

Ahmed Skounti

Professor

Department of Anthropology and Museology

Institut national des sciences de l'archéologie et du patrimoine,

Rabat, Morocco

**Evaluation Body of the Intergovernmental  
Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible  
Cultural Heritage of UNESCO**

**Synthesis and Lessons learnt from my term  
(2015-2017)**

February 2018

## **Acknowledgement**

I was delighted to work in the Evaluation Body of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage during these three years (2015-2017). This allowed me to rub shoulders with several people with whom I learned a lot or whose company during meetings in Paris was pleasant. I cannot thank all of them here but I would like to quote as many as possible.

My warmest thanks go first to Mrs Zohour Alaoui, Ambassador Permanent Delegate of the Kingdom of Morocco to UNESCO and President of the General Conference, and to Mrs Najat Rhandi, Deputy Permanent Delegate of the Kingdom of Morocco to the UNESCO as well as the delegation staff. I express my gratitude to Mr Mohamed Amine Sbihi, former Minister of Culture and to Mr Mohamed Laarej, Minister of Culture and Communication as well as to Mr Aomar Akerraz, Director of the National Institute of Archaeology and Heritage Sciences (INSAP), Mr Abdellah Alaoui, Director of cultural heritage and Mr Mustapha Nami, Chief of the service of intangible heritage.

My thanks go to the members of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Intergovernmental Committee during these three years.

I thank Cécile Duvelle, former Head of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Section, and her successor Timothy Curtis and the colleagues of the Section during these three years: Franck Proschan, Fumiko Ohinata, Joseph Sewedo Akoro, Marina Calvo, Elena Constantinou, Christine Delsol, Lee Doyun, Helena Drobna, Shin Eunkyung, Liza Gisbert, Julien Glenat Nakata, Ke Leng, Susanne Martin-Siegfried, Ritamae Hyde, David Martel, Samaa Moustafa, Caroline Munier, Julio Sa Rego, Rasul Samadov, Berta Sancristobal, Suzanne Schnuttgen, Giovanni Scepi, Hugues Sicard, Ingrid Theuninck, Marius Tukaj, Caroline Varnet, Victoria Weavil.

I thank my past and present fellow members of the Evaluation Body: Barbara Babweteera, Naila Ceribašić, John De Coninck, Emily Drani, Nawal Elmessiri, Eivind Falk, Amelia Frazão Moreira, Petr Jancek, Masami Iwasaki, Fares Kallas, Sonia Montecino Aguirre, Ahmed Aly Morsi, John Moogi Omare, Thi Hien Nguyen, Victor Rago, Andrea Rizzotto Falcao, Saša Srećković, Sidi Traore, Flora Moana van Beuque, Albert Van der Zeijden, Gang Zhu.

Last but not least, my wife Sakina Rharib and my daughter and son, Chama and Tachefine, deserve ribbon-wrapped thanks for having supported my absence during these years, either when I was working on the files or while travelling abroad to attend the Evaluation Body and the intergovernmental Committee meetings.

## **Introduction**

In accordance with paragraph 27 of the Operational Directives, the evaluation of nominations for inscription on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding and on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, of proposals to the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices and of requests for international assistance of more than US\$ 100,000<sup>1</sup> are made by an advisory body of the Intergovernmental Committee established in accordance with Article 8.3 of the Convention and Rule 20 of its Rules of Procedure. This body is referred to as the “Evaluation Body”.

The first such consultative body was established by the Intergovernmental Committee at its ninth session in Paris in November 2014. As this was the first time this body has been established and that it was to be instituted each year by renewing a quarter of its twelve members, it was necessary to draw lots to find out who among them would have a full four-year term or a three-year term or a two-year term or a one-year term. I was lucky and honoured not only to be elected to the body by the 24 members of the Intergovernmental Committee but also to have a three-year term from 2015 to 2017. Subsequently, I benefited from the confidence of my fellow members of the Board who elected me twice as Chair, in 2015 and 2017. The role of the Chair (as well as of the Vice-Chair and of the Rapporteur) is explained below.

The purpose of this report is, in a way, to report on this experience. I begin with outlining the results that the Evaluation Body has achieved in 2015, 2016 and 2017<sup>2</sup>. It includes the recommendations of the Board and the decisions of the Committee which may differ. In a second step, I will try to draw some lessons from this experience and, furthermore, some general conclusions about the implementation of the Convention globally. The ultimate goal is to contribute modestly to the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage at the international level.

## **I. Year 1, 2015**

### **I.1. Establishment of the Body**

By its Decision 9.COM 11, the Committee established such a body at its ninth session (UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, 24-28 November 2014). The Evaluation Body is composed of six qualified experts in the various domains of intangible cultural heritage, representatives of States Parties not members of the Committee and six accredited non-governmental organizations. The twelve members of the Evaluation Body were selected by the Committee taking into account equitable geographical representation and their expertise in the different fields of intangible cultural heritage. The twelve members

---

<sup>1</sup> Until 2015, the amount of the international assistance requests evaluated by the Evaluation Body was of more than US\$ 25 000. Since the adoption by the General Assembly of the latest version of the Operational Directives of the ICH Convention in June 2016, this amount is of more than US\$ 100 000.

<sup>2</sup> This recall is based on the working documents of the three sessions of the Intergovernmental Committee. They're are available on the website of the Convention: [www.ich.unesco.org/eng](http://www.ich.unesco.org/eng)

selected by the Committee, as well as the electoral groups (EG) and the countries they represent (in the case of experts), are:

### **Expert representatives of States Parties not members of the Committee**

EG I: Mrs Amelia Maria de Melo Frazao Moreira (Portugal)

EG II: Mr Saša Srećković (Serbia)

EG III: Mr Víctor Rago (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela)

EG IV: Ms. Masami Iwasaki (Japan)

EG V (a): Mr Sidi Traoré (Burkina Faso)

EG V (b): Mr Ahmed Skounti (Morocco).

### **Accredited non-governmental organizations**

EG I: Nederlands Centrum voor Volkscultuur / Dutch Center for Folklore and Intangible Heritage

EG II: International Council for Traditional Music (IACML)

EG III: Associação dos Amigos da Arte Popular Brasileira - Casa do Pontal Museum / Association of Friends of Brazilian Folk Art - Casa do Pontal Museum

EG IV: 中国民俗学会 / Chinese Folklore Society

EG V (a): The Cross-Cultural Foundation of Uganda (CCFU)

EG V (b): Syria Trust for Development.

## **I.2. Terms of reference**

| <b>Terms of Reference of the Evaluation Body for the 2015 Cycle</b> |  |
|---|--|
| The Evaluation Body   |  |
| 1.  | shall be composed of twelve members appointed by the Committee: six experts qualified in the various fields of the intangible cultural heritage representatives of States Parties non-Members of the Committee and six accredited non-governmental organizations, taking into consideration equitable geographical representation and various domains of intangible cultural heritage; |
| 2.  | shall elect its Chairperson, Vice-Chair and Rapporteur;  |
| 3.  | shall hold private meetings in accordance with Rule 19 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee;   |
| 4.  | shall be responsible for the evaluation of nominations for inscription on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding and on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, of proposed programmes, projects and   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | activities that best reflect the principles and objectives of the Convention and of international assistance requests greater than US\$25,000, in conformity with the Operational Directives for the Implementation of the Convention. It shall, in particular, include in its evaluation:   |
| a.   | an assessment of the conformity of nominations to the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding with the inscription criteria as provided in Chapter I.1 of the Operational Directives, including an assessment of the viability of the element and the feasibility and sufficiency of the safeguarding plan, and an assessment of the risks of its disappearing, as provided in paragraph 29 of the Operational Directives;   |
| b.   | an assessment of the conformity of nominations to the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity with the inscription criteria as provided in in Chapter I.2 of the Operational Directives;   |
| c.   | an assessment of the conformity of proposed programmes, projects and activities that best reflect the principles and objectives of the Convention with the selection criteria as provided in Chapter I.3 of the Operational Directives;  |
| d.   | an assessment of the conformity of international assistance requests greater than US\$25,000 with the selection criteria as provided in Chapter I.4 of the Operational Directives;   |
| e.   | a recommendation to the Committee to inscribe or not to inscribe the nominated element on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding; to inscribe or not to inscribe the nominated element on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity or to refer the nomination to the submitting State(s) for additional information; to select or not to select the proposed programmes, projects and activities that best reflect the principles and objectives of the Convention; or to approve or not to approve the international assistance requests greater than US\$25,000; |
| 5.   | shall provide the Committee with an overview of all files and a report of its evaluation;  |
| 6.   | shall cease to exist following submission to the tenth session of the Committee of the report of its evaluation of the files to be examined by the Committee in 2015.  |
| Once appointed by the Committee, the members of the Evaluation Body shall act impartially in the interests of all the States Parties and the Convention. |  |

### I.3. Recommendations of the Board, decisions of the Committee

A total of 45 files, including eight multinational nominations, were completed by submitting States in time for evaluation by the Evaluation Body as follows:

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Urgent Safeguarding List                             | 8         |
| Representative List                                  | 35        |
| Register of Best Safeguarding Practices <sup>3</sup> | 0         |
| International Assistance                             | 2         |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>45</b> |

Of the nominations evaluated for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List, three concerned resubmissions, two nominations that had not been inscribed by the Committee in 2013 and one withdrawn by the submitting State following a negative recommendation by the Consultative Body in 2011<sup>4</sup>. Three of the nominations reviewed by the Body for inscription on the Representative List had been referred by the Committee previously, two in 2013 and one in 2014. One of the two International Assistance requests proposes activities to safeguard a proposed element for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List in 2013.

The Evaluation Body met at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris on 3 and 4 March 2015 to define its working methods and timetable. The Body elected me as Chair, Ms. Emily Drania Drani (Cross-cultural Foundation of Uganda) as Vice-Chair and Ms. Naila Ceribašić (International Council for Traditional Music) as Rapporteur.

As in previous cycles, the Secretariat has set up a dedicated, password-protected website through which members have been able to access the files and all related documentation, files originally submitted and requests for information. An e-mail distribution list facilitated communication between the members of the Board. Each member of the Evaluation Body evaluated each file online and prepared an individual report explaining if and how the file met the applicable criteria.

The Evaluation Body met from 15 to 19 June 2015 to discuss its recommendations on each criterion for each file. On that basis, the Rapporteur has prepared draft decisions for each file, as well as cross-cutting remarks and recommendations made by the Body.

---

<sup>3</sup> The name of the Register has changed into the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices after the adoption by the General Assembly of the current Operational Directives in 2016. This new name will be used after 2016 in this Report.

<sup>4</sup> Prior to the establishment of the Evaluation Body, the nominations for inscription on the Urgent safeguarding List, the projects, programmes and activities submitted to the Register of Best safeguarding practices and the requests for International Assistance of more than US\$ 25 000 were evaluated by a Consultative Body composed of three experts and three members of accredited NGOs.

The Evaluation Body met again from September 9 to 11, 2015 to validate the draft recommendations for each file and adopt its report. The draft decisions thus formulated and presented in the four respective documents of the report represent the unanimous consensus of the members of the Evaluation Body.

The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe the following items on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding:

| <b>Draft decision</b>         | <b>Submitting State</b>                 | <b>Nomination</b>   | <b>File n°</b>        | <b>Committee decision</b> |
|-------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.a.6</a> | Portugal                                | Manufacture of cowbells   | <a href="#">01065</a> | Inscrit                   |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.a.7</a> | Former Yougoslave Republic of Macedonia | Glaoechko, male two-part singing in Dolni Polog                         | <a href="#">01104</a> | Inscrit                   |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.a.8</a> | Uganda                                  | Koogere oral tradition of the Basongora, Banyabindi and Batooro peoples | <a href="#">00911</a> | Inscrit                   |

The Evaluation Body recommended to the Committee not to inscribe the following elements for the moment:

| <b>Draft decision</b>         | <b>Submitting State</b>    | <b>Nomination</b>   | <b>File n°</b>        | <b>Committee decision</b>             |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|---|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.a.1</a> | Botswana                   | Dikopelo folk music of Bakgatla ba Kgafela in Kgatleng District           | <a href="#">01088</a> | N/A<br>(withdrawn by the State Party) |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.a.2</a> | Colombia                   | Traditional Vallenato music of the Greater Magdalena region               | <a href="#">01095</a> | Inscribed                             |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.a.3</a> | Egypt                      | Traditional hand puppetry   | <a href="#">01020</a> | Not inscribed                         |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.a.4</a> | Iran (Islamic Republic of) | Traditional knowledge and skills of constructing Baadgirs (wind catchers) | <a href="#">01111</a> | N/A<br>(withdrawn by the State Party) |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.a.5</a> | Mongolia                   | Coaxing ritual for camels   | <a href="#">01061</a> | Inscribed                             |

The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe the following elements on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity:

| Draft decision                 | Submitting State(s)                             | Element   | File n°               | Committee decision |
|--------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.2</a>  | Algeria   | Sbuâ, annual pilgrimage to the zawiya of Sidi El Hadj Belkacem in Gourara   | <a href="#">00667</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.3</a>  | Andorra, Spain, France                          | Summer solstice fire festivals in the Pyrenees  | <a href="#">01073</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.4</a>  | Argentina                                       | Filete porteño in Buenos Aires, a traditional painting technique  | <a href="#">01069</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.6</a>  | Austria   | Classical horsemanship and the High School of the Spanish Riding School Vienna  | <a href="#">01106</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.7</a>  | Azerbaijan                                      | Copper craftsmanship of Lahij   | <a href="#">00675</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.13</a> | Colombia, Ecuador                               | Marimba music, traditional chants and dances from the Colombian South Pacific region and Esmeraldas Province of Ecuador | <a href="#">01099</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.14</a> | Democratic People's Republic of Korea           | Tradition of kimchi-making in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea   | <a href="#">01063</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.17</a> | Greece  | Tinian marble craftsmanship   | <a href="#">01103</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.18</a> | Indonesia                                       | Three genres of traditional dance in Bali   | <a href="#">00617</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.20</a> | Kazakhstan, Kirghizistan                        | Aitysh/aitys, art of improvisation  | <a href="#">00997</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.22</a> | Namibia   | Oshituthi shomagongo, marula fruit festival   | <a href="#">01089</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.24</a> | Peru  | Wititi dance of the Colca Valley  | <a href="#">01056</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.25</a> | Romania   | Lad's dances in Romania   | <a href="#">01092</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.27</a> | Slovakia  | Bagpipe culture   | <a href="#">01075</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.30</a> | Turkmenistan                                    | Epic art of Görogly   | <a href="#">01028</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.31</a> | United Arab Emirates, Oman                      | Al-Razfa, a traditional performing art  | <a href="#">01078</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.32</a> | United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, Oman, Qatar | Arabic coffee, a symbol of generosity   | <a href="#">01074</a> | Inscribed          |



| Draft decision                 | Submitting State(s)                             | Element  | File n°               | Committee decision |
|--------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.33</a> | United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, Oman, Qatar | The Majlis, a cultural and social space  | <a href="#">01076</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.35</a> | Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)              | Traditional knowledge and technologies relating to the growing and processing of the curagua | <a href="#">01094</a> | Inscribed          |

The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee refer the following nominations to the submitting States:

| Draft decision                 | Submitting State(s)  | Element   | File n°               | Committee decision |
|--------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.1</a>  | Afghanistan  | Attan   | <a href="#">00986</a> | Referred           |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.5</a>  | Armenia  | Kochari, traditional group dance                            | <a href="#">01079</a> | Referred           |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.8</a>  | Bangladesh   | Jatra, traditional performing arts                          | <a href="#">01070</a> | Referred           |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.9</a>  | Bosnia and Herzegovina   | Konjic woodcarving  | <a href="#">01102</a> | Referred           |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.10</a> | Bulgaria   | Surova folk feast in Pernik region                          | <a href="#">00968</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.11</a> | Bulgaria, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Republic of Moldova and Romania | Cultural practices associated to the first of March         | <a href="#">01093</a> | Referred           |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.12</a> | Cambodia, Philippines, Republic of Korea and Viet Nam                            | Tugging rituals and games                                   | <a href="#">01080</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.15</a> | Dominican Republic   | Son   | <a href="#">01053</a> | Referred           |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.16</a> | Ethiopia   | Fichee-Chambalaalla, New Year festival of the Sidama people | <a href="#">01054</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.19</a> | Italia   | Celebration of the Celestine Pardon                         | <a href="#">00994</a> | Referred           |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.21</a> | Kirghizistan   | Kok-boru, traditional horse game                            | <a href="#">01067</a> | Referred           |

| Draft decision                 | Submitting State(s) | Element  | File n°               | Committee decision |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|--|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.23</a> | Nigeria             | Eyo masquerade festival  | <a href="#">01066</a> | Referred           |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.26</a> | Saudi Arabia        | Alardah Alnajdiyah, dance, drumming and poetry in Saudi Arabia | <a href="#">01196</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.29</a> | Tadjikistan         | Art of Chakan embroidery in Kulob                              | <a href="#">01097</a> | Referred           |
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.34</a> | Uzbekistan          | Ropewalking  | <a href="#">01087</a> | Referred           |

The Evaluation Body recommended to the Committee not to inscribe the following element:

| Draft decision                 | Submitting State(s) | Element  | File n°               | Committee decision                    |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|--|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.b.28</a> | Slovenia            | Traditional production of the Kranjska klobasa | <a href="#">01022</a> | N/A<br>(withdrawn by the State Party) |

The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee approve the following international assistance request:

| Draft decision                | Requesting State | Title   | Amount requested | File n°               | Committee decision |
|-------------------------------|------------------|---|------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.c.1</a> | Malawi           | Safeguarding of Nkhonde, Tumbuka and Chewa proverbs and folktales | US\$ 90 533      | <a href="#">01060</a> | Approved           |

The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee delegate its authority to the Bureau to make a decision on the following international assistance request:

| Draft decision                | Requesting State | Title  | Amount requested | File n°               | Committee decision   |
|-------------------------------|------------------|--|------------------|-----------------------|--|
| <a href="#">10.COM 10.c.2</a> | Kenya            | Safeguarding of Enkipaata, Eunoto and Olng'esherr, three male rites of passage of the Maasai community | US\$ 144 430     | <a href="#">00888</a> | Possible approval delegated to the Bureau of the Committee |

## **II. Year 2, 2016**

### **II.1. Establishment of the Body**

By its decision 10.COM 12, taken at its tenth session (Windhoek, Namibia, 30 November - 4 December 2015), the Committee established this body. As stated in Decision 9.COM 11, a rotation system between the seats has been established; in accordance with this system, the Committee retained nine members and selected three new members - Mr John Moogi Omare (Kenya), the Norwegian Institute for Crafts and the Czech Ethnological Society - at its tenth session (Decision 10.COM 12). They were selected by the Committee taking into account equitable geographical representation and their expertise in various fields of intangible cultural heritage. The 12 members of the Evaluation Body, as well as the electoral groups (EG) and the countries they represent (in the case of experts), are:

#### **Expert representatives of States Parties not members of the Committee**

GE I: Mrs Amelia Maria de Melo Frazao Moreira (Portugal)

GE II: Mr Saša Srećković (Serbia)

GE III: Mr Víctor Rago (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela)

GE IV: Ms. Masami Iwasaki (Japan)

GE V (a): Mr. John Moogi Omare (Kenya)

GE V (b): Mr Ahmed Skounti (Morocco)

#### **Accredited non-governmental organizations:**

GE I : Norsk Håndverksinstitutt / Norwegian Crafts Institute

GE II : Czech Ethnological Society

GE III : Associação dos Amigos da Arte Popular Brasileira – Museu Casa do Pontal / Association of Friends of Brazilian Folk Art - Casa do Pontal Museum

GE IV : 中国民俗学会 / Chinese Folklore Society (CFS)

GE V(a) : The Cross-Cultural Foundation of Uganda (CCFU)

GE V(b) : The Syria Trust for Development.

## II.2. Terms of reference

| The Evaluation Body |   |
|---------------------|---|
| 1.                  | shall be composed of twelve members appointed by the Committee: six experts qualified in the various fields of intangible cultural heritage representative of States Parties non-Members of the Committee and six accredited non-governmental organizations, taking into consideration equitable geographical representation and various domains of intangible cultural heritage;   |
| 2.                  | shall elect its Chairperson, Vice-Chair and Rapporteur;   |
| 3.                  | shall hold private meetings in accordance with Rule 19 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee;  |
| 4.                  | shall be responsible for the evaluation of nominations for inscription on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding and on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, of proposed programmes, projects and activities that best reflect the principles and objectives of the Convention and of international assistance requests greater than US\$25,000, in conformity with the Operational Directives for the implementation of the Convention. It shall, in particular, include in its evaluation: |
|                     | a. an assessment of the conformity of nominations to the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding with the inscription criteria as provided in Chapter I.1 of the Operational Directives, including an assessment of the viability of the element and the feasibility and sufficiency of the safeguarding plan, and an assessment of the risks of it disappearing, as provided in paragraph 29 of the Operational Directives;  |
|                     | b. an assessment of the conformity of nominations to the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity with the inscription criteria as provided in in Chapter I.2 of the Operational Directives;   |
|                     | c. an assessment of the conformity of proposed programmes, projects and activities that best reflect the principles and objectives of the Convention with the selection criteria as provided in Chapter I.3 of the Operational Directives;  |
|                     | d. an assessment of the conformity of international assistance requests greater than US\$25,000 with the selection criteria as provided in Chapter I.4 of the Operational Directives;   |
|                     | e. a recommendation to the Committee to inscribe or not to inscribe the nominated element on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding; to inscribe, not to inscribe or refer the nominated element on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity; to select or not to select the proposed programmes, projects and activities that best reflect the principles and objectives of the Convention; or to approve or not to approve the international assistance request greater than US\$25,000;        |
| 5.                  | shall provide the Committee with an overview of all files and a report of its evaluation;   |
| 6.                  | shall cease to exist following submission to the 11th session of the Committee of the report  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | on its evaluation of files to be examined by the Committee in 2016. |
| Once appointed by the Committee, the members of the Evaluation Body shall act impartially in the interests of all States Parties and the Convention. |   |

### II.3. Meetings and recommendations of the Body, decisions of the Committee

A total of 50 files were completed by the submitting States in time to be evaluated by the Evaluation Body. These files are broken down as follows:

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Urgent Safeguarding List   | 5  |
| Urgent Safeguarding List combined with an International Assistance Request | 1  |
| Representative List  | 37 |
| Register of Good Safeguarding Practices                                    | 7  |
| Total  | 50 |

Of the nominations considered for inscription on the Representative List, five were multinational nominations, two were nominations withdrawn by submitting States following a recommendation not to register by the Subsidiary Body in 2014<sup>5</sup> and one was an the enlargement of an element inscribed in 2009 to include two elements nominated for inscription on the Representative List referred by the Committee in 2011. Of the proposals evaluated for selection in the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices, one was a file withdrawn by the submitting State after a recommendation not to be selected by the Consultative Body in 2014.

The members of the Evaluation Body met at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris on 10 and 11 March 2016 to define their working methods and a timetable. Following a consultation, the Board elected Ms. Masami Iwasaki (Japan) as Chair, Mr. Eivind Falk (Norwegian Institute of Crafts) as Vice-Chair and Mr. John De Coninck (Cross-Cultural Foundation of Uganda) as Rapporteur.

As in previous cycles, the Secretariat has created a dedicated, password-protected website where members were able to access the files and accompanying documents, as well as the files initially submitted and the requests for additional information from the Secretariat. A mailing list facilitated communication among the members of the Body. All

---

<sup>5</sup> Until 2014, prior to the establishment of the Evaluation Body, the nominations submitted for inscription on the Representative List of the intangible cultural heritage of humanity were evaluated by a Subsidiary Body composed of six experts representing six of the 24 States Parties members of the Intergovernmental Committee.

members of the Evaluation Body evaluated each file online and prepared an individual report to explain whether it met the applicable criteria and how.

The members of the Evaluation Body met from 20 to 24 June 2016 to collectively discuss their recommendations and reach consensus on each criterion for each file, as well as on cross-cutting issues and other relevant issues. On this basis, the rapporteur has prepared a draft decision for each file and specified the general observations and recommendations made by the Board. The members of the Evaluation Body met again from 21 to 23 September 2016 to validate the draft decisions relating to each file and adopt the reports of the Body. The draft decisions presented in the four reports are therefore based on the consensus of the Evaluation Body.

The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe the following elements on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding:

| Draft decision                | Submitting State | Nomination                                    | File n°               | Committee decision |
|-------------------------------|------------------|---|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.a.3</a> | Portugal         | Bisalhães black pottery manufacturing process | <a href="#">01199</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.a.4</a> | Uganda           | Ma'di bowl lyre music and dance               | <a href="#">01187</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.a.5</a> | Ukraine          | Cossack's songs of Dnipropetrovsk Region      | <a href="#">01194</a> | Inscribed          |

The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee refer the following nominations to the submitting States:

| Draft decision                | Submitting State | Nomination  | File n°               | Committee decision                 |
|-------------------------------|------------------|---|-----------------------|------------------------------------|
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.a.1</a> | Botswana         | The use of Moropa wa Bojale ba Bakgatla ba Kgafela and its associated practices | <a href="#">01183</a> | Referred                           |
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.a.2</a> | Kenya            | Rituals and practices associated with Kit Mikayi Shrine                         | <a href="#">01180</a> | N/A (withdrawn by the State Party) |

The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe the following element on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding and approve

the following request for international assistance to implement the proposed safeguarding plan:

| Draft decision                                   | Submitting State | Nomination/request | Amount requested | File n°               | Committee decision                     |
|--|------------------|--------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--|
| <a href="#">11.COM</a><br><a href="#">10.a.6</a> | Cambodia         | Chapei Dang Veng   | US\$ 238 970     | <a href="#">01165</a> | Element inscribed and request approved |

The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe the following elements on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity:

| Draft decision                                   | Submitting State(s)   | Element  | File n°               | Committee decision |
|--|---|--|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <a href="#">11.COM</a><br><a href="#">10.b.1</a> | Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kazakhstan, Kirgystan, Pakistan, Tadjikistan, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ouzbekistan | Nawrouz, Novruz, Nowrouz, Nowrouz, Nawrouz, Nauryz, Nooruz, Nowruz, Navruz, Nevruz, Nowruz, Navruz                             | <a href="#">01161</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">11.COM</a><br><a href="#">10.b.2</a> | Azerbaijan, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kirgystan, Turkey   | Flatbread making and sharing culture : Lavash, Katyrma, Jupka, Yufka   | <a href="#">01181</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">11.COM</a><br><a href="#">10.b.5</a> | Belgium   | Beer culture in Belgium  | <a href="#">01062</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">11.COM</a><br><a href="#">10.b.6</a> | China   | The Twenty-Four Solar Terms, knowledge in China of time and practices developed through observation of the sun's annual motion | <a href="#">00647</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">11.COM</a><br><a href="#">10.b.7</a> | Cuba  | Rumba in Cuba, a festive combination of music and dances and all the practices associated                                      | <a href="#">01185</a> | Inscribed          |

| <b>Draft decision</b>                             | <b>Submitting State(s)</b>  | <b>Element</b>  | <b>File n°</b>        | <b>Committee decision</b> |
|---|---|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| <a href="#">11.COM</a><br><a href="#">10.b.12</a> | France  | Carnival of Granville   | <a href="#">01077</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">11.COM</a><br><a href="#">10.b.15</a> | United Arab Emirates,<br>Austria, Belgium, Czechia,<br>France, Germany,<br>Hungary, Italy,<br>Kazakhstan, Republik of<br>Korea, Mongolia,<br>Morocco, Pakistan,<br>Portugal, Qatar, Saudi<br>Arabia, Spain, Syrian Arab<br>Republic | Falconry, a living<br>human heritage  | <a href="#">01209</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">11.COM</a><br><a href="#">10.b.16</a> | Greece  | Momoeria, New Year's<br>celebration in eight<br>villages of Kozani area,<br>West Macedonia,<br>Greece | <a href="#">01184</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">11.COM</a><br><a href="#">10.b.19</a> | Japon   | Yama, Hoko, Yatai,<br>float festivals in Japan  | <a href="#">01059</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">11.COM</a><br><a href="#">10.b.21</a> | Mauritius   | Bhojpuri folk songs in<br>Mauritius, Geet gawai   | <a href="#">01178</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">11.COM</a><br><a href="#">10.b.24</a> | Republic of Korea   | Culture of Jeju<br>Haenyeo(women<br>divers)   | <a href="#">01068</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">11.COM</a><br><a href="#">10.b.27</a> | Saudi Arabia  | Almezmar, drumming<br>and dancing with<br>sticks  | <a href="#">01011</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">11.COM</a><br><a href="#">10.b.30</a> | Spain   | Valencia Fallas<br>festivity  | <a href="#">00859</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">11.COM</a><br><a href="#">10.b.32</a> | Switzerland   | Winegrowers Festival<br>in Vevey  | <a href="#">01201</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">11.COM</a><br><a href="#">10.b.33</a> | Tajikistan  | Oshi Palav, a<br>traditional meal and its<br>social and cultural<br>contexts in Tajikistan            | <a href="#">01191</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">11.COM</a><br><a href="#">10.b.34</a> | Turkey  | Traditional<br>craftsmanship of çini-<br>making   | <a href="#">01058</a> | Inscribed                 |



| <b>Draft decision</b>          | <b>Submitting State(s)</b> | <b>Element</b>  | <b>File n°</b>        | <b>Committee decision</b> |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.b.35</a> | Uzbekistan                 | Palov culture and tradition   | <a href="#">01166</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.b.37</a> | Viet Nam                   | Practices related to the Viet beliefs in the Mother Goddesses of Three Realms | <a href="#">01064</a> | Inscribed                 |

The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee refer the following nominations to the submitting States:

| <b>Draft Decision</b>          | <b>Submitting State(s)</b>            | <b>Element</b>  | <b>File No.</b>       | <b>Committee decision</b> |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.b.3</a>  | Bangladesh                            | Mangal Shobhajatra on Pahela Baishakh                                     | <a href="#">01091</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.b.4</a>  | Belarus                               | Celebration in honor of the Budslaŭ icon of Our Lady (Budslaŭ Fest)       | <a href="#">01174</a> | Referred                  |
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.b.8</a>  | Democratic People's Republic of Korea | Ssirum (wrestling) in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea           | <a href="#">01160</a> | Referred                  |
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.b.9</a>  | Dominican Republic                    | Music and dance of the merengue in the Dominican Republic                 | <a href="#">01162</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.b.10</a> | Egypt                                 | Tahteeb, stick game   | <a href="#">01189</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.b.11</a> | Ethiopia                              | Gada system, an indigenous democratic socio-political system of the Oromo | <a href="#">01164</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.b.13</a> | Georgia                               | Living culture of three writing systems of the Georgian alphabet          | <a href="#">01205</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.b.14</a> | Germany                               | Idea and practice of organizing shared interests in cooperatives          | <a href="#">01200</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.b.17</a> | India                                 | Yoga  | <a href="#">01163</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.b.18</a> | Iraq                                  | Khidr Elias feast and its vows  | <a href="#">01159</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.b.20</a> | Kazakhstan                            | Kuresi in Kazakhstan  | <a href="#">01085</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.b.22</a> | Mexico                                | Charrería, equestrian tradition in Mexico                                 | <a href="#">01108</a> | Inscribed                 |

| Draft Decision                 | Submitting State(s)                | Element   | File No.              | Committee decision |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.b.23</a> | Nigeria                            | Argungu international fishing and cultural festival                               | <a href="#">00901</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.b.25</a> | Romania                            | Whitsunday pilgrimage from Şumuleu Ciuc (Csíksomlyó)                              | <a href="#">01120</a> | Referred           |
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.b.26</a> | Romania, Republic of Moldova       | Traditional wall-carpet craftsmanship in Romania and the Republic of Moldova      | <a href="#">01167</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.b.28</a> | Slovakia, Czechia                  | Puppetry in Slovakia and Czechia  | <a href="#">01202</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.b.29</a> | Slovenia                           | Škofja Loka passion play  | <a href="#">01203</a> | Inscribed          |
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.b.31</a> | Sri Lanka                          | Traditional art of string puppetry in Sri Lanka                                   | <a href="#">01171</a> | Referred           |
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.b.36</a> | Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) | Carnival of El Callao, a festive representation of a memory and cultural identity | <a href="#">01198</a> | Inscribed          |

The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee select the following programs, which best represent the principles and objectives of the Convention:

| Draft Decision                | Submitting State | Proposal  | File No.              | Committee decision |
|-------------------------------|------------------|---|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.c.2</a> | Austria          | Regional Centres for Craftsmanship: a strategy for safeguarding the cultural heritage of traditional handicraft | <a href="#">01169</a> | Selected           |
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.c.4</a> | Croatia          | Community project of safeguarding the living culture of Rovinj/Rovigno: the Batana Ecomuseum                    | <a href="#">01098</a> | Selected           |
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.c.7</a> | Norway           | Oselvar boat – reframing a traditional learning process of building and use to a modern context                 | <a href="#">01156</a> | Selected           |

The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee refer the following programs to the submitting States:

| <b>Draft Decision</b>         | <b>Submitting State</b> | <b>Proposal</b>  | <b>File No.</b>       | <b>Committee decision</b> |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|--|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.c.5</a> | Fiji                    | Cultural mapping, methodology for the safeguarding of iTaukei intangible cultural heritage | <a href="#">01195</a> | Referred                  |
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.c.6</a> | Hungary                 | Safeguarding of the folk music heritage by the Kodály concept                              | <a href="#">01177</a> | Selected                  |

The Evaluation Body recommended to the Committee not to select the following programs for the time being:

| <b>Draft Decision</b>         | <b>Submitting State</b> | <b>Proposal</b>   | <b>File No.</b>       | <b>Committee decision</b> |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.c.1</a> | Argentina               | The Randas of time, a safeguarding model of textile art at El Cercado                                   | <a href="#">01212</a> | Not selected              |
| <a href="#">11.COM 10.c.3</a> | Bulgaria                | Festival of folklore in Koprivshtitsa: a system of practices for heritage presentation and transmission | <a href="#">00970</a> | Selected                  |

### III. Year 3, 2017

#### III.1. Establishment of the Body

By its decision 11.COM 11, taken at its eleventh session (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, from 28 November to 2 December 2016), the Committee established this body. As stated in Decision 9.COM 11, a rotation system between the seats has been established; in accordance with this system, the Committee renamed nine existing members and elected three new members - Ms. Sonia Montecino Aguirre (Chile), Ms. Hien Thi Nguyen (Viet Nam) and the Egyptian Society for Folk Traditions - at its eleventh session (Decision 11.COM 11). They were elected by the Committee taking into account equitable geographical distribution and their expertise in various fields of intangible cultural heritage. The twelve members, as well as the countries they represent in the case of experts, are:

## **Expert representatives of States Parties not members of the Committee**

GE I: Mrs Amelia Maria de Melo Frazao Moreira (Portugal)

GE II: Mr Saša Srećković (Serbia)

GE III: Ms. Sonia Montecino Aguirre (Chile)

GE IV: Ms. Hien Thi Nguyen (Viet Nam)

GE V (a): Mr. John Moogi Omare (Kenya)

GE V (b): Mr Ahmed Skounti (Morocco)

## **Accredited non-governmental organizations**

GE I: Norsk Håndverksinstitutt / Norwegian Crafts Institute

GE II: Czech Ethnological Society / Czech Ethnological Society

GE III: Associação dos Amigos da Arte Popular Brasileira - Casa do Pontal Museum / Association of Friends of Brazilian Folk Art - Casa do Pontal Museum

GE IV: 中国 民俗 学会 / Chinese Folklore Society (CFS)

GE V (a): The Cross-Cultural Foundation of Uganda (CCFU)

GE V (b): Egyptian Society for Folk Traditions.

## **III.2. Reference terms**

| The Evaluation Body |   |
|---------------------|---|
| 1.                  | shall be composed of twelve members appointed by the Committee: six experts qualified in the various fields of intangible cultural heritage representative of States Parties non-Members of the Committee and six accredited non-governmental organizations, taking into consideration equitable geographical representation and various domains of intangible cultural heritage; |
| 2.                  | shall elect its Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and Rapporteur;   |
| 3.                  | shall hold private meetings in accordance with Rule 19 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee;  |
| 4.                  | shall be responsible for the evaluation of nominations for inscription on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding and on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, of proposed programmes, projects and activities that best reflect the principles and objectives of the Convention and of                        |

|    |   |
|----|---|
|    | International Assistance requests greater than US\$100,000, in conformity with the Operational Directives for the implementation of the Convention. It shall, in particular, include in its evaluation:   |
| a. | an assessment of the conformity of nominations to the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding with the inscription criteria as provided in Chapter I.1 of the Operational Directives, including an assessment of the viability of the element and the feasibility and sufficiency of the safeguarding plan, and an assessment of the risks of it disappearing, as provided in Paragraph 29 of the Operational Directives;   |
| b. | an assessment of the conformity of nominations to the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity with the inscription criteria as provided in Chapter I.2 of the Operational Directives;   |
| c. | an assessment of the conformity of proposed programmes, projects and activities that best reflect the principles and objectives of the Convention with the selection criteria as provided in Chapter I.3 of the Operational Directives;   |
| d. | an assessment of the conformity of International Assistance requests greater than US\$100,000 with the selection criteria as provided in Chapter I.4 of the Operational Directives;   |
| e. | <p>a recommendation to the Committee to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- inscribe, not to inscribe the nominated element on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding or the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, or to refer the nomination to the submitting State(s) for additional information;</li> <li>- select or not to select the proposed programmes, projects and activity that best reflect the principles and objectives of the Convention or to refer the proposal to the submitting State(s) for additional information;</li> <li>- approve or not to approve the International Assistance request greater than US\$100,000, or to refer the request to the submitting State(s) for additional information;</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 5.  | <p>shall be responsible, pursuant to Decision 10.COM 19 concerning the request of Viet Nam to transfer the element ‘Xoan singing of Phú Thọ Province, Viet Nam’ from the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding to the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, on an exceptional basis and pending the adoption of relevant procedures by the General Assembly in 2018, for the evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- firstly, of the report submitted by Viet Nam on the status of the above-mentioned element; it shall, in particular, include in its evaluation a recommendation to the Committee to remove or not the above-mentioned element from the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding;</li> <li>- secondly, of the conformity of a new nomination concerning the same element to the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity with the inscription criteria as provided in Chapter I.2 of the Operational Directives; it shall, in particular, include in its evaluation a recommendation to the Committee to inscribe, not to inscribe the nominated element on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, or to refer the nomination to the submitting State for additional information.</li> </ul> |
| 6.  | shall provide the Committee with an overview of all files and a report of its evaluation;   |
| 7.  | shall cease to exist following submission to the twelfth session of the Committee of the report on its evaluation of files to be examined by the Committee in 2017.   |
| <p>Once appointed by the Committee, the members of the Evaluation Body shall act impartially in the interests of all States Parties and the Convention.</p> |   |

### III.3. Meetings and recommendations of the Board, decisions of the Committee

A total of forty-nine files were completed by the submitting States in time for evaluation by the Evaluation Body. These files are broken down as follows:

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| Urgent Safeguarding List                          | 6         |
| Representative List                               | 35        |
| Register of good safeguarding practices           | 4         |
| International Assistance                          | 3         |
| Transfer of an element from one List to the other | 1         |
| <b>Total</b>                                      | <b>49</b> |

Of the nominations considered for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List, one had been withdrawn after having been evaluated in a previous cycle and had not been

registered by the Committee in another previous cycle, and another had been withdrawn after being evaluated in a previous cycle. Of the nominations considered for inscription on the Representative List, five had been referred by the Committee in previous cycles, one had been withdrawn after being evaluated in a previous cycle, and another had been considered incomplete in a previous cycle.

The Evaluation Body met for the first time at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris on 2 and 3 March 2017. Following a consultation, the Body elected Mr. Ahmed Skounti (Morocco ) as President, Ms Amelia Maria de Melo Frazão Moreira (Portugal) as Vice-President, and Mr Saša Srećković (Serbia) as Rapporteur.

As in previous cycles, the Secretariat created a dedicated, password-protected website where members were able to view meeting documents, files submitted for evaluation and all accompanying documents. A mailing list facilitated communication among the members of the Board. All members of the Evaluation Body evaluated each dossier online and prepared an individual report for each of them, indicating whether the dossier meets the applicable criteria and how.

The members of the Evaluation Body met from 19 to 23 June 2017 to discuss and reach consensus on their recommendations for each criterion for each file, as well as cross-cutting issues. On this basis, the Rapporteur prepared a draft decision for each file and drafted general observations and recommendations issued by the Board. The members of the Evaluation Body met again from 25 to 27 September 2017 to validate the draft decisions on each file and adopt the reports of the Body. The draft decisions presented in the six reports are therefore based on the consensus of the Evaluation Body.

The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe the following items on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding:

| <b>Draft Decision</b>                            | <b>Submitting State</b> | <b>Nomination</b>   | <b>File No.</b>       | <b>Committee decision</b> |
|--|-------------------------|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| <a href="#">12.COM</a><br><a href="#">11.a.1</a> | Botswana                | Dikopelo folk music of Bakgatla ba Kgafela in Kgatleng District | <a href="#">01290</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">12.COM</a><br><a href="#">11.a.4</a> | Morocco                 | Taskiwin, martial dance of the western High Atlas               | <a href="#">01256</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">12.COM</a><br><a href="#">11.a.5</a> | Turkey                  | Whistled language   | <a href="#">00658</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">12.COM</a><br><a href="#">11.a.6</a> | United Arab Emirates    | Al Azi, art of performing praise, pride and fortitude poetry    | <a href="#">01268</a> | Inscribed                 |

The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee refer the following nominations to the submitting States:

| <b>Draft Decision</b>         | <b>Submitting State</b>                      | <b>Nomination</b>   | <b>File No.</b>       | <b>Committee decision</b> |
|-------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| <a href="#">12.COM.11.a.2</a> | Colombia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) | Colombian-Venezuelan llano work songs                           | <a href="#">01285</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">12.COM.11.a.3</a> | Mongolia                                     | Mongolian traditional practices of worshipping the sacred sites | <a href="#">00871</a> | Inscribed                 |

The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe the following elements on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity:

| <b>Draft Decision</b>          | <b>Submitting State(s)</b>       | <b>Nomination</b>   | <b>File No.</b>       | <b>Committee decision</b> |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| <a href="#">12.COM.11.b.2</a>  | Armenia                          | Kochari, traditional group dance                                  | <a href="#">01295</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">12.COM.11.b.3</a>  | Azerbaijan                       | Dolma making and sharing tradition, a marker of cultural identity | <a href="#">01188</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">12.COM.11.b.4</a>  | Bangladesh                       | Traditional art of Shital Pati weaving of Sylhet                  | <a href="#">01112</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">12.COM.11.b.5</a>  | Bolivia (Plurinational State of) | Ritual journeys in La Paz during Alasita                          | <a href="#">01182</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">12.COM.11.b.6</a>  | Bosnia and Herzegovina           | Konjic woodcarving  | <a href="#">01288</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">12.COM.11.b.10</a> | Germany                          | Organ craftsmanship and music                                     | <a href="#">01277</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">12.COM.11.b.11</a> | Greece                           | Rebetiko  | <a href="#">01291</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">12.COM.11.b.12</a> | India                            | Kumbh Mela  | <a href="#">01258</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">12.COM.11.b.14</a> | Iran (Islamic Republic of)       | Chogān, a horse-riding game accompanied by music and storytelling | <a href="#">01282</a> | Inscribed                 |



| <b>Draft Decision</b>          | <b>Submitting State(s)</b>             | <b>Nomination</b>   | <b>File No.</b>       | <b>Committee decision</b> |
|--------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.b.15</a> | Iran (Islamic Republic of), Azerbaijan | Art of crafting and playing with Kamantcheh/Kamancha, a bowed string musical instrument | <a href="#">01286</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.b.17</a> | Italy                                  | Art of Neapolitan 'Pizzaiuolo'  | <a href="#">00722</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.b.18</a> | Kazakhstan                             | Kazakh traditional Assyk games  | <a href="#">01086</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.b.19</a> | Kyrgyzstan                             | Kok boru, traditional horse game  | <a href="#">01294</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.b.22</a> | Mauritius                              | Sega tambour of Rodrigues Island  | <a href="#">01257</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.b.23</a> | Netherlands                            | Craft of the miller operating windmills and watermills                                  | <a href="#">01265</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.b.25</a> | Peru                                   | Traditional system of Corongo's water judges  | <a href="#">01155</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.b.26</a> | Portugal                               | Craftmanship of Estremoz clay figures   | <a href="#">01279</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.b.28</a> | Serbia                                 | Kolo, traditional folk dance  | <a href="#">01270</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.b.29</a> | Slovakia                               | Multipart singing of Horehronie   | <a href="#">01266</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.b.30</a> | Slovenia                               | Door-to-door rounds of Kurenti  | <a href="#">01278</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.b.31</a> | Switzerland                            | Basel Carnival  | <a href="#">01262</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.b.34</a> | Turkmenistan                           | Kushtdepdi rite of singing and dancing  | <a href="#">01259</a> | Inscribed                 |
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.b.35</a> | Viet Nam                               | The art of Bài Chòi in Central Viet Nam   | <a href="#">01222</a> | Inscribed                 |

The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee refer the following nominations to the submitting States:

| Draft Decision                   | Submitting State(s)   | Nomination  | File No.              | Committee decision                    |
|----------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.b.1</a>    | Algeria   | Knowledge and know-how related to the distillation of rose water and bitter orange water by the city-dwellers of Constantine, called Teqtar | <a href="#">01192</a> | N/A<br>(withdrawn by the State Party) |
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.b.7</a>    | Bulgaria, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Republic of Moldova, Romania | Cultural practices associated to the 1st of March   | <a href="#">01287</a> | Inscribed                             |
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.b.8</a>    | Côte d'Ivoire   | Zaouli, popular music and dance of the Guro communities in Côte d'Ivoire  | <a href="#">01255</a> | Inscribed                             |
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.b.9</a>    | Cuba  | Punto   | <a href="#">01297</a> | Inscribed                             |
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.b.13</a>   | Indonesia   | Pinisi, art of boatbuilding in South Sulawesi   | <a href="#">01197</a> | Inscribed                             |
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.b.16</a>   | Ireland   | Uilleann piping   | <a href="#">01264</a> | Inscribed                             |
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.b.20</a>   | Lao People's Democratic Republic  | Khaen music of the Lao people   | <a href="#">01296</a> | Inscribed                             |
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.b.21</a>   | Malawi  | Nsima, culinary tradition of Malawi   | <a href="#">01292</a> | Inscribed                             |
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.b.24</a>   | Panama  | Artisanal processes and plant fibers techniques for talcos, crinejas and pintas weaving of the pinta'o hat                                  | <a href="#">01272</a> | Inscribed                             |
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.b.27</a>   | Saudi Arabia  | Al-Qatt Al-Asiri, female traditional interior wall decoration in Asir, Saudi Arabia   | <a href="#">01261</a> | Inscribed                             |
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.b.32</a>   | Tajikistan  | Falak   | <a href="#">01193</a> | Referred                              |
| * <a href="#">12.COM 11.b.33</a> | The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey                                 | Spring celebration, Hidrellez   | <a href="#">01284</a> | Inscribed                             |

For the first time, the Evaluation Body has been asked to evaluate a request to remove an element from one list and possibly transfer the same element to the other list. This was a request from Viet Nam for which the Committee agreed in 2015 to decide at its 12th session in 2017. The Evaluation Body first assessed the Periodic Report presented by the State Party and concluded that Xoan song of Phú Thọ Province (Viet Nam) no longer meets one or more of the criteria of the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of

Urgent Safeguarding on which it was first inscribed in 2011. It then evaluated the nomination submitted by Viet Nam for inscription of the same element on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity and concluded that the element meets all the criteria for inscription on that list. The Body therefore recommended that the Committee remove the element from the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding (LSU) and inscribe it on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity (LR):

| Draft decision | Submitting State | Nomination                               | Report / File n°  | Committee decision                             |
|----------------|------------------|--|---|--|
| 12.COM 11.c    | Viet Nam         | Xoan song of Phú Thọ Province (Viet Nam) | <a href="#">Rapport ICH-11 (00538)</a><br><a href="#">01260</a> | Withdrawn from the USL and inscribed on the RL |

The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee approve the following international assistance requests:

| Draft Decision                | Requesting State | Title   | Amount requested | File No.              | Committee decision |
|-------------------------------|------------------|---|------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.d.2</a> | Uganda           | Community-self documentation and revitalization of ceremonies and practices associated with Empaako naming system in Uganda | US\$232,120      | <a href="#">01210</a> | Approved           |
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.d.3</a> | Zambia           | Strengthen the capacity for the safeguarding and management of intangible cultural heritage in Zambia                       | US\$334,820      | <a href="#">01281</a> | Approved           |

The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee refer the following request for international assistance to the submitting State:

| Draft decision | Requesting State | Title | Amount requested | File n° | Committee decision |
|----------------|------------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------------|
|----------------|------------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------------|

|                               |          |   |                                |                       |                                       |
|-------------------------------|----------|---|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.d.1</a> | Colombia | My heritage, my region: strategy for strengthening social management capacities of the intangible cultural heritage in the Colombian Orinoco region | 424 011 dollars des États-Unis | <a href="#">01211</a> | N/A<br>(withdrawn by the State Party) |
|-------------------------------|----------|---|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|

The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee select the following programs, which best reflect the principles and objectives of the Convention:

| Draft Decision                | Submitting State | Proposal   | File No.              | Committee decision |
|-------------------------------|------------------|--|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.e.2</a> | Bulgaria         | Bulgarian Chitalishte (Community Cultural Center): practical experience in safeguarding the vitality of the Intangible Cultural Heritage | <a href="#">00969</a> | Selected           |
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.e.4</a> | Uzbekistan       | Margilan Crafts Development Centre, safeguarding of the atlas and adras making traditional technologies                                  | <a href="#">01254</a> | Selected           |

The Evaluation Body recommended to the Committee not to select the following programs for the time being:

| Draft Decision                | Submitting State | Proposal   | File No.              | Committee decision                 |
|-------------------------------|------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------------------|
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.e.1</a> | Belgium          | Remembrance education and safeguarding the Last Post Ceremony at the Menin Gate Memorial in Ypres, City of Peace               | <a href="#">00875</a> | N/A (withdrawn by the State Party) |
| <a href="#">12.COM 11.e.3</a> | Egypt            | Documenting, preserving, training and promoting the Egyptian intangible heritage of the art and crafts of Tally in Upper Egypt | <a href="#">00963</a> | N/A (withdrawn by the State Party) |

## IV. Lessons learnt

### IV.1. Between recommendations and decisions

Before drawing on some lessons learnt from my mandate inside the Evaluation Body, I have first to recall the principle which, in my opinion, guides the whole process: to the expertise of the Body responds the sovereignty of the Committee. The former is obliged to present its recommendations on each file to the latter which has the right to follow or not the recommendations that are submitted to it.

Let us now look at the divergence between the recommendations of the Body and the decisions of the Committee during the three cycles of 2015, 2016 and 2017. This figure only includes are only positive recommendations and decisions, i.e. which lead to the inscription of an element, the selection of a program, activity or project, and the granting of an international assistance.

| Year/Action | Positive recommendation by the Body | Positive decision by the Committee | Gap |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----|
| 2015        | 23/45                               | 29/45                              | 6   |
| 2016        | 26/50                               | 43/50                              | 17  |
| 2017        | 32/49                               | 44/49                              | 12  |

The results of the three cycles allow for making a few remarks and drawing some conclusions. In the past, the Committee had exercised its sovereign right and adopted decisions that did not necessarily follow the recommendations of the advisory bodies (Consultative Body and Subsidiary Body until 2014 and Evaluation Body since 2015). But the small number of such changes was generally considered "normal", given the political dimension of the review work undertaken by the Committee. In addition, this was done when a very small minority of the five criteria was considered unmet by the advisory body. This is perfectly illustrated by the gap that appears in the 2015 cycle when six elements not recommended for inscription by the Evaluation Body were nevertheless inscribed by the Committee.

However, at the 11th session of 2016, almost all the draft decisions of the body were amended by the Committee. The "reversal" reached, for the first time, the record of four criteria considered by the Evaluation Body as unsatisfied. This resulted in an unprecedented 17 items gap (43 instead of 26), which is 86% (decision) instead of 52% (recommendation).

Not only the observer States Parties and others present found this session particularly unprecedented in this sense, but also many members of the Committee itself. Some clearly expressed their incomprehension of the methodology pursued by the Committee

and the results it has achieved. The debate focused on the need to establish a dialogue between the submitting States Parties and the Evaluation Body in order to enable the former to provide the latter with missing information and not to penalize the inscription of certain elements due to the lack of minor information. To address this issue, the Committee decided to set up an informal ad hoc Working Group open to its 24 members to make proposals to be discussed during its 12<sup>th</sup> session. This ad hoc working group met in Paris in 2017 and took advantage of the last meeting of the Evaluation Body in September of the same year to consult it on this subject. The position of the Body as presented to the members of the ad hoc Working Group is briefly summarized in the following section.

During the 11<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee, at the request of some of the members of the Committee, the floor was given to the Chairperson and Rapporteur of the Evaluation Body as well as to the observer States Parties. All cautioned towards this approach which goes against previous decisions of the Committee.

Among these decisions, it can be recalled that:

1. The Committee and its advisory bodies have repeatedly emphasized that the inscription of an element on one of the Convention's lists results from the process of evaluation and review of nomination files submitted by States Parties and not any consideration of the element itself as a specific cultural expression. The Committee thus emphasized that "its decision not to inscribe an element at this stage does not in any way constitute a judgment on the merits of the element itself, but refers exclusively to the relevance of the information presented in the application file". Decision 8.COM 8.
2. The Committee has repeatedly invited "States Parties to submit dossiers that provide all the information necessary for their appropriate assessment and examination". Decision 8.COM 7; Decision 7.COM 7 and Decision 7.COM 11.

During this same session, there was much discussion of "consistency" as in previous years. It is a permanent concern that guided the Committee. However, in my view, consistency does not only apply during one session but throughout the implementation process, from one session to the next. Given that the reflection on the process of setting up a dialogue between the submitting States Parties and the Evaluation Body has been initiated, it would have been wise to wait for this dialogue to be formalized and framed by legal requirements to ensure the transparency of the entire evaluation process.

The concept of "clarifications" was used several times during the 11th session. But this notion is vague. Asking for clarification on factual issues as has happened for a few applications is quite understandable. The Committee was thus able to loosen up, without ignoring the evaluation principles, the sometimes too strict recommendations of the Evaluation Body. On the other hand, "clarifications" requested on fundamental questions, mainly when they concern the majority of the criteria for inscription, risk

being new information on which the Committee does not have sufficient time or back to gauge their compliance or not with the criterion or criteria at stake.

In 2017, the atmosphere calmed down at the 12th session held in Jeju Island in the Republic of Korea from 4 to 9 December. It must be said that the Evaluation Body has anticipated to some extent the expectations of the Committee. It has proposed on a number of applications a dual option system focusing exclusively on criterion U5 or R5 relating to the inscription of the element on an inventory at national level. This allowed the Committee to request, during this session, the submitting States concerned to provide the factual information considered as missing by the Evaluation Body. It must be also said that the States concerned have prepared themselves as the report of the Body is published online four weeks before the session. This approach has thus widened the gap between the recommendation of the Evaluation Body and the decision by the Committee.

#### **IV.2. Work of the Body: from individual opinion to collective recommendation**

At the 11<sup>th</sup> session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage held in Addis Ababa, the working methodology of the Evaluation Body was discussed. It is therefore important to clarify the working methods of the latter, which, as everyone knows, flow from the Terms of Reference which are set by the Committee itself. The work of the Body is punctuated by three meetings, inter-meeting work, the preparation and finalization of the report and the presentation of the recommendations to the Committee.

The first meeting in March is two days. Its purpose is to explain to the members of the Body the methods and timeframe of the evaluation to which they are called upon to contribute in the context of both individual and collective work. Moderation of the first part of this meeting is carried out by the Secretariat of the Convention. The twelve members of the Evaluation Body are then called upon to elect a Chair, a Vice-Chair and a Rapporteur. In the election of these three people for the first time in 2015, I proposed to the other members to adopt the following criteria:

- representation of individual experts and representatives of accredited NGOs;
- a division of tasks in terms of gender;
- regional representativeness according to the electoral groups of Unesco.

It was also discussed to rotate from one year to the next so that the older ones give way to others and the new ones gradually gain experience.

Due to the spontaneity and brevity of the consultations to fill the three positions, these criteria could not be fully respected. These consultations take place during the break of the first day of the March meeting and leave little room to the twelve members to fully

apply these criteria. The results were as follows during these first three years of the Board:

| <b>Cycle</b> | <b>Position to be filled</b> | <b>Quality</b> | <b>Electoral Group<sup>6</sup></b> |
|--------------|------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|
| 2017         | President                    | Expert         | Vb                                 |
|              | Vice-president               | Expert         | I                                  |
|              | Rapporteur                   | Expert         | II                                 |
| 2016         | President                    | Expert         | IV                                 |
|              | Vice-president               | NGO            | I                                  |
|              | Rapporteur                   | NGO            | Va                                 |
| 2015         | President                    | Expert         | Vb                                 |
|              | Vice-president               | NGO            | Va                                 |
|              | Rapporteur                   | NGO            | II                                 |

It appears that some groups were not represented, especially Group III and others were represented more than once, especially groups I, II, Va and Vb. The latter deserves an explanation since it concerns me personally. Having proposed, in 2015, the informal criteria for filling all three positions, I wasn't expected to appear twice within the same mandate. But the insistence of my fellow members of the Body has been right in my resistance.

After the March meeting, applications are password-accessible on a dedicated platform created by the Secretariat. They are each subject to twelve individual online evaluations, with the exception of those originating from the country of nationality of the expert or the domiciliation of the NGO. This work is done between mid-March and late May-early June. The second meeting of the Evaluation Body is held around the third week of June. This five-day meeting allows the twelve members of the Body to reach consensus on each of the recommendations they adopt for submission to the Committee. The role of the president is crucial during this meeting. It is up to him to bring the members of the Body to adopt consensual positions within the time allotted to the meeting. He must watch his watch very closely and ensure that everyone speaks and the work is getting done. He can count on the unfailing support of the Secretariat.

How is the consensus built? The result of the individual evaluations is displayed on the screen for each application. The tables are always three-colored with Yes in green, No in red, Referral in black. The method used during these three cycles was to ask the extreme evaluator(s) for Yes or No to state the arguments for or against the inscription of an element, the selection of a program or activity of safeguarding or the granting of an international assistance. The floor is then given to the members upon request. When all the members who have asked for the floor have spoken, the chair proposes to follow the majority direction that is emerging. Unless otherwise stated, he strikes the hammer and announces that the decision is adopted. About twenty minutes go to each file. But this

---

<sup>6</sup> Groupes électoraux de l'Unesco : Europe et Amérique du Nord (I) ; Europe centrale et de l'Est (II) ; Amérique Latine et Caraïbes (III) ; Asie Pacifique (IV) ; Afrique (Va) ; Etats Arabes (Vb).



time is actually divided according to the complexity of each case that may require less or more than twenty minutes.

When a majority of opinions concerns the Yes, the president asks the minority opinion to state its arguments. In some cases, the minority opinion may convince the majority because of the strength of its arguments or the fact that the other members admit the absence of factual information which has escaped their vigilance. In such a case, the Body's recommendation follows the minority opinion in question. Conversely, where the minority opinion fails to convince the majority and the majority remains committed to the opinion it expressed in the individual assessments, the minority member has no choice but to join the others. The role of the president is crucial here because sometimes differences of opinion are expressed and they have to be ironed out. Respecting the various opinions, allowing all the members who wish to express themselves and recapitulate to show the heavy tendency that emerges during the discussion of a given point are all qualities that a president must have. . One of the president's concerns is to ensure the consistency of the Body's recommendations. The principles that should preside over the work of the Evaluation Body are: neutrality, impartiality and objectivity.

The reservations and objections of some members are taken into account by adopting additional recommendations addressed to the State Party concerned. Where information is not in the correct place on the form, inappropriate language is used, the attached documents do not fully comply with the relevant texts or decisions of the Committee, the Body recommends that the Committee draw the attention of the State Party concerned on these issues.

The Rapporteur's work is of the utmost importance from the second meeting on. He should have a clear idea of the debates on each of the nominations, the recommendations made by the Body and the cross-cutting issues that emerge from the debate. He also should note applications for which specific recommendations addressed to the States Parties concerned have been adopted and those considered to be exemplary. The preparation of the draft report depends on him. This takes place between the end of the June meeting and the end of August. On this last date and at the latest at the beginning of September, a first version of the report is sent by the Secretariat to the members.

The third meeting takes place during the second half of September and lasts three days. The members of the body read the draft report and make comments and observations to complete it. This is to ensure that the recommendations adopted in June on each of the applications are perfectly reflected. It is also a question of ensuring that all cross-cutting issues discussed are included. Following the September meeting, the Chair, the Vice-Chair and the Rapporteur, assisted by the Secretariat, proceed electronically to the adoption of the final version of the report. It is then submitted also electronically to the other members of the Body for final comments, following which the conformity of the

English and French versions is verified. In accordance with the Operational Directives of the Convention, the report is published online four weeks before the Committee session, i.e. by the end of October and the beginning of November.

The Chair and the Rapporteur must take part to the session of the Intergovernmental Committee. The Rapporteur is first invited to present the report of the Body which includes the progress of the evaluation work between the March meeting and the adoption of the report at the beginning of October, as well as the cross-cutting issues. The Chair presents the recommendations of the Body on each of the evaluated nominations. Both answer any questions asked by members of the Committee. Both can only repeat the opinion expressed by the Body as a group and not express a personal opinion on the issues raised.

Finally, in my view, the Evaluation Body has shown its effectiveness during the first three years of its existence. The Governing Bodies of the 2003 Convention have managed to find an appropriate and relevant formula that combines the positive aspects of the previous advisory and subsidiary bodies, while excluding their negative aspects. As is well known, the former advisory body consisted of six accredited NGO representatives, while the subsidiary body was composed of six of the 24 members of the Intergovernmental Committee. The first was responsible for nominations for inscription on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding, programs, projects or activities submitted for selection to the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices and requests for international assistance of more than \$ 25,000. United States of America. The second was responsible for the evaluation of nominations for inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. The first was "independent" from the Committee; the second was an emanation of the Committee. A single body of twelve members representing States Parties that are not members of the Committee and accredited NGOs seems to be a perfectly suitable formula. The annual renewal of three members out of twelve makes it possible to instil new blood and a new breath within the organ while enlarging, from year to year, the circle of evaluation expertise.

The Evaluation Body has become, in its very first years, an efficient organ. Thanks to the effective technical and logistical support from the Secretariat, he has managed to perform its work in good conditions. From my point of view, it has become a "technical" organ, in the positive sense of the term. Since the evaluation of files is based solely on their content, it considers that a particular criterion is not fully or partially satisfied when information is missing. This may be textual information that must be in the correct place on the form as it may be a required document (abstract from the inclusion in an inventory, proof of free, prior and informed consent, etc.). In general, the Body tends to be indulgent in reaching consensus. It avoids penalizing an application when the majority considers that it satisfies globally the criteria of inscription on the lists, selection under the Register or granting of the international assistance.

### **IV.3. Beyond evaluation**

It is important, at the end of a mandate, to draw some conclusions with the aim of contributing to the improvement of the functioning of the system as a whole. These are not technical proposals but qualitative and substantial considerations. Four points are worth due consideration.

The first concerns the objectives of the lists, the Register and International Assistance. I will limit myself to the lists in the following lines because the question of the objectives arises in their case more than in that of the two other mechanisms (the Register and the International Assistance). About the lists, questions arise. Some came from the exercise of the evaluation itself and were posed in the 2017 report of the Body. For example: is the Representative List to be extended indefinitely? Is it a finite list or an infinite list? What is the meaning of the notion of "representativeness"? Is it the result of the process of inscription or selection work of what is "representative" of the intangible cultural heritage of humanity? What is the difference between an element registered in the name of a State Party and another registered in the name of more than one State Party? Are they "representative" the same way? With regard to the Urgent Safeguarding List, one might ask: are the elements requiring urgent safeguarding to remain on this list *ad vitam aeternam*? The Xoan song of the Province of Phú Thọ of Viet Nam shows that safeguarded elements may be removed from this list and inscribed on the Representative List. It is clear that this procedure remains the only one to date, and that the viability of the elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List continue to undergo day after day. What is the purpose of this list if elements remain there while deteriorating irretrievably? What about elements that aren't getting better since their inscription on that list, four, six or eight years ago?

The second point relates to the intangible cultural heritage in general. As a facilitator of the Convention, I repeat at all capacity building workshops that all elements are equal and that there should be no hierarchy between them. But what we observe is quite the opposite. Inventory items at the national level or those listed in the Convention are indeed "elected elements". A form of hierarchy is established between them and all the others, which is not without generating a feeling of frustration among individuals, groups or communities which hold or identify with the elements that have not (still) been recognized or those which will not (or never) be recognized. The slowing pace of registrations since the adoption of the annual ceiling of fifty files is likely to increase this frustration. Not to mention political considerations related to certain nominations, be they internal or external or both.

A paradox is thus likely to emerge: a growing number of nominations, especially for inscription on the Representative List, partly thanks to the extension of the capacity-building program, on the one hand, and a limited capacity of the statutory organs of the Convention to consider a large number of them, on the other hand. This is likely to exacerbate the competition and generate disappointment and resentment. A recent

Moroccan episode helps to understand this situation. Morocco had submitted the nomination of Gnaouas (dances and songs of followers of a religious brotherhood with sub-Saharan influences) in 2015 for possible inscription on the Representative List. In 2016, the State Party submitted another nomination on Taskiwine, martial dance of the western High Atlas for a possible inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List. Already having six elements inscribed on the Representative List and in the light of the priorities established by paragraph 34 of the Operational Guidelines, Taskiwine was given priority to be examined by the Committee in 2017. The president of the association which initiated the nomination of Gnaouas, publicly called upon the responsibility of the Ministry of Culture and Communication. In her view, the priority should have been given to the Gnaouas file since it was first submitted to UNESCO. It was necessary to explain the procedures and, in particular, to recall the relevant provisions of the Operational Directives in order to clarify a little bit the situation. Still, the current ceiling is likely to increase dissatisfaction among communities around the world.

The third point relates to the implementation of the Convention and its impact on cultures. It must be recognized that the implementation of the Convention is leading to the redefinition of a field of human activity, namely the “tradition” and “traditional knowledge” in a broad sense. Public policies and the laws that result from them go in front to a redefinition of different cultural forms of expression. They reveal them and put them under spot lights. Elements that have previously been complex involving a wide range of people, practices and ideas are being redefined either to broaden or decrease their scope. Sometimes we focus on a micro-element to account for the whole practice or knowledge. The choice of the angle of identification and definition is never innocent and informs about the safeguarding project itself. Moreover, the implementation of the Convention and the resulting public policies lead to a redefinition of unclear notions such as communities, groups and individuals, in relation to the elements of the intangible cultural heritage that they hold or to which they identify. One may ask: who is really part of this group or that community? What are the rights of an individual within a group of practitioners? Intellectual property issues are never far away. The spirit of the Convention is that we should enhance a common appropriation to the detriment of exclusivity; nevertheless, this horizon seems more and more far away.

The last point is related to the three previous ones. Given my initial position as a researcher, I still believe that research is more than necessary for the implementation of the Convention. Vigilance and academic critic are valuable for the “intangible cultural heritage system”<sup>7</sup>. Fortunately, surveys have been conducted in recent years and publications are proliferating. Specialized trainings in intangible heritage are also opening up in academic institutions. This effort is expected to grow up and it is important to support it. Understanding the implementation of the Convention, revealing the underlying issues, analyzing the links between the national and the international

---

<sup>7</sup> Ahmed Skounti, 2018, « The Intangible Cultural Heritage System: many challenges, few proposals », in *Santander Arts and Culture Review* (Warsaw), in press

levels of its implementation, understanding the implications of the international recognition for the inscribed elements, these are but few of the topics that need to be explored. Category 2 centres and UNESCO Chairs dedicated to intangible cultural heritage as well as research associations can contribute to this investigative effort.