

DEFINITIONS AND GLOSSARIES FOR UNESCO'S 2003 CONVENTION FOR THE SAFEGUARDING OF THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE

Rieks Smeets

Former secretary of UNESCO's 2003 Convention

Heritage expert and consultant

To the memory of Misako Ohnuki*

Abstract

The 2003 Convention provides just three definitions, its Operational Directives (OD) include hardly any explicit definition and there is no authoritative list of definitions for Convention-related terms. Nevertheless, “intangible cultural heritage” (ICH) and – earlier on – “folklore” and related terms were extensively discussed at UNESCO for decades. Moreover, between 2001 and 2003, to assist the drafters of the Convention and – after 2006 – to serve implementing states’ parties and the Secretariat of the Convention, as many as six glossaries were prepared. All were concise, some were influential; none of them acquired official status. UNESCO’s sister heritage conventions enjoy higher levels of definition. The underdefined status of the Convention is not only an asset. An overview of the terms that are taken into account in the six glossaries is presented in an appendix.

Keywords: *intangible cultural heritage, definitions, glossaries, underdefinition.*

* In the early years of the century, Ms. Ohnuki, as director of the Cultural Division of the Asia/Pacific Cultural Centre for UNESCO (Tokyo), organized – and several times co-organized with UNESCO – events that helped to develop the new Convention. Later on, her action crucially contributed to its implementation in many countries in Asia and the Pacific area.

Culture Crossroads

Volume 28, 2025, <https://doi.org/10.55877/cc.vol28.614>

© Latvian Academy of Culture, Rieks Smeets

All Rights Reserved.

ISSN 2500-9974



Related conventions, WIPO

The 1972 World Heritage Convention (WHC) defines two concepts: “cultural heritage” and “natural heritage”. Its Operational Guidelines make up for that by explicitly defining a good number of terms (including “outstanding universal value”), most of which were gradually introduced as the need for them came up during the implementation of the WHC. In addition to that, the WHC website prominently presents a Glossary that provides information about world heritage, the WHC and the World Heritage Centre. At present, it contains 279 items, including an idiosyncratic definition of ICH; it was first developed in 1995/6.¹

Two recent UNESCO sister conventions include relatively large numbers of definitions. Both the 2001 *Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage* (Article 1), and the 2005 *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions* (Articles 4 and 27.3.e) present nine of them.

The Operational Guidelines of the 2005 Convention add definitions for “civil society” and “partnerships” [UNESCO 2019b] and on the website of the 2005 Convention one finds a concise *Glossary of diversity of cultural expressions-related terminology* that presents 24 terms, 8 of which are also defined in that Convention.² The 2001 Underwater Convention does not have a dedicated glossary, but the extensive and authoritative *Manual for Activities directed at Underwater Cultural Heritage* [Maarleveld (et al., eds.) 2013] explains a great deal of relevant concepts in context.

On the website of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) one finds a *Glossary of key terms related to intellectual property and genetic resources, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions*.³ The *WIPO Glossary*, which was first developed around 2012, includes definitions taken from the 2003 Convention and other UNESCO standard-setting texts. It also defines concepts that could have been but so far have not been defined in UNESCO's ICH context.

The 2003 Convention

The 2003 Convention, which was initially modelled after WHC, in its Art. 2, entitled *Definitions*, explicitly defines “intangible cultural heritage” (ICH), “safeguarding” and “states parties”, while “international cooperation” is loosely defined in Art. 19.1. Other technical terms, such as “General Assembly,” “Intergovernmental Committee,” “international assistance” or “ICH Fund”

¹ <https://whc.unesco.org/en/glossary/>; all websites referred to in this article have been accessed in October 2023.

² <https://www.unesco.org/creativity/en/glossary>

³ <https://www.wipo.int/tk/en/resources/glossary.html>

are largely clarified by information about the place reserved for them in the implementation of the Convention. By referring to the 2001 *UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity* [Stenou 2002], the 2003 Convention tacitly accepts the Declaration's definition for "culture", which fully covers ICH. Interestingly, the term "culture" does not occur in the 2003 Convention.

Crucial qualifiers such as "representative" and "urgent" in the names of the Convention's Lists, and pivotal concepts such as "elements" and "communities and groups", usually followed by "individuals" (CGI), were not defined by the drafters of the Convention. Defining CGI would not have been easy – because of divergent views of expert, divergent policies of states towards their communities, however defined, and because of time pressure. The Convention does, however, acknowledge the *important role of CGI in the production, safeguarding, maintenance and recreation* of the ICH (Preamble, 6th consideration), and in its recognition (Art. 2.1), and confirms that they *create, maintain and transmit* (Art. 15) their ICH.

The 1989 Recommendation and two programmes

In the 1970s and 1980s, UNESCO organized many meetings and prepared various texts aiming at the protection of folklore, legally and otherwise. Efforts were then made to define "folklore", later on also called "traditional or/and popular culture", for different contexts. These activities culminated in UNESCO's 1989 *Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore*, the first international legal instrument in the field. The Recommendation had a rather object-centred definition of "folklore"; "safeguarding" in its title primarily meant documenting and archiving, and protecting the interests of researchers and their outputs.

Two ICH programmes that UNESCO started in the 1990s, initially made use of the Recommendation's definition but otherwise significantly broke with its approaches. These programmes were the *Living Human Treasures (LHT) Programme* and the *Masterpieces Programme*.⁴ The latter, which was created in 1997/8, and inspired by the WH List, represented a first exercise in listing ICH internationally. Definitions for "Living Human Treasures" and "cultural spaces" were produced.

The Washington Conference

UNESCO and the Smithsonian Institution co-organized in June 1999, in Washington D.C., a major conference that concluded a worldwide evaluation

⁴ For the LHT Programme, see <https://ich.unesco.org/en/living-human-treasures>; for the *Programme of the Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity*, see <https://ich.unesco.org/en/proclamation-of-masterpieces-00103>.

of the 1989 Recommendation. The meeting took critical distance from that Recommendation [Seitel 2001a]. The Conference *inter alia* recommended studying problems of terminology and revising the Recommendation's definition. The term "folklore" was generally rejected. "Washington" also recommended the development of a new international legal instrument. Action by a number of member states followed, and, indeed, in November 1999 the Director-General (DG) of UNESCO was authorized by UNESCO's General Conference to study the feasibility of a new standard-setting instrument, and, in November 2001, to prepare a preliminary draft for a convention, to be submitted to it in 2003, for possible adoption in 2005.

Meetings and drafts

UNESCO then ordered a preliminary study [Blake 2001] and organized eight preparatory meetings, and a working group. Two preparatory expert meetings ("Turin" and "Rio") discussed the definition of ICH, further terminology, and the scope and possible approaches for the future convention. Then followed an initial drafting phase, which consisted of two small-scale meetings, denoted here SEL-1 and SEL-2. The SEL meetings worked on the basis of, respectively, Draft-1 and Draft-2, which like the following four drafts of the convention, were prepared by UNESCO. Just before SEL-2 a much-needed Glossary Meeting took place. Draft-3 (officially the First Preliminary Draft), which UNESCO prepared after SEL-2, formed the basis for the official drafting process by three sessions of an Intergovernmental Meeting of Experts (IME). In April 2003, between IME-2 and IME-3, an Intersessional Working Group was organized to speed up the drafting process.⁵ Only SEL-1 and the Working Group did not deal explicitly with terminological issues.

Overview of relevant meetings (2001–2003)

Turin Meeting – *International Round Table: Intangible Cultural Heritage, Working Definitions*; Turin, 14–17 March 2001; see [UNESCO 2001a];

Rio Meeting – *Intangible Cultural Heritage: Priority Domains for an International Convention*; Rio de Janeiro, 22–24 January 2002; see [UNESCO 2002a];

⁵ In February 2002, DG UNESCO and some member states – including Canada and France – reached a word-of-honour agreement, whereby UNESCO accepted to work towards what would become the 2005 Convention, while those states would abandon their resistance to the future 2003 Convention. At the closure of IME-2, DG Matsuura could announce that UNESCO would go for accelerated adoption of the ICH Convention (in 2003, instead of 2005).

SEL-1 – *Select Drafting Group on the first draft of an international convention for intangible cultural heritage*; Paris, 20–22 March 2002; see [UNESCO 2002c];

Glossary Meeting – *Expert meeting on Intangible Cultural Heritage – Establishment of a Glossary*; Paris, 10–12 June 2002; for the resulting glossary, see [Van Zanten 2002];

SEL-2 – *Second meeting of the select drafting group of a preliminary international convention on intangible cultural heritage*; Paris, 13–15 June 2002; see [UNESCO 2002f];

IME-1 – *First session of the Intergovernmental Meeting of Experts on the Preliminary Draft Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*; Paris, 23–27 September 2002; see [UNESCO 2002h];

IME-2 – *Second session of [...]*; Paris, 28 February–3 March 2003; see [UNESCO 2003c];

IME-3 – *Third session of [...]*; Paris, 2–14 June 2003; see [UNESCO 2003d].

Blake's study

Blake [2001: 7–11] among other things discussed terminology. The aspects of the Recommendation's definition that should be corrected were highlighted, and elements that a new definition of the Convention might have to take into account were presented. Blake [2001: 90] recommended that UNESCO organize an interdisciplinary group of experts to define ICH as to be protected under the new instrument.

The Turin Meeting (March 2001)

The Turin participants consolidated much of the outcomes of the Washington Conference that six of them had attended. Turin prepared a new definition for ICH, and *inter alia* discussed the scope and objectives of a possible future legal instrument. The meeting had a major influence on approaches and formulations that were eventually adopted for the 2003 Convention. It took distance from hierarchy-introducing approaches as applied in the Living Human Treasures and Masterpieces Programmes. The Turin outcomes were presented in an Action Plan [UNESCO 2001b: Annex 161EX/15].

Anthropologist Lourdes Arizpe, former UNESCO Assistant DG for Culture (1994–1998), insisted on understanding ICH *as a process of creation, comprising skills, enabling factors, products, meanings, impacts and economic value*. She also proposed a short list of ICH domains, with an overview of subdomains. Her proposal to consider ICH in terms of *enactments, performances and processes* found general support. Smithsonian folklorist and sociologist Peter Seitel advocated *ethical*,

collegial, equitable and mutually profitable relationships between practitioners and outsiders in safeguarding. Turin's process-centred definition is found in par. 7 of its Action Plan:

Peoples' learned processes along with the knowledge, skills and creativity that inform and are developed by them, the products they create, and the resources, spaces and other aspects of social and natural context necessary to their sustainability; these processes provide living communities with a sense of continuity with previous generations and are important to cultural identity, as well as to the safeguarding of cultural diversity and creativity of humanity.

The Action Plan also presented a set of objectives for the future legal instrument (par. 5) and recommended that international efforts to safeguard ICH *must be founded on universally accepted human rights, equity and sustainability, and on respect for all cultures that have respect for other cultures*. It further presented an indicative list of domains, as proposed by Arizpe, including *oral cultural heritage; languages; performing arts and festive events; social rituals and practices; cosmologies and knowledge systems; beliefs and practices about Nature*. "Handicrafts" and "traditional knowledge" were not included as such, since the meeting agreed with Arizpe that these, in view of their associated commercial aspects, were better left to consideration under WIPO.

The Seitel Glossary

Seitel, editor of the extensive report of the Washington Conference, in Turin presented a paper in which he, after categorizing definitions, first discussed a number of ICH-related terms "conceptually" [Seitel 2001b]. His paper ended with a Preliminary List of terms, suggested to him by UNESCO, for most of which he provided operational definitions, based on "common-sense anthropology". Seitel based himself also on what he called the *policy matrix* formed by the Washington meeting, which "established the primary importance of the agency of members of traditional cultures in the safeguarding of their own traditions" [Seitel 2001b, introduction]. The about 60 terms he discussed or defined, are presented in the annexed Overview as the first glossary developed for the 2003 Convention.

The Elche Meeting of the Masterpiece's Jury (September 2001)

After criticism at the Washington Conference and in UNESCO's Executive Board on conceptual aspects and criteria of the Masterpieces Programme, UNESCO organized an extraordinary session of the Programme's Jury [UNESCO 2001c]. The Jury was inspired by Turin outcomes: it adopted the Turin definition of ICH and considered that expressions and spaces nominated for Proclamation should

reflect the contemporary cultural and social life of the people concerned. These also had to be consistent with *the ideals of UNESCO* and the 1948 *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*.

The Jury rejected the idea of prioritizing domains of ICH; it also decided that languages as such would no longer be eligible for Proclamation, though cultural expressions closely linked to languages might be. DG Matsuura (1999–2009) at the opening of “Turin” still had mentioned language as an ICH domain in and by itself. Pressure from states unhappy with their internal linguistic diversity may have been behind UNESCO’s U-turn. Although languages are not explicitly excluded from the Convention’s definition of ICH, they are in practice only indirectly taken into account in the implementation of the Convention at the international level (cf. Art. 2.2.b). That situation may change since the list of domains in Art. 2.2 is not exhaustive.

The Rio Meeting (January 2002)

This meeting was to reflect on priority domains and orientations for the future convention; furthermore, it was informed about the Turin outcomes and the impacts of the first Proclamation of Masterpieces. For the report of the meeting see [UNESCO 2002a].

Peter Seitel [Seitel 2002] presented a paper on the scope of the term ICH, in which he advocated, among other things, that UNESCO safeguarding actions should be based on a people- and process-centred understanding of ICH. He also emphasized the importance of identifying and disseminating best safeguarding practices. Informed by Masterpieces Jury member Ralph Regenvanu, the meeting decided that in order to respect the principle of cultural diversity, no priority domains should be singled out; the future states parties should determine for themselves which domains required identification and safeguarding action.

Participants endorsed the outcomes of the Turin meeting, including its definition for ICH. They recommended that the future convention should favour a cultural approach, to avoid overlap with WIPO, and that *safeguarding should involve the identification, documentation, transmission and revitalization of different elements of the intangible cultural heritage*, thus laying the basis for the Convention’s definition of “safeguarding” [UNESCO 2002b: par. 10.iii.a]. They also recommended UNESCO to *establish a short operational glossary for the purpose of drafting an international convention on the ICH*.⁶

⁶ UNESCO had prepared the recommendations of the meeting.

The First Select Drafting Group Meeting (SEL-1, March 2002)

Small numbers of mainly legal experts participated in SEL-1 and SEL-2. Draft-1 of the incipient convention, which was presented to SEL-1, was heavily modelled after WHC. The only definition it contained was the Turin definition of ICH. In view of an imminent Glossary Meeting, SEL-1 did not dwell on terminological questions. DG Matsuura in his address emphasized that legal protection of ICH was to be left to WIPO; chair Mohammed Bedjaoui informed the meeting that the DG wished the operation of the future convention not to cover languages as such.⁷

The *White Glossary* (May 2002)

UNESCO had wanted to prepare before SEL-1 a glossary with working definitions for ICH-related terms. The preparation of an expert meeting required for that purpose did, however, not work out as planned [UNESCO 2002d: par. 33(a) of the Outline Work Plan]. In that situation Noriko Aikawa, Director of UNESCO's Intangible Heritage Section (ITH), in April 2002 asked the Dutch National Commission for UNESCO (NatCOM) whether it could organize the preparation of a set of tentative definitions that was to serve as a point of departure for a glossary meeting. The ITH Section had already been in contact with that NatCOM regarding a UNESCO initiative for the establishment of criteria for measuring language endangerment.

The NatCOM bureau agreed and organized a working group at the Social Sciences Faculty of Leiden University, on 15 May 2002. Most of the participants had assisted in several national-level discussions about ICH-related developments at UNESCO, organized by the NatCOM.⁸ The experts were provided, among other things, with Draft-1, the Seitel papers and the Turin and Rio reports. They started from tentative definitions prepared by their chair, cultural anthropologist Hans Claessen, who had been a participant in UNESCO's *Mondiacult* World Conference on Cultural Policies 20 years earlier.

The resulting 35 definitions (item 20 included two definitions) were edited by Wim van Zanten and sent to Paris (the *White Glossary*). On 6 June 2002 Paris asked whether the group could also prepare an alternative for the rather academic Turin definition, that was to consist of a list of domains, followed by a summarizing

⁷ Senior Algerian statesman and former President of the International Court of Justice chaired all preparatory meetings but the Turin meeting.

⁸ Participants included ethnologist and museum expert Mary Bouquet, cultural anthropologist Hans Claessen, ethnologist Gerard Rooijackers, ethno-musicologist Wim van Zanten (later Dutch governmental expert in IME), and – from the NatCOM – anthropologist Kees Epskamp (†), and ethno-linguist Rieks Smeets, (then Secretary of the NatCOM, author of this contribution).

definition. That, too, was organized by Van Zanten, who consulted the other experts by telephone.⁹ Their proposal, which retained much of the Turin definition, centred on “processes and practices” instead of “peoples’ learned processes that inform”. Another novel aspect of that definition that would make it to the definition of ICH as consolidated in the Convention, was the recognition of the ICH by tradition bearers themselves. UNESCO provided the *White Glossary*, as a working document, to the participants of the Glossary Meeting [UNESCO 2002e], which started on 10 June 2002.

The Glossary Meeting (June 2002) and the *Blue Glossary*

The Glossary Meeting, which was co-chaired by Wim van Zanten, was informed by extensive UNESCO documentation and the *White Glossary*, with the freshly proposed definition of ICH added to it. UNESCO once again suggested terms to be defined. The resulting *Blue Glossary* defined 34 terms, including ICH, whereby the definitions for about half of the 22 terms occurring in both *White* and *Blue*, were changed substantially. That also concerned the definition of ICH. In preliminary form the *Blue Glossary* was presented to SEL-2. After that it was edited by Wim van Zanten and, in August 2002, published by the Dutch NatCOM as a brochure, in a blue jacket [Van Zanten ed., 2002]. That version was presented to IME. Van Zanten [2004] presents theoretical and practical considerations underlying *Blue* definitions, in particular those for “ICH” and “safeguarding”.¹⁰ Blake [2006: 33] discusses the role of the *Blue Glossary*:

The Glossary, of course, remains an important tool for interpreting the terms of the Convention since many of them are defined in it. It also served as a working document for all sessions of the IGM [my “IME”, RS] and so the definitions it gives of terms used in the Convention can be understood to be those intended by the drafters.

In other words, *Blue* is a “supplementary means of interpretation” of the Convention in the sense of Article 32 of the *Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties*.

⁹ The preposition “VAN” in Dutch family names in the Netherlands is written “Van” when it is the first part of a name, and “van”, when it is not. In Flanders VAN-names in principle have stable “van” or “Van”.

¹⁰ Participants included Antonio Arantes (Brazil), Lourdes Arizpe (Mexico), Mohammed Bedjaoui (Algeria), Oskar Elschek (Slovakia), Sudha Gopalakrishnan (India), Chérif Khaznadar (France), Paul Kuruk (Ghana), Ralph Regenvanu (Vanuatu), Sompong Sucharitkul (Thailand), Wim van Zanten (Netherlands), Sue Wright (UK).

The Second Select Drafting Group Meeting (SEL-2, June 2002)

SEL-2 proposed to include definitions of “ICH” and “safeguarding” in Draft-3, and hesitated whether to attach the rest of the *Blue Glossary* to it. The *Blue* definition of ICH, which SEL-2 slightly adapted, excluded from the definition of ICH practices and representations not *consistent with generally accepted principles of human rights, equity, sustainability and mutual respect between cultural communities*. It mentioned four domains of ICH: (a) *oral expressions*, (b) *performing arts*, (c) *social practices, rituals, festive events*, (d) *knowledge and practices about nature*. It was decided to annex to Draft-3 an overview of subdomains clarifying these domains, prepared by Lourdes Arizpe for “Turin” (hereafter, the Subdomains Annex). The *Blue* definition of “safeguarding” was hardly changed either; it made it to the Convention, just extended – at IME – by “research” as a possible safeguarding measure, and by “through formal and non-formal education” after “transmission”. For Draft-3 (officially the “first preliminary draft”), which UNESCO prepared after SEL-2 as a basis for the discussions in IME, see [UNESCO 2002g].

The Intergovernmental Meeting of Experts: IME (September 2002 – June 2003)

At IME-1, according to the report [UNESCO 2002h], various delegations considered that the scope of the definition was too wide and the session agreed on hardly any issue. In view of this lack of progress – much time at IME-1 was filibustered away by the UK and other delegations that were opposed to the preparation of a new convention¹¹ – member states and NGOs were invited to send in comments on Draft-3. Comments were received from 58 states, the “African Group” and 3 NGOs; these were processed by UNESCO in a *Compilation of [1352!, RS] Amendments* [UNESCO 2003a] and a *Compilation of Comments* [UNESCO 2003b]. A fair number of the reactions dealt with the definitions included in Draft-3 and with the fate of the *Blue Glossary*.

Some countries (Belgium, China, Costa Rica, Italy, Japan) proposed to introduce a separate domain for handicrafts, or (Austria, Belgium, Costa Rica, Finland, Lithuania, Mali, Spain, UAE, Vanuatu) for languages. Japan and Turkey wrote they were strongly opposed to mentioning languages. About ten states paid attention to the status of the *Blue Glossary*, with some (Bolivia, Costa Rica, India, Uganda, Vanuatu) proposing to include it in the future convention, and others (Austria, Netherlands, Saint Lucia, Switzerland, Turkey) proposing to annex it to it. Various states criticised the proposed definition of ICH, which was said not to be clear, or not precise enough, too open, or not sufficiently open; some (for instance,

¹¹ The report of IME-1 is succinct and does not mention this.

Australia, Canada, Finland and the US) accordingly recommended organizing more debate, or meetings, to further discuss definitions.¹²

The Bolivian Glossary and an Argentinian proposal

An extraordinary reaction came from Bolivia, which contributed a list of about 55 ICH-related terms (including “ICH”) with definitions, and a list of domains with subdomains [UNESCO 2003a: Annex to Article 2, pp. 28–33]. About half of the terms included in the list were new, as compared to *Blue*. Some of these concerned rights, some tradition bearers, others tangible heritage. The definition for most of the terms also found in *Blue* (including that for “ICH”), were reproduced from *Blue*. The proposed domains and subdomains were inspired by Draft-3. Some minor differences between *Blue* and *Bolivian* definitions may be due to translations between Spanish and English. A distinction was made between “immaterial” and “intangible” cultural heritage. The *Bolivian Glossary* was not discussed at IME.

The same Annex presented a proposal by Argentina for definitions of “ICH”, “safeguarding” and “international safeguarding”. Argentina indicated that these definitions should be integrated in envisaged Art. 2 (Definitions), together with definitions for “community”, “UNESCO” and “states parties.”

IME decision

IME-2 and IME-3 continued discussing the definition of ICH. “Traditional craftsmanship” was added to the non-exhaustive list of domains¹³. Another important change was that practices, which were not compatible with certain requirements were no longer excluded from the definition of “ICH”, but would not be taken into account under the future convention, which led to the following caveat-sentence that immediately followed the definition (Art. 2.1):

For the purposes of this Convention, consideration will be given solely to such intangible cultural heritage as is compatible with existing international human rights instruments, as well as with the requirement of mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals, and of sustainable development.

¹² Australia, Canada and the US (and the UK) belonged to the eight member states that openly abstained in October 2003 when the Convention was adopted by UNESCO’s General Conference. The other four were New Zealand, Russia, Switzerland and Denmark. So far, only the last two ratified the 2003 Convention.

¹³ In the French it was the expression “les savoir-faire liés à l’artisanat traditionnel” that was added. The English and French expressions are not exactly translation equivalents. Moreover, the French expression is gender-neutral, the English one is not.

The term “sustainable development” was introduced in the Preamble by UNESCO after IME-2 – see Smeets [2023]; in the above cited caveat-sentence it came to replace earlier “sustainability”.¹⁴ Art. 2 retained its definition for “safeguarding” and IME-3 added a definition for “states parties.”

At the end of IME-3 it was decided not to include the *Blue Glossary* or the Subdomains Annex in the final draft, nor to attach them as annexes. The subdomains needed more reflection; ideas and definitions were bound to develop; the Convention was to be flexible and to cater for different visions from all regions of the world. Its interpretation should not be *immobilized*. And so, “communities” and other crucial terms remained without canonical interpretation. Annex I of IME-3’s report [UNESCO 2003d] recommended DG UNESCO to prepare a manual to assist member states in the safeguarding of the ICH, which should include in particular a glossary of terms and a non-exhaustive list of examples of intangible cultural heritage.

“States parties” defined

Art. 32, dealing with *ratification, acceptance or approval* of the Convention by states members of UNESCO, and Art. 33, dealing with *accession* by other states, were copied from WHC into Draft-1. Till IME-3 they survived the drafting process with minimal changes. Late during IME-3, Egypt and like-minded states requested that the future convention should be accessible for Palestine, which resulted – after an afternoon of negotiations backstage, led by ADG for Culture Mounir Bouchenaki (2000–2006) – to new draft Art. 2.4, 2.5 and 33.2.¹⁵ The new draft Art. 33.2 stated that the Convention would also be open to accession by territories that, *among other things, have not attained full independence*. New draft Art. 2.4, which defined “states parties”, served as referral point for new draft Art. 2.5 stating that “states parties”, *mutatis mutandis*, also refers to *the territories referred to in Article 33*. The new articles presented adaptations of Articles 26(2)(b), 2(a) and 2(b) of UNESCO’s 2001 *Underwater Heritage Convention*.¹⁶

¹⁴ Whereas “sustainable development” would be highlighted as a key term and main objective of the Convention some ten years later, for most drafters of the Convention mentioning “sustainable development” at the time had been like ticking a box – exceptions were Bénin, Brazil, Italy and Portugal, who in their post-IME-1 comments had proposed to link, in one way or another, ICH and sustainable development [UNESCO 2003a, *passim*].

¹⁵ In 2008, a Palestinian ICH was included in the Convention’s Representative List, along with 69 other “former Masterpieces”. See <https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/palestinian-hikaye-00124>.

¹⁶ Palestine did not make use of this option; it became, after decades of action, a full member of UNESCO in October 2011 and soon afterwards ratified the 2003 and other UNESCO conventions.

Intermediate expert meetings (2005–2006)

The ITH Section organized and co-organized various expert meetings between the adoption of the Convention (October 2003) and its entry into force (April 2006). In October 2004, the Section and the WH Centre, for instance, organized together with a number of Japanese counterparts, including the Asia/Pacific Cultural Centre for UNESCO (ACCU), a meeting to discuss, among other things, the need to harmonize definitions and terminologies used in the domains of tangible and intangible cultural heritage, and the relevance of the concept of “authenticity” for ICH. Par. 8 of the resulting *Yamato Declaration* [UNESCO 2004] presented a rare statement about “authenticity” and ICH:

further considering that intangible cultural heritage is constantly recreated, the term “authenticity” as applied to tangible cultural heritage is not relevant when identifying and safeguarding intangible cultural heritage.

In December 2005, an expert meeting on criteria for inscription on the Lists established by the 2003 Convention discussed in passing various expressions that were new in the ICH-arena, such as “free, prior and informed consent”, “safeguarding plan” and “sunset clause”. The experts considered that “representativeness” implied that no hierarchy should be established among elements of the ICH on the basis of their intrinsic value [UNESCO 2005, p. 5].

An expert meeting on community involvement in safeguarding ICH [UNESCO 2006a], which was co-organized between UNESCO and ACCU, *inter alia* worked on definitions for “communities, groups and individuals”. The experts decided not to consider “communities” and “groups” as equivalent and proposed the following definitions:

***Communities** are networks of people whose identity or connectedness emerges from a shared historical relationship that is rooted in the practice and transmission of, or engagement with, their ICH.*

***Groups** comprise people within or across communities who share characteristics such as skills, experience and special knowledge, and thus perform specific roles in the present and future practice, re-creation and/or transmission of their ICH as, for example, cultural custodians, practitioners or apprentices.*

The definition proposed for “individuals” followed the one for “groups: ***Individuals** are those within or across communities who share [...]*”. The terms “groups” and “individuals” did not occur yet in *Blue*, while the Tokyo definition for “communities” deviated importantly from the one in *Blue*.

The young Committee and glossaries (2006–2007)

At 1.COM (the first session of the Intergovernmental Committee; Algiers, November 2006) “[N]umerous delegations intervened to express their concern that work needed to continue to obtain good definitions and terminology adapted to ICH” [UNESCO 2006b: par. 38]. 1.COM requested the Secretariat to organize an expert meeting to further prepare the ground for further discussions in the Committee about inscription criteria for the Lists of the Convention. At that meeting (New Delhi, April 2007), some experts reportedly recommended a revision of *Blue* [UNESCO 2007a].

At the first extraordinary session of the Committee (Chengdu, May 2007) a possible revision of *Blue* was discussed at length [UNESCO 2007b]. Amidst a discussion concerning the interpretation of “revitalization”, the Secretariat (para. 66, 77) suggested the Committee it might wish to organize an expert meeting to revise *Blue*. The Gabonese and Romanian delegations then reminded about the New Delhi recommendation, which – as Romania noted – had not made it to that meeting’s report. In favour of holding a meeting or workshop for that purpose were Gabon (para. 68, 83), Estonia, France, Belgium, Algeria, Nigeria, Romania and Bolivia (para. 71–74). Brazil, recognizing that it would be desirable to reach agreement on definitions, also noted that it would be a time-consuming task (para. 76). ADG for Culture, Françoise Rivière (2006–2010) intervened, emphasizing that working on definitions should not delay the work of the Committee (para. 78). Brazil, India (wanting the Committee to be action-oriented), Japan, CAR, Syria, Nigeria (though the glossary issue should stay on the table) and UAE agreed with her (para. 79–83). France and Bolivia (par. 85, 86) still suggested that working on definitions needed not hinder the Committee, but eventually chair Ambassador Wang Xuexian (para. 91) concluded that no working group would be created (although the dialogue should continue), and with that the issue was off the table, where it has not returned.

The Keywords Glossary (2007)

The Secretariat meanwhile badly needed an updated glossary for the manual and other materials it had to develop, and also in order to be able to answer questions from states parties. New terms had come up in ICH-discourse, some *Blue* definitions had become redundant, others might need revision. The Secretariat thus convened in December 2007 an Expert meeting on Intangible Cultural Heritage Keywords [UNESCO 2007c] to supplement and revisit the *Blue* definitions.

Eight experts, three of whom (Gopalakrishnan, Khaznadar and Van Zanten) had participated in the 2002 Glossary Meeting, were requested to develop “interpretive

definitions” in relevant contexts.¹⁷ The resulting *Keywords Glossary* defined some 46 terms, 35 of which are found in the Convention, and 14 in *Blue*. The definitions developed for “communities” and “groups” were inspired by proposals made by the Tokyo 2006 expert meeting [UNESCO 2006a]:

*For the purposes of the Convention, **communities** are networks of persons who share a self-ascribed sense of connectedness and identity, anchored in the practice and transmission of their intangible cultural heritage (ICH). The concept of **indigenous community** introduces the idea of an attachment or link to a specific territory.*

***Groups** consist of persons from one or more communities who share specific characteristics such as skills, experience and knowledge in the practice and transmission of their ICH.*

After the meeting, Wim van Zanten, in consultation with the other experts, edited the glossary. In July 2008 he submitted a final version. For that version, click “Final outcomes: English/French” in [UNESCO 2007c]. The Secretariat did use the *Keywords Glossary* in subsequent years – for instance, in an information kit about the Convention that kept being updated and enlarged.¹⁸ Since the *Keywords Glossary* was developed as an internal tool for the Secretariat, it was not presented to the Committee, which could not have recognized it. It was made available on the Convention’s website only in 2019.

The Key Concepts Glossary (2010→)

Instead of a manual, the Secretariat started developing more flexible capacity-building materials to be used in world-wide training workshops on the implementation of the Convention. These materials were produced by consultants in first instance, and later organized in units and constantly adapted by the Secretariat. This has led to an ever-growing wealth of materials. Unit 3, entitled *Key Concepts in the Convention*, was first developed by Harriet Deacon and Rieks

¹⁷ The experts were Harriet Deacon (South Africa); Maria Cecilia Londres Fonseca (Brazil); Sudha Gopalakrishnan (India); Catherine Kerst (USA); Chérif Khaznadar (France); Toshiyuki Kono (Japan); Ahmed Skounti (Morocco), Wim van Zanten (Netherlands); from the Secretariat assisted: Frank Proschan, Rieks Smeets (Secretary of the Convention), David Stehl. Experts Deacon, Kono and Skounti had also participated in the above-mentioned Tokyo meeting. replace with : M. Bedjaoui, Ch. Khaznadar and T. Kono, elected in, respectively, 2006, 2008 and 2010, were the first three chairpersons of the General Assembly of the States Parties of the 2003 Convention.

¹⁸ See, for instance, <https://ich.unesco.org/en/kit>, or <https://ich.unesco.org/en/what-is-intangible-heritage-00003>

Smeets, around 2010. They made extensive use of the 2007 *Keywords Glossary*. The *Key Concepts Glossary* reminds the above-mentioned *World Heritage* and *WIPO Glossaries* by combining definitions and descriptions for a wide variety of ICH and Convention-related notions and technical terms. It has regularly been updated and enlarged by the Secretariat and has been made available to large numbers of trainees all over the world. While it is no longer updated, or referred to, it is still available on the Convention's website¹⁹ Some terms defined in the *WIPO Glossary* form a useful addition to the *Key Concepts Glossary*; these include “custodians”, “documentation”, “indigenous and local communities”, “misappropriation”, “prior informed consent”, “protection”, “sacred” and “traditional knowledge”.

The Bodies, “guardians of the spirit of the Convention”

As noted above, the dialogue in the Committee did not continue, and so various key terms of the Convention have remained undefined. On top of that, new terminology keeps appearing in the ODs. Since the early years of the Convention the advisory bodies of the Committee (Subsidiary Body, Consultative Body, and nowadays the Evaluation Body (EB)), assisted by the Secretariat, have been among the main interpreters of the Convention, and guardians of the often invoked “spirit of the Convention”. There are no reports of their meetings, which are closed. Instead, the Bodies early on started producing annual reports about their findings, which are based in the first place on discussions that take place when they evaluate nomination files and requests for financial assistance.

The Bodies so far have not felt the need to advise the Committee to return to the glossary issue. Although they have always been keen to flag *inappropriate vocabulary* used in nomination forms to characterize ICH (e.g. “authentic”, “unique”, “extraordinary”), the Bodies have kept to a casual approach towards definitions and terminology. Witness a consideration shared by the EB in its report on its work in 2019: “As such, the Lists themselves provide a definition of ICH, which is enlarged every year through new inscriptions” [UNESCO 2019a: par. 36]. In a somewhat similar vein, but more poetically, its 2015 report had stated: “At the same time, the Committee’s jurisprudence is also evolving, and thus what may once have been undefined is undefined no longer” [UNESCO 2015a: par. 23]. Instructive is also how the EB in its 2021 *Report* reveals its considerations and uncertainties around “community”:

Despite applying a broad and flexible view of diverse forms that communities may have in different societies, regions and contexts and keeping in mind that

¹⁹ For acquiring such permission, see <https://ich.unesco.org/en/capacity-building-materials>

the terms ‘community concerned’ or ‘group concerned’ are not defined in the text of the Convention, the Evaluation Body felt that some files did not clearly identify the communities, groups or individuals concerned with the nominated element. In some instances, it was necessary to ask whether government authorities could be considered part of the communities concerned [UNESCO 2021: para. 63(ii)].

The Secretariat

On the Forms-page of the website of the Convention, the Secretariat maintains Guidance Notes and Instructions which are useful tools for community members, civil servants and others who want to submit nomination files, reports or requests.²⁰ Such tools and, in particular, the instructions in the various forms they have to use, spare them the effort of analysing growing piles of EB recommendations and Committee decisions, and thus help them to some extent to find their way in the underdefined world of ICH, on condition they read English or French.²¹

The Secretariat has seldom taken the initiative to have a specific term clarified. A rare example was when it proposed at 5.COM (2010) a definition for “emergency”, in order to better guide states parties wanting to make requests for financial assistance in case of emergency. The Committee accepted that definition (Decision 5.COM 10.2 [UNESCO 2010]). Eventually, following a proposal by Brazil [UNESCO 2015b, par. 1050–1056] the definition of “emergency”, slightly modified, found its place in OD/50 in 2014.

Underdefinition: asset and liability

The low level of definition of terminology used in the Convention and in other Basic Texts was rarely discussed by Organs and Bodies of the Convention, or by the UNESCO Secretariat. For many stakeholders, however, and for the Convention, the current situation has its drawbacks. People active in ICH communities, NGOs, governmental institutions and the Organs of the Convention would be greatly served by the availability of a regularly updated and authoritative tool that would clarify, explain and/or define ICH and the terminology related to safeguarding of ICH. UNESCO’s 1972, 2001 and 2005 Conventions undeniably do better in this respect.

²⁰ See <https://ich.unesco.org/en/forms>

²¹ For example, <https://ich.unesco.org/en/overall-results-framework-00984#guidance-notes-by-indicators> (Guidance Note for periodic reporting). Till a few years ago the Secretariat also advised the use of Aide-mémoires that assisted to those who wanted to submit nominations for inscription on the Lists of the Convention; these tools are now getting outdated but have not totally disappeared. See ICH-02016_aide-mémoire-EN.doc for the Representative List and see ICH-02016_aide-mémoire-EN.doc for the Urgent Safeguarding List.

The current underdefinition also makes the Convention susceptible to hasty or ill-considered interpretations or reinterpretations, more so – for instance – than the WHC, with its higher level of definition (and its more independent advisory organisations, and stronger Committee). This can be illustrated, as follows: UNESCO could allow itself in 2013, by means of a large-scale evaluation of the implementation of the Convention that was prepared by its Internal Oversight Office [Torggler et al., 2013], to confront a hardly prepared Committee with draft decisions 5.c.1 and 5.c.2 [UNESCO 2013], that were promptly – and with only minor adaptations – adopted. This opened the way for a reinterpretation of the objectives of the Convention and for an ensuing fundamental reset of its implementation.²² The goal of that action of UNESCO, which was started under DG Irina Bokova (2009–2017), was to mobilize ICH (increasingly called “living heritage”) and the 2003 Convention to strengthen UNESCO’s long-standing quest for having culture accepted as an essential factor in UN sustainable development policies, and to buttress UNESCO’s position in the UN family. This reorientation of the Convention was consolidated through new Chapter VI of the ODs.

Appendix

Overview of terms treated in the six glossaries

The six glossaries

The about 185 terms that are defined or otherwise clarified in the six glossaries, are presented in alphabetical order in the first column of the *Overview* below. Follow from left to right six columns, one for each glossary, in chronological order. The right-most column indicates which of the terms that are treated in one or more of the glossaries, are found in the Convention. Note that the glossaries in columns 5 (*Keywords Glossary*) and 6 (*Key Concepts Glossary*) were elaborated well after the adoption of the Convention. The first four glossaries were produced in a busy two-year period (between early 2001 and early 2003) preceding that adoption. All glossaries but the *Bolivian* were elaborated at the request of UNESCO, which provided terms to be defined for the *Seitel*, the *White*, the *Blue* and the *Keywords Glossary*. All six glossaries were made available in English and French; they contain between 34 and just over 60 terms.

²² The Internal Oversight Office boldly stated that *states parties and other stakeholders* should be explained *all* [their, RS] *misconceptions regarding the purpose and use of the Representative List* and helped them by explaining that “representativeness” should be understood as *the contribution of ICH to cultural diversity worldwide* (see Torggler et al. 2013, par. 211). The Organs of the Convention apparently did not react to this incursion into their preserve.

The same noun is occasionally found in the singular in one glossary and in the plural in another. For such cases, and often also for infinitives, gerunds and verbal nouns derived from one and the same verb, only one entry was made in the first column. Otherwise, closely related terms normally are presented separately as changes in terminology merit attention. It is, for instance, interesting to note that all glossaries (but *White*) that were produced between 2001 and 2007, define “sustainability” but do not mention “sustainable development”, while the situation is the other way around in the *Key Concepts Glossary*, which was started in 2010. Or, that “Indigenous Peoples” are defined in the first two glossaries, and “Indigenous communities” in the last five (*White* has both terms). Terms occurring in all six glossaries are “communities”, “cultural space”, “ICH”, “protection”, “revitalization”, and “transmission”.

What is presented here as the *Seitel Glossary* is found scattered over different sections of the article that Peter Seitel prepared for the March 2001 Turin meeting [Seitel 2001b]. The last section of his article presents a Preliminary List of 41 terms suggested by UNESCO. Of these, 22 are provided with an operational definition in the List itself (marked in the Overview, below as L/DF – “List defines”). For definitions for the other terms in his list, Seitel refers to pages in – primarily – section 3 (Proposed conceptual definitions) and section 4 (Traditional knowledge) of his article. In the Overview these terms are marked L/RA (“List refers to article”), followed by section (S) numbers.²³ A few terms are defined both in the List and in other sections of the article. In Seitel’s article some 22 terms are discussed/defined that do not occur in the List; in the Overview these are indicated by AO (“Article Only”), followed by the relevant section (S) numbers. Terms that are just mentioned in passing by without being discussed or defined in any detail, are not taken up in the Overview – there is, of course, a grey zone here.

The *White Glossary*, which was prepared by mid-May 2002, includes 35 terms [UNESCO 2002e]. A *white* definition for ICH that was prepared by the same group of experts three weeks later (their thirty-sixth definition) could not be presented in the White Glossary. In the Overview terms defined in *White* are marked by means of the numbers (N) they were given in *White*.

The *Blue Glossary*, which was prepared by the Glossary Meeting in June 2002, defined 34 terms (including “ICH”). *Blue* was edited by Van Zanten, and published as a brochure in August 2002, by the Dutch NatCOM [Van Zanten (ed.) 2002]. The terms in *Blue* are presented in alphabetical order; they are not numbered.

²³ The article has eight sections, which are not numbered. In the *List* Seitel refers to page numbers. Since the version of Seitel’s article available on the internet has other page numbering than the unavailable original article, the autor had to fall back on section numbers.

The occurrence of a term in *Blue* – and, for that matter in the *Bolivian Glossary* and the *Key Concepts Glossary* in the Overview is marked by “+”. Appendix 1 of *Blue* presents the *white* definition of “ICH”.

The *Bolivian Glossary* was disseminated in early 2003 by UNESCO [UNESCO 2003b]. It presents, in alphabetical order, 56 unnumbered terms for inclusion in Art. 2.1 of the future convention and a small set of domains of ICH, each of them amply illustrated by subdomains, for inclusion in future Art. 2.2

The *Keywords Glossary*, which was prepared by an expert meeting that was convened by the Secretariat of the Convention in December 2007, includes about 46 terms with “interpretative” definitions, in the style of Seitel’s conceptual definitions. It was post-edited, like *White* and *Blue*, by Wim van Zanten This 15-page glossary is available at [UNESCO 2007c] under the heading *Keywords, edited version, 15 July 2008*. In the Overview for terms covered by this glossary, the numbers of the pages on which they can be found, are indicated.

The *Key Concepts Glossary* is available as Unit 3 of the *Capacity-building materials* that can be found on the website of the Convention. Initially prepared by a team of consultants, at present, it is no longer updated by the Secretariat of the Convention. The entries are presented in alphabetical order; under some of them several terms are defined. Despite its official name (*Key Concepts in the Convention*), several terms it presents, are not found in the Convention, and *vice versa*. For the Overview a mid-2016 version was used.

In the last column “Prea” (for *Preamble*) is followed by a number indicating which of the Preamble’s thirteen considerations is concerned.

Overview of terms treated in the six glossaries

	<i>Seitel</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>Blue</i>	<i>Bolivian</i>	<i>Key-words</i>	<i>Key Concepts</i>	<i>Convention</i>
<i>1989 Recommendation</i>	AO:S. 2, 4					+	Prea. 2
access					P.13		Art. 13.c.ii
actors		N.20.b					
agency			+				
agency of protection	AO:S.4						
amending the Convention						+	Art. 38
associated objects and spaces						+	cf, Art. 2.1
authenticity	L/DF				P.4	+	
awareness (raising)					P.6, 9	+	Art. 1.c, 14.1, 16.1
basic texts						+	
bearers (of tradition)	L/DF	N.19	+		P.2		
Bureau of the Committee						+	
capacity to intervene				+			
Category 2 centres						+	
code of ethics→	L/RA:S. 4, 7						
collective rights				+			
commercialization						+	
commodification	L/RA:S.4						
communities	L/RA:S.3	N.1	+	+	P.1	+	Prea. 4
communities and groups							Art. 2.1, 11.b, 14.a.ii
communities, groups and individuals						+	Prea. 6; Art. 1.b, 2.1, 15
community participation					P.1		cf. Art. 15
community rights and benefits						+ see "intellectual property"	
conservation		N.15	+	+			
consultative body						+	Art. 8.3

Continuation of the table

	<i>Seitel</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>Blue</i>	<i>Bolivian</i>	<i>Key-words</i>	<i>Key Concepts</i>	<i>Convention</i>
convention				+			
conventions recommendations, declarations						+	
creation				+			
creativity			+	+			Prea. 6, Art. 2.1
creators /creative individuals		N.20.a	+	+			
cultural community	L/RA:S.3	N.2	+	+			
cultural diversity	L/RA:S.7						Prea. 2,6; Art. 2.1, 16.1
cultural expressions	L/DF						
cultural heritage	L/DF						Prea. 7 ; Art. 2.1 ²⁴
cultural identity	L/RA: S.3, 7						
cultural process	AO:S.3						
cultural spaces	L/DF	N.34	+	+	P.14	+	Art. 2.1
culture			+	+			
custodians	L/DF	N.18	+		P.2		
custom	L/DF						
customary law	L/DF						Art. 19.2
customary practices					P.13		Art. 13.d.ii, 19.2
decontextualization						+	
to define							Art. 11.b
definition					P.11	+	
depository and collective memory (of peoples)	L/DF						
documentation			+	+	P.10	+	Art. 2.3, 13.d.ii
domains (of ICH)				+		+	Art. 2.2
dominant culture	L/RA:S.4						
education						+	Art. 2.3, 14

²⁴ "Cultural heritage" in the 2003 Convention has a wider meaning than in WHC.

Continuation of the table

	<i>Seitel</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>Blue</i>	<i>Bolivian</i>	<i>Key-words</i>	<i>Key Concepts</i>	<i>Convention</i>
electoral group						+	
elements (of ICH)						+	Art. 11.b ²⁵
emblem of the Convention						+	
empowerment	L/RA:S.8						
enhancement					P.6, 9	+	Art. 2.3, 14.a
equitable (relationships)	AO:S.4						Art. 6.1
ethical knowledge	AO:S.4						
<i>Ethical Principles</i> ²⁶						+	
ethical relationships	AO:S.4						
ethnic cultures	AO:S.3						
ethnic group		N.9					
Evaluation Body						+	
exotization	L/RA:S.4						
expression				+			Art. 2.1, 13.c.i
festive events			+	+			Art. 2.2
folklife	L/DF						
folklore	L/RA :S.4, 6	N.24					
folklorists	L/DF ; A :S.4						
folklorization	L/RA :S.4				P.4		
formal means of transmission					P.7		
free, prior and informed consent						+	
freezing					P.3		
guardians				+			
gender and ICH						+	

²⁵ The Convention uses “element” only once, and four times – with the same meaning – “items” (Art. 3.a, 17.3, 31.1, 31.2). In the Operational Directives “element” is the preferred expression; “item” is only used in relation to “former Masterpieces” – see OD/57–65.

²⁶ For the *Ethical Principles for Safeguarding ICH*, see <https://ich.unesco.org/en/ethics-and-ich-00866>

Continuation of the table

	<i>Seitel</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>Blue</i>	<i>Bolivian</i>	<i>Key-words</i>	<i>Key Concepts</i>	<i>Convention</i>
General Assembly						+	Art. 4
globalization	L/RA:S.2, 4						Prea. 4
grave threats					P.5		Prea. 4
groups					P.11		after «communities» only
holder(s)				+			
hybrid culture (creole)	AO:S.3						
identification/identify			+	+	P.11	+	Art. 2.3, 11.b, 12.1
immanent rights				+			
immaterial cultural heritage				+			
inalienable rights				+			
Indigenous		N.3					
Indigenous community		N.4	+	+	P.1	+	Prea. 6
indigenous cultures	AO:S.3						
indigenous knowledge		N.21					
Indigenous peoples	L/RA:S.4	N.6					
individual					P.1		after «communities and groups» only
informant	L/DF						
intangible cultural heritage (ICH)	AO:S.6	+ (no number)	+	+	see P.12	+	Art. 2.1 (Def.); <i>passim</i>
instrumental knowledge	AO: S.4						
intellectual property (rights)	L/DF					+	Art. 3.b
Intergovernmental Committee						+	Art. 8
international, regional, sub-regional, bilateral						+	Art. 1.c, 18.1, 19.2, 20.c

Continuation of the table

	<i>Seitel</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>Blue</i>	<i>Bolivian</i>	<i>Key-words</i>	<i>Key Concepts</i>	<i>Convention</i>
international assistance						+	Art. 22.4
international cooperation						+	Art. 19 (Def.)
instrumental knowledge	AO:S.4						
international human rights instruments						+	Prea. 1, Art. 2.1
inventories ²⁷					P.11		Art. 12.1
inventorying						+	
knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe				+		+ (see “domains”)	Art. 2.d
living cultural tradition	L/DF						
living culture		N.23					
<i>Living (Human) Treasures</i>	L/DF; L/RA:S.7					+	
local communities		N.5	+	+			
local material culture	L/DF						
local population		N.7					
maintenance/to maintain (ICH)					P.12		Art. 15
<i>Masterpieces</i>						+	Prea. 12, Art. 31
material cultural heritage				+			
mixed culture		N.27					
natural spaces					P.14		Art. 14.c
means of transmission (formal/non-formal/ informal)					P.7		
obligations (under the convention)						+	+ ²⁸

²⁷ See also <https://ich.unesco.org/en/guidance-note-on-inventorying-00966>

²⁸ See all instances of “shall” in the Convention that are followed by another infinitive than “endeavour”. For the major obligations for States Parties see Art. 11, 12, 26 and 29.

Continuation of the table

	<i>Seitel</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>Blue</i>	<i>Bolivian</i>	<i>Key-words</i>	<i>Key Concepts</i>	<i>Convention</i>
occupational practices	AO:S.3						
official culture	AO:S.3						
operational directives						+	Art. 7.e
oral expressions		N.31	+	+, +			
oral history	L/DF						
oral traditions	L/RA:S.3	N.28	+	+			
oral traditions and expressions							Art. 2.2.a
performing arts	L/DF		+	+, +			Art. 2.2.b
permanent rights				+			
places			+	+			
places of memory					P.14		Art. 14.c
popular culture		N.26	+	+			
(to) practice					P.12		Art. 2.1, 2.2.c, 2.2.d
practitioners	L/RA:S.4	N.17	+	+	P.2		Art. 21.b
preservation		N.11	+	+	P.3	+	Art. 2.3
process	AO:S.4	N.33	+	+			
products	AO:S.4.	N.32			P.12		
production (of ICH)					P.12		Prea. 6
promotion		N.14	+	+	P.9	+	Art. 2.3, 13
protection/protecting	AO:S.4	N.12	+	+, +	P.3	+	Art. 2.3, 14.c
ratification, acceptance, approval or accession						+	Art. 32, 33
recognition					P.6, 11		Art. 2.1, 14.a
reinvention/invention					P.8		
representations			+	+			Art. 2.1, 6.1
research					P.10	+	Art. 2.3, 13.c, 14.a.iii
researcher, administrator and manager			+				

Continuation of the table

	<i>Seitel</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>Blue</i>	<i>Bolivian</i>	<i>Key-words</i>	<i>Key Concepts</i>	<i>Convention</i>
respect					P.6	+	Art. 1.b, 2.1, 2.1, 14.a
revitalization	L/DF	N.13	+, +		P.8	+	Art. 2.3
revitalization/ revival (equivalent)				+, +			
revival					P.8	+	
right to be different				+			
right to control of use				+			
right to cultural diversity				+			
right to exist				+			
right to respect				+			
risks						+	
rules of procedure						+	Art. 4.3, 8.2
safeguarding	AO:S.4	N.10	+	++		+	Art. 2.3 (Def.), 11.A: 13, 19.1; <i>passim</i>
safeguarding measures					P.3, 10	+	Art. 2.3, 11.b, 17.1, 24.2
safeguarding mechanisms				+			
shared or cross- border heritage						+	
social group		N.8					
social identity	L/DF						
social practice			+	+			Art. 2.2.c
social practices, rituals and festive events				+		+ (do- mains)	Art. 2.2.c
spiritual values	L/RA:S.4						
states parties						+	Art. 2.4, 2.5, 4; <i>passim</i>
Subsidiary Body						+	
sui generis				+			
sustainability	L/DF		+	+	P.4		

Continuation of the table

	<i>Seitel</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>Blue</i>	<i>Bolivian</i>	<i>Key-words</i>	<i>Key Concepts</i>	<i>Convention</i>
sustainable development						+	Prea. 2, Art. 2.1
tangible cultural heritage				+			
threats and risks						+	
threats (of deterioration, disappearance, destruction)					P.5		Prea. 4
tradition	AO:S.3, 4, 5	N.29		+			Art. 2.2
traditional		N.30					Art. 2.2.e
traditional access					P.13		
traditional craftsmanship							Art. 2.2.e
traditional cultural heritage				+			
traditional culture	AO:S.3, 4, 5	N.25	+	+			
traditional forms of transmission					P.7		
traditional knowledge	L/RA:S. 4, 5	N.22					
traditional practices	AO:S.3, 4						
transmission	L/RA:S.3 ("transmitted")	N.16	+	+	P.7	+	Art. 2.3, 13.d.i
transmission mechanisms				+			
transnational culture	AO:S.3						
universal convention				+			
value systems	L/DF						
viability					P.4	+	Art. 2.3
viability at risk					P.5		
visibility					P.9		Art. 16.1

Bibliography

- Blake, J. (2001). *Developing a new standard-setting instrument for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage: elements for consideration*. Paris: UNESCO. Available: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000123744>
- Blake, J. (2006). *Commentary on the 2003 UNESCO Convention on the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Leicester: Institute of Art and Law.
- Maarleveld, Th., Guérin, U., Egger, B. (eds.). (2013). *Manual for Activities Directed at Underwater Cultural Heritage. Guidelines to the Annex of the UNESCO 2001 Convention*. Paris: UNESCO. Available: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000220708/PDF/220708eng.pdf.multi>
- Seitel, P. (2001a). Final Conference Report. In: Seitel, P. (ed.). *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage, Smithsonian Institution, pp. 263–306. Available: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000132327>
- Seitel, P. (2001b). *Proposed terminology for intangible cultural heritage: toward anthropological and folkloristic common sense in a global era*. Available: <https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/0529EN.pdf>
- Seitel, P. (2002). *Defining the scope of the term “Intangible Cultural Heritage”*. Available: <https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/0027EN.doc>
- Smeets, R. (2023). UNESCO, intangible heritage and sustainable development – the reorientation of a convention. In: Bortolotto, Ch., Skounti, A. (eds.). *Intangible Cultural Heritage and Sustainable Development: Inside a UNESCO Convention*. London: Routledge. (Forthcoming)
- Stenou, K. (2002). *UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity: A Vision, a Conceptual Platform, a Pool of Ideas for Implementation, a New Paradigm*. Paris: UNESCO. Available: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000127162>
- Torggler, B., Sediakina-Rivière, E., Blake, J. (consultant). (2013). *Evaluation of UNESCO’s standard-setting work of the Culture Sector. Part I: 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage; Final Report*. Paris: UNESCO. Available: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000223095>
- Zanten, W. van (ed.). (2002). *Glossaire patrimoine culturel immatériel/ Glossary Intangible Cultural Heritage*. The Hague: National Commission for UNESCO. Available: <https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/00265.pdf>
- Zanten, W. van (2004). Constructing new terminology for Intangible Cultural Heritage. *Museum International*, No. 56 (1–2), pp. 36–44. Available: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000135856>

UNESCO and Related Documents

- UNESCO. (2001a). Final report of International Round Table on 'Intangible Cultural Heritage – Working Definitions' (Turin, 14–17 March, 2001). Available: <https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/0007EN.pdf>
- UNESCO. (2001b). Action plan for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage as approved by the international experts on the occasion of the International Round Table on Intangible Cultural Heritage – Working Definitions. Annex to 161EX/15. Available: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000154011/PDF/154011eng.pdf.multi>
- UNESCO. (2001c). Final Report International Jury for the Proclamation by UNESCO of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity. Extraordinary Session, Elche: 21–23 September 2001. Available: <https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/0459EN.pdf>
- UNESCO. (2002a). Final report of the International meeting of experts Intangible Cultural Heritage: Priority domains for an international convention (Rio de Janeiro, 22–24 January 2002). Available: <https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/0007EN.pdf>
- UNESCO. (2002b). Recommendations of the International meeting of experts Intangible Cultural Heritage: Priority domains for an international convention (Rio de Janeiro, 22–24 January 2002). Available: <https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/0521EN.pdf>
- UNESCO. (2002c). Final report of the Select Drafting Group on the first draft of an international convention for intangible cultural heritage (Paris, 20–22 March 2002). Available: <https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/0007EN.pdf>
- UNESCO. (2002d). Preparation of a preliminary draft International Convention on the Intangible Cultural Heritage (Paris, 20–22 March 2002)²⁹. Available: <https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/0535EN.pdf>
- UNESCO. (2002e). Draft glossary proposed by a group of Dutch experts convened by the Bureau of the Netherlands National Commission for UNESCO³⁰. Available: <https://ich.unesco.org/en/events/second-meeting-of-the-select-drafting-group-of-a-preliminary-international-convention-on-intangible-cultural-heritage-00053>
- UNESCO. (2002f). Report of the Second Meeting of the Select Drafting Group Preliminary Draft International Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage (Paris, 13–15 June 2002). Available: <https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/0515EN.doc>
- UNESCO. (2002g). First preliminary draft of an international convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage. Paris: UNESCO, 26 July 2002. Available: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000127018>

²⁹ This working document in UNESCO documents is rarely referred to as Outline work plan for the Meeting of the “Restricted Drafting Group”. Note that in UNESCO documents the group concerned is referred to as “select drafting group” and as “restricted drafting group”.

³⁰ Here called *the White Glossary*.

- UNESCO. (2002h). Report of the First Session of the Intergovernmental Meeting of Experts on the Preliminary Draft Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (Paris: 23–27 September). Available: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000129000>
- UNESCO. (2003a). Compilation of amendments from member states concerning the convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage. Working document 5 (CLT-2002/CONF.203/3 Rev). Available: <https://ich.unesco.org/en/events/second-session-of-the-intergovernmental-meeting-of-experts-on-the-preliminary-draft-convention-for-the-safeguarding-of-the-intangible-cultural-heritage-00051>
- UNESCO. (2003b). Compilation of general comments from Member States concerning the preliminary draft Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage. Working document 7 (CLT-2003/CONF.205/5). Available: <https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/0455EN.doc>
- UNESCO. (2003c). Secretariat Report of the Second Session of the First Intergovernmental Meeting of Experts on the Preliminary Draft Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (Paris, 24 February – 1 March 2003). Available: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000130016>
- UNESCO. (2003d). Report of the Third Session of the First Intergovernmental Meeting of Experts on the Preliminary Draft Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. Available: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000153300>
- UNESCO. (2004). The Yamato Declaration on integrated approaches for safeguarding tangible and intangible cultural heritage (adopted in Nara, 22 October 2004). Available: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000137634/PDF/137634eng.pdf.multi>
- UNESCO. (2005). Report of the expert meeting on criteria for inscription on the Lists established by the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (Paris, 5–6 December 2005). Available: <https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/0003EN.pdf>
- UNESCO. (2006a). Report of the Expert Meeting on Community Involvement in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage: Towards the implementation of the 2003 Convention (Tokyo 13–15 March 2006). Available: <https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/0003EN.pdf>
- UNESCO. (2006b). Summary record of the First session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (Algiers, 18–19 November 2006). Available: <https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/0004EN.pdf>
- UNESCO. (2007a). Summary Report of the Expert Meeting on the Lists established in the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (New Delhi, 2–4 April 2007). Available: <https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/0018EN.pdf>

- UNESCO. (2007b). Summary records of the First Extraordinary Session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (Chengdu, 23–26 May 2007). Available: <https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/0025EN.pdf>
- UNESCO. (2007c). Expert Meeting on Intangible Cultural Heritage Keywords (Paris, 6–7 December 2007). Available: <https://ich.unesco.org/en/events/expert-meeting-on-intangible-cultural-heritage-keywords-00093>
- UNESCO. (2010). Decisions of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, taken at its fifth session (Nairobi, 15–19 November 2010). UNESCO: ITH-15.COM-CONF.20Decisions-EN.
- UNESCO. (2013). Decisions of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, taken at its eighth session (Baku, 2–7 December 2013). Available: <https://ich.unesco.org/en/8com>
- UNESCO. (2015a). Report of the Evaluation Body on its work in 2015. Document ITH/15/10.COM/10. Available: https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-110.COM-10_EN.doc
- UNESCO. (2015b). Summary records of the eighth session of the Committee. Document ITH/14/9.COM/4 Rev. Available: https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-110.COM-10_EN.doc
- UNESCO. (2019a). Report of the Evaluation Body on its work in 2019. Document LHE/19/14.COM/10. Available: <https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-114.COM-1EN.docx>
- UNESCO. (2019b). Basic texts of the 2005 Convention on the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions, 2019 edition. Paris: UNESCO. Available: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000370521.page=28>
- UNESCO. (2021). Report of the Evaluation Body on its work in 2021. Document LHE/21/16.COM/8. Available: <https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-216.COM-EN.docx>