Consultation with experts in the field of intangible cultural heritage safeguarding in the framework of the global reflection on the listing mechanisms of the 2003 Convention

INTRODUCTION

The international cooperation and assistance system of the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003 Convention) includes four mechanisms: two Lists, one Register and International Assistance. These are set out in Articles 16, 17, 18 and 20 of the Convention, respectively, and are further explained in the Operational Directives:

- The Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity ('Representative List' or 'RL')
- The List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding ('Urgent Safeguarding List' or 'USL')
- The Register of programmes, projects and activities that best reflect the principles and objectives of the Convention ('Register of Good Safeguarding Practices' or 'GSP')
- International Assistance from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund ('International Assistance' or 'IA').

This consultation follows the decision by the Intergovernmental Committee of the 2003 Convention to launch a global reflection on the listing mechanisms of the Convention, with support from the Government of Japan (Decisions 13.COM 6 and 13.COM 10).
The global reflection on the listing mechanisms of the 2003 Convention focuses on the two Lists and the Register. For the purposes of this survey, 'nomination' and 'inscription' also refer to proposals for inclusion on the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices.

The reflection will focus, inter alia, on the following issues:

- the nature and purposes of the Lists and the Register of the 2003 Convention
- the relevance of the various criteria for each of the listing mechanisms
- the methodology for evaluating and examining nominations
- issues related to the follow-up of inscribed elements or of selected good safeguarding practices.

The timetable for the reflection process, initially set out by the Committee and adjusted due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, includes a consultation with experts, to be followed by a meeting of an open-ended intergovernmental working group in July 2021. The sixteenth session of the Committee will provide an opportunity to engage in further intergovernmental discussions on the topic, and to propose relevant revisions to the Operational Directives for possible adoption by the General Assembly in 2022. The consultation with experts will follow a two-step process, with this online survey being the first step. The second step will consist of an online meeting of experts to be organized on 7 May (Part I) as well as on 26 and 27 May (Part II).

***

Experts in the field of intangible cultural heritage safeguarding are therefore invited to contribute to the global reflection through this online survey and to share their views on the main challenges identified so far concerning the listing mechanisms as well as on possible approaches to finding solutions for the future of the Convention.

Background information, together with a list of relevant Committee decisions, General Assembly resolutions, working documents and other reference material, can be consulted at : https://ich.unesco.org/en/global-reflection-on-the-listing-mechanisms-01164 (https://ich.unesco.org/en/global-reflection-on-the-listing-mechanisms-01164).

The deadline for submitting your replies to this survey is **11 April 2021**.

- There are 44 questions in this survey (open fields are limited to a maximum of 500 words). Answers may be provided in either of the working languages of the Convention: English and French.
- You may save your replies and return to the survey at a later stage to complete it. It is also not necessary to answer all the questions – some sections may be left blank.
- The answers provided through the survey will be analyzed to support the discussions during the expert meeting to be held during the second step of this consultation. Individual answers to this survey will be neither published nor disclosed to outside parties.

General Information

Title:

*

Choose one of the following answers
Please choose **only one** of the following:

- ◯ Mr
- ◯ Ms

Last Name:

*

Please write your answer here:

First Name:

*

Please write your answer here:

Nationality: *

Please write your answer here:

Name of institution and your position at the institution:

Please write your answer here:

Email address: *

Please write your answer here:

Telephone number(s):

Please write your answer here:

Other relevant information:

Please write your answer here:

Briefly describe your experience in working with the listing mechanisms of the 2003 Convention: *

Please write your answer here:

A. Overall approach to the listing mechanism

The Three Mechanisms

1. Which of the statements below best reflect your priorities for reforming the current listing system?
The listing system should be revised to:

Check all that apply
Please select at most 3 answers
Please choose **all** that apply:

- [ ] clarify the different yet complementary purposes of the three mechanisms (RL, USL and GSP)
- [ ] improve the current methodology used for evaluating and examining nominations
- [ ] redress the imbalance in the use of the listing mechanisms
- [ ] encourage more culturally and geographically balanced listing mechanisms
- [ ] make the nomination process better attuned to the realities and broader safeguarding intentions and practices of communities, groups and individuals
- [ ] enhance the monitoring of the changing viability of inscribed elements and their safeguarding status
- [ ] respond to the challenges related to the number of files treated in each nomination cycle
- [ ] other reasons
- [ ] no major revisions are necessary at this stage

Please explain your choice:

Please write your answer here:

2. What system would you envisage for the reformed listing system ?

❗ Choose one of the following answers
❗ 1
Please choose **only one** of the following:

◯ a more open and inclusive system based on a smaller number of inscription criteria on the Representative List

◯ continuing with a current criteria-based selection process, possibly with enhanced follow-up and monitoring mechanisms

◯ other options or combinations of these two systems

Make a comment on your choice here:

3. Would you be in favour of establishing a sunset clause for elements to be included on the Representative List?

❗ Choose one of the following answers
❗ 1
Please choose **only one** of the following:

◯ Yes
◯ No

Make a comment on your choice here:

4. In the context of an annual ceiling of files that can be treated, which files should be given priority? (Choose priority 1 to 8.)

❗ All your answers must be different and you must rank in order.
❗ Please select at most 8 answers
Please number each box in order of preference from 1 to 8

☐ nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List
☐ nominations to the Representative List
☐ proposals for the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices
☐ International Assistance requests above US$100,000
☐ nominations from States Parties with no/few elements inscribed
☐ multinational nominations
☐ nominations for elements (or domains of intangible cultural heritage) which are not represented, or underrepresented, on the listing mechanisms
☐ other

5. Do you think that the current annual ceiling for the treatment of nominations is appropriate?

Choose one of the following answers
1
Please choose **only one** of the following:

- ◯ yes
- ◯ no, the ceiling should be increased
- ◯ no, the ceiling should be lowered
- ◯ other

Make a comment on your choice here:

6. Should each mechanism (RL, USL and GSP) have a separate annual ceiling?

Choose one of the following answers
1
Please choose **only one** of the following:

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

Make a comment on your choice here:

A. Overall approach to the listing mechanism

Urgent Safeguarding List

7. Why do you think the Urgent Safeguarding List continues to be under-utilized?

Please write your answer here:

8. Which of the measures below could encourage States Parties to more actively utilize the Urgent Safeguarding List?

❗ Check all that apply
❗ Please select at most 3 answers
Please choose **all** that apply:

- [ ] transfer those elements that have regained sufficient viability from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List
- [ ] offer technical assistance on a systematic basis once States Parties have declared their intention to prepare files for the Urgent Safeguarding List
- [ ] ensure funding is available from the International Assistance provisions of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund for the approved safeguarding plans once elements are inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List, either: (a) through a revised and simplified ICH-01 bis Form; or (b) by fast tracking such requests for International Assistance – up to US$100,000 – to the Bureau
- [ ] align the periodicity for reporting on the status of elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List with other reporting mechanisms (i.e., by changing it from four to six years)
- [ ] shorten the duration of the process for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List
- [ ] no major revisions are necessary at this stage
- [ ] other

Please explain your choice:

Please write your answer here:

A. Overall approach to the listing mechanism

Representative List

9. Article 16 of the 2003 Convention states that the Representative List was established to:

- ensure better visibility of intangible cultural heritage
- ensure an awareness of the significance of intangible cultural heritage
- encourage dialogue which respects cultural diversity

To what extent do you think the Representative List accomplishes its purposes as reflected in Article 16 of the Convention?

Please write your answer here:

10. How should ‘representative’ be understood?

Choose one of the following answers

1

Please choose **only one** of the following:

◯ encompassing as many examples as possible that highlight the breadth and diversity of communities and their living heritage around the world

◯ highlighting the diverse domains or types of intangible cultural heritage around the world

◯ highlighting the diversity of communities around the world

◯ other

Make a comment on your choice here:

11. What changes could be envisioned to ensure the Representative List better meets its purposes as stated in Article 16 of the Convention?

Please write your answer here:

A. Overall approach to the listing mechanism

Register of Good Safeguarding Practices

12. What changes could be envisioned to make the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices more useful?

❗ Check all that apply
Please choose **all** that apply:

- [ ] include in the Register those safeguarding activities that have successfully revitalized elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List
- [ ] establish an alternative and simpler validation system for the Register that is separate from the inscription system for the two Lists
- [ ] others
- [ ] no major changes are necessary

Please explain your choice:

Please write your answer here:

B. Issues related to the criteria of inscription

Urgent Safeguarding List

13. Do you consider that it is necessary to remove or revise any of the criteria for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List?

U1

Please choose **only one** of the following:

◯ Yes
◯ No

U2

Please choose **only one** of the following:

◯ Yes
◯ No

U3

Please choose **only one** of the following:

◯ Yes
◯ No

U4

Please choose **only one** of the following:

◯ Yes
◯ No

U5

Please choose **only one** of the following:

◯ Yes
◯ No

14. If any of your answers to question 13 were yes, please explain why and how you propose revising those criteria

Please write your answer here:

B. Issues related to the criteria of inscription

Representative List

15. Do you consider that any of the criteria for inscription on the Representative List need to be removed or revised?

R.1

Please choose **only one** of the following:

◯ Yes
◯ No

R.2

Please choose **only one** of the following:

◯ Yes
◯ No

R.3

Please choose **only one** of the following:

◯ Yes
◯ No

R.4

Please choose **only one** of the following:

◯ Yes
◯ No

R.5

Please choose **only one** of the following:

◯ Yes
◯ No

16. If any of your answers to question 15 were yes, please explain why and in what way you propose revising those criteria (please note that R.2 will be dealt with specifically in question 17).

Please write your answer here:

17. How do you propose addressing the recurrent issues concerning criterion R.2 (Inscription of the element will contribute to ensuring visibility and awareness of the significance of the intangible cultural heritage and to encouraging dialogue, thus reflecting cultural diversity worldwide and testifying to human creativity):

❗ Check all that apply
Please choose **all** that apply:

☐ by once again reformulating the questions in Section 2 of Form ICH-02 on criterion R.2 to make it easier for submitting States to address the right questions (please explain how below)

☐ by removing Section 2 on criterion R.2 from Form ICH-02 and asking the Evaluation Body and the Committee to decide independently whether the nomination responds to the purpose of the Representative List based on the overall information provided in the files (please explain why below)

☐ by reviewing and redefining the criterion (R.2) in its entirety in the Operational Directives (please explain how below)

☐ no changes are necessary

☐ other

Please explain how / why:

Please write your answer here:

B. Issues related to the criteria of inscription

Register of Good Safeguarding Practices

18. Do you consider that any of the criteria for selection on the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices need to be removed or revised?

P.1

Please choose **only one** of the following:

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

P.2

Please choose **only one** of the following:

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

P.3

Please choose **only one** of the following:

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

P.4

Please choose **only one** of the following:

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

P.5

Please choose **only one** of the following:

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

P.6

Please choose **only one** of the following:

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

P.7

Please choose **only one** of the following:

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

P.8

Please choose **only one** of the following:

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

P.9

Please choose **only one** of the following:

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

19. If any of your answers to question 18 were yes, please explain why and how you propose revising those criteria.

Please write your answer here:

C. Issues related to the follow-up of inscribed elements

Mechanism for the follow-up of inscribed elements and treatment of Information

20. Do you think that the Periodic Reporting mechanism is sufficient for following up on the status of inscribed elements?

Please write your answer here:

21. If additional follow-up mechanism(s) to the Periodic Reporting were established, what should their main objective(s) be:

22. What specific mechanisms do you envisage would meet those objectives?

23. What role do you think communities, groups and/or individuals, associated with an element being nominated could or should play in the follow-up or monitoring of that element after its inscription? Please explain.

Please write your answer here:

24. What could the role of other stakeholders – the Committee, the Secretariat, the Evaluation Body, other experts, submitting States, NGOs and others – be in the follow-up of inscribed elements? Please explain.

Please write your answer here:

25. What kind of mechanism would you propose when the Secretariat receives information from the public concerning:

C. Issues related to the follow-up of inscribed elements

Removal of an element from a List

26. Under what circumstances should an element be removed from the Urgent Safeguarding List?

Please write your answer here:

27. Who should initiate this process?

Please write your answer here:

28. What kind of information, other than the Periodic Reports, could be used to assist the Committee in deciding on the removal of an element from the Urgent Safeguarding List and who should provide this information?

Please write your answer here:

29. Under what circumstances should an element be removed from the Representative List?

Please write your answer here:

30. Who should initiate this?

Please write your answer here:

31. What kind of information, other than the Periodic Reports, could be used to assist the Committee in deciding on the removal of an element from the Urgent Safeguarding List and who should provide this information?

Please write your answer here:

32. What do you think the key steps for removing an element from the following Lists should be:

C. Issues related to the follow-up of inscribed elements

Transfer of an element from one list to another

33. In your opinion, should the Committee have the possibility to transfer an element:

a. from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List

Choose one of the following answers

1

Please choose **only one** of the following:

◯ Yes

◯ No

Make a comment on your choice here:

b. from the Representative List to the Urgent Safeguarding List

Choose one of the following answers

1

Please choose **only one** of the following:

◯ Yes

◯ No

Make a comment on your choice here:

34. In your opinion, for the Committee to decide to transfer an element from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List, is it necessary to first demonstrate that the element is no longer in need of urgent safeguarding?

Choose one of the following answers

1

Please choose **only one** of the following:

◯ Yes

◯ No

Make a comment on your choice here:

35. Who do you think is best placed to ascertain whether an element is no longer in need of urgent safeguarding:

Check all that apply
Please choose **all** that apply:

- [ ] States Parties
- [ ] communities, groups and, where applicable, individuals
- [ ] experts and NGOs
- [ ] other

Please explain your choice:

Please write your answer here:

36. Do you think that if an element is deemed to be no longer in need of urgent safeguarding, it should be automatically transferred to the Representative List?

Choose one of the following answers
1
Please choose **only one** of the following:

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

Make a comment on your choice here:

37. What do you think should be the key steps for transferring an element:

a. from the Representative List to the Urgent Safeguarding List?

Please write your answer here:

b. from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List?

Please write your answer here:

D. Methodology for the evaluation of nominations

Overall process and methodology

38. Do you think that the current composition of the Evaluation Body is appropriate for the evaluation of nominations?

Choose one of the following answers

1

Please choose **only one** of the following:

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

Make a comment on your choice here:

39. Do you think that the current methodology and process for the evaluation of nominations by the Evaluation Body needs to be reviewed?

Choose one of the following answers
1
Please choose **only one** of the following:

◯ Yes, reforms are needed

◯ No, the methodology and process are adequate

Make a comment on your choice here:

40. If you answered yes to question 39, do you have a specific proposal on how to improve this methodology and process?

Please write your answer here:

41. Should the Evaluation Body use information available outside the contents of the file that may shed additional light on the accuracy and relevance of the arguments put forward in the file in relation to the criteria required for inscription:

Choose one of the following answers
Please choose **only one** of the following:

◯ Yes

◯ No

Make a comment on your choice here:

D. Methodology for the evaluation of nominations

Multinational files

42. Do you think that the process of extending multinational inscriptions to new States Parties should be simplified?

Choose one of the following answers
Please choose **only one** of the following:

◯ Yes

◯ No

Make a comment on your choice here:

43. If you answered yes to question 42, do you have any suggestions for how the process could be simplified?

Please write your answer here:

****

44. Please provide any other ideas you may have for improving the listing mechanisms of the 2003 Convention for safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage of communities around the world.

Please write your answer here: