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RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Based on

❖ analysis of subsidiary, consultative and evaluation body reports from 2009–2019

❖ research among former and current body members
  • interviews (18 respondents) – selected experts
  • qualitative survey (34 respondents) – open to all body members who wanted to participate

THANK YOU!
PURPOSE OF THE LISTING MECHANISMS

❖ all 3 lists are well-designed, complementary and serve the goals of the Convention
❖ disproportion in their use
❖ demanding nomination procedure
❖ lack of understanding concerning the purposes of USL and RGP
INFORMATION NEEDED ON...

- content, geographical and thematic balance of the RL
- effects of safeguarding elements currently inscribed on USL
- utilization of the RGP
- evaluation of positive and negative impacts of inscriptions
INSCRIPTION CRITERIA for RL and USL

- mostly adequate, reflecting principles of the Convention
- diverse interpretations

Is simplification possible (and desirable)??
U1/R1

= core criterion
= most important

U2

= no revision needed
⇒ change questions, concretize them
⇒ remove section 2 and ask Evaluation Body to decide
⇒ or...?
U3

= demanding and strict but very important

R3

⇒ Do viable and flourishing elements need safeguarding measures?
⇒ Beware of possible negative impacts following inscription!!
Who is entitled to represent the community?? (question with a cultural dimension)

How to measure the widest possible participation of communities, groups and individuals?

... and how to achieve it?
U5/R5

- technical criterion, unrelated to the nature of the element
- formal obligation

⇒ check that inventory is in conformity with Articles 11 and 12 in a different way through periodic reports in a specialized database
REGISTER OF GOOD SAFEGUARDING PRACTICES

Most extensive revision of criteria?
⇒ simplify
⇒ merge
⇒ delete

Applicability of good safeguarding practices for developing countries??
EVALUATION PROCESS

changes to the individual listing mechanisms
→→→ modifications of the evaluation process

❖ development of upstream dialogue
❖ use of external knowledge and resources
❖ annual ceiling and order of priorities
LET THE REFLECTION BEGIN!!

eva.kuminkova@gmail.com
+420 737 226 220