

**United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization**



**Report of the Expert Meeting on  
Documenting and Archiving Intangible Cultural Heritage**

**UNESCO – Paris / 12-13 January 2006**

**Intangible Heritage Section**

---

Intangible Heritage Section  
Division of Cultural Heritage  
UNESCO  
1, Rue Miollis  
75732 PARIS cedex 15

Tel.: +33 (0)1 45 68 42 52  
Fax: +33 (0)1 45 68 57 52  
E-mail: [ich@unesco.org](mailto:ich@unesco.org)

<http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich>

## Table of Contents

1.	Introduction .....	4
2.	Documenting ICH as an integral part of ICH inventories .....	5
3.	Documenting ICH for the Inscription into the Representative List.....	7
4.	Documenting and Archiving ICH for safeguarding and celebrating ICH.....	11
5.	Documenting and Archiving ICH with relation to Ethical Questions and Human Rights/Gender Issues .....	13
6.	Conclusion .....	15
Annex I:	Background Paper .....	16
Annex II:	Agenda .....	27
Annex III:	List of Experts .....	29



## 1. Introduction

The expert meeting on Documenting and Archiving Intangible Cultural Heritage was organized in Paris on 12-13 January 2006 by the UNESCO's Intangible Heritage Section. The meeting, co-financed by the Government of Norway, is one of the series of expert meetings of UNESCO's Intangible Heritage Section aiming at supporting the preparation of the implementation of the Convention by its statutory organs.

Documenting and archiving intangible cultural heritage serve various different purposes within the framework of the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (herein referred to as the 2003 Convention). The expert meeting was thus convened in order (i) to discuss diverse ways in which the documenting and archiving of the intangible cultural heritage could be done and used for the sake of the 2003 Convention, (ii) to study the needs for documentation created by the 2003 Convention, and (iii) to establish what approaches and practices suit the best various purposes of the Convention and what new approaches have to be investigated.

Twenty-four international experts from 23 countries, representing different disciplines and different perspectives, were invited to participate in the meeting in their personal capacity for their experience in the practice of producing, processing, storing, and making accessible documentation of ICH element. It is envisaged that outcomes of the meeting would contribute towards the elaboration of thematic manuals on the safeguarding of different domains of the intangible cultural heritage, which is currently under preparation, and also offer a number of complementary and/or alternative methods and methodologies for documenting and archiving ICH for different goals.

Prior to the meeting, the experts were provided with a background document, prepared by the Secretariat, which explained the purposes of the meeting and some key questions to be discussed (cf. Annex 1). Articles of the Convention relevant to the meeting include:

- **Article 11.a** which makes a reference to the obligation of the States Parties to the Convention by stipulating that “each State Party shall take the necessary measures to ensure the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage present in its territory.
- **Article 11 .b** which elaborates on the safeguarding measures (“each State Party shall identify and define the various elements of the intangible cultural heritage present in its territory, with the participation of communities, groups and relevant non-governmental organizations.)
- **Article 12** (on inventories) which further elaborates the safeguarding measures by stating that “to ensure identification with a view to safeguarding, each State Party shall draw up, in a manner geared to its own situation, one or more inventories of the intangible cultural heritage present in its territory. These inventories shall be regularly updated.
- **Article 13** which states that States Parties should endeavor to designate or establish one or more competent bodies for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage.
- **Article 15** which states that “the traditional access to the intangible cultural heritage has to be respected”. Consequently, if a community does not wish to have an element to be listed, it will not be listed.
- **Article 16** which states the establishment of the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
- **Article 17** which establishes the List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding.

Through the 2-day meeting, the experts exchanged their views, experiences and examples of good practices of documenting and archiving ICH for various purposes.

In this report, the discussion at the meeting is presented on the basis of four themes, namely, documenting ICH as an integral part of ICH inventories (**Chapter 2**); documenting ICH for its inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity (**Chapter 3**); documenting and archiving ICH for its safeguarding (**Chapter 4**); and finally documenting and archiving ICH with relation to human rights, gender issues, and ethical questions, in particular the question of repatriation of ICH (**Chapter 5**). Although these four themes are presented as a separate chapter, it needs to be mentioned that there exists a great deal of overlaps between and among the issues treated in each chapter. **Conclusion (Chapter 6)** summarizes the meeting from a global perspective and offers some practical and ethical suggestion for activities involved in the documenting and archiving of the Intangible Cultural Heritage.

## **2. Documenting ICH as an integral part of ICH inventories**

A large part of the meeting was dedicated to the important link between ICH inventories and its documenting aspect. Referring to the primary obligation of States Parties to the 2003 Convention to “ensure the identification of the intangible cultural heritage present on their territory through the drawing up of inventories” (Article 12), it was highlighted that the States Parties to the Convention could not be required to provide extensive information in their initial inventories given different means and capacities for doing so. Notwithstanding the importance of trying to include as much information as possible during the inventorying of ICH, it is important to define what is the minimum level of information which should be documented as imperative pieces of information in the ICH inventories. Referring to the list of selection criteria elaborated during the expert meeting of 5-6 December on the Criteria for inscription on the lists established by the 2003 Convention (see table 1), the experts were asked to make comments and proposals on what elements should be added to the list of items to be mentioned in the inventories.

title;	<p>Table 1: List of criteria/elements for inventories<sup>1</sup>. Short but maximally informative</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Community concerned/language involved;</li> <li>3. Location(s);</li> <li>4. Domain(s) concerned;</li> <li>5. Characteristics of the expression/tradition;</li> <li>6. Associated tangible elements (if any);</li> <li>7. Availability of associated tangible elements?</li> <li>8. Name of the element as used by community concerned;</li> <li>9. Performed at what occasion(s)?</li> <li>10. Performed by whom (age/gender/names)?</li> <li>11. How transmitted?</li> <li>12. Viability, or level of endangerment;</li> <li>13. Threats (if any);</li> <li>14. Relevant local organisations (NGOs and others) (if any);</li> <li>15. Community explicitly agreeing to listing?</li> <li>16. Reference to literature/discography, audiovisual material?</li> <li>17. Information collected by?</li> <li>18. Information collected when?</li> </ol>
--------	--

Concerning the general presentation of the elements to be taken into consideration in the inventories, it was proposed to re-organize the list according to their nature, i.e. identification, location, persons and institutions, state of the element, inventory-making.

Concerning the “community concerned” mentioned in point 2 of the list, it was suggested to add potential **sub-groups** when deemed appropriate.

With reference to the “location” mentioned in point 3 of the proposed list, it was pointed out that national administrative divisions (e.g., region/province/district/village) should also be mentioned. However, when political divisions do not coincide with communities divisions, these communities divisions should be taken into account. It was also mentioned that the term ‘location’ should also refer to the **place** to which an element of the ICH is closely linked since many ICH elements are traditionally linked to specific places but through time can be spread to and enacted in other places..

Drawing attention to the **transnational character** of some ICH elements, it was proposed to use a classification system which would allow to “transcend” the national boundaries in inventorying ICH. It was suggested to investigate the existing databases on languages which already use such a methodology for documenting transnational elements.

Referring to the importance of the community participation in the ICH inventory-making, an **explicit agreement** (a prior and informed consent) of the community concerned should be sought, and it should be understood that an agreement could take a variety of forms (e.g., recording of a verbal consent) as some communities might be reluctant to given a written agreement.

In inventorying ICH, both **vernacular names** and **internationally-recognized names** should be included.

In response to a question raised by an expert as to whether or not the list is to be used as a template for archiving, clarification was made that it was not the case.

As items to be added to the list, experts mentioned the following :

- the social status and/or the professional category (point 10)
- the apprentice-performer (point 10)
- A person who holds the knowledge when referring to the performer (point 10)
- Natural elements concerning the point of including tangible elements (point 7)
- Restriction to archiving and access to archiving through the development of protocols (point 15)
- Professional status of the collector (point 17)

It was mentioned that since communities are not homogenous, part of a community might wish to have an ICH element recorded or consider it as in danger of disappearance while another part of the same community might disagree. Given the intrinsic complexity embedded in the term, “community”; and various inventory-making systems being undertaken all over the world, the Intergovernmental Committee (hereinafter referred to as “Committee”) might wish to require only a minimum information from the ICH inventory(ies).

Consequently, it was also mentioned that purposes of existing ICH inventories in various countries might differ from those required under the 2003 Convention. An expert expressed the need to make it known that the idea of the inventory is to make a list of cultural expressions. Referring to Article 12, the experts were reminded that the inventory-making of ICH is to be a dynamic process rather than a finished product and be updated on a regular basis.

On the basis of the comments of the experts, a new list of points to be taken into account for the preparation of inventories was elaborated (see attached in annex... or below).

### **3. Documenting ICH for the Inscription into the Representative List**

Further to the discussion on documenting ICH as an integral part of ICH inventories, the experts were invited to explore the relationship between the documentation of ICH and the inscription of ICH into the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity (hereinafter the Representative List).

Under the 2003 Convention, two lists, namely the Representative List and the List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding, will be established (c.f. Articles 16 & 17). An important difference between the List under the 1972 Convention and the Lists under the 2003 Convention is that, while an outstanding universal value of a heritage in question is an important criterion for the inscription, the notions of “representativity” or “representativeness” of the intangible cultural heritage are essential under the 2003 Convention. While what is meant by “representativity” and “representativeness” needs to be further elaborated by the Committee, the underlying notion is that all elements, regardless of whether they are inscribed onto the Lists or not, are of equal value.

The experts were explained that there exist at least two levels to understanding “representativity/representativeness”: representativity for a community on the one hand (in line with the definition given under Article 2.1), and representativity for the worldwide humanity on the other hand (referring to Article 1 which talks about contributing to the preservation and celebration



of cultural diversity and human creativity). Based on the logic of the second representativity, when an ICH element from a domain that is not yet covered on the Representative List is submitted to the Committee for listing, such an element might be given a priority in order to make the Representative List as diverse/representative as possible.

While the exact procedure for the submission of ICH elements to be inscribed onto the Representative List will have to be elaborated by the Committee, it is plausible to assume that a proposal to be submitted to UNESCO will need to be well argued and documented. The submitted proposal will then be carefully evaluated by specialized NGOs which will make a recommendation to the Committee. The Committee will then make a final decision to inscribe the proposed element into the Representative List or not.

To further solicit ideas on criteria for the inscription into the Representative List, a list of criteria, which resulted from the discussions of the above-mentioned expert meeting on the Criteria for Inscription on the Lists established by the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (held in Paris on 5-6 December 2005), was presented.

Table 2: The List of Criteria developed by the Experts of the Criteria meeting

<p><i>Note: The report of the 5/6 December 2006 meeting is not yet ready; the criteria formulated at that occasion that are to be met by proposals for inscription on the Representative List are nevertheless presented here in a preliminary and adapted form.</i></p> <p><i>Proof must be given that the element submitted for inscription:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>(i) is considered by the community, group or, if appropriate, the individuals concerned as part of their cultural heritage;</i></li><li><i>(ii) provides the community or group involved with a sense of identity and continuity, based on shared experience and collective memory;</i></li><li><i>(iii) is rooted in the community or the group in which it is continuously transmitted and recreated;</i></li><li><i>(iv) would enhance, by being inscribed on it, the diversity of ICH on the List, thus reflecting cultural diversity worldwide and testifying to human creativity;</i></li><li><i>(v) is already inscribed on a National Representative List that complies with all relevant criteria established for selection for the Convention's Representative List ;</i></li><li><i>(vi) is submitted with the prior and informed consent of the community, group, or, if applicable, the individuals concerned and that it/they has/have participated at all stages of processes of identification, definition, documentation and nomination;</i></li><li><i>(vii) is being effectively safeguarded through appropriate means and measures, or may be effectively safeguarded by means of a well elaborated and feasible plan for safeguarding.</i></li></ul>
---

While the issue of documentation was not directly dealt with, a number of important points were in

fact developed by the above-mentioned expert meeting with respect to the threshold criteria that could be deduced from the text of the Convention.

A preliminary requirement would be to ensure that the elements in question to be proposed for the Representative List should fit into one or more domains of ICH defined under Article 2 of the 2003 Convention and that the elements are in conformity with generally accepted international instruments concerning human rights.

Drawing upon the above list, the experts were asked to indicate as to whether or not any other additional information should be attached to the proposal to be submitted to the Committee and what would be the minimum requirements to satisfy the need of the Committee to make an appropriate judgment about the elements in question to be inscribed on the Representative List.

Concerning representativity, it was mentioned that there exist the representativeness of groups, the representativeness of items of ICH, as well as the representativeness of variations of the same kind of knowledge or performance existing within a community. It was suggested that in order to avoid over representation of a certain domain of the ICH, the Committee might wish to elaborate on creating sub-domains of the ICH, which is already under preparation by the Intangible Heritage Section within the framework of the general manual.

Further on the question of representativity, an expert referred to an annual festival where an important link of a particular ICH practice can be made to different systems within a given society—systems such as kinship, rituals and symbolism. Drawing upon an experience of the Proclamation programme, an example of a candidature file which proposed a traditional cuisine to be proclaimed as a masterpiece was brought up. This candidature was rejected by the Jury as the cuisine itself could not be recognized as distinctive enough, while it could have been taken into account positively had the file proven that it was related to specific rituals as part of a system. In the same vein, another candidature file which proposed pottery only for tourism as a masterpiece could also not be accepted.

On the question of the inclusivity of groups and elements represented in the national inventories, it was mentioned that although the 2003 Convention asks States to make inventories in an inclusive way, this is a difficult task in the short term as intangible heritage is highly numerous. The establishment of a National Representative List by each State Party therefore might be considered necessary in order to start safeguarding activities of those elements already inventoried nationally and to be able to submit proposals for inscription on the Representative List under the 2003 Convention.

Concerning how to keep the Representative List manageable, some experts as well as institutions endorsed the idea of having a sunset clause introduced, which would allow an element to be placed on the Representative List for a limited period (e.g., ten to fifteen years) and maintain the number of ICH elements to be inscribed in the Representative List in constant (e.g., maximum three hundreds ICH elements should be on the Representative List at all times). Such a sunset clause would be logical as the intangible cultural heritage is evolving and changing.

Some experts asked for a definition of “community,” which point is the subject of another expert meeting to be held in March 2006.

Drawing upon the question evoked about the necessity to require a proof as to how deep a particular ICH element is rooted in a community, the experts were asked to consider what recordings and/or documentation should accompany the candidature file for the List in order to

demonstrate the proof of the rootedness of an intangible heritage it was mentioned that providing such a proof in the file would be important given the experience of the Proclamation programme, which demonstrated that the information received by the Secretariat varied greatly in terms of quality and quantity and that some effort should be made to standardize the minimum documents to be submitted.

An expert mentioned that that in small-scale societies, there are often shared prescriptions about who can participate and act in a particular intangible cultural heritage based on kinship or a status, and certain different roles or activities are assigned to specific people while such social recognition of one's status would not apply in large-scale societies.

Referring to African experiences in the field of documentation, within the proposal for the Lists, it was advised that documentation should be presented as a documentation file, i.e., with several entries. For instance, there could be a bibliography and several recordings (filmography, videography). While variations among countries should be allowed to some extent, the presentation of the documentation file should be rather standardized. It was also stressed that a documentation file should demonstrate a clear link between different types of documentation provided. Bearing in mind these points raised, it was mentioned that the documentation might be made an obligation of the States Parties in the preparation of the National Representative List and that the proposals for inscription should/might be based on this documentation which should further elaborated. Taking a traditional performance as an example, it was further developed that, a candidature file should/might demonstrate not only performance but also its value for communities concerned and the involvement of the communities and of the audience.

It was questioned to what extent documentation should be prepared before the inscription since preparing it would require extensive budgetary and human resources which some States might not be able to afford. Considering such a potential constraint, it was proposed to find a balance between different levels of documentation. As a response, it was stressed that it would be against UNESCO's principles not to have full documentation before the inscription, and that international assistance is foreseen for the purpose of elaborating documentation file as part of the candidature file. The content of the candidature file, therefore, should be well elaborated at the time of its submission to UNESCO.

In response to a question that there might be a necessity to have documentation on each element of the ICH listed on the National Representative List, it was underlined that requiring such a task could be difficult for certain large-scale countries, and that some experts in other expert meetings proposed to have two levels of inventories: one with little information to expedite the process ; and the other with as much detailed information as possible.

It was suggested that different kinds of documentation might be possible according to the different domains, to which it was responded that thematic manuals, currently under preparation by the Secretariat, would raise this issue, and that efforts would be made to translate them into various languages and make them available as widely as possible since they are intended for the grassroots people.

Another question was raised as to whether or not archives would only contain a summary description of an ICH element or a complete documentation. It was underlined that under the 2003 Convention, there should be a system of shallow inventories, a National Representative List on the basis of which files will be submitted to the Committee along with extensive documentation. It might be interesting if the requirements of the Convention could be somehow linked to existing archiving and documentation practices of the countries.

Notwithstanding the importance of documentation, it was stressed that the objectives of the Convention are not to foster research. It should be always kept in mind that documentation is for safeguarding.

Various question raised concerning the relationship between documentation and the inscription onto the Lists would no doubt be elaborated by the future Intergovernmental Committee, and the Secretariat would welcome further suggestions on this subject.

#### **4. Documenting and Archiving ICH for safeguarding and celebrating ICH**

As stated previously, documentation within the framework of the 2003 Convention should be considered as one of the safeguarding measures. It was explained to the experts that documentation should be useful for different purposes—for the memory of communities, for sharing ICH worldwide, and eventually for future research.

It was presented that traditional ways of ICH transmission are increasingly endangered by such factors as changing lifestyle, spread of mass media and urbanization. The example of the Epic Akyn of Kirgыз (Masterpiece proclaimed in 2003) was taken to illustrate that in some cases traditional ways of transmitting ICH are no longer possible and that new ways of transmission need to be devised to face the current reality. In specific cases of the Epic, young boys traditionally needed to follow a master for an extended period of time (several months at a time). As the present day requires young people to go to school, and in order to safeguard the Epic, it was proposed to create several Akyn schools to train young boys in this Epic chanting. As shown by the instance of this Epic, it was suggested that documentation might be used for finding a new way of safeguarding ICH even if it might sometimes mean a distortion of some ICH elements.

On the basis of understanding “documenting ICH” as a safeguarding measure, the experts raised several related issues. For instance, **museum** was mentioned by several experts as potentially having an important link to the documentation of ICH in terms of its use as a safeguarding measure. Alternative types of museum (such as community/local/eco-museums) might be used to house ICH documentation, enabling to present and celebrate ICH in a living way as well as at the local level, close to the community concerned. It was further mentioned that the interaction between local people and museums should be encouraged in order to make museums more relevant to the people.

One expert introduced a concept of **living archives**. It is a process of documenting and archiving oral history/tradition that facilitates dialogue with communities and the involvement of youth from various communities in documenting. The collected documents and archives would be then stored in such a way that permits archived materials to be easily retrieved and repackaged for different purposes. For example, these living archives could be recorded and screened on a national TV which would raise public awareness about the importance of oral history/tradition.

In the same vein, **the use of** mass media such as TV and radio was raised as an important aspect related to the ICH documentation and ICH safeguarding. Several experts mentioned that once documented, the information about ICH should be disseminated widely by various mass media, which can contribute towards raising low self-esteem of ICH bearers. Seeing and hearing about their own ICH by media could provide local ICH practitioners and bearers with a sense of pride

and a sense of identity, **identity** being a key word in the 2003 Convention (c.f. Article 2.1). Given that some communities suffer from a lack of recognition and self-esteem, reaffirming the importance of their ICH could potentially contribute towards fostering a renewed interest in their own ICH which would in turn facilitate their active participation in safeguarding activities.

In order to further ensure that the ICH documentation be duly utilized, some experts advocated the idea of integrating ICH into **school curricula**. For instance, drawing upon documented oral tradition, traditional poetry might be used at **school**. Traditional knowledge such as traditional ways of managing land and natural resources might also be introduced at school. In order to ensure that the ICH education at school becomes successful, it was mentioned that providing **teacher education** is imperative.

In order to encourage grassroot-based documenting of ICH, **capacity-building** projects should be offered in this domain. One expert expressed that when talking about celebrating ICH, visual images become highly important. If provided with good training, local people themselves would become capable of producing their own ethnographic films, helping them to enable self-representation and strengthen their sense of identity.

Training to produce good documents is also necessary. What needs to be kept in mind when promoting local production of documentation is that due values need to be given to the documents produced by community members. This would be in line with the spirit of the 2003 Convention which states that communities shall be involved in safeguarding activities and the management of their ICH (article 15.)

In addition to the provision of capacity-building projects, **support to local communities** might need to be taken into consideration. In order to encourage local people to continue practicing their traditions, it might be appropriate in certain circumstances to offer some assistance to the communities when documenting ICH. For instance, it was shared that in Sudan, when the recording of traditional music is undertaken, 50 % of the production is sent back to the community. Consequently, some community members send the cassette to local radio stations for their traditional music to be broadcast. Payment might also be made to performers in order to help them revitalize their music. Support to local communities is in line with the spirit of the 2003 Convention in a sense that the determination of the people to want to safeguard their ICH is one of the major factors to keep the ICH alive.

Referring to Article 13 d. (iii) about an idea of establishing data, documentation centre, an expert introduced a Canadian initiative of linking national and local archives, called Turtle Network. This network permits virtual copies and digital documents to be shared across the country, having a tremendous impact. In order to allow such cross-national, regional, as well as international sharing of documents, it was confirmed that a more or less standardized classification system is a crucial aspect for the access.

An expert expressed his concern that there is a need to make it clear that making a register is different from creating documents, and that given its intrinsically dynamic nature of ICH register, it should be acknowledged that communities in some cases might decide to withdraw certain ICH elements for one reason or another.

## 5. Documenting and Archiving ICH with relation to Ethical Questions and Human Rights/Gender Issues

In the course of 2-day discussion, the issue of **repatriation** was raised by several experts. It was explained that while the repatriation of tangible heritage tends to be a complex process in terms of negotiation, that of ICH might be potentially made possible with relatively small effort, and it might even promote a sense of brotherhood. For instance, copies of **photos** taken during colonial times might be returned to the local community from where the photos were originally taken. According to some experts, the repatriation of photos sometimes helps to revitalize ICH which was no longer actively practiced and about to be forgotten but was able to be remembered by community elders and/or help **reconstruct their memories**. When seeing old photos, elders might be able to identify several people on them, and dynamic exchanges might take place, reminding people of something that had been forgotten.

As for some traditional knowledge of weaving, too, the memory of the techniques might still exist at the local level, and seeing photos of the textile might re-evoked a fading sense of pride, self-esteem, a renewed sense of identity and a sense of belonging.

The experts generally agreed that **copies** are enough to be repatriated, and originals could stay where it is stored, when necessary, for good safekeeping and storing conditions. It was emphasized, however, that re-dissemination of ICH documents/items in local communities is important, and that if the repatriation of ICH is to be done, it should be sent back as close to the community concerned as possible (e.g., cultural centre/community museum).

Concerning the repatriation of documents/archives, a draft text of the intention of the statement developed by SEA.??? was distributed for comments/review/information. It was stated that a creation of network to find out where things are and to create a mechanism to enable bringing things back to local communities is important for various communities. As a first step, countries first need to develop a strategy to identify/document materials that existed from the colonial time.

A concern was expressed about the **condition of the safekeeping** of documents/archives in local museums/libraries. Due to such issues as understaffing, struggle with funding, fires, floods, humidity and lack of space, some precious documents and archives are at the risk of disappearing. This realistic concern needs to be further revisited and tackled.

An expert elaborated on a question of possible **restriction to archiving**. Referring to a research project conducted in the field of documentation and archiving traditional knowledge with indigenous communities, it was made clear by the indigenous people that the best solution would be not to document everything but rather to document names of cultural bearers and instructions on how to properly access and who can access the traditional knowledge concerned. By incorporating protocols at some levels of inventory-making, it would make inventories more usable as a safeguarding measure and would allow the development of trust between people who do not like the idea of inventorying and those who are undertaking the inventorying task. It was further added that in order to ensure the viability of the ICH, the focus should not be on the scientific significance but on the significance for the local community.

Some experts expressed the importance of **promoting access rights** when documenting and archiving ICH. It was pointed out that the concept of access right is related to the issue of collective ownership. Concerning the issue of access rights, a good practice of the Smithsonian institute where access right is ensured by making certain collections viewable only by men or only by women was shared. Another expert elaborated on the restricted access to certain songs which

are to be sung only in certain seasons and by certain people. In elaborating on the access rights, due respect needs to be given to customary practices.

A **donor restriction** was also raised as an important aspect in the process of documenting and archiving ICH. Thus, a measure might sometimes need to be taken to make certain materials accessible only to the family members whose family made the donation based on a certain **protocol**. For instance, traditional knowledge is often passed on to a certain member(s) of communities based on specific traditional guidelines, and the person who is entrusted with the succeeding of the traditional knowledge has the responsibility to maintain a certain amount of confidentiality attached to such knowledge. It was underlined that the **spiritual reality** and **customary laws** should be given a due consideration and respect. Documenting the name of the custodians rather than the traditional knowledge itself might be one of the ways to prevent ICH from freezing since those custodians entrusted with the knowledge would ensure to perpetuate the traditional knowledge.

Questions such as who should be considered as a part of a given **collective ownership** and who belongs to a given community were evoked. It was agreed that a workable definition of community should be explored urgently. (c.f., a report of the expert meeting on the definition of the community held on 13-15 March 2006)

When discussing collective rights, an idea of developing a creative commerce out of ICH was raised as one of the potential ways of using ICH for community empowerment and development (e.g., making a catalogue publicly accessible). It was further mentioned that such a creative commerce might become a contributing factor to the better documentation.

In relation to the issue of communities being actively participating in the inventory-making and the documenting of ICH, it was emphasized once again that community members need to be provided with good information prior to the commencement of activities and that a **prior and informed consent of the community** is imperative/prerequisite.

Relating to the issue of documenting ICH, a question of **gender** was touched upon. It was presented that in Vanuatu, a program involving women began in 1992, inviting them to become trained as a field worker to collect and document ICH in their own village. Further on the issue of gender, other experts confirmed that women indeed play a significant role in ICH. When asked to elaborate the reason of their significance, it was mentioned that certain ICH are practiced only by women as other ICH are practiced only by men. Traditional crafts, decoration, wall painting and oral tradition were raised as a few example of ICH specific to certain gender.

It was mentioned that in some traditional societies, since the starting of the western colonization which introduced a western concept of a gender relation and eventually western feminism, a traditional division of labor based on gender and a subtle balance between men and women have been disrupted. As a result, gender roles played by men and women which had been traditionally mutually respected and appreciated began to be looked down upon, causing social instability and disconnection. Learning lessons from the colonial experiences, while being aware of the fact that certain ICH might not be in conformity with the current understanding of human rights and thus should be encouraged to be modified, it was generally agreed that gender specific ICH practices should not be automatically understood as maintaining and/or contributing to gender inequality.

## **6. Conclusion**

Throughout the 2-day meeting, the experts raised a number of important issues pertaining to the documenting and archiving of the ICH. There exists a variety of views and approaches with respect to the documenting and archiving of the ICH, and it is important to establish a coherent system under the 2003 Convention while keeping it flexible enough to allow as wide participation of local communities and states parties as possible.

The creation of a coherent system will indeed be a laborious task which the Committee will have to take. The suggestions and recommendations made by the experts at the meeting will be presented to the Committee for their consideration in elaborating the Operational Directives which will be the guidelines based on which the 2003 Convention will be implemented. The inputs of the expert will also be used for the elaboration of the thematic manuals which will be eventually distributed to policy-makers and other ICH-related practitioners.

UNESCO will also be compiling various good practices of documenting and archiving the ICH, and the experts are hereby kindly requested to send to UNESCO summaries of the cases that they referred to during the meeting in order for UNESCO to compile a number of good practices and make it available for various states parties to the Convention for their reference/information.

In addition to their important contribution they made for the future Committee, the experts are encouraged to keep in touch with each other. The Secretariat was informed that informal talks with other experts during coffee breaks and lunch time were a valuable way of exchanging information. It is thus the wish of the Secretariat that the experts will not only continue being involved in the ICH activities of UNESCO but also further develop their relationship with each other in order to help to foster the international cooperation on the grassroots level as well as institutional, national and international level and in their professional and personal capacity.



## **Annex I: Background Paper**

### **Expert Meeting on Documenting and Archiving Intangible Cultural Heritage**

**UNESCO – Paris / 12-13 January 2006**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Background**

This paper is meant to give information on the meeting on documentation and archiving in the field of intangible cultural heritage (ICH) that UNESCO's Intangible Heritage Section will organise in Paris on 12 and 13 January 2006. The meeting will provide a platform for exchange of experiences and reflections on a variegated subject which has become of primary urgency, since documentation of intangible cultural heritage is one of the safeguarding measures mentioned in article 2.3 of the *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*.

Documentation is explicitly mentioned in the Convention as one of the measures to be used for realising the purposes of the Convention. Documentation will also be a necessary component in the proposals that will be made by States for the inscription of intangible cultural heritage elements on the Lists that are established by the Convention. It will also be essential to investigate the relation between inventory making and documentation, since all States Parties to the 2003 Convention will have to draft one or more inventories of the ICH present in their territory. For the text of this Convention (hereafter called "the 2003 Convention"), see annex 1.

It is important to emphasize, right from the beginning, that all safeguarding measures mentioned in article 2.3 of the Convention aim at *ensuring the viability of the intangible cultural heritage* and that an important characteristic of the 2003 Convention is its emphasis on the participation in safeguarding measures of the *communities and groups that create, maintain and transmit this heritage*.

### **1.2 Purpose of the meeting**

Through the exchange of views and experiences between experts representing different disciplines and stakeholders such as representatives of communities of tradition bearers and representatives of national authorities, the purpose of the meeting is to study the needs for documentation created by the 2003 Convention and to establish what approaches and practices suit best the various purposes of the Convention and what new approaches have to be investigated.

Many countries already have experience in documenting and archiving elements of their ICH. However, purposes and, consequently, approaches used differ widely from each other. There are extremely valuable collections of documentation in the field of ICH in many parts of the

world. The States Parties to the Convention will have to be advised on whether and how these collections can be used for the benefit of the implementation of the 2003 Convention.

The outcome of the meeting might be a set of recommendations reflecting the different experiences and expectations of states and disciplines, and offering a number of complementary or alternative methodologies for documentation for different goals. The debates and conclusions of the meeting are also intended to make a contribution to the elaboration of thematic manuals on the safeguarding of different domains of the intangible cultural heritage.

It is for sure that the States Parties will ask for examples of best practices concerning recording as well as documentation and archiving of elements of the intangible cultural heritage. UNESCO intends to collect and diffuse good and best practices in the field of the safeguarding of the ICH, including its documentation.

### **1.3 Participants**

The meeting will be attended by invited experts with experience in the practice of producing, processing, storing and making accessible documentation of ICH elements. The experts, coming from many different countries, do not represent their countries: they are invited to speak in their own name, not bound by any mandate of political constraint. All permanent delegations to UNESCO will be invited to send an observer.

## **2. THE 2003 CONVENTION**

### **2.1 Historical Background**

The 2003 Convention was not the first standard-setting text prepared by UNESCO in the field of the protection of the intangible cultural heritage: the year 1989 saw the adoption of the *Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore*. That recommendation proved to be less successful than hoped for in terms of follow-up activities in Member States. An obvious reason for this was its non-binding character. However, in the decade following its adoption, the *Recommendation* was critically analysed. This resulted not only in a recommendation to prepare an instrument of a more binding character, but also, while doing so, to rethink fundamentally goals, target groups, definitions and approaches.

It was recommended, among other things, that a new instrument was to be a tool for communities wishing to safeguard their ICH and for authorities wishing to assist communities in doing so, rather than for researchers eager to describe and analyse elements of that same heritage for scientific purposes. The new instrument would also have to address processes rather than products.

UNESCO in the meantime created programmes aiming at the protection of ICH and at raising awareness about its existence and importance, for instance by initiating in 1997 the programme of the *Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity*. After preliminary discussions at the 30th session of UNESCO's General Conference (1999), the 31st session of the General Conference decided in 2001 that a new standard-setting instrument,

preferably a convention, was to be prepared. Two years later UNESCO's General Conference eventually adopted the Convention in October 2003. The new Convention is intended as the counterpart to UNESCO's 1972 *Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*, better known as the World Heritage Convention. The 2003 Convention will enter into force in April or May 2006.

## 2.2 Definition and domains

Article 2.2 of the 2003 Convention presents a non-exhaustive list of five domains in which the intangible cultural heritage is manifested:

- (i) *oral traditions and expressions, including language as a vehicle of the intangible cultural heritage;*
- (ii) *performing arts;*
- (iii) *social practices, rituals and festive events;*
- (iv) *knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe;*
- (v) *traditional craftsmanship.*

Article 2.1 is more of a descriptive nature. It describes the ICH as *the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge and skills - as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated - therewith that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage*. So, the Convention wishes to safeguard temporary and ephemeral manifestations (*practices, representations, expressions*), as well as the *knowledge and the skills* needed for the performance of those manifestations, and movable elements (*instruments, objects, artefacts*) and built and natural settings (*cultural spaces*) that are made use of for the enactment of these temporary manifestations.

Article 2.1 states further that this intangible cultural heritage is transmitted from generation to generation, that it is constantly recreated and that it provides its bearers with a sense of identity and continuity.

This same article finally informs the reader that, under this Convention: consideration will be given only to such intangible cultural heritage as is compatible with international human rights instruments, as well as with requirements of mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals, and of sustainable development.

It should be specified that the 2003 Convention intends to safeguard living intangible cultural heritage - that is such manifestations that are spontaneously transmitted from generation to generation, that are liable to change at every manifestation and that are representative for groups and communities, in being of primary importance for their sense of identity and continuity.

### 2.3 Documentation, identification, inventory-making

Article 2.3 of the Convention defines the term “safeguarding” as *measures aiming at ensuring the viability of the intangible cultural heritage*. This viability can be obtained by protecting, restoring or creating the conditions that ensure continued enactment, recreation and continued or renewed transmission of intangible cultural heritage practices and expressions. Such measures, intended to protect processes, are specified in great detail. They are said to include the *identification, documentation, research, preservation, protection, promotion, enhancement, transmission, particularly through formal and non-formal education, as well as the revitalization of the various aspects of such heritage*.

Article 11 states that States Parties have to identify and define the various elements of their ICH with the participation of communities, groups and relevant NGOs. That the Convention is serious about this can also be understood from article 2, which defines, for the purposes of the Convention, ICH as practices, representations, expressions, knowledge and skills *that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage*.

The first paragraph of the next, twelfth article stipulates that *(T)o ensure identification with a view to safeguarding, each State Party shall draw up, in a manner geared to its own situation, one or more inventories of the intangible cultural heritage present in its territory*.

The Intangible Heritage Section organized in March 2005 a meeting on inventory making in the field of intangible cultural heritage; the report of that meeting, which soon will also be available in French, is attached as annex 2. It became evident that these inventories will be quite different in their approaches from State to State (for instance domains covered, depth of description, primary ordering parameters) and that in many cases inventory making will constitute a first step in documentation.

Member States will be supported by UNESCO in their task of setting up national inventories. According to article 20 of the Convention, international assistance may be granted for, among others, *the preparation of inventories in the sense of articles 11 and 12*.

The relation between inventory making, as asked for by the Convention, and different types of documentation and archiving will have to be elaborated.

In this context it is to be emphasized that article 15 of the Convention stipulates that *(W)ithin the framework of its safeguarding activities if the ICH, each State Party shall endeavour to ensure the widest possible participation of communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals that create, maintain and transmit such heritage, and to involve them actively in its management*. Thus, the Convention explicitly expects States Parties to the Convention to involve in their national safeguarding activities the groups and communities who are the holders and transmitters of the elements that are to be safeguarded.

### **3. ORGANS OF THE CONVENTION, OPERATIONAL DIRECTIVES AND MANUALS**

#### **3.1 Organs**

The Convention will enter into force three months after the deposit of the thirtieth instrument of ratification (by the end of 2005, 28 States already ratified). The States Parties, who will jointly constitute the Convention's General Assembly, will, after that entry into force, during the first session of their General Assembly, which probably will start on 27 June 2006, elect from their midst an 18-member Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage.

Articles 16 and 17 of the 2003 Convention stipulate that the Intergovernmental Committee shall establish, respectively, a *Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity* and a *List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding*. It will also prepare, as part of the *operational directives*, criteria for the inscription of elements of the intangible cultural heritage on those lists. The Committee will further select, for granting international assistance, various programmes and projects, thereby focusing on intangible cultural heritage inscribed on the *List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding* and on the preparation of inventories.

#### **3.2 Operational directives and manuals**

The Convention does not prescribe in detail the system of world-wide cooperation for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage it advocates. This will be the task of the *operational directives*, to be prepared by the Intergovernmental Committee for discussion and approval by the General Assembly of the Convention (see article 7 of the Convention), that will guide the interpretation and the implementation of the 2003 Convention. Unlike the text of the Convention, operational directives can be relatively easily subject to updating and adjustment: not only the intangible cultural heritage itself is evolving, but also views about it and about its safeguarding, which also differ from region to region, are bound to change over time.

The operational directives will also have to give indications on inventory making, documentation and access to them. In this regard it is worth referring to article 13.d (ii), which asks States Parties to endeavour to adopt appropriate measures aimed at, among other things, *ensuring access to the intangible cultural heritage while respecting customary practices governing access to specific aspects of such heritage*.

To explain the working of the Convention to State Parties and provide guidance for the implementation of safeguarding measures, several manuals will be produced. The manuals foreseen so far are: (1) a general manual, (2) one on social practices, rituals and festive events, (3) one on oral traditions and expressions and (4) one on traditional dance and music. The manuals are intended to serve practitioners in the communities, other experts (for instance those working in institutions specialising in research and/or documentation and archiving) and decision makers in their safeguarding actions and to assist these actors in implementing the provisions of the Convention. The manuals will be written by experts from all regions; they will introduce the various domains of the intangible cultural heritage and deal with methodologies for the implementation of safeguarding measures, including documentation, inventory-making and access to them. The manuals are to contain large numbers of examples of good practices, and

analyses of problematic questions encountered so far while taking into account regional differences in approaches and appreciations.

#### **4. Documentation and archiving in the spirit of the 2003 Convention**

##### **4.1 The context repeated**

The 2003 Convention, besides other goals, wishes to contribute to the safeguarding of ICH (see article 1), “safeguarding” meaning measures aimed at ensuring the viability of the ICH (see article 2.3) and “ICH”, for the purposes of this Convention, meaning traditional but living practices, expressions and representations, and underlying skills and knowledge, as well as associated instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces, that by communities and groups are recognized as part of their cultural heritage (see article 2.1). It seems appropriate in this context to emphasize that ICH traditionally is mainly transmitted orally and that recording and documentation should respect the oral dimension of the ICH expressions and practices. This means that when we are speaking about documentation and archiving in relation to the 2003 Convention, we are dealing with the need to record, to document, to archive and to make accessible the enactment and transmission of living practices in their social context, with a number of clear *purposes*, and under certain *conditions* as determined by the Convention.

##### **4.2 Purposes: safeguarding, memory, sharing, research**

UNESCO’s Secretariat is preparing the implementation of the 2003 Convention, including the drafting of a number of manuals that will introduce safeguarding measures for different domains of the ICH and illustrate them through the provision of best practices. Indications on how best to record, document and archive elements belonging to the different domains of the ICH (for these domains, see article 2.2) will have to be provided. While doing so, different target groups will have to be kept in mind: from professionals working in research institutions and archives, who often so far have been working with materials belonging to the past mainly (and/or in traditions where knowledge is mainly transmitted in written form), to – on the grass-root level - community members wishing to contribute to safeguarding ICH elements.

Since the Convention stresses the value and the function of ICH for the communities and groups concerned, as well as the importance of its continued transmission, it seems clear that the function of ICH elements and the way or ways in which they are transmitted deserve appropriate attention in the processes of recording and documentation.

Article 2.3 of the Convention indicates that documentation of ICH is one of many different **safeguarding** measures, which means that a major function of documentation should be contributing to continued enactment and continued transmission of ICH elements. The challenge is whether and, if yes, how documentation might contribute to continued transmission in traditional ways and how it may contribute to the development of new forms of transmission, in both types of cases without in the act freezing the element in question.

The “freezing” question may have to be tackled in a more general sense; it is often feared that documentation of a living tradition may contribute to its standardization. The establishment of, for instance, one canonical text for an epic tradition which knows a lot of variation and, in fact, is

constantly recreated, would not be in the spirit of the Convention.

Since the Convention assigns an important place to the communities and groups who are the bearers of ICH traditions, the next function of documenting ICH to be considered might be providing depositories of their ICH manifestations to the communities. Especially ICH elements that are about to disappear might be documented to preserve them, for the **memory** of the community (or, for that matter, the country/nation) for the coming generations. Easy access is here imperative.

A third function of documentation should be **sharing** ICH worldwide, thus celebrating human creativity and cultural diversity. In this regard one may refer to article 1 of the Convention and article 16 which introduces the Representative List of the ICH of Humanity, among other things *in order to ensure better visibility of the ICH and awareness of its significance*.

The final general goal might be collecting and documenting for the sake of **research**.

Restricted but specific, and from the point of view of the Convention very important requirements regarding recording, documentation and archiving are posed by the obligation for the Convention's States Parties to draft inventories of their ICH and by the possibility for States Parties to submit ICH elements for inscription on the Convention's Lists (see paragraphs 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5 below).

### **4.3 The relation between inventories and documentation**

As mentioned above, States Parties to the Convention are required to *identify* and *define* the ICH present in their territory (article 11) and, as a third introductory safeguarding measure, to *draft one or more inventories* of that heritage (article 12). Often these inventories present or will present only limited information. In many States there is so much to inventory that it does not seem possible, if only for financial and capacity considerations, to create in one go systems that provide full-fledged information about all inventoried elements. Moreover, it does not always seem advisable to provide all information available, in view of intellectual property rights issues and questions of access, for example because a community, in view of the secret or sacred character of some ICH elements, does not wish these elements to be documented, or even to be mentioned in a generally accessible inventory.

The meeting may wish to address the question which points – if relevant – should be addressed in any inventory of ICH elements. The following list may be used as a starting point:

- Short but maximally informative title;
  - Community concerned/language involved;
- Location(s);
  - Domain(s) concerned;
  - Characteristics of the expression/tradition;
  - Associated tangible elements (if any);
  - Availability of associated tangible elements?
- Name of the element as used by community concerned;
  - Performed at what occasion(s)?
  - Performed by whom (age/gender/names)?
  - How transmitted?
  - Viability, or level of endangerment;

- Threats (if any);
- Relevant local organisations (NGOs and others) (if any);
- Community explicitly agreeing to listing?
- Reference to literature/discography, audiovisual material?
- Information collected by?
- Information collected when?

#### **4.4 National Representative Lists**

One of the outcomes of the March 2005 meeting on inventory making pointed in the direction of a suggestion to States Parties to the Convention to create, on the basis of their national inventory (or inventories) a restricted National Representative List of ICH. The elements listed there should be selected in such a way that they are representative of the ICH of the various communities and groups that can be distinguished in a given country, and, hence, of that of the country as a whole. All National Representative Lists should meet certain uniform criteria that are in conformity with the conditions that can be found in the Convention and that are to be established by the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage that will implement the Convention. Elements that States wish to propose to the Committee for listing and/or funding in the framework of the 2003 Convention, should be taken from these lists. The need to recommend the creation of such national lists was felt since the inventories that States are establishing vary greatly as to – for instance - make up, domains covered and depth of information provided. Elements listed in the National Representative Lists would need more extensive information and documentation than elements that are listed only in the *inventories*.

#### **4.5 Documentation and inscription on the Convention's Lists**

Files that will be submitted by States to the Intergovernmental Committee in order to propose the inscription of an element of the ICH present in their territory, will need to contain profuse information and documentation on the element proposed. All points that minimally will have to be addressed in national inventories, should also be addressed – but more extensively – in proposals for inscription, and the proposed element should be thoroughly documented in a way that is appropriate for the specific domain(s) of the ICH it belongs to (see article 2.2). Similar requirements may be posed concerning elements of ICH that will be placed on the possible National Representative Lists that were mentioned above.

Proof that the proposed element is representative and distinctive for a given community, that it is living and traditional, and in conformity with generally accepted international human rights instruments will have to be provided. If applicable, factors threatening the viability of the element in question will have to be extensively discussed and a realistic action plan aimed at remedying the situation will have to be provided. Audiovisual recordings will have to be added that clearly demonstrate practices and performances, as well preparations for them, their social and cultural contexts and functions; finally, extensive proof of the prior and informed consent of the community concerned for listing and, if applicable, for safeguarding measures, is to be given. Reference is to be made to extensive bibliographies, discographies and collections of audiovisual materials, if present.

Independent experts, invited and coordinated by an umbrella-NGO, will have to evaluate such submissions. The NGO will advise the Intergovernmental Committee which is then to decide whether the element will be inscribed on the Representative List only, on both the Representative



List and the Urgent Safeguarding List, or – since the proposal fails to meet the requirements – on whether is not to be inscribed at all. The requirements concerning information and documentation that are to be provided by States Parties, will have to be specified in the Convention's Operational Directives which will be prepared by the Intergovernmental Committee.

Proposals for inscription on the Representative List should not only define, identify and document the element in question, they should also meet a number of explicit criteria that follow from threshold-stipulations made in the Convention. A first discussion about such criteria took place during an expert meeting held at UNESCO HQ on 5-6 December 2005; the set of criteria that was formulated at that time will be edited and offered to the Intergovernmental Committee for further discussion and elaboration.

The report of the 5-6 December 2005 meeting is not ready yet. The criteria, formulated at that occasion, are nevertheless already presented here in a preliminary and adapted form (the first four of these criteria together may be considered as constituting a test for representativity).

*Proof must be given that the element submitted for inscription:*

- (viii) is considered by the community, group or, if appropriate, the individuals concerned as part of their cultural heritage;*
- (ix) provides the community or group involved with a sense of identity and continuity, based on shared experience and collective memory;*
- (x) is rooted in the community or the group in which it is continuously transmitted and recreated;*
- (xi) would enhance, by being inscribed on it, the diversity of ICH on the List,*
- (xii) thus reflecting cultural diversity worldwide and testifying to human creativity;*
- (xiii) is already inscribed on a National Representative List that complies with all relevant criteria established for selection for the Convention's Representative List ;*
- (xiv) is submitted with the prior and informed consent of the community, group, or, if applicable, the individuals concerned and that it/they has/have participated at all stages of processes of identification, definition, documentation and nomination;*
- (xv) is being effectively safeguarded through appropriate means and measures, or may be effectively safeguarded by means of a well elaborated and feasible plan for safeguarding.*

#### **4.6 Domains and approaches: practical questions**

Documentation of ICH for all purposes mentioned above has to cater for the different domains that are distinguished in article 2.1 of the Convention, that is: (i) oral traditions and expressions, including language as a vehicle of the intangible cultural heritage; (ii) performing arts; (iii) social practices, rituals and festive events; (iv) knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe; (v) traditional craftsmanship. Other domains may be added in the future; candidates could be: (a) traditional games and plays, (b) culinary traditions, (c) places of memory.

The experts might wish to discuss, from a comparative perspective, their experiences with recording and documenting of different types of ICH, while keeping in mind that the Convention is

as much - if not more - interested in processes, in functions and values as perceived by the communities themselves, and in preparations within the community, and in the interaction between performers and audiences during the performances themselves, than in final products. When speaking about handicrafts, for instance, it is rather production processes and related traditions and practices, the related knowledge and skills and underlying values, than the objects produced that should get the main attention.

It will also be necessary to discuss the relative usefulness of different types of recording, from simple transcriptions till full-fledged multi-media approaches, in relation to the widely divergent domains to be covered, and in relation to the various purposes for which the Convention advocates or requires recording, documentation and – possibly – archiving. Finally, financial constraints will also have to be taken into account; since there are countless ICH elements which ask for recording and documentation, and since the financial possibilities differ from country to country, exchanges of experiences about how to limit costs while keeping up quality standards will also be welcome.

#### **4.7 Actors and communities: organisational and ethical questions**

The States Parties to the Convention are encouraged to create or designate competent bodies for the safeguarding of the ICH, including “documentation institutions”, to facilitate access to them, and further to foster scientific and technical studies with a view to effective ICH safeguarding (article 13 of the Convention). Article 15 asks all States Parties to ensure *the widest possible participation of communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals that create, maintain and transmit the ICH, and to involve them actively in its management.*

The Convention leaves it to its States Parties to develop their own strategies as to the involvement of “competent bodies” and institutions, and of the communities of practitioners. Concrete information about good practices from a wide variety of countries would be most welcome, specifically about well-trying approaches for involvement of communities of tradition holders and practitioners.

Access to documentation and archives deserves a good deal of attention since article 13 of the Convention does not only wish that measures be taken that aim at facilitating the access to documentation institutions but also that customary practices governing access to specific aspects of the ICH be respected.

Exchanges between archives and other institutions in former colonial powers and in developing countries might also be discussed; experiences in this respect would be welcome.

UNESCO is eager to collect practical experiences with protocols or agreements that give communities the possibility to agree or not to agree to recording, documentation and archiving of elements that belong to their ICH, and to negotiate their conditions concerning access and possible profit-sharing.

There are several more general codes of ethics at the international, national and local levels, dealing with, among other things:

- The Protection of the integrity and the preservation of the context of archived materials,
- Probity in access, collection development and other transactions,
- The right of access,
- Observing the ‘rule of law’ and policy-based decision making,

- Integrity, honesty, accountability and transparency,
- Confidentiality,

Apparently the FIAF is the only audiovisual archiving federation to have adopted a formal code of ethics (it did so in 1998) and adherence to it is obligatory for its members (<http://www.fiafnet.org/uk/members/ethics.cfm>).

In view of the complementary mandates of UNESCO and WIPO, the World Intellectual Property Organization, when it comes to the protection or safeguarding of ICH elements, the meeting will not be asked to deal extensively with intellectual property rights: whereas UNESCO's Convention wishes to maintain or restore conditions under which manifestations of ICH can be enacted and transmitted, it is WIPO which is studying the possibilities of developing an international instrument for protecting the property rights of communities and groups over their ICH practices and expressions.

\*\*\*\*\*

Intangible Heritage Section, UNESCO/Paris 06-01-2006

**Annex II: Agenda**

**Expert Meeting on Documenting and Archiving  
Intangible Cultural Heritage  
UNESCO – Paris / 12-13 January 2006**

Place Fontenoy, room IX

**Draft Agenda**

**Thursday 12 January 2006**

- |                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| <b>09:00-09:15</b> | <b>Registration of participants</b>  |
| <b>09:15-11:00</b> | <b>Opening</b><br>Welcome<br>Adoption of the Agenda<br>Introduction to the meeting           |
| <b>11:00-11:15</b> | <b>Coffee break</b>  |
| <b>11:15-13:00</b> | <b>Session 1: Documentation and Inventories</b>  |
| <b>13:00-14:30</b> | <b>Lunch</b> offered to the invited experts, UNESCO restaurant<br>(7 <sup>th</sup> floor)    |
| <b>14:30-16:00</b> | <b>Session 2: Documentation and proposals for inscription on<br/>the Representative List</b> |
| <b>16:00-16:15</b> | <b>Tea break</b>   |
| <b>16:15-18:15</b> | <b>Session 3: Documenting for sharing, celebrating and<br/>memory</b>                        |

**Friday 13 January 2006**

<b>09:15-11:00</b>	<b>Session 4:</b>	<b>Documenting for safeguarding</b>
<b>11:00-11:15</b>	<b>Coffee break</b>	
<b>11:15-13:00</b>	<b>Session 5:</b>	<b>Actors and technologies involved</b>
<b>13:00-14:30</b>	<b>Lunch</b> offered to the invited experts, UNESCO restaurant (7 <sup>th</sup> floor)	
<b>14:30-16:00</b>	<b>Session 6:</b>	<b>Access and ownership</b>
<b>16:00-16:15</b>	<b>Tea break</b>	
<b>16:15-18:15</b>	<b>Session 7:</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>

**Annex III: List of Experts**

**Expert Meeting on Documenting and Archiving the Intangible Cultural Heritage  
UNESCO Paris, 12 &13 January 2005**

**List of participants**

<b>N°</b>	<b>Name of experts</b>	<b>Country</b>
1	Marcellin ABONG	Vanuatu
2	Lissant BOLTON	United Kingdom
3	Belina CAPUL	Philippines
4	Mamadou Ben Chérif DIABATE	Mali
5	Ali AL DAW	Sudan
6	Laszlo FELFÖLDI	Hungary
7	Claudia Marcia FERREIRA	Brazil
8	Xinsheng GAO	China
9	Alain GODONOU	Benin
10	Samir KAFAS	Morocco
11	Masatoshi KUBO	Japan
12	Kimberley LAWSON	Canada
13	Mohamed OULD MOHAMED LEMINE	Mauritania
14	Soledad MUJICA	Peru
15	Raphaël NDIAYE	Senegal
16	Mangone NIANG	Niger
17	Metje POSTMA	The Netherlands
18	Javier ROMERO	Bolivia
19	Dietrich SCHÜLLER	Austria
20	Peter SEITEL	USA
21	Hugues SICARD	France
22	Vellorimo SUMINGUIT	Philippines
23	Carol VAN WYK	South Africa
24	Susanne ZIEGLER	Germany