



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization



Intangible
Cultural
Heritage

Urgent Safeguarding List

Original: English

CONVENTION FOR THE SAFEGUARDING OF THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE SAFEGUARDING OF THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE

Fifth session
Kenya
November 2010

REPORT ON THE EXAMINATION OF NOMINATION FILES NO. 00321 FOR INSCRIPTION ON THE LIST OF INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE IN NEED OF URGENT SAFEGUARDING IN 2010

Name of the examiner: Dr. Hans Van Tilburg
Name of the expert (if different):
Date of the examination: (revised on) 15 July 2010
Nomination file No. 00321 State Party: China Name of element: The watertight-bulkhead technology of Chinese junks
<p><i>Note: Information in italics in boxes is provided for the examiner's reference; it includes excerpts from the Operational Directives or from the explanations given to submitting States Parties in the nomination form. The examiner shall rely upon the information provided within the nomination file, including any photos, video or additional information that is made available as part of the nomination. The examiner shall bring to bear his/her personal and professional knowledge in assessing the credibility and completeness of the information provided within the nomination, but his/her report shall primarily address whether or not the submitting State, within the nomination, has adequately demonstrated that the criteria for inscription are satisfied. The examiner shall neither be a national of the State(s) Party(ies) submitting the nomination nor have any conflict of interest that could influence unduly the results of the examination.</i></p>

Excerpts from the Operational Directives

Examination of nominations:

5. *With a view to their evaluation by the Committee, nominations shall be examined by preferably more than one advisory organization accredited in conformity with Article 9.1 of the Convention. In conformity with Article 8.4, the Committee may invite public or private bodies and/or private persons with recognized competence in the field of intangible cultural heritage, in order to consult them on specific matters. No nomination will be examined by (a) national(s) of the State(s) Party(ies) submitting the nomination.*
6. *Examinations shall include assessment of the nomination's conformity with the inscription criteria.*
7. *Each examination shall include assessment of the viability of the element and of the feasibility and sufficiency of the safeguarding plan. It shall also include assessment of the risk of its disappearing, due, inter alia, to the lack of means for safeguarding and protecting it, or to processes of globalization and social or environmental transformation.*
8. *The reports of these examinations shall include a recommendation to the Committee to inscribe, or not to inscribe, the nominated element.*

Brief textual description of the nominated element

The examiner should provide a brief description of the nominated element, suitable for publication. This may draw upon item D of the Cover Sheet, but should also draw upon the nomination as a whole to provide a summary overview of the essential features of the element. The description should be prepared based on the information provided within the nomination file.

(175 to 225 words)

The watertight bulkhead technology of Chinese junks represents the keystone feature in Chinese wooden vessel construction, a traditional skill which dates back to the Jin Dynasty (265-420 AD). While the practice of watertight bulkheads was widespread in coastal (motorized) fishing vessels, the application in traditional Chinese sailing junks is now limited to only a few coastal areas in Fujian Province, and to only three master craftsmen and a few junk building villages currently identified with the practice.

The role of watertight bulkhead technology in history would be hard to overstate. The ability to construct vessels safe for navigation (compartmentalized) contributed to Chinese trade and communication throughout East and Southeast Asia, and as far as East Africa during the Ming Dynasty (15th century). This includes what is now called the 'Maritime Silk Route.' The technology was shared with other cultures and influenced seafaring activities on an international scale.

Perhaps 60 people are currently active in constructing traditional watertight bulkhead junks, built mainly from camphor, pine, and fir timber. Bulkhead planks are rabbet-jointed and caulked with the traditional mixture of ramie, lime, and tung oil, forming multiple independent watertight compartments. Traditional ceremonies specific to the construction and launching of junks are still conducted. The identification of coastal Chinese culture and heritage with junk/bulkhead technology is rooted in history and in contemporary practices within these limited coastal areas.

Criterion U.1 The element constitutes intangible cultural heritage as defined in Article 2 of the Convention.

Excerpts from the nomination form

Description of the element (Not to exceed 1,000 words)

A clear and complete description is essential to demonstrate to the Committee that the nominated element meets the Convention's definition of intangible heritage. The description should provide the Committee with sufficient information to determine:

- that the element is among the 'practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith';
- that 'communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize [it] as part of their cultural heritage';
- that it is being 'transmitted from generation to generation, [and] is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history';
- that it provides communities and groups involved 'with a sense of identity and continuity'; and
- that it is not incompatible 'with existing international human rights instruments as well as with the requirements of mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals, and of sustainable development'.

The description should refer to all the significant features of the element as it exists at present, and should include discussion of its social and cultural functions at present, the characteristics of the bearers and practitioners, any special roles or categories of persons with specific responsibilities towards the element, among others. Nomination files need not address in detail the history of the element, or its origin or antiquity.

Nomination demonstrates that the element satisfies Criterion U.1:

Yes

No

Examiner's comments regarding the element's conformity with the definition of intangible cultural heritage in the Convention

The examiner should address whether the submitting State has adequately demonstrated that the element satisfies the Convention's definition of intangible cultural heritage.

(250 to 500 words)

The submitting state has demonstrated that the craft of watertight bulkhead technology is a core traditional skill long established in Chinese history, the knowledge being continuously transmitted orally through the generations by skilled shipwrights. Current practice involves a specific set of skills and knowledge, traditional carpentry instruments, and is associated with specific shipyards (cultural spaces) and villages. Watertight bulkhead technology is successfully identified with the craft of wooden junk construction, the central object and physical expression of Chinese coastal maritime heritage.

This practice is recognized by specific communities as a feature of Chinese culture and heritage, reflecting coastal seafaring activities. Specific core regions/coastal townships are identified with the craft. The few master craftsmen who maintain this practice are reportedly respected in their community, and ceremonial activities associated with junk construction and launching are mentioned as still conducted by these limited communities (several shipbuilding villages) today. The master craftsmen, Fangcai Chen, Xixiu Liu, and Zhaowei Liu, have been recognized as

representative transmitters. In turn, they direct approximately 60 assistant in the construction of watertight bulkhead technology.

The submitting state has demonstrated that the craft has been transmitted orally through the generations from master craftsmen to apprentice, within the specific shipbuilding families of the coastal villages. Skills developed to construct wooden Chinese sailing junks (core feature watertight bulkheads) were a direct result of the need for resource gathering, communication, and exchange within the marine environment. The continuing construction of watertight bulkheads in wooden sailing vessels is a recreation/replication of that response to the environment.

The submitting state has demonstrated that communities remain proud of their shipbuilding history and seafaring heritage. Fujian Province is known as the historic center of overseas junk construction. Traditional ceremonial activities associated with the construction and launching of Chinese junks is a form of direct participation in the cultural heritage of the traditional Chinese junk, of which watertight bulkheads are the core technological feature. The submitting state has not gone into detail regarding how widespread these ceremonies are beyond the few remaining craft communities. It has, though, addressed some contemporary impacts from recent examples. The replica junk Princess Taiping's 2008 voyage served to focus appreciation within the community. And one of the master craftsmen has been contracted to build a Song Dynasty replica based on the archaeological remains of the 'South China Sea No. 1' wreck, connecting current cultural practice directly to historical evidence.

To the best of my knowledge, the practice of watertight bulkhead technology is not incompatible with existing international human rights, requirements of human right among communities...etc. However, the submitting state, in addressing the issue of sustainability in regards to the camphor, pine, and fir needed for the practice of the craft, states that 'it's difficult to ensure the sustainability of raw material supply.'

Criterion U.2 The element is in urgent need of safeguarding because its viability is at risk despite the efforts of the community, group or, if applicable, individuals and State(s) Party(ies) concerned.

Excerpts from the nomination form

Viability assessment (Not to exceed 500 words)

Describe the current level of viability of the element, particularly the frequency and extent of its practice, the strength of traditional modes of transmission, the demographics of practitioners and audiences and its sustainability.

Threat and risk assessment (Not to exceed 500 words)

This section should identify and describe the threats to the element's continued transmission and enactment and describe the severity and immediacy of those threats.

Nomination demonstrates that the element satisfies Criterion U.2:

Yes

No

Examiner's comments regarding whether the nomination demonstrates that the element is in urgent need of safeguarding

The examiner should address whether the submitting State has adequately demonstrated that the element's viability is at risk, that the community, group or, if applicable, individuals and State(s) Party(ies) concerned have made efforts to ensure its viability, and that it is consequently in urgent need of safeguarding.

(250 to 500 words)

The submitting state makes the strong case that, despite the practice of watertight bulkhead technology being much more prevalent in the past, the craft has dramatically declined and is now threatened. This assessment is the direct result of the result of a survey conducted in 2006-2007. Though this survey is unfortunately not described in any detail (no examination of methods), this assessment is completely reasonable, given the supported facts that: 1) wooden junks have declined in usage with the spread of modern steel ship construction; 2) camphor, fir and pine timbers of the appropriate size (trees age 30 years) for ship construction are increasingly difficult to obtain; 3) labor costs are increasing; and 4) craftsmen skilled can no longer make a living and have switched to different careers. The described 'crisis in use' and 'crisis in transmission of the heritage' are phenomena all too familiar in the field of maritime heritage preservation.

The submitting state has demonstrated specific efforts made to ensure the continued viability of the traditional practice including promulgation of preservation rules, resource surveys, museums, subsidies to practitioners, model construction, textbooks etc. Most of these efforts focus on simply assessing the craft itself; only one (minor subsidies to three master craftsmen) directly address the economic obstacles. All efforts so far appear geographically limited to the few identified core areas.

For a craft which was once so prevalent and critical to the maritime activity throughout an entire region to now be so reduced in scope to be limited to a handful of villages and the practice of only three master craftsmen reflects a dire and all too common situation within the global field of maritime cultural heritage preservation. The craft of watertight bulkhead technology, core feature to Chinese wooden junk construction, is therefore in urgent need of safeguarding from both a national and international aspect.

Examiner's assessment of the viability of the element

The examiner should address whether the submitting State's assessment of the element's viability is accurate, realistic and complete.

(150 to 300 words)

It is difficult to know whether the submitting state's assessment of the watertight bulkhead technology is complete, as the application contains few details on the methods of the survey used to assess the resource. The criteria for categorizing a coastal village as within the influence of the core technology remains undefined. However, the capability for this practice identified with these communities and practitioners is judged as realistic as some few wooden coastal fishing vessels are still produced, and accurate historical constructions have been built (Princess Taiping) and are being (Song Dynasty replica) planned. These examples indicate that traditional working examples of the watertight bulkhead technology still exist, that the capacity to construct the technology into its traditional (sailing) form still exists, and that the technology is still being accurately informed by historical evidence. Any more locations or practitioners not mentioned in the survey would serve to increase the viability measure.

The nomination states that, although the construction of wooden Chinese junks has declined, specific components of the watertight bulkhead technology do continue and are, in fact, widespread throughout the modern shipbuilding industry. The traditional caulk of mixed ramie, tung oil and lime is still 'widely used in the construction of coastal fishing vessels, outboard

motorboats, and motorized sailboats.'

Examiner's assessment of the risk of the element's disappearing, due, inter alia, to the lack of means for safeguarding and protecting it, or to processes of globalization and social or environmental transformation

The examiner should address whether the submitting State's assessment of the risk of the element's disappearing is accurate, realistic and complete.

(150 to 300 words)

The submitting state lists five strong reasons that the craft of watertight bulkhead technology is disappearing: 1) 'ironclad' [sic steel-hulled...ie 'modern'] vessels replacing traditional wooden ship construction; 2) declining supply and increasing costs of appropriate sized timber for wooden ship construction; 3) past general illiteracy of craftsmen (skill traditionally transmitted orally and through practice, rather than blueprints of documents); 4) fewer practicing craftsmen due to economic pressures; and 5) lack of appeal or transmission of the craft to younger apprentices. These are realistic obstacles which accurately and completely summarize the main challenges to the practice of this intangible cultural heritage. Even with the current limited safeguarding measure employed by the submitting state, the practice is in danger of disappearing due to these trends.

The retraining of selected master craftsmen as highly skilled wood workers, creating economically feasible positions for them which remain related to the practice of watertight bulkhead technology, is a possibility which could alleviate some of the risk due to lack of demand and declining numbers of practitioners. This possibility is mentioned only briefly in the nomination, though, and not described in any detail.

Criterion U.3 Safeguarding measures are elaborated that may enable the community, group or, if applicable, individuals concerned to continue the practice and transmission of the element.

Excerpts from the nomination form

Safeguarding measures

Items 4.a. to 4.c. request the elaboration of a coherent set of safeguarding measures as called for in Criterion U.3. The safeguarding measures, if effectively implemented, should be expected to contribute substantially to the safeguarding of the element within a time-frame of approximately four years. They should include measures aimed at ensuring the viability of the element by enabling the community to continue its practice and transmission.

4.a. Current and recent efforts to safeguard the element (not to exceed 500 words)

Describe the current and recent efforts of the concerned community, group or, if applicable individuals to ensure the viability of the element. Describe efforts of the concerned State(s) Party(ies) to safeguard the element, taking note of external or internal constraints such as limited resources.

4.b. Safeguarding measures proposed (not to exceed 2,000 words)

This section should identify and describe a coherent set of safeguarding measures that, within a time-frame of approximately four years, could substantially enhance the viability of the element, if implemented, and provide detailed information as follows:

- a) What primary objective(s) will be addressed and what concrete results will be expected?*
- b) What are the key activities to be carried out in order to achieve these expected results? Please describe the activities in detail and in their best sequence,*

addressing their feasibility.

- c) *Management and implementation: describe the mechanisms for the full participation of communities, groups or, if appropriate, individuals in the proposed safeguarding measures. Describe the implementing organization or body (name, background, etc.) and the human resources available for implementing the project.*
- d) *Timetable and budget: provide a timetable for the proposed activities and estimate the funds required for their implementation, identifying any available resources (governmental sources, in-kind community inputs, etc.).*

4.c. Commitments of States and of communities, groups or individuals concerned
(not to exceed 500 words)

The feasibility of safeguarding depends in large part on the aspirations and commitment of the community, group or, if applicable, individuals concerned and the support and cooperation of the State Party concerned. This section should demonstrate that the community, group or, if applicable, individuals concerned have the will and commitment to safeguard the element if conditions are favourable and that the State Party concerned has the commitment to support the safeguarding effort by creating favourable conditions for its implementation.

Nomination demonstrates that the element satisfies Criterion U.3:

Yes

No

Examiner's assessment of the feasibility and sufficiency of the safeguarding plan

The examiner should address whether the submitting State has elaborated a coherent set of safeguarding measures that can reasonably be expected to strengthen the viability of the element within the coming four years, and assess whether they reflect the priorities and aspirations of the communities concerned, whether the measures are feasible, and whether the communities and States are adequately committed to their implementation.

(250 to 500 words)

The submitting state has drafted a set of safeguarding efforts (both current and proposed) which present a coherent set of protection measures. These efforts are laid out in a timeline with budget estimates attached. There is no way to independently verify these proposed measures outside the nomination form. However, these measures as stated can reasonably be expected to strengthen the viability of watertight bulkhead technology and Chinese wooden junk construction. They account for direct action in education, international outreach, projects, facilities (training center) and economic subsidies, and also include 'indirect' but equally important provisions for the establishment of fund raising mechanisms (heritage foundation) and operations/management mechanisms (heritage association).

As the shipbuilding villages within the identified areas are historically associated with the practice of watertight bulkhead technology and junk construction, it is perhaps possible to assume that preservation of this technology is a local priority and aspiration. The nomination packet includes only two consent forms in support of this though, and both forms are signed by the same representative transmitters of watertight bulkhead technology, in the name of the committee and the communities involved. There are no forms signed directly by community groups and no existing associations. There are, however, pledges from several of the local governmental townships, municipalities, and both governmental and non-governmental cultural institutions committing efforts and resources to the safeguarding measures. As it is not the role of the Secretariat to define 'community' within the nominating state, these civic institutions may be accepted as the civic community. The noted lack of non-institutional 'grass roots' community involvement within this nomination, while puzzling, does not alone suffice to negate community support for this nomination. (In fact, lack of non-institutional community support can be attributed directly to the identified threats to this heritage craft.) Therefore, the answer to whether

these safeguarding efforts demonstrate community priorities and aspirations is a qualified 'yes.'

In general, most of the measures to safeguard the intangible cultural heritage appear to be feasible, as they reflect known techniques for heritage preservation. The ability for national and local governments, and for heritage organizations to meet budgetary goals and provide the stipulated support (total 3.34 million RMB) is beyond the scope of this assessment to prove or disprove. It is important, though, to note that the measures include the establishment of a Foundation for the Protection of the Watertight-Bulkhead Technology of Chinese Junks (2013) which can play a central role in fundraising. The construction of a replica of Zheng He's 'treasure ship' (2015) is the single questionable measure, as the actual design and size (and therefore cost) remain unclear.

Criterion U.4 The element has been nominated following the widest possible participation of the community, group or, if applicable, individuals concerned and with their free, prior and informed consent.

Excerpts from the nomination form

a. Participation of communities, groups and individuals

Describe how the community, group and, if applicable, individuals concerned have participated in the nomination process at all stages, as required by Criterion R.4. States Parties are further encouraged to prepare nominations with the participation of a wide variety of other concerned parties, including where appropriate local and regional governments, neighbouring communities, NGOs, research institutes, centres of expertise and other interested parties.

b. Free, prior and informed consent

The free, prior and informed consent of the community, group or, if applicable, individuals concerned may be demonstrated through written or recorded concurrence, or through other means, according to the legal regimens of the State Party and the infinite variety of communities and groups concerned. The Committee will welcome a broad range of demonstrations or attestations of community consent rather than specifying any single standard.

c. Respect for customary practices governing access

Demonstrate that inscription and implementation of the safeguarding measures fully respects customary practices governing access to specific aspects of such heritage, if such practices exist (cf. Article 13). Describe any specific measures that might need to be taken to ensure such respect.

Nomination demonstrates that the element satisfies Criterion U.4:

Yes

No

Examiner's assessment of the participation of the community, group or, if applicable, individuals concerned

The examiner should assess whether the community, group or individuals concerned have participated fully in the nomination process at all stages and whether the nomination reflects their participation.

(150 to 300 words)

The submitting state makes a strong case for the full participation of the specific heritage transmitters in the survey and nomination process. The identified transmitters of the technology were engaged in the survey and nomination process from the start, including participation in all safeguarding discussions and in the documentary film. In addition, it is stated that Jinjiang City, Jiaocheng District (Ningde) and 'other relevant communities' collected documents, tools, and even vessels for inclusion in the intangible cultural heritage inventory. Experts from these communities formed fieldwork teams to conduct thematic surveys, which can provide the basis

for future safeguarding measures.

Furthermore, numerous civic institutions and bureaus and public museums provided input and staff time into the nomination process. Higher administrative units, such as the Chinese Ministry of Culture, the Chinese Academy of Arts, and the Protection Center of Intangible Cultural Heritage of China conducted the evaluation. Therefore, the direct inheritors, as well as these local and national institutions, appear to have been fully engaged in the nomination process at all the critical stages.

Examiner's comments on their free, prior and informed consent

The examiner should assess whether the submitting State has provided satisfactory evidence of the free, prior and informed consent of the community, group or individuals concerned.

(150 to 300 words)

The application includes two signed documents from the identified transmitters. These signed documents include traditional thumb prints affixed to the signature. At face value, this would appear to indicate satisfactory evidence of free, prior (as the inheritors have been engaged in all the steps of the nomination process) and informed consent.

It is more difficult to judge whether free prior and informed consent has actually been granted by the identified communities, as the nature of community represented in this nomination is civic and/or institutional/governmental. These groups, though, appear to have been involved willingly and prior to the nomination itself. There is no evidence of free prior consent from the aforementioned 60-some assistant craftsmen, beyond their representation by the master craftsmen transmitters. Greater details regarding the resource inventory and survey methodology would have helped address this issue, and such details were requested in the Secretariat's call for additional information (document 03103 dated 15 June 2009), but not fully answered by the submitting state. Therefore the nomination provides only marginal evidence of free, prior, and informed consent from the transmitters and civic institutions which represent the communities and groups and individuals concerned.

Examiner's comments on respect for customary practices governing access to the element, if applicable

The examiner should comment on whether the submitting State has adequately addressed the question of any customary practices that might govern access to the element.

(not to exceed 300 words)

There do not appear to be any specific requirements, mandates, or prohibitions featuring customary practices associated with watertight bulkhead technology and Chinese junk construction. However, there are specific traditions or customary practices long associated with Chinese junks and ones which perhaps should be respected, but in any case at least merit recognition and mention in the nomination form. These are the worship of Tienhou (Tienfei), respect for the religion and beliefs of the local community, respect for the folk religion and beliefs surrounding Chinese junks in general, and the traditional ceremonies which attend significant stages of the construction and launching of a vessel, to name a few. These traditional practices associated with the cultural heritage of Chinese junks are mentioned directly in the nomination in section 2 criterion U.1 as solemn memorial ceremonies conducted by local communities. It seems very strange, then, that these are not reflected later in the same nomination under customary practices. The nomination therefore does not adequately address customary practices.

(Some of the above practices are included in the 'additional nomination form' document 03095 dated 9 March 2009, but are absent from the current nomination dated 26 April 2010. As per instructions to the examiners, all nomination forms prior to the current nomination are to be treated as incidental background material only.)

Criterion U.5 The element is included in an inventory of the intangible cultural heritage present in the territory(ies) of the submitting State(s) Party(ies) as defined in Articles 11 and 12.

Excerpts from the nomination form

The submitting State should identify the inventory in which the element has been included and the office, agency, organization or body responsible for maintaining that inventory. The description also should demonstrate that the inventory has been drawn up in conformity with Articles 11 and 12, in particular Article 11(b) that stipulates that intangible cultural heritage shall be identified and defined ‘with the participation of communities, groups, and relevant non-governmental organizations’ and Article 12 requiring that inventories be regularly updated.

The nominated element’s inclusion in an inventory should not in any way imply or require that the inventory(ies) should have been completed prior to nomination. Rather, a submitting State Party may be in the process of completing or updating one or more inventories, but has already duly included the nominated element on an inventory-in-progress.

Nomination demonstrates that the element satisfies Criterion U.5: Yes No

Examiner’s comments on the nomination’s conformity with Criterion U.5

The examiner should comment on whether the submitting State has adequately demonstrated that the element is included within an inventory, and has shown that the inventory was drawn up in conformity with the Convention, especially Article 11(b) requiring the participation of communities, groups and relevant non-governmental organizations.

(100 to 200 words)

The inventory of the watertight bulkhead technology resource has been included in the second batch of elements listed as national-level intangible cultural heritage by the submitting state as of June 2008. This inventory was a product of the 2006-2007 survey conducted that identified the relevant areas, communities, practitioners, and existing resources. Field teams collected a wide range of oral information and local documentation. The survey was conducting in coordination with the shipbuilding craftsmen of Shenhu Town in Jinjiang City and Zhangwan Town in Ningde City, the participation of the identified master craftsmen, public cultural institutions (museums), etc. ‘Other relevant communities’ are also cited. In 2009, experts, scholars, and ‘transmitters’ from relevant communities again formed field teams and conducted thematic surveys, updating the initial inventory. Therefore, the submitting state has adequately demonstrated that the element is indeed included in an inventory in conformity with the Convention.

OVERALL RECOMMENDATION

The examination report shall include ‘a recommendation to the Committee to inscribe, or not to inscribe, the nominated element’.

Recommend to inscribe:

Recommend not to inscribe:

Examiner's comments on the overall recommendation

To be inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List, an element must satisfy all of the criteria. If the examiner concludes that any criterion is not satisfied, the overall recommendation cannot be to inscribe the element. The examiner may wish to offer further explanation of any such negative conclusions, or may wish to suggest to the Committee certain conditions it might consider attaching to a favourable decision to inscribe the element.

(150 to 300 words)

Nomination 00321 meets all the criteria and provides support for the historical significance of the resource and the engagement of specific master craftsmen, governmental entities and civic institutions. My recommendation is therefore for nomination of the element. Maritime heritage, as captured here by the core technology of traditional Chinese junk construction, is often multicultural and global in nature, for the seas served as passages for cultural exchange. Chinese seafaring technology played a large role in cultural exchange, therefore safeguarding this maritime heritage is a part of our global heritage preservation.

However, the submitting state could have made a stronger application. The difficulty in reviewing this nomination comes from the fact that, although in my opinion the watertight bulkhead technology of Chinese junks is clearly an established cultural heritage, is currently threatened by a number of social and environmental transformation and global modernization factors, and therefore can benefit from enhancement of the submitting state's preservation efforts, the nomination itself contains some weak points which decrease its overall effectiveness. Determining the level to which community-based non-governmental non-institutional groups were engaged in the nomination process is problematic. Further details on the connection between governmental entities and village-level practitioners were officially requested as additional information, yet the updated nomination 26 April 2010 did not fully provide new details. Methodology of the 2006-2007 survey (which led to the inventory and nomination) and customary practices at the village level would have both benefitted from greater attention to the way participants were engaged.