Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

Collaboration

Vera Refólio

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage

The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

Contents

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

Introduction

Under the *DCHPII project — Digital Cultural Heritage: Platforms and Inventories of the Intangible*[1] — the *Map of e-Inventories of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* was published in 2017. In a preliminary analysis, it was concluded that among the 158 inventories registered in this Map, only 22 (14%) clearly announced the collaborative nature of the inventory, calling for direct participation of "Communities, Groups and Individuals" (expression hereinafter often replaced by the acronym CGIs).[2] This call referred to the submission of elements to be inscribed in the inventories and instructions for filling in the online database. With few exceptions, we did not find in these platforms references to participation in other phases of the inventory, namely in the planning, structuring and evaluation of the process.

Since the application of participatory methodologies is one of the research lines of the *DCHPII project*, and considering that CGIs' participation has a central role in the implementation of the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage (UNESCO, 2003) – i.e., in all measures of safeguards invoked in it, and not only in the inventory - the results of the Map analysis activated in the project the need to elaborate the state of art of the use of these methodologies. For this reason, a comprehensive perspective is presented in this publication, a work that addresses the issues of inventory and digital platforms, but supplants them by analysing the overall safeguarding process.

In the first chapter, based on binding legal instruments for the safeguard of Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH) — the UNESCO 2003 Convention, its Operational Directives and the Ethical Principles that guide its implementation — we present the theoretical conceptualisation which defines what is meant by "involvement of the CGIs". Among

---

[1] Financed by national funds through the *Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology - FCT Investigator Programme*.

[2] An acronym suggested by Jacobs (2017) and used from that date by several researchers in order to facilitate references to these social actors without generalizing or, as sometimes happens, without replacing the three concepts that are different from each other - "communities", "groups" and "individuals" by a single definition of "communities". Hertz comments that the expressions "community, group or, if applicable, individuals" and their "free, prior and informed consent" are referred to repetitively in the Convention and in the Operational Directives and "*no synonyms, approximations or shortcuts are in evidence*" which defines them as "*entities legitimated by the international normative framework (...) crucial not only to the conceptual scheme set forth by the ICH Convention but also to its operationalization.*" (2015: 30).

others, the concepts of "participation", "free, prior and informed consent", "communities", "groups" and "individuals" are defined and problematized.

The second chapter, dedicated to the practices, presents a review of articles that allows us to analyse the application of the participatory methodologies based in two types of *corpus*: 1) the conclusions of studies on the reports that States Parties presented to UNESCO and on the application processes to inscribed ICH elements in the World Lists; b) the conclusions of empirical studies based on specific projects - experiences of implementation of safeguard measures carried out by museums and inventory experiences carried out by different entities.

The aim was to understand whether participatory methodologies are being applied or not; whether the involvement of populations is just an unfulfilled idealistic intention or not; if it is possible to identify problems, advantages, good practices or clues that support new and more effective ICH participatory techniques.

Confronting the theory with the practices we can conclude that the CGIs' participation is emphasized in the discourses but, in practice, the real involvement is still residual. We can also identify, in the scope of ICH safeguard projects, five aspects that make this difficult to achieve: 1) excessive centrality of the States Parties in the heritagization process; 2) diversity of interpretations of the concepts; 3) deficit of information among the CGIs; 4) deficit of experience in the improvement of teams composed of different actors and 5) deficit of methods and professionals to operationalise the participation of communities, groups and individuals. After describing each of these obstacles, to finish, we will present a methodological suggestion that can be adapted to different moments of the safeguarding process, which should be understood as flexible and adaptable according to the cultural contexts.

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

1. UNESCO's 2003 Convention and the focus on the people – the concepts

In 2003 at the UNESCO's General Conference, Member States acknowledging the non-existence of a multilateral binding instrument intended for safeguarding the Intangible Cultural Heritage[3] voted for the adoption of the Convention with this purpose.[4]

The base for this decision is the fact that intangible cultural heritage is perceived to be:

- an important mainspring for dialogue and cultural diversity;
- a guarantee of sustainable development;
- undervalued (especially if compared with tangible and natural heritage);
- endangered by "*grave threats of deterioration, disappearance and destruction* (...)*, in particular owing to a lack of resources for safeguarding such heritage*" (UNESCO, 2003, Preamble);
- endangered by being subjected to the consequences of processes of globalization and social transformation (and other circumstances, such as the phenomenon of intolerance).

In that way, the answer to the question: Why adopt the 2003 Convention? Lies in the decision held by the international community to intervene and foster safeguard measures that would ensure the enhancement, diversity, sustainability and transmission of intangible culture to future generations. Oral expressions, social practices, representations and knowledge, know-how, performing arts and other popular expressions acquire a binding instrument to uphold and promote measures for their safeguard. By ratifying the Convention, States commit themselves to the implementation of processes that involve the application of such measures in their countries.

However, which safeguarding measures are referred to in the Convention?

At this point, and prior to other conceptualizations, it remains important to clarify what is meant by "heritagization process". The implementation of safeguarding measures on intangible cultural goods presupposes the establishment of heritagization processes (for this reason the Convention does not refer to "intangible cultural goods",

---

[3] Unlike other heritage forms with reference to the 1972 Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, there were only recommendations, declarations and programs that have been evaluated and weighed in order to form the basis for the creation of the 2003 UNESCO Convention (notably the UNESCO Recommendation for the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore of 1989, which was evaluated in 1999 and concluded that it was largely ignored and ineffective (Kurin, 2007; Jacobs, 2016; Van Uytsel, 2012); 2001 UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity, the Istanbul Declaration of 2002 and the Program for the Proclamation of the Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity).

[4] In October 2018, 178 countries had rectified the 2003 UNESCO Convention. In https://ich.unesco.org/en/states-parties-00024.

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

but rather to "intangible cultural heritage"). This process of deciding according to certain criteria and Operational Directives which cultural goods are likely to be recognized as heritage and, therefore, as object of safeguard measures, is always a process subjected to social, economic and political conditions and pressures. I.e., what is defined as "intangible cultural heritage" is a social construction that depends on its key players, temporality, space and the narrative that is chosen to tell. And the narrative has changed with the UNESCO Convention.

Among other issues, the current narrative distances itself from the traditionalist and classical one. Especially in Europe the concept of "intangible culture" redefines concepts such as "folklore" or "popular culture", particularly in countries where, over the last century, dictatorial and "nationalist ethnography" have left a strong legacy, and the concept of "folklore" is still associated with States and regimes that used popular culture as an instrument of acculturation, relating the idea of tradition with the nationalist movement and the concepts of "authentic", "typical" and "picturesque" (Costa, 2008, 2013; Khaznadar, 2013; Leal, 2009, 2013; Pereiro, 2006; Sousa, 2015). The Convention counteracts a perspective centred on the power of the States, on governmental bodies, on academic and scientific authority, and argues for a humanist, liberal[5] and participatory perspective.

The heritagization process of expressions of intangible culture should, therefore, be in the hands of "communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals" and not centred in the States. This is because ICH is, by definition, a "living heritage", dynamic, subject to change, mobility and flow of people, knowledge and goods, being constantly recreated in response to people's environment, to their interaction with nature, to their history and sustainability (Bortolotto, 2011; Sousa, 2015).

In short, at the core of this process should be the communities, groups and individuals since ICH is dependent on those who practice it and to safeguard is:

- to ensure the viability and sustainability of the heritage and of the CGIs who practice expressions of intangible culture.

The main aim of the Convention is thereby to maintain the "living heritage", its continued practice and its relevance to the actors involved (Blake, 2009; Kurin, 2007; Severo & Venturini, 2015).

In addition, according to the Convention, the ICH safeguard measures involve the following action (UNESCO 2003, number 3 of Article 2 and Articles 12, 13, 14, 16 and 17):

---

[5] Since it values the representations and subjective feelings of the individuals on the ICH.

- identification and enhancement of ICH;
- research, documentation and inventorying;
- preservation, protection, transmission (formal and non-formal) and its promotion;
- planning, defining tutelage, legal instruments and financing;
- development of educational programs, training, raising awareness and capacity building of the communities;
- inscription on the UNESCO World Lists - the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity and List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding.

As referred above, none of these actions will have relevance if the meaning of the tradition is lost for their practitioner communities. A particular expression of intangible culture may be valued, disseminated, documented and transmitted at the local, national, or even international level, but if its practice is not ensured then there isn't any heritage to safeguard. As stated by Kurin:

> *"If the tradition is still alive, vital and sustainable in the community, it is safeguarded. If it exists just as a documentary record of a song, a videotape of a celebration, a multi-volume monographic treatment of folk knowledge, or as ritual artifacts in the finest museums in the country, it is not safeguarded"* (2007: 12).

Thus, considering the 2003 Convention, the answer to the question: who should produce and implement the safeguard measures? It falls on the role given to communities, groups and individuals. According to Van Uytsel, it was the need to actively involve these stakeholders, positioning them in the centre of the heritagization process of the intangible culture, empowering them, that has promoted the adoption of the 2003 Convention:

> "*The final impetus for adopting a binding legal instrument (i.e., a convention) was the criticism that the existing soft law instruments did not adequately recognize the communities' proper role in the safeguarding process, being the active involvement of the communities*" (Uytsel, 2012: 1).[6]

---

[6] The author refers to criticisms on some of the instruments listed in footnote 3 of this publication, in particular the 1972 Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage and the UNESCO Recommendation for the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore of 1989.

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

1.1.   Safeguard measures and their implementation

If CGIs are central in ICH issues, it is not possible, however, to neglect that the heritagization policies and practices (processes built by different actors with different roles and different interests, but sharing a common purpose – the heritagization of cultural goods) are characterised by relationships established on a wide social network. Also regarding intangible culture, it is necessary to consider this complex network where the communities and their representatives have a central role, but where the role of States, non-governmental organizations, heritage professionals and experts, academics and international institutions, among others, also stands out. These are actors who relate to each other diversely by collaboration, conflict, tension, or consensus. In order to implement the Convention, States must necessarily acknowledge and engage this network, which is often dispersed and heterogeneous. A complex task made more difficult by the lack of experience in implementing ICH safeguard systems (Kurin 2004, 2007; Severo & Venturini, 2015; Tauschek, 2015).

It is widely known that it was the government organizations, national and supra-national which set up the conceptualization of the ICH through an *etic*[7] procedure. These institutions have defined what "regulates" the heritagization process of the intangible culture, due not to the population's claim or their democratic participation in these decisions, but because, in an interventional action, they felt that it was urgent to do so. The successful implementation of the Convention depends directly on the manner governments designate tutelages, legal instruments and funding, parallel to the liaison between heritage and other sectors - education, the arts and culture, tourism, economics or communication (Kurin, 2007). It is, however, the change of perspective which confers an innovative character to the Convention: by taking an *emic* approach, this instrument argues that the catalyst in the heritagization process should not come from the States and their institutions, but rather from the CGIs. It takes a departure from the exclusive *etic* approach that gave rise to it, and warns to the fact that external agents to the communities - scientific, technical, or administrative bodies - may incur in the error of ignoring or rejecting the subjective discourse and the meaning consigned by the actors to their own heritage (Leal, 2013; Sousa, 2015).

CGIs are the active agents of heritagization processes, so they should be the Convention's "first voice" by taking control over all stages of the process (Galla, 2008). Nonetheless, in a perspective of sustainable action and shared responsibility, CGIs

---

[7] *"… descriptions or analyses from etic standpoint are 'alien' in view, with criteria external to the system. Emic descriptions provide an internal view, with criteria chosen from within the system. They represent to us the view of one familiar with the system and who knows how to function within it himself"* (Pike, 1967: 38).

must use this agency in collaboration with administrative bodies and scientific and/or heritage organizations. In turn, the actions of these entities are briefed for collaboration, mediation, and "negotiation" with the CGIs as supporting agents, in the sense of not retaining the "exclusivity" or "authority" of the process (Costa, 2013). The administrative entities, for example, collaborate, explain, or facilitate logistics and legal procedures; and the academy, professionals, heritage institutions and NGOs inform, decode the Convention, promote the empowerment of communities or guide the processes of inventory (Hertz, 2015; Kurin, 2007; Sousa, 2015). It was in this direction that, in 2006 in Tokyo, the recommendations were drafted in the report that resulted from the expert meeting to discuss, among other subjects, the issues of involvement of communities in the safeguarding of the ICH:

> "*The practitioners and custodians of ICH must play a central role in safeguarding measures, (…) active collaboration is needed between different stakeholders (…) top-down and bottom-up approaches are equally indispensable for designing and implementing measures at the national and the international level*" (ACCU-UNESCO, 2006: 8).

It should be noted, however, that if it seems evident that duties on ICH safeguard are considered in the light of the right of freedom of practitioners and bearers – as they may not consent to the heritagization process and, ultimately, they can authorize the extinction of a particular expression (Claro, 2009; Sousa, 2015), in fact, according to the Convention, it is not so obvious who has the legitimacy to decide the future of the intangible expressions. On the one hand the CGIs may authorize, or not, its transmission and/or heritagization (depending on the attribution, or not, of meaning and relevance to a particular expression), on the other hand, in the case this practice is in danger of disappearing, the Convention frames it under a regime of urgent safeguarding, which implies a joint action between producers and specialized agents, who are scientifically and technically informed (Costa, 2008). The information about who must decide if an expression is in need or not of revitalization actions is not therefore clear, or free from interpretations (Sousa, 2015).

It will be another document that came almost 10 years after the beginning of the Convention's implementation, which would clarify this issue a little more - the document that defines the twelve Ethical Principles (EP) for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage.[8] In particular, Principle 12 assumes that ICH is the heritage of humanity, stating that:

> "*The safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage is of general interest to humanity and should therefore be undertaken through cooperation among bilateral, sub regional, regional and international parties; nevertheless, communities, groups and, where applicable, individuals should never be alienated from their own intangible cultural heritage*".

---

[8]Adopted in 2015 at the tenth session of the Intergovernmental Committee - decision 10.COM 15.a., see Annex 1.

However, the combined analysis of the 12 Ethical Principles points out, again, to the centrality of CGIs in the heritagization processes of ICH - 11 principles out of the 12 make reference to the agency of these actors. If there were any doubts concerning this subject, after the approval and publication of this document, this centrality could not be more explicit.

1.2.   Definitions of "communities", "groups" and "individuals" (CGIs)

Due to the complexity of the expression "communities, groups and individuals" the Convention, purposely, did not present any concrete conceptualization on this matter, opting to put off these settings to the implementation phase and therefore initiating a broad and complex debate on these concepts which is not always consensual. The outcome of this discussion, in particular on the concept of "communities", renders evident the following considerations (Bortolotto, 2011; Sousa, 2015; Tauschek, 2015):

- communities are complex and heterogeneous organizations, comprising different modalities, strengths and interests;
- there is no such thing as "the community", there are many ways in which "communities" organize themselves;
- communities are not "naturally" constituted and unified at their inception, their evolution or in their decisions;
- communities, as social, cultural, economic and political systems, are subject to power distribution, conflict and consensus;
- communities build and maintain identity images and representations through which they project themselves to the outside world.

Taking these aspects into account and since heritagization is a mechanism of legitimization of identity, it is appropriate not to simplify or define a superficial and idealized concept of "community". It is important to assume that this process will involve, within the communities, tensions, claims of power, dialectics and negotiations (Pereiro, 2006; Sousa, 2015).

In 2006, to guide and, to some extent, facilitate the implementation of the Convention (although not forgetting the endangerment behind the use of a single and homogeneous term) the concept of "communities" defined in Tokyo, in the abovementioned report, has been recurrently used:

- *"communities are networks of people whose sense of identity or connectedness emerges from a shared historical relationship that is rooted in the practice and transmission of, or engagement with, their ICH"* (ACCU-UNESCO, 2006: 9).

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

At this meeting, experts agreed that it would be important to include in the concept of "communities", not only the practitioners, but also a network of people whose sense of identity emerges from a shared and rooted historical relationship centred not only in the practice, but also in the transmission or in other types of involvement with their heritage.

The other two definitions of "communities" referred to with some regularity in the literature produced on ICH issues are:

- a broader definition of "heritage community": "*people who value specific aspects of cultural heritage which they wish, within the framework of public action, to sustain and transmit to future generations*" (defined in Article 2 (b) of the 2005 Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society, known as the Faro Convention);
- a more restricted definition, "community of practice": people who are directly and actively involved in the practice of intangible cultural expressions (Lave & Wenger,1991; Kurin, 2007; Severo & Venturini, 2015; Wenger, 1998).[9]

In the three definitions considered above, common terms can be identified that point to what is fundamental to consider when speaking of "communities" within the framework of the 2003 Convention: a) the collective and broad profile of the concept, referring deliberately to "people" and not to differences or delimitations, such as ethnic or territorial differences; b) the necessary relation of these people to the intangible cultural heritage (because they value, maintain or transmit it); c) the active profile of the "community" because it is involved with "its" heritage, because it "wants" to keep and transmit it or because it is dedicated to its practice. Community is not a set of "passive informants", spectators or beneficiaries of heritagization, it is the active agent of this process and d) the centrality of those who practice and transmit cultural expressions (even when the community is understood as a social network where different actors are interrelated).

The concepts of "groups" and "individuals" used in the context of the Convention are also defined in the ACCU-UNESCO document (2006: 9). In these cases, the experts decided to characterize "groups" as a set of people and "individuals" as singular persons who, within or between communities, have a direct relationship with cultural expression, such as bearers, practitioners and apprentices (which in this way can be associated with the concept of "community of practice"):

---

[9] Also associated with the concepts of "resource communities" (Fu et al., 2017) and "cultural communities" (Blake, 2009, 2015; Kurin, 2007).

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

• *"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 intangible cultural heritage as, for example, cultural custodians, practitioners or apprentices."*

• *"Individuals: are those within or across communities who have distinct skills, knowledge, experience or other characteristics, and thus perform specific roles in the present and future practice, re-creation and/or transmission of their intangible cultural heritage as, for example, cultural custodians, practitioners and, where appropriate, apprentices"* (ACCU-UNESCO, 2006: 9).

1.3. Modalities of the communities, groups and individuals' participation

As the Convention does not define the concepts of "communities", "groups" and "individuals", it also does not clarify what is meant by "participation", how it is accomplished or who represents the communities and groups in a participatory process. Considering the way in which the concept of "participation" has been disseminated in the past four decades in the context of diverse policies - community and international development, urban planning, environment, humanitarian aid, among others – it is understood that "participation" correlates to a process (for instance, consultation, counselling, debate or intervention), which, for democratic and empowering purposes, will lead the CGIs to become involved in the planning and implementation of actions with a specific aim, in this case, the safeguarding of ICH (Bakar et al., 2014; Hertz, 2015).

It is assumed that this participatory approach is at the core of the "spirit of the Convention" and without it its implementation will be unsuccessful. However, the term "participation" is only referred to three times throughout the document: once in Article 11 (b) on the identification of the expressions to undergo heritagization, where it is clarified that it is the responsibility of the States to *identify and define the various elements of the intangible cultural heritage present in its territory, with the participation of communities, groups and relevant non-governmental organizations"* (UNESCO, 2003, Article 11 (b)); twice in Article 15 devoted exclusively to "Participation of communities, groups and individuals", but it does not advise on a specific procedure, instead only suggests that:

"W*ithin the framework of its safeguarding activities of the intangible cultural heritage, each State Party shall endeavour to ensure the widest possible participation of communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals that create, maintain and transmit such heritage, and to involve them actively in its management"* (UNESCO, 2003, Article 15).

Paradoxically in this Article, the expressions "ensure" and "possible participation" seem to relieve the States of a deeper commitment to bring forward the involvement of the CGIs.

It is the document that defines the Operational Directives of the Convention, adopted in 2008 by the General Assembly of the States Parties,[10] which clarifies some more about the democratic and participatory process of community intervention in the heritagization of the intangible culture (Chapter III, (1) - "*Participation of communities, groups and, where applicable, individuals, as well as experts, centres of expertise and research institutes*"). At this point, four resolutions deserve special mention [emphasis added]:

Although not obliged, States Parties are encouraged to:

a) create a **consultative body or a coordination mechanism** whose function is to facilitate the participation of the CGIs in all stages of the ICH heritagization process;
b) develop **sub-regional and regional networks** of communities, experts, specialized centres and research institutes to develop joint approaches to ICH;

With more binding character, States Parties shall:

c) take necessary measures to raise the awareness and ensure capacity-building of CGIs, and
a) endeavour to facilitate access to the results of research carried out among CGIs, while respecting customary practices governing the access to specific aspects of such heritage.

In the Operational Directives the participation of the CGIs and their "free, prior and informed consent" furthermore appear as fundamental criteria for the inscription of elements in the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding and in the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity; for the selection of programs, projects and activities that best reflect the principles and objectives of the Convention (OD U.4, I.1; OD R.4 I.2 and OD P.5 I.3) and for awareness-raising actions that are promoted in relation to their ICH (OD 101 (b)).

To conclude, it is important to return to the 12 Ethical Principles. While they leave no doubt about the centrality of the CGIs, the importance of the active role of

---

[10] Inspired by the recommendations produced by the Experts' Meeting Report in Tokyo (ACCU-UNESCO, 2006).

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

these actors it is also explicit. On the participation issues, the Principles consubstantiate and particularize some aspects. For example, it is mentioned that:

- mutual respect and appreciation should prevail in States' interactions with CGIs (EP 3);
- the value and worth of the heritage must be defined by the CGIs and not by external judgments (EP 6);
- participation implies "*access and benefit sharing*'" (Jacobs, 2016: 80) on "*the moral and material interests resulting from such heritage, and particularly from its use, research, documentation, promotion or adaptation by members of the communities or others.*" (EP 7);
- through this participation, CGIs, national and transnational organizations "*should carefully assess the direct and indirect, short-term and long-term, potential and definitive impact of any action that may affect the viability of intangible cultural heritage or the communities who practice it*" (EP 9);
- CGIs play a central role in the identification of the threats that may affect their ICH, such as the "*decontextualization, commodification and misrepresentation of it and in deciding how to prevent and mitigate such threats.*" (EP 10);
- in this participation, which will always involve the respect for cultural diversity, "*specific attention to gender equality, youth involvement and respect for ethnic identities (…)*" (EP 11) should be given.

Theoretically, the participation of the CGIs is associated with all stages and measures of safeguarding, even with regard to the planning and definition of legal instruments and financing, since "*within the limit of available resources, the Committee may invite any public or private body (…) as well as private persons with recognized competence in the field of intangible cultural heritage (including communities, groups, and other experts) to participate in its meetings in order to sustain an interactive dialogue and consult them on specific matters*" (OD 89). In this process what seems urgent is the development of new institutions and mechanisms that operationalize the real and adequate participation of the CGIs.

In practice, these new institutions and mechanisms do not have yet significant expression in the various safeguarding measures. It is in the identification and inventory phases and in the inscriptions in World Lists that, while the definition of these mechanisms remains unclear, UNESCO has clarified more explicitly the centrality of the CGIs. Namely, concerning the inventory, UNESCO prompts it by defining several guidelines, promoting capacity-building and various debates[11] and regarding Lists'

---

[11]As an example, Inventorying Intangible Cultural Heritage (Paris, March 2005); Expert Meeting on Community Involvement in Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage: Towards the Implementation of the 2003 Convention (Tokyo, March 2006); Expert Meeting on Documenting and Archiving Intangible Cultural Heritage (Paris, January 2006) e Principles and Experiences of Drawing up ICH Inventories in Europe (Estonia, May 2007).

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

inscriptions, mainly through guidelines given by the Operational Directives. However, this information, linking the agency of these actors, rarely gives clues on how to ensure the real involvement, participation and empowerment of communities, groups and individuals. What levels of participation should be considered - consultation (information gathering, or advice)? Setting-up strategic partnerships? Or, in terms of what the "spirit of the Convention" seems to recommend, the implicated action of the CGIs, by which they are the true authors of the agendas and safeguarding plans? (Galla, 2008). Which techniques are to be use? Which material and human resources? What is the profile of professionals who can boost participatory methods? What are these methods?[12]

1.3.1 The CGIs' participation in identification and inventorying

At the phase of ICH identification, the elements to consider are those that the communities, groups or individuals "recognize" as "representative" of their culture, through a process in which they themselves attribute cultural significance to that heritage and therefore appoint it for safeguarding. The Convention thus distances itself from hierarchical processes, authorized by agents external to practitioners, who classify the cultural expressions as "unique" or "exceptional", processes characteristic of the classical approach and previous heritagization of tangible or natural assets (Blake, 2015; Kurin, 2007).

Therefore, Intangible cultural heritage is:

• What communities, groups or individuals define as such (Bortolotto 2011; Sousa, 2015; UNESCO, 2003).

It should be borne in mind, however, that the CGIs must carry out this identification in accordance with the "spirit of the Convention", that is to say, considering the criteria set forth in that document as characteristic of the intangible cultural elements susceptible of heritagization. In other words, ICH is what the CGIs decide, as long as these expressions:

---

[12]Hertz alerts that the notion of "participation" has become so widespread that "*some authors speak of it as 'the new tyranny' (Cooke and Kothari 2001), an ideology that serves to mask political interests and smooth over controversy by appealing to an unimpeachable political subject – 'the community'– and a seemingly self-executing mode of administration – 'the bottom-up approach'*" (2015: 26).

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

- are transmitted through generations;

- exist in the present day, they are "living heritage" (they are not representations of expressions that, at present, do not have any cultural and social function);

- are not removed from their original context;

- are not understood as immutable and fixed;

- are not standardized or imposed on other cultures;

- are not manipulated for commercial, political or religious purposes;

- respect human rights;

- are considered in relation to tangible and natural assets;

- provide a sense of identity and continuity;

- contribute to the promotion of the respect for cultural diversity and human creativity.

Associated with the phase of ICH identification is the research, documentation and inventory phase. Article 12 of the Convention states that "*each State Party shall draw up, in a manner geared to its own situation, one or more inventories of the intangible cultural heritage present in its territory*" (UNESCO, 2003), and all nomination for inscription in one of the two ICH World Lists must be registered on an ICH Inventory. However, specific guidelines on the method of inventory are not given. This is an open question, with governments having the possibility to define how to build this inventory. However, a fundamental condition is the involvement of CGIs in this process.

The main objectives of the inventory are the systematized registration and the organization of the knowledge produced on cultural expressions in the different domains and categories of the ICH. Information, audiovisual records and other documentation are organized in these inventories. When published, it is intended that the inventories contribute to disseminate the local, regional and/or national ICH and raise awareness about its importance. ICH inventories are understood as instruments for safeguarding, as tools or resources to systematize the knowledge elaborated according to different methods that complement each other. Inventories are not an end or an isolated methodology, they are working tools that should be easy to consult allowing bridges between synthesis data, analysis and complex studies, documentation and hypermedia resources to be established, relating intangible, tangible and natural cultural heritage (Sousa, 2015).

As mentioned above, the Convention and the Operational Directives do not clarify how to inventory with the active participation of the CGIs, but there are several UNESCO

guidelines on what to inventory and, summarizing, in this process it is important to collect information, documentation and records on:

- denomination, characterization and origin/history of the element;
- context of production (data on community, group or individual);
- territorial context (data on the local/locations, country/countries);
- temporal context (date and periodicity);
- associated expressions (intangible, tangible and natural);
- the transmission context (status, context, agents and languages);
- associated rights (description and reference to the practitioners and bearers);
- safeguarding (risks and threats, safeguarding actions);
- the teams responsible for the inventory process.

On the inventory, the group of experts meeting in 2006 in Tokyo gave advice on institutional procedures. It considered the correct identification of the ICH elements fundamental, as well as the identification of the CGIs and their representatives, the "free, prior and informed consent" to proceed with the inventory and the identification of the consequences of this process. It also recommended the implementation of agreements that ensure an ethical relationship between the different stakeholders, if possible through protocol formalization.

UNESCO also recommends that inventories should be regularly updated and, while respecting "*customary practices governing access to specific aspects*" of such heritage (OD 153), be publicly accessible, being the use of the *Web* a logical choice.

One of the difficulties seems to be the ability to involve the CGIs as suggested by the Convention, to know how they should participate in defining the inventory structure, fill it in, collect documentation and produce and direct audiovisual resources or other associated content (Bortolotto, 2013; Sousa, 2015).

Bortolotto (2013), through the analysis of the Italian reality, identifies several ways of managing this involvement:

- The community provides information to researchers during the field work;
- Civil society representatives are responsible for inventorying in collaboration with heritage professionals and local administrations, and with scientific mediation;
- The inventory is an activity of social actors without professional and scientific mediation.

Given these hypotheses, the option where the inventory gains technical and scientific legitimacy - because it implies a collaborative work, networked, validated by shared responsibility among CGIs, researchers, heritage technicians and local/regional or

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

national administrations - is the b) hypothesis. In such case, the identification of cultural expressions to be inventoried starts with the CGIs, but the communities are supported in the inventory by professionals who have the appropriate technical and scientific profiles. The other hypotheses seem less indicated for this purpose because practitioners are seen as mere informants, not being involved in the inventory program (hypothesis a); or because the process of inventorying is neither instructed nor legitimized by proper technical and scientific skills, in this way losing its meaning (hypothesis c) (Sousa, 2015).

1.3.2. The UNESCO World Lists

As referred previously, in the Operational Directives the participation of the CGIs and "their free, prior and informed consent" are mandatory criteria at various stages of the heritagization process, and in particular for the inscription of elements in the UNESCO World Lists, but as Ruddolff and Raymond (2013) explain, also about this principle, its mode of application is not clear, for it allows ambiguities and different interpretations. In the forms that States Parties must fill out to apply for an element to be inscribed in one of the two Lists, it is necessary to document this consent in field 4.b, through written, recorded or other resources, with appreciation on the diversity of evidence against standard or uniform declarations. Consent should be provided in the CGIs original language as well as in English or in French, if necessary. Ruddolff and Raymond's analysis of the consents documented in the 2011 nominations demonstrates, among other issues, that these were often given through official authorizations,[13] local and regional administrative bodies, research centres, experts and NGOs on behalf of the practitioners, not by the practitioners themselves (Ruddolff & Raymond, 2013).

That is, the forms disclose the supporting ways to document that consent, which are diverse and dependent upon the way they choose to express it, yet, it is not clear who or which representatives of the communities and groups should supply it, what kind of information should be linked to these documents and how they ensure the "free, prior and informed consent" (Blake, 2015; Ruddolff & Raymond, 2013). Is this guaranteed because the consent was produced following a referendum? Was it produced by a majority of votes or through consensus held in public sessions? By independent auditors who verified this consent? What other ways?

---

[13] The analysis of dossiers from later periods shows the recurrent resource of protocol lists with a more or less extensive set of signatures.

Principle 4 of the 12 Ethical Principles referred to above introduce a new concept to this consent stating that, besides being "free, prior and informed", it must be sustained. Without clarifying what is meant by "sustained consent", a number of interpretations can be proposed, including: as concluded at the Committee meeting which approved the 12 Ethical Principles, such as safeguarding measures and plans have to be regularly reviewed and updated, the same must be done with the consent, guaranteeing its sustainability through time (Jacobs, 2016); or we can argue that the drafting of principle 4 is inspired by the currently defended "Sustainable and Responsible Participatory Methodologies" where practitioners, citizens, NGOs, States, researchers, etc., dialogue and collaborate with transparency, common language and common purposes:

> "4. *All interactions with the communities, groups and, where applicable, individuals who create, safeguard, maintain and transmit intangible cultural heritage should be characterized by transparent collaboration, dialogue, negotiation and consultation, and contingent upon their **free, prior, sustained and informed consent**" (UNESCO, 2015, decision 10.COM 15.a) [emphasis added].

The issue that arises concerning the Lists relates to the fact that this idea of networking and collaboration between several actors, where CGIs must play a central role, besides not being evidently demonstrated, can be subverted. One of the objectives of the Lists is to highlight the importance of the ICH by drawing the attention of States, *media* and the general public to the value of this heritage and its practitioners. This recognition, at first sight, empowers the CGIs by encouraging them to maintain, transmit and safeguard ICH. The problem is that the Lists can also be used as an instrument of promotion not of the practitioners, but of the States and their governmental representatives who see the inscription of elements in the Lists as a title of honour that favours their international visibility, their privileges and power (Khaznadar, 2013; Kurin, 2007; Sousa, 2015).

The situation becomes worse when, in many countries, UNESCO Lists are mainstream. The inclusion of ICH elements in these Lists is publicly perceived as the most important aspect of the Convention, which demonstrates the weak investment in information/awareness/training/capacity-building of the CGIs on ICH issues. Even in the present-day, almost 12 years after the implementation of the Convention, when it comes to ICH, the generalized idea is to identify a cultural expression to be included in the Lists - due to the high coverage of the media, and because of the large amount of time that the Intergovernmental Committee devotes to them in their sessions, especially when compared with the time devoted to other safeguarding measures. What aggravate this situation are some of the Intergovernmental Committee decisions

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

on the Evaluation Body recommendations. In addition to being supported in the Operational Directives, these recommendations are sometimes refuted by delegates and ambassadors (Jacobs, 2016), who place diplomatic and political interests ahead of cultural interests and the Ethical Principles approved by them (Brumann, 2015). These "negotiations"[14] are declining in recent years, but they still exist and disbelieve the process of inscribing elements in the Representative List punctuating it with expressions that hardly can be recognized as ICH or considered in line with the "spirit of the Convention". If they prevail, these procedures will only damage the ICH's safeguarding purposes and will soon lose the negotiation value that diplomats have attributed to them.

While the need for an Urgent Safeguarding List is valid, one may question the meaning of the Representative List. The inclusion in the Representative List can be an advantage, but it can also be dangerous not only because of political misappropriation, but also because this inscription promotes the distinction between the ICH elements that are on the list and those that are not. In this way increasing the risk of privileging certain expressions to the detriment of others, hierarchizing or discriminating less recognized traditions (Isnart, 2013; Sousa, 2015).

---

[14] Practices that, due to UNESCO's transparency policy, are public, monitored in livestreaming and documented on the institution's website.

2. UNESCOˈs 2003 Convention and the focus on the people – the practices

Almost 12 years after the implementation of the Convention, several issues have arisen: Is the execution of safeguard measures guaranteeing the sustainability and diversity of ICH expressions? Are CGIs participating? If they do participate, in what way do they do so?

In 2011, several nominations for UNESCO's World Lists were rejected for the first time because they did not show community participation (Bortolotto, 2015) and, in 2013, the evaluation report presented by the Internal Oversight Service of UNESCO at the 8th session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Baku, Azerbaijan, concludes that the greatest challenge in the implementation of the Convention is its participation in the various moments and actions of safeguarding:

> "***Although community participation is at the heart of the 2003 Convention, it has proven to be one of the most challenging aspects in its implementation****. Community participation needs to be enhanced in many areas related to the implementation of the Convention, including in inventorying, in the elaboration of safeguarding programmes and projects, and in the preparation of nomination files*." (UNESCO, 2013, 9-10) [Emphasis in the original]

An identical result is presented by Deacon and Bortolotto (2012) in a paper included in the final report of the *First ICH-Researchers Forum: The Implementation of UNESCO's 2003 Convention*. In an analysis of more than 650 publications, the authors identified trends and gaps in Convention-related research, concluding that one of the major omissions was the research on community participation in ICH programs. The authors recommend applied research on the results of the implementation of safeguard measures, on participatory and collaborative approaches (focused on the CGIs), testing and improving the methods and techniques used, evaluating their impact on the practices, on actors and different sectors.

After the creation of binding legal instruments and the long, complex and, in our view, fruitful debate on the theoretical concepts, it seems to make sense to move to the analysis of practices and to see if the "spirit of the Convention" and the participatory approach is being applied or if the involvement is only an unfulfilled idealistic intention; to perceive if it is possible to identify experiences that enunciate difficulties, advantages, good practices or clues that sustain new and more effective modes of action.

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

With this objective, we present a review of papers whose themes are related to the application of the participatory method in ICH safeguard. Based on a bibliographical research placed on the intersection of the terms "community" and "participation" and the expression "intangible cultural heritage",[15] around 30 papers that unequivocally focused on the analysed subject were considered. At first reading, the main features of this set of papers have been identified:

a) publication dates focus on the last decade (which coincides with the implementation phase of the Convention), specially on the last 3 years (2015-2017), i.e., after evaluations and recommendations that reaffirm the need to demonstrate more clearly the involvement of CGIs in ICH issues;

b) the diversity of literary production that, on the one hand, refers to different academic and professional areas - anthropology; museological studies; sociology; politics, heritage management; new technologies and digital platforms, among others - and, on the other hand, have different geographical references, thus, different sociocultural and political contexts.[16] This aspect enriches the analysis with different perspectives, but also hinders its structuring, making it diffuse or fragmented;

c) production of papers on countries that have ratified the Convention and countries that have not ratified it (e.g., the United Kingdom, Canada and the USA);

d) studies carried out mainly on activities executed within UNESCO's framework or in the "spirit of the Convention", but also by other international organizations whose mission also covers this subject, such as the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and the European Commission.

A second approach to the papers allowed us to define the framework of analysis, a structure that is always focused on the use of participatory methodologies in safeguarding the ICH, but based on two different perspectives:

a) the conclusions of critical and analytical studies on documentation and processes presented to UNESCO - States Parties' reports and the nomination files for the inscription of ICH elements in the World Lists;

---

[15] Research carried out in libraries and repositories and/or journals published online - articles written in English, French, Portuguese and Spanish.

[16] Results that match with two conclusions presented in the study by Deacon and Bortolotto (2012), previously mentioned. The authors demonstrate a significant regional and disciplinary differentiation in the publications they analysed that relate to the 2003 Convention. The first is explained, among other aspects, by national/regional options and the respective investments in ICH research, being the question of participation of communities neglected (only with some relevance in Latin America and Australia). The second is the product of different approaches - cultural criticism (associated in particular with social and human sciences) and heritage cultural practice/management (e.g., on legislation, tourism and museological studies).

    b) the conclusions of empirical studies which, based on projects related to one or more safeguarding measures - namely identification, inventorying and/or transmission - have been promoted by diverse institutions - e.g., museums, natural parks, universities and local and regional administrations.

Perspectives which we will present below.

2.1. The CGIs' participation in the processes delivered to UNESCO

After the ratification of the 2003 UNESCO Convention, States Parties are obliged to periodically submit reports to the Committee "*on the legislative, regulatory and other measures taken for the implementation of this Convention.*" (UNESCO, 2003, Article 29). In these reports, States also provide information on the status of all ICH elements present in their territory and inscribed on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, indicating how communities, groups and individuals, as well as non-governmental organizations have participated in safeguarding those elements (OD 157).

Janet Blake (2015, 2018) reviewed the 2011-2013 cycle reports and concluded that there is a general tendency of States Parties to centralise policy-making, decision-making and actions to implement the Convention. Nonetheless, the author names some cases of decentralization that are worthy of mention since they demonstrate that, in addition to the States, there are other important and active actors, such as CGIs, but also Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), local authorities, community centres, museums, cultural associations and even the private sector. Blake specifies with the case of Brazil that created the Centres and Points of Culture to implement safeguarding plans at local level; she also speaks of the example of Flanders (Belgium) that capacitates NGOs (such as *Faro* and *Tapis Plein*) and Civil Society Organizations to work with stakeholders (local authorities, local communities and practitioners) – to safeguard their ICH; Cyprus, which grants state subsidies to communities and civil society organizations that submit proposals for safeguarding. The author highlights the "Turkish experience", a country that has established 81 administrative units as safeguarding coordinating mechanisms, emphasizing the role of local museums as important institutions to assist communities by involving them in this process of decentralization.

From the analysis of the States Parties' reports submitted to UNESCO, Blake concludes that the paradigm shift in the safeguarding of cultural heritage, introduced by the 2003 UNESCO Convention, implies a change that is still residual, but begins to reveal some participation of non-governmental entities in managing programs for specific ICH

elements. A fact that poses new challenges to governments and requires that cultural institutions, such as museums, rethink their role in a twofold manner: with regard to the heritage they hold and exhibit and with regard to the communities that created it (Blake, 2015, 2018).

With respect to the inscription of ICH elements on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, the previously mentioned Ruddolff and Raymond work (2013) also presents findings on the participation of the CGIs in the preparation of the nomination and the documentation presented to demonstrate their "free, prior and informed consent" (criterion 4). To this end, the authors have analysed the files presented for the 2011 nominations, alongside with the reports drawn up by the Evaluation Body on these files and whose recommendations inform the final decisions of the Intergovernmental Committee. Considering the 49 files submitted, they verified that the Evaluation Body presented divergent views on 45, disagreeing on the concrete demonstration of the participation of the CGIs in these processes, alleging in particular difficulties in recognizing the referenced communities and in the recognition of the signatory representatives. By achieving consensus, the Evaluation Body eventually referred to only 7 files which, given their full content, would be commendable examples for future nominations. The authors then proceeded to the analysis of these seven files considering the items that demonstrate the participation and the consent of the CGIs. They concluded that concerning these points only 3 files should be considered exemplary - Colombia, *Traditional knowledge of the jaguar shamans of Yuruparí*; Peru, *Pilgrimage to the sanctuary of the Lord of Qoyllurit'i* and Portugal, *Fado, urban popular song*.

The authors point out that the nomination processes depart from different approaches on "participation" and on the documentation to be presented to ascertain "prior, free and informed consent". In the case of files which raised doubts about the actual involvement of the CGIs, the following characteristics were mentioned:

- even when they mention the representative community, they do not always identify the diversity of the represented communities or the practitioners;
- it is not clear to what extent the signatories relate to the element of intangible culture or how they were authorized or appointed to represent the CGIs;
- files do not refer to any public consultation; do not present evidence of collaboration/relationship between local administration, NGOs, CGIs and other actors;
- demonstration of participation is usually the result of the application of bureaucratic systems by local legislative measures, meetings and documentation formalized by the local administration.

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

Conversely, in the three exemplary files they consider it possible to:

- identify the diversity and cultural dialogue among the CGIs involved;
- identify the implementation of participatory methodologies with the organization of public community meetings, workshops, debates, consultation and involvement of practitioners;
- the evidence of participation does not only involve the presentation of official documents and lists of signatures, but also the presentation of documentation and records of the declarations, testimonies, opinions, meanings and concerns of practitioners;
- the evidence of participation and consent refers to the entire nomination process - the preparation, drafting and planning of safeguarding measures - and not just the authorization for the State to submit the application.

Ruddolff and Raymond (2013) conclude that through the file's evaluation it is not possible to verify if the Convention's objective of placing the CGIs at the heart of its ICH safeguarding activities has been achieved. To address these discrepancies, they recommend:

- training and enhancement of capacity-building on informed consent and preparation of nominations for the Lists;
- revision of the nomination form in order to guarantee the description and definition of the signatories' representation, their legitimacy in the process and their relation to the ICH element;
- inclusion of consent in all safeguarding measures and in all stages of the nomination process;
- establishing accurate standards for the documentation proving the participation and consent;
- use of other resources for documentation, such as audiovisual and new media.

The question about the use of audiovisual media as a resource to evidence the active participation of CGIs is already stated in the instructions for filling in the same nomination forms for the inscription of elements on the UNESCO World Lists.[17] In these documents it is requested that the associated photographs and videos demonstrate the different aspects of the element in its current state, especially considering the role of the CGIs in their practice and transmission, avoiding the use of images and videos from archives or exclusively images of objects and landscapes. The videos must be between 5 and 10 minutes long in the original language with subtitles

---

[17] Documents *CH-01-Instructions e ICH-02-Instructions* in https://ich.unesco.org/en/forms [consulted 04/2018]

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

in English or French and the communities, groups and, if applicable, individuals should be the main protagonists. Their statements must appear in the form of first person, without depending on the voice-over narration of individuals external to the communities, and must express meanings, opinions and knowledge about the element in question. The 2011 Evaluation Body's report about the videos submitted for that cycle stated that these should not be of a promotional or touristic nature.

Also considering 2011, Van Zanten (2012), a documentary filmmaker on performing arts in Indonesia, analysed the videos of the 19 items inscribed in the Representative List and available on the UNESCO website through the institution's YouTube channel. Van Zanten wanted to see whether the videos demonstrated the current social function of the element and the involvement of the CGIs. In addition to mentioning 4 positive examples - Turkey, *Ceremonial Keşkek tradition*; Korea, *Jultagi, tightrope walking*; Belgium, *Leuven age set ritual repertoire* and Japanese, *Mibu no Hana Taue, ritual of transplanting rice in Mibu*, Hiroshima - the author was disappointed with most of the videos. He believes that audiovisual recordings, as they allow the visualization, for example, of gestures, social interactions and environments or listening to words and music, would be ideal to demonstrate the CGIs relationship with the element and how they participated in the definition of safeguarding measures, but concludes that this objective has not been achieved. Van Zanten advocates that those responsible for filming ICH expressions should use methodologies and techniques similar to those used by anthropology, with "respect for the cultural flow of time."

The author considers that a 10 minute video is adequate for the purpose - to present an audiovisual document to complement the nomination - but he emphasizes that some videos contain excessive voice-over information, which often overlaps the sound of the video. Likewise, he points out that the musical treatment is not always adequate and, on this subject, gives the example of the video presented in the nomination file of *Fado, urban popular song* of Portugal - a nomination that, as previously mentioned, Ruddolff and Raymond (2013) evaluated as an example of the demonstration of CGIs' involvement, but whose video Van Zanten considers inappropriate due to the overlap of the English translation, presented in voice-over, which does not allow one to hear the song: "*It is surprising that in the film "Fado, urban popular song of Portugal" the English voice-over and fado music sound together, almost throughout the film. There is too much spoken information at the cost of hearing the fado singing properly*" (2012: 91).

Van Zanten also highlights that in some videos the broad social context is not valued, and the social interactions of practitioners and other members of the community are absent. The author suggests that one way to improve the audiovisual representation of the elements is to subject the produced video to the appreciation of the CGIs involved

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

in the process and, with this feedback, perceive if they feel recognized in the work presented. The author suggests that the CGIs comments, which can also be filmed, may be useful in developing appropriate cultural policies.

Years later, Pietrobruno (2016) analyses the videos of inscribed elements in 2015 and available on UNESCO's YouTube channel[18] and concludes that, apart from some progress, several examples continue to use English narration and frequently the communities' voices are lost. The author also analyses the case study of the *Mevlevi Sema* ceremony, inscribed by Turkey in 2005 on the List of Masterpieces of Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity, integrated in 2008 into the Representative List, and whose official video was published in 2009. Pietrobruno adverts that the video does not fit into the "spirit of the Convention", in particular in the definition of the ICH as a "living heritage", subject to change and promoting dialogue and cultural diversity, because it seems to defend the "fixation" and "authenticity" of the practices - showing the ceremony practiced only by men dressed in a specific white attire and displayed for a male audience -, in doing so, it excludes other realities and practitioner communities, namely the execution of the ceremony by women and, as indicated in the nomination, excludes a specific community (EMAV) that introduced changes in the traditional content and format.[19] According to the author, beyond this aspect, the narrative technique applied in the video is English voice-over, not Turkish, silencing the voices of the communities and of the practitioners.

Still considering the recommendations expressed in the instructions for submitting nominations to the UNESCO World Lists, in which the audiovisual resources integrating the files should highlight the discourse and participation of the CGIs, an analysis of the videos of the 37 elements inscribed in 2016 (Sousa, 2017)[20] demonstrate that only 5 did not use the voice-over of interlocutors other than practitioners and bearers; 32 used this resource (in 21 videos 70% to 100% of the interventions are produced using the voice-over of experts or journalists as a main resource).

Since these videos do not follow UNESCO's recommendations, why are they published in the UNESCO website? Certainly, it is not because UNESCO considers them to be exemplary, but because, following a transparency policy, this organization, as it does with the entire nomination process, puts all the videos of the elements inscribed online. In the case they are understood as illustrative or evidence of the methodologies applied in those nominations, most of the audiovisual resources reveal

---

[18] In a critical appraisal of YouTube's use for hosting ICH videos, the author gives this platform a paradoxical framework - alongside essentially commercial goals, YouTube also provides a social service by allowing the widespread dissemination of these videos. She warns, however, that, depending on the quality of the videos presented, their dissemination may strengthen or restrict the expression of the CGIs and, consequently, the safeguarding of ICH.

[19] Pietrobruno (2016) reports that other videos of the ceremony, published online by institutions other than UNESCO and by the CGIs themselves, demonstrate the diversity of practitioner communities and the adaptation/evolution of practices over time.

[20] Communication *Audiovisual Formats in Ethnographic and in Intangible Cultural Heritage Research* presented at the International Conference *The Visualization of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, 20-10-2017, at the Ethnographic Museum of Slovenia in Ljubljana.

Filomena Sousa
The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

a residual participation of the CGIs, which suggests three questions: is there an incorrect approach to the video for lack of competence and lack of sensitivity to ethnographic and participatory methodologies? Through the videos, is it not possible to verify the participation of the CGIs because this involvement, in fact, does not exist? In any case, why are these videos accepted by the Secretariat, accepted by the Evaluation Body and then endorsed by the Committee?

Concluding the review of papers about the Intergovernmental Committee sessions and the processes submitted to UNESCO – State-Parties reports; nominations files for inscriptions in the World Lists and the audiovisual resources that complement these files - several authors specify that participatory governance underlying the "spirit of the 2003 Convention" is still far from being truly implemented. In addition to the conclusions already mentioned, it is also important to stress structural, political, conceptual and epistemological difficulties (Adell, 2015; Blake, 2015; Bortolloto, 2015; Deacon and Bortolotto, 2012; Kurin, 2007; Van Uytsel, 2012; Tauschek, 2015):

- the different interpretations on "forms of participation", in particular between the UNESCO Bodies, the CGIs and the National Ambassadors and Delegates representing governments in the Intergovernmental Committee;
- the traditional and strong influence of the States in the development and management of heritagization processes, with the participation of the CGIs dependent on the structure of governments, with less participation if, in a centralist approach, the State argues that the decision-making refers to issues of national sovereignty or with higher participation if, in a democratic approach, they promote the agency of other actors;
- misuse, non-transparent or merely theoretical use of the participatory paradigm (and of the cultural value of the ICH elements) for diplomatic negotiations and political, ideological and mercantilist influence;
- the traditional "authorised heritage discourse" which delivers the production of knowledge, the definition of heritage and the implementation of safeguarding measures to experts and to the academy. In this case, the participatory paradigm is devalued and often is understood as populist or based on a "romantic vision" of the "community" (Bauman, 2001 cf. Bortolotto, 2015: 259).
- the still restricted visibility and restricted voice given to the CGIs and NGOs in the General Assemblies of the Secretariat and in the Sessions of the Intergovernmental Committee. Usually, in these meetings of 3 and 5 working days, respectively, the ICH NGO Forum, representing the NGOs working on ICH issues, has only some minutes to make its intervention exposing its perspectives and enunciating some recommendations. In turn, CGIs only appear in these sessions or indirectly - through the display of videos and photos - or "live" to "act" in a few minutes and in a kind of "show case" for the assistance of Delegates and the media, celebrating the inscription of a specific ICH element on the UNESCO Lists.

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

2.2. The CGIs' participation in museums actions and in ICH inventory

2.2.1. Museums, ICH and Participatory Methodologies

In order to identify different approaches from different actors and institutions that promote ICH safeguarding activities and participatory methodologies, we first present the conclusions of a set of analysis about experiences carried out by museums: 1) papers review on projects carried out in Finland, Portugal, Austria, China and the United Kingdom (Bhowmik & Díaz, 2016; Carvalho, 2011, 2016; Christidis et al., 2008; Fu et al., 2017; Smith, 2009); 2) Janet Blake's work (2015, 2018), which gives examples of projects carried out in museums in Cyprus, Lithuania, Croatia, Bulgaria, Turkey, Iran and Hungary, and 3) the analysis of the reports of the *International Conference: Intangible Cultural Heritage, Museums and Participation* held in February 2018 in Palermo, under the *Intangible Cultural Heritage and Museums (IMP)* project – *Creative Europe Program* with partners in Belgium, Italy, France, Switzerland and the Netherlands.[21]

As an introduction to this subject, considering the history of museology it is worth mentioning that the enhancement of the communities' perspective fits the New Museology's approach, a movement promoted since the 80's (20th century) that raised questions about the performance of the traditional museum - centred on the experts' knowledge concerning collections and objects - and advocates for a more active, integrative and social interdisciplinary practices. A summary of the assumptions of this movement is given below (Bruno, 1996; Janeirinho, 2012; Lima, 2008; Moreira, 2008; Primo, 1999; Soares, 2008; Sousa, 2015; Vergo, 1989):

- A museology with social character that promotes participatory community action, social and territorial cohesion, holistic interpretations and sustainable development (cultural, social and economic). Museology as an instrument of citizenship and of communities' empowerment;
- The replacement of singular and authoritative discourses by the involvement and integration of visitors and their critical view (focus museology);
- New museum formats - with **diverse geometries and areas of influence,** decentralised and acting at a local level, working the surrounding cultural and social context. For example, ecomuseums, community museums and economuseums;

---

[21] For analysis purposes were considered the various communications, the Conference Report and the Experts' Meeting Report, which took place on the same occasion (including the presentation of 20 projects developed by museums, the testimony of 4 practitioners and the result of 6 working groups). https://www.ichandmuseums.eu/en/reports/it-international-conference-participation [Accessed June 2018].

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

- The enhancement of intangible cultural heritage, "living culture" and collective and social memory (and inclusion of these elements in museums' collections);
- Communities' democratization and responsibility regarding heritage protection and safeguarding;
- Museology that uses technological resources in exhibition spaces and is also present online. For example, digital museums, virtual museums and total virtual museums (with existence confined to the internet, without physical space).

Regarding the centrality of museums in organizing and promoting participatory approaches and methods for ICH safeguarding, Blake (2015, 2018), through the aforementioned analysis of the 41 reports submitted to UNESCO by the States Parties in the 2011-2013 cycle, identifies initiatives already adopted by museums and others to be implemented:

- Assume the centrality of "local museums" in ICH safeguarding, in cooperation with the CGIs;
- Educational, social and spatial capacity-building actions:
  - training courses in ICH management and inventory;
  - establishment of documentation centres in local museums and cultural centres, making this documentation accessible to communities;
  - raising awareness about the social function of ICH, removing the emphasis on the documentation to highlight other safeguarding and transmission measures;
  - safeguarding actions and improvement of physical spaces necessary for the performance, practice and activation of the ICH, including the natural space and its resources;
- Promote ICH focus museums involving the practitioners by demonstrating their competencies and the expressions *in situ*.[22]

Through the analysis of the two sets of examined articles and the reports on the International Conference, we concluded that the democratic approach of the heritagization processes dominates the discourse of the museums. The projects are presented in an assertive tone and evidence the assimilation of the New Museology assumptions, in particular, the enhancement of the holistic perspective of heritage, of local museums, of ICH and community involvement in museum activities (less frequent

---

[22] In addition to the 2003 Convention, the author points out that the spirit of the movement for the democratization of the heritage paradigm is also present in the UNESCO Recommendation concerning the Protection and Promotion of Museums and Collections, their Diversity and their Role in Society (2015), in line with the growing interest in "community museums", "minority museums" and the issue of "immigrant and refugee communities", a highly topical and relevant issue, particularly in multicultural cities subject to profound social changes.

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

is the reference to the involvement of museums in community initiatives and in practices *in situ*).

There is an intrinsic attitude to the discourse that moves away from the museum as a space that privileges the material. Notwithstanding, one of the most promoted initiatives by museums, understood as a way of boosting the community participation, derives precisely from the objects themselves[23]: the invitation made to CGIs to, through objects associated with ICH (which are exhibited in the museum or are brought and donated to the museum), tell "their stories" and "their memories" regarding the use of these objects in the current context in which the expressions are performed, or by reference to a past context.[24] Hence, databases of narratives, stories and memories are built up, which in conjunction with objects, help to contextualize them and add value to them.

Other activities mentioned in the papers and involving the use of participatory methodologies correspond to exhibitions, training actions, workshops, practitioners' demonstrations, conferences, seminars, debates and some inventory projects. These Initiatives are mostly promoted in the museums' buildings, on a specific expression or crossing different expressions of intangible culture, or in relation to "new traditions" (which have not yet been transmitted generationally), connected with pop culture or contemporary art (in an effort of confrontation and/or complementarity, highlighting differences and similarities).

With reference to these initiatives, a number of positive results have been listed, in particular, the people's raising awareness of the ICH value. The practitioners who spoke at the International Conference and the feedback that museums claimed to receive from the CGIs reveal the satisfaction and understanding of these initiatives, they consider that these activities promote the visibility and social prestige of the practitioners and of the cultural expressions; they underline the importance of museums in producing knowledge about the history and evolution of the intangible heritage and they appreciate the way in which museums establish networks that lead practitioners to meet other practitioners, share experiences and connect with cultural diversity.

However, a number of recommendations on what can be improved with regard to museums action towards the implementation of the 2003 Convention and the use of participatory methodologies stand out. First, in the emphatic discourse on ICH projects there is some dispersion, even divergence, of conceptual definitions, namely in the

---

[23] Perhaps because, in this way, it is easier for heritage professionals to understand the importance of the intangible.
[24] Blake (2015, 2018) also refers to the care taken with the collection of objects associated with the elements of the ICH, this collection should not restrict the use of these objects in cultural practices and the museum should allow the communities access to the objects deposited in the collections.

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

definition of "intangible cultural heritage" or in the definitions of "participation" and "community".

Meanings attributed to ICH by museums are diverse and it is common to find projects that promoters defend as "in line with the spirit of the 2003 Convention", but do not always fit in the terms or definitions of that document. For example: a) activities carried out on expressions that are not "living heritage" which refer to representations, memories and recreations of practices that have been extinct for some time, without current cultural or social function (activities stated as working ICH but that fall in the scope of Oral History or Collective Memory); b) situations occur in which cultural expressions are removed from their original context to be presented in a showcase, a performance event inside the museum, at festivals or public shows, that devalue the locality of practices and disregard further or adjacent contexts, as well as key elements that may need to be safeguarded; c) some initiatives were undertaken to cross different types of culture and art (e.g., traditions, pop culture and contemporary art) which are carried out without being clear of their purpose or results, especially with regard to ICH safeguarding.

It seems that the fact that intangible cultural heritage is inferred not as "fixed", but subject to change (influenced by the flow and mobility of people, goods and knowledge), at times, allows misappropriations and is recommended to constantly return to the definition of the 2003 Convention to not consider everything that is "intangible" *per se* as ICH - memories, ideologies, theories, the digital, etc. (regardless of the bridges/complementarities that can be established between intangible cultural heritage and these others "intangibilities").

In the projects reviewed, the concept of community also assumes different configurations, often referring to the concept of "local community" - in the context of diversity of the actors residing in the territory covered by the action of museums; sometimes it refers to work done with local cultural associations and practitioners of ICH expressions, but not in all cases. The "community", the "visitors" or the "target audience" of the museum is not always differentiated. Rarely do museums identify themselves as part of this "community", as the definition of "heritage community" suggests (European Union, 2015), a characteristic highlighted by Jacobs (2018) at the Palermo Conference.

In certain projects, the lack of definition of what is meant by "community" and by ICH results in the diversity of interpretations concerning the meaning of the "CGI's participation". Generalizing, to present two simple examples – if, in the "spirit of the 2003 Convention", "participation" means not only but mainly safeguarding *in situ*, the support to a network of actors involved in the protection of a certain cultural

expression (highlighting the role of bearers and practitioners) and participation in a collaborative process that defines and implements a safeguard plan - it is possible to conclude: 1) when museums refer to "participation" by looking only at the way in which visitors enjoy an exhibition (associating it with modes of expository interaction or strategies to attract audiences), museums are not properly speaking of "participation" in accordance with the previous definition; 2) when museums give an example of "participation" through local community consultation on its management and programming, without mentioning initiatives related to ICH, they are talking about the civil society's participation in the activities of museums, not on the role of museums in the involvement of CGIs in ICH heritagization processes.

In reviewing the above-mentioned observations, the importance of the relationship of museums and of ICH with "space", "locality" and "temporality" is evident. Among the various dimensions to be considered is what Blake mention (2015, 2018) - museums, as institutions with physical headquarters, can provide communities with the necessary space for meeting, practicing, training, education and ICH promotion. As referred by Clifford (1997), it is possible to identify museums as "contact zones", i.e., the junction in space and time of people, geographic and historically separated before. In this "contact zone" the museum can give back what it has already received from the communities and can empower CGIs. The "contact zone" is a space where the public and the museum (belonging to the same community or different communities) can share common concerns, their divergences and aims, and may even constitute a "new community".

Nevertheless, the management of this "contact zone" raises a number of issues. Considering the examples analysed, there is a tendency for museums to overestimate the physical space of the institution, neglecting the space and time of the ICH, building a relationship more focused on the museum's management than on the safeguarding of the intangible heritage. The very presence and performance of the practitioners in the museum space, outside their own context, presupposes a produced and staged situation, risking the detachment of the interests of practitioners from the interests of the institution. Further, as already mentioned, there is also the danger of mischaracterizing the cultural expressions.

It was considering the situations mentioned above that the recommendation for the museums to promote actions in the public space (respecting the different contexts of meetings and exchanges) emerged. Yet, we may ask, how can this be done? Sometimes, also here, erroneous solutions are given - to act outside the museums, as far as ICH is concerned, does not lie in set up a fair or a set of stands in the garden or in the avenue in front of the museum with the same kind of events that are done inside the building. Such initiatives can be important to form new audiences and give more

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

visibility to heritage issues, but they do not solve the problem of the relocation of practitioners and practices.

At the Palermo Conference (2018), the discussion on "space, locality and temporality" was guided in a different direction, aligned with the "spirit of the Convention": the action of museums in ICH safeguarding must also take place where the diffusion of knowledge reaches its maximum effectiveness, i.e., in the place where the cultural expressions take place, in the space and in the daily life of the communities, respecting the aspects that characterise these expressions, their meanings, their practitioners, their calendars and their rhythms. [25]

Still on this subject, it is important to highlight the intervention of the practitioners in the same Conference. They emphasized the seriousness with which they engage in the creation, transmission and practice of popular culture; they have declared themselves available to share their knowledge and to work together with the diverse institutions for the protection of heritage. But they want to be heard, they want their aid requests and identified needs to be considered, especially when the ICH safeguard becomes an urgent matter. In particular, Alessandro Ervas' intervention (of the El Felze Association - an association for artisans who contribute to the construction of the Gondolas, in Venice) has shown that the practitioners' call is not always considered by the authorities who are responsible for the heritage issues, even under the perseverance of the Association and the support of civil society. On the question of locality, Alessandro Ervas mentioned that every craft and knowledge should be practiced *in loco*, where they are developed and transmitted, not in museums, where there is the danger of being far from their context.

From the concluding observations of the Conference, we highlight the question raised by Vito Lattanzi. He stated that if museums want to familiarise themselves with people's lives, they "need" the intangible culture. But, he pondered, does intangible heritage "need" museums? Without giving a categorical answer to this question, considering the articles and documents analysed, it is possible to perceive that practitioners recognize the value and importance of the role of museums in ICH safeguarding. However, there is a need to intensify the relationship between museums and CGIs and, in particular, between museums and practitioners and bearers of intangible cultural expressions. It becomes crucial to build up a serious relationship, amongst equals, that is long-term based and that relies on the feeling of trust and mutual respect. A relationship in favour of ICH safeguarding and in the "spirit of the Convention" (if they wish), clarifying what this means and implies.

---

[25] This was emphasized by practitioners who have participated in the Conference, in the conclusions of different working groups and in the communication made by Daniela Perco at the expert meeting
.

To close this point, we concluded that, to build an effective relationship with the CGIs, museums need to mobilize multidisciplinary teams and professionals specialized in the application of participatory methodologies - the so-called "bridge figures", mediators, facilitators, *gatekeepers, gamekeeper*, *ice-breakers*, *the cultural broker*, etc. Museums need to assume that these professionals have to be highly qualified, with competencies and profiles that are carefully defined. That is to say, they must distinguish the recruitment of museology professionals or social and human sciences professionals who have an empathic character, from the recruitment of someone with high skills in ICH and relational skills, but also theoretical, technical and methodological skills in order to promote, with success, the participation, the contact with the meanings, the feelings and the purposes of the traditional practices in the current society, promoting *in situ* and in the museum the transmission and the reinforcement of the cultural, educational, economic and social functions of the ICH.

2.2.2. The participation of CGIs in the ICH inventory

As mentioned above, neither the 2003 Convention nor the Operational Directives refer to specific methodologies regarding the registration and inventorying of intangible cultural expressions. The space and flexibility given to these processes imply, nonetheless, a fundamental condition: the CGIs' involvement. Regardless, also on this matter, the way to proceed is not explicit. The challenge relies on the development of collaborative work on several levels of the process - inventory design, collection/registry of information and knowledge production (through audiovisual resources and in other ways). It is also important to achieve a balance between the participation of communities, groups and individuals and the work informed by technical and scientific expertise, which gives legitimacy and meaning to the inventory process.

It should be noted at this point that the legal flexibility that characterizes the 2003 Convention, in spite of being a challenge and, sometimes, causing instability and discussion, is not usually interpreted as negative. Regarding the ratification decision and taking into consideration the cultural, political, financial and technical specificities of a country, a more rigid structure could be less attractive to certain States Parties (Van Uytsel, 2012). On the other hand, this flexibility allows experimentation, going forward and backward according to the achieved results, an opportunity to improve the techniques and methods in exploratory projects.

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

Based on the article review,[26] we present below some reflections on ICH inventory and CGIs' participation (projects developed in several countries). A preliminary approach to these works allowed us to perceive that the set of selected articles is divided into two distinctive groups – one group refers to the inventory process according to a broad planning, highlighting the different phases of the process, but without focusing on the production of digital platforms (even if they make use of this resource) (Barbe et al., 2015; Bakar et al., 2014; Chan, 2017; Gonzalez, 2016; Hertz, 2015; Sancho, 2014; Shankar, 2010; Wendland, 2009; VNA, 2009), and the other group that, among the various issues related to inventory, emphasizes the use of new technologies, presenting projects for the implementation of e-Inventories of ICH, with public access, free and online (Artese & Gagliardi, 2017; Giglitto, 2014; Janssens et al., 2013; Kivilaakso & Marsio, 2017; McCleery & McCleery, 2016; Orr & Thomas, 2016; Park, 2014; Rodil & Rehm, 2015; Sousa, 2015 and 2017; Tamm, 2017). The articles will be commented taking into consideration the following questions: how participatory methodologies used in inventory projects are characterised? And, in the case of projects of e-inventories, in what way were technological resources used to promote the involvement of the CGIs?

a) The CGIs and the ICH inventory - General Perspective

It is possible to describe several scenarios for different levels of CGI involvement through the inventory process:

a) **Informative/Advisory Level** - external agents define the problems to be solved and the solutions to be implemented, while considering the CGIs only as beneficiaries and informants, or even as consultants, but without the possibility of deciding or influencing the defined plan - for example, by attending information sessions, being interviewed and answering surveys or participating in focus groups. These are elementary levels of involvement;

b) **Advisory/Mobilizer basic level** - the CGIs are part of forums, councils, panels or citizens' juries, working meetings and other group dynamics. In this situation they are considered as agents in the inventory process;

c) **Mobilizer basic level** - if the collaboration materializes itself in a shared responsibility relationship, in a commitment through which they participate actively in the decisions made, the level of involvement is higher, and the CGIs present themselves as partners and co-authors of the planning. Participation increases if

---

[26] Including the introduction of the project *Vídeo nas Aldeias* (VNA) on the online site- http://videonasaldeias.org.br.

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

there is an effective implication in the various implementation phases - diagnosis, planning, action and evaluation;

e) **Mobilizer advanced level** - the ideal maximum level is achieved when the initiative of the inventory process begins with the CGIs and when, in partnership with external agents, it is the communities, groups and individuals who self-mobilize and manage the project (Adnan et al., 1992; Community Places, 2014; Pretty, 1994).

Considering the levels of involvement described above and the analysis of the projects consulted, one fact is clear: the inventory process, whether local, regional or national is, most often, initiated by governmental institutions or by international organizations (such as UNESCO and WIPO), usually in partnership with the States and academic institutions. Even when the identification of ICH elements to be inventoried is initiated by the CGIs or their representatives, even when they were consulted or participated in the definition of the process, most of the inventories are under the direct responsibility of governmental entities. The very promotion of participatory methodologies is driven above all by the commitment of States Parties to implement the 2003 Convention, that is, it is activated by the recommendations of international and national institutions and not by the motivation or requirement of the CGIs (Artese & Gagliardi, 2017; Barbe et al., 2015; Gonzalez, 2016; Herzt, 2015; Janssens et al., 2013; Kivilaakso & Marsio, 2017; Park, 2014; Shankar, 2010; Tamm, 2017; Sousa, 2017; Wendland, 2009). In conclusion, considering the promoters and the motivation it is not possible to identify a predominantly participatory system. But how can we characterize the involvement of the communities, groups and individuals when these actions are implemented? What kinds of techniques are used? What are the difficulties and the results obtained from this process?

Addressing later the details that characterise the digital and the online inventory systems, we will now approach the descriptions of the different stages of the inventory process. Hence, despite the diverse contexts and the various interpretations about what the involvement of the CGIs may be, the projects, conjoined, presented the following main stages of the participatory method: identification of the stakeholders; definition of the purpose of the involvement (why use participatory methodologies?); definition of the techniques to be applied; application of these techniques and, finally, reflection and evaluation of the process. Rarely do they mention the resources required and the long term sustainability of the project.

Regarding who the communities, groups, and individuals are, it is important not only to identify them, but also characterize them and understand what can determine their greater or lower involvement. This type of analysis is, however, scarce. Project

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

planning is often undertaken without a deeper evaluation of what might boost or hinder the participation. An example of such diagnosis is described by Bakar et al. (2014) in a case study carried out in the central and border area of Malacca,[27] which analysed the correlation between 10 socio-demographic indicators and the levels of involvement in ICH safeguarding.[28] The results showed that only gender and social origin did not influence participation levels. All other factors were significantly correlated: ethnicity - with the increasing of "acculturation and deculturation" because of migration to urban areas; mixed marriages and the widespread use of the English language (id. ibidem, 2014: 5); age - with less interested young people and the elderly population more aware; the marital status - with single respondents less involved; religion - with the prohibition of certain practices due to religious norms; geographical location - with strong cultural heterogeneity fostering ethnic enclaves in urban areas, making it difficult to get involved; degree of education - with obstacles to the adaptation of conventional knowledge to the native context and vice versa; reduced income associated with higher involvement, but also the exclusion from decision-making processes and, finally, professional occupation - with higher participation among retired, domestic and civil servants (id. ibidem, 2014).

This type of analysis at the beginning of a safeguarding plan allows for the directing of resources and energies to what most influences the levels of participation, involving those already interested and raising awareness and mobilizing those who voluntarily or involuntarily are not involved in the safeguarding of ICH.

With similar importance at the starting point of a participatory process, alongside with the identification and sociodemographic characterization of the CGIs, are the informative campaigns. The purpose of these actions is to mobilize citizens by making them aware of the importance of the ICH and its safeguarding. Following these initiatives, which relate to an elementary level of involvement, it is possible to move towards consultative activities through public sessions structured in different ways - for example in plenary, assembly or conference. These activities are advantageous as long as they, in a transparent and public procedure, address a wide range of people, provide information on the process, clarify doubts and put different actors in contact with each other. As a disadvantage is the hypothesis that affluence at these sessions is reduced and does not represent the CGIs; also public exposure can be a disadvantage, inhibiting participation or, if the session is not well-mediated, triggering conflictive situations.

---

[27] At the moment of the nomination to the World Heritage Site of the city of Malacca.

[28] *"The selected community resides in the Core Zone and Buffer Zone of the WHS. The residential areas are Morten Village, Portuguese Village, Heren and Jonker Streets and Chetty Village"* (Bakal et al., 2014: 2).

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

Two other consultation strategies are the application of surveys and the call for proposals of elements to be inventoried (usually via internet). In such cases, the action is directed at a large number of people, yet the feedback is not direct, it is carried out through an information gathering instrument such as a form to be filled out. These tools allow the collection of a large number of qualitative and/or quantitative data (which will only be useful if the questions are well structured and the results can be subject to analysis). It is also important to consider the time available for the processing of this information. Still, it is necessary to consider the low rate of response that these calls usually assume and previously design strategies that promote participation. These techniques rarely produce a sense of belonging in people, so they are recommended as part of a more comprehensive methodology that, in addition, applies engagement techniques and deeper contact with the CGIs (Community Places, 2014; European Union, 2018).

All the techniques referring only to consultation have as main disadvantage the non-involvement of CGIs in the decision-making process and in the implementation plans of these decisions. On the other hand, they usually address the general population, and the gathered information may not come from the practitioners or bearers of ICH.

As an example of the use of a participatory methodology based on consultation techniques we can present the Swiss case, in which the creation of the ICH National Inventory fell on the governments of the Cantons (Hertz, 2015). In addition to the diversity of approaches and the institutional democratic tradition of this country, Hertz considers that the "bottom-up" perspective had only been applied in three of the twenty six Cantons: in Aargau and Solothurn, through consultation with active cultural associations based in their territories and in Neuchâtel through a strategy designed by a group of experts (including the author, affiliated with the University of Neuchâtel).[29] In the latter case, the process began with an information action through a press conference followed by letters sent to the commune administrations, explaining the initiative and making a call for proposals of "living traditions" to integrate the inventory. The answers to this call were sent via website and they obtained eight proposals, of which seven were included in the National Inventory.[30]

---

[29] The author did not elaborate on the consultation techniques used in Aargau and Solothurn. She refers, however, an example of "top-down" interference in this process – out of more than a thousand elements proposed by these two Cantons for a "bi-cantonal list" this was limited by the Federal Organ of Culture to 15 and 11, respectively. This was justified by the need to "balance" the number of proposals from each Canton in the National Inventory.

[30] Throughout this process, the author emphasizes the fact that UNESCO recommendations that give the agency of the inventory process to communities, groups and individuals, identifying them as main actors, with special rights and duties, do not fit to the democratic institutions and practices actually existing in Switzerland. She points out that, below the level of the Canton, "the commune" rather than identifying itself as CGIs, is constituted by citizen associations, a system considered by the author to promote cultural democracy in a broader way. Hertz even questions the need to emphasize the role of the CGIs in the context of "living traditions". From this perspective, the disadvantage noted above, which refers to the fact that consultation processes covering a broader population are not always representative of the interests of practitioners and bearers, is devalued.

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

Turning now to activities that can be classified at a higher level of involvement, which allow participation in deliberations and decision-making, it is possible to refer, for example, citizens' juries. This technique consists of bringing together a group of citizens to represent a particular population, to debate, to deliberate and to decide on a certain subject. Citizens may consult experts on these boards to help them reach a verdict or a list of recommendations (Community Places, 2014). Barbe et al. (2015) describe a participatory inventory experience in which it was decided to create a citizens' jury system in a project carried out at the *Parc Naturel Regional des Ballons des Vosgues* (2007-2009) done in collaboration with the decentralised services of the French Ministry of Culture and set up in two areas of the park's territory, including several municipalities of Lorraine and Franche-Comte. The process was led by a Committee (representatives of the Park, of the Ministry and of the Municipalities and also members of a multidisciplinary scientific council) and it was divided into several phases: first, through an information campaign and public meetings during which the ICH elements were indicated to be inventoried;[31] then, the recruitment of the members of two jurors (selected by the Committee from the public meetings and randomly chosen by telephone), and finally the juries, without the intervention of the Committee and guided by a facilitator (hired by the Park to mediate the discussions and ensure that everyone expressed their views). The purpose of these juries was to discuss and select among the elements proposed in the public meetings, those that would be object of an inventory, examining them according to pre-defined criteria, research of information and conversations with the practitioners (Barbe et al., 2015).

The authors conclude that this process had raised in the jury a deep reflection on the complexity of the heritage, allowing them to understand it as a resource oriented towards a future benefit, far beyond what constitutes an inventory. In the end, the negative point, that damaged the credibility of the process, was the Committee's decision to not consider all the recommendations presented, annulling the jury's authority. This fact was reflected in the programs promoted later by the Park, which obtained a lower participation of citizens. The authors noted that one of the problems in this project was concerned with the conflicts that arose in the Committee - the fact that they were promoting and managing the whole process and the fragility of consensus building.

Some of the advantages and disadvantages usually identified in relation to the organization of citizens' juries have been verified in the results of this project. As advantages it is usual to mention: the involvement of a large number of people; the random selection that aims at making the process egalitarian and the construction of

---

[31] According to the authors, it was not easy to mobilize "public" for these meetings, mainly due to the difficulty in raising awareness about the importance of the theme and clarifying the concept of ICH.

collective and informed decisions through the consultation of "specialists" (who can be both academic experts and practitioners). As disadvantages: the deviation of representativeness - which depends on the way jurors are selected; the hypothesis of the practitioners and bearers not belonging to the jury, and this way, not participating actively in the decisions while being considered just mere consultants; the possibility of jury manipulation by the advisors' panel or other jurors; the high commitment and high availability that are requested of jurors and the loss of credibility of the process in case the advisors' panel or the organizing entity do not implement the recommendations or the final verdict (Community Places, 2014).

On activities involving an even higher level of participation, we report, as an example, actions and capacity-building workshops designed to, from the perspective of social intervention and action research, enable participants with skills, tools and autonomy to initiate and develop project registration and ICH inventory. There are several projects that have promoted this type of activities. The training developed for the inventory process carried out under the project *Celebration of Coastal Culture* (2007-2009) is an example.

Executed in Portugal and coordinated by a multidisciplinary team of the *Mútua de Pescadores,*[32] this project, designed with the objective of promoting the local river-maritime culture as a factor of sustainable and integrated development, gave rise to a network that involved municipalities, cultural associations, research centres and museums located in 7 points of the country and islands (Sancho, 2014).[33] Amongst other actions, this network trained "inventory-makers" in each area of influence, selecting civilians with knowledge and experiences linked to the local heritage. At the end of these actions, the participants, trained with the knowledge and the instruments for this purpose, guided by the local entity and the coordination of the project, collaborated in the registration and inventorying of ICH elements. The intention was to gradually make them agents of the revitalization of the elements under study since, through the implementation of the inventory - identification, documentation and deep knowledge of these cultural expressions -, they would acquire a higher awareness about the importance of their heritage and the need to safeguard it (id. ibidem, 2014).

According to Sancho (2014) the initiative, although it was positively evaluated for designing and building structure with a potential to be replicated,[34] presented difficulties in terms of time management and difficulties in the definition and

---

[32]*Mútua de Pescadores* is a non-profit insurance cooperative and the project was co-financed by EEA Grants and Sines Town Council.

[33] The regions of the rivers Douro and Minho; the *Lagoa de Aveiro* and surrounding municipalities; Peniche; the municipalities of Sines and *Lagoa de Santo André*; the Guadiana Valley (*Vale do Guadiana*); Culatra Island and the community of *Rabo de Peixe* in the Azores.

[34] For this purpose, for example, an "inventory-maker's manual" has been developed.

understanding of the objectives and tools to be used (felt by the coordination and by the participants). Additionally, no registration of post-project activity could be found and, at the date of this publication, the SIG database of the inventory and the online links associated to this project were not available.[35]

Another collection and inventory program that developed capacity-building activities was the *Community Cultural Documentation* included in the *Creative Heritage* project launched in 2008 by World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) in partnership with the Maasai Heritage Foundation, the American Folklife Center, the Library of Congress in Washington and the Duke University's Center for Documentary Studies in Durham. In this case, a pilot experiment was carried out, which intended to be long lasting and replicable to other communities. The objective was to assist indigenous communities by helping them to document their own heritage (Shankar, 2010; Wendland, 2009). The program consisted of two phases (Shankar, 2010): first, in 2008, two representatives of the Maasai community and an anthropologist of the National Museum of Kenya received a two-week training — at the American Folklife Center and at the Center for Documentary Studies (on research management, ethics, documentation techniques, archive methods, database and audio and video recordings), at the end they went to Switzerland to deepen and discuss issues related to intellectual property rights and management; later in 2009, representatives from the WIPO, American Folklife Center and Center for Documentary Studies provided a computer, an audio recorder and a video camera, reinforced training in methods and techniques and later on, in Kenya for a week, trainees and two other members of the Maasai community conducted fieldwork by collecting 1000 digital images and 6 hours of audio recording on aspects of community life that they wanted to explore. A copy of these materials was delivered to the community and, with their consent, another copy was deposited in the Library of Congress. Parallel to this process, one of the trainees produced two documentaries, and the community used some photographs and music recordings for commercial purposes.

Another result of this project was the creation of a site by the Center for Documentary Studies with guidelines, tools and information on good practices for self-documentation. Also, in relation to this program it was not possible to find the registration of post-project activity and, at the date of this publication, the database was not available, but it is possible to access the didactic material produced to guide the capacity-building actions.[36]

---

[35] www.mutuapescadores.org/Frontend/; http://ccc.mutuapescadores.pt/; http://www.fcsh.unl.pt/ccc/.
[36] http://www.loc.gov/ folklife/edresources/ed-cultdocmethods.html; http://www.wipo.int/tk/en/resources/training.html and http://www.wipo.int/tk/en/databases/creative_heritage/

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

Among the scenario of capacity-building activities in the audiovisual register of the ICH, stands out the work of the NGO *Vídeo nas Aldeias* (Video in the villages) with several prizes and recognized as an example of good practices. Headquartered in Brazil, this organization was constituted in 2000 after the development, for 14 years, of a homonymous project. At the beginning, this project was promoted by the *Centro de Trabalho Indigenista* and had as main objective the support of indigenous people in the valorisation and safeguarding of their territorial and cultural heritage through audiovisual register. After the first training phase the project began to work with an increasing number of indigenous communities,[37] distributing the necessary equipment to empower them in the production of their videos and creating a network of distribution. Through these activities, *Vídeo nas Aldeias* project has grown into a video production centre and an audiovisual training school. Once incorporated as an independent entity, the entire collection of images and more than 70 films are organized in an archive which is available online.[38]

In conclusion, it is possible to enumerate both potentialities and constraints in the way the previously described initiatives have been implemented. Capacity-building actions, organized in relatively small groups, encourage discussion, identification of key issues, efficient time management and relationships; they can be designed according to the features of a specific group - practitioners, bearers, young people, indigenous, migrants, etc. These are activities that usually involve active pedagogical techniques, where the participants' experience is used promoting team work and the future application of the acquired knowledge. Capacity-building actions and workshops must, however, be mediated by highly competent professionals to motivate and respond to participants' expectations, to facilitate egalitarian participation and to properly convey the planned topics (Community Places, 2014). The results of these actions may not match what is expected if is not possible to proceed with post-project activities that guarantee the implementation of the knowledge in the long term, especially, if the necessary human and material resources are not previously considered. Often the post-project actions or occasional sporadic experiences are understood as an end in themselves and not as part of a wider safeguarding plan. When this occurs, the whole process is distorted, since the main objective of the capacity-building is the practice and the long-term application of the skills acquired.

It is essential to realize that, if a project of recording and inventorying intends to go beyond the process of consultation or planning coproduction, if it intends to explore methodologies of community intervention that make the CGIs agents and promoters

---

[37] Such as, Ashaninka, Guarani-Mbya, Hunikui, Ikpeng, Kisêdjê, Kuikuro, Manchineri, Paraná, Waimiri Atroari, Wajãpi, Xavante, Xingu, among others.
[38] http://videonasaldeias.org.br/2009/index.php and http://videonasaldeias.org.br/loja.

Filomena Sousa
The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

of the inventory, then it is important to enable them with the methods and techniques of the Social Sciences (with the awareness that not all practitioners and bearers will be interested or empowered to do so).

On this subject, it is opportune to mention the experience of inventorying six *milongas*, a sub-element of tango, conducted between May and October of 2013 by *Oficina Regional del UNESCO* for Latin America - Buenos Aires, Argentina, within the framework of the *Living Heritage* project. The work was coordinated by a team of researchers and involved six participants selected from organizers of *milongas*. The process involved meetings held every two weeks (for discussion and adjustments) and one of the objectives was to mobilize participants to collect information and register the previously selected *milongas* (the inventory would be done through direct observation, interviews and video/image capture). In the analysis presented by Gonzalez (2016), assistant technician of the project, there was no reference to capacity-building actions. The author says that in the end the participants evaluated the project in a positive way and a public policy of safeguarding was defined, but Gonzalez also enumerates a series of problems that seemed to arise, precisely, from the reduced capacity of the participants: the difficulty to assimilate the concepts of UNESCO which influenced, for example, the rigidity of the definition of the elements to be catalogued — selected by participants by reference to an "ideal type", a stereotype of the *milonga*, which did not represent the diversity of practices; in the field work, the lack of familiarity with interview techniques and the use of technological instruments for data collection affected the final result, with the participants needing more support from the coordinators.

Moving forward to the question of the use of new technologies and digital platforms in the inventory process, in addition to the reference of these resources in the 2003 Convention not being explicit, their relevance appears in the Operational Directives (119) and is implicitly in the recommendation for the inventory to be public. Besides, if the need for capacity building in this area is obvious, it is not possible to ignore the fact that in today's society people are familiar with digital platforms, video, audio and photo recording. Many of them take part in forums and social networks, they take photos and they produce and share videos online. The participation of the CGIs in the production and diffusion of audiovisual contents begins to be understood as resources of power and affirmation and as a possibility to express their own opinion about their heritage (Martins, 2013; Sousa, 2015). It is in this context that we go on to review articles that, in addition to inventory and participation issues, focus on e-inventory projects - digital platforms that promote new ways of communicating and safeguarding ICH, accessible at any time and in any part of the world where there is access to the Internet (Sousa, 2015).

b) The CGIs and the ICH inventory - The digital potential

Before discussing some of the participatory techniques used in the implementation of ICH e-Inventories, it is useful to define the concepts that these comments will be based on. By digital we mean the dematerialization of physical and analogical media through electronic technologies which allows us to transmit, process and store information. ICH e-Inventories are inventories of expressions of one or more domains of intangible cultural heritage published online, with free access.

The relationship between the increase and availability of new digital technologies and the current visibility of the ICH is highlighted by several authors, a fact considered to be advantageous for the implementation of certain safeguarding measures, but also a challenge that involves considerable thought (Bhowmik & Díaz, 2016; Giglitto, 2014; Khaznadar; 2016; Severo, 2016; Sicard, 2016; Rodil & Rehm, 2015; Sousa, 2015; Van Zanten, 2012).

In short, the advantages are that open access and online sharing platforms promote the creation of hypermedia ICH inventories that act as aggregation tools to systematize and connect the knowledge produced by different methods - synthesis data, analysis and complex studies, documentation, audiovisual resources and hypermedia; the possibility to link and relate intangible cultural heritage with tangible and natural heritage; the advantage of including diversified information from different sources, enhancing the diversity of viewpoints and representations about the same cultural expression; the fact that the information is organized, indexed, and sometimes mapped, thus it can be consulted through several research terms or by georeference; the possibility to document the evolution and changes of ICH over time, periodically updating the information (which reduces the risk of "fossilizing" or simplifying the characterization of the elements); the advantage of increasing ICH visibility by sharing information on platforms with worldwide projection, bypassing knowledge beyond the place where the element is practiced.

As aspects to consider with some caution are: the protection of intellectual rights and other rights of the CGIs when the information is published and shared on the Internet; the use of worldwide projection platforms whose purposes are mainly commercial; the fact that the creation of digital ICH platforms is too dependent on the funding of time-limited projects, meaning funds run out for updating and guaranteeing the "survival" of these platforms in the post-project period; the need for specialized support teams to moderate the public access of the platforms; the constant and rapid evolution of web technologies, devices and software, which implies a permanent investment in human and technological resources to guarantee the long and effective availability of the information online; the fact that not all e-inventories have active advanced search

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

systems, in this way reducing the potential for query and cross-referencing; the danger of confusing the digital platforms, the database and the audiovisual archive (digital heritage) with the intangible cultural heritage itself; the danger of considering the knowledge produced by technological and multimedia resources as the "reality" and not a new representation of the ICH.

Drawing attention to the CGIs' participation in the creation and implementation of digital platforms, the advantages are: open access and online sharing that fosters participation through the creation of new "contact zones" and, consequently, the creation of new communities — "heritage", "practice", or "virtual" communities; the possibility of CGIs voluntarily contributing to the ICH registration, documentation and inventory; the ease of research and access to information by a large number of people, democratizing the dissemination of contents at reduced costs; the possibility for those who consult digital platforms to develop a non-linear use of information, benefitting from an autonomous, personal and interactive experience, being able to organize, use and share the knowledge available on the internet; the possibility to disseminate, through audiovisual and other resources, what is being done in the context of ICH safeguarding, allowing society to know not only the ICH expressions, their context, their state and social functions, but also the role of the CGIs in these processes.

As issues to consider with concern we highlight: the problem of info-exclusion — the CGIs that, by not having the necessary knowledge of or access to the Internet, are excluded from taking part in the safeguard measures conceived in the digital context; the lack of research on how the use of audiovisual and new technologies affect the evolution of the ICH elements documented by such resources and, finally, the weak demonstration of the real involvement of the CGIs in the online inventory processes.

Also among those who manage ICH digital platforms there is a dominant position of governments. In the *Map of e-Inventories of Intangible Cultural Heritage* (Sousa, 2017), of the 158 ICH e-Inventories identified,[39] 118 (75%) are under the supervision of Ministries, Secretariats, Regional Administrations or Departments related to Culture, but also to Tourism, Economy, Foreign Affairs and other sectors of States. Beyond these, 20 inventories are coordinated by UNESCO Category 2 Centres; 12 inventories are promoted by NGOs, associations or foundations; 7 by UNESCO National Commissions and 1 individually.

Regarding the centrality of Governments in the ICH digital world, is also important to mention the conclusions of the research carried out by Severo and Venturini (2015) on the social connections promoted on French, Italian and Swiss ICH digital platforms

[39] Collected from the reports submitted by States Parties to UNESCO and from information collected through *Google* search for 198 countries - 46 from Europe; 31 countries in Latin America and the Caribbean; 37 from the Asia-Pacific; 42 countries in Africa; 18 Arab States and 24 countries that, in 2017, had not ratified the 2003 Convention.

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

(analysed by building a "web mapping" using the hyperlinks found on these online platforms). The authors mentioned that the websites of national governmental institutions, in particular the Ministries of Culture, centralise links with other sites, assuming an authoritative position regarding the ICH presence on the web. Their visibility is higher than the visibility of the platforms promoted by CGIs that, even with an active presence on the web, are smaller in number and have a peripheral position. The sites built by CGI are usually informal, specializing in a single cultural expression, and the few external links they have direct the user to websites and blogs of other CGIs. They rarely link to government platforms, showing that, even in the digital world the connection between communities, groups and individuals and central government institutions is residual. [40]

Referring to info-exclusion, the analysis of the *Map of ICH e-Inventory* corroborates the existence of disparities in the number of e-inventories identified by geographic region. Among 158 e-inventories mapped, 53% (83) are from European countries. There are no inventories identified in 129 countries, with Africa as the region with the least number of inventories online.

Regarding the set of articles that dealt with inventory processes that use digital platforms, we can identify specific analysis dimensions, some more explored than others, depending on the project. If we take into account the overview of these dimensions, we can group them into the following themes:

a) the contents - the information about the *corpus* of the inventories (types of information collection, use of information from other platforms and/or production of original information; use of primary or secondary sources; types of records - written, audio, visual, multimedia; ICH domains and categories, language, etc.);

b) the structure - the organization of the e-inventories (inventory fields and records, ways to fill in the data, web technology, open access platforms and software used; layout, menus, systems and tools for navigation and research; linkage and content interdependence);

c) the production and management of the platforms and the participation of CGIs in this process - who has access to the data structure? Who contributes information, who fills it in, moderates and manages it? (administrators, publishers and users and their authorization levels); participatory methodologies and the use of informative, advisory and decision-making techniques on the planning, implementation and management of platforms;

---

[40] Severo and Venturini (2015), however, identify differences in network structures that mirror the characteristics of each country's cultural system. For example, a more centralised system in France and one less centralised in Switzerland.

d) the accessibility and usability - who uses and how do they use the e-inventories? Who consults and uses the data base? - the types of public (the general population, the CGIs, academics, institutions, students, etc.); the types of navigation and research carried out; links to other online structures (social networks, forums, open access portals and virtual communities, etc.); the dynamics of consultation and the use of new technologies (hypermedia, streaming, 360° photos, virtual reality, augmented reality and others). [41]

Considering again the *Map of ICH e-Inventories* (Sousa, 2017), we can see that most of the platforms integrated expressions from the five ICH domains (84%), organized the information in databases (74%) and presented a "traditional" organization divided into inventory fields. The most frequent data, present in almost all databases, is: the element name, the ICH domain, the location, the description (summary or detailed) and the multimedia record. Most e-inventories are searchable in three ways: by keywords, by the element name and/or by the ICH domain. Less conventional and in smaller numbers are the inventories whose elements are georeferenced or those that use the Wikipedia system (which we will return to later on in more detail).

Regarding participatory methodologies, the Map analysis indicates that 66% of the inventories state, in light of the Convention, the importance of the CGIs' involvement, but mostly do not detail the method applied in this process. They quote Article 15 of the Convention without clarifying its operationalization. They declare that "customary practices" have been respected and "community consent" has been obtained for the safeguarding and implementation of the inventory, but they rarely describe the process that has led to such consent. As noted above, among the 158 e-inventories only 22 (14%) clearly announce the collaborative nature of the inventory and call for the direct participation of practitioners, local institutions, other actors and the general population (id. ibidem, 2017).

Next, we present five examples of ICH e-inventories that, among the aforementioned minority, provide instructions for participation, allowing the submission of proposals for elements by the CGIs. These projects were chosen for this purpose because they

---

[41]Also, Rodil and Rehm (2015), from a papers screening published in the *International Journal of Intangible Heritage* (2006-2014), identified different dimensions of analysis on the use of technological resources in safeguarding the ICH (which they called "Tripartite Digitisation Model"). In short, the authors note the dimensions: 1) "capture" - the type of information collected and the way it was collected 2) "representation" - the type of data processing and how it is structured and related for further consultation, and 3) "dissemination" - how new technologies are used to disseminate the inventoried information (through the use of static, dynamic or interactive strategies). They concluded that the resources used in each of the phases are quite standardized not making use of really participatory or innovative methods. They point out that only a few authors use technological tools for collecting and recording information, usually audio and video recording, and in rare cases the CGIs are involved in the process. Regarding the way data are structured, the authors consider that few technical specifications are given about the models used and on how CGIs participated in defining this structure. Finally, in relation to the dissemination of the projects, they mention that this is usually reduced to a webpage.

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

are described and analysed comprehensively in several articles of the consulted bibliography. Two of these e-inventories follow a conventional participation structure, based on a private database, with restricted access, subject to authorization and registration: the *ICH inventory of the Italy-Switzerland border region* (Artese & Gagliardi, 2017) and the *National Inventory of Estonia* (Tamm, 2017). The other three inventories follow a less conventional model, based on the free Wikipedia system - *ICH Scotland — Scotland's Live Culture Inve*ntory (Giglitto, 2014; McCleery & McCleery, 2016; Orr & Thomas, 2016); I*CHPEDIA — Encyclopedia of Intangible Cultural Heritage of the Republic of Korea* (Park, 2014) and the *Living Heritage Wiki of Finland* (Kivilaakso & Marsio, 2017).

The work developed by Artese and Gagliardi (2017) exemplifies the type of research in which the purpose is to develop a framework that allows the management of ICH elements on the web. A framework that integrate the use of new technologies, ways of organizing and interrelating contents and needs of different users. The project *E.CH.I.2 – Etnografie italo-svizzere per la valorizzazione del patrimonio immateriale* (2007-2013)[42] provided the identification of the characteristics and the tools required to run the *ICH inventory for the Italy-Switzerland Border Region* and, based on the *corpus* of the *Archivio di Etnografia e Storia Sociale della regione Lombardia*, the *modus operandi* were defined, the technical system and the necessary software to create an ICH inventory to be used by the general public - *intangiblesearch*.[43] On this platform, *via* the "community" section anyone can suggest the registration of elements by filling in a form. The quality of the online submitted information is ensured by the employees of the Lombardy region, who control and validate the inventory file (the "ICH Card"). The CGIs can also suggest elements or send up-to-date information through comments and shared audiovisual content on the project's *YouTube* channel or *Facebook* page.

Epp Tamm (2017) outlines the *Estonian National Inventory*, promoted by the Estonian Ministry of Culture through the Folk Culture Centre, according to a crowdsourcing process, named in this way because the elements are registered by the CGIs, a task carried out through a public call for submissions. The inventory process is part of a broader program that began with the establishment of the Estonian Council for the ICH – an experts' advisory body – and the establishment of the Chamber of Intangible Cultural Heritage at the Folk Culture Centre (to secretariat the Council, to organize information and capacity-building sessions, to advise the communities and manage the National Inventory). Additionally, a regional network of relevant institutions was implemented, such as NGOs, community representatives and 15 experts in popular culture (one for each one of Estonia's administrative division). The inventory process

---

[42] Project funded by the Cross-border Cooperation Italy Switzerland 2007-2013 (INTERREG), European Union (http://www.echi-interreg.eu/)
[43] http://www.intangiblesearch.eu

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

began with a pilot project promoted between the years 2007 and 2010 in Hiiumaa, one of the islands on the west coast of Estonia. According to Tamm, if the elements proposed by the CGIs correspond to the Convention definition, they are inscribed in the inventory. Currently, 86 elements from different regions of Estonia are included in the National Inventory. The inscriptions guided by operational directives refer to expressions linked to specific communities or practiced throughout the country. The Council reviews these proposals prior to their publication and makes suggestions to the submitters. The management of the information proposed by those who submit the element and the suggestions of the Council is pointed out by Tamm as one of the difficulties of this process. Nevertheless, the author of the inscription has the right to refuse the changes proposed.

A solution adopted in some countries for the implementation of the online inventory, oriented by a participatory approach, is based on wiki software and inspired by the *Wikipedia* concept. Scotland[44] was a pioneer in the implementation of an inventory of this kind, the *ICH Scotland,* developed in a partnership between the Museums Galleries Scotland (MGS), the Scottish Arts Council and the Scottish Committee of the United Kingdom Commission for UNESCO. The Edinburgh Napier University was responsible for analysis and mapping the ICH elements (that culminated in a report published in 2008 including the recommendation of creating an online inventory using the wiki format).[45] The Scottish strategy to promote the inventory was multiple and subject to adjustments during the 2009-2011 period: workshops and training for MGS employees and local authorities, dissemination on social networks (blog, *Facebook* and *Twitter*), publication of a quarterly newsletter, distribution of posters, pamphlets and promotional packs in libraries and community centres, a series of six short video documentaries available on *Youtube* and information and awareness-raising actions to promote the production of inventory records among the CGIs (Giglitto, 2014; McCleery & McCleery, 2016; Orr & Thomas, 2016). Despite these disseminations activities, according to Giglitto (2014) the wiki inventory did not get the expected result among the population, with low level of inscriptions. To overcome this issue, MGS revitalised *ICH Scotland* in 2015 by enabling improvements in the usability and the search system.[46]

---

[44]United Kingdom has not ratified the 2003 Convention and Scotland, integrating the country's territory, does not have the autonomy to ratify it. The Scottish Parliament has, however, legitimacy to decide on internal issues, including cultural heritage.
[45] http://ichscotland.org/
[46] With the use of a Creative Commons license applied to the whole site and using the Drupal platform (https://www.drupal.org/). Also in this context Giglitto (2014) presents the *CURIOS* project to expand the use of *ICH Scotland*. The project identified communities that could serve as case studies to: a) determine the effectiveness of wiki software to promote CGI participation and b) to see if and how this can result in increased community empowerment. The methodological lines to be adopted would be action research and ethnographic research through participant observation - training sessions and public events - and conducting interviews with key informants. At the time of publication of this article we did not find updated information on the results of these initiatives.

The entry of elements in the inventory is now performed in real time and subjected to a slight moderation ("light-touch approach") — after its publication, MGS employees analyse the entries by confirming through keyword search that the information does not includes improper content. The original information and the review are both saved and stored (Orr & Thomas, 2016).

Between the years 2010 and 2012, the *ICHPEDIA*[47] project team - with researchers from different disciplines - conducted surveys, fieldwork and research on ICH in the Republic of Korea, which later led to the establishment of a digital platform - an archive system based on *Wikipedia* - a combination of free and open source software that allows online registration of ICH elements by using text, photos, audio and video. The platform allows searches of the data previously categorized by region, subregion and domain, highlighting possible connections between ICH elements (Park, 2014). The participants, while accessing the portal (conceptualised for potential users - practitioners, communities, government officials, researchers, NGOs, etc.), can provide or modify information that is shared in real time (keeping track of all modifications). The platform provides guidance regarding its use and the team provides aid when required (especially amongst communities without internet access). Without specifying participation methods and techniques, Park (2014) mention that the system enhances the creation of networks, interest groups and discussion groups. The author emphasizes issues of quality control of the information, such as ensuring the reliability of the data and the property rights over published content or ensuring that the inscriptions do not involve practices that violate human rights (id. ibidem, 2014).

Finland's wiki-inventory for Living Heritage[48] was designed and implemented by the Finnish National Board of Antiquities in collaboration with members of the wiki-community and with consultation to the CGIs (Kivilaakso & Marsio, 2017). The project was included in the 2003 Convention's implementation plan (ratified in 2013 by Finland), published in 2015, yet it was preceded by a 12-month pre-project supported by two studies - the first, with the review of the implementation of the Convention in 15 countries and, the second, by analysing the results of two surveys and 10 discussion groups. Kivilaakso and Marsio (2017) pointed out that, beyond the visibility of wiki-inventory through media and social networks - *Facebook*, *Twitter* and *YouTube* page -, the key tool in promoting was holding regional seminars in six provinces and, also, holding thematic seminars (on crafts, nature, circus, Sami and Roma minorities and the Swedish-speaking minority of Finland) which brought together participants from diverse backgrounds, such as practitioners, ethnic minorities, NGOs, museums, training institutions, regional councils, art councils, and universities. One-day events that brought together from 50 up to 100 participants whose results are available on the

---

[47] http://www.ichpedia.org/
[48] https://Wiki.aineetonkulttuuriperinto.fi/

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

project's site and *YouTube* channel. Another measure was the establishment of three "Circles of Living Heritage",[49] multi-stakeholder networks (each with 20 NGOs and other institutions) that act as coordinating bodies for meetings and common safeguarding actions: the "Handicraft Circle", the "Nature Circle" and "Folk Music and Folk Dance Circle".

Officially launched in 2016, the online platform of Finland is directly filled in by the CGIs that publish their information on ICH elements covering the various domains and the entire Finnish territory. The platform is moderated by the responsible entity for ICH in Finland, which comments on the content and requests expert advice when needed. Apart from being open to all the CGI proposals, this system is monitored to check if the number of contributions covers all areas of the ICH and all regions of the country, as well as whether cultural diversity is reflected in the content. If this is not the case and representativeness is not guaranteed, promoters plan new actions, establish new partnerships, and hold workshops or seminars with relevant groups. In 2017, one year after its implementation, the inventory had 100 submissions.

From the elements of the wiki-inventory, the Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture expects that, in response to the public calls, the CGIs propose elements in order to build a *National Inventory of Living Heritage*. In this case, the final decision on what elements are to inscribed in the latter inventory comes from the Ministry based on a proposal from the *National Board of Antiquities* and the group of experts on ICH issues. Given this duality of inventories - the open-ended, wide range wiki and the more institutionalized and restricted National Inventory - Kivilaakso and Marsio (2017) question the influences of one over the other, in particular they hypothesise that the effects of the media coverage of the second inventory may cause some disregard for the wiki-inventory, with the CGIs considering the expressions included in the National Inventory as "more valuable".

In conclusion, in addition to the advantages mentioned concerning the ICH digital platforms (in the case of the wiki model, added to the fact that this system allows anyone to inscribe and edit information), the configuration of the online inventory is not only in itself a guarantee of participation and involvement of the CGIs. In the five projects described, the need to implement complementary measures in order to inform the general public and the CGIs and to empower them to use this feature for their own benefit is evident. The difficulties denoted remind us of the disadvantages already mentioned about the techniques that refer to public consultation through online systems - the fact that they are not based on personal contact and they do not produce a strong feeling of belonging or involvement among the people – and, therefore, are recommended as part of a broader methodology that implies

---

[49] A similar concept was applied in Sweden (Kivilaakso & Marsio, 2017).

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

engagement techniques and close relationship with the CGIs. Hence, important initiatives such as the monitoring of practices *in situ*, workshops, seminars, thematic circles, citizens' councils, networks, forums, and so on, are very important.

Furthermore, the figure of "CGIs' representative" assumes a role not always easy to characterise in responsive systems and calls for submission. According to Tamm (2017), on the one hand that person[50] must uphold the social value of ICH transmission within and outside the community, but must also be able to construct an analytical overview. On the other hand, the representative, authorised by communities, groups or individuals, should provide information that mirrors the diversity of the CGI interpretations. In the case of Estonia, Tamm concludes that many of these interpretations lack clarification and discussion - for example, although safeguarding policies discourage the idea of preserving "authenticity" or "distinction", the author mentions that there are communities, groups and individuals who still value ICH from this perspective and, devalue or do not identify as heritage more common cultural expressions. In other words, the question regarding information is once again of high importance. In this case not only because more information promotes greater participation, but also because an informed participation seems to be more democratic and it is probable that the deliberations that arise from it will have positive repercussions on the safeguarding of the heritage. Conversely, uninformed participation may have more disadvantages than advantages.

Finally, one fact must be mentioned. Systems that allow the general public to enter and/or edit information placed online involve risks and concerns. People may share information they do not have the right or permission to, they may post inappropriate content or, if they have access to content published by others (such as in the wiki system), they may delete or vandalise this information. For this reason, platform promoters take precautions and implement systems of moderation and control over inventory inscriptions. Once again, and also in the digital world, the role of the moderator is very important and assumes specific skills - not only to verify and edit the information, but essentially to cooperate and motivate the CGIs, providing them with the knowledge and tools they need to acquire autonomy in the inventory process. As it was possible to verify in the described cases above, the control can be more or less restricted, with institutions to carry out the so-called "heavy-handed" control, when the editing of the contents is made before the publication and under the institution's authority (with the danger of disallowing the CGIs); or a "light-touch" approach, where they simply review the materials after publication and identify unethical or inappropriate content (with the danger of not fully guaranteeing the trustworthiness of the information or the associated rights). Another ideal "light-touch" system is to

---

[50] Or persons/representatives [our comment].

encourage the CGIs to moderate each other, to establish limits and acceptable behaviour, define rules and reach consensus on the objectives and characteristics of the contents to be published online.

Filomena Sousa
The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

Conclusion

Between theory and practice - a distance to be shortened

Confronting the theories set forth in the first part of this publication with the practices and results of the participatory approaches described in the second part, we summarize here the conclusions of this research. We also elaborate a suggestion of participatory methodologies and techniques that could be adapted to different moments of the heritagization process of intangible culture. A proposal that should be understood as flexible and modifiable according to the cultural contexts.

It may seem redundant to re-enunciate, as a conclusion, the main objective of the UNESCO 2003 Convention - to ensure the viability and sustainability of the ICH, being the CGIs the main actors in the safeguarding process - nonetheless, considering the practices, reinforcing this statement continues to make sense. If, theoretically, the participation of CGIs is emphasized in ICH discourses, in practice, we concluded that this involvement is difficult to achieve (Blake, 2009; Kurin, 2007; Severo & Venturini, 2015; Sousa, 2015).

In the guidelines and concepts defined in the various legal documents associated with the ICH, the agency of the heritagization of intangible culture relies on the CGIs. However, if we consider both the review of publications on UNESCO's processes (the reports of the States Parties and nominations for entries in the World Lists), or the articles' review on the implementation of projects, we verified that the participatory approach underlying the "spirit of the 2003 Convention" is still far from being effective. From the analysis, we can identify, in the scope of ICH, five aspects that make it difficult to achieve this (Adell, 2015; Artese & Gagliardi, 2017; Barbe et al., 2015; Blake, 2015 e 2018; Bortolloto, 2015; Deacon & Bortolotto, 2012; Gonzalez, 2016; Herzt, 2015; Janssens et al., 2013; Kivilaakso & Marsio, 2017; Kurin, 2007; Park, 2014; Shankar, 2010; Sousa, 2017; Tamm, 2017; Tauschek, 2015; Van Uytsel, 2012; Wendland, 2009):

1. Excessive centrality of States Parties in the heritagization process;
2. Diversity of interpretations of the concepts;
3. Deficit of information among the CGIs;
4. Deficit of experience in the improvement of teams composed of different actors;
5. Deficit of methods and professionals to operationalize the participation of CGIs.

We briefly describe each of these items below. Obstacles that have made it difficult to implement the participatory approach of the 2003 Convention.

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

Excessive centrality of the States Parties in the heritagization process

Here, we refer to the tendency of government entities of the States Parties to centralise policy-making, decision-making and actions to implement the UNESCO 2003 Convention. That is to say, the strong influence of the States that makes the participation of the CGIs and non-governmental entities dependent on the governments' structure. Therefore, safeguarding measures developed at local, regional or national level are most often not stemming from the CGIs initiative, but rather from the initiative of the State or international organizations. The very incentive to participatory methodologies is activated by the recommendation of these institutions and not by the motivation or requirement of the CGIs.

As an example, in the context of heritagization processes and support of ICH digital platforms, this research concludes that there is, clearly, a dominant position of governments. The e-inventories and websites of national governmental institutions, in particular Ministries of Culture, assume an authoritative position regarding ICH presence on the web (Severo & Venturini, 2015; Sousa, 2017).

Regarding the nomination of elements in the World Lists, mainly the Representative List, it is often perceived as an instrument of self-promotion by States Parties, a title of honour that promotes international visibility and its privileges, enhancing situations of misappropriation and politicization of the ICH. Thus, undermining the main purpose of the nomination - to highlight the importance of the ICH as well as its practitioners and bearers (Khaznadar, 2013; Kurin, 2007; Sousa, 2015).

Diversity of interpretations of the concepts

Considering the projects described above, it is clear that they point out the democratic and participatory perspective and the 2003 Convention. However, the terms expressed are not always in line with "the spirit" of this document, in particular regarding the definitions of "ICH", "community" and "participation". For example, on the concept of "intangible cultural heritage" we identify some situations that evaluate the cultural expressions according to criteria of "authenticity" or "rarity"; in other cases they work on elements that do not constitute "living heritage" since they refer to representations, memories and recreations of extinct practices, without current cultural or social function; it is also possible to find situations where cultural expressions are taken out of their original context, without realizing the purpose of this procedure or the results at the safeguarding level.

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

The dispersion, and even divergence, of definitions about the meaning of "community" or "forms of participation" still occurs. In this case, they occur not only among promoters and participants of specific projects, but also, within the UNESCO Bodies (Secretariat and Evaluation Body), the National Ambassadors and the Delegates representing governments in the Intergovernmental Committee. As mentioned previously, concerning these terms, the Convention purposely does not present any concrete conceptualization. Due to their complexity, these definitions are referred to the implementation phase. Thus, since 2006, several guidelines have been drafted to support the practices, often resulting from wide and complex debates which are not always consensual.

The conceptual flexibility, in addition to presenting itself as a challenge and a cause for some instability, is not usually interpreted as negative as it allows one to go forward and backward according to the achieved results, being seen as an opportunity to improve techniques and methods in exploratory projects. Yet, after a decade of experimentation, it is important to move forward with comprehensive research on the results and on the impact of participatory processes. It is relevant to structure conclusions to move towards an effective democratic approach by analysing the difficulties, the advantages, the good practices or clues that reinforce new and more effective forms of action (Deacon & Bortolotto, 2012; European Union, 2018).

Therefore, considering the definition of "community" (not disregarding the danger behind the use of a single, homogeneous, populist or even "romanticised" concept), today and in general terms, it emphasizes its collective and broad character, not limiting it to ethnic or territorial aspects. It highlights the way in which the "communities" reflect the relation of a wide social network (of different actors) within the ICH.

Regarding the concept of "participation", it is understood that it corresponds to a process with its own methods and techniques (for instance, consultation, counselling, debate or intervention/action) that, for a democratic and empowering purpose, leads the CGIs to become involved in the implementation of ICH safeguarding actions (Bakar et al., 2014; Hertz, 2015).

Deficit of information among the CGIs

In addition to being residual, we classified the current participation of the CGIs in the ICH heritagization processes as poorly-informed. Generally, it is through the media that civil society acknowledges the term "intangible cultural heritage". Many people

recognize ICH as referring to "traditions" and are aware that States apply for inscription in World Lists, but many are unaware of the content of the 2003 Convention. There are still limited clarifications about how to identify, study and safeguard the local and national ICH.

The issue of information has very important contours. On the one hand, participation depends on the information available. An informed population corresponds to a larger participation. On the other hand, informed participation appears to be more democratic. For example, without information on the "spirit of the Convention", the traditionalist narrative tends to prevail, the "authentic" character of cultural expressions is often valued. This is because the known narrative is this, but we cannot assume that it remains after the CGIs get to know other approaches. Informing and decoding the 2003 Convention aids to build informed opinions.

Article 14 (a) (i) of the 2003 Convention mentions the need to implement "*educational, awareness-raising and information programmes, aimed at the general public*". It is time for government and/or non-governmental institutions to start to implement these programs in a serious and consistent manner.

Deficit experience in the improvement of teams composed of different actors

In this case we refer to the lack of experience in the improvement of teams composed of actors with different skills, different social and professional backgrounds, from different locations and with different personal interests, but having in common the relation with a certain intangible cultural expression and the purpose of safeguarding that heritage. Lack of experience and difficulty in promoting a cooperative network among the CGIs, the administrative organizations, the scientific and the heritage organizations, the non-governmental organizations, the private organizations and others.

One of the main obstacles to this cooperation is the strong influence of the traditional "authorised heritage discourse". This discourse supports the idea that only experts and the academy have the authority to define what is heritage, the authority to produce knowledge and to implement safeguarding measures. That is, by an *etic* perspective that does not recognize the powers of the CGIs to safeguard their own heritage and perceives their participation as an inappropriate and populist procedure. This is an attitude that prevails in the scope of tangible and natural heritage, but which "contaminates" the intangible, besides every recommendation going in the opposite direction.

However, within the framework of the 2003 Convention and the Operational Directives, the paradigm has changed, and the *emic* perspective, which emphasizes the importance of the knowledge, the "voices" and wills of the CGIs is now valued. Ideally (always considering first and foremost the relevance of ICH to the actors who practice, maintain and transmit it) it would be important to develop a collaborative work in the various stages of the process, achieving a balance between the participation of the communities, the groups and the individuals and, simultaneously, the experienced work provided by technical and scientific skills that guide safeguarding. This would require the implementation of the so-called Responsible and Sustainable Action - teamwork and shared responsibility among the CGIs, researchers, heritage professionals, citizens, representatives of central government, local and regional administrators and others.

Under these circumstances, the goals, plans and actions to be developed must be defined in cooperation, and the language and concepts must mean the same to everyone. In other words, disseminating the "spirit of the Convention" requires overcoming the ambiguity and complexity of concepts and, among partners, the decoding of this document, explaining and discussing its details and possible meanings, step by step.

A collaborative work implies dialogue and negotiation, as it implies a critical attitude on misappropriation situations. A work guided by ethical principles, enhancing the empowerment of the CGIs, diversity and intercultural dialogue.

Deficit of methods and professionals to operationalize the participation of CGIs

If in the preceding point we emphasized the need to develop ICH safeguarding through plural and democratic teams, in this item, we highlight the importance of involving the CGIs as something to be stimulated and moderated by competent professionals in the application of participatory methodologies.

On this subject it is concluded that, theoretically, the participation of CGIs is associated to all ICH safeguarding phases and measures, however, in practice, it is necessary to create the mechanisms and to involve the professionals who can promote this participation in an appropriate manner. That is, there is a need to disseminate the use

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

of participatory methodologies and their techniques, aspect often expressed in ICH discourses, but less often financed, applied and evaluated in this context.[51]

The conclusions of critical and analytical research on documentation submitted to UNESCO and the conclusions of empirical studies evidence that the application of the participatory approach has not yet been significantly expressed in several safeguarding measures, in particular, in education, training and capacity-building programs. Slightly more developed are the initiatives within the scope of the inventory (to which we dedicated special attention in this research) and in the World Lists' nominations. But here, once more, it is not always clear which are the levels of participation applied: consultation through information gathering? Creation of Advisory Bodies? Creation of strategic partnerships? Implied action of CGIs as decision makers? Other ways?

Questionable is also the production of the CGIs "consent" for the implementation of the safeguarding measures. We rarely realize whether they are the result of a referendum, vote or consensus; rarely is it demonstrated that the "consent" is free, prior, informed and sustainable, or reflects cultural diversity. Also the "representative" of the communities (or groups) is not always properly characterised, risking the misappropriation of this role.

Considering the inventory, it is not easy to understand whether the CGIs participated in defining the inventory structure, filling it in, collecting documentation and producing audiovisual resources or other associated content. Most inventories do not detail the participatory method applied in this process.

About participation in ICH safeguarding projects, it is concluded that, even in a preliminary way, it is essential to define a plan to answer the following questions (Adnan et al., 1992; Community Places, 2014; Pretty, 1994; European Union, 2018):

• Who are the CGIs? Who will participate in the process?

• Will they participate in safeguarding actions?

• Who has the legitimacy to represent the communities and groups?

• What are the methods and the documents that support the free, prior and informed CGIs consent to move forward with the plan?

• For each actor involved, what are the motivations/objectives to participate?

• What kind of participation is it intended to promote (consultative, interventional, mobilizing)?

---

[51] Methodologies already studied and experimented in different fields, especially since the 70s of the twentieth century, in public management and administration, in urban planning, in sociology, in psychology, among others.

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

• Which are the participatory methodologies to be used? Which techniques are to be applied?

• What is the timeframe for the actions?

• What material and human resources are required?

• How to finance these resources?

• What is the profile of the professionals to be hired?

• How to evaluate the process and the results/impact of the actions?

• What is expected to occur post-project?

• How to ensure the sustainability of post-project actions?

• How to evaluate post-project actions?

A frequent practice, inappropriate in our view, is to hire heritage professionals or social scientists to promote techniques of participatory methodologies without having verified, by a curricular evaluation, if they have the necessary skills to apply these techniques, if they have qualifications and experience in mediation, group dynamics, intervention-action or other facets. About the ability to work with CGIs, rarely does the professional evaluation go beyond a superficial appreciation of the empathic personality of the applicant - relational competence is important but it is only effective if associated with theoretical and technical skills.

There are many professional areas in the social and human sciences. Thinking that all graduates in these areas are experts in participatory methodologies is the same as thinking that all doctors are, for instance, surgeons. There are social scientists specialized in quantitative methods, others in qualitative methods, some in macro perspectives, others in micro perspectives, some in theoretical research, others in applied research, some in experimental techniques, others in participatory methodologies, and so on. In addition, to think that having an empathic character is enough to deal with the CGIs and to promote their participation is the same as thinking that one can practice nursing because he/she "has a talent in dealing with people" without having to acquire other types of skills. In other words, to efficiently involve the CGIs in ICH safeguarding actions, it is important to gather multidisciplinary teams and specialised professionals - the so-called "bridge figures", mediators and facilitators - and assume that these professionals must be highly qualified with defined profiles.

It is equally important to review the tendency of promoters to implement only one type of method and a limited number of techniques. At different stages of the

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

safeguarding process it may be relevant to use different methodologies. For example, in a diagnostic phase public consultation through online systems perhaps makes sense, but if one intends to inform and decode the 2003 Convention it may be important to promote working groups that allow direct contact with the CGIs and the use of their experiences to clarify concepts. In the phase of planning the safeguarding measures, the use of more interventional techniques may be justified, with CGIs participating in the decision-making process. Before the implementation phase, it may be important to organize capacity-building actions. Throughout all process, it will be highly relevant to combine the actions planned and the observing of practices *in situ*.

To conclude, we present on Table 1 a suggestion of an open framework with different methods and techniques that can promote the participation of CGIs in the different phases of the ICH safeguarding process. A proposal that, as mentioned previously, should be understood as a theoretical approach that can be implemented if modified and adjusted to the cultural context applied. This perspective is in line with one of the European Union (2018) recommendations on the use of participatory methodologies which we quote below:

> "*Always keep in mind that there is **no participatory governance of culture model that provides a one-size-fits-all solution** to modernise the governance framework, policy formation and management of cultural heritage. Each situation has certain characteristics that must be weighed carefully before deciding on the model and level of participatory governance appropriate for a specific project or initiative*" (European Union, 2018: 59) [authors' emphasis].

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

Table 1. Examples of methods and techniques to promote the involvement of the CGIs/phases of ICH safeguarding process.

Safeguarding Process Stages			Participatory Methods/Objective	Examples of Techniques
diagnostic	• Preliminary identification of practices, CGIs and their representatives; • Current characterization of CGIs (socio-cultural and economic); • Characterization of the current level of participation of CGIs - obstacles and potentialities; • Meanings of ICH, Community and Participation by Actor; • Willingness to participate, motivations, goals and expectations per actor. (...)		**Informative/Advisory** Informs. Question, analyse and relate information.	• Application of survey (to an enlarged population or to a sample, face-to-face application, online or by post); • Application of interview (face-to-face to key actors and/or a sample); • Focus Groups; (...)
Information/ enhancement	• The importance of safeguarding the ICH - Inform and promote cooperation; • Tutelage - legal instruments - Decoding of the 2003 UNESCO Convention; • Concepts - Safeguarding, ICH, CGIs, Participation ...; • The different safeguarding measures; • The project and its objectives, preliminary plan and financing; (...)		**informative/Advisory** Informs. Question, analyse and relate information. **Mobilizer - basic level** Raises awareness and engages.	• Public call through media, online and by invitation to participate in Public Information Sessions; • Public Sessions - Conferences, Plenaries, Forums and Seminars favourable to the intervention of the different social actors; • Publish and distribute brochures and leaflets; create a website to centralise information; create groups or communities on social networks; (...)
Planning/ Decision Making	• Effective identification of practices, CGIs and their representatives; • Building a common vision/objective for the project; • Consent of the CGIs to start the project - what methods/supports? • Operationalization of Safeguarding measures - transmission, inventory ...; • Preliminary definition of the actions to be implemented; • Participatory methodologies to be used per action; • Techniques to be applied by method; • Timeframe of actions; • Material and human resources required; • Financing of resources; • Profile of the professionals/definition and hiring of the team; (...)	Develop consensus	**Mobilizer - medium level** Raises awareness and engages. Promotes shared commitment and responsibility. Promotes decision-making and solutions.	• The techniques mentioned in the previous section for the Basic Mobilizer level; • Seminars/ workshops and working groups where it is possible to promote: group dynamics on the theme - role play, brainstorming, thematic circles, community/cultural mapping (e.g. to identify and locate practices and CGIs); techniques to facilitate dialogue and to activate trust and cooperation ...; • Round tables, juries and/or citizens' panels; • Create platforms for communication and sharing of documents/information - accessible on and off the web; (...)
Actions/ Implementation	• Effective definition of safeguarding actions to be implemented; • Public launch of the project; • Research/Documentation/Inventory; • Safeguarding the practices; • Transmission (formal and non-formal); • Education; • Training; • Capacity-building; • Promotion; • Identification of Good Practices; • Sustainability of practices; • Nomination in Representative Lists; (...)	Ensure shared responsibility. Maintain interest/confidence of participants. Maintain transparency and ethics. Enable participation, sharing of experiences and joint solutions. Respect the diversity of proposals. Manage conflicts and interests.	**Mobilizer - advanced level** Raises awareness and engages. Promotes commitment and shared responsibility. Promotes decision-making and solutions. In partnership, the different actors become autonomous and are the promoters of ICH safeguarding.	• The techniques referred to in the previous section for the Medium Mobilizer level; • Specialized training workshops and post-action CGI intervention. For example, for Research/Documentation/Inventory: training on conducting interviews, collecting documents, video registration, inventory frameworks, filling in data, online publication, among others. Conducting post-capacity-building inventory. • Action-research and capacity-building techniques on the practices. For example, to promote Transmission - the actors' network, highlighting the role of the "community of practice", shares and teaches by showing and doing - **in the original context of the ICH (*in situ*)** and, then or in parallel, in the context of training/education. The actors' network, the public and, in particular, children and young people learn by watching and participating. • Improvement of Working Groups where the CGIs, in a concerted strategy, define, implement and promote specific actions; • Working groups feedback sessions (public or non-public) - analysis of the process. Presentation of Reports. Modification of the plan if necessary. Review expectations; (...)
Monitorization/ Evaluation and Sustainability	• Evaluation of the process and the results/impact of the actions; • Post-project program; • Plan for the sustainability of post-project actions; • Evaluation of post-project actions; (...)		**Mobilizer - advanced level** Raises awareness and engages. Promotes commitment and shared responsibility. Promotes decision-making and solutions. In partnership, the different actors become autonomous and are the promoters of ICH safeguarding.	• Evaluation Sessions - Presentation of Results and Post-Project Plan - in the Working Groups and in Public Sessions; • Dissemination of the results on the website, in the media and in public events (Exhibitions, Street Stalls ...); • Publication of the Final Report with quantitative and qualitative data, with the registration of the process, identification of the benefits for the safeguarding and for the CGIs and the description of the post-project plan - online and printed; • Implementation of the post-project plan - sustainability of the practices and long-term application of the skills acquired by the CGIs; (...)

Bibliography

ACCU-UNESCO (2006) *Expert Meeting on Community Involvement in Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage: Towards the Implementation of the 2003 Convention*. Tokyo, Japan. 13-15 March.
 https://www.accu.or.jp/ich/en/pdf/b2006Expert.pdf [Accessed 08/01/2018]

ADELL, Nicholas (2015) "Polyphony vs. Monograph: The Problem of Participation in a French ICH Dossier". In ADELL, Nicolas; BENDIX, Regina F.; BORTOLOTTO, Chiara; TAUSCHEK, Markus (Eds.) *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice*. Göttingen Studies in Cultural Property, Vol. 8. Universitäsverlag. 237-247.
www.oapen.org/download?type=document&docid=610380 [Accessed 01/04/2018]

ADNAN, S., BARREN, A., NURUL ALAM, S. M., e BRUSTINOW, A. (1992). *People's participation: NGOs and the flood action plan*. Dhaka, Bangladesh: Research and Advisory Services.

ARTESE, Maria Teresa; GAGLIARDI, Isabella (2017) "Inventorying Intangible Cultural Heritage on the Web: a Life-cycle Approach". In *International Journal of Intangible Heritage*, Vol. 12. 112-138.
http://www.ijih.org/fileDown.down?filePath=12/dtl/56e8bbcc-03b6-445f-b85d-510e84399763&fileName=IJIH+vol12_9_Inventorying+ICH.pdf&contentType=volumeDtl&downFileId=667&fileType=PDF&type=pdf [Accessed 08/01/2018]

BAKAR, Aisyah Abu; OSMAN, Mariana M.; BACHOK, Syahriah; IBRAHIM, Mansor (2014) "Analysis on Community Manifestation of Intangible Cultural Heritage:Case Study of Malacca Cultural Community ". *In Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences,* Vol. 01. 1-11.
https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Aisyah_Abu_Bakar/publication/275909892_Analysis_on_Community_Manifestation_of_Intangible_Cultural_Heritage_Case_Study_of_Malacca_Cultural_Community/links/5549b1b70cf205bce7ac37d3.pdf   [Accessed 08/01/2018]

BARBE, Noël; CHAULIAC, Marina; TORNATORE, Jean-Louis (2015) "Intangible Cultural Heritage Exposed to Public Deliberation: a Participatory Experience in a Regional Park". In ADELL, N.; BENDIX, R.; BORTOLOTTO, C.; TAUSCHEK, M. (Eds.) *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice*. Göttingen Studies in Cultural Property, Vol. 8. Universitäsverlag. 201-217.
www.oapen.org/download?type=document&docid=610380 [Accessed 01/04/2018]

BAUMAN, Zygmunt (2001) *Community: Seeking Safety in an Insecure World*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

BHOWMIK, Samir; DÍAZ, Lily (2016) "Hot Stones and Cool Digitals: Sustainable Contact Zones for Intangible Cultural Heritage in Finland". In *International Journal of Intangible Heritage*, Vol. 11. 162-171.
http://www.ijih.org/fileDown.down?filePath=11/dtl/68c503d7-bf3c-41bc-8f8f-a1ab646d8566&fileName=vol+11_sp1_Samir+Bhowmik+and+Lily+D%C3%ADaz.pdf&contentType=volumeDtl&downFileId=614&fileType=PDF&type=pdf. [Accessed 08/01/2018]

BLAKE, Janet (2009) "UNESCO 2003 Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage: the implications of community involvement in 'safeguarding'". In SMITH, Laurajane; AGAWAKA, Natsuko (Eds.) *Intangible Heritage*. London&New York. Routledge Taylor&Francis Group. 45-73.

BLAKE, Janet (2015) "From Global to Local Heritage: Intangible Cultural Heritage and the Role of the Museum". In *Anthropology of the Middle East*, Vol. 10, Nº 1. 22-40.
https://www.berghahnjournals.com/view/journals/ame/10/1/ame100103.xml. [Accessed 08/01/2018]

BLAKE, Janet (2018) "Further reflections on community involvement in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage". In Natsuko Akagawa, Laurajane Smith (eds.) (2018) *Safeguarding Intangible Heritage Practices and Politics*. London: Routledge.

BORTOLOTTO, Chiara (2011) "A salvaguarda do patrimônio cultural imaterial na implementação da Convenção da UNESCO de 2003". In *Revista Memória em Rede*, Pelotas, Vol.2, Nº 4. 6-17.
https://periodicos.ufpel.edu.br/ojs2/index.php/Memoria/article/view/9532 [Accessed 17/04/2018]

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

BORTOLOTTO, Chiara (2013) "Les Inventaires du Patrimoine Immatériel en Italie État, Régions et Associations". In *Atas do Colóquio Internacional Políticas Públicas para o Património Imaterial na Europa do Sul: percursos, concretizações, perspetivas*. Lisboa. Edição electrónica: Direção-Geral do Património Cultural. 27-42.
http://www.igespar.pt/media/uploads/dgpc/Politicas_Publicas_para_o_Patrimonio_Imaterial_na_Europa_do_Sul_DGPC_2013.pdf [Accessed 30/04/2018]

BORTOLOTTO, C. (2015) "UNESCO and Heritage Self-Determination: Negotiating Meaning in the Intergovenmental Committee for the Safeguarding of ICH". In ADELL, N.; BENDIX, R.; BORTOLOTTO, C.; TAUSCHEK, M. (Eds.) *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice. Göttingen Studies in Cultural Property*, Vol. 8. Universitäsverlag. 249-271.
www.oapen.org/download?type=document&docid=610380 [Accessed 01/04/2018]

BRUMANN, Christoph (2015) "Community as Myth and Reality in the UNESCO World Heritage Convention" in ADELL, Nicolas; BENDIX, Regina F.; BORTOLOTTO, Chiara; TAUSCHEK, Markus (Eds.) *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice. Göttingen Studies in Cultural Property*, Volume 8. Universitätsverlag Göttingen. 273-288.
www.oapen.org/download?type=document&docid=610380 [Accessed 01/04/2018]

BRUNO, Cristina (1996) "Museologia e Comunicação". In *Cadernos de Sociomuseologia*, Vol. 9. Centro de Estudos de Sociomuseologia. ULHT. Lisboa.

CARVALHO, Ana (2011) *Os Museus e o Património Cultural Imaterial: Estratégias para o Desenvolvimento de Boas Práticas*. Évora: CIDEHUS/Edições Colibri.

CARVALHO, Ana (org.) (2016) *Participação: Partilhando a Respon*sabilidade. Lisboa: Acesso Cultura.

CHAN, Catherine S. (2017) "Folklore without a folk: questions in the preservation of the Marinduque Moriones heritage." *In International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 23, Nº 1. 29-40.
http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/13527258.2016.1232746?needAccess=true. [Accessed 08/01/2018]

CHRISTIDIS, Leslie; DANIEL, Vinod; MONAGHAN, Paul (2008) "Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Pacific: a Brief Report on Recent Progress at the Australian Museum". In *International Journal of Intang*ible Heritage, Vol. 03. 144-147.
http://www.ijih.org/fileDown.down?filePath=3/dtl/1b5434bb-28f1-4936-8b45-
af338b33327e&fileName=Safeguarding+Intangible.pdf&contentType=volumeDtl&downFileId=41&fileType=PDF&type=pdf.
[Accessed 08/01/2018]

CLIFFORD, James (1997) "Museums as Contact Zones" in *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth*. Century. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press: pp. 188-219.

CLARO, João Martins (2009) "«Aspectos Jurídicos do Património Cultural Imaterial". In Paulo Ferreira da Costa (Coord.) *Atas do Colóquio Museus e Património Imaterial : agentes, fronteiras, identidades*. Lisboa. Instituto dos Museus e da Conservação, Softlimits. 141-151.

COMMUNITY PLACES (2014) *Community Planning Toolkit - Community Engagement. Belfast: Big Lottery Fund*.
https://www.communityplanningtoolkit.org/sites/default/files/Engagement.pdf [Accessed 01/07/2018]

COSTA, Paulo Ferreira da (2008) "Discretos Tesouros: Limites à Proteção e outros Contextos para o Inventário do Património Imaterial". In *Revista Museologia.pt*, Nº 2, Lisboa. Instituto dos Museus e da Conservação. 17-35.

COSTA, Paulo Ferreira da (2013) "O «Inventário Nacional do Património Cultural Imaterial»: da prática etnográfica à voz das comunidades". In *Atas do Colóquio Internacional Políticas Públicas para o Património Imaterial na Europa do Sul: percursos, concretizações, perspectivas*. Lisboa. Edição electrónica: Direção-Geral do Património Cultural. 93-116.

http://www.igespar.pt/media/uploads/dgpc/Politicas_Publicas_para_o_Patrimonio_Imaterial_na_Europa_do_Sul_DGPC_2013.pd
f [Accessed 30/04/2018]

DAGNINO, Francesca; POZZI, Francesca (2016) "The i-Treasures project: capturing the intangible through
Information and Communication Technologies". In SEVERO, Marta ; CACHAT, Séverine (eds.) *Patrimoine
culturel immatériel et numérique: transmission, participation, enjeux*. L'Harmattan. Paris. 169-182.
DEACON, Harriet; BORTOLOTTO, Chiara (2012) "Charting A Way Forward: Existing Research and Future
Directions for ICH Research Related to the Intangible Heritage Convention". In *2012 The First ICH
Researchers Forum of 2003 Convention*. International Research Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in
the Asia-Pacific Region (IRCI). 31-41.
http://irci.jp/assets/files/2012_ICH_Forum.pdf#page=29. [Accessed 08/01/2018]

DR (Diário da República) (2008) Resolução da Assembleia da República n.º 47/2008 de 12 de Setembro.
Aprova a *Convenção Quadro do Conselho da Europa Relativa ao Valor do Património Cultural para a
Sociedade*, assinada em Faro em 27 de Outubro de 2005.
https://dre.pt/application/conteudo/453874 [Accessed 15/04/2018]

FU, Yi; KIM, Sangkyun; MAO, Ruohan (2017) "Crafting Collaboration: Conflict Resolution and Community
Engagement in the Hangzhou Arts and Crafts Museum Cluster". In *International Journal of Intangible
Heritage*, Vol. 12. 60-75.
http://www.ijih.org/fileDown.down?filePath=12/dtl/2ef4b931-7613-46bb-a893-
3585da1622bf&fileName=IJIH+vol12_6_Crafting+Collaboration.pdf&contentType=volumeDtl&downFileId=664&fileType=PDF&typ
e=pdf [Accessed 08/01/2018]

GALLA, Amareswar (2008) "The First Voice in Heritage Conservation". In *International Journal of
Intangible Heritage*, Vol. 03. 10-25.
http://www.ijih.org/fileDown.down?filePath=3/dtl/851d4fac-68d5-4664-9ad7-3225dfd057a8&fileName=3-
1.pdf&contentType=volumeDtl&downFileId=31&fileType=PDF&type=pdf [Accessed 08/01/2018]

GIGLITTO, Danilo (2014) "Using wiki software to enhance community empowerment by building digital
archives for intangible cultural heritage". In *Euro Med 2014, Intangible Cultural Heritage Documentation*.
267-277.
https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/8ba6/0fe0de183481db8b5dc8ddb51e01bc1102b4.pdf [Accessed 08/01/2018]

GONZÁLEZ, Mercedes B. (2016) "World Heritage, Grassroot Management: A Community Participation
Experience Inventorying Six "Milongas" in Buenos Aires". In HENRIQUES,Cláudia; MOREIRA, Maria
Cristina; CÉSAR, Pedro (org.) *Tourism and History World Heritage – Case Studies of Ibero-American
Space*. Interdisciplinary Centre of Social Sciences – University of Minho (CICS.NOVA.UMinho). 468-482.
http://revistacomsoc.pt/index.php/cics_ebooks/article/view/2578. [Accessed 08/01/2018]

HERTZ, Hellen (2015) "Bottoms, Genuine and Spurius". In ADELL, N.; BENDIX, R.; BORTOLOTTO, C.;
TAUSCHEK, M. (Eds.) *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice*. Göttingen Studies in
Cultural Property, Vol. 8. Universitäsverlag. 25-57.
www.oapen.org/download?type=document&docid=610380 [Accessed 01/04/2018]

ISNART, Cyril (2013) "«Le Patrimoine Immatériel en Europe du Sud du Folklore à L'action Culturelle
Ordinaire". In *Atas do Colóquio Internacional Políticas Públicas para o Património Imaterial na Europa do
Sul: percursos, concretizações, perspetivas*. Lisboa. Edição electrónica: Direção-Geral do Património
Cultural.   117-129.
http://www.igespar.pt/media/uploads/dgpc/Politicas_Publicas_para_o_Patrimonio_Imaterial_na_Europa_do_Sul_DGPC_2013.pd
f
[Accessed 30/04/2018]

JACOBS, Marc (2016) "The Spirit of the Convention – Interlocking Principles and Ethics for Safeguarding
Intangible Cultural Heritage". In *International Journal of Intangible Heritage*, Vol. 11. 72-87.
http://www.ijih.org/fileDown.down?filePath=11/dtl/73f5b3cf-ed6a-4e37-9e20-
76ae126d5d35&fileName=vol+11_vp4_Marc+Jacobs.pdf&contentType=volumeDtl&downFileId=608&fileType=PDF&type=pdf
[Accessed 08/01/2018]

JACOBS, Marc (2017) "Glocal Perspectives on Safeguarding. CGIs, ICH, Ethics and Cultural Brokerage". In
UESUGI, tomiyuki; SHIBA, Mari (eds.) (2017) *Global Perspectives on Intangible Cultural Heritage: Local*

Filomena Sousa

The Participation in the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
The role of Communities, Groups and Individuals

Communities, Researchers, States and UNESCO, with special focus on Global and National perspectives. Tokyo. Center for Global Studies, Seijo University. 49-72.
http://www.seijo.ac.jp/research/glocal-center/publications/english-study-series/jtmo420000000rgg-att/jtmo42000000iyf4.pdf [Accessed 01/04/2018]

JANEIRINHO, Raquel F. (2012) *Património, Museologia e Participação: Estratégias Museológicas Participativas no Concelho de Peniche*. Dissertation submitted for the degree of Master in Museology, in the Master Course in Museology, conferred by the University Lusófona de Humanidades e Tecnologias.
http://www.museologia-portugal.net/files/upload/mestrados/raquel_janeirinho.pdf [Accessed 15/07/2018]
JANSSENS, Ellen; LINDEN, Hans van der; WIERCX, Bram (2013) www.immaterieeelerfgoed.be: A platform for intangible cultural heritage in Flanders (Belgium). In 2013 Digital Heritage International Congress (Digital Heritage). Marseille. 95-98.
http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?tp=&arnumber=6744736&isnumber=6743615 [Accessed 08/01/2018].

KHAZNADAR, Chérif (2013) "Des Arts Traditionnels au Patrimoine Immatériel". In *Atas do Colóquio Internacional Políticas Públicas para o Património Imaterial na Europa do Sul: percursos, concretizações, perspetivas*. Lisboa. Edição electrónica: Direção-Geral do Património Cultural. 9-16.
http://www.igespar.pt/media/uploads/dgpc/Politicas_Publicas_para_o_Patrimonio_Imaterial_na_Europa_do_Sul_DGPC_2013.pdf [Accessed 30/04/2018]

KHAZNADAR, Chérif (2016) "Intangible cultural heritage and digital tools: passing on, participative management, issues at stake". In International Journal of Intangible Heritage, Vol. 12. 218-220.
http://www.ijih.org/fileDown.down?filePath=12/dtl/a045a809-9e29-4bd9-8b62-be466a52f564&fileName=IJIH+vol12_17_Intangible+cultural+heritage+and+digital+tools.pdf&contentType=volumeDtl&downFileId=675&fileType=PDF&type=pdf . [Accessed 08/01/2018]

KIVILAAKSO, Aura; MARSIO, Leena (2017) "Safeguarding living heritage with participatory Wiki-inventorying in Finland". In Memoriamedia Review, vol. 01. Art. 3.
http://memoriamedia.net/pdfarticles/ENG_%20MEMORIAMEDIAREVIEW_Finlandia.pdf [Accessed on: 19/01/2018)

KURIN, Richard (2004) "Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage in the 2003 UNESCO Convention: a critical appraisal". In *Museum International*, Vol. 56, Nº 1-2. 66-77.
http://www.shi.or.th/upload/Download%20File/%E0%B8%A8%E0%B8%B8%E0%B8%81%E0%B8%A3%E0%B9%8C%E0%B9%80%E0%B8%AA%E0%B8%A7%E0%B8%99%E0%B8%B2%202555/Kurin%202004.pdf [Accessed 08/01/2018]

KURIN, Richard (2007) "Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage: Key Factors in Implementing the 2003 Convention". In International Journal of Intangible Heritage, Vol. 02. 10-20.
http://www.ijih.org/fileDown.down?filePath=2/dtl/5e19c24e-9ccc-4149-a8b0-f5cd525a734d&fileName=Vol.2-1.pdf&contentType=volumeDtl&downFileId=16&fileType=PDF&type=pdf [Accessed 08/01/2018]

LAMOTHE, Mathilde (2012) "Captation d'images et inventaire multimédia du patrimoine culturel immatériel, une expérience Québécoise". In *Journal des anthropologues*, Nº 130-131. 281-303.
http://journals.openedition.org/jda/5191 [Accessed 08/01/2018].

LEAL, João (2009) "O Património Imaterial e a Antropologia Portuguesa". In Paulo Ferreira da Costa (Coord.) *Museus e Património Imaterial: agentes, fronteiras, identidades*. Lisboa. Instituto dos Museus e da Conservação, Softlimits, S.A. 288-295.

LEAL, João (2013) "Cultura, Património Imaterial, Antropologia". In *Atas do Colóquio Internacional Políticas Públicas para o Património Imaterial na Europa do Sul: percursos, concretizações, perspetivas*. Lisboa. Edição eletrónica: Direção-Geral do Património Cultural. 131-144.
http://www.igespar.pt/media/uploads/dgpc/Politicas_Publicas_para_o_Patrimonio_Imaterial_na_Europa_do_Sul_DGPC_2013.pdf [Accessed 30/04/2018]

LAVE, Jean; WENGER, Etienne (1991) *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

LIMA, José (2008) *Museus em «Banda Larga» – Estudo Exploratório sobre Museus, Comunicação e Novas Acessibilidade*. Dissertation submitted for the degree of Master in Museology, in the Master Course in Museology, conferred by the University Lusófona de Humanidades e Tecnologias.

http://www.museologia-portugal.net/files/upload/mestrados/jose_lima.pdf [Accessed 15/07/2018]

MARTINS, H., (2013), "Sobre o lugar e os usos das imagens na antropologia: notas críticas em tempos de audiovisualização do mundo" in *Etnográfica* [Online], vol. 17 (2) | 2013. Pp. 395-419.
http://etnografica.revues.org/3168 ; DOI : 10.4000/etnografica.3168 [Consultado em 18-1-2015]

MCCLEERY, Alison ; McCLEERY, Alistair (2016) "Inventorying Intangible Heritage: the approach in Scotland" . In SEVERO, Marta ; CACHAT, Séverine (eds.) *Patrimoine culturel immatériel et numérique: transmission, participation, enjeux*. L'Harmattan. Paris. 183-197.

MOREIRA, Fernando (2008) *O Turismo e os Museus Nas Estratégias e nas Práticas de Desenvolvimento Territorial*. Dissertation submitted for the degree of Ph.d. in Museology in the Doctoral Course in Museology, conferred by the University Lusófona de Humanidades e Tecnologias.
http://www.museologia-portugal.net/files/upload/doutoramentos/fernando_moreira.pdf [Accessed 15/07/2018]

ORR, Joanne; THOMAS, Sara (2016) "From First Footing to Faeris: An Inventory of Scotland's Living Culture". In SEVERO, Marta; CACHAT, Séverine (eds.) P*atrimoine culturel immatériel et numérique: transmission, participation, enjeux.* L'Harmattan. Paris. 199-206.

PARK, Soon Cheol (2014) "ICHPEDIA, a case study in community engagement in the safeguarding of ICH online". In *International Journal of Intangible Heritage*, Vol. 09. 70-82.
http://www.ijih.org/fileDown.down?filePath=9/dtl/fed62778-f552-4894-8712-
c4924fa55ba0&fileName=IJIH-
Vol.9%28eng%29%28Soon+Cheol+Park%29.pdf&contentType=volumeDtl&downFileId=465&fileType=PDF&type=pdf   [Accessed 08/01/2018]

PEREIRO, X. (2006) "Património cultural: o casamento entre património e cultura". In *ADRA*, Nº 2. Revista dos sócios do Museu do Povo Galego. 23-41.

PIETROBRUNO, Sheenagh (2016) "Youtube and Intangible Cultural Heritage: Disseminating Community Expressions Within a Commercial Platform". In SEVERO, Marta et CACHAT, Séverine (eds.) *Patrimoine Culturel Immatériel Et Numérique: Transmission, participation, enjeux*. Paris. L'Harmattan. 109-130.

PIKE, Kenneth L. (1967) *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structures of human behavior* (2nd ed.). The Hague. Mouton.

PRETTY, J. N. (1994). "Alternative systems of inquiry for sustainable agriculture" in *IDS Bulletin*, 25(2), 37-48. University of Sussex: IDS

PRIMO, Judite (1999) "Pensar Contemporaneamente a Museologia". In *Cadernos de Sociomuseologia- Museologia: Teoria e Prática*, Nº 16. Centro de Estudos de Sociomuseologia. Lisboa. ULHT. 5-38.
http://revistas.ulusofona.pt/index.php/cadernosociomuseologia/article/view/350 [Accessed 15/07/2018]

RODIL, Kasper (2017) "A Perspective on Systems Design in the Digitisation of Intangible Cultural Heritage". In *International Journal of Intangible Heritage*, Vol. 12. 190-198.
http://www.ijih.org/fileDown.down?filePath=12/dtl/ec93d3be-5a12-4a58-a0da-
a92271d47697&fileName=IJIH+vol12_13_Digitisation+systems.pdf&contentType=volumeDtl&downFileId=671&fileType=PDF&typ
e=pdf [Accessed 08/01/2018]

RODIL, Kasper; REHM, Matthias (2015) "A Decade Later: Looking at the Past while Sketching the Future of ICH through the Tripartite Digitisation Model". In *International Journal of Intangible Heritage*, Vol. 10. 48-60.
http://www.ijih.org/fileDown.down?filePath=10/dtl/12bbe42c-2923-41ce-86a9-4bf28f5f8874&fileName=05-
IJIH+A+Decade+Later.pdf&contentType=volumeDtl&downFileId=563&fileType=PDF&type=pdf. [Accessed 08/01/2018]

RUDDOLFF, Britta; RAYMOND, Susanne (2013) "A Community Convention? An analysis of Free, Prior and Informed Consent given under the 2003 Convention". In *International Journal of Intangible Heritage*, Vol. 8. 154-164.

http://www.ijih.org/fileDown.down?filePath=8/dtl/165568a0-699c-4ed4-9003-da45645a2e7f&fileName=IJIH-Vol.8%28eng%29%28Britta+Rudolff.Susanne+Raymond%29.pdf&contentType=volumeDtl&downFileId=434&fileType=PDF&type=pdf [Accessed 08/01/2018]

SANCHO, Lorena (2014) "License to Listen": the Challenge of Building a System of Participatory Inventory of Ich with Coastal Communities in Portugal". In *Journal of Maritime Research*, Vol. XI, Nº I. 25–33.
https://www.jmr.unican.es/index.php/jmr/article/view/320/289. [Accessed 08/01/2018]

SEVERO, Marta (2016) "Avant-Propos".In SEVERO, Marta et CACHAT, Séverine (eds.) *Patrimoine Culturel Immatériel Et Numérique: Transmission, participation, enjeux*. L'Harmattan. Paris. 7-12.

SEVERO, Marta; VENTURINI, Tommaso (2015) "Intangible cultural heritage webs: Comparing national networks with digital methods". In New Media & Society, Vol. 18, Nº 8. 1616-1635.
http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461444814567981.[Accessed 08/01/2018]

SHANKAR, Guha (2010) "From subject to producer: refraiming the indigenous heritage through cultural documentation training". In *International Journal of Intangible Heritage*, Vol. 05. 14-24.
http://www.ijih.org/fileDown.down?filePath=5/dtl/95aea280-489d-4e29-9f92-a87cb08892bc&fileName=Vol.5-2.pdf&contentType=volumeDtl&downFileId=55&fileType=PDF&type=pdf. [Accessed 08/01/2018]

SICARD, Hugues (2016) "Le numérique au secours du patrimoine culturel immatériel?". In SEVERO, Marta et CACHAT, Séverine (eds.) *Patrimoine Culturel Immatériel Et Numérique: Transmission, participation, en*jeux. L'Harmattan. Paris. 31-40.

SMITH; Rhianned (2009) "Finding the 'First Voice' in Rural England: the challenges of safeguarding Intangible Heritage in a National Museum". In *International Journal of Intangible Heritage*, Vol. 04. 14-25.
http://www.ijih.org/fileDown.down?filePath=4/dtl/9dbe0230-4596-43b7-96e5-a0b5dfee279f&fileName=Vol.4-1.pdf&contentType=volumeDtl&downFileId=44&fileType=PDF&type=pdf. [Accessed 08/01/2018]

SOARES, Maria F. (2008) *Museus Tradicionais e Museus Virtuais: Os objectos e os Modelos 3D numa Relação Paradigmática*. Thesis submitted as partial requirement for obtaining a Master degree in Museology: Exhibition Contents granted by the Instituto Superior de Ciências do Trabalho e da Empresa, Departments of History and Anthropology.
https://repositorio.iscte-iul.pt/bitstream/10071/3066/1/Tese%20PDF.pdf [Accessed 15/07/2018]

SOUSA, Filomena (2015) *INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE. MEMORIAMEDIA e-Museum- methods, techniques and practices*. Lisboa. Memória Imaterial CRL.
http://www.memoriamedia.net/pci_docs/PCI-MEMORIAMEDIA_METODOS_PRATICAS_web.pdf. [Accessed 18/04/2018]

SOUSA, Filomena (2017) "Map of e-Inventories of Intangible Cultural Heritage". In *Memoriamedia Review*, Vol 01, Nº 1. Art.1.
http://memoriamedia.net/pdfarticles/ENG_MEMORIAMEDIAREVIEW_Mapa_einventarios.pdf [Accessed on 19/01/2018]

• TAMM, Epp (2017) "Estonian National Inventory of Intangible Cultural Heritage – crowdsourcing practising communities". In *Memoriamedia Review*, Vol. 01. Art.3.
http://memoriamedia.net/pdfarticles/EN_MEMORIAMEDIAREVIEW_Estonia.pdf [Accessed 19/01/2018]

TAUSHEK, Marcus (2015) "Imaginations, Constructions and Constraints: Some Concluding Remarks on Heritage, Community and Participation". ADELL, Nicolas; BENDIX, Regina F.; BORTOLOTTO, Chiara; TAUSCHEK, Markus (Eds.) *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice*. Göttingen Studies in Cultural Property, Vol. 8. Universitäsverlag. 291-306.

UNESCO (1972) *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Herit*age.
http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0011/001140/114044e.pdf#page=134 [Accessed 17/04/2018]

UNESCO (1989) *Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore*. Twenty-fifth session, Paris, France. 17 October-16 November.
http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0008/000846/084696e.pdf#page=242 [Accessed 17/04/2018]

UNESCO (1999) *International Conference 'A Global Assessment of the 1989 Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore: Local Empowerment and International Cooperation'*, Washington, U.S.A. 23-30 June.
https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/00111-EN.pdf [Accessed 17/04/2018]

UNESCO (2001) *Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity*.
http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001271/127162e.pdf [Accessed 17/04/2018]

UNESCO (2002) *Intangible Cultural Heritage, mirror of cultural diversity. Third Round Table of Ministers of Culture. Istanbul, Turkey. 16-17 September.*
http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=6209&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html [Accessed 17/04/2018]

UNESCO (2003) *Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage*.
http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001325/132540e.pdf [Accessed 17/04/2018]

UNESCO (2005) *Expert meeting on inventorying Intangible Cultural Heritage. Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, Paris, France. 17-18 March.
https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/00036-EN.pdf [Accessed 18/04/2018]

UNESCO (2006) *Expert meeting on documentation and archiving of intangible cultural heritage. Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, Paris, France. 12-13 January.
https://ich.unesco.org/en/events?meeting_id=00017 [Accessed 18/04/2018]

UNESCO (2007) *International seminar on Principles and Experiences of Drawing Up ICH Inventories in Europe.* Tallinn, Estonia. 14-15 May.
https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/00203-EN.pdf [Accessed 17/04/2018]

UNESCO (2013) *Report on the evaluation by the Internal Oversight Service of UNESCO's standard-setting work of the Culture Sector and the related audit of the working methods of Cultural Conventions. Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, Eighth session Baku, Azerbaijan. 2-7 December 2013 (ITH/13/8.COM/5.c).
http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002230/223095E.pdf [Accessed 17/04/2018]

UNESCO (2015) *Expert meeting on a model code of ethics. Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, Tenth session, Windhoek, Namíbia. 30 November- 4 December (ITH/15/10.COM/15.a).
https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/10.COM/15.A. [Accessed 18/04/2018]

UNESCO (2016) *Operational Directives for the Implementation of the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*.
http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002230/223095E.pdf [Accessed 17/04/2018]

UNIÃO EUROPEIA (2018) *Participatory Governance of Cultural Heritage*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

VAN UYTSEL, Steven (2012) "Philosophies Behind the Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention: Equality in Heritage Protection, Community Recognition and Cultural Diversity". *SSRN´s* eLibrary.
https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2001835 [Accessed 08/01/2018]

VAN ZANTEN, Wim (2012) "The Relation Between Communities and Their Living Culture as Represented by Audiovisual Files". In *2012 The First ICH Researchers Forum of 2003 Convention. International Research Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage* in the Asia-Pacific Region (IRCI). 87-92.
http://irci.jp/assets/files/2012_ICH_Forum.pdf#page=29 [Accessed 08/01/2018]

VNA (2009), *Vídeo nas Aldeias* http://videonasaldeias.org.br

VERGO, P. (1989), *The New Museology*. London: Reaktion Books.

WENDLAND, Wend B. (2009) "Seeking tangible benefits from linking culture, development and intellectual property". In *International Journal of Intangible Heritage*, Vol. 04. 128-136.
http://www.ijih.org/fileDown.down?filePath=4/dtl/78bba0b7-0af5-45eb-9632-8f718d7645a3&fileName=Vol.4-8.pdf&contentType=volumeDtl&downFileId=51&fileType=PDF&type=pdf . [Accessed 08/01/2018]

WENGER, Etienne (1998) *Communities of Practice. Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Annex 1

Ethical Principles for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage
in https://ich.unesco.org/en/ethics-and-ich-00866 [Consulted 18/04/2018] [Emphasis in the original]

1. Communities, groups and, where applicable, individuals should have the **primary role** in safeguarding their own intangible cultural heritage.
2. The **right of communities, groups and, where applicable, individuals** to continue the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge and skills necessary to ensure the viability of the intangible cultural heritage should be recognized and respected.
3. **Mutual respect** as well as a respect for and mutual appreciation of intangible cultural heritage, should prevail in interactions between States and between communities, groups and, where applicable, individuals.
4. All interactions with the communities, groups and, where applicable, individuals who create, safeguard, maintain and transmit intangible cultural heritage should be characterized by **transparent collaboration**, dialogue, negotiation and consultation, and contingent upon their **free, prior, sustained and informed consent**.
5. **Access** of communities, groups and individuals to the instruments, objects, artefacts, cultural and natural spaces and places of memory whose existence is necessary for expressing the intangible cultural heritage should be ensured, including in situations of armed conflict. Customary practices governing access to intangible cultural heritage should be fully respected, even where these may limit broader public access.
6. Each community, group or individual should assess the value of its own intangible cultural heritage and this intangible cultural heritage should **not be subject to external judgements of value or worth**.
7. The communities, groups and individuals who create intangible cultural heritage should **benefit from the protection** of the moral and material interests resulting from such heritage, and particularly from its use, research, documentation, promotion or adaptation by members of the communities or others.
8. The **dynamic and living nature of intangible cultural heritage** should be continuously respected. Authenticity and exclusivity should not constitute concerns and obstacles in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage.
9. Communities, groups, local, national and transnational organizations and individuals should carefully assess the direct and indirect, short-term and long-term, potential and definitive **impact** of any action that may affect the viability of intangible cultural heritage or the communities who practise it.
10. Communities, groups and, where applicable, individuals should play a significant role in determining what constitutes **threats to their intangible cultural heritage** including the decontextualization, commodification and misrepresentation of it and in deciding how to prevent and mitigate such threats.
11. **Cultural diversity** and the identities of communities, groups and individuals should be fully respected. In the respect of values recognized by communities, groups and individuals and sensitivity to cultural norms, specific attention to **gender** equality, **youth** involvement and **respect for ethnic identities** should be included in the design and implementation of safeguarding measures.
12. The safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage is of **general interest to humanity** and should therefore be undertaken through cooperation among bilateral, sub regional, regional and international parties; nevertheless, communities, groups and, where applicable, individuals should never be alienated from their own intangible cultural heritage