

Preparing nominations to the Lists of the Convention: general framework and criteria following the global reflection on the listing mechanisms

Presentation by Ms Barbra Babweteera, Executive Director, The Cross-Cultural Foundation of Uganda – CCFU



General overview

Starting from 2024, there were a number of changes to the nomination process that took effect:

- A **new form** to guide transfer of inscribed elements.
- Criterion R2 is assessed on the basis of the information provided in the entire nomination.
- Criteria used for **best safeguarding practices**: from P1 - P8 to G1 - G4.
- **Audiovisual materials**: encouraged use to support especially criterion R2/U2.



© Niyi Odekanyin, Nigeria, 2021

Criterion R.2

Criterion R2 was maintained but under the revised Form ICH-02, this criterion is assessed based on the information provided in the nomination file as a whole to demonstrate how the inscription of the element will contribute to **ensuring visibility and awareness** of the significance of intangible cultural heritage, and encouraging dialogue.

In addition, the submitting States are invited to consult communities and indicate their view on the contribution of the element to **sustainable development**.

- Some submitting States tick all the boxes on sustainable development. However, they fail to provide relevant information to explain this link.
- The audiovisual materials submitted **should not be long**.



© Aka Konin/Office Ivoirien du patrimoine culturel (OIPC), 2015

Consent forms



Consent letters should **clearly indicate the purpose** of consent (e.g. consent to inscription of an element, consent to transfer an element or consent to inscribe an element as a good safeguarding practice).

Submitting States should strive for a **sufficient representative sample** of consent letters signed off by the bearer communities or their representatives.

There is a tendency to submit **standardized consent letters** from the communities: this is **highly discouraged**.

In some cases, the consent letters submitted **are all from State authorities** and not community members/practitioners: this raises a concern as to whether such letters reflect the full, prior and informed consent by concerned communities.

© Patrick Maundu, Kenya, 2016



Community participation

Community participation in the planning processes of nomination and proposing safeguarding measures of an element is critical.



© Commission National de la République de Mozambique auprès de l'UNESCO

Mitigation measures for over-commercialization

Despite positive impact that **commercialization and tourism** of intangible cultural heritage can have on sustainable livelihood of the practitioners, this may result in **over-commercialization and de-contextualization** of the element if special attention is not provided to mitigation measures.



© National Heritage Fund, Mauritius, 2015 & Nipon Medhi, 2015

Inventory

For Criterion 5 on **inventorying**, link has been established with national periodic reports so as to relieve the State from the burden of repeating the required information.

Recurrent challenges include insufficient attention to community participation in the preparation and updating of inventories.



© National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia, 2015



Titles which do not properly reflect the element

In some instances, the **titles** of elements have been suggested to be changed from what a State Party prior proposed.

This is because of a **mismatch** between the title and the contents provided in the nomination file.



© Engabu Za Tooro, 2014

Adherence to word limits



In some cases, there is **non-compliance with the word limits** requested for in specific boxes.

However, this affects more **multinational files** than **national files**.

Inclusivity and other crosscutting issues

There are sometimes well written files that demonstrate inclusion of **diversity themes** (e.g. gender, disability, youth engagement, inclusion of education about an element in safeguarding measures, demonstrating links between ICH and climate adaptation, tangible heritage, safer cities, hunger alleviation).

However, sometimes there are files submitted with **linguistic issues**:

- Unclear and imprecise language.
- Typographical errors.
- Misplacement of information in sections.



© Ishmael Ogaufi Otladisa and Veekuhane, Botswana, 2018

Multinational files

The Evaluation Body has recognized the complexities of preparing multinational files, and commends the efforts made by the submitting States. Some observations drawn by the Evaluation Body on multinational files are:

- **Imbalance of information:** there is often an imbalance of information between the submitting States.
- **Joint safeguarding measures:** multinational files should always seek to include some joint safeguarding measures to safeguard the element as a shared heritage. Joint and collaborative safeguarding measures are often a positive reflection of work accomplished under the Convention. Complete absence of any joint safeguarding measures prevents the fulfillment of criterion R.3.
- **Evidence of communities' consent:** nomination files have to show active community participation. Consent letters from communities should not be standardized. In case of **extension request**, in addition to the consent of newly joining communities, the consent from representatives of the communities from the original nomination shall be provided.
- **'State by State' paragraphs:** Sometimes, the information provided by each individual state is different and the files were unable to highlight the shared nature of the element among the submitting states

