

## The Challenges of UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage

その他（別言語等）のタイトル	ユネスコ無形文化遺産の課題
著者	Caroline BERTORELLI
著者別名	キャロライン バートレリ
journal or publication title	Journal of Tourism Studies
volume	17
page range	91-117
year	2018-03
URL	<a href="http://id.nii.ac.jp/1060/00009834/">http://id.nii.ac.jp/1060/00009834/</a>

# The Challenges of UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage

Caroline BERTORELLI

## **Abstract**

*The Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* was adopted by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in 2003. Intangible cultural heritage (ICH) encompasses living cultural processes and performances. ICH assets are organized into three lists, *Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity*, *a List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safekeeping*, and *Register of Good Safeguarding Practices*, which comprises national projects demonstrating success in safeguarding ICH.

Although the 2003 Convention has successfully spurred many of its member nations to record and implement activities for safeguarding ICH, UNESCO ICH's current framework and processes, which are broad in both scope and scale, are impeding this very mission. For UNESCO ICH to more efficiently and effectively achieve its goal of safeguarding global ICH, it may be better to narrow its scope and divert more responsibility to member nations.

The aim of this paper is to overview the challenges of management of global ICH by UNESCO by examining the scope and process of UNESCO's ICH Lists.

## **Keywords**

UNESCO, intangible cultural heritage, global cultural heritage, intangible heritage management, global management

## **1. Introduction**

As natural and man-made disasters and events threaten tangible assets, so too is there a drive to preserve intangible culture and traditions of nations for future generations. Intangible cultural heritage (ICH), also called living cultural assets, is defined by United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (UNESCO ICH, 2003) as "*traditions or living expressions inherited from our ancestors and passed on to our descendants, such as oral traditions, performing arts, social practices, rituals, festive events, knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe or the knowledge and skills to produce traditional crafts,*" traditional or contemporary in origin or expression.

UNESCO legislation for the protection of cultural heritage has a long history, starting with assistance to Syria and Egypt in the 1950's to protect monuments after completion of the Aswan High Dam. This led to the establishment of the World Heritage Convention (WHC) following a request by the United States of America (USA) to create a world nature conservation trust. Today WHC lists over 1000 properties by 165 of 195 member nations, 85% participation (UNESCO WHC, 2017c). As a counterpart to the WHC, UNESCO established UNESCO ICH via the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (hereafter, 2003 Convention). As of December 2017, 429 elements are listed by 113 of 175 UNESCO ICH member nations, 65% participation (UNESCO ICH, 2017b). A further 50 elements are pending approval in 2017 (UNESCO ICH, 2017c). It may be just a matter of time for greater participation. Given the volume of elements and rapid changes and challenges globally, however, will the existing infrastructure of UNESCO ICH be able to cope?

The aim of this paper is to assess the management of UNESCO ICH established under the 2003 Convention in its role to safeguard global ICH by examining its definition and scope; assessing the administration of ICH lists and list element nominations; highlighting relevant issues; exploring a sample of nations and their domestic ICH legislation; analyzing to what extent the convention's goals are being met; and finally drawing conclusions.

## **2. UNESCO**

### **2.1 Structure**

UNESCO's mission is to eradicate poverty and promote peace, sustainable development and intercultural dialogue through education, science, information, and culture globally. UNESCO ICH was created to address the threat of modification or replacement of local culture by other cultures by globalization. Japan and Korea led the way, concerned by the potential loss of cultural traditions and communities after World War II (Alivizatos, 2012). Their activities influenced Japanese national Koichiro Matsuura, the UNESCO Director General from 1999 to 2009, to enact measures to safeguard ICH for all UNESCO members. The main objectives of the 2003 Convention are not only preservation and promotion, but also recognition by stakeholders such as communities and individuals, and support: (a) to safeguard the intangible cultural heritage; (b) to ensure respect for the intangible cultural heritage of the communities, groups, and individuals concerned; (c) to raise awareness at the local, national and international levels of the importance of the intangible cultural heritage, and of ensuring mutual appreciation thereof; and (d) to provide for international cooperation and assistance (UNESCO ICH, 2003, Article 2, p.2).

The 2003 Convention's aims are effected via three lists: (1) *List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding* (hereafter, ICH Urgent Safeguarding List), including elements requiring immediate action; (2) *Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity* (hereafter,

ICH Representative List), including elements exemplifying a nation's ICH; and (3) *Register of Good Safeguarding Practices* (hereafter, ICH Good Safeguarding Practices List), including programs and activities best demonstrating the Convention's objectives (see Appendix 2 for participation). List elements are classified into five domains: (1) oral traditions and expressions, including language as a vehicle of the intangible cultural heritage; (2) performing arts; (3) social practices, rituals and festive events; (4) knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe; and (5) traditional craftsmanship (UNESCO ICH, 2003, Article 2, p.2). Elements may refer to more than one domain, for example, Washoku, Japanese traditional food preparation and consumption, covers (3) social practices, rituals, and festive events, and (4) knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe (UNESCO, 2013b).

Nominations to lists are made by "State Parties," UNESCO Member States who have ratified the 2003 Convention (UNESCO ICH, 2003). Each list type has a separate procedure, which follows an annual April to March cycle, typically requiring two to three years to complete. Any delay shifts the processing to the next cycle, meaning a delay of one year. After nomination, periodic updates are required such as every four years for elements to the ICH Urgent Safeguarding List and every six years for those on the ICH Representative List. Specific documentation is required for inscribed nominations, viewable on the UNESCO ICH website (UNESCO ICH, 2017f), including a 150-250 word description (1000 words on the nomination form), pictures, a 5-10 minute video, various nomination documents such as the State Party's inventory listing, and community consent, and the date of the next update.

## **2.2 Governance**

UNESCO ICH has various committees and bodies overseeing its operations including the General Assembly, Intergovernmental Committee (hereafter, the Committee), Evaluation Body, and Secretariat. The General Assembly, the overall governing body, is an assembly of all the State Parties to the convention. It meets every other year and its functions include strategic planning of UNESCO ICH. The Committee's role is to offer guidance on ICH safeguarding, examine nominations to the lists, and assess funding requests up to US\$100,000. It comprises 24 members elected by the General Assembly from suitably qualified candidates fielded by the State Parties, who are equitably rotated by geographical grouping to ensure fair representation, with terms limited to four years and half the committee membership changing every two years.

The Evaluation Body evaluates and recommends list nominations to the Committee, and approves requests for assistance of US\$100,000 or more. It comprises six non-Committee State Parties with expertise in ICH nominated by the Committee and six members from accredited non-governmental organizations (NGOs) operating within the ICH domains. Membership selection has equitable geographical distribution to ensure fair representation, with terms limited to four years and 25% of members replaced every two years. The Secretariat is the executive branch of UNESCO ICH including

the Director-General and some 2000 staff from around 170 countries that provide the general administration function. Around one third of this workforce staffs 65 UNESCO field offices worldwide. The Secretariat receives and processes the initial nominations from State Parties.

Other bodies include Category 2 Centres that provide support to State Parties on a regional basis to assist in achieving UNESCO ICH's strategic objectives (UNESCO ICH, 2017f). There are currently eight centres in various locations worldwide with an emphasis in Asia: Algeria, Brazil, Bulgaria, China, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Peru, and Republic of Korea. There are also a large number of NGOs (164 as of December 2017; UNESCO ICH, 2017d) that provide expertise to support the 2003 Convention and who act in an advisory capacity to the Committee meetings. There are NGO forums held directly prior to the Committee meetings, of which 5 have been held since 2010.

### **2.3 Funding**

All State Parties who ratified the 2003 Convention are required to contribute the level of 1% of their regular UNESCO contribution to the ICH Fund. Additional funding is collected via supplementary voluntary contributions by State Parties and other public or private donors, and is used for specific projects such as training and support to draw up inventory.

### **2.4 Global Strategic Plans**

UNESCO ICH's global strategic plans are general rather than specific. The UNESCO 2014-2021 Medium-term Strategy (37 C/4) document (UNESCO, 2014) states its aims are to (1) increase the focus of UNESCO; (2) bring UNESCO closer to the field; (3) strengthen UNESCO's role within the UN; and (4) develop and unify its partner relationships. The three core areas are: (1) renewing its goal of protecting and promoting heritage; (2) becoming more results-driven via staff training and management reporting; and (3) working closer in the field. The latter two are recommendations from the External Evaluation (see Section 2.6). The UNESCO 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Goals is a 15-year plan organized into 17 Sustainable Development Goals, paralleling corporate initiatives to protect the environment, and reduce energy use and wastage (UNESCO, 2017g).

### **2.5 Management**

To achieve its aims of promoting and assuring safeguarding global ICH efficiently, an enormous undertaking, UNESCO ICH needs to observe good management practice through appropriate organizational structure and capability. The UN is a member of the European Foundation Centre (EFC) aimed at independently-governed organizations that employ funds for the public good (EFC, 2017). Other members include The Rockefeller Foundation and Wellcome Trust. EFC draws up guidelines for good management practice to ensure all operations of its member nations are carried out responsibly and collaboratively together with all stakeholders. These include (1) independent governance; (2) sound management, including sustainable investment initiatives; (3) transparency; and (4) accountability.

## 2.6 Evaluation

UNESCO ICH periodically undergoes internal and external evaluation to monitor achievement of medium- and long-term strategies. Internal evaluation is carried out by the Internal Oversight Service Evaluation Office covering three main areas: (1) accountability, to provide assurance on UNESCO ICH's operations according to international standards, conducted by qualified internal audit professionals; (2) evaluation, to assess whether objectives and mandates are being met; and (3) investigation of grievances, fraud, and illegal activities by UNESCO personnel (UNESCO, 2017c). For external evaluation, UNESCO invites teams of independent experts to evaluate aspects of its scope, programmes, and legislative instruments to obtain recommendations to improve the overall operations.

The Internal Oversight Service Evaluation Office in a recent report while acknowledging UNESCO ICH's success in raising awareness among and promoting action by State Parties to safeguard ICH, highlighted 24 recommendations including: (1) harnessing greater exchange with local groups, for example, NGOs and community groups, to improve knowledge; (2) greater sharing of ICH safeguarding practices among State Parties to provide models both formally via the lists, and informally through social media such as Facebook and Twitter; and (3) incorporating more qualitative and quantitative measures in the 4-yearly periodic reporting required for list elements for more effective monitoring (Torggler and Blake, 2013). This review also revealed that many nominations to the ICH Good Safeguarding Practices were failing owing to lack of evidence of effectiveness of programs and activities in safeguarding ICH.

An external evaluation carried out in 2010 resulted in the following issues being incorporated into the 37 C/4 2014-2021 medium-term strategy and the UNESCO 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Goals: (1) increasing the focus of UNESCO in terms of priorities and strategies; (2) decentralizing UNESCO in terms of reducing its leadership role and encouraging greater participation at the State Member and local level; (3) working more cooperatively rather than competitively within the framework of the UN; (4) strengthening governance by reviewing and redefining roles, enacting a four-year programming and planning cycle as currently advocated elsewhere within the UN, and incorporating greater accountability; and (5) reducing bureaucracy and developing a partnership strategy with State Parties, NGOs, and other participating organizations incorporating clear divisions of responsibility (UNESCO, 2010b).

## 2.7 Legislation

As Alissandra Cummins, Editor-in-Chief of *The International Journal of Intangible Heritage*, remarked in her editorial for the April 2016 issue, tangible and ICH are interdependent (Cummins, 2016), as mirrored by the legislation (see Table 1 above). For example, the *1954 Hague Convention* and the *2003 Declaration concerning the Intentional Destruction of Cultural Heritage* both refer to cultural

Table 1. *Chronology of UNESCO laws and guidelines on protection of cultural heritage*

Year	Legislation
1954	Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (“The Hague Convention”)
1956	Recommendation on International Principles Applicable to Archaeological Excavations
1960	Recommendation concerning the Most Effective Means of Rendering Museums Accessible to Everyone
1962	Recommendation concerning the Safeguarding of Beauty and Character of Landscapes and Sites
1964	Recommendation on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Export, Import and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property
1966	Declaration of Principles of International Cultural Co-operation
1968	Recommendation concerning the Preservation of Cultural Property Endangered by Public or Private works
1970	Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property
1972	Recommendation concerning the Protection, at National Level, of the Cultural and Natural Heritage
1972	Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage
1976	Recommendation concerning the International Exchange of Cultural Property
1976	Recommendation concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas
1976	Recommendation on Participation by the People at Large in Cultural Life and their Contribution to It
1978	Recommendation for the Protection of Movable Cultural Property
1980	Recommendation for the Safeguarding and Preservation of Moving Images
1989	Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore
1993	Proposal of Living Human Treasures System
2001	Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity (UNESCO, 2005)
2001	Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity
2001	Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage
2002	Guidelines for the Establishment of Living Human Treasures Systems (UNESCO ICH, 2002)
2003	Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
2003	Declaration concerning the Intentional Destruction of Cultural Heritage
2005	Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expression
2011	Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape
2015	Recommendation concerning the protection and promotion of museums and collections, their diversity and their role in society

Sources: UNESCO, 2017d unless otherwise stated.

heritage in war zones. Some legislation has been superseded such as the 2001 *Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity* by the 2003 Convention. Some recommendations have been promoted from proposal to guideline, for example, the *Proposal of Living Human Treasures System* in 1993 to *Guidelines on the Establishment of Living Human Treasures Systems* in 2002. Such interweaving of content among the various legal instruments and guidelines is, therefore, cumbersome to navigate.

State parties themselves have also enacted legislation and guidelines to safeguard ICH (UNESCO,



2017f), some example of which are detailed later. Forsyth (2012), in reference to the safeguarding of traditional knowledge of Pacific Island countries, asserts that given the both the complexity and quantity of ICH legislation at the international, national, and local levels, a so-called pluralistic approach may be the most practical way to proceed, all legislation being incorporated into a single framework.

### **3. UNESCO ICH Domains**

UNESCO ICH is classified into five domains: (1) oral traditions and expressions; (2) performing arts; (3) social practices, rituals and festive events; (4) knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe; and (5) traditional craftsmanship. One issue is that often two or more domains are indicated for one element. For example, the Republic of Korea's culture of Jeju Haenyeo (women divers) covers the two domains of (1) social practices, rituals, and festive events, and (2) knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe. For the multinational ICH element of falconry, nominated by 18 State Parties together including France, the Republic of Korea, and Qatar (see item 8, Appendix 3), four domains are marked, namely, (1) oral traditions and expression, including language as a vehicle of the ICH; (2) social practices, rituals, and festive events; (3) knowledge and practices concerning the nature and the universe; and (4) traditional craftsmanship. Perhaps nominators believe that the more domains covered, the greater chance of being listed. Such cross-listings suggest either that the domain categories are too broad or too vague, or both. As the ICH lists become bigger and the volume of ICH elements surge, the domains should be more precise to avoid confusion.

### **4. UNESCO ICH Lists**

#### **4.1 ICH Urgent Safeguarding List**

The ICH Urgent Safeguarding List contains ICH elements that State Parties and relevant communities consider may disappear and require urgent action to safeguard for the future. Examples from various regions include the manufacture of cowbells in Portugal (inscribed 2015), Mongolian calligraphy (inscribed 2013), and traditions and practices associated with the Kayas in the sacred forests of the Mijikenda (inscribed 2009) (UNESCO ICH, 2017b). Given that the nomination procedure follows a two-year cycle and preparation of documentation for the nomination may take a year or more, this timeline may be too slow to achieve the desired outcome of safeguarding ICH that is in critical danger of being lost.

#### **4.2 ICH Representative List**

The ICH Representative List contains ICH elements deemed by State Parties and relevant communities to be of value to protect for humanity. The main purpose of this list is to showcase and raise awareness of the importance and diversity of ICH of State Parties. It is not required that State Parties list all ICH elements, but rather a selection of examples as a representation of the ICH of the



State Parties. Examples from various regions include Beer Culture in Belgium (inscribed 2016), Cherry Festival in Morocco (inscribed 2012), and Baul Songs of Bangladesh (inscribed 2008) (UNESCO ICH, 2017b).

### 4.3 *ICH Good Safeguarding Practices List*

The ICH Good Safeguarding Practices List is a register of projects and activities whose objective is safeguarding ICH in a specific State Party together with relevant communities. Examples from different regions include Festival of folklore in Koprivshitsa, a system of practices for heritage presentation and transmission in Bulgaria (inscribed 2016), strategy of training coming generations of Fujian puppetry practitioners in China (inscribed 2012), and Fandango's Living Museum in Brazil (inscribed 2011) (UNESCO ICH, 2017b).

### 4.4 *Current List Inscriptions*

As of December 2017, 429 elements are listed in total, namely, 47 on the ICH Urgent Safeguarding List, 365 on the ICH Representative List, and 17 on the ICH Good Safeguarding Practices List (UNESCO ICH, 2017b). This includes the 90 elements from the defunct *Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity*. If one considers the multinational elements (see Appendix 3) as separate inscriptions by State Parties, these numbers are 443, 48, and 18, respectively, totaling 507 (see Appendix 2).

Which State Parties have the most listings? As of December 2017, the top ten State Parties with the most listings are China (39: 31 ICH Representative List; 7 ICH Urgent Safeguarding List; 1 ICH Best Safeguarding Practices) followed by Japan (21: 21; 0; 0), Republic of Korea (19: 19; 0; 0), Spain (16: 13; 0; 3), Croatia (15: 13; 1; 1), France (15: 14; 1; 0), Turkey (14: 14; 0; 0), Belgium (13: 11; 0; 2), Mongolia (13: 7; 6; 0), and India (12: 12; 0; 0). These top ten of 175 State members account for over a third of elements listed.

As has been recognized by UNESCO ICH, the numbers of elements on the three lists are not equally distributed, the ICH Representative List being favored (UNESCO, 2010a). One reason may be the nomination procedure for the ICH Representative List has fewer requirements. Some State Parties may also avoid nominations to the ICH Urgent Safeguarding List as a matter of national pride, since this may indicate a lack of interest, activity, or initiative by the State Party to safeguard their own heritage. As mentioned above, however, the ICH Good Safeguarding Practices List has had many nominations rejected for lack of documentary evidence, which may be due to a misunderstanding of the purpose of the list. Since this list requires reference to activities related to an already inscribed element on the other two lists, this suggests a need to revise or rename the list categories.

#### **4.5 Element Selection**

State Parties themselves decide which ICH elements in their realm are to be selected, which necessitates prioritizing or ranking of ICH elements (Park S-Y., 2013), raising concern about discrimination of communities within and by a State Party (Labadi, 2013).

#### **4.6 Language Issues**

Although the 2003 Convention itself is available in 38 languages, its website is only available in a limited number of languages, main pages being available in English, French, and Spanish. The nomination applications to the ICH lists must be in English or French, although some supporting documents may be in the State Party's national or official language. For example, videos showcasing ICH on the website must have English or French subtitles if the spoken language is another language. This may cause a language barrier regarding not only the nomination application process itself, but also participation in the Committee meetings.

#### **4.7 Management Issues**

##### **4.7.1 ICH Elements**

There appears to be no guidance as to the limit on the volume of ICH elements to be listed other than it should not be all the ICH elements of a State Party but rather a selection of representative elements, hence the inclusion of "representative" in the name of the list.

##### **4.7.2 Nomination Process**

The nomination procedure follows a 2-year cycle, including a stage for the Secretariat to review nomination documents and request resubmission where deficiencies exist. In spite of this, not all nominations are approved. For example, in 2009, only 76 out of 111 nominations (by 27 State Parties) were approved (UNESCO, 2010a). Moreover, as of December 2017, there is a backlog of 125 nominations submitted by 34 countries, notably 25 by the Republic of Korea, 24 by India, and 13 by China (UNESCO ICH, 2017a). This backlog of the nomination approval and inscription is a significant bottleneck. The Committee itself has recognized this and expressed criticism over the volume of nominations including those with insufficient documentation, and suggesting measures such change such as limiting the number of nominations per cycle and allowing extensions in the case of multinational nominations (UNESCO ICH, 2013a). This, however, would counter the essence of the 2003 Convention to promote awareness of all ICH to all of humanity, since limiting the list would not only delay listings but require some form of ranking of the nominations. Clearly the nomination process has become unmanageable. Urgent action is needed to organize a proactive program of safeguarding ICH with clear framework, strategy, and goals.

##### **4.7.3 Top-down Hierarchy**

The infrastructure of UNESCO ICH is rigidly top-down with a clearly defined hierarchy and prescriptive processes requiring careful approval. Stefano (2012) asserts that the main limitations of the current framework include a combination of "conceptualizing, spotlighting, and safeguarding ICH"

(Stefano, 2012, p231). Given that UNESCO ICH needs communities at both the national and local level to participate in the implementation of the 2003 Convention, more flexibility is required to address the myriad varieties of ICH. The nomination process has heavy documentation requirements, effectively pigeon-holing all ICH into a kind of one-size-fits-all model. Stefano (2012) considers this approach to ICH to be “non-holistic,” rather favoring an “ecomuseological approach” in the sense of documentation and preserving both historical and living artifacts in museums.

## **5. Nations That Have Ratified the 2003 Convention**

The percentage of UNESCO Member States having ratified the 2003 Convention represents nearly 90% compared with 98% for UNESCO WHC (UNESCO WHC, 2017a). Let us look at some examples of ICH legislation and activities among ratified nations.

### **5.1 Japan and Republic of Korea**

Japan and Republic of Korea’s national legislation and activities safeguarding both tangible and intangible heritage owing to concerns following World War II led to UNESCO establishing legislation to safeguard both tangible and intangible cultural heritage. This is reflected in their active participation in both the WHC (21 and 12, respectively, as of December 2017) and 2003 Convention (22 and 18, respectively, as of December 2017), which they ratified in 1992 and 2004 (Japan) and 1988 and 2005 (Korea), respectively. There are also 5 and 25 nominations in the ICH backlog file for Japan and Korea, respectively.

### **5.2 Botswana**

Botswana in Southern Africa has two World Heritage Sites, having ratified the WHC in 1998, and one inscription to the ICH Representative List, having ratified the 2003 Convention in 2010. With various indigenous peoples and a rich natural cultural heritage, Botswana already had in place heritage safeguarding legislation prior to the 2003 Convention, for example, the *Monument and Relics Act* and the Botswana National Museum, both established in the 1970s (Keitumetse, 2012).

### **5.3 Thailand**

Thailand in South-East Asia has so far five World Heritage Sites listed, having ratified the WHC in 1987, but as yet no UNESCO ICH listings, having ratified the 2003 Convention in 2016. Nevertheless, the 2003 Convention has stimulated many initiatives such as the launch of an ICH Field School by the Princess Maha Chakti Sirindhorn Anthropological Centre in Bangkok in collaboration with the Urban Lamphun Community Museum (established in 2007) to foster learning and exchange of ICH issues (Denes, 2012). The Thailand Ministry of Culture and the Office of National Culture and Commission are also involved in programmes to safeguard ICH such as folklore and local wisdom.

## **6. Nations That Have Not Ratified the 2003 Convention**

As of December 2017, 20 of 195 UNESCO Members States (see Appendix 1), accounting for 10%, had not ratified the 2003 Convention. These include major economies such as Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the USA, whose indigenous peoples are widely known: Aborigines, Inuit, Maori, and Native American Indians, respectively. Others include Israel, Russian Federation, Singapore, some African nations such as South Africa and some island nations such as the Solomon Islands and the Maldives. What might be motivations for non-ratification? One reason put forward for non-ratification is tourism—that non-ratifying nations have sufficiently successful tourism industries to warrant further expense and effort participating in the 2003 Convention, and that those nations may in future ratify to protect their tourism industry (Logan, 2009). This implies that the main ratification motivation to inscribe elements in the UNESCO ICH lists is for tourism promotion. However, a closer look at member states that have not ratified the 2003 Convention reveals more complex reasons.

### **6.1 Australia**

Despite Australia being the first to ratify the WHC in 1974, listing 19 World Heritage as of December, 2017, its reticence in ratifying the 2003 Convention is the potential conflict between protecting ICH of indigenous peoples and their human rights, which may alter if there is a threat to tourism (Logan, 2009), and conflicts with other legislation such as the *2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expression*, Australia ratified in 2009 (Leader-Elliot and Trimboli, 2012). Some national legislative bodies and instruments Australia has itself established to safeguard ICH include the *Australian Human Rights Commission (AHRC)*; the *Heritage Collections Council of Australia* that provides assistance to galleries and museums in the procurement, upkeep, and promotion of their collections; the *Federation of Ethnic Communities' Councils of Australia (FECCA)* to protect Australian peoples of culturally diverse backgrounds; and *Australia International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS)* including the protection of cultural spaces (Leader-Elliot and Trimboli, 2012).

### **6.2 Canada**

Although Canada embraced the WHC in 1976, with 18 listings as of December 2017, it has struggled with the 2003 Convention partly due to confusion over the definition of ICH and how to separate out intangible cultural identity interwoven with tangible cultural heritage, for example, tangible objects such as houses, crafts, and clothing used in traditional musical events (MacKinnon, 2012). Another reason is lack of progress on dialog and consensus between the Canadian federal government and provincial governments on how to interpret and proceed with initiatives regarding safeguarding ICH given the complexities of the definitions in the context of Canadian cultural heritage. Despite Canada's non-ratification of the 2003 Convention, there has been a lot of regional activity to safeguard ICH. For example, Nova Scotia has implemented projects to support artists under UNESCO's *Living Human Treasures System* established in 1993. Other legislative bodies and instruments, and initiatives in place in

Nova Scotia to safeguard ICH include the *Heritage Property Act* (1989) and *Special Places Act* (1989) for safeguarding historical, paleontological, and ecological sites; the *Gaelic Council* for protection of the Gaelic language of the immigration community originating from Scotland; the *Department of Tourism, Heritage, and Culture*; the University of Cape Breton's Master of Arts degree in Heritage Studies; and a Canada Research Chair in ICH at Cape Breton University, set up by the Canadian federal government (Leader-Elliott and Trimboli, 2012).

### **6.3 Guyana**

Guyana, a small country in Latin America, ratified the WHC in 1977 with as yet no listings, but not the 2003 Convention, as of December 2017. Despite this, the 2003 Convention has given Guyana an impetus for safeguarding its ICH, especially concerning revitalizing the ICH of Amerindian Communities via the *Iwokrama International Centre for Rainforest Conservation and Development and the North Rupununi District Development Board* through sustainable development and tourism (Bowers and Corsane, 2012).

### **6.4 United Kingdom**

The United Kingdom (UK) ratified the WHC in 1984, listing 31 World Heritage Sites as of December 2017. Despite not having ratified the 2003 Convention, it set up the UK National Committee for UNESCO in 2004 and regional initiatives such as UNESCO Cymru Wales in 2005 to explore this issue (Dixley, 2012). There are a number of regional programmes such as the Welsh Eisteddfod, a festival of Welsh music, performance art and literature. Wales, moreover, has included in its ICH inventory two domains in addition to those of UNESCO ICH, namely, Welsh Icons and Wales Abroad, the latter recognizing the culture of Welsh peoples who have migrated elsewhere (Dixley, 2012). One of the issues holding back progress on ratification by the UK is the complex regional divisions and diversified cultures, which is not only about the original peoples and communities of England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland but is complicated by the influx of numerous immigrant populations over the decades, including Afro-Caribbean and Asian Communities, and more recently Eastern European Communities, not to mention the complication of how to document the culture and peoples of mixed ethnic background.

### **6.5 Implications of Non-ratification**

A number of nations with populations of diverse and mixed heritage across all corners of the globe, including Australia Canada, and the UK, as mentioned above, and nations in Africa (Abungu, 2012), have been holding back from ratification of the 2003 Convention because of the complexity of fitting their ICH into the current UNESCO ICH framework. UNESCO ICH should identify why nations are not ratifying the 2003 Convention, and resolve those issues. If UNESCO ICH cannot secure ratification of and inscription by all UNESCO Member States, it is failing in its mission to safeguard ICH of all humanity.

## **7. Participation in UNESCO ICH Lists**

### **7.1 State Parties with Elements Listed**

Out of the 175 State Parties who have ratified the 2003 Convention, as of December 2017, 113 State Parties (65%) have listings on one or more of the ICH Representative List, ICH Urgent Safeguarding List, and ICH Best Safeguarding Practices List (see Appendix 2). Additionally, the Russian Federation, even though it has not ratified the 2003 Convention, has two elements on the ICH Representative List owing to incorporation under the *Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity* in 2001, which ceased in 2005, those elements being incorporated under the 2003 Convention. Therefore, 63 State Parties who have ratified the 2003 Convention have as yet either not made any attempts to nominate elements or have not yet had their nominations approved. Labadi (2013) found a heavy concentration of inscriptions by Europe, expressing concern about Africa. As of December 2017, however, Europe no longer dominates the list of elements. Asia has taken over, with numerous inscriptions notably by China, Japan, and the Republic of Korea. Moreover, Africa, earmarked as a UNESCO “global priority” in its 37 C/4 2014-2021 medium-term strategy (UNESCO, 2014), as of December 2017 has 20 countries with at least one listing inscription including Egypt, Nigeria, and Zimbabwe.

### **7.2 Multinational Elements Listed**

Where an ICH element exists across borders of nations, the 2003 Convention allows for “Multinational” listings, applications made jointly by more than one State Party. As of December 2017, there are 29 such multinational listings from 2-18 State Parties on the ICH Representative List (see Appendix 3), for example, the Mediterranean Diet, nominated by seven State Parties: Cyprus, Croatia, Spain, Greece, Italy, Morocco, and Portugal. There is also one multinational inscription on the ICH Good Safeguarding Practices List, ICH of Aymara communities by Bolivia, Chile and Peru.

### **7.3 State Parties with No Elements Listed**

As of December 2017, in spite of 507 UNESCO ICH elements listed less than a decade after the lists started, which is half that of the current WHC listing of 1,073 over 45 years of operation, there are 63 State Parties (65%) that have ratified the 2003 Convention with as yet no elements listed (see Appendix 5). These range from Ireland to Samoa and Thailand. The case of Thailand, as overviewed in Section 5.3, shows that in spite of no inscriptions as of yet, ratification of the Convention has stimulated many initiatives to safeguard ICH.

### **7.4 Implications of Non-listing**

It is not clear why some State Parties do not as yet have inscriptions on one of the UNESCO ICH lists. It may be owing to a lack of resources, either or both monetary and personnel, to produce the documentation required for the application or lack of personnel with expertise in the intangible culture,



although UNESCO ICH can provide such support. Other reasons may be that the State Party does not consider it a priority to have any elements listed or there is confusion over fitting into the UNESCO ICH domains and lists. Alternatively, it could be merely that the nominations are pending approval. As of December 2017, there is a backlog of 125 nominations. Whatever the reasons, as for non-ratification of UNESCO Member States, for UNESCO ICH to achieve its goal of awareness and activity to safeguard global ICH, it should proactively investigate why and take appropriate measures to resolve the issues.

## **8. Discussion**

The 2003 Convention is a much-needed legal instrument in the current era of rapidly changing migration patterns, changing social and economic conditions, and increasing conflict around the world, which are threatening cultural heritage, existing culture, and cultural diversity of all nations (UNESCO, 2017e). The 2003 Convention emerged following five decades of legislation, initially focused exclusively on tangible cultural property. It is now time to review legislation on ICH and investigate alternative management structures to make practical proposals for a new infrastructure for successful future safeguarding of global ICH with a clear vision, target, timeline, and appropriate management and oversight.

### **8.1 UNESCO ICH Management and Operation**

As Park (2013) observes, the 2003 Convention has been largely successful in terms of participation with ratification by 85% of UNESCO Member States; transparency of the nomination and vetting processes for inscription to the ICH lists; consensus orientation, with almost unanimous agreement of decisions; equity and inclusiveness, in that there is fair rotation of members from different regions to the Intergovernmental Committees, as well fair rotation of the venues of the meetings among the different regions.

Shortcomings in management and operations identified by UNESCO ICH include: (1) confusion over the definition and scope of the domains and lists, resulting in incomplete nomination applications, imbalance of numbers of inscriptions to the lists, and non-listing by some State Parties; (2) poor timeliness, the sheer volume of nomination applications for inscription to the ICH lists overwhelming the workload of the Committee resulting in a severe backlog of nominations to process (Park, 2013); (3) ineffectiveness and inefficiencies from a rigid top-down structure, whereby there is a backlog or approvals owing to bottlenecks; and (4) lack of ratification by major economies, suggesting a failure to be inclusive of all nations worldwide; and (5) lack of inscriptions by ratified State Parties, indicating more support may be needed to be extended.

### **8.2 Other Issues in Safeguarding Global ICH**

Owing to the nature and diversity of ICH, there are a number of other relevant issues that may hinder



inscription of elements to UNESCO ICH lists, for example: (1) cultural interference as a consequence of documenting a living culture (Oguamanam, 2009); (2) human rights infringement of indigenous peoples whose lives may be destabilized by unintentional attention or ranking (Logan, 2009); (3) intellectual property rights regarding ICH asset ownership—the communities, the nation, or other parties? (George, 2010); (4) political motivation arising from inadvertently favoring one group of peoples at the expense or bias of others when inscribing an ICH element (Oguamanam, 2009); (5) authenticity in the case of restoration for preservation (Labadi, 2013); (6) documenting ICH, digital media suggested as the best way to capture the intangible (Oguamanam, 2009; Hennessy, 2012); and (7) human resources capability in terms of producing the required documentation of ICH elements despite financial and training support available from UNESCO ICH.

### ***8.3 The Future of UNESCO ICH***

A lot of research on ICH and the 2003 Convention has focused on various countries and their individual ICH legislation together with examples of the elements inscribed in the ICH Representative List, ICH Urgent Safeguarding List, and ICH Good Safeguarding Practices List. Some researchers have denounced the efficacy and effectiveness of the UNESCO 2003 Convention as an instrument to safeguard global ICH owing to the serious threat to the human rights of indigenous peoples (for example, Logan, 2009). A recent issue that may impact the future of UNESCO ICH is the impending withdrawal from the UN by the USA at the end of 2018, an action put in motion by President Trump owing to perceived “anti-Israel” bias, with Israel itself expected to follow suit (BBC, 2017). While the USA has not ratified the 2003 Convention, as a major economy with world influence, it may induce others to withdraw from UN, with uncertain implications and repercussions for the future of other UN bodies including UNESCO ICH.

Whether supporting or not supporting the UN or the 2003 Convention in its current format, what is clear is a mutual global awareness that ICH does require safeguarding. Moreover, many nations whether or not they have ratified the 2003 Convention, have been spurred into action to safeguard ICH, as demonstrated above. The next step for UNESCO ICH is to resolve the issues that are hindering more extensive ratification of the 2003 Convention, further listings by more State Parties, and potential withdrawals.

## ***9. Conclusion***

A measure of the success of UNESCO ICH is the extent to which all UNESCO Member States have ratified the 2003 Convention, to what extent the State Parties are participating in the ICH lists, the participation and scope of the lists themselves, and other organizational features such as the domains and the regional divisions. Thus, although UNESCO ICH has succeeded to a large extent in promoting and securing worldwide participation in safeguarding global ICH, UNESCO ICH has itself identified

through both internal and external evaluations key areas that need to be improved for sustainability of the mission, notably greater effort in how to more efficiently process and organize the body of knowledge of the State Parties' ICH, which needs clearer definitions and greater participation through proactively reaching out and also delegation of responsibility. How to do these are the major challenges UNESCO ICH faces, and may require a complete overhaul of the infrastructure, operation, and documentation.

**APPENDICES****Appendix 1 UNESCO Member States, 195, as of December 2017 (UNESCO, 2017b)****(Bold italic with asterisk (\*) are Member States who have not ratified the 2003 Convention [20 in total].)**

Afghanistan	Dominica	<b>Libya*</b>	Grenadines
Albania	Dominican Republic	Lithuania	Samoa
Algeria	Ecuador	Luxembourg	<b>San Marino</b>
Andorra	Egypt	Macedonia	Sao Tome & Principe
<b>Angola*</b>	El Salvador	Madagascar	Saudi Arabia
Antigua & Barbuda	Equatorial Guinea	Malawi	Senegal
Argentina	Eritrea	Malaysia	Serbia
Armenia	Estonia	<b>Maldives*</b>	Seychelles
<b>Australia*</b>	Ethiopia	Mali	<b>Sierra Leone*</b>
Austria	Fiji	Malta	<b>Singapore*</b>
Azerbaijan	Finland	Marshall Islands	Slovakia
Bahamas	France	Mauritania	Slovenia
Bahrain	Gabon	Mauritius	<b>Solomon Islands*</b>
Bangladesh	Gambia	Mexico	<b>Somalia*</b>
Barbados	Georgia	Micronesia	<b>South Africa*</b>
Belarus	Germany	Moldovia	South Sudan
Belgium	Ghana	Monaco	Spain
Belize	Greece	Mongolia	Sri Lanka
Benin	Grenada	Montenegro	Sudan
Bhutan	Guatemala	Morocco	Suriname
Bolivia	Guinea	Mozambique	Swaziland
Bosnia & Herzegovina	Guinea-Bissau	Myanmar	Sweden
Botswana	<b>Guyana*</b>	Namibia	Switzerland
Brazil	Haiti	Nauru <sup>2</sup>	Syrian Arab Republic
Brunei Darusalaam	Honduras	Nepal	Tajikistan
Bulgaria	Hungary	Netherlands	Tanzania
Burkina Faso	Iceland	<b>New Zealand*</b>	Thailand
Burundi	India	Nicaragua	Timor-Leste
Cabo Verde	Indonesia	Niger	Togo
Cambodia	Iran	Nigeria	Tonga
Cameroon	Iraq	<b>Niue*</b>	Trinidad & Tobago
<b>Canada*</b>	Ireland	Norway	Tunisia
Central African Republic	<b>Israel*</b>	Oman	Turkey
Chad	Italy	Pakistan	Turkmenistan
Chile	Jamaica	Palau	Tuvalu
China	Japan	Palestine	Uganda
Colombia	Jordan	Panama	Ukraine
Comoros	Kazakhstan	Papua New Guinea	United Arab Emirates
Congo	Kenya	Paraguay	<b>United Kingdom*</b>
Congo, Democratic Republic of	<b>Kiribati*</b>	Peru	<b>United States of America*</b>
Cook Islands	Korea, Democratic People's Republic	Philippines	Uruguay
Costa Rica	Korea, Republic of	Poland	Uzbekistan
Côte d'Ivoire	Kuwait	Portugal	Vanuatu
Croatia	Kyrgyzstan	Qatar	Venezuela
Cuba	Lao	Romania	Viet Nam
Cyprus	Latvia	<b>Russian Federation</b>	Yemen
Czech Republic	Lebanon	Rwanda	Zambia
Denmark	Lesotho	Saint Kitts and Nevis	Zimbabwe
Djibouti	<b>Liberia*</b>	Saint Lucia	
		Saint Vincent &	

\*Nation that has not ratified the 2003 Convention

**Appendix 2 UNESCO ICH Listings Per State Party as of December 2017 (1 of 3)**

(Includes multinational inscriptions, adapted from UNESCO ICH, 2017b)

	Country	Number of Elements on Representative List of the ICH of Humanity	Number of Elements on List of ICH in Need of Urgent Safeguarding	Number of elements on Register of Good Safeguarding Practices	Total Number of Elements Listed
1	Afghanistan	1			1
2	Albania	1			1
3	Algeria	5			5
4	Andorra	1			1
5	Argentina	2			2
6	Armenia	4			4
7	Austria	3		1	4
8	Azerbaijan	8	1		9
9	Bangladesh	3			3
10	Belarus		1		1
11	Belgium	11		2	13
12	Belize	1			1
13	Benin	1			1
14	Bhutan	1			1
15	Bolivia	4		1	5
16	Bosnia & Herzegovina	1			1
17	Botswana		1		1
18	Brazil	5	2	1	8
19	Bulgaria	4		1	5
20	Burkina Faso	1			1
21	Burundi	1			1
22	Cambodia	3	1		4
23	Central African Republic	1			1
24	Chile	1		1	2
25	China	31	7	1	39
26	Columbia	8	1		9
27	Costa Rica	1			1
28	Cote d'Ivoire	2			2
29	Croatia	13	1	1	15
30	Cuba	2			2
31	Cyprus	3			3
32	Czech Republic	5			5
33	Dominican Republic	3			3
34	Ecuador	3			3
35	Egypt	2			2
36	Estonia	4			4
37	Ethiopia	3			3
38	France	14	1		15
39	Gambia	1			1
40	Georgia	3			3

**Appendix 2 UNESCO ICH Listings Per State Party as of December 2017 (2 of 3)**

(Includes multinational inscriptions, adapted from UNESCO ICH, 2017b)

	Country	Number of Elements on Representative List of the ICH of Humanity	Number of Elements on List of ICH in Need of Urgent Safeguarding	Number of elements on Register of Good Safeguarding Practices	Total Number of Elements Listed
41	Germany	2			2
42	Greece	4			4
43	Guatemala	2	1		3
44	Guinea	1			1
45	Honduras	1			1
46	Hungary	3		2	5
47	India	12			12
48	Indonesia	4	2	2	8
49	Iran	9	2		11
50	Iraq	3			3
51	Italy	7			7
52	Jamaica	1			1
53	Japan	21			21
54	Jordon	1			1
55	Kazakhstan	7			7
56	Kenya	2			2
57	Korea, Democratic People's Republic of	2			2
58	Korea, Republic of	19			19
59	Kyrgyzstan	6	1		7
60	Latvia	1	1		2
61	Lebanon	1			1
62	Lithuania	3			3
63	Luxembourg	1			1
64	Madagascar	1			1
65	Macedonia	2	1		3
66	Malawi	3			3
67	Malaysia	1			1
68	Mali	6	2		8
69	Mauritania		1		1
70	Mauritius	2			2
71	Mexico	8		1	9
72	Moldovia	2			2
73	Mongolia	7	6		13
74	Morocco	6			6
75	Mozambique	2			2
76	Namibia	1			1
77	Nicaragua	2			2
78	Niger	2			2
79	Nigeria	4			4

**Appendix 2 UNESCO ICH Listings Per State Party as of December 2017 (3 of 3)**

(Includes multinational inscriptions, adapted from UNESCO ICH, 2017b)

	Country	Number of Elements on Representative List of the ICH of Humanity	Number of Elements on List of ICH in Need of Urgent Safeguarding	Number of elements on Register of Good Safeguarding Practices	Total Number of Elements Listed
80	Norway	1			1
81	Oman	7			7
82	Pakistan	2			2
83	Palestine	1			1
84	Peru	8	1	1	10
85	Philippines	3			3
86	Portugal	4	2		6
87	Qatar	3			3
88	Romania	6			6
89	Russian Federation <sup>1</sup>	2			2
90	Saudi Arabia	5			5
91	Senegal	2			2
92	Serbia	1			1
93	Slovakia	4			4
94	Slovenia	1			1
95	Spain	13		3	16
96	Switzerland	1			1
97	Syrian Arab Republic	1			1
98	Tajikistan	3			3
99	Togo	1			1
100	Tonga	1			1
101	Turkey	14			14
102	Turkmenistan	2			2
103	Uganda	1	5		6
104	Ukraine	1	1		2
105	United Arab Emirates	6	1		7
106	Uruguay	2			2
107	Uzbekistan	6			6
108	Vanuatu	1			1
109	Venezuela	4	1		5
110	Viet Nam	9	2		11
111	Yemen	1			1
112	Zambia	2			2
113	Zimbabwe	1			1
	TOTALS	443	48	18	507

Source: Adapted from UNESCO ICH, 2017b.

<sup>1</sup> Russian Federation has an inscription inherited from the 2001 *Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity* but has not ratified the 2003 Convention.<sup>2</sup> The total excluding multinational inscriptions (more than one State Party listed as the nominator) is 429 elements (399 national, 30 multinational).

**Appendix 3 UNESCO ICH Multinational Entries on ICH Representative List as of December 2017 (1 of 2)**

ICH Representative List (UNESCO ICH, 2017b)

	Element	State Parties (Number of State Parties)
1	Aitysh/Aitys, art of improvisation	Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan (2)
2	Al-Ayyala, a traditional performing art of the Sultanate of Oman and the United Arab Emirates (UAE)	Oman, United Arab Emirates (2)
3	Al-Razfa, a traditional performing art	United Arab Emirates, Oman (2)
4	Al-Taghrooda, traditional Bedouin chanted poetry in the UAE and the Sultanate of Oman	United Arab Emirates, Oman (2)
5	Arabic coffee, a symbol of generosity	United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, Oman, Qatar (3)
6	Baltic song and dance celebrations	Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania
7	Cultural practices and expressions linked to the balafon of the Senufo communities of Mali, Burkina Faso and Côte d'Ivoire	Mali, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire (3)
8	Falconry, a living human heritage	United Arab Emirates, Austria, Belgium, Czechia, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Kazakhstan, Republic of Korea, Mongolia, Morocco, Pakistan, Portugal, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic (18)
9	Flatbread making and sharing culture: Lavash, Katyrma, Jupka, Yufka	Azerbaijan, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkey (5)
10	Gule Wamkulu	Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia (3)
11	Kankurang, Manding initiatory rite	Gambia, Senegal (2)
12	Language, dance and music of the Garifuna	Belize, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua (4)
13	Majlis, a cultural and social space	United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, Oman, Qatar (4)
14	Marimba music, traditional chants and dances from the Colombia South Pacific region and Esmeraldas Province of Ecuador	Colombia, Ecuador (2)
15	Mediterranean diet	Cyprus, Croatia, Spain, Greece, Italy, Morocco, Portugal (7)
16	Men' s group Colindat, Christmas-time ritual	Romania, Republic of Moldova
17	Nawrouz, Novruz, Nowrouz, Nowrouz, Nawrouz, Nauruz, Nooruz, Nowruz, Navruz, Nevruz, Nowruz, Navruz	Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, India, Iran, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan (12)
18	Oral heritage and cultural manifestations of the Zápara people	Ecuador, Peru (2)
19	Oral heritage of Gelede	Benin, Nigeria, Togo (3)
20	Practices and knowledge linked to the Imzad of the Tuareg communities of Algeria, Mali and Niger	Algeria, Mali, Niger (3)



***Appendix 3 UNESCO ICH Multinational Entries on ICH Representative List as of December 2017 (2 of 2)***

ICH Representative List (UNESCO ICH, 2017b)

	Element	State Parties (Number of State Parties)
21	Processional giants and dragons in Belgium and France	Belgium, France (2)
22	Puppetry in Slovakia and Czechia	Slovakia, Czechia (2)
23	Shashmaqom music	Uzbekistan, Tajikistan (2)
24	Summer solstice fire festivals in the Pyrenees	Andorra, Spain, France (3)
25	Tango	Argentina, Uruguay (2)
26	Traditional knowledge and skills in making Kyrgyz and Kazakh yurts (Turkic nomadic dwellings)	Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan (2)
27	Traditional wall-carpet craftsmanship in Romania and the Republic of Moldova	Romania, Moldova (2)
28	Tugging rituals and games	Cambodia, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Viet Nam (4)
29	Urtiin Duu, traditional folk long song	Mongolia, China

***Appendix 4 UNESCO ICH Multinational Entries on ICH Good Safeguarding Practices List as of December 2017***

ICH Good Safeguarding Practices List (UNESCO ICH, 2017b)

	Element	Parties	State Parties
1	Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage of Aymara communities in Bolivia, Chile and Peru	3	Bolivia, Chile, Peru (3)

***Appendix 5 State Parties with No Elements Listed (63) as of December 2017 in Alphabetical Order (UNESCO ICH, 2017e)***

State Party	Date	Marshall Islands	2015
Antigua & Barbuda	2013	Micronesia	2013
Bahamas	2014	Monaco	2007
Bahrain	2014	Montenegro	2009
Barbados	2008	Myanmar	2014
Brunei Darusalaam	2011	Nauru	2013
Cabo Verde	2016	Nepal	2010
Cameroon	2012	Netherlands	2012
Chad	2008	Palau	2011
Comoros	2013	Panama	2004
Congo	2012	Papua New Guinea	2008
Congo, Democratic Republic of	2010	Paraguay	2006
Cook Islands	2016	Poland	2011
Denmark	2009	Rwanda	2013
Djibouti	2007	Saint Kitts & Nevis	2016
Dominican Republic	2006	Saint Lucia	2007
El Salvador	2012	Saint Vincent & the Grenadines	2009
Equatorial Guinea	2010	Samoa	2013
Eritrea	2010	Sao Tome & Principe	2006
Fiji	2010	Seychelles	2005
Finland	2013	South Sudan	2016
Gabon	2004	Sri Lanka	2008
Ghana	2016	Sudan	2008
Grenada	2009	Suriname	2017
Guinea-Bissau	2016	Swaziland	2012
Haiti	2009	Sweden	2011
Iceland	2005	Tanzania	2011
Ireland	2015	Thailand	2016
Kuwait	2015	Timor-Leste	2016
Lao	2009	Trinidad & Tobago	2010
Lesotho	2008	Tunisia	2006
Malta	2017	Tuvalu	2017

**REFERENCES**

- Abungu, G., 2012. Africa's rich intangible heritage: Managing a continent's diverse resources. In: Stefano, M., Davis, P. and Corsane, G. eds. 2012, *Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage*, Suffolk: Boydell, pp.57-70.
- Alivizatou, M., 2012. The paradoxes of intangible heritage. In: Stefano, M., Davis, P. and Corsane, G. eds. 2012, *Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage*, Suffolk: Boydell, pp. 9-21.
- BBC (British Broadcasting Corporation) (2017, 12 October). Israel to join US in quitting Unesco. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.com>.
- Bowers, D. and Corsane, G., 2012. Revitalising Amerindian intangible cultural heritage in Guyana and its value for sustainable tourism. In: Stefano, M., Davis, P. and Corsane, G. eds. 2012, *Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage*, Suffolk: Boydell, pp.201-212.
- Cummins, A., 2016. Editorial. *International Journal of Intangible Heritage*, 11, pp.8-13 [pdf] Available at <[https://www.academia.edu/27376830/IJIH\\_vol.11\\_editorial\\_2016.pdf](https://www.academia.edu/27376830/IJIH_vol.11_editorial_2016.pdf)> [Accessed 17 May 2017].
- Denes, A., 2012. Acquiring the tools for safeguarding intangible heritage: Lessons from an ICH field school in Lampun, Thailand. In: Stefano, M., Davis, P. and Corsane, G. eds. 2012, *Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage*, Suffolk: Boydell, pp.165-176.
- Dixley, A., 2012. Intangible cultural heritage in Wales. In: Stefano, M., Davis, P. and Corsane, G. eds. 2012, *Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage*, Suffolk: Boydell, pp.137-148.
- EFC (European Foundation Centre), 2017. Available at <<http://www.efc.be>> [Accessed 03 December 2017].
- Forsyth, M., 2012. Do you want it gift-wrapped?: Protecting traditional knowledge in the Pacific Island countries. In: Drahos, P. and Frankel, S., eds. 2012, *Indigenous peoples' innovation: Intellectual property pathways to development*, Canberra: ANU Press, pp. 189-214 [e-book] Available at <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/j.ctt24hfgx.15.pdf>> [Accessed 16 May 2017].
- George, W., 2010. Intangible cultural heritage, ownership, copyrights, and tourism. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 4 (4), pp.376-388.
- Hennessy, K., 2012. From intangible expression to digital cultural heritage. In: Stefano, M., Davis, P. and Corsane, G. eds. 2012, *Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage*, Suffolk: Boydell, pp.33-45.
- Keitumetse, S., 2012. Conversation piece: Intangible cultural heritage in Botswana. In: Stefano, M., Davis, P. and Corsane, G. eds. 2012, *Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage*, Suffolk: Boydell, pp.149-152.
- Labadi, S., 2013. *UNESCO, Cultural heritage, and outstanding universal value: Value-based analyses of the World Heritage and Intangible Cultural Heritage Conventions*. Plymouth: AltaMira Press.
- Leader-Elliot, L. and Trimboli, D., 2012. Government and intangible heritage in Australia. In: Stefano, M., Davis, P. and Corsane, G. eds. 2012, *Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage*, Suffolk: Boydell, pp.111-124.
- Logan, B., 2009. Playing the devil's advocate: Protecting intangible cultural heritage and the Infringement of Human Rights. *Historic Environment*, 33, pp.14-18.
- MacKinnon, R., 2012. The UNESCO convention for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage and its implications for sustaining culture in Nova Scotia. In: Stefano, M., Davis, P. and Corsane, G. eds. 2012, *Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage*, Suffolk: Boydell, pp.153-161.
- Oguamanam, C., 2009. Documentation and digitization of traditional knowledge and intangible cultural knowledge: Challenges and prospects. In Toshiyuki Kono, ed., *Intangible cultural heritage and intellectual property: Cultural diversity and sustainable development*. Antwerp: Intersentia, pp.357-383. Available at: SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2296199> [Accessed 29 January 2017].

- Park, S-Y., 2013. On intangible heritage safeguarding governance: An Asia-Pacific context. Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Stefano, M., 2012. Reconfiguring the framework: Adopting an ecomuseological approach for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. In: Stefano, M., Davis, P. and Corsane, G. eds. 2012, *Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage*, Suffolk: Boydell, pp. 223-238.
- Torggler, B. and Blake, J., 2013. Evaluation of UNESCO's standard-setting work of the culture sector: 2003 Convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage [pdf] Available at <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002230/223095e.pdf> [Accessed 30 May 2017].
- UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), 2005. Masterpieces of the oral and intangible heritage of humanity [pdf] Available at <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001473/147344E.pdf> [Accessed 03 December 2017].
- UNESCO, 2010a. Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage: Excerpts of the draft summary records of the fourth session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (28 September to 2 October 2009, Abu Dhabi) [pdf] Available at <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001879/187941e.pdf> [Accessed 03 December 2017].
- UNESCO, 2010b. Report on the independent external evaluation of UNESCO [pdf] Available at <https://www.government.nl/documents/reports/2010/09/17/report-on-the-independent-external-evaluation-of-unesco> [Accessed 03 December, 2017].
- UNESCO, 2014. 37 C/4: Medium-term strategy 2014-2021 [pdf] Available at <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002278/227860e.pdf> [Accessed 12 December 2017].
- UNESCO, 2017a. UNESCO website. Available at: <http://en.unesco.org> [Accessed 03 December 2017].
- UNESCO, 2017b. Countries [online] Available at <http://en.unesco.org/countries> [Accessed 02 December 2017].
- UNESCO 2017c. Internal Oversight Service [online] Available at <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/unesco/about-us/how-we-work/accountability/internal-oversight-service/> [Accessed 03 December 2017].
- UNESCO, 2017d. Legal instruments [online] Available at [http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=13649&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=-471.html](http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13649&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=-471.html) [Accessed 03 December 2017].
- UNESCO, 2017e. UNESCO 2016 [pdf] Available at: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002480/248073e.pdf> [Accessed 12 December 2017].
- UNESCO, 2017f. UNESCO database of national cultural heritage laws [online] Available at <http://www.unesco.org/culture/natlaws/> [Accessed 03 December 2017].
- UNESCO, 2017g. UNESCO moving forward the 2030 agenda for sustainable development [pdf] Available at <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002477/247785e.pdf> [Accessed 03 December 2017].
- UNESCO ICH (Intangible Cultural Heritage), 2002. Guidelines for the establishment of human living treasures systems Available at <https://ich.unesco.org/en/convention> [Accessed 03 December 2017].
- UNESCO ICH, 2003. Convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage. Available at: <https://ich.unesco.org/en/convention> [Accessed 03 December 2017].
- UNESCO ICH, 2013a. Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage 8th Session [pdf] Available at: <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/8com> [Accessed 03 December 2017].
- UNESCO ICH, 2013b. Washoku, traditional dietary cultures of the Japanese, notably for the celebration of New Year [online] Available at: <https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/washoku-traditional-dietary-cultures-of-the-japanese-notably-for->

the-celebration-of-new-year-00869> [Accessed 03 December 2017].

UNESCO ICH, 2017a. Backlog files [online] Available at <<https://ich.unesco.org/en/backlog-files-00554>> [Accessed 02 December 2017].

UNESCO ICH, 2017b. Browse the Lists of Intangible Cultural Heritage and the Register of good safeguarding practices [online] Available at <https://ich.unesco.org/en/lists> [Accessed 03 December 2017].

UNESCO ICH, 2017c. Files under process [online] Available at <<https://ich.unesco.org/en/files-2017-under-process-00859>> [Accessed 23 May 2017].

UNESCO ICH, 2017d. Non-governmental organizations accredited to provide advisory services to the Committee [online] Available at <<https://ich.unesco.org/en/accredited-ngos-00331>> [Accessed 03 December 2017].

UNESCO ICH, 2017e. State parties to the convention for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage (2003) [online] Available at <<https://ich.unesco.org/en/states-parties-00024>> [Accessed 03 December 2017].

UNESCO ICH, 2017f. UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage [online] Available at <<https://ich.unesco.org/en>> [Accessed 03 December 2017].

UNESCO WHC (World Heritage Convention), 2017a. States Parties ratification status [online] Available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/statesparties/> [Accessed 03 December 2017].

UNESCO WHC, 2017b. World Heritage List [online] Available at <<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/>> [Accessed 03 December 2017].

## The Challenges of UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage

バートレリ・キャロライン

### [要約]

無形文化遺産の保護に関する条約は、2003年にユネスコによって採択されました。「無形文化遺産」は、生きた文化的プロセスと公演を含む。無形文化財は、無形文化遺産の代表的なリストと緊急保管が必要な無形文化遺産のリスト、無形文化遺産の保護に成功したと示されている国家プロジェクトの3つです。

2003年の条約は、加盟国にICHの保護活動を記録し、実施することに成功したものの、範囲と規模の両方が広く、ユネスコのICHの現在の枠組みとプロセスは、その使命を妨げています。ユネスコICHがより効率的かつ効果的にグローバルICHの保護目標を達成するためには、その範囲を狭め、より多くの責任を加盟国自身に渡すほうが良いかもしれません。

本書の目的は、ユネスコの無形文化遺産（ICH）リストの範囲とプロセスを検討することにより、教育科学文化機関（UNESCO）による世界無形文化遺産（ICH）の管理の課題を概観することです。

### [キーワード]

ユネスコ、無形文化遺産、世界文化遺産、無形遺産管理、グローバルマネジメント