



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization



Intangible  
Cultural  
Heritage

**5 COM**

ITH/10/5.COM/CONF.202/6  
Paris, 6 October 2010  
Original: English

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

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE  
SAFEGUARDING OF THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE**

**Fifth session  
Nairobi, Kenya  
15 to 19 November 2010**

**Item 6 of the Provisional Agenda:  
Evaluation of nominations for inscription in 2010 on the  
Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**

At its third session, the Committee established a Subsidiary Body responsible for the examination of nominations for inscription on the Representative List in 2009 and 2010 (Decision 3.COM 11). This document constitutes the report of the Subsidiary Body which includes an overview of the 2010 nomination files and working methods (Part A), the recommendations of the Subsidiary Body (Part B), comments and observations on the 2010 nominations (Part C) and a set of draft decisions for the Committee's consideration (Part D).

**Decision required: paragraph 44**

**Report and recommendations of the  
Subsidiary Body for the examination of nominations for inscription on the  
Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity 2010**

1. According to the Operational Directives<sup>1</sup>, the examination of nominations to the Representative List is accomplished by a Subsidiary Body of the Committee established in accordance with Rule 21 of its Rules of Procedure. At its third session (Istanbul, Turkey, 4 to 8 November 2008), the Committee established a Subsidiary Body for the examination of nominations for inscription on the Representative List in 2009 and 2010 (Decision 3.COM 11). The body consists of Estonia, Kenya, Mexico, Republic of Korea, Turkey and the United Arab Emirates.
2. According to its terms of reference, the Subsidiary Body shall provide the Committee with an overview of all nomination files and a report of its examination, and shall, in particular, include in its examination:
  - a. an assessment of any nomination's conformity with the inscription criteria as provided in the Operational Directives<sup>2</sup>, benefitting from the technical information to be provided by the Secretariat, if the Subsidiary Body so requests;
  - b. a recommendation to the Committee to inscribe, or not to inscribe, the nominated element.
3. This document provides an overview of all 2010 nomination files and of their examination by the Subsidiary Body (Part A), a summary of recommendations concerning the inscription of the nominated elements on the basis of the assessment of each nomination's conformity with the inscription criteria (Part B), other recommendations concerning the 2010 nominations (Part C) and a set of draft decisions for the Committee's consideration, with each draft decision addressing one nomination's conformity with the criteria and whether or not to inscribe the nominated element (Part D).

**A. Overview of nomination files and working methods**

4. A revised version of the nomination form ICH-02 was posted on the website of the Convention on 19 June 2009. A total of 32 States Parties submitted 147 nominations on or before the 31 August 2009 deadline. Of these nominations, 145 were national and two were multi-national. The regional distribution of nominations was as follows:

Electoral Group	Number of States Parties (31/08/2009) <sup>3</sup>	Number of submitting States	Number of nominations submitted
I	14 (12,4 %)	7 (22 %)	25 (17 %)
II	20 (17,7 %)	7 (22 %)	11 (7 %)
III	23 (20,4 %)	3 (9 %)	7 (5 %)
IV	17 (15 %)	8 (25 %)	99 (67 %)
V (a)	25 (22,1 %)	1 (3 %)	1 (1 %)
V (b)	14 (12,4 %)	6 (19 %)	18 (12 %)
<b>Total</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>147<sup>4</sup></b>

5. In its Decision 4.COM 19 taken at its fourth session in Abu Dhabi (28 September to 2 October 2009), the Committee decided 'on an exceptional basis relating only to the nominations proposed for evaluation in 2010, that the Secretariat and the Subsidiary Body examine with priority the nominations for the Representative List submitted by States Parties

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph 23 of the Operational Directives adopted in June 2008 and paragraph 29 of the Operational Directives adopted in June 2010.

<sup>2</sup> Paragraph 19 of the Operational Directives adopted in June 2008 and paragraph 2 of the Operational Directives adopted in June 2010.

<sup>3</sup> Number of States Parties at the time of the deadline for nominations.

<sup>4</sup> Total exceeds 147 because multinational nominations are counted within more than one electoral group.

that do not have elements inscribed on said List, have few elements inscribed on it or have presented multinational nominations'. Following this decision, a meeting of the Subsidiary Body was organized during the Committee session, in which the Subsidiary Body determined it would be able to manage examining about 50 nominations. It also decided that it wished to examine at least one nomination from every State that had submitted nominations.

6. After applying the three priority criteria set out in Decision 4.COM 19 (nominations from States Parties that do not have elements inscribed on the Representative List, have few elements inscribed on it or have presented multinational nominations) and including at least one nomination from every submitting State, the Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body determined that a total of 54 nominations would be examined by the Subsidiary Body during the 2010 cycle.
7. The 54 nominations (including two multinational nominations) were submitted by a total of 32 States. The regional distribution of the nominations examined by the Subsidiary Body was as follows:

Electoral Group	Number of States Parties (31/08/2009) <sup>5</sup>	Number of submitting States	Number of nominations examined
I	14 (12,4 %)	7 (22 %)	18 (33 %)
II	20 (17,7 %)	7 (22 %)	9 (17 %)
III	23 (20,4 %)	3 (9 %)	7 (13 %)
IV	17 (15 %)	8 (25 %)	20 (37 %)
V (a)	25 (22,1 %)	1 (3 %)	1 (2 %)
V (b)	14 (12,4 %)	6 (19 %)	12 (22 %)
<b>Total</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>54<sup>6</sup></b>

8. At the beginning of October 2010, the Secretariat contacted the 11 States Parties that had submitted a larger number of nominations than the Subsidiary Body could examine, reminding them of the decision taken by the Committee at its fourth session concerning the priorities for examining nominations for the 2010 cycle. It informed them about the number of nominations that the Subsidiary Body would be able to examine in accordance with those priorities, and asked them to indicate which nominations among those they submitted should be examined on a priority basis for the 2010 cycle.
9. Upon receipt of instructions from each concerned State about the nominations to be examined with priority, the Secretariat ascertained their technical completeness, in conformity with the Operational Directives. Only one of the 54 files was considered complete at the time it was submitted. Prior to the statutory deadline of 1 November 2009, the Secretariat wrote to most of the submitting States Parties concerned to indicate what information would be needed to complete the other 53 nominations and reminding them of the deadline for such information. Additional time was granted for several files since the Secretariat was not able to process them before the 1 November deadline.
10. The Secretariat also ascertained the completeness of twelve additional nomination files from those States Parties that had to identify a limited number of nominations to be examined with priority during the 2010 cycle, in order to give them the possibility to replace one of the files previously identified for priority processing. One State took advantage of this opportunity to replace one of the nomination files that it had previously identified as a priority.
11. By the deadline of 15 January 2010, most submitting States had responded to the Secretariat's request to provide additional information regarding their nominations. The States to which an extension had been granted because of the delay of the Secretariat in the processing of several files responded soon after. Of the 54 nominations examined, 5 were submitted in French, 41 in English and 8 in both languages.

<sup>5</sup> Number of States Parties at the time of the deadline for nominations.

<sup>6</sup> Total exceeds 54 because multinational nominations are counted within more than one electoral group.

12. The Subsidiary Body met on 13 January 2010 to determine its working methods and schedule in preparation for its meeting of 17 to 20 May 2010. Discussions also focused on the nomination form ICH-02, the draft form for examination reports, the format of the draft decisions, and the reports to the Committee from the Subsidiary Body and the Rapporteur. Clarifications were made concerning several of the cross-cutting issues that were previously discussed by the Subsidiary Body at its meetings held on 12 and 13 January 2009 and on 11 to 15 May 2009.
13. As it had done for the first cycle of examination of nominations, the Secretariat established a password-protected, dedicated website through which the members of the Subsidiary Body could consult the nominations and supporting documentation. As requested by the Subsidiary Body, the optional videos accompanying the nominations were made available, in addition to the required photographs. Also available to the Subsidiary Body were the original nomination files and the Secretariat's 53 requests for additional information. All of the files were posted online in their original languages before 1 March 2010 and in both languages by 15 March 2010.
14. The members of the Body were given the opportunity to enter their examination reports directly through the dedicated site. Each of the six members of the Subsidiary Body examined each nomination and prepared a report on it that assessed whether the nomination satisfied all of the five criteria for inscription and included the member's comments regarding each criterion. The six members of the Subsidiary Body submitted a total of 315 examination reports to the Secretariat. The Secretariat then drew up summaries of each nomination and draft recommendations, in many cases offering alternate proposals to reflect the divergent opinions of Body members. Of the 54 nominations, the initial examination reports showed divergent opinions for 36, or two-thirds of the total. When it met on 17 to 20 May 2010, the Subsidiary Body examined each nomination, giving particular attention to those where members did not share the same views in their initial examination reports, decided whether to recommend inscription or not, and revised the draft recommendations accordingly. The resulting recommendations and draft decisions presented below thus represent the unanimous consensus of the Subsidiary Body members.
15. The decisions of the Subsidiary Body were communicated to the submitting States Parties in the week of 21 June 2010, before the statutory deadline of 1 July 2010, in conformity with the Operational Directives then in effect (since amended by the General Assembly at its third session in June 2010). Subsequently, seven nominations that had received the Subsidiary Body's recommendation not to inscribe at this time were withdrawn by the submitting States Parties prior to the date for the present document to be dispatched to the Committee and made available to States Parties.

## B. Recommendations

### *Favourable Recommendations*

16. The Subsidiary Body recommends to the Committee to inscribe the following nominated elements :

Draft Decision	Submitting State(s)	Element	File No.
<a href="#">5.COM 6.1</a>	Armenia	Symbolism and craftsmanship of Khachkars, Armenian cross-stones	<a href="#">00434</a>
<a href="#">5.COM 6.2</a>	Azerbaijan	The Azerbaijani carpet	<a href="#">00389</a>
<a href="#">5.COM 6.3</a>	Belgium	Aalst carnival	<a href="#">00402</a>
<a href="#">5.COM 6.4</a>	Belgium	Houtem Jaarmarkt, annual winter fair and livestock market at Sint-Lievens-Houtem	<a href="#">00403</a>
<a href="#">5.COM 6.5</a>	Belgium	Krakelingen and Tonnekensbrand, end-of-winter bread and fire feast at Geraardsbergen	<a href="#">00401</a>
<a href="#">5.COM 6.6</a>	China	Acupuncture and moxibustion of traditional Chinese medicine	<a href="#">00425</a>
<a href="#">5.COM 6.7</a>	China	Peking opera	<a href="#">00418</a>
<a href="#">5.COM 6.8</a>	Colombia	Marimba music and traditional chants from Colombia's South Pacific region	<a href="#">00436</a>
<a href="#">5.COM 6.9</a>	Colombia	The Wayuu normative system, applied by the Pütchipü'üi (palabrero)	<a href="#">00435</a>
<a href="#">5.COM 6.10</a>	Croatia	Gingerbread craft from Northern Croatia	<a href="#">00356</a>
<a href="#">5.COM 6.11</a>	Czech Republic	Shrovetide door-to-door processions and masks in the villages of the Hlinecko area	<a href="#">00397</a>
<a href="#">5.COM 6.12</a>	France	Compagnonnage, network for on-the-job transmission of knowledge and identities	<a href="#">00441</a>
<a href="#">5.COM 6.13</a>	France	The craftsmanship of Alençon needle lace-making	<a href="#">00438</a>
<a href="#">5.COM 6.14</a>	France	The gastronomic meal of the French	<a href="#">00437</a>
<a href="#">5.COM 6.15</a>	India	Chhau dance	<a href="#">00337</a>
<a href="#">5.COM 6.16</a>	India	Kalbelia folk songs and dances of Rajasthan	<a href="#">00340</a>
<a href="#">5.COM 6.17</a>	India	Mudiyettu, ritual theatre and dance drama of Kerala	<a href="#">00345</a>
<a href="#">5.COM 6.18</a>	Indonesia	Indonesian Angklung	<a href="#">00393</a>
<a href="#">5.COM 6.19</a>	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	The music of the Bakhshis of Khorasan	<a href="#">00381</a>
<a href="#">5.COM 6.20</a>	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	The Pahlevani and Zoorkhaneh rituals	<a href="#">00378</a>
<a href="#">5.COM 6.21</a>	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	The ritual dramatic art of Ta'ziye	<a href="#">00377</a>
<a href="#">5.COM 6.22</a>	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Traditional skills of carpet weaving in Fars	<a href="#">00382</a>
<a href="#">5.COM 6.23</a>	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Traditional skills of carpet weaving in Kashan	<a href="#">00383</a>

<b>Draft Decision</b>	<b>Submitting State(s)</b>	<b>Element</b>	<b>File No.</b>
<u>5.COM 6.24</u>	Japan	Kumiodori, traditional Okinawan musical theatre	<u>00405</u>
<u>5.COM 6.25</u>	Japan	Yuki-tsumugi, silk fabric production technique	<u>00406</u>
<u>5.COM 6.26</u>	Lithuania	Sutartinės, Lithuanian multipart songs	<u>00433</u>
<u>5.COM 6.27</u>	Luxembourg	The hopping procession of Echternach	<u>00392</u>
<u>5.COM 6.28</u>	Mexico	Parachicos in the traditional January feast of Chiapa de Còrzo	<u>00399</u>
<u>5.COM 6.29</u>	Mexico	Pirekua, traditional song of the P'urhépecha	<u>00398</u>
<u>5.COM 6.30</u>	Mexico	Traditional Mexican cuisine - authentic, ancestral, ongoing community culture, the Michoacán paradigm	<u>00400</u>
<u>5.COM 6.31</u>	Mongolia	The Mongolian traditional art of Khöömei	<u>00396</u>
<u>5.COM 6.32</u>	Mongolia	Naadam, Mongolian traditional festival	<u>00395</u>
<u>5.COM 6.33</u>	Oman	Al-Bar'ah, music and dance of Oman Dhofari valleys	<u>00372</u>
<u>5.COM 6.34</u>	Peru	Huaconada, ritual dance of Mito	<u>00390</u>
<u>5.COM 6.35</u>	Peru	The scissors dance	<u>00391</u>
<u>5.COM 6.36</u>	Republic of Korea	Daemokjang, traditional wooden architecture	<u>00461</u>
<u>5.COM 6.37</u>	Republic of Korea	Gagok, lyric song cycles accompanied by an orchestra	<u>00444</u>
<u>5.COM 6.38</u>	Spain	The chant of the Sybil on Majorca	<u>00360</u>
<u>5.COM 6.39</u>	Spain	Flamenco	<u>00363</u>
<u>5.COM 6.40</u>	Spain	Human towers	<u>00364</u>
<u>5.COM 6.41</u>	Spain, Greece, Italy, Morocco	The Mediterranean diet	<u>00394</u>
<u>5.COM 6.42</u>	Turkey	Kırkpınar oil wrestling festival	<u>00386</u>
<u>5.COM 6.43</u>	Turkey	Semah, Alevi-Bektaşî ritual	<u>00384</u>
<u>5.COM 6.44</u>	Turkey	Traditional Sohbet meetings	<u>00385</u>
<u>5.COM 6.45</u>	United Arab Emirates, Belgium, Czech Republic, France, Mongolia, Morocco, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic	Falconry, a living human heritage	<u>00442</u>
<u>5.COM 6.46</u>	Viet Nam	Gióng festival of Phù Đổng and Sóc temples	<u>00443</u>

**Unfavourable Recommendations**

17. The Subsidiary Body recommends to the Committee not to inscribe the following nominated element at this time.

Draft Decision	Submitting State(s)	Element	File No.
<u>5.COM 6.47</u>	Croatia	The Sinjska Alka, a knights' tournament in Sinj	<u>00357</u>

**C. Comments and observations on the 2010 nominations**

18. The Subsidiary Body was impressed, as it had been in 2009, with the diversity of intangible cultural heritage that was nominated, including two ambitious multinational nominations. It was again pleased to see the participation of communities in the elaboration of nominations, and their evident enthusiasm to see their heritage inscribed on the Representative List. It wishes to commend those communities and all States Parties concerned for their keen interest in the Representative List.
19. The Subsidiary Body takes note that the larger number of nominations submitted in this second cycle, compared to the number in the first cycle, provides evidence of the global interest in the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage. It nevertheless signals its concern, as it did in 2009, that this growing quantity poses a substantial challenge to the quality with which the Committee, the Subsidiary Body and the Secretariat can carry out their respective responsibilities. In 2009 it recommended a number of revisions to the Operational Directives concerning the Representative List which were presented in Document ITH/09/4.COM/209/19. Consequently, in its Decision 4.COM 19, the Committee also addressed this critical concern.<sup>7</sup>
20. The Subsidiary Body reiterates the regret it expressed in 2009 that the nominations it examined in the 2010 cycle were not more geographically representative. Of the 147 nominations initially submitted, more than half came from only four countries, all within a single electoral group, group IV. From electoral group V (b) a single State Party was represented. The Subsidiary Body recalls its suggestion made in 2009 that the Committee seek strategies to encourage a more equitable geographical representation in future cycles, in order that the Representative List can truly be representative of the intangible cultural heritage of humanity.
21. The Subsidiary Body welcomed the initiative of the Secretariat that has taken measures to **strengthen the capacities of States Parties**, especially developing countries, in their national implementation of the Convention and in their participation in its international mechanisms such as the Representative List. Training modules are being developed and workshops will be convened at the regional, sub-regional and national levels for a wide range of participants including national authorities, experts, communities and others, and the Subsidiary Body anticipates that these sustained efforts will soon begin to allow a wider and more effective participation by States, particularly developing countries.
22. The Subsidiary Body observed an overall **improvement in the quality of nominations** that were submitted for examination. This qualitative improvement was noticeable both in the files as originally submitted, and especially in the nominations as resubmitted with additional information that had been requested by the Secretariat. During the 2009 cycle, almost one-third of the files that were submitted did not contain sufficient information to demonstrate that they fully met the criteria for inscription. This gave rise to many difficult discussions among the members of the Subsidiary Body during their examination of the 2009 nominations, and 35 files whose recommendations were not favourable were withdrawn by the States Parties

<sup>7</sup> The General Assembly, on the basis of revisions proposed by the open-ended intergovernmental working group set up by the Committee by the same decision 4.COM 19, adopted a set of revised Operational Directives at its third session in June 2010. [Note of the Secretariat]

concerned prior to their submission to the Committee. During its 2009 examination, the Subsidiary Body consequently requested that the Secretariat provide in the 2010 cycle greater assistance both to the submitting States and to the Body itself by providing more detailed and specific requests for additional information, so that the nomination files that were finally examined would present the strongest possible evidence for the element's inscription.

23. The Subsidiary Body deemed that the observed improvement is due in part to the greater understanding of procedures and to the submitting States' careful attention to the nomination forms and to its reports from 2009. But the improvement is largely a result of the detailed requests for additional information sent to States Parties by the Secretariat, in response to the Subsidiary Body's instructions of the previous cycle.
24. Nevertheless, the Subsidiary Body was concerned about the poor **linguistic quality** of some nomination files. It is clear that poor wording should not affect the substantive examination of the nominations, although in some cases it presented a substantial obstacle to comprehension. The Body emphasized that efforts should be made by the submitting States to improve the linguistic quality not only to facilitate the work of the Subsidiary Body but also for later public visibility, if the elements were to be inscribed.
25. In some nomination files, information was not found where it belonged, but elsewhere. In such cases, the Subsidiary Body recognized the need to consider the file in totality when examining each criterion and did not rule against a nomination. However, it reminds submitting States to provide the information requested in the nomination form in its proper place.
26. The Subsidiary Body also pointed out the use of **inappropriate vocabulary**, such as references to a tentative list, the world heritage of humanity, Masterpieces, and so on, that betrayed a lack of understanding on the part of submitting States of the specific character of the 2003 Convention. Although it did not conclude that any nomination should be rejected as a result of such inappropriate references, it urges States to take heed of the importance of respecting both the spirit and the letter of the Convention.
27. While examining the nominations, the Subsidiary Body was mindful that its decisions – particularly in the first two cycles of inscriptions to the Representative List – will establish important precedents that will steer the course of the Convention for many years to come.
28. In this regard, the Subsidiary Body wishes to explain that throughout its examinations during the two cycles, it relied on the information that was provided by States Parties within the nomination file. It points out that members' personal knowledge of the element did not supplement the missing information and did not interfere in the assessment of the content of the file. It also wishes to emphasize — to States Parties and especially to the communities, groups and individuals concerned with an element — that its recommendation not to inscribe an element at this time in no way constitutes a judgement on the merits of the element itself, but refers only to the adequacy of the information presented in the nomination file.
29. In the same vein, the Subsidiary Body was keenly aware of the geographical imbalance between regions and countries. However, it emphasizes that each nomination was considered on its own merits and that questions of geographical distribution did not influence its recommendation to inscribe or not to inscribe an element.
30. The Subsidiary Body was informed by the Secretariat of several **letters of protest** received from organizations concerned with specific nominations. In this regard, the Subsidiary Body directed that letters of protest concerning a nomination should not be brought to its attention during the examination process in order not to influence its recommendation. Subsequent to its decision on each nomination so concerned, the Subsidiary Body was informed of the substance of the protests received, and reaffirmed in each instance its original recommendation. Any such protests, the Subsidiary Body decided, could be made available to the Committee, but should not figure into the Body's own examinations.



31. Of the eight nominations that did not receive a favourable recommendation, none received an unfavourable recommendation because it failed to satisfy a single criterion (as compared to 13 files that were not recommended in 2009 because of a single criterion). This shows an improvement in the understanding of the criteria by States Parties. This improvement is also due to the fact that, as requested by the Subsidiary Body, the Secretariat provided greater assistance to the submitting States by providing more detailed and specific requests for additional information.

Criteria	Files where this was the sole criterion not satisfied	Files where this was one of several criteria not satisfied
R.1: The element constitutes intangible cultural heritage as defined in Article 2 of the Convention.	0	2
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.	0	6
R.3: Safeguarding measures are elaborated that may protect and promote the element.	0	6
R.4: The element has been nominated following the widest possible participation of the community, group or, if applicable, individuals concerned and with their free, prior and informed consent.	0	7
R.5: The element is included in an inventory of the intangible cultural heritage present in the territory(ies) of the submitting State(s) Party(ies), as defined in Articles 11 and 12.	0	0

32. The Subsidiary Body underlined the close link between criterion R.1 and criterion R.2, as well as the close link between criterion R.3 and criterion R.4. It noted that some States encountered difficulty in demonstrating that criterion R.2 was satisfied, but that no files were rejected only because they did not respond to this criterion.
33. Regarding criterion R.3 (safeguarding measures), the Subsidiary Body highlighted that specific safeguarding measures relevant for the element should be described and not general ones. It noted that the same text was used in different files and concluded that this must be avoided in order to demonstrate that measures specific to each element meet the needs of the element concerned. The Subsidiary Body also emphasized that safeguarding measures should address primarily communities and not the needs of researchers.
34. With regard to evidence of **community participation**, the Subsidiary Body reaffirmed that the submission of a nomination file necessitated the community concerned to participate as widely as possible in all stages (identification of the element, preparation of the nomination, elaboration and implementation of safeguarding measures, etc.).
35. In this regard, the members of the Subsidiary Body adopted a broad and flexible view of the variety of forms that communities in different cultural and political contexts can take. However, they noted in some cases that such participation had not been convincingly demonstrated but had merely been asserted.
36. The Subsidiary Body wishes to remind States Parties that when they nominate an element for inscription, it must be inscribed in an **inventory** drawn up in the spirit of articles 11 and 12 of the Convention. Although none of the nominations received an unfavourable recommendation because it did not satisfy criterion R.5 concerning the inclusion of an

element in an inventory, the understanding of this criterion presented difficulties to a number of submitting States. Indeed, the Subsidiary Body has debated how to treat the elements included in inventories prepared before the coming into force of the Convention and for which the participation of communities in the spirit of the Convention could not be clearly established. It also considered that an element inscribed on an on-going inventory could be accepted, but that clear evidence of its specific inscription should be provided and not only of the existence of an inventory of the intangible cultural heritage. The inscription of bearers of an element in an inventory has been confused with the inscription of the element itself. This point should be clarified so that inventories presented focus on elements and not on people.

37. The Subsidiary Body noted with concern the **commercial aspects** as well as the reference to **touristic** intentions of several nominations. Some members also found it difficult to consider practices relating to some type of **entertainment** as intangible cultural heritage.
38. When examining nominations relating to **handicrafts**, the Subsidiary Body noted in some cases that too much emphasis was put on the technical description of the handicraft. It invites States Parties to focus the description on the social function and meaning of the practice without, however, neglecting the technical description.
39. The Subsidiary Body agreed that it found it difficult to conclude that a nomination requires a favourable or an unfavourable recommendation because the element has its roots in a **war or conflict**. It recalled that the inscribed elements of intangible cultural heritage should encourage and promote intercultural dialogue and mutual respect. It held that, even if the element does not refer specifically to a specific conflict in its practice, the reference to its origin may not promote intercultural dialogue and mutual respect. Thus, the Subsidiary Body expressed reservations on the submission of elements based on wars or conflicts and reached the conclusion that this issue might be further discussed by the Committee.
40. The Subsidiary Body also considered that the submission by a single State of nominations relating to very **similar elements**, i.e. files that cover a same but fragmented element presented from different aspects, was a cause for concern. It also noted that in several nomination files some parts were strictly identical. It underlined that overlapping of similar elements and repetition of texts among different files should be avoided. It also stressed that each nomination should have its own identity and that it would be better for States to submit a more inclusive element in such cases.
41. In regard to elements found on the territories of several States, the Subsidiary Body maintained, as it did during the first cycle, that it did not have the authority to require a State to submit a joint nomination with other States, as it remains its prerogative to do so. Nonetheless, the members of the Subsidiary Body pointed out that the Convention encouraged international cooperation and that it was important to promote **multinational nominations**.
42. In this regard, one particular file, namely that of Falconry: a living human heritage submitted by the United Arab Emirates, Belgium, the Czech Republic, France, Mongolia, Morocco, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Spain and the Syrian Arab Republic, was mentioned as an **outstanding example of co-operation** between States and the exemplary quality of the information provided was underlined.
43. Finally, the Subsidiary Body wishes to conclude that the nature of this work requires experience that is acquired over time, and it is important to pass on such experience to future Subsidiary Bodies. This is essential in order to ensure both consistency and continuity in the conduct of its work, the processing and examination of nomination files to the Representative List. Such consistency will be important to submitting States as they prepare future nomination files as well as to the Committee and Subsidiary Body themselves. Thus, the Subsidiary Body reiterates its suggestion that the Committee 'at the time it establishes a new Subsidiary Body at its fifth session, consider instituting a system of staggered terms in which part of the members of the Body would be renewed every year, in order to allow continuity in the Body's work.

**D. Draft decisions**

44. The Subsidiary Body recommends the Committee to consider the following draft decisions for adoption:

**Draft Decision 5.COM 6**

1. Recalling Article 16 of the Convention,
2. Further recalling articles 2, 13, 17 and 25 to 32 of the Operational Directives as revised by the General Assembly at its third session in June 2010 concerning inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity,
3. Having examined Document ITH/10/5.COM/CONF.202/6 and the nomination files submitted by the respective States Parties,

**Draft Decision 5.COM 6.14**

## The Committee

1. Takes note that France has nominated **the gastronomic meal of the French** for inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, described as follows:

The gastronomic meal of the French is a customary social practice for celebrating important moments in the lives of individuals and groups, such as births, weddings, birthdays, anniversaries, achievements and reunions. It is a festive meal bringing people together for an occasion to enjoy the art of good eating and drinking. The gastronomic meal emphasizes togetherness, the pleasure of taste, and the balance between human beings and the products of nature. Important elements include the careful selection of dishes from a constantly growing repertoire of recipes; the purchase of good, preferably local products whose flavours go well together; the pairing of food with wine; the setting of a beautiful table; and specific actions during consumption, such as smelling and tasting items at the table. The gastronomic meal should respect a fixed structure, commencing with an apéritif (drinks before the meal) and ending with liqueurs, containing in between at least four successive courses, namely a starter, fish and/or meat with vegetables, cheese and dessert. Individuals called gastronomes who possess deep knowledge of the tradition and preserve its memory watch over the living practice of the rites, thus contributing to their oral and/or written transmission, in particular to younger generations. The gastronomic meal draws circles of family and friends closer together and, more generally, strengthens social ties.

2. Decides that, from the information provided in nomination file No. 00437, **the gastronomic meal of the French** satisfies the criteria for inscription on the Representative List, as follows:
  - R.1: The gastronomic meal of the French plays an active social role within its community and is transmitted from generation to generation as part of its identity;
  - R.2: Its inscription on the Representative List could contribute to greater visibility for intangible cultural heritage, as a catalyst for mutual respect and intercultural dialogue;
  - R.3: Safeguarding measures reflect the commitments of the community, the French authorities and NGOs to reinforce its transmission, particularly through the education system, while encouraging research and promotion;
  - R.4: The nomination has been submitted following active and broad participation of communities throughout the country in meetings, debates and surveys, and many institutions and associations gave their free, prior and informed consent;
  - R.5: The gastronomic meal of the French is inscribed in the inventory of intangible cultural heritage of France, established by the Mission of Ethnology of the Ministry of Culture.
3. Inscribes **the gastronomic meal of the French** on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.

**Draft Decision 5.COM 6.30**

## The Committee

1. Takes note that Mexico has nominated **traditional Mexican cuisine - authentic, ancestral, ongoing community culture, the Michoacán paradigm** for inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, described as follows:

Traditional Mexican cuisine is a comprehensive cultural model comprising farming, ritual practices, age-old skills, culinary techniques and ancestral community customs and manners. It is made possible by collective participation in the entire traditional food chain: from planting and harvesting to cooking and eating. The basis of the system is founded on corn, beans and chili; unique farming methods such as milpas (rotating swidden fields of corn and other crops) and chinampas (man-made farming islets in lake areas); cooking processes such as nixtamalization (lime-hulling maize, which increases its nutritional value); and singular utensils including grinding stones and stone mortars. Native ingredients such as varieties of tomatoes, squashes, avocados, cocoa and vanilla augment the basic staples. Mexican cuisine is elaborate and symbol-laden, with everyday tortillas and tamales, both made of corn, forming an integral part of Day of the Dead offerings. Collectives of female cooks and other practitioners devoted to raising crops and traditional cuisine are found in the State of Michoacán and across Mexico. Their knowledge and techniques express community identity, reinforce social bonds, and build stronger local, regional and national identities. Those efforts in Michoacán also underline the importance of traditional cuisine as a means of sustainable development.

2. Decides that, from the information provided in nomination file No. 00400, **traditional Mexican cuisine - authentic, ancestral, ongoing community culture, the Michoacán paradigm** satisfies the criteria for inscription on the Representative List, as follows:
  - R.1: Traditional Mexican cuisine is central to the cultural identity of the communities that practise and transmit it from generation to generation;
  - R.2: Its inscription on the Representative List could enhance the visibility of intangible cultural heritage and promote respect for cultural diversity and human creativity;
  - R.3: Current and planned safeguarding measures include consultations and research projects as well as practical training, with the support of the State and the communities concerned;
  - R.4: Practitioners participated actively in the nomination process and provided their free, prior and informed consent;
  - R.5: Traditional Mexican cuisine is included in the Inventory of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Mexico maintained by the National Council for Culture and Arts.
3. Inscribes **traditional Mexican cuisine - authentic, ancestral, ongoing community culture, the Michoacán paradigm** on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.

## Draft Decision 5.COM 6.41

### The Committee

1. Takes note that Spain, Greece, Italy and Morocco have nominated the **Mediterranean diet** for inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, described as follows:

The Mediterranean diet constitutes a set of skills, knowledge, practices and traditions ranging from the landscape to the table, including the crops, harvesting, fishing, conservation, processing, preparation and, particularly, consumption of food. The Mediterranean diet is characterized by a nutritional model that has remained constant over time and space, consisting mainly of olive oil, cereals, fresh or dried fruit and vegetables, a moderate amount of fish, dairy and meat, and many condiments and spices, all accompanied by wine or infusions, always respecting beliefs of each community. However, the Mediterranean diet (from the Greek *diaita*, or way of life) encompasses more than just food. It promotes social interaction, since communal meals are the cornerstone of social customs and festive events. It has given rise to a considerable body of knowledge, songs, maxims, tales and legends. The system is rooted in respect for the territory and biodiversity, and ensures the conservation and development of traditional activities and crafts linked to fishing and farming in the Mediterranean communities which Soria in Spain, Koroni in Greece, Cilento in Italy and Chefchaouen in Morocco are examples. Women play a particularly vital role in the transmission of expertise, as well as knowledge of rituals, traditional gestures and celebrations, and the safeguarding of techniques.

2. Decides that, from the information provided in nomination file No. 00394, the **Mediterranean diet** satisfies the criteria for inscription on the Representative List, as follows:
  - R.1: The Mediterranean diet is a set of traditional practices, knowledge and skills passed on from generation to generation and providing a sense of belonging and continuity to the concerned communities;
  - R.2: Its inscription on the Representative List could give broader visibility to the diversity of intangible cultural heritage and foster intercultural dialogue at regional and international levels;
  - R.3: The nomination describes a series of safeguarding efforts undertaken in each country, together with a plan for transnational measures aimed at ensuring transmission to younger generations and promoting awareness of the Mediterranean diet;
  - R.4: The nomination is the result of close cooperation of official entities in the four States, supported by the active participation of communities, and it includes evidence of the latter's free, prior and informed consent;
  - R.5: The Mediterranean diet has been included in inventories of intangible cultural heritage in the four States concerned and will be included in a transnational inventory of the Mediterranean that is underway.
3. Inscribes the **Mediterranean diet** on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.