, for example in promoting their work to visitors and locals.

Intangible cultural heritage-related research and documentation was undertaken by a number of museums, working with communities concerned. The Azerbaijani National Carpet Museum in Baku, for instance, conducted fieldwork research activities in different regions of Azerbaijan to evaluate the viability of particular schools of Azerbaijani carpet weaving and embroidery. It also collaborated closely with NGOs working in the domain of handicrafts and encouraged research by other stakeholders.

Strong networks and well-resourced national and international funding programmes have supported research on intangible cultural heritage. UNESCO Chairs in the field of intangible cultural heritage in Europe have played an important role in research and documentation. The Chairs have explored a range of topics such as intangible heritage and sustainable development, formal and non-formal education, applied studies on intangible cultural heritage, transcultural music studies, comparative law and heritage policy, critical heritage studies, traditional know-how, folk music heritage and storytelling. Italy reported that the UNESCO Chair in the [Benecon University Consortium](http://www.benecon.it) created a knowledge network with UNESCO Chairs that focus on Landscape, Cultural Heritage and Territorial Governance, as well as an interactive WebGIS portal that includes all the nearly 800 UNESCO Chairs worldwide. In Croatia, the EU project "Identity on the line" (Ugroženi identitet), funded by [Creative Europe](https://culture.ec.europa.eu/creative-europe), collected testimonies reflecting on "difficult heritage" associated with major migration movements in the post-war history of Europe.

Occasionally, State research funding has been specifically allocated to community organizations. In Flanders (Belgium), annual grant schemes have been made available to cultural heritage organizations for diverse activities, such as surveys, research and publications on popular traditions, as well as publications and other promotional activities. The Ministry of Culture in Belgium funded *Focus Craftsmanship* (2020-2023) in close cooperation with the intangible cultural heritage network in the country, developing audio-visual documentation methodologies for crafts. In Sweden, the [Craft Laboratory](https://www.gu.se/hantverkslaboratoriet) at the University of Gothenburg helped to safeguard traditional craftsmanship necessary for the preservation and development of cultural and historic landscapes through documentation and skills-sharing among craftspeople. The Laboratory published a series of films about various craft techniques on its [YouTube](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCISZUm8lwGl1e0I1kmgMaMw) channel.

A few reports mentioned public-private collaboration for funding intangible cultural heritage research, although this does not seem to have been commonplace. For example, in 2019 the Raiffeisen Bank in Bulgaria, through a donation campaign called “choose to help”, supported scientific studies on intangible cultural heritage conducted by researchers and community cultural centres. One of the outcomes of these projects was a book of traditional recipes collected by the community of the village of Yuper, Razgrad.

### Community participation in and access to research and documentation[[34]](#footnote-34)

Almost all countries (37 out of 41, or 90%) reported involving intangible cultural heritage practitioners and bearers in the management, implementation and dissemination of research findings and scientific, technical and artistic studies, with their free, prior, sustained and informed consent (B9.3). The reports gave many examples of community involvement in research, documentation activities or collaboration initiatives. Across the reports, while such research was reported as being in conformity with the Ethical Principles, this was often because it was conducted under general ethical research guidelines or under research institutions. In Sweden, for example, the Swedish Research Council’s “Good Research Practice” publication lists informed consent as a basic requirement in research projects.[[35]](#footnote-35) Montenegro’s report noted the difficulties of monitoring compliance with requirements such as community consent when researchers were not connected with research institutions. The Operational Directives of the Convention were translated and distributed to all relevant stakeholders to support institutions, organizations and initiatives for documentation.

Research and documentation processes, sometimes linked to inventorying, could be used by public authorities, cultural workers, and researchers to inspire increased community interest in practising and transmitting an element. Most countries reported that communities, groups and individuals concerned had some degree of access to documentation and research findings (38 out of 42, or 90%), and in only a few countries (3 out of 42, or 7%) was access considered limited (B10.1). Data access was given through web sites and digital platforms, research publications, archives, libraries, seminars or educational materials. In Malta, for instance, ethnographic research done under the National Archives of Malta’s “[Memorja](http://www.memorja.com/)” programme has been made available online, with personal photographs, documents, artifacts and audio-visual material illustrating the life stories of underrepresented groups. In Türkiye, the Traditional Arts Association created a [website](http://www.gelenekselsanatlar.org/en) to share the outcomes of research and projects on traditional crafts. Digital platforms were also particularly useful in engaging communities. In Spain, students, teachers and local residents in the municipality of Vedra (Galicia) used a mobile application to help recover a partially-forgotten vocabulary related to the intangible cultural heritage of the area. The Multilingual Integrated Public Centre of Vedra developed the mobile application called “Lend me a hand” ("[Bótame un capio](http://www.edu.xunta.gal/centros/cpidevedra/taxonomy/term/124)") together with schools, local NGOs and other bodies. It can be downloaded from [google play store](https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=org.consultem.app.capio).

The reports gave some examples of community-led research and documentation. These included the Arctic Indigenous Design Archives project ([AIDA](https://arkisto.fi/aida/)), which involved Sámi archivists working with traditional craftspeople to establish archives of their individual creative processes and collective heritage. The Danish Folk Dance group, and other community associations, collected audio-visual footage, photographs and sheet music relating to about a thousand folk dances from all regions of Denmark. This research showed that the viability of the dances was now becoming rather threatened.

In spite of many initiatives to promote accessibility of documentation and research, reports identified a number of persistent challenges. These included the need to provide free, permanent access to public documentation, the importance of updating and maintaining databases, and enabling clear public communication of good quality scientific research in appropriate languages and formats, while respecting ethical principles regarding data access.

### Utilization of research and documentation for safeguarding[[36]](#footnote-36)

Over four fifths (34 out of 42, or 81%) of countries altogether reported some use of research and documentation for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding, particularly in the development of safeguarding measures for specific intangible cultural heritage elements (B10.3, see Figure 8 below). Research and documentation were also used for policy-making, although reportedly to a somewhat lower extent (B10.2, see Figure 9 below). However, no more than a third of the countries in each case reported that research was used to a “high” extent for these purposes.

The reports gave examples of research initiatives carried out in universities and research institutions, or as part of the inventorying process, informing safeguarding work and the development of safeguarding measures or plans. In Greece, the EU Horizon research programme [Pericles-Maritime Culture](https://www.pericles-heritage.eu/) documented the tangible and intangible cultural heritage of coastal communities on the Northeast Aegean Sea. Researchers engaged with local communities to gather information on fishing traditions, consulted archival sources and formulated proposals for safeguarding plans and the transmission of the fishing tradition to young people in the area. In Portugal, the Centre for Research in Anthropology ([CRIA](https://www.cria.org.pt/en)) conducted broad-ranging research on intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and its impacts both nationally and internationally. Research topics included heritagization processes, effects of inscription on the UNESCO Lists, the relationship between craft production and tourism in Cape Verde, and the role of different stakeholders in documenting and safeguarding intangible heritage.

##### Figure 8: Extent to which results of research and documentation were used for safeguarding in reporting countries (n=42) (B10.3)
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#### *Example: Research on intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding (Poland)*

Poland’s report gave several examples of research contributing to the development of safeguarding plans and measures. Research conducted by Poland’s Centre for the Interpretation of the Intangible Heritage of Krakow and public consultations with the bearers of the [Nativity Scene](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/nativity-scene-szopka-tradition-in-krakow-01362) informed the "Plan to support the protection of Krakow nativity scenes in the area of the Municipality of Krakow", which was adopted by the Krakow City Council. The plan designated several premises as creative studios for the use of makers of Nativity Scenes and other intangible cultural heritage bearers. Bearers of the tradition of [Flower Carpets](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/flower-carpets-tradition-for-corpus-christi-processions-01743) in Spycimierz were involved in a series of seminars between 2018 and 2019. Workshops for local community leaders and young people in Spycimierz were held alongside the seminars. The seminars created the context for discussions about the viability of the practice, possible safeguarding measures and the potential impact of nomination and inscription on the UNESCO Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.

Research and documentation on intangible cultural heritage was used to inform policy-making, too, although not often to a high extent. Altogether, over three quarters of the countries reported “some” or “high” levels of use of research in policy-making (32 out of 42, or 76%). Just over a tenth (6 out of 42, or 14%) reported that policy makers had limited access to research (B10.2, see Figure 9 below).

##### Chart, waterfall chart Description automatically generatedFigure 9: Extent to which research, documentation, and scientific, technical and artistic studies on intangible cultural heritage are being utilized in policy-making in reporting countries (n=42) (B10.2)

The reports provided some examples of ways in which the results of research were utilized in drafting of national policies, both in the area of culture and more generally.

##### Example: Use of research in policy-making (Latvia)

Latvia’s long term Sustainable Development Strategy until 2030 (the NDP 2030) included “Strengthening the Sense of Belonging to the Latvian Cultural Space” as a priority long-term objective. The planning document “Guidelines for the Development of a Cohesive and Civically Active Society for 2021–2027” referenced an extensive research base, including the National Research Program “Latvian Heritage and Future Challenges for the Country’s Sustainability” (2018–2021) and research on “Minority Participation in Democratic Processes in Latvia” conducted by the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the University of Latvia (2017). The [Osmose project](https://dpc.hypotheses.org/le-projet-osmose/the-osmose-program), led by the Latvian Academy of Culture and by the Institute of Social Sciences of Politics in Paris (France), created an international network for scientific exchange on legal frameworks for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding in different countries of the world. The project published an analysis of the content and implementation of these laws, which may guide future policymakers, not just in Europe but also in other regions.

Inclusion of advisory or consultative bodies in policy processes enabled more effective use of research in policy-making. The Ministry of Culture in Slovakia established a network of expert advisory bodies to ensure that the results of current research, recent challenges and emerging threats are incorporated in the implementation and evaluation of public policies.

Research can play an important role in determining challenges in the sector and how to address them, thereby also informing policies. The Austrian Federal public authorities responsible for culture and economic development, for example, commissioned a [survey](https://www.wko.at/branchen/gewerbe-handwerk/study-traditional-craftsmanship-austria.pdf) on traditional craftsmanship both as intangible cultural heritage and as an economic factor in the country. The study identified the need for changes in the public image of traditional craft as a vocation, in the vocational system supporting transmission of skills, and the taxation and regulation of small craft-based businesses. Similar work was done in Estonia. In 2019, the Ministry of Culture, the Estonian Song and Dance Celebration Foundation, the Estonian Choral Association and the Estonian Folk Dance and Folk Music Association commissioned a study that analyzed working conditions for instructors in the [Baltic song and dance celebrations](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/baltic-song-and-dance-celebrations-00087) and the finances of artistic groups. The study showed that low salaries and lack of support during unemployment reduced the motivation of young people to become conductors or dance instructors. It also found that more than half of the current instructors would soon retire and artistic groups were not financially sustainable. As a result of this study, a support package for instructors was prepared in 2021, establishing a higher minimum rate of pay.

Intangible cultural heritage-related research informed policy-making beyond the culture sector, such as in tourism or environmental development planning, which will be discussed in detail under Thematic Area V. The Estonian National Museum drew on a research project entitled "Heritage tourism in Estonia: potential and development opportunities” and analysis of food heritage policies to provide advice to the Ministry of Rural Affairs on linking intangible heritage safeguarding and tourism strategies. In Greenland (Denmark), for instance, the Nature Institute created a digital application so that traditional hunters and fishers could submit their observations on the marine environment, including the discovery of new species or mass death events caused by melting sea ice. This information was used by biologists to make environmental policy recommendations to the government. Further work could be done in reporting countries to make the link between research on intangible cultural heritage and policy-making more visible, especially in sectors other than culture.

### Baselines and targets

Table 5 below shows that, using the automatic calculator, over three quarters of countries satisfied the core indicator at the baseline in respect to the contribution of research and documentation to safeguarding (33 out of 42, or 79%, for core indicator B9). In contrast, only 29% (12 out of 42) fully satisfied the core indicator at the baseline in relation to B10. Another 31% of the countries (13 out of 42) largely satisfied the indicator and the same number satisfied it only partially. This is likely due to reported challenges regarding accessibility and utilization of research and documentation to strengthen policy-making and improve safeguarding.

Three quarters of reporting countries that set a target, set their targets as equal to their baseline for B9 (27 out of 36, or 75%). Five countries (out of 36, or 14%) set their targets below their automatically calculated baseline for B9. However, reporting countries were much more confident about future progress on B10, with only about half (20 out of 36, or 56%) setting their target at the baseline, and two fifths (15 out of 36, or 42%) setting it above. Six countries likely did not set a target for B9 and B10 (6 out of 42, or 14%).[[37]](#footnote-37)

##### Table 5: Attainment scores on the baseline for indicators B9 and B10 in reporting countries (n=42)

| **Indicator** | **Not satisfied** | **Minimally** | **Partially** | **Largely** | **Satisfied** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B9. Extent to which research and documentation, including scientific, technical and artistic studies, contribute to safeguarding | 1 / 42 | 0 / 42 | 2 / 42 | 6 / 42 | 33 / 42 |
| B10. Extent to which research findings and documentation are accessible and are utilized to strengthen policy-making and improve safeguarding | 1 / 42 | 3 / 42 | 13 / 42 | 13 / 42 | 12 / 42 |

Thematic area IV - Policies, legal and administrative measures

Establishing a set of relevant policies and/or legal and administrative measures creates an important basis for supporting the design, development, delivery and implementation of effective and sustainable programmes and activities for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in different sectors. Article 13(a) of the Convention encourages States Parties to “adopt a general policy aimed at promoting the function of the intangible cultural heritage in society, and at integrating the safeguarding of such heritage into planning programmes” (see also OD 153(b)(i)). A primary area of such policy-making and planning is likely to be the culture sector, where action plans and strategies for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding may also be developed (see ODs 1, 2 and 171(d)) with the involvement of communities, groups and individuals concerned, in line with Article 15.

In the Convention, education is given particular attention as a means of ensuring respect for intangible cultural heritage and raising awareness of its importance (Article 1) as well as an important means for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage through supporting its transmission (Article 2.3). Article 14(a)(ii) of the Convention also emphasizes the desirability of “specific educational and training programmes within the communities and groups concerned” as a means to “ensure recognition of, respect for, and enhancement of the intangible cultural heritage in society”. Policies in other development sectors, including inclusive social or economic development, and environmental sustainability, can be established or revised to consider intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding in line with the Ethical Principles. The Convention’s Article 13(a) refers to the importance of “integrating the safeguarding of [intangible cultural heritage] into planning programmes”, and more detailed guidance is given in Chapter VI of the Operational Directives.

The periodic report thus contains a number of questions about policies, legal and administrative measures that support intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and how communities, groups and individuals concerned are involved in policy-making. These questions are as follows:

***List of core indicators and assessment factors on policies, legal and administrative measures (B11-B14)***

| **Core Indicators** | **Assessment according to the following** |
| --- | --- |
| B11. Extent to which policies as well as legal and administrative measures in the field of culture reflect the diversity of intangible cultural heritage and the importance of its safeguarding and are implemented | * 1. Cultural policies and/or legal and administrative measures integrating intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding, and reflecting its diversity, have been established or revised and are being implemented. |
| * 1. National or sub-national strategies and/or action plans for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding are established or revised and are being implemented, including safeguarding plans for specific elements, whether or not inscribed. |
| * 1. Public financial and/or technical support for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage elements, whether or not inscribed, is provided on an equitable basis, in relation to the overall support for culture and heritage at large, while bearing in mind the priority for those identified as in need of urgent safeguarding. |
| * 1. Cultural policies and/or legal and administrative measures integrating intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding are informed by the active participation of communities, groups and individuals. |
| B12. Extent to which policies as well as legal and administrative measures in the field of education reflect the diversity of intangible cultural heritage and the importance of its safeguarding and are implemented | * 1. Policies and/or legal and administrative measures for education are established or revised and implemented to ensure recognition of, respect for and enhancement of intangible cultural heritage. |
| * 1. Policies and/or legal and administrative measures for education are established or revised and implemented to strengthen transmission and practice of intangible cultural heritage. |
| * 1. Policies and/or legal and administrative measures promote mother tongue instruction and multilingual education. |
| B13. Extent to which policies as well as legal and administrative measures in fields other than culture and education reflect the diversity of intangible cultural heritage and the importance of its safeguarding and are implemented | * 1. The Ethical Principles for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage are respected in development plans, policies and programmes. |
| * 1. Policies and/or legal and administrative measures for inclusive social development[[38]](#footnote-38) and environmental sustainability are established or revised to consider intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding. |
| * 1. Policies and/or legal and administrative measures to respond to situations of natural disaster or armed conflict are established or revised to include the intangible cultural heritage affected and to recognize its importance for the resilience of the affected populations. |
| * 1. Policies and/or legal and administrative measures for inclusive economic development are established or revised to consider intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding.[[39]](#footnote-39) |
| * 1. Favorable financial or fiscal measures or incentives are established or revised to facilitate and/or encourage practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage and increase availability of natural and other resources required for its practice. |
| B14. Extent to which policies as well as legal and administrative measures respect customary rights, practices and expressions, particularly as regards the practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage | * 1. Forms of legal protection, such as intellectual property rights and privacy rights, are provided to intangible cultural heritage practitioners, bearers and their communities when their intangible cultural heritage is exploited by others for commercial or other purposes. |
| * 1. The importance of customary rights of communities and groups to land, sea and forest ecosystems necessary for the practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage is recognized in policies and/or legal and administrative measures. |
| * 1. Policies and/or legal and administrative measures recognize expressions, practices and representations of intangible cultural heritage that contribute to dispute prevention and peaceful conflict resolution. |

### 

### Overview of core indicators B11-B14

All countries responding in this thematic area reported establishing or revising and implementing policies and/or legal and administrative measures in the culture sector that incorporated intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding and reflected its diversity (B11.1). This included inclusion of intangible cultural heritage in national constitutions or heritage legislation and establishing administrative measures or frameworks for implementing the Convention, including inventorying. Strategies and/or action plans for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding at the national or sub-national level were also developed in almost all reporting countries (B11.2).

Equitable public financial and/or technical support for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding, in relation to the support given to culture and heritage as a whole, was reported by all countries (B11.3). However, countries had different interpretations of what this meant. A number of reports noted that funding for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding is often incorporated into general cultural funding and that more funding still goes to tangible than intangible cultural heritage. Some countries prioritized specific funding for projects aiming at increased diversity, social inclusion and participation in the cultural sector. About half of the countries reported prioritizing intangible cultural heritage in need of urgent safeguarding in providing financial or technical support (B11.3). Almost all countries reported some community participation informing cultural policies and administrative measures, but only about a third reported high levels of such participation (B11.4). Community participation in policy-making varied from participation in public discussions to involvement in committees, commissions, and policy-making bodies. Over four fifths of the reporting countries (88%) thus fully satisfied the core indicator B11 at the baseline, in regard to integration of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding in policies in the culture sector.

Nearly four fifths of reporting countries have established policies and legal or administrative measures in the education sector that ensure recognition of, respect for and enhancement of intangible cultural heritage (B12.1) and/or strengthen its transmission (B12.2). The analysis of the reports suggests that references to intangible cultural heritage in education policies are found mainly through attention to concepts such as culture, intercultural or multicultural education, folklore and folk culture, and language. Nearly all countries reported implementing policies to promote mother-tongue instruction and multilingual education (B12.3). With regard to the integration of intangible cultural heritage in policies in the education sector, just over two thirds of countries (69%) thus satisfied the core indicator B12 at the baseline.

Almost all countries reported respecting the Convention´s Ethical Principles in development plans, policies and programmes (B13.1), often through regulatory frameworks relating to non-discrimination or public participation in inventorying, funding, sustainable development, tourism, environmental management or urban planning. Around four fifths of reporting countries considered intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding in policies for inclusive social development and environmental sustainability (B13.2), including policies managing or regulating access to natural spaces for practising intangible cultural heritage. A similar number of countries gave consideration to intangible cultural heritage in policies for inclusive economic development (B13.4), usually in the context of cultural tourism, festivals, traditional foodways and craft. Nearly half of the countries have also taken intangible cultural heritage into consideration in policies responding to situations of natural disaster or armed conflict (B13.3). Many reports stressed the need for stronger cooperation between ministries with different competencies, and between multiple stakeholders at national and subnational levels to support safeguarding work. In regard to the integration of intangible cultural heritage in policies in sectors other than culture or education, about a third of all reporting countries fully satisfied the core indicator B13 at the baseline, and another third largely satisfied it (in total, 69%).

Forms of legal protection, such as intellectual property rights and privacy rights, were available in almost all countries to communities, groups and individuals when others exploited their intangible cultural heritage for commercial or other purposes (B14.1). This was often achieved through intellectual property and data privacy laws on the national level, or through regional laws such as the EU’s General Data Protection Regulation ([GDPR](https://commission.europa.eu/law/law-topic/data-protection/data-protection-eu_en)) and international instruments, including those protecting human rights. Just over two thirds of countries reported that their policies recognized the importance of protecting the customary rights of communities and groups to land, sea and forest ecosystems necessary for practising and transmitting intangible cultural heritage (B14.2), such as wild foraging, fisheries or traditional management of water resources. Legal and administrative measures recognizing intangible cultural heritage that contribute to peaceful conflict prevention and resolution were reported by just over half of the countries (B14.3). Such policies included provisions supporting multiculturalism and inclusion when identifying intangible cultural heritage elements for safeguarding, policies supporting practices or heritage events that are socially inclusive and promote mutual respect, and legislation proscribing hate speech. Just under half of the countries (45%) fully satisfied the core indicator B14 at the baseline in regard to respect for customary rights, practices and expressions in policies.

### Challenges and opportunities

The analysis of thematic areas II and III above already identified some key areas for expanding public policies in regard to culture and education, which are confirmed in this section. In the culture sector, as in areas like tourism and creative industries, the contribution of intangible cultural heritage is not always differentiated from culture in general. Obtaining targeted funding for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding thus also often remains a challenge. This is especially true at the community level: community organizations are, for example, not always eligible for institutional or research grants. Some innovative funding approaches for the sector were shared in the reports, which can inspire new forms of support.

While intangible cultural heritage had for some time been fairly well integrated into culture and education policies in reporting countries, sometimes under the rubric of language, ethnic studies or folklore, policies related to economic and environmental development had more recently begun to reference it. In many cases, development policies that incorporated intangible cultural heritage focused on certain sectors, such as cultural tourism. Broader recognition of the role of intangible cultural heritage in sustainable environmental and economic development may require better cross-sectoral coordination and more targeted data collection. In particular, further reflection may be needed on how intangible cultural heritage can be taken into account in responses to challenges such as environmental disasters and conflict.

While legal and policy frameworks did provide some protection for communities in regard to their intangible cultural heritage, public knowledge about legal protection and its effective use was not always very high. Communities may require special assistance in addressing threats and risks to the viability of their heritage that may arise in a commercial context, such as insufficient remuneration, over-commercialization, misappropriation and misrepresentation. In some contexts, there are also inconsistencies between policies, such as customary law and environmental regulations around access to natural resources. Practitioners may for example find themselves in contravention of new regulations such as food safety standards, when making traditional products for sale. The reports highlighted the benefits of international cooperation, legal reform, community-based training and the development of guidance to maximize community benefit from the use of legal and other protections for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding.

### Policies in the culture sector[[40]](#footnote-40)

It was clear from the reports that all countries had policies and/or legal and administrative measures in the culture sector that incorporated intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding and reflected its diversity (B11.1). The reports mentioned 237 policies in total, 98 of which were cultural policies, 98 legal measures and 60 administrative measures. The distinction between these kinds of policies was not always clear to reporting countries.

Ratification of the Convention was often a stimulus for development or revision of policies on intangible cultural heritage. As can be seen in Figure 10 below, some of the earliest culture sector policies that States were reporting on in this section had originally been established before ratification of the Convention, and were perhaps modified after ratification. This was the case in at least 22 of these 38 countries (58%), see Figure 10 below.[[41]](#footnote-41) In the other 16 countries (out of 38, or 42%), policies that took intangible cultural heritage into account were established at the time of, or after, ratification of the Convention. Stakeholder input, experiences and research informed the revision of existing culture policies, legal or administrative measures in a number of countries.

##### A picture containing chart Description automatically generatedFigure 10: Date of ratification of the Convention compared to date of establishment of earliest culture policy, legal or administrative measure now supporting intangible cultural heritage safeguarding (n=38) (B11.1)[[42]](#footnote-42)

Many laws and policies relating to tangible heritage were amended to reference intangible cultural heritage. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, for example, several sub-national administrations amended laws on museums and cultural heritage to include intangible cultural heritage and make provision for inventorying and safeguarding it within the framework of the Convention. Montenegro’s Law on the Protection of Cultural Properties (2010, revised in 2020) recognized the equal status of tangible and intangible cultural heritage. Other cultural policies set general policy objectives such as promoting cultural diversity and youth culture, as Iceland’s cultural policy (2013-2030) has done. Many policies established the competent bodies for implementing the Convention, or gave new mandates to existing bodies, and set up inventories and associated processes to realize this aim. A number of countries also mentioned policies providing for financial support to intangible cultural heritage institutions, initiatives or practitioners, which will be discussed further below.

Countries with federal and/or devolved systems of governance tended to have multiple policy frameworks for intangible cultural heritage within their territory, and several reports from such countries thus mentioned the importance of cooperation and coordination between the different levels of government. Switzerland’s 26 cantons, for example, each have autonomous competences in the field of culture and pursue their own policy for the implementation of the Convention, although there are coordination structures at the national and regional levels. In 2018, the Parliament accepted an amendment to the law[[43]](#footnote-43) setting out certain provisions concerning the safeguarding of movable, documentary, linguistic and intangible cultural heritage of cantonal interest. Under the Basic Law of the Federal Republic of Germany, promoting culture falls primarily within the remit of the states (Länder) and municipalities. Not all of the Länder have enacted specific legislation to this end, although the Cultural Code (Kulturgesetzbuch) adopted by North Rhine-Westphalia in 2021 explicitly mentioned safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage.

Most countries also integrated intangible cultural heritage safeguarding into broader strategic planning for culture. For example, intangible cultural heritage was mentioned as playing a crucial role in Albania’s National Strategy on Culture 2019-2025, which has led so far to increased intangible cultural heritage activities, more training for artisans and endangered crafts, better funding and more international activities. In 2019, Slovakia developed the “Concept of Sustainable Development of the Intangible Cultural Heritage and Traditional Folk Culture for 2020-2025”, which incorporated the Overall Results Framework for implementing the Convention. The results of the periodic reporting process will serve as a starting point for the “National Action Plan for the Sustainable Development of Intangible Cultural Heritage and Traditional Folk Culture” for 2022-2025.

In a few cases, under a general intangible cultural heritage policy, specific policies and programmes were designed to ensure parallel aims such as gender equality.

##### Example: Initiatives promoting gender equality in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding (Spain)

In Spain, the [National Plan to Safeguard the Intangible Cultural Heritage](https://www.culturaydeporte.gob.es/planes-nacionales/planes-nacionales/salvaguardia-patrimonio-cultural-inmaterial.html), implemented by the Institute of Spanish Cultural Heritage (IPCE) of the Ministry of Culture and Sport, seeks to establish a theoretical framework for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding, prepare safeguarding projects, raise awareness and facilitate information sharing and coordination between administrations. Regional and national policies have emphasized the need to take account of gender issues in intangible heritage safeguarding. The IPCE published a [report](https://www.culturaydeporte.gob.es/dam/jcr:60200a40-ec07-490d-ab2b-5b8d2686b158/participacion-mujeres-patromonio-inmaterial-ipce.pdf) in 2019 and hosted a [webinar](https://eur02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.youtube.com%2Fwatch%3Fv%3D92ZUHP-8xZI%26list%3DPLmAw6SZis81Lh6-QnYtxGsNNmWweVV95L%26index%3D1&data=05%7C01%7Charriet%40conjunction.me.uk%7C64c7f589039d47a41cf108db00835237%7C7c6acbf416ba4831bb61fffd7b03ecf9%7C0%7C0%7C638104336258595879%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=Utr8kJzJQ2sn%2FDWLXhDbH4Ko2oY%2FIur7UXj64OF%2B4MU%3D&reserved=0) in 2021 on the participation of women in intangible cultural heritage practice in Spain. Specialized training seminars were organized by government agencies in Catalonia to help public and private stakeholders manage cultural and festive activities more effectively and inclusively, including preventing violence against women during intangible cultural heritage activities. One seminar held in November 2020, “[Giants and she-devils. Breaking sexist stereotypes in folk culture”](https://eur02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fcultura.gencat.cat%2Fes%2Fdepartament%2Festructura_i_adreces%2Forganismes%2Fdgcpt%2F05_documents_i_recursos%2F02_jornades_estudis_leg%2F01_gestio_cultpop&data=05%7C01%7Charriet%40conjunction.me.uk%7C64c7f589039d47a41cf108db00835237%7C7c6acbf416ba4831bb61fffd7b03ecf9%7C0%7C0%7C638104336258595879%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=y24QMo3vN%2BvIx3MyIlvES7ryV%2Fh4Sth3M2v%2BI2n3RrA%3D&reserved=0), presented some examples of good practices, and outlined the policy instruments needed to promote and encourage gender equality and protect cultural and ethnological/intangible heritage. These policies created the framework for activities by other stakeholders promoting gender equality. Aside from the NGO-led project “[Intangible Heritage and Gender](https://fundaciongabeiras.org/patrimonio-inmaterial/)”, already mentioned above, which addressed gender inequalities in participation at festivals, other initiatives were led by communities. The group Semblante Aragonés, practitioners of Aragonese jota (traditional dance), created a show called “[The feminine jota](https://www.cartv.es/aragoncultura/nuestra-cultura/la-jota-en-femenino)” (2019), changing traditional lyrics to tackle issues such as gender violence and pay differences. The show also incorporated a sign language interpreter. It was broadcast on Aragonese Radio and TV.

Strategies and/or action plans for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding at the national or sub-national level were developed in almost all reporting countries (40 out of 42, or 95%) (B11.2). Two thirds of the countries reporting strategies or action plans (27 out of 40, or 68%), noted the existence of plans designed for safeguarding specific elements, whether or not inscribed on the Lists of the Convention (B11.2, see Figure 11).

##### Diagram Description automatically generatedFigure 11: Percentage of countries establishing (or revising) and implementing national or sub-national strategies and/or action plans for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding (n=42) (B11.2)

In some cases, policies at the level of national strategic planning focused on specific kinds of intangible cultural heritage. Georgia’s Ten-Year Action Plan for the Development of Culture, for example, included specific objectives for the protection and promotion of folk sports. In other cases, safeguarding strategies were developed for specific elements, including community protocols or codes of ethics. This will be discussed further under Thematic Area VII on Safeguarding.

### Participation of communities concerned in policy-making and implementation[[44]](#footnote-44)

Communities participated in policy-making and implementation in different ways, ranging from inclusion of specific community representatives in policy processes or advisory frameworks, to more general forms of public consultation on policy. Almost all countries reported some extent of community participation informing cultural policies and administrative measures, but only about a third (15 out of 42, or 36%) reported high levels of such participation (B11.4, see Figure 12 below). For example, in Belgium, the research project “Virtuoos Vlaanderen” (2014) informed a new Flemish regulation in 2018, funding scholarships for apprentices to master practitioners. The vision paper “A Policy for Intangible Cultural Heritage in Flanders” was developed following a bottom-up approach involving communities and NGOs. It presented “heritage communities” and groups as the key actors in all safeguarding efforts, with the government assuming a facilitating, mediating and supporting role.

##### Chart, bar chart Description automatically generatedFigure 12. Extent of participation of communities, groups and individuals in cultural policy-making and implementation in reporting countries (n=42) (B11.4)

Policy-making was sometimes directly informed by community lobbying. For example, in 2018 the communities of the “[Hopping Procession of Echternach](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/hopping-procession-of-echternach-00392)” petitioned the Chamber of Deputies of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg regarding safeguarding of their element. The Chamber of Deputies held a public debate and the Ministries of Culture, and of Education, Childhood and Youth then took specific safeguarding measures concerning intangible cultural heritage in general, and the Echternach Dancing Procession in particular. A concept note on the implementation of the Convention, developed by the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg in 2018, contained an action plan, which served as a basis for the updating of the national inventory of intangible cultural heritage and the creation of a [website](http://www.iki.lu) dedicated to living heritage.

### Policies in the education sector[[45]](#footnote-45)

Nearly four fifths of reporting countries (33 out of 42 countries, or 79%) established policies, legal or administrative measures in the education sector that ensured recognition of, respect for and enhancement of intangible cultural heritage (B12.1), or strengthened its transmission (B12.2). Many education policies did not specifically mention intangible cultural heritage but focused more broadly on culture, intercultural or multicultural education, on folklore and folk culture, as well as on language and other related concepts. Nearly all countries (40 out of 42, or 95%) reported implementing policies to promote mother tongue instruction and multilingual education (B12.3). An increasing interest in intangible cultural heritage within educational curricula has been discussed above under Thematic Area II.

Several countries reported increased references to intangible cultural heritage, or the Convention, in education policies during the reporting period, although Norway reported also on some discontinued courses in the field of dance. For example, in Latvia both the Education Law and the General Education Law emphasized the need for students in various education contexts to have an understanding of cultural heritage and its role in identity, history and innovation. Students also had to take part in practising, safeguarding and promoting intangible cultural heritage in their local area. The new “Competence Approach to Curriculum” (Skola 2030), implemented from 2016 to 2023 by the National Centre for Education, integrated intangible cultural heritage into the study of language, culture and self-expression in art, and social and civics education. In Estonia, the overall objective of “Education Strategy 2035” was underpinned by the safeguarding of the Estonian language and culture. One important focus in the new Education Development Plan was thus "valuing Estonian culture and language and a cohesive society". Article 11 of Ukraine’s Law "On complete general secondary education" established a State Standard for educational programmes that included language and cultural competencies. Model curricula made available for local modification by schools included lessons on minority languages and cultural practices such as folk singing and paper cutting (vytynanka).

While much intangible cultural heritage remains informal in nature, regulation of vocational training for intangible cultural heritage practitioners within formal education was mentioned in the reports as an important way to recognize and promote intangible cultural heritage knowledge and skills. Denmark’s report noted the importance of formal vocational education for transmission of the intangible cultural heritage of Greenland Inuit, such as hunting ethics, dog care, building and use of a sled and a kayak (qajaq).

Formal vocational training was conducted in many different kinds of institutions. Of course, maintaining a close relationship between formal and non-formal forms of vocational education remains an important benchmark of its safeguarding potential. This was done both by recognizing non-formal vocational qualifications alongside formal ones, and by involving practitioners as educators in formal vocational institutions. For example, the State Agency for Vocational Education in the Republic of Azerbaijan organized and coordinated the activities of vocational education institutions under the Ministry of Education, ensuring the recognition of skills acquired through informal methods in fields such as copper craftsmanship, carpet weaving and traditional foodways. In Greece, a 2020 law[[46]](#footnote-46) regulated post-secondary technical and vocational education in various kinds of institutions, including Vocational Training Schools (SEK), Vocational Training Institutes (IEK), Lifelong Learning Centers and Apprenticeship Vocational Schools of the Greek Employment Organization (OAED). The Askardamykti Lifelong Learning Center, founded by a group of young people in 2014, was officially certified to provide vocational training. It created an environment for young craftspeople to engage with experienced practitioners and develop innovative ways to use and adapt traditional know-how in different crafts, including the making of stringed musical instruments, leather shoes and accessories, wood carving and wooden furniture design.

### Policies in sectors other than education and culture[[47]](#footnote-47)

As mentioned above, most reporting countries also took intangible cultural heritage into consideration in broader policies and administrative measures for inclusive social development, environmental sustainability and inclusive economic development. Bulgaria incorporated intangible cultural heritage into the National Development Programme “Bulgaria 2030”, for example, within the context of Agenda 2030. This policy framework recognized intangible cultural heritage as a source of identity and continuity, as a source of knowledge and skills and as a resource for achieving sustainable development, for example through cultural tourism and environmentally-friendly practices in agricultural production.

Overlaps between culture sector policies and those in other development sectors gave some indication of cross-cutting concerns about culture and development, and the degree to which coordination and communication were happening across sectors in reporting countries.

Most of the 41 countries reporting that they had policies supporting intangible cultural heritage safeguarding in the culture sector (B11.1) also had policies supporting intangible cultural heritage safeguarding in both education and other development sectors (27 out of 41, or 66%) (B12.1 and B13.2, see Figure 13).

The reports noted that the kind of data collected on intangible cultural heritage can affect the level of attention paid to this sector in policy-making. For example, the fact that traditional crafts are not classified as a specific category of non-industrial goods has led to low visibility in policy-making and reduced opportunities for targeted support.

##### Diagram Description automatically generatedFigure 13: Number of countries establishing, revising or implementing policies supporting intangible cultural heritage safeguarding in the culture (n=41), education (n=33) and development (n=34) sectors (B11.1, 12.1 and 13.2)

#### Policies for social, economic and environmental development[[48]](#footnote-48)

Broader policies and administrative measures for inclusive social development and environmental sustainability (B13.2) or inclusive economic development (B13.4) took intangible cultural heritage into consideration in around four fifths of the countries (34 out of 42 countries, or 81% in each case). In many countries, the aims of such policies were intertwined. For example, legal frameworks in Iceland focused on ensuring that increased economic activity in the Arctic region will contribute to sustainable utilization of resources and observe responsible handling of the fragile ecosystem and the conservation of biota. They also underlined the importance of sustaining the culture and way of life of indigenous peoples in the Arctic region. In Serbia, the “Strategy for Agriculture and Rural Development” (2014-2024) recognized the importance of intangible cultural heritage knowledge and skills, providing opportunities for intangible cultural heritage bearers and local communities to get involved in local economic development. The “Strategy of Sustainable Urban Development” (until 2030) highlighted the need to respect both tangible and intangible cultural heritage in spatial and urban planning.

Policies for inclusive social development and environmental sustainability taking intangible cultural heritage into consideration covered areas such as agriculture, food security, climate change, access to clean water and sustainable water use, gender equality and health care. Both the National Strategy for Sustainable Development (2015) and the National Strategy for Environmental Education (2020) in Portugal recognized the importance of intangible cultural heritage and access to natural environments for its practice. Specific laws have been passed to monitor the practice of fishing with xávega gear[[49]](#footnote-49) and to protect cork oaks and holm oaks needed for the practice of extracting cork.[[50]](#footnote-50) These elements were included in the national inventory of the intangible cultural heritage, as “Xávega art of Costa da Caparica” and “Cork extraction in the municipality of Coruche” respectively.

Just over two thirds of reporting countries (29 out of 42, or 69%) said that their policies recognized the importance of protecting the customary rights of communities and groups to ecosystems necessary for the practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage (B14.2). In many European countries, the customary rights and institutions of communities are recognized by the authorities in regard to the management of pastures, forests and access to wild foraging, fisheries or water resources. In Switzerland, the customary rights, and specifically water rights, of the cooperative organizations (consortages) in Valais have been recognized in law to support the management of traditional irrigation systems and mountain pastures.

As indicated above, tensions have arisen in some contexts regarding the relationship between environmental policies and intangible cultural heritage safeguarding. For example, in Germany, a group of thatchers opposed environmental legislation restricting access to reed beds in Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania for the purpose of cutting thatching materials. They argued that their craft was being discriminated against by the failure to classify reeds as a renewable raw material, and by the failure to equate the cutting of reed beds with the care of grasslands. They noted that their practice in fact contributed to healthy aquatic environments and the safeguarding of habitats for some species of fish, insects, amphibians and birds.

Policies related to economic development focused mostly on cultural tourism, festivals, traditional foodways and craft. Culinary culture was considered a particularly strong driver of local and sustainable tourism in many reporting countries. In Slovenia, intangible cultural heritage was referenced as an integral part of the tourist experience in the “Strategy for Sustainable Growth of Slovenian Tourism” (2017-2021), and was part of the new strategy to be adopted for the period 2022-2028. In this document, cultural heritage and creativity, and the ability to cooperate, have been represented as capital resources for growth and the development of a civic nation. In the Republic of North Macedonia, the Ministry of Economy developed a National Strategy for Development of Crafts. Municipalities, within their local strategies, also included reference to intangible cultural heritage safeguarding, primarily for the purpose of local economic development. Some policies sought to address the specific challenges of intangible cultural heritage safeguarding in the context of economic development. This issue will be discussed further below under ‘Availability of Legal Protection’.

#### Policies for peace and conflict resolution[[51]](#footnote-51)

Under Thematic Area V below, strategies for using intangible cultural heritage for dialogue promoting mutual respect, conflict resolution and peace-building will be discussed in more detail. This section focuses on the ways in which policies recognize intangible cultural heritage that promotes conflict resolution, whether by giving traditional conflict resolution mechanisms some legal status or supporting their functioning through policies and laws.

About half of the countries (20 out of 42, or 48%) took intangible cultural heritage into consideration in policies responding to situations of natural disaster or armed conflict (B13.3). Within the framework of the [ProCultHer](https://www.proculther.eu/) project, the Grand-Ducal Fire and Rescue Service (CGDIS) in Luxembourg, for example, has taken the safeguarding and protection of living heritage into account in elaborating rescue plans. Three fifths of the countries (25 out of 42, or 60%) reported that their policies and/or legal and administrative measures recognized intangible cultural heritage that contributes to peaceful conflict prevention and resolution (B14.3). Some countries provided public support to intangible cultural heritage practices focusing on preventing and resolving disputes. In Ireland, the [Reconciliation Fund](https://www.dfa.ie/reconciliation) of the Department of Foreign Affairs awarded grants to organizations working to build better relations between people in Northern Ireland, between North and South, and between Ireland and Britain.

Customary agreements may be recognized by administrative authorities at a local level even where they are not codified in law. In Andorra, traditional councils managed agreements in respect to grazing rights for livestock using a book of customary law, rather than formal laws. Towns that no longer have traditional councils continued to respect agreements with neighboring towns. Traditional mechanisms for conflict resolution can also be formalized, sometimes through customary law, or recognized in other ways. For example, in France, customary law and customary institutions in the French overseas collectivity of Wallis and Futuna and in the Department of Mayotte have been recognized as competent to resolve disputes among persons belonging to certain communities.

### Financial measures or incentives[[52]](#footnote-52)

All of the 42 countries reporting in this cycle said they had equitable public financial and/or technical support for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding, although only about half of them (22 out of 42, or 52%) prioritized intangible cultural heritage in need of urgent safeguarding (B11.3).

Thirty-one out of 42 countries (74%) reported they established or revised favourable financial or fiscal measures or incentives to facilitate and/or encourage the practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage (B13.5). The Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sports in Montenegro, for example, made an annual call for proposals seeking funding of protection and safeguarding of all cultural properties, including both tangible and intangible cultural heritage. Of these countries reporting on financial measures, 24 (out of 31, or 77%) ensured the availability of natural and other resources required for the practice of intangible cultural heritage. This also often had environmental benefits. State subsidies for the removal of wood in the forest using [working horses](https://www.horsepower.lu/centre-competence/infos--documentation/subventions-etatiques-au-luxembourg/) in Luxembourg, for example, were aimed both at safeguarding traditional techniques of animal traction as well as protecting available natural resources and maintaining biodiversity.

Among the countries reporting specific schemes for funding endangered intangible cultural heritage, Türkiye provided funding for safeguarding elements such as the “[Whistled Language](https://ich.unesco.org/en/USL/whistled-language-00658)” and the “[Traditional Ahlat stonework](https://ich.unesco.org/en/USL/traditional-ahlat-stonework-00655)” inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List on the basis of their safeguarding action plans. In Croatia, specific priority was also given to financial support for safeguarding endangered intangible cultural heritage. About a fifth of the countries reported on specific funding addressing threats associated with the COVID-19 pandemic (9 out of 42, or 21%, see B11.3 and B13.5). Some countries also set aside specific funding for safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage of marginalized groups or minorities, such as the Tater/Romani people in Norway. In Slovakia, the government has funded vouchers, subsidies and grants for practitioners, particularly from marginalized groups, through the Slovak Arts Council since 2016 and the public institution [Minority Cultures Fund](https://kultminor.sk/sk/) since 2018.

Reports from a few countries mentioned that more funding still goes to tangible than intangible heritage, but not all countries kept such statistics. This was partly because intangible cultural heritage funding has not always been distinguished from general cultural funding. This situation is gradually changing. For example, in Cyprus, State funding was specifically earmarked for intangible cultural heritage in 2016. The Cultural Services of the Ministry of Education, Sport and Youth, in collaboration with the Cyprus National Commission for UNESCO, launched a two-year pilot funding scheme to support projects and activities aimed at safeguarding elements inscribed on the National Inventory. Special attention was given to the revitalization of intangible cultural heritage practices – mostly traditional craftsmanship – and their adaptation to contemporary needs as well as to the promotion of intangible cultural heritage that is continuously recreated and transmitted. Organized groups of practitioners, local authorities, and NGOs collaborating with the communities concerned received funding under the scheme. In Romania, the National Cultural Fund provided biannual funding for cultural projects including projects based on intangible cultural heritage topics. In 2021, funding was prioritized for developing safeguarding plans relating to Romania’s inscriptions on the Representative List.

Aside from inventorying and documentation, financial and technical support included subsidizing festivals, culinary and craft fairs, workshops, educational and awareness-raising events, meeting places or venues, and safeguarding projects, as well as offering grants and prizes for bearers, cultural organizations and NGOs. For example, Monaco granted subsidies to associations working with intangible cultural heritage, and funded projects for cultural promotion. The Government of Monaco and the Monaco City Council provided communities with meeting places and facilitated the organization of festivities in public spaces. Some countries supported practitioners as traditional craftspeople, “human treasures” or “masters of folk art”. Tax incentives for craft practitioners, cultural initiatives and private enterprises in traditional craft were offered by Hungary, Türkiye, Lithuania and Belarus, among others.[[53]](#footnote-53) Some countries, such as Switzerland and Denmark, provided support through lottery funding to cultural initiatives in general, including intangible cultural heritage.

Support mechanisms were sometimes decentralized to sub-national levels of government, including cantons, provinces, districts or municipalities. The Grodno region in Belarus, for example, supported bearers of traditional weaving skills through a regional cultural award named after A.I. Dubko. In Switzerland, the Law on the Promotion of Culture (2018) established a fund for cultural heritage to support institutions and projects, as well as inventorying at the cantonal level. A revision of the Cultural Promotion Act in 2020, within the framework of the Cultural Promotion Bill 2021-2024, allowed financial support from the Confederation (i.e. at the national level of government) for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding projects.

Research on local contexts and community needs informed funding strategies in some countries. In Finland, Taike (the Arts Promotion Centre) conducted research in different parts of the country and cooperated with local actors to develop networks and funding strategies to meet local needs and identify opportunities to improve artists’ working conditions and livelihoods.

### Alignment of policies with the Ethical Principles[[54]](#footnote-54)

Reports from 38 out of the 42 countries (90%) noted that the Convention’s Ethical Principles were respected in development plans, policies and programmes relating to intangible cultural heritage (B13.1). However, as noted elsewhere, alignment of policies with ethical approaches in the field of intangible cultural heritage was not always specifically achieved by referencing the Ethical Principles themselves, but by following more general legal frameworks and guidelines regarding issues such as gender equality, community participation, cultural diversity and mutual respect.

These frameworks included constitutions, sustainable development and cultural policies, and regulations for environmental management or urban planning, whether at the national or sub-national level. In the Republic of Moldova, for example, “Tourism 2020”, the country’s strategy for tourism development, and its action plan for 2014-2020, positioned communities at the centre of developing cultural and rural tourism. A National Day of the Traditional Costume was established by a Decision of Parliament[[55]](#footnote-55) in order to encourage understanding of cultural diversity by displaying heritage costumes of different ethnic groups. Ethical frameworks and guidelines informed actions taken in regard to intangible cultural heritage projects. In Spain, laws on urban planning for heritage in the region of Castile and Leon, and the Cultural Rights of Navarre included ethical principles on intangible cultural heritage safeguarding.[[56]](#footnote-56) Financial support for intangible cultural heritage projects was also in some countries linked partly to the level of community participation and involvement that applicants could demonstrate.

### Availability of legal protection to communities concerned[[57]](#footnote-57)

Almost all countries (39 out of 42, or 93%) reported that forms of legal protection, such as intellectual property rights and privacy rights, were available to communities, groups and individuals when their intangible cultural heritage is exploited by others for commercial or other purposes (B14.1). In most countries, available forms of legal protection included conventional intellectual property rights such as copyright and performers’ rights, individual or collective trademarks, geographical indications and design rights, and general data protection laws. Special provision has sometimes been made for intangible cultural heritage in these laws. For example, Czechia’s Copyright Act permitted free use of products of traditional folk culture, but with the provision that “such works may only be used in a way that shall not detract from their value”.[[58]](#footnote-58)

Intellectual property protection has been used in some countries to help protect community interests and promote common economic benefit when their intangible cultural heritage elements were being used in a commercial context. In Italy, trademarks were registered in the case of “[Traditional Violin Craftsmanship in Cremona](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/traditional-violin-craftsmanship-in-cremona-00719)”, the “[Mediterranean diet](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/mediterranean-diet-00884)”, and the good safeguarding practice, [Tocatì](https://ich.unesco.org/en/BSP/tocat-a-shared-programme-for-the-safeguarding-of-traditional-games-and-sports-01709), to enable community members to differentiate their products or services from others in the market. Geographical indications and labelling schemes were also used to protect community interests and indicate the origin of goods. In Serbia, geographical indications were registered to protect the commercial use of the traditional names of some products linked to elements inscribed on the national inventory of intangible cultural heritage (Pirot cheese making, Pirot kilim making). In Norway, a community organization representing makers of traditional costumes (“bunads”) worked to introduce rules requiring garments to be labelled with the country of origin, so that consumers can understand whether the garment they are buying is imported or the result of local craft production.

In a number of cases, government schemes assisted practitioners of crafts or foodways by giving them access to a more general territorial brand to promote their work. The Hungarian Heritage House, a government institute, registered a trademark known as the “Peacock trademark” ([Páva védjegy](http://www.pavavedjegy.hu/)), for use by authorized folk art creators. The Association of Hungarian Folk Artists’ website promoted these products and their creators. The brand “Artisanal products of Andorra” (Productes artesans d'Andorra) was registered for use by local producers who practise certain artisanal production methods to promote their products. These products included artisanal cheeses and typical shepherd's clothing made from sheep's wool. In Greece, the Hellenic Agricultural Organization "Dimitra" developed a series of agricultural and livestock product quality labels, as well as a "Greek Label" designating traditional Greek products such as cheese and olive oil. These labels helped to raise awareness about the intangible cultural heritage associated with the products, and to assure consumers of their quality.

Public knowledge about the use of legal protection available for communities concerned aimed at intangible cultural heritage safeguarding can be low. Conventional intellectual property law (such as copyright, patents or design rights) does not easily apply to intangible cultural heritage that is handed down over the generations. A number of reports thus mentioned the value of training programmes about legal protections for intangible cultural heritage. In Poland, workshops on intellectual property rights were regularly organized for folk artists by the National Institute of Cultural Heritage. In Spain, the Intangia Association worked with experts and community members to develop good practices on managing intellectual property linked to intangible heritage.[[59]](#footnote-59) In the Nordic countries, considerable work has been done about the challenges and opportunities for indigenous Sámi and Inuit peoples in using conventional intellectual property rights and other forms of legal protection to safeguard intangible cultural heritage such as traditional handicrafts in commercial contexts.[[60]](#footnote-60)

### Baselines and targets

Table 6 below shows that almost all of the reporting countries fully satisfied the core indicator B11 at the baseline, in regard to policies in the culture sector (37 out of 42, or 88%). With regard to the integration of intangible cultural heritage in policies in the education sector, just over two thirds of countries satisfied the core indicator B12 at the baseline (29 out of 42, or 69%). A third of all reporting countries fully satisfied the core indicator B13 at the baseline, in regard to the integration of intangible cultural heritage in policies in other sectors (14 out of 42, or 33%). Just under half of the countries fully satisfied the core indicator B14 at the baseline in regard to respect for customary rights, practices and expressions in policies (19 out of 42, or 45%).

Over four fifths of reporting countries that set a target, set their targets as equal to their baseline for B11 and B14 (29 and 30 out of 35, or 83% and 86% respectively). However, reporting countries were more confident about future progress on B12 and B13, with, in the case of B12, about two thirds (24 out of 35, or 69%) setting their target at the baseline, and a quarter (9 out of 35, or 26%) setting it above. Between six and seven countries likely did not set targets for B11-14.[[61]](#footnote-61)

##### Table 6: Attainment scores on the baseline for indicators B11-B14 in reporting countries (n=42)

| **Indicator** | **Not satisfied** | **Minimally** | **Partially** | **Largely** | **Satisfied** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B11. Extent to which policies as well as legal and administrative measures in the field of culture reflect the diversity of intangible cultural heritage and the importance of its safeguarding and are implemented | 0 / 42 | 0 / 42 | 1 / 42 | 4 / 42 | 37 / 42 |
| B12. Extent to which policies as well as legal and administrative measures in the field of education reflect the diversity of intangible cultural heritage and the importance of its safeguarding and are implemented | 2 / 42 | 4 / 42 | 6 / 42 | 1 / 42 | 29 / 42 |
| B13. Extent to which policies as well as legal and administrative measures in fields other than culture and education reflect the diversity of intangible cultural heritage and the importance of its safeguarding and are implemented | 0 / 42 | 2 / 42 | 11 / 42 | 15 / 42 | 14 / 42 |
| B14. Extent to which policies as well as legal and administrative measures respect customary rights, practices and expressions, particularly as regards the practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage | 2 / 42 | 1 / 42 | 5 / 42 | 15 / 42 | 19 / 42 |

Thematic area V - The role of intangible cultural heritage in society

The Convention suggests that intangible cultural heritage is of importance to communities, groups and individuals concerned, as it ‘provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity’ (Article 2.1). Of course, specific elements of intangible cultural heritage have a particular meaning and value to bearer communities, including as a means of dialogue, a source of knowledge and skills, and a resource for sustainable development. The requirement of ‘mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals’ figures into the Convention’s definition of intangible cultural heritage (Article 2.1), and the Convention’s aim to “ensure respect for the intangible cultural heritage of the communities, groups and individuals concerned” (Article 1(b)) implies respect for those people as well as their intangible cultural heritage.

The Convention also recommends that States Parties adopt “a general policy aimed at promoting the function of the intangible cultural heritage in society, and at integrating the safeguarding of such heritage into planning programmes” (Article 13(a)). These policies should be inclusive and non-discriminatory, in accordance with the emphasis on cultural diversity in the Convention’s Preamble, Article 2.1, Article 11 and related texts. The Operational Directives paragraph 174, for example, says that “States Parties shall endeavour to ensure that their safeguarding plans and programmes are fully inclusive of all sectors and strata of society, including indigenous peoples, migrants, immigrants and refugees, people of different ages and genders, persons with disabilities and members of vulnerable groups, in conformity with Article 11 of the Convention”.

The periodic report thus contains a number of questions about the role of intangible cultural heritage in society, particularly for bearer communities, and how it is being promoted and recognized, for example in development interventions. These are as follows:

***List of core indicators and assessment factors on the role of intangible cultural heritage in society (B15-B16)***

| **Core Indicators** | **Assessment according to the following** |
| --- | --- |
| B15. Extent to which the importance of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding in society is recognized, both by the communities, groups and individuals concerned and by society at large | * 1. Communities, groups and individuals use their intangible cultural heritage for their well-being, including in the context of sustainable development programmes. |
| * 1. Communities, groups and individuals use their intangible cultural heritage for dialogue promoting mutual respect, conflict resolution and peace-building. |
| * 1. Development interventions recognize the importance of intangible cultural heritage in society as a source of identity and continuity, and as a source of knowledge and skills, and strengthen its role as a resource to enable sustainable development. |
| B16. Extent to which the importance of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage is recognized through inclusive plans and programmes that foster self-respect and mutual respect | * 1. Intangible cultural heritage safeguarding plans and programmes are inclusive of all sectors and strata of society, including, but not limited to: * indigenous peoples; * groups with different ethnic identities; * migrants, immigrants and refugees; * people of different ages; * people of different genders; * persons with disabilities; * members of vulnerable groups. |
| * 1. Self-respect and mutual respect are fostered among communities, groups and individuals through safeguarding plans and programmes for intangible cultural heritage in general and/or for specific elements of intangible cultural heritage, whether or not inscribed. |

### Overview of core indicators B15-B16

Almost all countries reported that communities, groups and individuals used their intangible cultural heritage for promoting well-being to some extent (B15.1). Acknowledging intangible cultural heritage as part of collective memory and identity fostered a sense of community, and intangible cultural heritage practice contributed to improving quality of life in some cases. Nearly all countries reported that communities, groups and individuals used their intangible cultural heritage for dialogue promoting mutual respect, conflict resolution and peace-building to some degree (B15.2). Some forms of intangible cultural heritage themselves promoted conflict resolution and peace-building, or suggested solutions to current questions. However, the reports also noted some disputes about human rights compliance within certain intangible cultural heritage practices.

Over four fifths of countries noted that development interventions recognized the importance of intangible cultural heritage in society, whether as a source of identity and continuity, as a source of knowledge and skills and as a resource for sustainable development (B15.2). Community uses of intangible cultural heritage for well-being were frequently intertwined with maintaining livelihoods and encouraging environmental sustainability. Development programming has also become more attentive to intangible cultural heritage by integrating investments in local community support, small agri-food or craft businesses and cultural tourism, and environmental management. The reports indicated a number of ways in which local communities have been involved in shaping such development strategies. Nearly three fifths of the reporting countries (59%) thus fully satisfied the core indicator B15 at the baseline, with another quarter of the countries satisfying it largely (26%).

Most of the countries reported involving people of different ages, ethnic identities and genders, as well as people with disabilities, in safeguarding plans and programmes (B16.1). About three fifths reported inclusivity in respect to members of vulnerable groups and migrants, immigrants or refugees. A third reported involving indigenous peoples. In many cases, non-discrimination is mandated in legislation or policy that applies to intangible cultural heritage safeguarding, as it does to all public or private initiatives. Many elements of intangible cultural heritage, such as festivals, also encourage inclusive participation, although some are primarily practised by specific communities or groups. The reports gave a number of examples of active measures to recognize underrepresented intangible cultural heritage, address cases of discrimination and to promote inclusive participation, where appropriate and with community consent. Nearly all countries reported that safeguarding plans and programmes for intangible cultural heritage fostered self-respect within and mutual respect between communities, groups and individuals (B16.2). Around four fifths of reporting countries (79%) thus fully satisfied the core indicator B16 at the baseline, regarding the inclusivity of safeguarding plans and programmes that foster self-respect and mutual respect.

### Challenges and opportunities

Intangible cultural heritage has been well recognized in most of the reporting countries as a contributor to well-being, peace and conflict reduction, as well as to environmental and economic development. The reports highlighted the potential benefits of community engagement in development programming, linking local needs to national development frameworks, and developing an evidence base for future planning. This can help to maximize synergies between development initiatives and intangible cultural heritage safeguarding, and to minimize risks of over-commercialization or misrepresentation.

Many reports noted the importance of foregrounding marginalized community voices in supporting the role of intangible cultural heritage in social development. Some gave opportunities for marginalized communities and groups to decide whether and how to share their cultural practices with others, what accommodations might be needed, and whether and how they wish to participate in majority cultural practices and events. It is clear from the reports that the specific contribution of marginalized groups to mainstream forms of cultural heritage can be recognized and acknowledged, on their own terms. Further dialogue is needed on how to address conflicts over intangible cultural heritage practice, where these occur.

### Inclusivity of safeguarding plans and programmes[[62]](#footnote-62)

Inclusivity of safeguarding plans and programmes and strategies for addressing discrimination have been covered to some extent elsewhere in this report, particularly in regard to ethnic background, gender or sexual orientation, age and indigenous peoples. Reporting countries provided a number of examples of safeguarding programmes including people with disabilities and vulnerable groups, ranging from engagement in communal intangible cultural heritage activities, such as sport, music or craft, and providing training for sustainable livelihoods. Some of these have been mentioned above under thematic area II on education.

Inclusivity regarding gender, ethnic identity, age, and disability in safeguarding plans and programmes was reported by over four fifths of countries (B16.1, see Figure 3 above). Inclusivity was reported by 38 out of 41 (or 93%) of countries regarding gender and by 33 out of 41 (or 81%) countries regarding persons with disabilities. Inclusivity of members of vulnerable groups and migrants, immigrants or refugees in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding plans and programmes was reported by fewer countries: 25 (or 61%) and 24 (or 59%) out of 41 countries respectively. It is worth noting, however, that in multicultural urban contexts there may be significant overlap, for example, between inclusivity of migrants and inclusivity of different ethnic groups, and that these are fluid categories, as Belgium’s report pointed out. Only about a third of the countries (16 out of 41, or 39%) reported the involvement of indigenous peoples in these plans and programmes; as noted above, this was partly because most countries did not report about any indigenous peoples in their territory.

Most countries reported involving diverse groups in safeguarding plans and programmes due to the fact that inclusivity or non-discrimination of various kinds was mandated at the policy level. Safeguarding specific elements of intangible cultural heritage was also frequently described as inclusive because many practices placed no restrictions on participation and/or were themselves based on inclusionary values. One example given in the reports was the anti-authoritarian open-source ethos of digital experts in the Danish branch of the transnational “Demoscene”, a loosely connected underground culture, in which enthusiasts in computer software, hardware programming and manufacturing gathered together to share their work. Other practices promoted inclusivity by reaching out to marginalized groups. In Slovenia, just before New Year, Grandfather Frost, a friendly old man with a long white beard and moustache, pays visits to children in their homes and schools to bestow gifts. The Slovenian Association of Friends of Youth, an NGO, collected donations so that he could provide gifts for children from disadvantaged backgrounds.

As will be discussed further below, the success of efforts promoting increased inclusivity in safeguarding programmes may depend not just on the existence of non-discriminatory policies, or the absence of restrictions on participation in shared forms of heritage, but also on the development of active measures to recognize underrepresented intangible cultural heritage and to promote inclusive participation, where appropriate. In the case of people with disabilities, for example, this could include provision of wheelchair access and special toilet facilities for intangible cultural heritage events, and provision for sign language or Braille information services. Various reports demonstrated that attitudes to disability can be changed through campaigns and festivals, making the issue visible in the community. Implementing such strategies requires resources, expertise and planning, however. The Museum of Krakow (Poland) trained over 85 culture professionals to make museum educational programmes more accessible. Examples of strategies for greater inclusivity of other marginalized or underrepresented groups have been given elsewhere in this report.

### Use of intangible cultural heritage to promote well-being[[63]](#footnote-63)

Communities, groups and individuals were reported by almost all countries in this cycle (41 out of 42, or 98%) to have used their intangible cultural heritage for promoting well-being (B15.1). Taking healthy traditional foods or medicines, engaging in dancing and craft, and joining communal, culturally-relevant activities can promote individual health and build social cohesion. Environmentally beneficial and economically sustainable intangible cultural heritage practice can also support broader well-being and livelihoods within a community.

Certain kinds of intangible cultural heritage can reportedly enhance well-being directly, and the fact that interest in them increased during the COVID-19 pandemic was taken as a sign of their value to practitioners. The reports gave examples of traditional games, traditional medicines, dancing, horse riding, “[Alpinism](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/alpinism-01471)”, swimming in hot springs, [sauna](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/sauna-culture-in-finland-01596), fishing, hunting, foraging and agricultural work promoting social cohesion and well-being. The therapeutic value of craft for the health of older people or as a rehabilitative method in correctional facilities was noted in several reports, including that of Malta. Learning and practising skills and activities such as cooking, [miniature painting](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/art-of-miniature-01598) and knitting can improve mental and physical health.

Practising intangible cultural heritage of a collective nature, such as festivals, storytelling and traditional games was reported to contribute to collective memory and identity, and foster a sense of community. The Storytelling Network in Sweden suggested that [storytelling](https://ich.unesco.org/en/BSP/land-of-legends-programme-for-promoting-and-revitalizing-the-art-of-storytelling-in-kronoberg-region-01392) strengthens self-esteem and identity, showcasing cultural heritage and bringing it to life. Storytelling is also a powerful pedagogical tool that can contribute to understanding, interest, and commitment to learning complex subjects. In Switzerland, the Badenfahrt, a large festival that takes place approximately every ten years in Baden in the canton of Aargau, has brought together the entire population of the city in a festive atmosphere around shows and cultural events of all kinds and for all audiences.

Scientific evidence of the effect of intangible cultural heritage on well-being is available, although not always widely disseminated. The Ministry of Health in Croatia, for example, promotes the “[Mediterranean diet](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/mediterranean-diet-00884)” in health care provision because of its association with lower mortality, reduced levels of obesity, cardiovascular disease and metabolic syndrome. Norway’s report shared studies about the positive health benefits of [culture and language](https://www.helsebiblioteket.no/267203.cms) activities in general, “yoik” performances (a vocal tradition in Sápmi), [reindeer herding](https://forskningsprosjekter.ihelse.net/prosjekt/PFP1115-13) and the [preservation of boats](https://gupea.ub.gu.se/handle/2077/64378). In Finland, the “Culture for All” service and the Arts Promotion Centre Finland produced several reports and surveys on cultural well-being. Based on this evidence, doctors were allowed to prescribe “100 Minutes of Art” or other cultural activities in a situation where the possible causes of the disorder may be related to a lack of social inclusion or complex health challenges. By the end of the reporting cycle, nearly 500 qualified Forest Mind instructors offered a program, originally launched in 2014, connecting training on nature-based well-being and mind skills to promote self-awareness, stress relief and re-invigoration.

Community uses of intangible cultural heritage for well-being were frequently intertwined with maintaining livelihoods and environmental sustainability. Through events, sale of traditional foods, crafts or cultural tourism, intangible cultural heritage practice in many cases supported livelihoods, which led to increased community well-being. In Bulgaria, the Chestnut festival held in mid-October in the village of Kolarovo in the Belasitsa Nature Park raised awareness about traditional horo-dances and games, and provided a venue for local practitioners to show and sell traditional products and food from the local area. Further examples of the inclusion of intangible cultural heritage in development programming will be included below under B15.3.

### Use of intangible cultural heritage for dialogue promoting mutual respect, conflict resolution and peace-building[[64]](#footnote-64)

Nearly all countries (40 out of 42, or 95%) reported that communities, groups and individuals used their intangible cultural heritage for dialogue promoting mutual respect, conflict resolution and peace-building (B15.2). Around the same number of countries (41 out of 42, or 98%) reported that safeguarding plans and programmes promoted self-respect and mutual respect (B16.2). The reports provided a number of examples of intangible cultural heritage practices and events being inclusive and welcoming to all, and also identified ways to address situations where intangible cultural heritage practice was itself a source of conflict.

Some forms of intangible cultural heritage themselves promote conflict resolution and peace-building. For example, the elements [Consensus-seeking and direct democracy](https://www.lebendige-traditionen.ch/tradition/en/home/traditionen/konsenskultur-und-direkte-demokratie.html) and [Clubs and societies](https://www.lebendige-traditionen.ch/tradition/en/home/traditions/clubs-and-societies.html), inscribed in the Swiss Inventory of Living Heritage, highlighted the importance of collective action in community building and conflict resolution. Collective forms of action help people deal with disasters. In Lower Austria, the intangible cultural heritage practice expressed by the “Association for Mutual Assistance in Fire Emergencies” (Nebenleistung), a neighborhood self-help organization, provided monetary and in-kind assistance to local residents after fires. Festivals and events can be important in maintaining contacts between cultural groups in order to promote peace, even after a period of conflict. Luxembourg’s Echternach Dance Procession gives a place of honour to German pilgrims, and thus promotes mutual respect and peace-building at the site of the atrocities perpetrated during the Second World War. In Germany, the “Dragon Stab” of Furth im Wald folk theatre (Bavaria) has tackled current social developments and flagged up possible solutions taken from parallel situations in history. The Bochum May Evening Festival (North Rhine-Westphalia) re-enacted the reconciliation of Dortmund and Bochum after a medieval feud, expressing mutual respect and the consolidation of peace.

Intangible cultural heritage can also be a means of welcoming and including marginalized, migrant or minority groups, for example by fostering inclusivity at festivals and events and/or information sharing about cultural practices and intercultural engagement. Georgia’s report noted that different communities frequently came to share aspects of their intangible cultural heritage over time, and thus developed shared points of contact. For example, Georgians, Armenians and Russians visit their Azerbaijani neighbors on the feast of Kurban-Bayram.

Raising awareness about the diversity of intangible cultural heritage promoted mutual respect and inclusion, and reduced conflict, as a number of countries noted, especially in regard to marginalized or minority groups. This can involve creating new combinations of traditions to include different groups. In France, the Centre for Traditional Music in the Rhône-Alps (CMTRA) worked with Le Rize, the Centre for Memories and Society in Villeurbanne, helping a class of fifth grade students in 2021 to compose the city's intercultural anthem using documentation of the music of migrant communities in the city that had been collected in 2008.

Various strategies were used to make safeguarding programmes more inclusive and self-reflexive in cases where intangible cultural heritage was the subject of controversy and disagreement. The Netherlands, for example, has published a professional code for communities, groups and individuals based on the Ethical Principles. The Netherlands Institute for Human Rights, an independent agency that oversees compliance with human rights in both the European and Caribbean Netherlands, issued recommendations on ethical concerns raised about the tradition of St Nicholas and “Black Pete” (Zwarte Piet), his assistant, who has often been depicted in blackface. Under the project “Heritage in Motion”, the Dutch Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage (KIEN) facilitated community and public dialogue on the issue. The documentary “White is a colour too” (2016) was used to present different perspectives on the controversy about the characterization of Zwarte Piet. The emotion networking method developed by De Reinwardt Academy, together with the archive and museum “Imagine IC”, was used to provide insights into the complex interplays between emotions and interests that inform understandings about heritage and associated communities.

Broader strategic approaches have also been effective in reducing conflict and increasing inclusivity. Discrimination was actively addressed in Finland through a Diversity Agent Course and Diversity Clinic project launched in 2021, under the “Culture for All” service supported by the Ministry of Education and Culture. These initiatives provided art and cultural institutions across the country with tools for anti-racist work and consideration of diversity.

### Role of intangible cultural heritage in society recognized in development interventions[[65]](#footnote-65)

Research and documentation (see thematic area III) and policies and legislation, especially in the area of sustainable development (see thematic area IV), have encouraged many development programmes to be more attentive to the role of intangible cultural heritage in society. Many reports mentioned development programmes at the national level that referenced intangible cultural heritage, as noted above.

The reports indicated several ways in which intangible cultural heritage was made visible in development planning policies at the national and local levels. Development interventions reportedly recognized the importance of intangible cultural heritage in society, whether as a source of identity and continuity, as a source of knowledge and skills and as a resource for sustainable development in over four fifths of countries (35 out of 41, or 85%), as Figure 14 below demonstrates (B15.3). Of these, 89% (31 out of 35 countries) recognized intangible cultural heritage as a source of identity and continuity, 77% (27 out of 35) as a source of knowledge and skills, and 86% (30 out of 35) as a resource to enable sustainable development. In the examples given in the reports, promoting intangible cultural heritage as a source of identity was often linked to programmes for sustainable development and skills acquisition.

##### Chart, bar chart Description automatically generatedFigure 14: Recognition of the importance of intangible cultural heritage in society, in development interventions in reporting countries (n=35) (B15.3)

Creative approaches involving communities can help ensure that intangible cultural heritage is included in local development planning. In Estonia, for five years prior to the end of this reporting cycle, a “social hackathon” (“Vunki mano") was held in the Võrumaa region. This involved local residents in the planning process, and as a result, several development initiatives included intangible cultural heritage.[[66]](#footnote-66)

##### Example: Including intangible cultural heritage in comprehensive development planning, in line with the Ethical Principles (Lithuania)

In Lithuania, nearly fifty Local Action Groups, representing communities, NGOs, business and municipal administrations, developed long-term rural development strategies, including measures to safeguard cultural identity and ensure the continuity of intangible cultural heritage. The local strategies were aligned with national and EU rural development priorities and implemented with support from the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (LEADER) of the EU.

A new Comprehensive Plan of the Territory of the Republic of Lithuania was adopted by the government of the country in September 2021. The Plan incorporated strategic policies across various fields including business, agriculture, tourism, recreation, protection of the environment, landscape and biodiversity, natural and cultural heritage, and creation of infrastructure. The document acknowledged the importance of cultural heritage in building sustainable communities and economic development, developing regional and local identities, and contributing to the social and economic attractiveness of regions. Safeguarding of tangible and intangible cultural heritage was thus included in the strategic aims of the Plan: 1) to increase the country‘s regional and international competitiveness, and 2) to promote regional development.

In line with the Ethical Principles, the Plan acknowledges that local communities play a central role in identifying and safeguarding their intangible cultural heritage, so that they can benefit from its use in areas such as crafts, agriculture and tourism. Particular attention is paid to the inclusion of people belonging to national minorities and their cultural heritage in the Plan. It also aims to ensure better access of persons with disabilities to cultural heritage resources, both tangible and intangible.

Community perspectives shaped ideas about what constitutes development in some cases. France’s report noted that in Fonds-Saint-Denis (Martinique), development approaches were influenced by local perspectives on the social and solidarity economy. These ideas were introduced by the Lasotè association, created by local farmers in 2008, drawing on the humanist values of mutual aid practices (lasotè). Lasotè is a form of intangible cultural heritage developed in the aftermath of the abolition of slavery in the hills of the island. France’s report also noted the benefits for communities of integrating intangible cultural heritage into development planning in other parts of the country. Since a once-marginalized Gwoka musical practice has been revitalized and strengthened in Guadeloupe, for example, it has created about a thousand jobs, including opportunities for those who make the instruments.

Development strategies recognizing the importance of intangible cultural heritage frequently cut across the cultural, social, economic and environmental development spectrum, integrating investments in awareness-raising, community support, business and tourism, and environment management. For example, including intangible cultural heritage in tourism development strategies helped both to raise awareness of the identities of specific locations or communities, and to promote businesses linked to local festivals, foods, crafts, language or place names. Tourism strategies were linked to sustainable environmental development in some cases. In northern Spain, for example, promotion of the rural routes of the Way of Saint James, part of the Camino de Santiago, was used to support economic development, heritage safeguarding and environmental regeneration. Recognition of foods as intangible cultural heritage supported practitioner livelihoods and helped maintain traditional landscapes, including techniques such as [drystone walling](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/art-of-dry-stone-walling-knowledge-and-techniques-01393).

##### Example: Integration of intangible cultural heritage in tourism development strategies (Armenia)

In a project called “[My Armenia](https://myarmenia.si.edu/en/about-us/)” (2016-2021), Armenian partners worked with the Smithsonian Institution of the United States and the UN Development Programme to develop cultural tourism strategies across the country. Researchers from the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Armenia worked with communities at pilot sites to identify viable elements of intangible cultural heritage that could form the basis for community-based cultural tourism proposals, foregrounding storytelling and local narratives. Project partners also worked with regional craftsmen to support training, technical skills development, product design, pricing and marketing. As part of this initiative, the project “My Handmade Armenia” promoted the recognition and, in some cases, the restoration of craft traditions such as wood carving, stone carving, embroidery, weaving and pottery. This helped to promote transmission of intangible cultural heritage skills within the community.

Many reports noted the rising popularity and social, economic and environmental value of traditionally-produced foods, their importance in tourism and business development planning, and the link to sustainable agriculture, land-use planning and environmental management. Including intangible cultural heritage in development planning can promote safeguarding. Promotion of specific traditional dishes through tourism, as well as competitions, events and round tables, can also encourage local awareness, practice and transmission of food heritage as well as local participation in related intangible cultural heritage festivals. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, for example, an NGO called “Slow Food from Trebinje” worked with students of the College of Tourism to create an online promotional tourist map, with information about heritage foods and local producers, and thematic trails on topics such as traditional cheeses and honey. This project aimed to raise awareness and encourage production and consumption of local traditional foods. A similar project in Bulgaria in 2021 involved the creation of a “CulinarFest” Android [mobile application](https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=com.gmail.stani30000.apv2) (financed by the National Culture Fund) to promote culinary festivals. It provided access to a calendar with information about 20 local festivals, including the festival programme, a gourmet emblem of the region with local dishes, and an ethnographic study of the local culinary art.

Many development programmes focused on handicrafts, sometimes linked to tourism or social and business development. With a view to improving the living and working standards in rural areas and to diversify the rural economy through non-agricultural activities, for example, the Republic of Moldova offered grants in support of community-led projects aimed at the safeguarding, development, and diversification of crafts in rural areas, for example through the development of educational and training centres. In Malta, small family-run businesses making traditional foods and crafts benefited from access to government-subsidized premises in Craft Villages and the “Ta’ Qali Craft Village and Interpretation Centre”. In Hungary, the municipality in Kalocsa supported the Association of Kalocsa Tradition to set up its own building, where members of the association can gather regularly, organize exhibitions, folk music concerts, craft demonstrations and traditional programmes. These examples underlined importance of ensuring ongoing access to spaces and places for transmission of intangible cultural heritage in development programming.

A number of the development initiatives mentioned in the reports were concerned about environmental sustainability, for example through reuse and recycling in handicraft projects or through eco-tourism and green agriculture. In Romania, the Ivan Patzaichin–Mila 23 Association in the Danube Delta used local intangible cultural heritage knowledge relating to the natural landscape and wetlands management to design local development initiatives in ecotourism, green infrastructure, education and social reintegration around Mila 23, a typical fishing village. Germany noted that traditional techniques of meadow irrigation in the Queichwiesen between Landau and Germersheim (Rhineland-Palatinate) created periodically humid water meadows that offer a high degree of biodiversity and a habitat for numerous red-listed species. This helped farmers to get a good hay yield even without using fertilizers which enabled them to participate in local nature conservation programmes.

Some reports mentioned challenges in integrating safeguarding and economic development. For example, North Macedonia mentioned that threats identified in their inventory of intangible cultural heritage included decontextualization as a consequence of adaptation of the intangible heritage for the needs of tourism, theatricalization and excessive commercialization. Other reports mentioned situations of over-tourism when visitor numbers are uncontrolled and communities suffer from a lack of privacy. Several reports also noted the negative impact on safeguarding of insufficient remuneration of practitioners and unremunerated costs from setting up events. This underlined the importance of equitable distribution of benefits. Various strategies were used to address such problems, including community protocols, codes of ethics, legal measures and support to practitioners and businesses, mentioned in various sections above and below under the Thematic Areas on Policies and Awareness raising. The Ministry of Culture and Tourism in Türkiye, for example, issued three circulars in 2008, 2013 and 2017 to help guard against decontextualization of the “[Mevlevi Sema ceremony](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/mevlevi-sema-ceremony-00100)”. The circulars explained that the element should be performed in appropriate spaces and conditions, with suitable materials and by skilled and experienced practitioners.

### Baselines and targets

Table 7 below shows that about three fifths of the reporting countries (25 out of 42, or 59%) fully satisfied the core indicator B15 at the baseline. Another quarter (11 out of 42, or 26%) satisfied it largely, and the rest clustered mainly in the “partially” category. Nearly four fifths of reporting countries (33 out of 42, or 79%) fully satisfied the core indicator B16 at the baseline, regarding the inclusivity of safeguarding plans and programmes that foster self-respect and mutual respect.

Over four fifths of reporting countries that set a target, set their targets as equal to their baseline for B15 and B16 (29 out of 35, or 83%). In each case, only a few of the remaining countries set their targets above or below the baseline. Seven countries likely did not set targets for B15 and B16.[[67]](#footnote-67)

##### Table 7: Attainment scores on the baseline for indicators B15 and B16 in reporting countries (n=42)

| **Indicator** | **Not satisfied** | **Minimally** | **Partially** | **Largely** | **Satisfied** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B15. Extent to which the importance of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding in society is recognized, both by the communities, groups and individuals concerned and by society at large | 0/42 | 1/42 | 5/42 | 11/42 | 25/42 |
| B16. Extent to which the importance of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage is recognized through inclusive plans and programmes that foster self-respect and mutual respect | 1/42 | 0/42 | 2/42 | 6/42 | 33/42 |

Thematic area VI – Awareness raising about the importance of intangible cultural heritage

Awareness raising about the importance of intangible cultural heritage is one of the Convention’s main four purposes (Article 1(c)) and can help ensure broad appreciation of it. To this end, States are encouraged to “ensure recognition of, respect for, and enhancement of the intangible cultural heritage in society, in particular through: (i) educational, awareness-raising and information programmes, aimed at the general public, in particular young people” (Article 14(a), see also ODs 100-117). Awareness-raising activities should be carried out with wide community participation in line with Article 15, and in conformity with relevant Ethical Principles.

The periodic report thus contains a number of questions about awareness-raising activities, community and youth participation in them, the role of media and actors of the public sector, and alignment with the Ethical Principles. These are as follows:

***List of core indicators and assessment factors on awareness raising about the importance of intangible cultural heritage (B17-B20)***

| **Core indicators** | **Assessment according to the following** |
| --- | --- |
| B17. Extent to which communities, groups and individuals participate widely in raising awareness about the importance of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding | * 1. Awareness-raising actions reflect the inclusive and widest possible participation of communities, groups and individuals concerned. |
| * 1. The free, prior, sustained and informed consent of communities, groups and individuals concerned is secured for conducting awareness-raising activities concerning specific elements of their intangible cultural heritage. |
| * 1. The rights of communities, groups and individuals and their moral and material interests are duly protected when raising awareness about their intangible cultural heritage. |
| * 1. Youth are actively engaged in awareness-raising activities, including collecting and disseminating information about the intangible cultural heritage of their communities or groups. |
| * 1. Communities, groups and individuals use information and communication technologies and all forms of media, in particular new media, for raising awareness of the importance of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding. |
| B18. Extent to which media are involved in raising awareness about the importance of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding and in promoting understanding and mutual respect | * 1. Media coverage raises awareness of the importance of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding and promotes mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals. |
| * 1. Specific cooperation activities or programmes concerning intangible cultural heritage are established and implemented between various intangible cultural heritage stakeholders and media organizations, including capacity-building activities. |
| * 1. Media programming on intangible cultural heritage is inclusive, utilizes the languages of the communities and groups concerned, and/or addresses different target groups. |
| * 1. Media coverage of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding is in line with the concepts and terminology of the Convention. |
| B19. Extent to which public information measures raise awareness about the importance of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding and promote understanding and mutual respect | * 1. Practitioners and bearers of intangible cultural heritage are acknowledged publicly, on an inclusive basis, through policies and programmes. |
| * 1. Public events concerning intangible cultural heritage, its importance and safeguarding, and the Convention, are organized for communities, groups and individuals, the general public, researchers, the media and other stakeholders. |
| * 1. Programmes for promotion and dissemination of good safeguarding practices are fostered and supported. |
| * 1. Public information on intangible cultural heritage promotes mutual respect and appreciation within and between communities and groups. |
| B20. Extent to which programmes raising awareness of intangible cultural heritage respect the relevant ethical principles | * 1. The Ethical Principles for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage are respected in awareness-raising activities. |
| * 1. Ethical principles, particularly as embodied in relevant professional codes or standards, are respected in awareness-raising activities. |

### Overview of core indicators B17-B20

Community participation in awareness raising about their intangible cultural heritage (B17.1), with their free, prior, sustained and informed consent (B17.2), was reported by almost all countries. Inventorying processes, in particular, seem to have helped to create both a focus for community engagement and dialogue, and an opportunity for more general information sharing about intangible cultural heritage elements, as discussed above in thematic area III. More than four fifths of countries reported that there were mechanisms in place that duly protected the rights of communities concerned, and their moral and material interests during awareness raising activities about their intangible cultural heritage (B17.3). In many countries, additional consultation with practitioners prior to the implementation of awareness-raising activities was expected, or even required. Such mechanisms often derived from existing laws related to intellectual property rights and data protection.

Youth engagement in awareness raising about intangible cultural heritage was encouraged by the inclusion of intangible cultural heritage in education, as discussed in thematic area II, and by use of new media platforms. In almost all reporting countries, mechanisms were in place to facilitate the active engagement of the youth in awareness-raising activities, including the collection and dissemination of information about intangible cultural heritage (B17.4). All countries reported that communities, groups and individuals used information and communication technologies or any other form of media, in particular new media, for raising awareness of the importance of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding (B17.5). Nearly four fifths of reporting countries (79%) thus fully satisfied the core indicator B17 at the baseline, regarding the extent to which communities, groups and individuals participate widely in raising awareness about the importance of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding.

Media coverage was reported to raise awareness of the importance of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding in all countries (B18.1). Inclusion of elements on inventories, or inscription on the Lists of the Convention or selection for the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices stimulated media coverage. Most countries reported that media coverage promoted mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals. Almost all of the reporting countries reported joint cooperation activities or programmes between the media and other stakeholders concerning intangible cultural heritage, including capacity-building activities (B18.2).

Almost all countries reported that intangible cultural heritage-related media coverage was inclusive and utilized the language(s) of the communities and groups concerned (B18.3). Four fifths of countries reported that media programming on intangible cultural heritage addressed different target groups (B18.3). However, less than a fifth of countries reported that media coverage was highly in line with the concepts and terminology of the Convention (B18.4). Thus, just over three fifths of reporting countries (62%) fully satisfied the core indicator B18 at the baseline, regarding media involvement in raising awareness about the importance of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding and in promoting understanding and mutual respect. About another third largely satisfied the core indicator at the baseline.

In almost all reporting countries, public information policies and programmes publicly acknowledged intangible cultural heritage practitioners on an inclusive basis (B19.1). Public institutions such as museums, NGOs and government initiatives for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding supported many awareness-raising activities. Almost all countries reported that public events about intangible cultural heritage and the Convention were organized (B19.2) and that programmes for promotion and dissemination of good safeguarding practices were encouraged and supported (B19.3). All but one country reported that public information on intangible cultural heritage promoted mutual respect and appreciation within and between communities and groups (B19.4). Over four fifths of reporting countries (83%) thus fully satisfied the core indicator B19 at the baseline, regarding the extent to which public information measures raise awareness about the importance of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding, and promote understanding and mutual respect.

Awareness-raising activities were reported to conform with the Ethical Principles in almost all countries (B20.1). Efforts were taken to increase awareness of the Ethical Principles, for example by translating them into different languages. Just over four fifths of countries reported that ethical principles embodied in professional codes or standards were respected in awareness-raising activities (B20.2). Almost four fifths of reporting countries (79%) thus fully satisfied the core indicator B20 at the baseline, regarding the extent to which awareness-raising programmes respect the relevant Ethical Principles. Most of the remaining countries (19%) largely satisfied the core indicator at the baseline.

### Challenges and opportunities

Mechanisms for awareness raising about the importance of intangible cultural heritage were fairly well established in reporting countries, but some challenges and opportunities could be identified in this thematic area.

Countries provided good examples of effective awareness-raising activities, many of which were linked to inventorying and inscription of elements at the national or international level. Such activities tend to offer rather short-term publicity. The reports demonstrated the potential advantages of also developing comprehensive communication and long-term outreach strategies for awareness raising. In doing so, stronger cooperation between different intangible cultural heritage stakeholders and media organizations may be needed, since media coverage in the majority of countries still used incorrect terminology or concepts when reporting about intangible cultural heritage. Concrete measures to address this problem that were mentioned in the reports included providing capacity-building and educational resources for media professionals.

Many awareness-raising activities covered in the reports were funded by the State through public broadcasting or institutional programming. The reports noted an increasing use of digital tools in awareness raising, which had created opportunities for the general public and local communities, especially young people, to participate in awareness raising, for example on social media. At the same time, the digital media context raised questions about how best to reach older groups, and how to create conditions for open dialogue and mutual respect in regard to intangible cultural heritage that serve the aims of the Convention. Providing more support for community-led awareness raising and reflection on the use of digital platforms by different stakeholders can help to ensure the that Ethical Principles are respected.

### Community and youth participation in awareness-raising activities[[68]](#footnote-68)

All of the reporting countries noted the widest possible and inclusive participation of the communities, groups and individuals concerned in awareness raising about intangible cultural heritage, both in general and specifically about their own intangible cultural heritage (B17.1). Awareness raising in many countries is regulated by government policies requiring community participation for activities such as inventorying and safeguarding, or engagement with certain indigenous or cultural minority groups.

Community members (including youth) participated in both the development and delivery of awareness-raising activities and programmes. Activities included festivals, exhibitions, conferences, celebrations, media productions as well as educational projects. For example, in Ukraine, educational events aimed at young people were regularly hosted by museums such as the National Center for Folk Culture "Ivan Honchar Museum" and the National Museum of Folk Architecture and Life of Ukraine. The President of Ukraine offered a scholarship for young masters of folk art, recognizing their activities in the field of intangible cultural heritage. In Romania, the Olympics of Traditional Artistic Crafts, organized every year by the ASTRA Museum in Sibiu, brought together the most talented school children in the country engaged in traditional handicrafts (including ceramics, sewing and woodwork).

Inventorying processes, in particular, helped to create both a focus for community engagement and dialogue, and an opportunity for more general information sharing. Awareness-raising activities may extend across multiple regions, intangible cultural heritage elements and communities. In Austria and Slovenia, for example, municipalities, NGOs, research institutions and museums as well as civil society were involved in the documentation of Slovene field and house names in the cross-border region of Carinthia between 2009 and 2015. The inclusion of the naming practices in the national inventories of Austria and Slovenia, the publication of [maps](https://maps.flurnamen.at/) and the organization of events raised awareness about this transnational intangible cultural heritage, and contributed to peace-building. Slovene minorities in Austria reported that public perception of the linguistic and cultural diversity of Carinthia had consequently become more positive, as it was perceived as enriching rather than controversial.

Mechanisms to facilitate youth engagement in awareness raising about intangible cultural heritage were reported by all but three countries (39 out of 42, or 93%) (B17.4). This was encouraged not just by increased investment in digital platforms, but also, as mentioned above, by the inclusion of intangible cultural heritage in education. In Azerbaijan, for example, young people were involved in awareness raising during “[Novruz](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/nawrouz-novruz-nowrouz-nowrouz-nawrouz-nauryz-nooruz-nowruz-navruz-nevruz-nowruz-navruz-01161)”. Games, traditional meals and music and dance performances were held on city streets, to draw their attention to traditional culture. Novruz is celebrated in almost each family in Azerbaijan, supported by the proclamation of several days of national holiday to mark the event. Some countries established support programmes to increase youth participation as part of awareness raising. The “GENCDES” youth support project run by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism in Türkiye, for example, encouraged young people to undertake projects in various branches of art and culture, including intangible cultural heritage. Seventy-three projects were granted funding in 2017 and 2018, most related to a particular element of intangible cultural heritage.

Several countries emphasized that young people felt empowered when they were given an active role in safeguarding activities. In Andorra, young people were admitted as members of the Festival Commissions to help develop programmes of activities, for example. Awareness raising could also be used in order to start a dialogue with young people about the viability of intangible cultural heritage elements and their safeguarding. In Denmark, the school Sankt Annæ Gymnasium organized several workshops and awareness-raising activities for children and parents on the safeguarding of the “Classical European Boys Choir Tradition”. The workshops discussed how to address declining numbers of active practitioners, including what the choir could do to attract more practitioners and how the element should develop in line with its tradition and the expectations of current and future generations. Other strategies shared in the reports included the creation of youth committees or youth councils for safeguarding, summer schools, internships and volunteering programmes and social media-based capacity building.

Young people were engaged in collecting and disseminating information about the intangible cultural heritage of their communities or groups in most countries (36 out of 37 countries, or 97%) (B17.4). For example, in Cyprus, the UNESCO Chair on Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Dialogue for a Culture of Peace, University of Nicosia, in close collaboration with the Cyprus National Commission for UNESCO, worked with students to create videos about intangible cultural heritage elements inscribed on the National Inventory such as [Pipilla lace in Omodos and Koilani](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xw_i-QN-fZM&list=PLDE43iWl-jlT5fVoLXCfXiSZDIBLJsctS&index=1) and [Lefkaritiko Embroidery Lace Modi and Modulations](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2UPbasPFPuA&list=PLDE43iWl-jlT5fVoLXCfXiSZDIBLJsctS&index=4). Students worked as camera operators, production managers, technicians, and even directors, learning from diverse groups of practitioners and discovering similarities and differences between the different elements of intangible cultural heritage. The videos were used for promotion and education and the students themselves, from various cultural backgrounds, became ambassadors for cultural heritage in Cyprus.

All countries reported that communities, groups and individuals used information and communication technologies or any other form of media, in particular new media, for raising awareness about the importance of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding (B17.5). Digital awareness-raising mechanisms included websites, social media, mobile applications, virtual exhibitions, online masterclasses, video conferences and live online broadcasting of events and performances, especially useful during the COVID-19 pandemic. Examples mentioned in some of the reports have also been shared on the Convention’s [website](https://ich.unesco.org/en/living-heritage-and-the-covid-19-pandemic-01179). The Lithuanian Countryside Tourism Association ([LCTA](https://www.countryside.lt/en-about-lkta-1/)) worked with craftspeople and other bearers to promote traditional Lithuanian crafts and UNESCO World Heritage sites. They developed an online [tourist guide](https://www.countryside.lt/localcrafts/) on Lithuanian crafts, with descriptions, photos, videos, a map and information about craft-based educational activities for visitors. The project was implemented from 2019 to 2020, with support from the European Regional Development Fund.

Mobile applications have been used as an innovative tool for awareness-raising. Many government agencies and community organizations used social media platforms, such as Instagram, to attract the interest of younger people. In the Netherlands, as part of a 2019 project “Spotting Intangible Cultural Heritage” ([Immaterieel Erfgoed Spotten](https://www.immaterieelerfgoed.nl/en/spotten)), QR codes were placed throughout the country at different locations. These codes were linked to a dedicated online platform, monitored by KIEN, the Dutch Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage, that offered more information about a particular element of the intangible cultural heritage.Participating communities selected the placement of the QR Code and provided content for the webpage.

Use of digital media was popular with younger people, but posed challenges for older generations and vulnerable groups in some contexts. Training programmes for digital media could, however, contribute to the strengthening of intergenerational dialogue on intangible cultural heritage, as the example below demonstrates.

##### Example: Bridging the age-based digital divide for awareness-raising (Bulgaria)

In Bulgaria, young people trained people over the age of 55 in digital literacy as part of a free capacity-building programme called “Internet for All”, initiated by the mobile operator A1 in cooperation with the “Modern Chitalishta” Association. The programme was first launched in 2014 to improve the technology skills of children and youth, and then by 2016 expanded to address older men and women, as well as people with low socio-economic status and people living in smaller settlements. The project had been implemented in 20 settlements by the end of this reporting cycle. The project fostered intergenerational dialogue and also strengthened the social media capacities of different stakeholders involved in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding. For example, the employees of the community cultural centers were trained through the programme. They subsequently used these digital skills to improve the visibility of the centres and their safeguarding efforts on different social media platforms including Facebook, Instagram and YouTube. This has raised awareness about intangible cultural heritage. Digital skills were particularly valuable for the work of the community cultural centres during the COVID-19 pandemic.

### Media awareness-raising activities[[69]](#footnote-69)

All of the countries reported that media coverage raised awareness of the importance of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding, and all but three (out of 42, or 93%) reported that it promoted mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals (B18.1).

A considerable amount of the awareness-raising content mentioned in the reports was provided by publicly-funded broadcasters. For example, in Montenegro, the Public Broadcasting Service streamed several documentaries on intangible cultural heritage elements. In some countries, the scope and content of media coverage of the intangible cultural heritage was regulated through contracts between public broadcasting services and the government. While media interest in intangible cultural heritage seems to have been steadily rising since the ratification of the Convention, much of the coverage mentioned in the reports seemed to focus on inclusion of elements in inventories, or inscription on the Lists or Register of the Convention. Several countries reported that documentaries were made on elements included in inventories at the national level.

Although detailed information on media programming at the local level was not routinely included in the reports, Bosnia and Herzegovina noted that local media could give more in-depth attention to community safeguarding actions and local intangible cultural heritage. In Croatia, for example, children from various villages performed their own versions of the “[Sinjska Alka Knights’ Tournament](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/sinjska-alka-a-knights-tournament-in-sinj-00357)”, which were broadcast on local media. Older residents played the roles of the judges and leaders in these performances.

A number of reports raised concerns about media coverage of intangible cultural heritage not being in line with the concepts and terminology of the Convention. Almost one third of reporting countries (12 out of 42, or 29%) reported that media coverage in line with the Convention was limited (B18.4, see Figure 15 below). Almost half of the countries (19 out of 42, or 45%) reported that their media coverage was only somewhat in line with the concepts and terminology of the Convention. There was persistent confusion between the 1972 and 2003 Conventions, for example, and many media reports focused on claims about the “authenticity” and “uniqueness” of intangible cultural heritage elements.

Ongoing communication with journalists, briefings, press releases, publications and glossaries helped to some extent in educating the media on the concepts and terminology of the Convention. For example, in Finland, to support media coverage of inscriptions, the Finnish Heritage Agency provided the media with press releases covering examples from different areas; journalists were connected with local practitioners. Community organizations were given a communication package including information for press releases, guidance for creating communications plans and good examples of media campaigns.

##### Chart, bar chart Description automatically generatedFigure 15: Extent of media coverage in reporting countries about intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding, in line with the concepts and terminology of the Convention (n=42) (B18.4)

Online media coverage about intangible cultural heritage enabled broader access, supported safeguarding and helped to reduce isolation and loneliness, both in general and particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic. Portugal noted that video streaming of festivities, including the [Festas das Rosas](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RQa-Zee-cN8) in 2020, allowed people with limited mobility or physical disabilities who could not attend the event physically, to follow virtually. In Denmark, the national public service broadcasting company aired the programme “community singing” (Fællessang) on Friday evening primetime. Well-known Danish songs were performed and viewers were encouraged to sing along at home. This program continued a tradition of public singing, which is included on the Danish inventory of intangible cultural heritage.

The majority of intangible cultural heritage-related media coverage was reported to be inclusive (38 out of 42, or 90%), and to utilize the language(s) and dialect(s) of the communities, groups and individuals concerned (39 out of 42, 93%) (B18.3). In four fifths of countries (34 out of 42, or 80%), media programming on intangible cultural heritage reportedly addressed different target groups (B18.3). Reports often linked media inclusivity to coverage of minorities, their culture and languages, and sometimes to accommodations such as subtitles or sign language interpretation. Regulated by the Law on National Minorities in Albania, the public television broadcasting station aired regular programs dedicated to minorities in their respective languages, including coverage of their intangible cultural heritage. In Czechia, the television show “the Neighbours” (Sousedé) aimed to foster mutual understanding and respect in society by providing insights into the changing lifestyles and customs of diverse social groups, including national minorities, thereby reflecting on issues of social integration and co-existence.

Most countries (38 out of 42, or 91%) reported that cooperation activities or programmes concerning intangible cultural heritage, including capacity-building activities, were jointly established and implemented between the media and other intangible cultural heritage stakeholders (B18.2). In many countries, public broadcasting services worked with government agencies, NGOs, heritage institutions and communities to promote intangible cultural heritage as well as to publicize safeguarding and inventorying projects. In the Caribbean region of the Netherlands, the Bonairean Historical Cultural Foundation (FuHiKuBo), accredited as an NGO under the Convention in 2020, has raised awareness about intangible cultural heritage on all six island territories within the Kingdom. The NGO has created and published interviews with bearers and practitioners online, made them freely available through radio and TV programmes, published them in booklets and newspaper articles, and made them accessible for future use in its archive.

One of the challenges with such cooperation activities, as noted in several reports, was the fact that community volunteers and intangible cultural heritage practitioners were often expected to work for free in creating media content.

### Public awareness-raising programmes and policies[[70]](#footnote-70)

All but one country (41 out of 42, or 98%) reported that public events were organized about intangible cultural heritage, its importance and safeguarding, and the Convention (B19.2, see Figure 16 below). These activities included guided walks, workshops, seminars and public events, and intangible cultural heritage-related festivals, celebrations, exhibitions and concerts. In Ireland, the Department of Tourism, Culture, Arts, Gaeltacht, Sport and Media (DTCAGSM) funded 18 projects in 2020 to showcase and raise public awareness of Ireland’s intangible cultural heritage. The projects were recorded in an open digital archive to enable future access.

##### Diagram Description automatically generatedFigure 16: Percentage of countries organizing public events about intangible cultural heritage, its importance and safeguarding, as well as the Convention, for different stakeholders (n=42) (B19.2)

[European Heritage Days](https://www.europeanheritagedays.com/EHD-Programme/About/About-Us) is a joint action of the Council of Europe and the European Commission held annually during a week in September. This provided an opportunity in many reporting countries to promote participatory cultural events that raised awareness about intangible cultural heritage and familiarized the general public with communities, workshops, locations, and spaces that often are not easily or readily accessible. In Poland, for example, the National Institute of Cultural Heritage used the occasion to launch the campaign "Tastes of Heritage". This campaign involved community organizations, groups and individuals from all over Poland organizing more than 500 events that promoted culinary heritage, regional cuisine, and traditional family recipes. In Armenia, European Heritage Days have included flash mobs of folk dances and songs, performances of rope dancers, exhibitions of crafts and dishes, master classes, lectures and movie screenings. The pan-Armenian flash mob "Come and Dance Kochari", performing a traditional dance, was held online in 2020.

All but two countries (40 out of 42, or 95%) reported that awareness-raising policies and programmes acknowledged the practitioners and bearers of intangible cultural heritage on an inclusive basis (B19.1). Acknowledgement was achieved through prizes, awards, grants and titles for practitioners and community actors. Several countries organized ceremonies on a regular basis to honour communities whose elements were recently included on an inventory at the national level. In some contexts, communities were able to use an official intangible cultural heritage logo to raise awareness about their element after its inclusion on the national inventory. Like the UNESCO emblem, such a logo was generally designed for informational use, rather than for direct marketing of goods and services.

Programmes for the promotion and dissemination of good safeguarding practices were encouraged and supported by almost all reporting countries (38 out of 42, or 91%) (B19.3). Several countries had developed, or were developing, dedicated inventories or programmes to promote good safeguarding practices, including those selected to the Register. For example, a [Safeguarding Practices](https://safeguardingpractices.com/) website was set up to share experiences in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage from Nordic and Baltic countries. Other countries reported sharing safeguarding practices through peer learning activities, conferences, media productions and tuition programmes.

Periodic reporting itself was reported by several countries to contribute to awareness raising. Greater awareness generated by the periodic reporting process resulted in local municipal administrations setting up intangible cultural heritage inventories in Lithuania, and new cooperation partnerships being developed among stakeholders in Norway.

### Respect for ethical principles in awareness raising[[71]](#footnote-71)

All but one country (41 out of 42, or 98%) reported that public information on intangible cultural heritage promoted mutual respect and appreciation within and between communities and groups (B19.4), but little systematic data is available on the effects of such programmes. Strategic reviews can help to monitor and evaluate the impact of awareness raising. In Austria, for example, media reports on intangible cultural heritage were collected, analyzed, and published annually by the Austrian Commission for UNESCO. These analyses showed that the implementation of the Convention had ensured greater public recognition of and respect for intangible cultural heritage, and that it had raised awareness, particularly about local knowledge and practices concerning nature and traditional craftsmanship.

Most countries (41 out of 42, 98%) reported that awareness-raising activities concerning specific elements of their intangible cultural heritage were undertaken on the basis of the free, prior, sustained, and informed consent of the communities, groups, and individuals concerned (B17.2). In more than four fifths of reporting countries (36 out of 42, 86%), mechanisms were in place that duly protected the rights of communities concerned, and their moral and material interests during awareness raising activities about their intangible cultural heritage (B17.3). Protection deriving from existing laws on intellectual property rights and data protection was sometimes supplemented during or after inventorying processes by additional mechanisms, such as written contracts and agreements, to manage use of information for awareness raising. Luxembourg noted that awareness-raising activities were carried out only upon request by the communities concerned.

A few reports discussed the role of the media in cases where there was conflict within or between communities, groups and individuals around intangible cultural heritage, which has been discussed elsewhere in this analysis. Growing awareness of intangible cultural heritage fostered a number of debates about discrimination, cultural appropriation and animal rights in relation to some practices. These debates touched on alignment with the Convention and its Ethical Principles, in particular Article 2.1 on compliance with human rights, mutual respect and sustainable development frameworks, and the Ethical Principle 11, on respect for gender equality and cultural diversity. Media engagement could heighten public conflict around intangible cultural heritage, for example by sharing derogatory representations, or, by contrast, it could provide a platform for open discussion and reflection. For these reasons, it is very important that awareness raising activities are informed by the Ethical Principles and conducted in the spirit of the Convention.

Awareness-raising activities were generally reported to conform with the Ethical Principles (41 out of 42, or 98%) (B20.1), even if the Convention’s Principles were not directly referenced as such. The reports gave examples where communities developed their own ethical guidelines based on or reflecting the Ethical Principles. In Belarus, following media attempts to folklorize the “[Kaliady Tzars rite](https://ich.unesco.org/en/USL/rite-of-the-kalyady-tsars-christmas-tsars-00308)”, for example, a local community in the village of Semezhevo, with the support of researchers, developed a “Community Protocol”. The protocol, which takes into account the Ethical Principles, set out rules of access and conduct by the press, tourism, and other organizations during the Kaliady Tzars ceremony. Similar work is now being carried out by other communities, including those practising the [Spring rite Juraŭski Karahod](https://ich.unesco.org/en/USL/spring-rite-of-juraski-karahod-01458).

About four fifths of countries (35 out of 42, or 83%) reported that ethical principles, as embodied in relevant professional codes or standards, were respected in awareness-raising activities (B.20.2). Examples of relevant professional codes or standards mentioned in the reports included the International Council of Museums (ICOM) [Code of Ethics for Museums](https://icom.museum/en/resources/standards-guidelines/code-of-ethics/) and codes published by various Ethnological Societies or other academic organizations in different countries. The [Code of Ethics](https://narodopisnaspolecnost.cz/index.php/about/ethical-code/item/download/166_98e81b67c1e4cb65e87e412cabb91655) of the Czech Ethnological Society (Czechia), for example, provides guidance to members on ethical issues. These issues related not just to how ethnological research is conducted, but also to the processing or storage of data and research results and how they are used and disseminated in publications, media and teaching.

The Ethical Principles as such are still relatively unknown in many countries; efforts have been made to increase awareness of them. Translations have been made into German, Greek and Latvian, for example. The National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia, the competent body for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding in the country, offered practical training on the Ethical Principles to communities and municipalities.

### Baselines and targets

Table 8 below shows that, using the automatic calculator, nearly four fifths of countries fully satisfied the core indicator B17 and 20 at the baseline regarding community participation in awareness raising and the extent to which programmes raising awareness of intangible cultural heritage respect the relevant ethical principles (33 out of 42, or 79%). Just over four fifths fully satisfied the core indicator B19 at the baseline in regard to the extent to which public information measures raise awareness about intangible cultural heritage (35 out of 42, or 83%). However, as several countries commented in their report, this does not mean that there are no remaining challenges or gaps that need to be filled, for example in raising awareness about the Ethical Principles.

A significantly lower number of reporting countries fully satisfied the core indicator B18 at the baseline regarding the extent of media involvement in raising awareness about the importance of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding, and in promoting understanding and mutual respect (26 out of 42, or 62%). This is not very surprising considering that in three quarters of countries only some or a limited amount of media coverage was reported to be in line with the Convention.

More than three quarters of reporting countries that set a target, set their targets as equal to their baseline for B17-20 (between 27 and 30 out of 35, or between 77% and 86%). Reporting countries were most confident about future progress on B18, with nearly a fifth (6 out of 35, or 17%) setting their target above the baseline. Seven countries likely did not set targets for B17-20.[[72]](#footnote-72)

##### Table 8: Attainment scores on the baseline for indicators B17-B20 in reporting countries (n=42)

| **Indicator** | **Not satisfied** | **Minimally** | **Partially** | **Largely** | **Satisfied** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B17. Extent to which communities, groups and individuals participate widely in raising awareness about the importance of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding | 0 / 42 | 0 / 42 | 2 / 42 | 7 / 42 | 33 / 42 |
| B18. Extent to which media are involved in raising awareness about the importance of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding and in promoting understanding and mutual respect | 0 / 42 | 1 / 42 | 2 / 42 | 13 / 42 | 26 / 42 |
| B19. Extent to which public information measures raise awareness about the importance of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding and promote understanding and mutual respect | 0 / 42 | 0 / 42 | 2 / 42 | 5 / 42 | 35 / 42 |
| B20. Extent to which programmes raising awareness of intangible cultural heritage respect the relevant ethical principles | 0 / 42 | 0 / 42 | 1 / 42 | 8 / 42 | 33 / 42 |

Thematic area VII - Safeguarding activities for intangible cultural heritage

Effectively involving a broad range of actors is essential to achieving the best safeguarding results, whether for intangible cultural heritage in general or for specific elements of intangible cultural heritage. Key among these actors are the communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals concerned, whose widest possible participation in the safeguarding and management of their intangible cultural heritage is encouraged in Article 15, the Operational Directives and Ethical Principles. This does not simply imply a two-way partnership between the State and such communities; rather, the Operational Directives have also developed an important role in safeguarding for NGOs and other civil society actors (e.g. ODs 90, 108, 157(e), 158(b), 162(e), 163(b)), as well as the private sector (OD 187). The effectiveness of intangible cultural heritage safeguarding programmes and measures can be increased and improved through regular monitoring and through scientific, technical and artistic studies to provide feedback about positive or negative impacts. Such monitoring studies can be done by communities concerned, NGOs and other civil society bodies, research institutions and centres of expertise, scholars and experts.

The periodic report thus contains a number of questions about engagement of diverse actors in safeguarding activities.

These are as follows:

***List of core indicators and assessment factors on safeguarding activities for intangible cultural heritage (B21-B22)***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Core indicators** | **Assessment according to the following** |
| B21. Extent to which engagement for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage is enhanced among stakeholders | * 1. Communities, groups and individuals participate, on an inclusive basis and to the widest possible extent, in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in general and of specific elements of intangible cultural heritage, whether or not inscribed. |
| * 1. NGOs and other civil society actors participate in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in general, and of specific elements of intangible cultural heritage, whether or not inscribed. |
| * 1. Private sector entities participate in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, and of specific elements of intangible cultural heritage, whether or not inscribed, respecting the Ethical Principles for Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. |
| B22. Extent to which civil society contributes to monitoring of intangible cultural heritage safeguarding | * 1. An enabling environment exists for communities, groups and individuals concerned to monitor and undertake scientific, technical and artistic studies on intangible cultural heritage safeguarding programmes and measures. |
| * 1. An enabling environment exists for NGOs and other civil society bodies to monitor and undertake scientific, technical and artistic studies on intangible cultural heritage safeguarding programmes and measures. |
| * 1. An enabling environment exists for scholars, experts, research institutions and centres of expertise to monitor and undertake scientific, technical and artistic studies on intangible cultural heritage safeguarding programmes and measures. |

### Overview of core indicators B21-B22

High levels of inclusive community participation in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding were reported in about three quarters of the countries (B21.1). To this end, many countries established policies, programmes and mechanisms requiring community participation, and used networks and partnerships to encourage it. Two thirds of the countries reported high levels of participation in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding by NGOs and other civil society organizations (B21.2). Many reports noted the capacity of NGOs to connect different stakeholders and involve minority groups, with States often providing funding to assist NGOs. In contrast, only about one quarter of the countries reported high private-sector participation in safeguarding activities, at least that was in line with the Ethical Principles. Nearly a half reported some extent of private-sector participation in this context. In total, over four fifths of reporting countries (85%) thus either fully or largely satisfied the core indicator B21 at the baseline, regarding engagement of stakeholders for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage.

As already indicated above, reporting countries provided extensive institutional support to researchers and NGOs undertaking safeguarding actions. Nearly all countries reported that an enabling environment existed for communities, groups and individuals (B22.1) and for NGOs and other civil society actors (B22.2) to monitor and undertake studies on intangible cultural heritage safeguarding programmes and measures. All countries reported that such an enabling environment existed for academic research (B22.3). Thus, almost all reporting countries (88%) fully satisfied the core indicator B22 at the baseline, regarding civil society contributions to monitoring of intangible cultural heritage safeguarding.

### Challenges and opportunities

Many safeguarding initiatives, from a wide range of stakeholders, were reported in regard to elements of intangible heritage, whether or not inscribed on UNESCO’s Lists and Register or included on inventories at the national level. Community engagement in safeguarding was reportedly high. NGO and civil society participation in supporting intangible cultural heritage safeguarding has likely increased during the reporting period, as awareness of its importance has grown. However, further capacity-building for NGOs and civil society organizations may be needed in regard to the Convention’s principles, methodologies and perspectives regarding intangible cultural heritage safeguarding.

Private sector involvement in safeguarding (at least that which was in line with the Ethical Principles) was generally reported to be lower than that of other stakeholders. The reports nevertheless mentioned various ways in which the private sector participated in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, whether by funding or providing technical assistance, facilities or other kinds of support to safeguarding projects. Sectors such as tourism, food and crafts frequently involved third-party private sector stakeholders, in addition to practitioner-entrepreneurs and community businesses. Given the negative effects of some forms of private sector engagement with intangible cultural heritage, some reports emphasized the value of drafting guidelines or ethical codes. At the same time, several reports noted difficulties in sustaining practice and transmission when practitioners cannot earn sufficient income from their activities and work with intangible cultural heritage. Further attention could be paid to the role of private sector actions in safeguarding, highlighting good practices, mitigating risks, and identifying new opportunities for public-private cooperation supporting safeguarding in line with the Ethical Principles. The overall scope and nature of private sector engagement in safeguarding, and the challenges faced in respecting the Ethical Principles, were difficult to assess because of the absence of systematic data in this area. This is, of course, a more general problem in the intangible cultural heritage sector.

Enabling environments for safeguarding research have been fostered through State funding and policies, networking initiatives and legal or institutional frameworks. However, as mentioned in the thematic area III on research and documentation above, more focused investment and intervention may be needed to support community-led research, identifying good safeguarding practices, fostering multi-stakeholder networks and supporting monitoring and evaluation activities documenting threats or risks to viability and safeguarding impacts. Relatively few comprehensive safeguarding plans were shared in the reports, perhaps reflecting the low public availability of such plans. A mechanism or platform(s) at the national, regional or international levels for sharing such documents, where appropriate, could assist communities and other stakeholders in developing safeguarding plans for other elements.

### Community participation[[73]](#footnote-73)

Community involvement is central to any safeguarding process. About three quarters of reporting countries (31 out of 42, or 74%) reported high levels of the widest possible inclusive participation of communities, groups and individuals concerned in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding, whether in general or for specific elements (B21.1, see Figure 17 below). More than one fifth of the remaining countries (10 out of 42, or 24%) reported some extent of community participation.

##### Chart Description automatically generatedFigure 17: Extent of wide and inclusive community participation in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding activities in reporting countries (n=42) (B21.1)

Community participation in safeguarding processes was often mandated in public policies, as discussed above under thematic area IV on policies. Reporting countries highlighted active community participation in identification of threats and risks to intangible cultural heritage elements, for example by direct consultation during inventorying. The reports shared a few examples of safeguarding plans compiled with community participation, although not many comprehensive safeguarding plans for intangible cultural heritage seemed to be publicly available in reporting countries. Spanish law mandates public authorities to ensure community participation in safeguarding measures regarding their intangible cultural heritage.[[74]](#footnote-74) The [Safeguarding Plan on Esparto Culture](https://www.culturaydeporte.gob.es/planes-nacionales/planes-nacionales/salvaguardia-patrimonio-cultural-inmaterial/actuaciones/plan-de-salvaguarda-de-la-cultura-del-esparto.html), a comprehensive action plan, was elaborated after extensive participatory work with bearers and practitioners across Spain. Safeguarding actions included awareness raising campaigns, support for the craft and industrial sectors, documentation and elaboration of educational materials, training and research. Within the [TRANSHABITAT project](https://repositorio.iaph.es/handle/11532/329818), guidelines were developed for safeguarding traditional crafts and environmental contexts linked to lime production in Andalusia (Spain) and Morocco. The Alka Knights Society in Croatia developed a safeguarding plan for the [Sinjska Alka Knights](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/sinjska-alka-a-knights-tournament-in-sinj-00357) tournament, considering cultural, scientific and financial sustainability and including an action plan.

Some safeguarding processes were assisted by government agencies, cultural institutions or NGOs, but safeguarding does not always require outside intervention. In Lithuania, the community-funded project “Reviving the Community of Ziurai” revived village life and promoted intergenerational transmission of intangible cultural heritage in a rural community affected by emigration. Through the Ziurai folklore ensemble choir, a social media group and gatherings organized by young people, the project helped old and young residents to share and learn folklore songs.

Reporting countries have made efforts to ensure that community participation in safeguarding is inclusive. Armenia reported that in the last few years the scope of community participation in intangible cultural heritage activities organized by the Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sports has increased, as more NGOs and intangible cultural heritage bearers, including women, displaced people and members of vulnerable groups, have competed for cultural programme funding. Involving young people in reflecting on how heritage can and should adapt to new contexts, such as in the Austrian project “[The Heritage ‘Hack’: Rethinking mining and industrial heritage](http://www.eisenstrasse.co.at/eu-projekte/youind/hack/)”, helped to maintain its relevance to new generations.

### NGO and civil society participation[[75]](#footnote-75)

Two thirds of the countries reported high levels of NGOs and other civil society actor participation in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding (28 out of 42, or 67%). Another fifth (11 out of 42, or 26%) reported their participation to some extent (B21.2, see Figure 18 below). Of course, these NGOs and civil society organizations took different forms and operated in multiple ways. Some were community organizations, some were helping communities to develop safeguarding initiatives and others acted as consultative or advisory bodies at the national level and/or worked internationally in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, a number being [accredited](https://ich.unesco.org/en/accredited-ngos-00331) under the Convention.

Public-sector support was important for NGOs. In Azerbaijan, the Ministry of Culture regularly held consultations on the role of NGOs in the sustainable development of culture to promote cooperation on safeguarding; joint projects were initiated between government agencies and NGOs. Many reports underlined the capacity of NGOs and civil society organizations to connect different types of stakeholders in safeguarding initiatives, sometimes by bringing multiple organizations together. One example given in the reports was [Platform Agora](https://www.agora-bg.org/bg/) in Bulgaria, an association that supports local initiatives for community development through its network of over 100 community cultural centres. Many of the initiatives mentioned in the report were related to identification, safeguarding and awareness raising about cultural heritage of local communities. Platform Agora administered funding and offered capacity-building, organized an annual competition to identify community initiatives, and helped cultural centres work together for different projects.

##### Chart, bar chart Description automatically generatedFigure 18: Extent of participation by NGOs and other civil society actors in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding activities in reporting countries (n=42) (B21.2)

Some organizations mentioned in the reports were involved in safeguarding particular intangible heritage practices or domains. In Iceland, for example, the [Handicraft Association](https://www.heimilisidnadur.is/en/about) (Heimilsiðnaðarfélagið) has been committed to safeguarding and raising awareness on Icelandic folk art and handicrafts as well as encouraging quality craftmanship of modern handicrafts based on Icelandic cultural heritage. Its school offered a variety of classes during the reporting period, ranging from sewing the Icelandic costume to weaving and spinning, embroidery techniques and woodcarving.

Other organizations promoted intangible cultural heritage safeguarding more generally through work in areas such as cultural diversity, education, art, urban or rural development, and environmental sustainability. In Greece, for example, the urban non-profit company “[Labyrinth](https://labyrinthmusic.gr/en/what-is-labyrinth/what-is-labyrinth-2)” Musical Workshop, based on the island of Crete, encouraged intercultural encounters, safeguarding of traditional music and the education of young artists in various traditional musical cultures of the Balkans, Asia, India or North Africa.

### Private sector participation[[76]](#footnote-76)

High levels of private sector participation in safeguarding activities in line with the Ethical Principles were reported by only about a quarter of the countries (10 out of 41, or 24%), although nearly a half of them (18 out of 41, or 44%) reported some extent of such participation. Only one country reported no private sector participation in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in line with the Ethical Principles (B21.3). The reports generally interpreted this question as relating to third-party private sector actors, but some noted that intangible cultural heritage practitioners (including craftspeople, musicians, theatre performers and dancers) were frequently entrepreneurs themselves, engaging in business activities to sustain livelihoods. Thus, the categories of community members and private sector actors are not of course completely distinct.

Private sector stakeholders mentioned in the reports included family-run businesses, banks, foundations, private museums and trade associations, which provided funding or access to materials or spaces, did tourism promotion, organized festivals or artisanal events, provided technical assistance or participated directly in safeguarding activities. The Georgian Wheat Producers Association, for example, researched intangible cultural heritage associated with growing local wheat varieties. The Association led the elaboration of a plan for the protection of Georgian wheat culture, in collaboration with local farming communities and the National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation. Some professional associations also gave free guidance to support intangible cultural heritage practice and transmission, as indicated above.

Businesses acted, in some cases, as private donors supporting safeguarding actions under the rubric of social responsibility.

##### Example: Private sector involvement in intangible cultural heritage education and the establishment of community businesses (Türkiye)

The project “One Master Thousand Masters” (2010-2019) in Türkiye was implemented with the financial support of Anadolu Sigorta, a private insurance company, by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism in cooperation with NGOs and local communities. The project trained 1000 people in 50 traditional crafts in 44 different cities over a decade. Local communities, local administrations and NGOs were involved in the identification of safeguarding needs and project priorities through Local Intangible Cultural Heritage Boards.[[77]](#footnote-77) Practitioners of traditional crafts inscribed on the National Inventory were engaged as trainers and developed the content and methodology for the courses. Free training programmes lasting three to six months were then offered to selected participants. Governmental institutions provided technical assistance and coordinated the implementation of the project. Anadolu Sigorta provided financial support and coordinated project communications.

Collaboration could be of mutual benefit to businesses and communities. In Portugal, privately-owned restaurants provided venues and income opportunities for [Fado](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/fado-urban-popular-song-of-portugal-00563) performances, supporting safeguarding of the tradition while also sustaining their businesses, for example. Some forms of intangible cultural heritage, such as festivals, themselves create business opportunities. In Andorra, local businesses advertised their services on leaflets distributed by festival organizers. Local restaurants and bakeries produced the foods that were part of the traditional celebrations. Supporting awareness-raising initiatives in the field of intangible cultural heritage could also help market products. In the Faroe Islands (Denmark), events such as “Seamen’s Day” and the Knitting Festival were supported financially by private companies. Navia, a wool and knitwear company in the islands, utilized wool from local farmers for their products and published a booklet with patterns for knitwear designs created by locals.

The Ethical Principles of the Convention were not always well known in the private sector context. Codes of ethics relating to community participation and consent, such as those used by academic researchers (discussed above), do not always apply in entrepreneurial contexts. This may be why so few countries mentioned high levels of private sector involvement in line with the Ethical Principles. Some States sought to address this by offering public-sector support, for example through tourism strategy development and public-private partnerships promoting ethical and sustainable intangible cultural heritage tourism practices. Codes of ethics specifically for businesses were also sometimes developed to manage private-sector use of intangible cultural heritage. The Sámi Parliament in Finland, for example, developed [Ethical Guidelines for Sámi tourism](https://www.samediggi.fi/culturally-responsible-sami-tourism/?lang=en) to address the need for responsible socially, culturally, ecologically and economically sustainable Sámi tourism product development and presentation. Alongside this, [Sustainable Travel Finland](https://travel-trade.visitfinland.com/en/sustainability/) (STF), a programme designed by Visit Finland, offered tourism companies in the country capacity-building resources and support to become more sustainable. The STF label given to qualifying businesses was used to promote responsible tourism and allow the international travel trade to easily identify sustainable tourism providers. Similar models could be applied across different intangible cultural heritage domains, communities or territories.

### Research and monitoring about intangible cultural heritage safeguarding[[78]](#footnote-78)

An enabling environment supporting communities, groups and individuals to monitor and undertake scientific, technical and artistic studies on intangible cultural heritage safeguarding was reported by almost all countries (39 out of 42, or 93%) (B22.1). A similar number of countries reported that an enabling environment existed for NGOs and other civil society bodies to the same end (38 out 42, or 90%) (B22.2). All countries reported that an enabling environment existed for scholars, experts, research institutions and centres of expertise to monitor and research intangible cultural heritage (B22.3). Some of these studies concerned safeguarding, although, as indicated above, many involved general documentation and other kinds of cultural heritage research. As indicated in the thematic area IV on policies, an enabling environment for research led by communities or local organizations could be fostered by legislation and policy instruments at different levels of government recognizing the role of bearers and ensuring their participation in safeguarding programs.

As discussed in thematic area III on inventories, inventory-making often formalizes processes for both community participation in the development of safeguarding plans, and their regular updating and monitoring. Inscription of an element could thus promote safeguarding-related research linked to documentation and updating processes. In Italy, following inscription of “[Traditional violin craftsmanship in Cremona](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/traditional-violin-craftsmanship-in-cremona-00719)”, the “Antonio Stradivari” Consortium of Violinmakers in Cremona actively participated in elaborating safeguarding plans and in discussing the effectiveness of safeguarding measures with other community stakeholders, including trade associations and individual violinmakers. InBelarus, as part of the inventorying system, Regional Centres of Folklore conducted annual monitoring of the viability of intangible cultural heritage elements, involving expert centres, various organizations of culture, education, and community organizations. Guidance for those conducting the monitoring process, including a toolkit, was developed in 2014. Results were sent to the National Inventory Service, analyzed and published in a report form.

NGOs working with specific elements of intangible cultural heritage, in conjunction with the community concerned, were in a few cases involved in monitoring and evaluating safeguarding measures, outside of the inventorying process.

##### Example: Evaluation of safeguarding programmes (Norway)

The Norwegian Centre for Traditional Music and Dance, an NGO accredited under the Convention, was involved in implementation and evaluation of the project “The Countryside Dances” ([Bygda dansar](https://www.bygdadansar.no/nyheter-2/2021/6/25/20-r-med-bygda-dansar)). This was a national dance project, supported by the Ministry of Culture, involving activities in 11 counties of Norway since 2001. It was set up in response to an Arts Council Norway report, showing that folk dance was suffering from a recruitment crisis and suggesting a process of renewal within the framework of the performing arts. The main focus of the project was the dissemination and transmission of Norwegian folk dance, as well as the adaptation of folk dance for stage productions. The project aimed to safeguard the heritage in this process, considering for example how the values of social dancing could be kept in a staged performance, without turning the dance into a show, or a narrative story. Evaluations of the project (some of which were external) were used to assess the [safeguarding strategy](https://safeguardingpractices.com/good-practice/bygda-dansar-safeguarding-traditional-dancing/) and inform future work. Youth evaluations showed, for example, that young participants loved the stage performances, and used traditional dances from their area as a grounding for these performances. In each county, young people from the project continued dancing or teaching after the project ended. Several were, by 2017, working as folk dance teachers, professional dancers or dance archivists.

Some countries reported establishing permanent mechanisms to monitor and evaluate safeguarding progress that went beyond monitoring specific elements or projects. In Flanders (Belgium), multi-stakeholder cooperation allowed for a broader layer of monitoring on top of the inventorying process. Government departments responsible for culture formally followed up on the biennial reports of bearer communities of elements inscribed in the inventory. The organization Workshop Intangible Heritage (WIE) undertook more general monitoring work on crosscutting issues related to intangible heritage too. This included assessing gender inclusivity, diversity or progress on different safeguarding measures or functions. Thematic heritage service organizations monitored safeguarding more specifically within certain intangible heritage domains. Heritage Cells monitored safeguarding actions in a specific locality. As indicated above, such monitoring could inform the development of more general safeguarding strategies in a country to address the safeguarding needs of a variety of communities, domains or sub-regions.

Fostering an enabling environment for multi-stakeholder involvement in research requires considerable investment. More research funding specifically dedicated to studies on safeguarding, and to the work of monitoring and evaluation, is needed, according to some of the reports. North Macedonia’s report noted the need to find new models of financing and cooperation between governmental agencies, the private sector and NGOs to support research on safeguarding. Greater awareness of work that is being done could also assist in creating an enabling environment for research and monitoring. The reports noted the importance of networks and partnerships between NGOs, communities and state agencies in creating an enabling environment for monitoring and research. Museums and ethnopôles in France helped to provide a permanent framework for community-researcher partnerships in the field of intangible heritage, for example.

### Baselines and targets

Table 9 below shows that, using the automatic calculator, while only about half the countries fully satisfied it, over four fifths (36 out of 42, or 86%) of reporting countries fully or largely satisfied the core indicator B21 at the baseline, regarding engagement of stakeholders for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. The reports suggested that engagement with private sector actors could be further developed, in line with the Ethical Principles. Over four fifths (37 out of 42, or 88%) fully satisfied the core indicator B22 at the baseline, regarding civil society contributions to monitoring of intangible cultural heritage safeguarding.

Over 70% of reporting countries that set a target, set their targets as equal to their baseline for B21 and B22 (25 and 27 out of 35 respectively, or 71% and 77%). Reporting countries were more confident about future progress on B21, with nearly a fifth (7 out of 35, or 20%) setting their target above the baseline. Seven countries likely did not set targets for B21-22.[[79]](#footnote-79)

##### Table 9: Attainment scores on the baseline for indicators B21 and B22 in reporting countries (n=42)

| **Indicator** | **Not satisfied** | **Minimally** | **Partially** | **Largely** | **Satisfied** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B21. Extent to which engagement for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage is enhanced among stakeholders | 0 / 42 | 0 / 42 | 6 / 42 | 14 / 42 | 22 / 42 |
| B22. Extent to which civil society contributes to monitoring of intangible cultural heritage safeguarding | 0 / 42 | 3 / 42 | 1 / 42 | 2 / 42 | 37 / 42 |

Thematic area VIII - International cooperation and engagement

One of the Convention’s four purposes is “to provide for international cooperation and assistance” (Article 1(d)), and the Convention further defines international cooperation as including joint initiatives, among other things (Article 19). International mechanisms such as International Assistance, inscription on the Lists and Register of the Convention (especially mechanisms allowing multinational nominations), enable collaboration, cooperation and communication between States Parties at the international level. Article 19 encourages States “to cooperate at the bilateral, sub-regional, regional and international levels,” and such cooperation can be formalized through networking and institutional cooperation, including accreditation of NGOs.

The periodic report thus contains a number of questions about international cooperation and engagement in safeguarding activities at the bilateral, sub-regional, regional and international levels. These are as follows:

***List of core indicators and assessment factors on international cooperation and engagement (B24-B25)***

| **Core Indicators** | **Assessment according to the following** |
| --- | --- |
| B24. Percentage of States Parties actively engaged with other States Parties in cooperation for safeguarding | * 1. Bilateral, multilateral, regional or international cooperation is undertaken to implement safeguarding measures for intangible cultural heritage in general |
| * 1. Bilateral, multilateral, regional or international cooperation is undertaken to implement safeguarding measures for specific elements of intangible cultural heritage, in particular those in danger, those present in the territories of more than one State, and cross-border elements. |
| * 1. Information and experience about intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding, including good safeguarding practices, is exchanged with other States Parties. |
| * 1. Documentation concerning an element of intangible cultural heritage present on the territory of another State Party is shared with it. |
| B25. Percentage of States Parties actively engaged in international networking and institutional cooperation | * 1. State Party engages, as host or beneficiary, in the activities of category 2 centres for intangible cultural heritage. |
| * 1. International networking is fostered among communities, groups and individuals, NGOs, experts, centres of expertise and research institutes, active in the field of intangible cultural heritage. |
| * 1. State Party participates in the intangible cultural heritage-related activities of international and regional bodies other than UNESCO. |

Section A also contains some questions on accreditation of NGOs (A4), inscriptions on the Lists and programmes selected for the Register (A5), International Assistance funding (A5) and synergies with other international frameworks (A7). These relate partly to core indicators B23 and B26 that will be reported only at the global level; nevertheless, some information will be included here for completeness.

### Overview of core indicators B24-B25

Almost all countries reported some level of cooperation with other countries on intangible cultural heritage safeguarding in general (B24.1). Nearly all reported cooperating at the regional level, and well over four fifths at the bilateral and international levels. Over three quarters reported cooperation on intangible cultural heritage safeguarding in general at all three levels. Not quite as many countries reported cooperation in regard to specific elements of intangible cultural heritage, particularly those in danger or shared heritage (B24.2). The large number of multinational nominations (viz. 28 multinational inscriptions on the Representative List and one multinational programme on the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices) provided evidence of strong multilateral and bilateral cooperation for safeguarding. Two inscriptions involved seven or more reporting countries by the end of the reporting cycle. Nearly all of the countries reported exchanging information and experience about intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding, including good safeguarding practices, with other States Parties (B24.3). Just over half reported sharing documentation concerning an element of intangible cultural heritage present on the territory of another State Party with it (B24.4). Thus, two thirds of the countries reporting in this cycle (67%) fully or largely satisfied the core indicator B24 at the baseline, regarding active engagement with other States Parties in cooperation for safeguarding.

Half of the countries reported being involved in the activities of the UNESCO Category 2 Centre in Sofia, the [Regional Centre for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage in South-Eastern Europe](https://www.unesco-centerbg.org/en/) (B25.1). These activities included capacity-building workshops, publications, and the organization of a university network. Another nine countries were involved in Category 2 Centres based in other regions, but working with reporting countries. Armenia and Türkiye participate, for example, in the activities of the [Regional Research Centre for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage in West and Central Asia](https://ich.unesco.org/en/category2#iran-islamic-republic-of-regional-research-centre-for-safeguarding-intangible-cultural-heritage-in-west-and-central-asia) (Iran). Almost all countries reported encouraging and supporting international networking among communities, groups and individuals, NGOs, experts, centres of expertise and research institutes active in the field of intangible cultural heritage (B25.2). Most countries reported that they participated in intangible cultural heritage-related activities of international and regional bodies other than UNESCO (B25.3). These bodies included regional organizations such as the Commonwealth of Independent States, the Council of Europe and the European Union, as well as UN agencies such as WIPO (World Intellectual Property Organization) and the FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations). Overall, over four fifths of reporting countries (88%) fully or largely satisfied the core indicator B25 at the baseline, regarding active engagement in international networking and institutional cooperation.

### Challenges and opportunities

Reporting countries engaged extensively in international, regional and bilateral cooperation, especially (although of course not exclusively) within the European region, viz. UNESCO Electoral Groups I and II. Such cooperation was supported by strong regional frameworks, and the presence of well-funded NGOs and academic institutions. Intangible cultural heritage was referenced in foreign policy and diplomacy in a number of countries. The reports shared a number of examples of international cooperation initiatives with positive effects on the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. Most of these initiatives were managed by government agencies or cultural institutions, however. Community organizations and practitioners could benefit from increased visibility and support when undertaking cross-border cooperation in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding.

Intangible cultural heritage safeguarding can be conducted under other international frameworks than the Convention, both within and outside of UNESCO. The reports provided some good examples of ways in which synergies between frameworks provided overlapping protection for heritage practices, sites and landscapes, and supported environmental and human rights protection alongside safeguarding. Safeguarding projects in reporting countries may benefit from more general reflection about ways of harnessing synergies between such frameworks, and mitigating any tensions relating to their different aims and objectives.

### Inscriptions on the Lists and programmes selected for the Register[[80]](#footnote-80)

As mentioned in the introductory section, reporting countries have engaged extensively with the various international mechanisms of the Convention. In this cycle, reporting countries had nominated 12 elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List, 179 elements inscribed on the Representative List and 16 Programmes selected for the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. Multinational nominations have been a major tool in encouraging international cooperation for safeguarding specific elements among reporting countries and internationally, with 28 multinational inscriptions on the Representative List and one multinational programme on the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. As already mentioned above, experiences from good safeguarding practices, including those on the Register, in the Nordic-Baltic region were shared internationally through an [online platform](https://safeguardingpractices.com/).

The inscriptions “[Art of dry stone walling](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/art-of-dry-stone-walling-knowledge-and-techniques-01393)” and “[Mediterranean diet](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/mediterranean-diet-00884)”, involved seven or more reporting countries. Countries reported on plans to significantly expand the number of countries involved in the inscription “[Transhumance, the seasonal droving of livestock along migratory routes in the Mediterranean and in the Alps](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/transhumance-the-seasonal-droving-of-livestock-along-migratory-routes-in-the-mediterranean-and-in-the-alps-01470)” by Greece, Italy and Austria, with the addition of Spain, France, Romania, Luxembourg, Andorra, Albania and Slovenia. Further multinational nomination files were in progress at the time of reporting, including on the tradition of breeding Lipizzan horses. Regional cooperation for the safeguarding of Alpine food heritage also emerged out of the INTERREG Alpine Space Project [AlpFoodway](https://www.alpine-space.eu/projects/alpfoodway/en/home) (2016-2019), in preparation for a nomination to the Representative List. The [International Research Center for Traditional Polyphony](http://polyphony.ge/en/home-2/) in Georgia organized exchange visits with Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia and North Macedonia in the framework of an Erasmus+ project on inscribed elements or programmes relating to polyphonic singing on the Lists and Register of the Convention. The inscription of the “[Pilgrimage to the St. Thaddeus Apostle Monastery](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/pilgrimage-to-the-st-thaddeus-apostle-monastery-01571)” (Iran-Armenia) ensured cooperation around the sustainable transmission of knowledge about the Monastery and related rituals and traditions within the Armenian community living in the towns surrounding Chaldran County in Iran.

### International assistance funding[[81]](#footnote-81)

Eight projects were financed through the [International Assistance](https://ich.unesco.org/en/requesting-assistance-00039) mechanism of the Convention (the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund), benefiting five of the reporting countries: Albania, Armenia, Belarus, Latvia and Ukraine. Most of these projects concerned documentation and inventorying, an exception being Latvia, which received a grant for preparing an Urgent Safeguarding List nomination in 2008. Albania received International Assistance for three projects, including two inventorying projects, an inventory of “[Albanian folk iso-polyphony](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/albanian-folk-iso-polyphony-00155)”[[82]](#footnote-82) (2011-2012) and a community-based inventory of intangible cultural heritage in Albania (2020-2022). Ukraine received project funding in 2019 for a needs assessment for reinforcing national capacities in strategy development for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding.

### Accreditation of NGOs[[83]](#footnote-83)

As mentioned above, a large number of accredited NGOs (99 in all) were based in countries reporting in this cycle, representing about half of all NGOs accredited under the Convention by 2021. This report has given numerous examples above of how these organizations have played a variety of roles in the implementation of the Convention in reporting countries, sometimes acting as competent bodies, assisting in inventorying or awareness-raising and other aspects of safeguarding, facilitating community participation and so on. Accredited NGOs also played a role in international cooperation. A number of countries, including Bosnia and Herzegovina, Czechia, Luxembourg and Slovakia, for example, mentioned involvement in cross border activities of the International Council of Organizations of Folklore Festivals and Folk Arts (CIOFF), an NGO accredited under the Convention.

### Regional and international cooperation and engagement[[84]](#footnote-84)

Most countries reported high levels of international cooperation on intangible cultural heritage safeguarding in general (B24.1), with 95% (37 out of 39) reporting such cooperation at the regional level, 87% at the bilateral level (34 out of 39) and 85% at the international level (33 out of 39). Thirty countries (out of 39, or 77%) reported cooperation at all three levels (B24.1), see Figure 19 below.

##### Diagram, venn diagram Description automatically generatedFigure 19: Number of countries reporting regional (n=37), bilateral (n=34) and international cooperation (n=33) on intangible cultural heritage safeguarding in general (B24.1)

Slightly fewer countries reported such cooperation in regard to specific elements of intangible cultural heritage, with 78% (28 out of 36) reporting such cooperation at the regional level, 69% at the international level (25 out of 36) and 67% at the bilateral level (24 out of 36). Sixteen countries (44%) reported cooperation at all three levels in this regard (B24.2), see Figure 20.

##### Diagram, venn diagram Description automatically generatedFigure 20: Number of countries reporting regional (n=28), bilateral (n=24) and international (n=25) cooperation on intangible cultural heritage safeguarding for specific elements (B24.2)

Cooperation between countries on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage thus seems most frequently to have occurred at the regional level. This was often in the context of regional or sub-regional multilateral frameworks, as already mentioned above, such as the Commonwealth of Independent States ([CIS](https://e-cis.info/)), the [Council of Europe](https://www.coe.int/en/web/portal/home), the European Union ([EU](https://european-union.europa.eu/index_en)), the [Nordic Council of Ministers](https://www.norden.org/en/nordic-council-ministers) and the International Organization of Turkic Culture ([TURKSOY](https://www.turksoy.org/en-US)). Regional organizations such as these sometimes created policies and laws that affected the implementation of the Convention. Several Council of Europe framework conventions - including the [Faro Convention](https://www.coe.int/en/web/culture-and-heritage/faro-convention), the [Convention for the Protection of National Minorities](https://www.coe.int/en/web/minorities) and the [European Landscape Convention](https://www.coe.int/en/web/landscape), for example, encouraged integrated approaches to culture, human rights and environmental management in Europe. Under the [Framework Convention on the Protection and Sustainable Development of the Carpathians](http://www.carpathianconvention.org/convention/history/), involving Czechia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia and Ukraine, a working group has been created on the cultural heritage of the Carpathians and negotiations are in progress on an additional protocol concerning the intangible heritage of the region.

Some of these regional or sub-regional frameworks funded research or safeguarding projects. Others created frameworks for events, the designation of cultural capitals or commemorations. The Commonwealth of Independent States declared a cultural capital every year, and Member States organized events at the local level; it has declared 2022 as the "Year of Folklore and Cultural Heritage". In 2021, two NGOs in Armenia organized an "Exhibition-Fair of Armenian Folk Crafts" in the city of Gyumri of Shirak marz under the CIS programme.

TURKSOY has identified international, regional and sub-regional cooperation in the field of intangible cultural heritage as one of the priorities of cultural cooperation. Their work in this area included research and publication in Turkic languages and dialects, awareness-raising events and promoting shared culture. TURKSOY declared a different city of the Turkic World as its [Cultural Capital](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Culture_and_Arts_Capital_of_the_Turkic_World) annually and planned activities for commemorations and anniversaries.

European Union support was provided for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding in various ways, including under regional development programmes ([INTERREG](https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/home_en)) and [Creative Europe](https://culture.ec.europa.eu/creative-europe) for EU Member States, and the [European Neighbourhood Instrument](https://www.euneighbours.eu/en/policy/european-neighbourhood-instrument-eni#given) (ENI) for neighboring countries in the east and south. [European Capitals of Culture](https://culture.ec.europa.eu/policies/culture-in-cities-and-regions/european-capitals-of-culture) (ECoC) promoted cultural infrastructure, cultural activities and cultural tourism in cities, helping to create a positive environment for intangible cultural heritage awareness and safeguarding. The INTERREG [CHERISH](https://projects2014-2020.interregeurope.eu/cherish/good-practices/) project (2018-2023), for example, which aims to improve regional development policies to protect and promote cultural heritage in fishing communities in Europe, has helped to share [good practices](https://www.interregeurope.eu/policy-solutions/good-practices/projects?keywords=&projects=CHERISH) within the region. Creative Europe funding supported a project called “Heritage Hubs”, led by the Association of Cultural Heritage Education in Finland. This project brought together 10-16 year old children and young people from Finland, Serbia and Spain to share examples of their cultural heritage via digital platforms and to experience, interpret and practise the cultural heritage of others in face-to-face interaction at home and abroad. The pupils produced videos and other digital presentations of what they regarded as important cultural heritage.

Many countries also reported activities under the Council of Europe that supported intangible cultural heritage safeguarding, for example through the [European Heritage Days](https://www.coe.int/en/web/culture-and-heritage/european-heritage-days?id=tamara_200742911511), [European Heritage Label](https://culture.ec.europa.eu/cultural-heritage/initiatives-and-success-stories/european-heritage-label) sites, or [Cultural Routes](https://www.coe.int/en/web/cultural-routes/about). In 2018 the Republic of Moldova hosted an exhibition called “Woven Poems” at its embassy in Talinn, Estonia, raising awareness about traditional costumes and carpets as part of European Heritage Days. Cultural Routes connected different kinds of stakeholders across countries, raising awareness about tangible and intangible heritage, and helping to manage them in a holistic way. For example, the [Iter Vitis](https://www.coe.int/en/web/cultural-routes/the-iter-vitis-route) Cultural Route, in which fifteen of the reporting countries participated, raised awareness about the heritage of wine and winemaking.

The reports gave various examples of international cooperation at the multilateral or bilateral level that happened outside of these regional or sub-regional frameworks. In Hungary, for example, the Hungarian Heritage House hosted a [Handicraft Catalogue](https://keka.hagyomanyokhaza.hu) online that linked heritage craft practitioners, event organizers and customers, and showcased winners of craft competitions. By the end of the reporting cycle, the catalogue contained information about 141 skilled artisans from Hungary, Romania and Serbia, with plans to include artisans from other countries. Iceland and Norway organized a Summer Academy in 2021 called “Fiber Fokus: wool as a shared cultural heritage and art”, at which wool artists and craftspeople from the two countries exchanged knowledge and skills. A city twinning programme formed the basis of cooperation between Monaco and Sainte Dévote in Corsica (France), as both celebrate festivals commemorating the same patron saint.

Some reports mentioned collaboration between countries in different regions. For example, Czechia, Poland, Serbia and Slovakia worked with China on an international research and academic exchange on intangible cultural heritage safeguarding (2016-2019). The Turkish National Commission for UNESCO participated in a number of exchange meetings in 2017 and 2021 with UNESCO Chairs in Europe and National Commissions in Latin America and the Caribbean, Arab States and Africa. Within the context of the UNESCO project "Strengthening national capacities for safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage in Sudan", the Austrian Commission for UNESCO shared the experience of developing an Austrian database for intangible cultural heritage elements to help create a platform for a digital national inventory of the intangible cultural heritage in Sudan. Training was provided between December 2020 and August 2021 for Sudanese colleagues using the database.

The reports shared examples of cross-border community cooperation for the safeguarding of shared heritage too. Fairs, festivals and the activities of cultural institutions and organizations facilitated such exchanges. Andorra’s Ordino Livestock Fair, for example, provided opportunities for people from Andorra, France and Spain to share knowledge and experience around traditional foods and crafts. In Norway, the [Riddu Riddu Festival](http://www.riddu.no), an annual international festival of music and culture for indigenous people, was held in the municipality of Kåfjord in North Troms. The festival aimed to highlight, challenge and develop the culture and identity of the Sámi and other indigenous people. A few countries mentioned specific funding for community cooperation across borders. In the Netherlands, the Cultural Participation Fund offered a special-purpose grants scheme aimed at encouraging and facilitating international cooperation and exchange between practitioners of intangible cultural heritage.

As mentioned above, international cooperation was facilitated by strong expert networks of practitioners, accredited NGOs and academics, UNESCO Chairs, National Commissions for UNESCO and UNESCO Category 2 Centres on intangible cultural heritage. Category 2 Centres have played an important role in fostering international cooperation. In Bulgaria, the Sofia Category 2 Centre has supported the meetings of the [South East European Experts Network on Intangible Cultural Heritage](https://en.unesco.org/fieldoffice/venice/ichsee) (SEE) since 2012, and also the capacity-building programme of the Living Heritage Entity since 2017. The SEE network, established in 2007, contributes to the exchange of good practices, the implementation of regional projects, and the organization of annual meetings or workshops. The Network’s annual meetings are coordinated by the UNESCO Office in Venice around a different special theme chosen every year. The Sofia Centre launched a university network in 2018 to exchange good practices and promote cooperation on university education for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage in Southeast Europe. Since 2017, an international meeting of experts of intangible cultural heritage of the Tehran Regional Centre for Safeguarding the Intangible Cultural Heritage in West and Central Asia, also a Category 2 Centre, encouraged experience-sharing and visits between the Puppet and Doll Museum of Kashan of Iran and the "Church Calendar: Revival of Traditional Festivals" NGO operating in the community of Byurakan of Armenia.

International cooperation was supported by various institutions, including museums. In Latvia, the NGO “Skanumaja”, which promotes the playing of traditional instruments, and associated training courses and events, regularly cooperated with similar organizations in Lithuania, Estonia, Sweden, Russia and Great Britain to network, share educational methods and information about the use of traditional culture in contemporary cultural environments.

##### Example: Museums enabling international cooperation (Italy)

The role of museums as centres for cultural encounter, dialogue, innovation and knowledge-sharing in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding was discussed at an exhibition organized in Italy in the context of the EU-funded project [SWICH](https://www.swich-project.eu/) – Sharing a World of Inclusion, Creativity and Heritage (2014-2018). This project, a collaboration between a number of museums in Europe, focused on the practice of ethnographic museums in the context of post-migrant societies. Italy’s National Museum of Civilizations (MuCiv) and the "Luigi Pigorini" National Museum of Prehistory and Ethnography put on an exhibition in 2017 called “[The Making of a Point of View: Spotlights on the Indonesian and Malaysian Collections](https://www.swich-project.eu/nocache/documentation/detail/article/the-making-of-a-point-of-view-1/index.html)”. The exhibition contributed to the transmission of knowledge between the first and second generation of Indonesian diaspora-communities in Rome. It engaged a group of students of Indonesian origin as ambassadors for their cultural heritage. MuCiv has also been involved in creating a participatory digital archive to promote access to and use of the museum's collections by communities of origin, under the “[Aboriginal Archives](https://aboriginalarchivesitaly.com/)” project relating to indigenous peoples from Australia. The digital participatory archive was created using the open-source software Mukurtu, a digital space created specifically for accessing indigenous content.

### Synergies with international frameworks other than the 2003 Convention[[85]](#footnote-85)

Reporting countries mentioned safeguarding activities conducted under a number of international frameworks other than the 2003 Convention, both within UNESCO and outside of it. Because such activities were reported in both Section A7 and B25, responses to these questions were combined to make the summary below.

#### UNESCO frameworks other than the 2003 Convention

Activities that contributed to intangible cultural heritage safeguarding under UNESCO frameworks other than the Convention were shared in the reports (under A7). These activities particularly related to the 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage and the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions.

The [1972 Convention](https://whc.unesco.org/en) aims to help UNESCO Member States conserve cultural and natural heritage properties of Outstanding Universal Value, many of which have associated intangible cultural heritage. In the UNESCO World Heritage site, "Walled City of Baku with the Shirvanshah's Palace and Maiden Tower" in Azerbaijan, the Icherisheher Centre for Traditional Arts, established in 2012, ensures the continuity of local traditional crafts that link to the history of communities residing in the site. They offer a three-year training programme teaching crafts such as wood inlay, textile, ceramics and silverwork jewelry.

The [2005 Convention](https://en.unesco.org/creativity/) promotes cultural diversity and sustainable development by promoting policies supporting cultural and creative industries. For example, in Estonia, an annual Master Craftsman Contest was held in Viljandi, a UNESCO Creative City of Crafts and Folk Art. The theme of the contest for the year 2021 was ‘repairing’. This contest furthered the aims of both the 2003 and 2005 Conventions, raising awareness about intangible cultural heritage bearers and giving them recognition, as well as promoting cultural industries.

Several reports noted the value of ratifying the 1954 Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and its two Protocols, as well as the 1970 Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property. The practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage often depends on access to specific objects and places, and is threatened by conflict and illicit trade. The [1954 (Hague) Convention](https://en.unesco.org/protecting-heritage/convention-and-protocols/1954-convention) aims to protect cultural property and scientific collections in times of armed conflict. The [1970 Convention](https://en.unesco.org/about-us/legal-affairs/convention-means-prohibiting-and-https:/en.unesco.org/about-us/legal-affairs/convention-means-prohibiting-and-preventing-illicit-import-export-andpreventing-illicit-import-export-and) promotes international cooperation in addressing illicit trafficking of cultural heritage property. Ukraine ratified both Conventions and acceded to the second Protocol of the 1954 Convention in 2020. The Armed Forces of Ukraine has trained soldiers about the importance of protecting cultural heritage in situations of armed conflict, educating them about the traditional practices of Ukrainian and indigenous peoples.

The UNESCO [Man and the Biosphere Programme](https://en.unesco.org/mab) (MAB) is an intergovernmental programme that aims to establish a scientific basis for enhancing the relationship between people and their environments. At the time of reporting, there were about 260 biosphere reserves in [Europe](https://en.unesco.org/biosphere/eu-na), whose management involved various intangible cultural heritage practices. In Italy’s Sila Biosphere Reserve, for example, sustainable agricultural practices associated with soil maintenance and forest pastoral activities were included in the nomination file. In Menorca (Spain), the [Biosphere Reserve Action Plan](http://www.biosferamenorca.org/documents/documents/5107doc22.pdf), approved in 2019, included a specific section on safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage.

##### Example: Intangible cultural heritage of beekeeping as part of foreign policy and development cooperation (Slovenia)

The intangible cultural heritage of beekeeping was the subject of international cooperation for safeguarding under the UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Programme (MAB). In 2021, UNESCO and Guerlain launched a five-year female beekeeping entrepreneurship programme, "Women for Bees," implemented in UNESCO designated biosphere reserves around the world with the support of the French training centre OFA. Beekeepers from the [Kozjansko and Obsotelje Biosphere Reserve](https://en.unesco.org/biosphere/eu-na/kozjansko-obsotelje) in Slovenia (Kozjansko Regional Park) were among those who benefited from the project.

In Slovenia, intangible cultural heritage was also an important component of foreign policy and international development aid, contributing to more balanced and equitable fair global development, poverty eradication, reduction of inequalities and sustainable development in partner countries. In 2019, under the Honey Diplomacy initiative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, a project was implemented by the Embassy of the Republic of Slovenia in Tehran. Under this project, six urban beehives were donated for educational purposes and practical training to a school for Afghan girls and children of refugees in Karaj, Iran. The project aimed to empower vulnerable groups, particularly girls, street children and children of Afghan refugees and their families in Iran, by providing access to the opportunities offered by beekeeping and the production of honey and honey products.

#### International frameworks other than UNESCO

Nearly all of the reporting countries (38 out of 42, or 91%) participated in intangible cultural heritage-related activities of international and regional bodies other than UNESCO (as noted in B25.3). In Section A7, around half also reported synergies with international frameworks other than UNESCO, although not all countries completed this section fully.

The reports paid significant attention to environmental questions in this section. Reported synergies with international frameworks other than UNESCO most frequently involved the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (B25.3, A7). The [Convention on Biological Diversity](https://www.cbd.int/) (CBD), a multilateral treaty that came into force in 1993, promotes the conservation of biological diversity (or biodiversity) and the sustainable use of its components. The Convention’s Nagoya Protocol assists communities whose traditional knowledge is associated with local genetic resources to develop access and benefit sharing agreements with third parties using it for commercial purposes. Andorra’s sixth report on implementation of the CBD in 2018 positioned traditional knowledge as an important focus for conservation. Transhumance was mentioned in that report as an agricultural and forest management system with environmental benefits.

The [Ramsar Convention](https://www.ramsar.org/) is an intergovernmental treaty that provides the framework for the conservation and wise use of wetlands and their resources. In the Netherlands, RAMSAR designations in Curaçao and Aruba highlighted intangible cultural heritage associated with natural environments. In Curaçao, one RAMSAR site is part of a more extended region that participates in the UNESCO Man and Biosphere Program, and has an intangible cultural heritage component of traditional fishing. Such designations have helped to safeguard intangible cultural heritage that might otherwise have been threatened. The government in Curaçao was, for example, able to prevent semi-commercial recreational development of a RAMSAR site with rare traditional medicinal trees.

Several countries reported participating in the World Intellectual Property Organization ([WIPO](https://www.wipo.int/tk/en/igc/snapshot.html)) Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore (IGC). In 2021, the Belarusian National Intellectual Property Centre, in cooperation with WIPO, held a summer school devoted to various forms of intellectual property rights protection for traditional knowledge holders. In 2022, the Belarus Ministry of Culture planned to present some seminars on this topic for representatives of communities and NGOs engaged in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding.

The World Tourism Organization ([UNWTO](https://www.unwto.org/)) is the United Nations agency responsible for the promotion of responsible, sustainable and universally accessible tourism. Since 2012, a number of its activities and reports have referenced intangible cultural heritage. Belgium and Lithuania reported participating in the UNWTO Study on [Tourism and Intangible Cultural Heritage](https://www.e-unwto.org/doi/book/10.18111/9789284414796) (2012). In 2013, the Lithuanian Chamber of Tourism signed the UNWTO Private Sector Commitment to the [Global Code of Ethics for Tourism](https://www.unwto.org/global-code-of-ethics-for-tourism). This contributed to raising awareness about the use of intangible cultural heritage within the tourism sector and promoted respect for it.

### Baselines and targets

Table 10 below shows that two fifths of the countries (16 out of 42, or 38%) fully satisfied the core indicator B24 at the baseline, regarding active engagement with other States Parties in cooperation for safeguarding. A similar proportion (17 out of 42, or 40%) fully satisfied the core indicator B25 at the baseline, regarding active engagement in international networking and institutional cooperation. A further third of reporting countries in the case of B24 (12 out of 42, or 29%) and nearly half in the case of B25 (20 out of 42, or 48%), largely satisfied the baseline. As in the case of the Latin America and Caribbean cycle, these scores at the baseline do not fully reflect the high level of international cooperation and engagement of reporting countries in this cycle, perhaps because of the weighting given to sharing documentation (B24.4) and involvement in the activities of Category 2 Centres (B25.1), which was not always relevant given the absence of such centres in parts of the region.

Over 70% of reporting countries that set a target, set their targets as equal to their baseline for B24 and B25 (25 and 26 out of 35 respectively, or 71% and 74%). Reporting countries were more confident about future progress on B24 than the other indicators, with nearly a third (10 out of 35, or 29%) setting their target above the baseline. Seven countries likely did not set targets for B24-25.[[86]](#footnote-86)

##### Table 10: Attainment scores on the baseline for indicators B24 and B25 in reporting countries (n=42)

| **Indicator** | **Not satisfied** | **Minimally** | **Partially** | **Largely** | **Satisfied** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B24. Percentage of States Parties actively engaged with other States Parties in cooperation for safeguarding | 0/42 | 5/42 | 9/42 | 12/42 | 16/42 |
| B25. Percentage of States Parties actively engaged in international networking and institutional cooperation | 1/42 | 0/42 | 4/42 | 20/42 | 17/42 |

# Status of elements on the Representative List

Article 16 of the Convention states that the aims of inscriptions on the Representative List are “to ensure better visibility of the intangible cultural heritage and awareness of its significance, and to encourage dialogue which respects cultural diversity”. According to Article 29 of the Convention and ODs 151-152, States Parties shall submit reports to the Committee on currently inscribed elements, including those inscribed on the Representative List. Reporting on the status of elements inscribed on the Representative List can help to raise awareness about the significance of intangible cultural heritage. It can assist in the monitoring and evaluation of the role of the List, the impact of inscription, and contribute to the safeguarding of inscribed elements. The periodic report thus contains a number of questions about elements inscribed on the Representative List.

### Overview

Before the inscriptions at [16.COM](https://ich.unesco.org/en/16com) (2021), a total of 179 elements were inscribed on the Representative List by 37 out of the 44 countries reporting in this cycle. Twenty-eight of these elements were multinational nominations. The most inscriptions (19 each) were nominated by France and Türkiye. Only four of the reporting countries did not yet have inscriptions on any of the Lists or the Register by the end of the reporting cycle.

Figure 21 below shows how many reporting countries had elements inscribed on the Representative List within a few years after ratification of the Convention. Inscriptions in 2008, some of which happened before ratification, were linked to the incorporation of ‘Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity’ (2001-2005) into the Representative List.

##### A graph with blue and orange dots Description automatically generatedFigure 21: The time elapsed between ratification of the Convention and inscription of the first element on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity (A5)[[87]](#footnote-87)

### Social and cultural functions[[88]](#footnote-88)

Safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage depends on understanding and maintaining the social and cultural functions and meanings of the element for the communities, groups and individuals concerned. Section C1 of the periodic reporting form specifically requests information on changes to the information provided under inscription criterion R.1.

Most of the social functions of the elements analyzed for this report were reported as stable. Some elements continued to contribute to social cohesion even as some aspects of them changed. For example, organizing the [Ride of the Kings](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/ride-of-the-kings-in-the-south-east-of-the-czech-republic-00564) strengthened the sense of unity among residents in villages in the south east of Czechia, retaining its traditional character even as the practice involved a wider range of families. In Bulgaria, while the Survakar masquerade groups created new village celebrations for the “[Surova folk feast in Pernik region](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/surova-folk-feast-in-pernik-region-00968)”, some of the money collected was still donated to people in need or used to complete local projects. Other kinds of social functions were also mentioned in regard to inscribed elements. The report of the Republic of Moldova noted that in regard to [Traditional wall-carpet craftsmanship](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/traditional-wall-carpet-craftsmanship-in-romania-and-the-republic-of-moldova-01167), inscribed in 2016, the utilitarian and symbolic functions of the carpets, even for diaspora communities, remained the same, even as their sizes and motifs have changed. In Greece, “[Rebetiko](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/rebetiko-01291)” lyrics continued to represent working class experiences and the lives of marginalized groups, even as they referenced current events such as the financial downturn or more recently the immigration crisis. Thus, in many cases, the overall social functions of the intangible cultural heritage remained stable.

Some reports mentioned the incorporation of current themes around social equality, including gender equality, in the social functions of inscribed elements. The inscribed element “[Bećarac singing and playing from Eastern Croatia](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/bearac-singing-and-playing-from-eastern-croatia-00358)” is used to express opinions, criticisms, or feelings relating to current events and circumstances such as global changes (emigration, migration from the Middle East, COVID-19) or even sports competitions (games of the Croatian National Football team). The genre had recently become popular in social media, as a format for short videos with humorous texts. A debate on gender equality in the context of Bećarac indirectly influenced the revision of rules for the largest Bećarac festival in Croatia. From 2018, women were invited to play the opening role (pocimalje) in the formal performance of Bećarac and a separate women's competition category was created. In Cyprus, talented women began to occupy the previously exclusively male role of poetic duellist ([Tsiattista](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/tsiattista-poetic-duelling-00536)), performing improvised rhyming couplets in iambic fifteen-syllable verse in family gatherings or at local folk festivals. The "[Tradition of Kosiv painted ceramics](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/tradition-of-kosiv-painted-ceramics-01456)” in Ukraine saw both women and men being involved in painting as well as making the pottery during the reporting period, tasks which had previously been gender-specific. Involvement of younger practitioners also led to innovation. The craft has been invigorated by the emergence of ten young masters who have combined established traditions with new trends.

The social and cultural functions of some inscribed elements have been highlighted by the COVID-19 pandemic and climate change. Increased numbers of the Maltese population tried to make their own [Ftira](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/il-ftira-culinary-art-and-culture-of-flattened-sourdough-bread-in-malta-01580) bread at home during the pandemic, and home bakers shared their recipes and ideas on social media platforms. In the Netherlands, the “[Craft of the miller operating windmills and watermills](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/craft-of-the-miller-operating-windmills-and-watermills-01265)” became more significant because many more people wanted to bake at home using traditionally milled flour. At the same time, concern about climate change elevated the importance of historical mills as auxiliary pumping stations to manage water levels. The sustainable production methods used by the millers generated greater public interest in this context, too.

Because of the need to respond to climate change, agricultural practices such as [dry stone walling](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/art-of-dry-stone-walling-knowledge-and-techniques-01393) (Croatia, Cyprus, France, Greece, Italy, Slovenia, Spain and Switzerland) have attracted increased public interest in many reporting countries as a way to promote environmental sustainability. Switzerland’s report noted that restrictions on travel abroad encouraged residents to (re)discover their local environment and to engage in dry wall renovation. In spite of urbanization and fewer permanent inhabitants in rural areas, dry stone construction was increasingly understood as part of the cultural landscape. Dry stone structures were becoming more highly valued because of their functional properties (isothermia, regulation of ventilation and humidity), and the fact that stone construction by hand avoids use of expensive insulation materials or energy-consuming machines.

### Assessment of viability and current risks[[89]](#footnote-89)

The development of intangible cultural heritage safeguarding strategies is based on an assessment of the current level of viability of the element, and threats or risks to this viability, if any. This may change over time, so Section C2 of the Periodic reporting form specifically requests information on the current viability of inscribed elements, even those on the Representative List.

Most countries reported ongoing viability of inscribed elements, which was in some cases promoted by increased visibility and awareness after inscription on the Representative List. Following inscription in 2012 of “[Craftsmanship and performance art of the Tar, a long-necked string musical instrument](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/craftsmanship-and-performance-art-of-the-tar-a-long-necked-string-musical-instrument-00671)” in Azerbaijan, tar musical instrument makers experienced increased demand for instruments and employed more apprentices, promoting viability of the element and practitioner livelihoods, as instrument making was their main source of income. Tar performers continued to play an essential role in weddings and other social gatherings, festive events, public concerts, TV- and radio programs and annual competitions. The tar remained one of the most popular amateur instruments in the country in this reporting cycle. In the case of “[Puppetry in Slovakia and Czechia](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/puppetry-in-slovakia-and-czechia-01202)”, inscription on the Representative List in 2016 led to increased awareness of its importance as intangible cultural heritage at national or local level in Slovakia. Before its inscription, the element had been mainly perceived by the public as a minority theatre genre intended simply to entertain children and provide an aesthetic experience. Serbia’s report noted that the ongoing inter-generational transmission of “[Zlakusa pottery making, hand-wheel pottery making in the village of Zlakusa](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/zlakusa-pottery-making-hand-wheel-pottery-making-in-the-village-of-zlakusa-01466)”, inscribed in 2020, was supported by awareness-raising activities of the Staro Selo Open-Air Museum Sirogojno and by the continued practice of transmission within families. The increasing number of young potters using hand-powered wheels helped to maintain the quality of the pottery and raised awareness of the skill. This reduced market competition with pottery made using non-traditional techniques, including mechanization.

Major threats and risks to viability mentioned in the reports included urbanization (specifically, young people moving away from rural areas), loss of interest in practice of the elements by young people, changing food habits, over-commercialization, counterfeit products competing with handicrafts, environmental sustainability, lack of raw material necessary for handicrafts, disappearance of places and venues associated with the practice of intangible cultural heritage, economic constraints and the COVID-19 pandemic. In North Macedonia, the viability of “[Kopachkata, a social dance from the village of Dramche, Pijanec](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/kopachkata-a-social-dance-from-the-village-of-dramche-pijanec-00995)” was affected somewhat negatively by depopulation due to out-migration, although traditional modes of transmission remained strong. In Hungary, safeguarding actions after inscription and rising demand for [blue print](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/blaudruck-modrotisk-kkfests-modrotla-resist-block-printing-and-indigo-dyeing-in-europe-01365) products helped to support three family-owned workshops. Distinguishing the outputs from these workshops from ‘counterfeit’ products made using other techniques remained a challenge, nevertheless. France’s report noted that while more widespread availability on the internet of the work of “[Maloya](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/maloya-00249)” song and dance artists in Réunion Island had played an important part in giving them increased visibility, it also posed some threats to viability of the element. A community organization (La klarté, the Committee for Maloya) noted that as it became more popular, greater emphasis was sometimes placed on aesthetic rather than spiritual aspects of the performance, and that texts of the stage repertoire showed a reduction in references to struggle. They thus took steps to ensure that the spiritual aspects of the tradition were maintained and were vigilant against inappropriate commercial uses of it.

As already mentioned above, the COVID-19 pandemic affected the practice and transmission of many intangible cultural heritage elements, often alongside existing challenges. Czechia reported that [Slovácko Verbuňk](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/slovcko-verbuk-recruit-dances-00147) recruit dancing had become more popular across the country since inscription in 2008. However, increased urbanization led to the loss of some ceremonial contexts for its performance and also to the mixing of “verbunk” styles, with the loss of some regional repertoires. The high cost of costumes, music, refreshments and spaces for performance in urban areas hampered practice of the element, as did the economic impact of the pandemic in 2020-2021.

The pandemic had both positive and negative effects. Many gatherings, festivals and productions associated with inscribed elements were cancelled or curtailed. Some activities moved online, which broadened access to and awareness in some contexts. For example, Ireland reported that the pandemic affected “[Hurling](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/hurling-01263)” negatively by reducing revenue opportunities and disrupting planned programmes, but more recent innovations in online learning allowed volunteers from every part of Ireland and internationally to access online workshops, courses and videos at any time. Germany noted that the pandemic accelerated an existing decline in church attendance and shut down secular concert life. Nevertheless, lockdowns also provided an opportunity for organ builders to repair the instruments and for organists to do online performances, thus contributing to the viability of “[Organ craftsmanship and music](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/organ-craftsmanship-and-music-01277)”. Unfortunately, online experiences of concert recordings cannot mimic the experience of live performances. As restrictions were lifted, new educational concepts were thus put in place to encourage active participation of children.

Some of the negative effects of the pandemic were short term in nature. Enthusiasm for intangible cultural heritage events was thus rekindled to some extent as normal life resumed, for example, during the performance of the [Saint Hubert Trumpeters](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/musical-art-of-horn-players-an-instrumental-technique-linked-to-singing-breath-control-vibrato-resonance-of-place-and-conviviality-01581) of Luxembourg in June 2021. Longer-term effects of the pandemic on inscribed elements may become evident in later reporting cycles.

### Contribution to the goals of the List[[90]](#footnote-90)

The goals of the Representative List include ensuring visibility of the intangible cultural heritage in general, raising awareness at the local, national and international levels of its importance, as well as promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity, and mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals. Section C3 of the Periodic reporting form thus requests information on how inscription of the element has contributed to achieving these goals. Answering this question requires consideration of the impact of inscription from the perspective of the goals of the Convention, and not just specific safeguarding goals relating to an inscribed element.

The reports noted a growing awareness about the value of intangible cultural heritage in society, aided by inscriptions on the Representative List. This seemed to be especially true for the first inscriptions in each country and those that are widely practised, or where inscription was accompanied by significant media attention. In the Republic of Moldova, inscription in 2013 of “[Men’s group Colindat, Christmas-time ritual](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/mens-group-colindat-christmas-time-ritual-00865)”, a multinational file with Romania, led to increased local support for intangible cultural heritage practice from municipalities, museums, NGOs and communities concerned. Moldovans living in other countries have used the carolling tradition to help create a stronger link with their home country, and to speak about their own cultural identity in the diaspora context. The inscription of [Petrykivka decorative painting as a phenomenon of the Ukrainian ornamental folk art](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/petrykivka-decorative-painting-as-a-phenomenon-of-the-ukrainian-ornamental-folk-art-00893) has helped to promote awareness of intangible cultural heritage at the national level through celebrations of the anniversary of inscription every December. A series of exhibitions held internationally between 2015 and 2019 also helped to popularize Ukrainian intangible cultural heritage at a broader level. However, not all inscriptions encouraged local and national authorities, and other stakeholders, to invest more in supporting intangible cultural heritage safeguarding or to recognize its value. Romania’s report noted that while county administrations still organized [Colindat](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/mens-group-colindat-christmas-time-ritual-00865) carolling celebrations in some areas, in other areas the local authorities have become less involved and key performers have moved away, leading to a decline in organized events that was exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Inscription on the Representative List promoted respect for cultural diversity and human creativity, or among communities, groups and individuals, in various ways both at the national level and internationally. For example, at the national level, inscription of elements practised by communities that had been previously marginalized, and the participation of minority groups in cultural events, promoted increased respect for cultural diversity and mutual respect between groups. In Albania, this was the case when members of minority groups and people from neighbouring countries participated in the Folklore Festivals "Përmeti Multikulturor" and "Divani Lunxhiot" that included performances of “[Albanian folk iso-polyphony](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/albanian-folk-iso-polyphony-00155)”. Some reports mentioned how the competitive character of some intangible cultural heritage elements contributed to human creativity and intercultural dialogue. In Türkiye, the “[Kırkpınar oil wrestling festival](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/krkpnar-oil-wrestling-festival-00386)” provided an opportunity for competitive testing of individual skill as well as for meeting people from different backgrounds, teaching respect for diversity.

At the international level, inscription of “[Shrimp fishing on horseback in Oostduinkerke](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/shrimp-fishing-on-horseback-in-oostduinkerke-00673)” (in 2013, nominated by Belgium) promoted cross-border dialogue with the community of [Haenyeo divers](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/culture-of-jeju-haenyeo-women-divers-01068) on Jeju Island (Republic of Korea) and a community of dip net fishing practitioners from the Torne river in Sweden and Finland. This strengthened understanding of and respect for diverse local artisanal fishing cultures and how to safeguard them. The exhibition “[Walking the Indigo Walk](https://www.unesco.at/presse/artikel/article/internationale-blaudruck-ausstellung-walking-the-indigo-walk)” coordinated by the Austrian Commission for UNESCO, displayed on the fence of the headquarters of UNESCO during the UNESCO General Assembly in 2019, involved the five reporting countries (Austria, Czechia, Germany, Hungary and Slovakia) involved in the multinational nomination of [blue print](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/blaudruck-modrotisk-kkfests-modrotla-resist-block-printing-and-indigo-dyeing-in-europe-01365). It also showcased indigo dyeing practices from other parts of the world, including Bangladesh, Colombia, Estonia, Georgia, India, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Lithuania, Latvia, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Romania, the Russian Federation and Palestine. Textile artisans, artists, and designers from around the world submitted more than thirty indigo designs. This showed how widespread the practice is as a common heritage across the world, and highlighted international cooperation and exchange between practitioners.

### Efforts to promote or reinforce the element[[91]](#footnote-91)

Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage often involves the development and implementation of safeguarding measures. Section C4 of the Periodic reporting form thus requests information on the measures that have been implemented to promote and reinforce the element, particularly detailing any measures that might have been necessary as a consequence of its inscription.

Inscription on the Representative List in some cases necessitated implementation of additional safeguarding measures to address negative effects of greater visibility, including new commercial pressures. To protect the livelihoods of practitioners of “[Azerbaijani carpet weaving](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/traditional-art-of-azerbaijani-carpet-weaving-in-the-republic-of-azerbaijan-00389)” against unfair competition from mass-produced products, the Museum of Azerbaijani Carpets reinforced its procedures and requirements for the certification of carpets, especially those sold to tourists.[[92]](#footnote-92) Certification was based on traditional criteria including the quality of wool, use of natural dyes, traditional weaving technologies and patterns. In a similar vein, the Cyprus Organization of Standardization drafted a National Standard, gazetted in December 2015, to protect “[Lefkara laces or Lefkaritika](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/lefkara-laces-or-lefkaritika-00255)” against unfair competition. The standard set out the main characteristics of the handicrafts in terms of designs, techniques and materials, in consultation with key stakeholders, particularly bearers and practitioners. This was utilized for the certification of handmade Lefkara Laces, distinguishing them from other types of lace. A similar standard was being drafted for the Fyti Embroideries on a Weaving Loom, also included on the National Inventory.

A wide variety of safeguarding measures was implemented for inscribed elements, including provision of funding, infrastructure and legal protection, establishment of organizations with safeguarding mandates, educational and awareness-raising programmes, and support for festivals, competitions and research. For example, through the National Center of Traditional Activities, the Albanian Ministry of Culture supported several festivals promoting the element “[Albanian folk iso-polyphony](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/albanian-folk-iso-polyphony-00155)”, including the National Typological Folklore Festival of Iso-Polyphony, celebrated in Gjirokastra in November 2021. The Institute of Cultural Anthropology and Art Studies undertook research and digitization, and produced publications on Albanian iso-polyphony. In 2020, an interactive museum on the Ukrainian [Tradition of Kosiv painted ceramics](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/tradition-of-kosiv-painted-ceramics-01456) was created by modernizing part of the exhibition of the Kosiv Museum of Folk Art and Life of the Hutsul Region. Seven films about Kosiv ceramic masters were broadcast on regional TV channels and social media as part of the Inexhaustible Source Project and the Painted Jar Festival in the same year, and various festivals, competitions and exhibitions were organized to promote their work up to the end of the reporting period. Practitioners participated in a workshop on copyright protection and attribution of their work, co-organized by the regional chapter of the National Union of Artists of Ukraine.

Research played an important part in guiding some safeguarding activities, as indicated in several of the Thematic Areas above. In Austria, the Spanish Riding School in Vienna and the Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for Archaeological Prospection and Virtual Archaeology (LBI ArchPro) conducted a [research project](https://piber.lbi-archpro.org/) in November 2020. The project produced detailed digital images of historical buildings at the Lipizzaner Stud Piber in Styria and the surrounding landscape. These images will help to conserve the tangible heritage spaces necessary for the practice of [Classical horsemanship](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/classical-horsemanship-and-the-high-school-of-the-spanish-riding-school-vienna-01106) at the School, which involves breeding, keeping, training and riding Lipizzaner horses.

Many reports mentioned awareness-raising activities among the safeguarding measures. Several documentary films were produced about “[Falconry](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/falconry-a-living-human-heritage-01708)” in Slovakia, for example, with the active participation of the Slovak Falconers’ Club. Local falconers and their birds were featured on the Halali television programme, contributed to the Falconer (Sokoliar) magazine among others, and performed at permanent falconry stages and on tours through the country and elsewhere in Europe. As an innovative promotional activity, in 2021 the Croatian Post Office issued a special postage stamp celebrating “[Spring procession of Ljelje/Kraljice (queens) from Gorjani](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/spring-procession-of-ljelje-kraljice-queens-from-gorjani-00235)”, distributed by Lucija Karalic Cultural and Tourist Center in Gorjani.

As discussed above, digital tools have become very important in not only promoting awareness and public participation, but also encouraging sharing of information. In Andorra, public participation in practising and researching “[Summer solstice fire festivals in the Pyrenees](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/summer-solstice-fire-festivals-in-the-pyrenees-01073)” was promoted through a [festival website](https://fallesandorra.com/), international symposiums and a [virtual museum](https://prometheus.museum/). A ‘Mediterranean Fire Festivals Symposium’ was held in Andorra la Vella in 2019, linking the element to related regional manifestations. In Portugal, an online Digital Sound Archive was launched in 2017, providing free access to thousands of sound recordings of “[Fado, urban popular song of Portugal](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/fado-urban-popular-song-of-portugal-00563)”. In partnership with the Lithuanian Culture Research Institute, the Lithuanian National Commission for UNESCO created a [website](https://kryzdirbysteskelias.lt/) for the element “[Cross-crafting and its symbolism](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/cross-crafting-and-its-symbolism-00013)”, containing the maps of cross-crafting sites and cross crafters. This was part of other safeguarding actions. Under the Council of Europe [Cultural Routes](https://www.coe.int/en/web/cultural-routes/about) programme, the “[Santiago de Compostela Pilgrim Routes](https://www.coe.int/en/web/cultural-routes/the-santiago-de-compostela-pilgrim-routes)” included the Hill of Crosses, which promoted the craft and helped to sustain cross-crafters’ livelihoods. Scholarships for Art Creators and a cross-crafters’ certification administered by the Lithuanian Ministry of Agriculture supported practitioner training.

Several reports noted the development of specific organizations, networks or committees to implement safeguarding measures for inscribed elements. In Italy, for example, the "Italian Network of Organizations for the Protection, Promotion, and Enhancement of the “[Opera dei Pupi](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/opera-dei-pupi-sicilian-puppet-theatre-00011)" was established in 2018 to support safeguarding of the element. In Slovenia, the Municipality and the Capuchin monastery of Škofja Loka worked together with the local community to safeguard the “[Škofja Loka Passion Play](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/kofja-loka-passion-play-01203)”, inscribed in 2016. A new municipal public institution (Institution 973) and two professional advisory boards were created to take care of the staging and organization of the play.

### Community participation in safeguarding[[93]](#footnote-93)

The participation of communities, groups and individuals concerned is essential in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, assisted where relevant by NGOs. Section C5 of the Periodic reporting form thus requests information on such participation and prospects for its continuation in the future.

According to the reports in this cycle, community participation was generally directed towards supporting continued practice and transmission of the element, involving various communities, groups and other stakeholders, depending on the element. Romania’s report noted that performers, teachers, the local administration, parish priests and families in the area were very active in safeguarding “[Men’s group Colindat, Christmas-time ritual](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/mens-group-colindat-christmas-time-ritual-00865)”, organizing events, a children’s folk ensemble and ensembles for non-professional dancers. Community involvement in the safeguarding of inscribed elements was inclusive of different social groups in some cases, too. For example, in North Macedonia, the “[Feast of the Holy Forty Martyrs in Štip](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/feast-of-the-holy-forty-martyrs-in-tip-00734)” involves all city inhabitants of different ages and genders, social, economic and religious backgrounds, including Orthodox Christians and Muslims, the latter predominantly Roma. Diaspora communities in Latvia were involved in the practice and transmission of the [Baltic song and dance celebrations](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/baltic-song-and-dance-celebrations-00087) (Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania). Among more than 43,000 participants in the Celebration in 2018, there were 84 foreign Latvian artistic collectives with 2,411 participants. Around 57,000 children and young people were involved as early as autumn 2019 in rehearsing for the Celebration of 2021.

While some reports mentioned the roles of individual practitioners and bearers, community members also established organizational structures to support safeguarding activities, including local unions, associations, committees and NGOs. For example, the Union of Artists and Calligraphers of Georgia held annual competitions for young people practising “[Living culture of three writing systems of the Georgian alphabet](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/living-culture-of-three-writing-systems-of-the-georgian-alphabet-01205)”, especially in Kvemo-Kartli where many non-Georgian-speaking communities reside. In Türkiye, nearly 500 archery clubs representing practitioners of “[Traditional Turkish Archery](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/traditional-turkish-archery-01367)” enrolled as members of the Traditional Turkish Archery Federation, established in 2019. The Federation worked with community members and other NGOs to draw up a safeguarding plan for the element, implement it and to monitor safeguarding efforts after inscription.

Community members and organizations frequently worked with other stakeholders, including museums and NGOs, to organize activities and to develop and implement safeguarding measures. In Luxembourg, for example, the Willibrord Foundation (Willibrordus Bauverein) worked with the City of Echternach to promote the “[Hopping procession of Echternach](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/hopping-procession-of-echternach-00392)” and to involve local communities in its safeguarding. This included launching a competition for local students to develop a logo for the event in 2017. The Foundation also facilitated community exchanges with Carlow in Ireland, where St Willibrord, patron saint of Luxembourg, lived before establishing his monastery in Echternach. In 2020, when the procession was cancelled, community members were encouraged to use a platform on the Ministry of Culture’s [intangible cultural heritage website](https://iki.lu/) to share documentary film and photographs from the Procession in 2019.

### Institutional context[[94]](#footnote-94)

Community organizations and other stakeholder agencies generally play an essential role in the safeguarding of inscribed intangible cultural heritage elements, and carry formal responsibilities for doing so in some contexts. Section C6 of the periodic reporting form thus requests information on the institutional context for the element inscribed on the Representative List, including competent bodies involved in its management and/or safeguarding, and organizations of the community or group concerned with the element and its safeguarding.

Not all inscribed elements had (or needed) community organizations established for their safeguarding. Mountaineering, cycling and social clubs were among the community organizations that supported “[Picking of iva grass on Ozren mountain](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/picking-of-iva-grass-on-ozren-mountain-01289)” in Bosnia and Herzegovina, for example, but no community organization specifically focused on grass picking was reported to have been created for its safeguarding. In many cases, community organizations were established for safeguarding a specific inscribed element. In Germany, for example, associations such as the German Federation of Organ Experts (VOD) and the Federation of German Master Organ Builders (BDO) acted as information and fund-raising hubs for “[Organ Craftsmanship and Music](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/organ-craftsmanship-and-music-01277)” during the COVID-19 pandemic, providing vital advice on heating, ventilation and safety. Sometimes very few organizations were involved in organizing the actual practice and transmission of an element. For example, the “[Krakelingen and Tonnekensbrand, end-of-winter bread and fire feast at Geraardsbergen](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/krakelingen-and-tonnekensbrand-end-of-winter-bread-and-fire-feast-at-geraardsbergen-00401)” was run by local government in consultation with the community’s Krakelingen Committee. A lack of organizational infrastructure, including full time professional support and a recognized location, sometimes hampered safeguarding. The volunteer organization representing the “[Irish harping](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/irish-harping-01461)” community (Ireland) noted that this had been a barrier to implementing the core recommendations of the 2016 Art Council-commissioned Report on Irish Harping by Toner Quinn.

Reporting countries mentioned a wide range of organizations with formal responsibilities for safeguarding inscribed elements alongside communities concerned, including ministries responsible for culture at national or sub-national levels, municipal authorities, museums, research organizations and NGOs. In regard to “[The tradition of carpet-making in Chiprovtsi](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/the-tradition-of-carpet-making-in-chiprovtsi-00965)” in Bulgaria, for example, relevant institutions involved in safeguarding included the community organization Petar Bogdan-1909 Chitalishte in the town of Chiprovtsi, as well as the mayor of Chiprovtsi Municipality, the Montana District Administration and the competent authorities at the national level under the Ministry of Culture. The Regional History Museum (Montana) and the History Museum (Chiprovtsi) did research and provided expert assistance in safeguarding and promoting the element.

In many cases, organizations with formal responsibilities for safeguarding inscribed elements at the national level bore broader responsibilities for regularly updating inventories and developing policy frameworks or safeguarding programming. Academic or cultural institutions, whether national or local, were usually responsible for more general research, conservation, protection and dissemination of tangible and intangible cultural heritage. These kinds of institutions worked with local stakeholders with more specific mandates in respect of the element itself and the location in which it is practised, for example developing safeguarding measures or organizing events. Other kinds of supporting organizations assisted in this process, for example by maintaining associated tangible heritage or supporting education and awareness raising. Effective collaboration between different stakeholders was thus mentioned in the reports as a key criterion for the success of safeguarding measures. National Commissions for UNESCO sometimes played a coordinating role in this regard at the national level. Georgia’s report noted the important work done by the Georgian National Wrestling Federation, in coordinating safeguarding work for “[Chidaoba, wrestling in Georgia](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/chidaoba-wrestling-in-georgia-01371)” at different levels across the country and abroad.

### Participation of communities in preparing the Periodic report[[95]](#footnote-95)

Article 15 of the Convention encourages States Parties to ensure the widest possible participation of the communities, groups and, where applicable, individuals concerned as well as relevant NGOs in safeguarding activities. Section C7 of the periodic reporting form thus requests information on the extent of their participation during the process of preparation of this report.

Although the periodic reports were usually compiled by competent bodies or relevant staff in ministries responsible for culture, or National Commissions for UNESCO, significant efforts were made to ensure participation of communities, groups and, where applicable, individuals concerned. In Armenia, the report on “[Duduk and its music](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/duduk-and-its-music-00092)” was compiled with the input of specialist duduk music teachers, expert musical instrument makers and some of the best duduk players, alongside inputs from educational, cultural and non-governmental organizations, particularly local museums, which provided significant information on community safeguarding events, activities of individual bearers and their funding situation. In some cases, consultation processes were delegated to local authorities, museums, intangible cultural heritage bodies or NGOs. For example, [blue print](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/blaudruck-modrotisk-kkfests-modrotla-resist-block-printing-and-indigo-dyeing-in-europe-01365) practitioners in Hungary did not have their own NGO or association. Therefore, the Association of Folk Artists, which worked on behalf of all artisans nationwide, organized community consultations, collected data and liaised between practitioners and the Intangible Cultural Heritage Directorate of the Hungarian Open Air Museum, which was responsible for reporting on this element.

Different methods of community consultation were used, including meetings, surveys, follow-ups after events linked to festivals or processions. Documentation about intangible cultural heritage elements, inventories, censuses of practitioners, municipal-level questionnaires and research interviews with community members were also sometimes used to compile information for the reports. The Arts Council Norway, for example, used a piece of research done by a local practitioner and researcher in 2020 to draft an initial report on the “[Practice of traditional music and dance in Setesdal, playing, dancing and singing (stev/stevjing)](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/practice-of-traditional-music-and-dance-in-setesdal-playing-dancing-and-singing-stev-stevjing-01432)” in Norwegian. The draft report was sent to the Setesdal Folk Music Association, made available online and sent to other key stakeholders for comment and amendment before being finalized and translated for the periodic report. Community members were given the opportunity in a number of other cases, too, to check the periodic reports for accuracy and make amendments. Two rounds of consultation with community members, institutions and experts were held in Polish on the reports for “[Nativity scene (szopka) tradition in Krakow](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/nativity-scene-szopka-tradition-in-krakow-01362)” (Poland) and “[Tree beekeeping culture](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/tree-beekeeping-culture-01573)” (Poland and Belarus) before translation and finalization of the text in English for Poland’s report. This underlined the importance of using local languages to enable effective consultation.

The reports mentioned a number of challenges ensuring community participation in reporting, including the specialist language of the reporting form. Personal communications, discussions or shorter and more accessible questionnaires tailored to specific audiences were thus needed to elicit information required for the reporting process. Difficulties in organizing in-person meetings during the COVID-19 pandemic frequently necessitated a move to online modalities and these digital tools were useful in enabling broad community consultation.

1. Two reports (Montenegro and Ukraine) have not been included in the statistical analysis for section B because they were submitted after the completion of the analysis. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. At 16.COM in 2021, after this reporting cycle, “[Cultural Heritage of Boka Navy Kotor: a festive representation of a memory and cultural identity](https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/cultural-heritage-of-boka-navy-kotor-a-festive-representation-of-a-memory-and-cultural-identity-01727)” was inscribed on the Representative List. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. On 2 December 2022, the seventeenth session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage has decided to remove the ‘Ducasse of Ath’ of the element ‘Processional giants and dragons in Belgium and France’ (Belgium and France) from the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity (Decision [17.COM 8.a](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/17.COM/8.a)). For further information, see document [LHE/22/17.COM/8.a](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-22-17.COM-8-EN.docx). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Resolution 31/21 of the Sámi Parliament in Norway on Ownership of Sámi Intangible Cultural Heritage. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. See <https://www.unesco.org/en/gender-equality> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. References to “whether or not inscribed” should be understood to mean “inscribed on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding or the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity”. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. References to “inclusive”, “inclusively” or “on an inclusive basis” should be understood to mean “inclusive of all sectors and strata of society, including indigenous peoples, migrants, immigrants and refugees, people of different ages and genders, persons with disabilities and members of vulnerable groups” (cf. Operational Directives 174 and 194). When these actions and outcomes are reported, States Parties will be encouraged to provide disaggregated data or to explain how such inclusiveness is ensured. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Refer to assessment factors B1.1 and B1.2 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Refer to assessment factor B1.3 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Refer to Assessment Factors B1.4 and B1.5 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this Thematic Area. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. The periodic reporting form automatically sets the baseline target as ‘not satisfied’ if no target is set, so unless the country indicated a reason for setting a ‘not satisfied’ target, this has been regarded as a non-response. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. In this report, although it is part of Thematic Area I, the core indicator B2 has been included in the current section, as it closely relates to capacity development through education. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Although the Convention consistently utilizes the expression, “communities, groups and individuals”, several assessment factors, like some Operational Directives, choose to refer to “practitioners and bearers” to better identify certain of their members who play a specific role with regards to their intangible cultural heritage. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Refer to Core Indicators B2, B5, B6, and Assessment Factors B4.3 and B4.4 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this Thematic Area. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. According to UNESCO, non-formal education is institutionalized, intentional and planned. Its defining characteristic is that it is an addition, alternative and/or a complement to formal education (cf. <http://uis.unesco.org/en/glossary-term/non-formal-education>). Countries recognize that intangible cultural heritage, however, is transmitted mainly in an informal context, which is why non-formal education in this context is used to include a range of different formalities that could also be involved in community-based transmission. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Tertiary and post-secondary education (B2.1, B6.1 and 6.2) were not always clearly distinguished in the reports. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Refer to Assessment Factors B3.1 and B4.1 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this Thematic Area. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Refer to core indicator B2 and assessment factor B3.2 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. The “ethnopôle” label is used by the French Ministry of Culture to describe cultural institutions working both locally and nationally in the fields of ethnological and intangible cultural heritage research, information and cultural action. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Refer to core indicators B2 and B3 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Refer to Core Indicator B4 and Assessment Factors B4.2, B5.2, and B6.1 in the above List of core indicators and assessment factors for this Thematic Area. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Dual education systems combine practical work experience through professional apprenticeships with vocational education at school. Systematic training of apprentices in this way, organized by trade associations and by skilled masters managing their own businesses, is essential for the safeguarding of traditional craftsmanship in some countries, as reported for example by Austria, Germany and Slovakia. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. The Periodic reportingPeriodic reporting form automatically sets the baseline target as ‘not satisfied’ if no target is set, so unless the country indicated a reason for setting a ‘not satisfied’ target, this has been regarded as a non-response. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. As section A6 of the periodic reporting form also contains a number of questions about individual inventories, the analysis of that section has been included here. Questions about research and documentation that are part of thematic area III have been included in the following section of this report. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Refer to section A6 of the periodic reporting form. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Refer to section A6.p in the periodic reporting form, and assessment factor B8.1 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Refer to section A6.o in the periodic reporting form, and assessment factors B7.4a and B8.1 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. See the 2021 action plan "Menningarsókn – Aðgerðaáætlun til 2030" under Iceland’s 2013 Cultural Policy. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Refer to sections A6.i, j, q and r in the periodic reporting form, and assessment factors B7.1b, B7.2 and B8.2 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. Refer to section A6.h, i and j in the periodic reporting form. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. Refer to section A6.f, k, l, and m in the periodic reporting form, and assessment factors B7.1a, B7.2, B7.3, and B7.4b in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. The periodic reporting form automatically sets the baseline target as ‘not satisfied’ if no target is set, so unless the country indicated a reason for setting a ‘not satisfied’ target, this has been regarded as a non-response. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. Refer to assessment factors B9.1 and B9.2 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. Refer to assessment factors B9.3 and B10.1 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. https://www.vr.se/analys/rapporter/vara-rapporter/2017-08-29-god-forskningssed.htm. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. Refer to assessment factors B10.2 and B10.3 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. The Periodic reportingperiodic reporting form automatically sets the baseline target as ‘not satisfied’ if no target is set, so unless the country indicated a reason for setting a ‘not satisfied’ target, this has been regarded as a non-response. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. In conformity with Chapter VI of the Operational Directives, “inclusive social development” comprises food security, health care, gender equality, access to clean and safe water and sustainable water use; quality education is included within core indicator B12. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. In conformity with Chapter VI of the Operational Directives, “inclusive economic development” comprises income generation and sustainable livelihoods, productive employment and decent work, and impact of tourism on the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage and *vice versa*. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. Refer to assessment factors B11.1 and B11.2 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. The exact date of establishment of policies and/or legal and administrative measures in the culture sector that incorporated intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding and reflected its diversity was reported by 38 countries. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. Not all countries gave a date for the earliest policies established, and some dates given in the reports were themselves dates of revising policies rather than establishing them. Nevertheless, this graph gives an indication of the relationship between ratification, policy revision and policy establishment around intangible cultural heritage. The ratification of the Convention itself as a policy instrument was excluded from the figures used in this graph. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. Law on the Promotion of Culture of 15.11.1996. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. Refer to assessment factor B11.4 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. Refer to core indicator B12 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. Law 4763/2020 (21-12-2020) “For Technical and Vocational Education”. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. Refer to core indicator B13 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. Refer to assessment factors B13.2, B13.4, and B14.2 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. Ordinance No.172/2017 of 25 May. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. Decree-Law No.169/2001 of 25 May. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. Refer to assessment factors B13.3 and B14.3 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. Refer to assessment factor B11.3 and B13.5 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. Decree of the President of the Republic of Belarus No. 364 on Handicraft Activities carried out by Individuals, 9 October 2017. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. Refer to assessment factor B13.1 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. Decision of the Parliament nr. 194 from 19.11.2015. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
56. Law 12/2002, of 11 July, on the Cultural Heritage of Castile and Leon; Regional Law 1/2019, of 15 January 2019, articles 2 and 4. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
57. Refer to assessment factor B14.1 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
58. Copyright Act no. 121/2000 Coll., as amended, Article 3(b). See <https://wipolex-res.wipo.int/edocs/lexdocs/laws/en/cz/cz043en.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
59. The guidelines are available at www.intangia.es and www.labrit.net. [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
60. For example, the Conference on the Protection of Nordic Indigenous Traditional Knowledge and Intellectual property organized in Inari (Finland) in November 2021. [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
61. The periodic reporting form automatically sets the baseline target as ‘not satisfied’ if no target is set, so unless the country indicated a reason for setting a ‘not satisfied’ target, this has been regarded as a non-response. [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
62. Refer to assessment factor B16.1 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
63. Refer to assessment factor B15.1 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
64. Refer to assessment factors B15.2 and B16.2 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-64)
65. Refer to assessment factor B15.3 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-65)
66. The social hackathon is the Estonian pilot of a Co-creation of Service Innovation in Europe (CoSIE) project, replicated elsewhere in Estonia. [↑](#footnote-ref-66)
67. The periodic reporting form automatically sets the baseline target as ‘not satisfied’ if no target is set, so unless the country indicated a reason for setting a ‘not satisfied’ target, this has been regarded as a non-response. [↑](#footnote-ref-67)
68. Refer to core indicator B17 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area, excluding 17.2 and 17.3 reported below under Respect for Ethical Principles (B20). [↑](#footnote-ref-68)
69. Refer to core indicator B18 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-69)
70. Refer to assessment factors B19.1 to B19.3 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-70)
71. Refer to assessment factors B17.2, B17.3 and B19.4 and core indicator B20 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-71)
72. The periodic reporting form automatically sets the baseline target as ‘not satisfied’ if no target is set, so unless the country indicated a reason for setting a ‘not satisfied’ target, this has been regarded as a non-response. [↑](#footnote-ref-72)
73. Refer to assessment factor B21.1 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-73)
74. See Article 3 of [Law 10/2015](https://www.boe.es/buscar/act.php?id=BOE-A-2015-5794), of 26 May. [↑](#footnote-ref-74)
75. Refer to assessment factor B21.2 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-75)
76. Refer to assessment factor B21.3 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-76)
77. These Boards are coordinating mechanisms for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding established on the local level in all 81 cities of Türkiye (see above). [↑](#footnote-ref-77)
78. Refer to core indicator B22 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-78)
79. The periodic reporting form automatically sets the baseline target as ‘not satisfied’ if no target is set, so unless the country indicated a reason for setting a ‘not satisfied’ target, this has been regarded as a non-response. [↑](#footnote-ref-79)
80. Refer to section A5 in the periodic reporting form. [↑](#footnote-ref-80)
81. Refer to section A5 in the periodic reporting form. [↑](#footnote-ref-81)
82. This element was inscribed on the Representative List in 2008. [↑](#footnote-ref-82)
83. Refer to section A4 in the periodic reporting form. [↑](#footnote-ref-83)
84. Refer to section A7 in the periodic reporting form, and to core indicators B24-B25 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-84)
85. Refer to section A7 in the periodic reporting form, and B25.3 in the above list of core indicators and assessment factors for this thematic area. [↑](#footnote-ref-85)
86. The periodic reporting form automatically sets the baseline target as ‘not satisfied’ if no target is set, so unless the country indicated a reason for setting a ‘not satisfied’ target, this has been regarded as a non-response. [↑](#footnote-ref-86)
87. Note: in the case of Georgia, ratification coincided with the first inscription on the Representative List, so no blue dot appears for ratification of the Convention on the graph. [↑](#footnote-ref-87)
88. Refer to section C1 in the periodic reporting form. [↑](#footnote-ref-88)
89. Refer to section C2 in the periodic reporting form. [↑](#footnote-ref-89)
90. Refer to Section C3 in the periodic reporting form. [↑](#footnote-ref-90)
91. Refer to Section C4 in the periodic reporting form. [↑](#footnote-ref-91)
92. Article 7 of the ‘Law on Preservation and Development of the Azerbaijani Carpet’. [↑](#footnote-ref-92)
93. Refer to Section C5 in the periodic reporting form. [↑](#footnote-ref-93)
94. Refer to Section C6 in the periodic reporting form. [↑](#footnote-ref-94)
95. Refer to Section C7 in the periodic reporting form. [↑](#footnote-ref-95)