



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization

Organisation  
des Nations Unies  
pour l'éducation,  
la science et la culture

# World Heritage

# 38 COM

**WHC-14/38.COM/INF.8B4.Rev**

**Doha, 16 June 2014**

**Original: English / French**

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC  
AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION**

**CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF  
THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

**WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**Thirty-eighth session**

**Doha, Qatar**

**15 – 25 June 2014**

**Item 8 of the Provisional Agenda: Establishment of the World Heritage List and  
of the List of World Heritage in Danger**

**INF.8B4: Factual error letters**

## **SUMMARY**

This document contains the factual errors notifications received from States Parties by 2 June 2014 in compliance with paragraph 150 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

*This document cancels and replaces the previous one.*

**Alphabetical list by State Party of notifications of factual errors in the evaluation reports of the Advisory Bodies relating to nominations to be examined at the 38th session of the World Heritage Committee (15-25 June 2014)**

State Party	World Heritage nomination	ID No.		Recommendation	Pp
Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru	Qhapaq Ñan, Andean Road System	1459		I	2
Belgium	Plantin-Moretus House-Workshops-Museum Complex (MBM)	1185	Bis	N	9
Botswana	Okavango Delta	1432		I	11
China / Kazakhstan / Kyrgyzstan	Silk Roads: Initial Section of the Silk Roads, the Routes Network of Tian-shan Corridor	1442		I	14
China / Kazakhstan / Kyrgyzstan	Silk Roads: Initial Section of the Silk Roads, the Routes Network of Tian-shan Corridor	1442		I	17
Denmark	Stevns Klint	1416		I	19
France	Tectono-volcanic Ensemble of the Chaîne des Puys and Limagne Fault	1434		N	20
Germany	Carolingian Westwork and Civitas Corvey	1447		R	54
Ghana	Tongo-Tengzuk Tallensi Cultural Landscape	1409		D	56
India	Rani-ki-Vav (The Queen's Stepwell) at Patan, Gujarat	922		I	57
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Shahr-I Sokhta	1456		D	60
Iraq	Erbil Citadel	1437		D	62
Italy	The Vineyard Landscape of Piedmont: Langhe-Roero and Monferrato	1390	Rev	I	67
Japan	Tomioka Silk Mill and Related Sites	1449		I	68
Mexico	Ancient Maya City and Protected Tropical Forests of Calakmul, Campeche [Extension and renomination of the "Ancient Maya City of Calakmul, Campeche" ]	1061	Bis	D / D	72
Myanmar	Pyu Ancient Cities	1444		D	80
Netherlands	Van Nellefabriek	1441		I	90
Palestine	Palestine: Land of Olives and Vines – Cultural Landscape of Southern Jerusalem, Battir	1492		N	92
Republic of Korea	Namhansanseong	1439		I	95
Russian Federation	Bolgar Historical and Archaeological Complex	981	Rev	I	97
Turkey	Bursa and Cumalıkızık: the Birth of the Ottoman Empire	1452		D	105
Turkey	Pergamon and its Multi-Layered Cultural Landscape	1457		D	115
United Arab Emirates	Khor Dubai (Dubai Creek)	1458		N	117
United States of America	Monumental Earthworks of Poverty Point	1435		D	122
Viet Nam	Trang An Landscape Complex	1438		D / D	124
Zambia	Barotse Cultural Landscape	1429		D	129

**Factual errors notifications are presented in the language in which they have been submitted by the State Party**



**FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS**



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the *Operational Guidelines*)

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Perú

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Qhapaq Ñan, Andean Road System

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
320,1,1	<b>Qhapaq Ñan</b>	Qhapaq Ñan, Andean Road System	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.</b>
320,1,6	<b>Qhapaq Ñan, Andean Road System</b>	Qhapaq Ñan, Andean Road System	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.</b>
320,1,27	<b>Qhapaq Ñan, Andean Road System</b>	Qhapaq Ñan, Andean Road System	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.</b>
320,1,14	Regiones de <b>Arica Parinacota</b>	Regiones de Arica y Parinacota	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this typing error.</b>
321,2,25	are often temples or <b>usnus</b> (ceremonial platforms) but also	are often temples or ushnus (ceremonial platforms) but also	Ushnus are spelled without h in the nomination dossier e.g. p. 109) (and the additional information provided)  <b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.</b>
322,1,1	<b>Argentina presents five key sections</b>	Argentina presents five key subsections	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.</b>
322,1,6	<b>These sections are presented in 20 subsections</b>	These subsections are presented in three subsections and eleven segments.	ICOMOS did not always follow the division of sections, subsections and segments as present in the nomination dossier. It focused mostly on site components – the division supported by the Operational Guidelines and

			<p>describes these as subsections and archaeological sites.</p> <p><b>ICOMOS considers that the remaining corrections re-iterate arguments / justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</b></p>
322,2,13	<b>Qollayusu</b>	Qollasuyu	<p>ICOMOS notes that this main road section is spelled in two different versions in the nomination dossier and can also be found as Qollayusu (e.g. p. 245)</p> <p><b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.</b></p>
322, 2, 23-24	Chile has proposed all its network segments on the level of sub-sections rather than sections of which it contributes five: Putre – Zapahuira, Incahuasi – Lasana, Cupo – Catarpe, Camar – Peine, and Portal del Inca –Finca Chañaral. These sub-sections are presented in 34 segments according to dedicated inventory numbers, <b>51 component</b> sites and include 138 associated archaeological sites.	Chile has proposed all its network segments on the level of sub-sections rather than sections of which it contributes five: Putre – Zapahuira, Incahuasi – Lasana, Cupo – Catarpe, Camar – Peine, and Portal del Inca – Finca Chañaral. These sub-sections are presented in 34 segments according to dedicated inventory numbers, and include 138 associated archaeological sites.	<p>ICOMOS did not always follow the division of sections, subsections and segments as present in the nomination dossier. It focused mostly on site components – the division supported by the Operational Guidelines and describes these as subsections and archaeological sites.</p> <p><b>ICOMOS considers that the remaining corrections re-iterate arguments / justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</b></p>
322,2, 42	<b>Qollayusu</b>	Qollasuyu	<p>ICOMOS notes that this main road section is spelled in two different versions in the nomination dossier and can also be found as Qollayusu (e.g. p. 245)</p> <p><b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.</b></p>
323, 1, 2-6	Colombia contributes elements in one section of the Qhapaq Ñan, Rumichaca – Pasto, <b>which it does not further divide into</b>	Colombia contributes elements in one section of the Qhapaq Ñan, Rumichaca – Pasto, divide into 9 roadsegments: Rumichaca, San	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.</b>

	<p>subsections or segments.</p> <p>The section is presented in 9 site components, which do not contain any associated archaeological sites.</p>	<p>Pedro, La Cofradía, La Paz, Chitarran, Rosal de Chapal, Guapuscal Bajo, Inantas and Los Ajos. The section do not contain any associated archaeological sites.</p>	
323, 1, 25-39	<p><b>Perú</b> and Colombia. Among the national sections the following are listed: Pulcas - Troya A, Pulcas - Troya B, Mariscal Sucre - El Tambo, La Paz - Quebrada Tupala, Loma Virgen -Chiquito, Juan Montalvo - Cabuyal, Pimán - Caranqui, Campana Pucará - Quitoloma, Nagsiche - Panzaleo, Achupallas - Ingapirca, Palcañan Grande - Palcañan Chico, El Tambo - Honorato Vázquez, Cerro de Cojitambo (Loma Curiquinga) - Rumiurco, Pachamama - Llacao, Llaviuco - Llaviuco, Mamamag - Mamamag, Paredones - Paredones, Hierba Buena - San Antonio, Santa Martha - Botija Paqui, Caragshillo - Cañaro - Tuncarta, Oñacapa - Loma de Paila (la Zarza), Ciudadela - Vinoyaco Grande, Quebrada Huatuchi - Plaza del Inca - Las Aradas, Jimbura . Puente Roto, San José -Llamacanchi - Las Limas. The sections are presented as 62 site components in 28 inventoried segments and include 50 associated archaeological sites. The length of the Ecuadorian <b>Qhapaq Ñan</b> components amounts to 113.73 kilometres. The size of all serial components in Ecuador is 41.98 hectares, which are surrounded by a buffer zone of 70.990 hectares.</p>	<p><b>Perú Ecuador</b> and Colombia.</p> <p>Among the binational sections shared with Colombia the following are listed: Rumichaca, Pulcas - Troya A, Pulcas - Troya B, Mariscal Sucre - El Tambo, La Paz – Quebrada Tupala, Loma Virgen - Chiquito, Juan Montalvo – Cabuyal. Ecuador has selected the following subsections and segments: Subsections: Achupallas - Ingapirca, Quebrada Huatuchi - Plaza del Inca - Las Aradas Segments: Pimán - Caranqui, Campana Pucará - Quitoloma, Nagsiche - Panzaleo, Palcañan Grande - Palcañan Chico, El Tambo - Honorato Vázquez, Cerro de Cojitambo (Loma Curiquinga) - Rumiurco, Pachamama - Llacao, Llaviuco - Llaviuco, Mamamag - Mamamag, Paredones - Paredones, Hierba Buena - San Antonio, Santa Martha - Botija Paqui, Caragshillo - Cañaro - Tuncarta, Oñacapa - Loma de Paila (la Zarza), Ciudadela - Vinoyaco Grande. Among the binational sections shared with Perú the following are listed: Jimbura - Puente Roto, San José -Llamacanchi - Las Limas. The sections are presented 26 inventoried segments, 2 subsegments and include 50 associated archaeological sites. The length of the Ecuadorian <b>Qhapaq Ñan</b> components amounts to 113.73 kilometres. The size of all serial components in Ecuador is 41.98 hectares, which are surrounded by a buffer zone of 70.990 hectares.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that Perú needs to be retained as otherwise the sentence would lose its meaning. Ecuador cannot share a binational section with itself.</p> <p>With regard to the other corrections, ICOMOS did not always follow the division of sections, subsections and segments as present in the nomination dossier. It focused mostly on site components – the division supported by the Operational Guidelines and describes these as subsections and archaeological sites.</p> <p><b>ICOMOS considers that the remaining corrections re-iterate arguments / justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</b></p>
323,1,46	The Ecuadorian components provide evidence to the...	The Ecuadorian sections, subsections and segments provide evidence to the...	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.</b>
323,2, 3	Including <b>usnu</b> sites on mountain peaks. The binational	Including ushnu sites on mountain peaks. The binational	<p>Usnus are spelled. without h in the nomination dossier e.g. p. 109) (and the additional information provided)</p> <p><b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.</b></p>

323, 2,7-22	<p>The Peruvian segments of the Qhapaq Ñan consist of 8 main sections, <b>which are subdivided into 114 subsections, which will hence not be listed here.</b></p> <p>The segments are presented in <b>140 component sites in 114 inventoried sections.</b> These also include 85 associated archaeological sites. The length of the Peruvian components amounts to <b>720.28 kilometres</b> and the overall territory comprised in the property boundaries is <b>11,406.95 hectares.</b> These are surrounded by buffer zones of in total <b>663,069.68 hectares.</b></p>	<p>The Peruvian segments of the Qhapaq Ñan consist of 8 main sections, which include 25 subsections and 75 segments (Pags. 63-68 from the nomination file) which will hence not be listed here.</p> <p>The segments are presented in 60 component sites. These also include 85 associated archaeological sites. The length of the Peruvian components amounts to 272.49 kilometres and the overall territory comprised in the property boundaries is 2,051.16 hectares. These are surrounded by buffer zones of a total 561,368.56 hectares.</p>	<p>ICOMOS did not always follow the division of sections, subsections and segments as present in the nomination dossier. It focused mostly on site components – the division supported by the Operational Guidelines and describes these as subsections and archaeological sites.</p> <p><b>ICOMOS considers that the remaining corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</b></p>
323,2,32	<b>The Chinchaysuyu</b>	The Chinchasuyu	<p>ICOMOS notes that this main road section is spelled in two different versions in the nomination dossier and can also be found as Chinchaysuyu (e.g. p. 414)</p> <p><b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change</b></p>
324,1,46	<b>Chicas who lived in the eastern valleys and the Bolivian high</b>	Chichas who lived in the eastern	<p>ICOMOS notes that the name of this group is spelled in two different versions in the nomination dossier and can also be found as Chicas (e.g. p. 698)</p> <p><b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change</b></p>
324, 2, 7	Today, the remains of the Qhapaq Ñan road network are still used as key transportation roads across five countries, <b>Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia and Peru</b> and reach into the south of Colombia.	Today, the remains of the Qhapaq Ñan road network are still used as key transportation roads across five countries, Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, <b>Ecuador</b> and Peru and reach into the south of Colombia.	<p><b>ICOMOS considers this correction a factual error but suggests the following correct formulation:</b></p> <p>Today, the remains of the Qhapaq Ñan road network are still used as key transportation roads across five countries, Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Ecuador and Peru and reach into the south of Colombia.</p>
326,1, 47	altitude of more than 6,000 metres, to the coast,	altitude of more than 6,000 metres, to the coast, <b>and to the</b>	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an</b>

		Ecuadorian Amazon	editorial change.
326,1,6-17	These sites are the segment Vilcanota-La Raya (PE-CD-05/C-2011), the segment Colquejahu-Pacaje (PE-CD-07/C-2011), <b>the segment Walla-Kintama (PE-OL-20/C-2011), including its five associated archaeological sites,</b> the segment Toroyoq-Kutacoca (PE-VCH-25/CS-2011) including its 4 associated archaeological sites, the segment <b>Ipsas Grande (PE-XP-28/C-2011,</b> the segment Quebrada Escalera (PE-XP-29/C-2011), the segment Pachamama – Llaaco (EC-PL-15/CS-2011), the segment Oñacapa – Loma de Paila (La Zarza) (EC-OL-24/CS-2011) and the segment Jimbura – Puente Roto (EC-JP-27/C-2011).	These sites are the segment Vilcanota-La Raya (PE-CD-05/C-2011), the segment Colquejahu-Pacaje (PE-CD-07/C-2011), <b>the segment Walla-Kintama (PE-OL-20/C-2011),</b> the segment Toroyoq-Kutacoca (PE-VCH-25/CS-2011) including its 4 associated archaeological sites, the segment <b>Ipsas Grande (PE-XP-28/C-2011,</b> the segment Quebrada Escalera (PE-XP-29/C-2011), the segment Pachamama – Llaaco (EC-PL-15/CS-2011), the segment Oñacapa – Loma de Paila (La Zarza) (EC-OL-24/CS-2011) and the segment Jimbura – Puente Roto (EC-JP-27/C-2011).	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction a difference of opinion.</b>
<b>326, 1,23</b>	The nomination file offers the impression that the choice made is rather exhaustive in presenting <b>all</b> segments and sections of the Qhapaq Ñan which are in acceptable state in terms of conservation and <b>authenticity and which the concerned States Parties intend to preserve.</b>	The nomination file offers the impression that the choice made is rather exhaustive in presenting <b>some</b> segments and sections of the Qhapaq Ñan which are in acceptable state in terms of conservation and authenticity and which the concerned States Parties <b>intend to preserve.</b>	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction a difference of opinion.</b>
<b>326, 1,28</b>	It can therefore be concluded that <b>apart from</b> the excluded segments indicated for potential future integration, <b>serial additions will be very limited.</b>	It can therefore be concluded that <b>the</b> excluded segments indicated for potential future integration, <b>will be priority for serial additions.</b>	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction a difference of opinion.</b>
327, 1,22-23	include the Apacheta structures, the segment <b>San Agustín del Callo - Nagsiche - Panzaleo (EC-NP-10/CS-2011)</b>	include the Apacheta structures, the segment Nagsiche Panzaleo, and the archaeological site San Agustín del Callo (EC-NP-10/CS-2011)	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction a difference of opinion.</b>
329,1,15	<b>Qhapaq Ñan, Andean Road System</b>	Qhapaq Ñan, Andean Road System	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.</b>
329,2,49	<b>303 archaeological sites</b>	308 archaeological sites	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction a difference of opinion.</b>
330, 2,41-45	The buffer zone currently discussed and agreed upon with the community at segment <b>Pancca-Buena Vista-Chuquibambilla (PE-CD-06/CS-2011)</b> requires to be legally formalized.	The buffer zone currently discussed and agreed upon with the community at segment <b>Pancca-Buena Vista-Chuquibambilla (PE-CD-06/C-2011)</b> requires to be legally formalized.	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this typing error.</b>
331, 1, 47-50	The two complete segments in private ownership are <b>Pancca-Buena Vista, Chuquibambilla-Qhesqa (PE-CD-06/C-2011),</b> Q'omer Moqo-Nicasio (PE-CD-08/C-2011).	The two complete segments in private ownership are <b>Pancca-Buena Vista, Chuquibambilla (PE-CD-06/C-2011),</b> Q'omer Moqo- Nicasio (PE-CD-08/C-2011).	ICOMOS cannot see any difference between its evaluation text and the correction.

331, 1, 52-54 331, 2, 1-10	These are the Plaza Inca HananHauk'aypata (PE-PH-01/CS-2011), the segment <b>Paucarcol-La-Yanamayo (PE-CD-09/CS-2011)</b> , Kancharani-Andenes (PE-CD-10/C-2011), Sipampa-Pomata (PE-CD-13/C-2011), <b>Arbol-Era-Parcco Chua Chua (PE-CD-15/C-2011)</b> , Huacahuasi-Tambohuaylla (PE-OL-16/CS-2011), Inca Chaka-Qollotayoc (PE-OL-17/C-2011), Choquecancha-KillaKhawarina (PE-OL-18/CS-2011), Paucarpata-Ichuka (PE-OL-19/CS-2011), Tawis-Puente Ollanta (PE-OL-21/CS-2011), <b>Inca Mach □ Ay-Samarinapata (PE-VCH-23/CS-2011)</b> , Kutacoca-Choquequirao (PE-VCH-26/CS-2011) and <b>Puente Q □ Eswachaka (PE-PQ-27/C-2011)</b> .	These are the Plaza Inca HananHauk'aypata (PE-PH-01/CS-2011), the segment <b>Paucarcolla-Yanamayo (PE-CD-09/CS-2011)</b> , Kancharani-Andenes (PE-CD-10/C-2011), Sipampa-Pomata (PE-CD-13/C-2011), <b>Arbolera-Parcco Chua Chua (PE-CD-15/C-2011)</b> , Huacahuasi-Tambohuaylla (PE-OL-16/CS-2011), Inca Chaka-Qollotayoc (PE-OL-17/C-2011), Choquecancha-KillaKhawarina (PE-OL-18/CS-2011), Paucarpata-Ichuka (PE-OL-19/CS-2011), Tawis-Puente Ollanta (PE-OL-21/CS-2011), <b>Inca Mach □ ay-Samarinapata (PE-VCH-23/CS-2011)</b> , Kutacoca-Choquequirao (PE-VCH-26/CS-2011) and <b>Puente Q □ eswachaka (PE-PQ-27/C-2011)</b> .	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.</b>
332, 1, 51-53.	In Peru, <b>Law No. 28.296</b> the General Law of the Nation's Cultural Heritage provides the regulatory framework for official heritage designation.	In Peru, Law No. 28296 the General Law of the Nation's Cultural Heritage provides the regulatory framework for official heritage designation.	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.</b>
333,2,13	<b>Qhapaq Ñan, Andean Road System</b>	Qhapaq Ñan, Andean Road System	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.</b>
334,2,46	<b>303 archaeological sites</b>	308 archaeological sites	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction a difference of opinion.</b>
235, 1, 27-28	<b>Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia and Perú</b> and reach into the South of Colombia. Parts of it have been	Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador and Perú and reach into the South of Colombia. Parts of it have been	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction a factual error but suggests the following correct formulation:</b>  Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Ecuador and Perú and reach into the South of Colombia. Parts of it have been...
335,2,35	<b>697.450 kilometers</b>	693.524 kilometers	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction a difference of opinion</b> but is willing to calculate again with the State Parties concerned the exact length of the road segments accepted for inscription.
335,2,5, 23 and 43	<b>Qhapaq Ñan, Andean Road System</b>	Qhapaq Ñan, Andean Road System	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.</b>
325, 1, 31-32	sections remain in their original materials of the Incan era and are used by pedestrians and with riding animals,	sections remain in their original materials of the <b>Pre - Incan</b> and Incan eras and are used by pedestrians and with riding animals,	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.</b>



336,1,47	<b>Qhapaq Ñan, Andean Road System</b>	Qhapaq Ñan,Andean Road System	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.</b>
337,2,11	<b>Qhapaq Ñan, Andean Road System</b>	Qhapaq Ñan,Andean Road System	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.</b>



**FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS**



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the *Operational Guidelines*)

STATE PARTY: Belgium

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Plantin-Moretus House-Workshops-Museum Complex (Minor Boundary Modification)

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
p.34, "3. ICOMOS Recommendations", 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph	The current buffer zone as a CHE-zone is being managed for its value as the historic centre of Antwerp <b>as well as the immediate setting of the Plantin-Moretus Museum. ...</b>	The current buffer zone as a CHE-zone is being managed for its value as the historic centre of Antwerp <del>as well as the immediate setting of the Plantin-Moretus Museum.</del> <sup>1</sup> ...	<b>ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a clarification.</b>
p.34, "3. ICOMOS Recommendations", 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph	... Currently the City of Antwerp <b>undertakes impact assessments for development within the buffer zone not only for potential impact on the property but also on all other protected buildings on the zone.</b>	... Currently the City of Antwerp <u>takes into account the impact of proposed interventions on the cultural, historic or aesthetic values of a building or site situated in a CHE-zone during the planning application procedure.</u>	<b>ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a clarification.</b>

<sup>1</sup> The CHE-zone was designated in 1979 in the regional zoning plan for Antwerp, i.e. long before the Plantin-Moretus House-Workshop-Museum complex was inscribed on the World Heritage List or even listed as a monument. The CHE-designation is a generic measure in all regional zoning plans in Belgium. It makes reference to the general cultural, historic or aesthetic qualities of an area (generally a city centre), without reference to a particular building.

<p>p.34, “<b>3. ICOMOS Recommendations</b>”, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph</p>	<p>The issue is thus whether this change of regulations impacts on the necessary size of the buffer zone. ICOMOS does not consider that this is the case. <b>At the time of inscription, the ICOMOS evaluation considers the size of the buffer zone to be appropriate to encompass the immediate setting of the property which is the historic centre.</b> Reducing the buffer zone to 9.63 ha would limit consideration of the impact of development to a very small area around the property, beyond which development could still have a sizable impact and would not be specifically assessed for its impact on OUV by Flanders Heritage.</p>	<p>The issue is thus whether this change of regulations impacts on the necessary size of the buffer zone. ICOMOS does not consider that this is the case. <del>At the time of inscription, the ICOMOS evaluation considers the size of the buffer zone to be appropriate to encompass the immediate setting of the property which is the historic centre.</del><sup>2</sup> Reducing the buffer zone to 9.63 ha would limit consideration of the impact of development to a very small area around the property, beyond which development could still have a sizable impact and would not be specifically assessed for its impact on OUV by Flanders Heritage.</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS considers that the correction is not a factual error.</b> The ICOMOS evaluation would have commented if the buffer zone had been considered inadequate.</p>
---	--	--	--

---

<sup>2</sup> The 2005 ICOMOS evaluation makes no reference whatsoever to the buffer zone or its size.



**FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS**



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the *Operational Guidelines*)

STATE PARTY: Botswana

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Okavango Delta

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: IUCN

Page, Column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
Page 5, 1. Documentation, d) Consultations, line 3	The mission also met with the Minister, the <b>Permanent Secretary and the Agriculture Deputy Permanent Secretary</b> of the Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism.	The mission also met with the Minister of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism, and Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism.	<b>Factual error</b>  This change should be accepted.
Page 6, 1. Documentation, d) Consultations, line 13	the <b>Kwha</b> community	the Khwai community	<b>Factual error</b>  This is a typo and should be corrected.
Page 6, 2. Summary of natural values, Paragraph 1, line 7	The delta comprises a fan-shaped plain of alluvial sediments with approximately <b>600,000</b> hectares (ha) of permanent swamps and an additional 700,000 to 1.2m ha of seasonally flooded grasslands.	The delta comprises of a fan-shaped plain of alluvial sediments with approximately 266,165 hectares (ha) of permanent swamps and an additional 1,106,422ha of seasonally flooded grasslands.	<b>New information which contradicts information provided at earlier stages of the evaluation procedure</b>  IUCN is happy to agree the amendment but would wish to confirm the information and its provenance with the State Party. IUCN notes that the original figures came from the nomination - p. xvi of the nomination dossier which refers to 600,000 ha of swamps and 1.2m ha of seasonally flooded grassland.
Page 6, 2. Summary of natural values, Paragraph 6,	The Okavango Delta System is also one of the largest Ramsar sites, designated in <b>1996</b> .	The Okavango Delta System is also one of the largest Ramsar sites, designated in 1997.	<b>Difference of opinion, possible factual error</b>

line3			It is not clear where the SP is referencing this from. The Ramsar database shows the designation date for Okavango Delta System as 12/09/1996 (Ramsar database - <a href="http://ramsar.wetlands.org/Database/SearchforRamsarsites/tabid/765/Default.aspx">http://ramsar.wetlands.org/Database/SearchforRamsarsites/tabid/765/Default.aspx</a> )
Page 7, 4. Integrity, Protection and Management , 4.1 Protection,	CHAs exist within WMAs and are managed by Community Based Organizations for <b>hunting</b> . The revised property's boundaries	CHAs exist within WMAs and are managed by Community Based Organizations and Private Tourism Companies for non-consumptive purposes. The	<p><b>New information which contradicts information provided at earlier stages of the evaluation procedure, and possible factual error</b></p> <p>IUCN will need to clarify this point with the State Party. The supplementary info provided by the State Party on 21/02/14 advised that 'In these areas (CHAs) controlled hunting is allowed but there is no control over other activities even if they are detrimental to wildlife populations'. The supp info goes on to note that 'the government of Botswana has nonetheless as a precautionary measure suspended hunting indefinitely following signs of declines in wildlife populations'. One must conclude that although hunting is legally permissible it is currently banned.</p>
Paragraph 1, line 16	(see below) comprise a core area of one Game Reserve, one <b>CHA</b> , and <b>18 WMAs</b> .	revised property boundaries (see below) comprise a core area of one Game Reserve, two WMAs, and 18 CHAs.	<p><b>New information which contradicts information provided at earlier stages of the evaluation procedure. IUCN will seek to clarify this with the State Party at the Committee meeting.</b></p> <p>The text in IUCN's evaluation is based on advice from the SP in its supp info rec'd 21/02/14. Table provided in the document "MANAGEMENT PLANNING ARRANGEMENTS" shows the areas comprising the nominated area as 1 Game Reserve; 1 CHA and 18 WMAs.</p> <p>IUCN's evaluators advise that the legal protection afforded by WMAs is greater than that of CHAs notwithstanding the hunting ban imposed by the Govt of Botswana which was advised in the supp info.</p>

Page 9, 4.3 Management, Paragraph 3, line 3	Areas under lease to Community Trusts benefit from a good system of Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) <b>Technical Advisory Committees (TACs).</b>	Areas under lease to Community Trusts benefit from a good system of Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) implemented through Technical Advisory Committees (TACs).	<b>Clarification</b>  Change “implemented through” to “and”
Page 11, 6. Application of Criterion (x), Paragraph 1, line 24	Finally Botswana supports the world's largest population of Elephants, numbering around <b>130,000</b> , for which the Okavango Delta is the core area for this species survival.	Finally, Botswana supports the largest population of Elephants, numbering around 200,000, for which the Okavango Delta is the core area for this species survival.	<b>New information which contradicts information provided at earlier stages of the evaluation procedure. IUCN will clarify this matter with the State Party at the Committee.</b>  The figure of 130,000 came from the nomination file - p. xvi of the nomination dossier quotes this figure as 130,000.
Page 11, 7. Recommendations, Brief Synthesis, Paragraph 1, line 3	The area includes the permanent swamps which cover approximately <b>600,000</b> ha along with up to <b>1.2m</b> ha of seasonally flooded grassland.	The area includes permanent swamps which cover approximately 266,165 ha along with up to 1,106,422 ha of seasonally flooded grassland.	See point above, <b>this point will need formal confirmation with the State Party to ensure that the SoOUV is correct, if the Committee support the inscription of the property.</b>
Page 13, 7. Recommendations, Protection and Management, Paragraph 1, line 3	, and the remainder is composed of <b>18 Wildlife Management Areas and a Controlled Hunting Area</b> managed by community trusts or private tourism concessions.	, and the remainder is composed of 2 Wildlife Management Areas and 18 Controlled Hunting Areas managed by community trusts or private tourism concession holders.	See point above, <b>this point will need formal confirmation with the State Party to ensure that the SoOUV is correct, if the Committee support the inscription of the property.</b>



**FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS**



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the *Operational Guidelines*)

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): People's Republic of China

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Silk Roads: Initial Section of the Silk Roads, the Routes Network of Tian-shan Corridor ( China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan)

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS, No.1442

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
Page 151, line 1; page 165, right column, line 21; page 169, left column 4, line 14	<b>Silk Roads: the Routes Network of Tianshan Corridor</b>	Silk Roads: the Routes Network of Chang'an-Tianshan Corridor	ICOMOS considers that the correction can be accepted as a factual error.
Page 152, right column, line 37,49; Page 166, left col., line 24	<b>Chang'an</b>	Chang'an ( present day Xi'an)	ICOMOS considers that the correction can be accepted as a factual error.
Page 162; page 168, left col., line 3	Formed in <b>2007</b>	Formed in <b>2009</b>	ICOMOS considers that the correction can be accepted as a factual error.
Page 157; page 166, left col., the last par., line 3; right col., line 6	<b>Luoyong</b>	Luoyang	ICOMOS considers that the correction can be accepted as a factual error.
Page 164, Conclusions, Line 4	<b>Seven</b> years	<b>Nine</b> years	ICOMOS considers that the correction can be accepted as a factual error.

Page 153, left column, line 8-10	including Han, Cao Wei, Western Jin, Western Qin, Northern Wei, Sui, Tang, Song, Yuan, Xianbei and Mongolian peoples.	including Han, Turk, Xianbei and Mongolian peoples, etc.  (Notes: Cao Wei, Western Jin, Western Qin, Sui, Tang, Song, Yuan are names of Dynasty in Chinese history, but not names of ethnic groups. )	ICOMOS considers that the correction can be accepted as a factual error.
Page 154, left column, line 28	some 900 kilometres	Over 900 kilometres  (Notes: The total length of Hoxi Corridor is about 900-1000 kilometers.)	ICOMOS considers that the correction can be accepted as a factual error.
Page 166, right column, line 19	the 1,000 mile corridor	the nearly 1000 kilometres corridor  (Notes: 1. same as above 2. change mile to kilometer.)	ICOMOS considers that the correction can be accepted as a factual error.
Page 154, right column, line 21	southern edge	southern and northern edge  (Notes: Buddhism was transmitted along both southern and northern sides of the Taklimakan Desert.)	ICOMOS considers that the correction can be accepted as a factual error.
Page 154, right column, line 24	Yar City Site of Bashbaliq City	Yar City Site	ICOMOS considers that the correction can be accepted as a factual error.
Page 154, right column, line 28	Bachbaliq city	Bashbaliq city	ICOMOS considers that the correction can be accepted as a factual error.
Page 155, left column, line 30-31	Shi Huangdi (reigned 221 –210BCE)	Emperor Wu of Han (reigned 140–87BCE)	ICOMOS considers that the correction can be accepted as a factual error.
Page 155, left column, line 32	2nd century	It should be: 3rd century	ICOMOS considers that the correction can be accepted as a factual error.
Page 157, left column, line 40 ; Page 166, left column, line 51	via Karakorum	via Karakorum and Tianshan  (Notes: The geographical location of the nominated corridor is in the Tian-shan Mountains.)	ICOMOS considers that the correction can be accepted as a factual error.



<p>Page 157, right column, line 19-23</p>	<p><b>The extensive Karez underground water channels of the extremely arid Turpan basin, many of which are still in use, that supplied water to Qocho city, and were supplemented by deep wells inside Yar city;</b></p>	<p><b>In the extremely arid Turpan basin, water was supplied to Qocho city through irrigation channel, while within the Yar city, water was supplemented by digging deep wells.</b></p> <p>(Notes: There has been clear record that water was supplied to the Qocho City through river channel in Tang Dynasty. Within the Yar City, the remaining numerous deep wells provide concrete evidence as to the water supplement.</p> <p>Concerning the origins of Karez wells, there are two different views in academia, someone think they came from Central Plain of China,while others think they came from Persia.)</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS considers that the correction can be accepted as a factual error.</b></p>
<p>Page 166, right column, line 25-29</p>	<p><b>the extensive Karez underground water channels of the extremely arid Turpan basin, many still in use, that supplied water to Qocho city, and were supplemented by deep wells inside Yar city</b></p>	<p>See above</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS considers that the correction can be accepted as a factual error.</b></p>
<p>Page 159, right column, line 51-52 ; Page 167, left column, line 51-52</p>	<p><b>Nestorian Christianity (which reached China in 500AD)</b></p>	<p><b>Nestorian Christianity (which reached China before 7rd centuryAD)</b></p> <p>or</p> <p>Nestorian Christianity</p> <p>(Notes: In the current Chinese record, it is clearly documented that Nestorian Christianity reached the Central Plain of China in the year of 635 (9th year of Emperor Taizong of Tang Dynasty), which can be traced in the Stele to the propagation of the luminous religion of Daqin in China. Perhaps are there any other international evidence?)</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS considers that the correction can be accepted as a factual error.</b></p>



**FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS**



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the *Operational Guidelines*)

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Kyrgyz Republic

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Silk Roads: Initial Section of the Silk Roads, the Routes Network of Tian-shan Corridor ( China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan)

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS, No. 1442

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
Page 153 Left column Para 6	...and the <b>Qarluq Karluk</b> , nationalities included Xiongnu...	and the Qarluq (Karluk), nationalities included Xiongnu	The correction can be accepted as a factual error.
Page 153 Right column Para 2	...the major religions of Buddhism, Zoroastrianism, <b>Nestorian</b> , Manichaeism.....	the major religions of Buddhism, Zoroastrianism, Nestorian Christianity, Manichaeism	The correction can be accepted as a factual error.
Page 153 Right column Para 4	.... such as the Turgesh, and the peoples of the Kara-Khanid Khanate and the <b>Qarluq Karluk</b>	....such as the Turgesh, and the peoples of the Kara-Khanid Khanate and the Qarluq (Karluk)	The correction can be accepted as a factual error.
Page 154 Right column Para 6	Some were large towns or cities: Suyab (Ak-Beshim), city of Balasagun (Burana), city of Nevaket ( <b>Krashya</b> Rechka),	Some were large towns or cities: Suyab (Ak-Beshim), city of Balasagun (Burana), city of Nevaket (Krasnaya Rechka),	The correction can be accepted as a factual error.
Page 154 Right column Last Para	....such as Ak-Beshim (Suyab), <b>Krashya</b> Rechka (Nevaket) with a 100ha <b>citadel</b> and 20km long walls,	....such as Ak-Beshim (Suyab), Krasnaya Rechka (Nevaket) with a 100ha central town and 20km long walls,	The correction can be accepted as a factual error.

Page 162 Left column Para 8	Akyrtas, Kayalyk, Aktobe and <b>Burana</b> have been maintained.....	Akyrtas, Kayalyk, Aktobe have been maintained <sup>3</sup>	<b>The correction can be accepted as a factual error.</b>
Page 164, Para 4	Currently apart from Akyrtas and <b>Burana</b> , which have site museums	Currently apart from Akyrtas, which have site museums <sup>4</sup>	<b>The correction can be accepted as a factual error.</b>

---

<sup>3</sup> *Burana belongs to Kyrgyzstan*

<sup>4</sup> *Burana belongs to Kyrgyzstan*



FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the *Operational Guidelines*)

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Denmark

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Stevns Klint

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: IUCN

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
p. 55, Section 2, column 2, line 1	The nominated property includes <b>intertidal</b> cliffs and adjacent constructed tunnels and abandoned quarries which expose Cretaceous and Tertiary strata.	The nominated property includes <b>coastal</b> cliffs and adjacent constructed tunnels and abandoned quarries which expose Cretaceous and Tertiary strata.	<b>Factual error</b>  The intended wording should be "intertidal areas, cliffs and adjacent constructed tunnels..."  The State Party proposal is equally acceptable.



**FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS**



**(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the Operational Guidelines)**

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): France

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Tectono-volcanic Ensemble of the Chaîne des Puys and Limagne Fault

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: IUCN

Page / Column	Line	Relevant part	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
				<p>General introduction:</p> <p>IUCN thanks the State Party of France for its proposals on factual errors which are analysed below. IUCN finds some minor factual errors in its report, but most of the points raised are not such errors. Most points raised relate rather to differences of opinion or matters of clarification. Furthermore IUCN considers some points in the State Party letter are themselves factually inaccurate.</p> <p>IUCN comments use the following terms to consider information included in the letter of suggested factual errors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• factual error</li> <li>• advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier</li> <li>• re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the Advisory Bodies</li> <li>• new information that cannot be taken into account at this stage</li> <li>• difference of opinion</li> <li>• clarification</li> <li>• new information which contradicts information provided at earlier stages of the evaluation procedure</li> </ul> <p>IUCN also understands additional</p>

Front page			<b>Photography</b>	This picture does not show either the Chaîne des Puy or the Limagne Fault, but a <b>limited portion of the Montagne de la Serre, a secondary component</b> of the tectono-volcanic assemblage (comprising 7% of the site's surface area).	<p>information, including points not made below, has also been provided directly by the State Party of France to Committee members. IUCN has seen at least some of that information and reviewed it where available. As a matter of principle, IUCN considers that such information should be made transparently available to Committee members through the factual error process, to facilitate dialogue and resolution of concerns to the extent possible.</p> <p>Finally IUCN has invited further dialogue with the State Party of France on the nomination. IUCN would be pleased to further engage in such dialogue if requested by the State Party.</p> <p><b>Clarification.</b></p> <p>This is clearly not a factual error. The nomination document available to the Committee provides extensive photography.</p>
68	Left	26 to 28	« The nominated property [...] is located in the <b>Massif Central region</b> of France »	The site is located in the French administrative region of the <b>Auvergne</b> . The Massif Central is a geological area.	<b>Clarification.</b> The IUCN document is not referring to the administrative region, but we recognise that this is in the Auvergne administrative region.
68	Left	28 to 30	« The boundaries for the nominated property were drawn up to include all the geological features and landscapes which characterise this <b>region</b> »	The features selected for this proposal are those which specifically characterise the <b>tectono-volcanic assemblage</b> and <b>not the region as a whole</b> .	<b>Clarification.</b> IUCN text is intended to convey exactly the sense of the suggested correction (the IUCN text does not use the words “as a whole” but referring to the Puy/Limagne features).
68	Left	39	« [...] which is an <b>extinct</b> volcanic field with the last eruptions dated to about 8,000 years before present»	The Chaîne des Puy volcanoes which are younger than 10,000 years in age are not extinct, but <b>dormant</b> ; in other words they are still potentially active according to the international classification of the Smithsonian Institution.	<b>Factual error.</b> IUCN agrees that “extinct” should be amended to “dormant”. The dormant status was fully explored and discussed, including regarding matters such as hazard management during the evaluation mission.

					<p>(Note: IUCN believes that the French suggested correction is incorrect, and should read “younger than <u>100,000 years</u>” not “younger than 10,000 years” – the age range of the volcanoes of the nominated property being understood to be 95,000 to 8,400 years bp).</p> <p><b>Revision:</b></p> <p>“[...] which is a <u>dormant volcanic field</u> [...]“</p>
68	Right	7 to 9	« [...] the landscape of the property is and has been <b>heavily managed</b> for more than <b>10,000 years</b> »	<p>Sedentary human occupation of the site has been attested to from Neolithic times, thus less than 5,000 years ago for the first settlers. Furthermore, this <b>human presence</b> was not significant until the Roman occupation <b>2,000 years ago</b>, and even though, it <b>cannot be qualified as “heavily managed” for 2,000 years.</b></p>	<p><b>Clarification and factual error.</b></p> <p>IUCN agrees that this has been oversimplified in editing, and proposes amended text below to clarify this point.</p> <p>This correction does not impact the key point that this is a heavily managed landscape, and with a very long and complex history of human occupation.</p> <p>IUCN’s amendment to the report would read as follows, and does not impact on the central conclusions of the IUCN report. <b>“The landscape of the property is heavily managed. It has seen human presence for c.5000 years, and with significant presence for over 2,000 years since the Roman occupation.”</b></p>
68	Right	23	« [...] Many of the <b>eighty cones</b> [...] »	<p>As shown throughout the dossier, the Chaîne des Puys is distinguished at an international level by the variety of its volcanic edifices, which cannot be reduced simply to cones since they cover all the range of volcanic edifices (<b>domes, maars, cones, tuff rings</b>) and their specific forms.</p> <p><b>This wording devalues the fundamental diversity</b> of the monogenetic field, whose variety is indeed one of its distinctive features on a world scale.</p>	<p><b>Clarification and difference of opinion.</b></p> <p>This is an editorial issue, and the values of the property are described in preceding text in the IUCN evaluation report. IUCN agrees that the term “edifices” (the term used in French) would be more accurate, though less accessible. The site’s own website uses “volcanoes” as a general term which would also be a better choice.</p> <p>There is no dispute that the field includes a range of features as noted by the State Party, and IUCN considered the question of diversity during its evaluation process, as one component of the evaluation.</p>

69	Left	5 to 6	«[...] The Chaîne des Puys (with <b>its cones</b> and lava flows) [...]»		
69	Left	7 to 8	«The <b>comparative analysis</b> in the nomination is <b>focused almost exclusively on the volcanic features</b> on the site »	<p>All of the demonstration of the comparative analysis of the application dossier (p. 257 – 289) rests on the tectono-volcanic specificity of the proposed site, and endeavours to show the <b>combination of these two geological phenomena.</b></p> <p>Of the <b>33-page study</b>, only <b>six</b> pages are devoted exclusively to <b>volcanism</b>, <b>five</b> exclusively to <b>tectonics</b>, and <b>twenty-two to the geological combination.</b></p>	<p><b>Clarification and difference of opinion.</b></p> <p>This is an editorial matter, and the clarification is not disputed.</p> <p>The "tectono-volcanic specificity" (by its very nature) is a feature that IUCN does not consider supports a claim of Outstanding Universal Value, given the specialized and complex nature of the justification. Such arguments on "specificity" inevitably provide an inappropriate basis for considering Outstanding Universal Value, moving the analysis away from the concept of "a select list of the most outstanding of these from an international viewpoint" (§52, Operational Guidelines). Given the clear and repeated guidance of the World Heritage Committee regarding volcano nominations, this issue is particularly important.</p> <p>(This type of argument can be very appropriate underpinning for the option of Geopark status).</p> <p>IUCN adopted comparative approaches that considered past evaluations, decisions and the past guidance by the World Heritage Committee, and defined in the Operational Guidelines.</p> <p>IUCN also considered the framework provided in the IUCN thematic study on volcanoes and volcanic landscapes (which did not recommend the site as a priority for gap-filling, and does not provide the basis for a site demonstrating "tectono-volcanic specificity related to monogenetic volcanism" to be considered as a gap on the World Heritage List).</p> <p>The IUCN global comparative analysis (GCA) also focused on the volcanic features of this property because the GCA of the nomination also focused substantially on the volcanic features (including their</p>



					<p>relationship to the tectonics). The principal features of this property, for which it is known, are the volcanic edifices (cones, domes, maars, lava flows).</p> <p>The nomination indeed asserts that the “basement” (i.e. pre-volcanic geology) is an important part of the “ensemble”. The outcrops and exposures of the “basement” geology are seen only in roadcuts or abandoned quarries, covered by forest or agricultural vegetation, or deeply weathered and not easily recognized. As for the fault portion of the ensemble, the few exposures reviewed were principally in former quarries. The fault could also be imagined from a landscape level when viewed from the air or other advantageous viewpoint.</p>
69	Left	51 à 54	<p>“Recent <b>global reviews of monogenetic volcanism</b> in the peer-reviewed literature (Nemeth, 2010; de la Cruz-Reyna and Yokoyama, 2011; Kereszturi and Nemeth, 2012; Valentine and Gregg, 2008) [...]”</p>	<p>There is <b>no global review of monogenetic volcanism to date</b>. The quoted literature does not aim to be exhaustive, but <b>focuses on specific elements</b> of monogenetic volcanism.</p>	<p><b>Clarification, difference of opinion, new information</b></p> <p>This comment appears to be partly a question of semantics (i.e. what is a “global review”) and secondly addresses some fundamental points regarding why IUCN did not regard the case for OUV of the nominated property to be demonstrated.</p> <p>IUCN notes the statement by the State Party that there has been no global review of monogenetic volcanism to date. By this IUCN assumes the suggestion is that there has been no <u>comprehensive</u> review. Taking at face value this new information immediately serves to undermine the contention that a rigorous global comparative analysis is currently possible, sufficient to support a listing of a monogenetic volcanic field (including its tectono-volcanic relationships).</p> <p>In terms of the papers cited, IUCN does not wish to insist on the word “reviews”, in the sense of all of these papers being comprehensive global overview, and understands the authors do not regard this term as appropriate to their papers. However IUCN considers all of these papers are indeed overviews of aspects of monogenetic volcanism, and some of the papers as presented</p>

					<p>clearly appear to be global reviews (one even including global maps showing the diversity of sites cited).</p> <p>These papers are certainly “overviews” or “summaries” of a range of aspects of monogenetic volcanism” by major authors, that cite examples selected from different regions. IUCN finds it reasonable to expect that authors would use what they felt were important examples of monogenetic volcanism to illustrate their points in these papers, based on their extensive field and literature knowledge. We also assumed that if Chaîne des Puys were seen as particularly outstanding in relation to other monogenetic sites, including monogenetic volcanic fields, it would be a likely candidate to be mentioned consistently in key papers on the subject.</p> <p>IUCN further notes that cumulatively the four papers cited mention over 40 other examples of monogenetic volcanic sites, and more than 10 of these (c.14?) are explicitly listed as monogenetic volcanic fields (including Pinacate, which is mentioned in 3 of the 4 papers, as a monogenetic volcanic field). The following sites indicated as monogenetic volcanic fields are mentioned in more than one of these papers:</p> <p>Auckland (New Zealand), Quaternary Llanquihue (Argentina), West Eifel (Germany), East Izu (Japan), El Pinacate (Mexico), South West Nevada (USA).</p> <p>(Also, though not mentioned as monogenetic volcanic fields, IUCN also notes several other already listed World Heritage Sites with monogenetic features are listed in these papers as well, such as Jeju, Korea).</p> <p>IUCN further notes the highly referenced special edition of the IAVCEI (International Association of Volcanology and the Chemistry of the Earth's Interior) Commission on Monogenetic Volcanism (CMV). This is one of 20+ specialist Commissions of IAVCEI.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>The volume, published in 2011, is entitled: Maars and scoria cones: the enigma of monogenetic volcanic fields (Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research, Volume 201, Issues 1–4).</p> <p>According to IAVCEI-CMV this volume presented selected papers from the two inaugural global events that CMV supported organised following its formation in 2009. IUCN also notes that this volume includes an “even handed review” on a further aspect of monogenetic volcanism (White, J., Ross, P.-S. (2011) Maar-diatreme volcanoes: a review. Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research, v. 201, p. 1-29)</p> <p>Chaîne des Puys does not appear to be either a subject of papers selected for publication in the Special Edition (over 25 sites were the subject of papers in the volume), nor is it mentioned in the review on Maar-diatreme volcanoes in the CMV volume.</p> <p>IUCN thus concludes that review of a selection of leading literature available does seem to show that there are many comparable sites with at least equivalent or greater current international recognition than the Chaîne des Puys. These include several sites that are already included on the World Heritage List. The literature does not support a case for OUV for the Chaîne des Puys.</p> <p>IUCN’s evaluation already notes that the very active research group local to the property is generating a range of new literature, in the last few years. That is not in dispute, and is creditable.</p> <p>Returning to the specific question of wording in the evaluation report, adopting the word “overviews” would provide a clarification, respecting the reported views of some of the respected authors of the studies mentioned in the evaluation, but IUCN does not consider this is a factual error:</p> <p>A possible rewording could be along these lines:</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>“[...] Recent overviews (list references) of aspects of monogenetic volcanism in the peer-reviewed literature usually do not mention the nominated property. Conversely, these papers cite many (over 40) other monogenetic volcanic sites globally as examples, in over 30 different countries. A number of these other sites were mentioned several times in different studies. The named sites include a range of existing listed natural World Heritage Sites [...]”</p> <p>To assist the Committee IUCN has provided as an annex the list of sites mentioned in the above mentioned papers on monogenetic volcanism, with a separate list of sites included in the IAVCEI-CMV special volume on Monogenetic Volcanic Fields (2011).</p>
69	Right	10 to 15	<p>“In relation to the recent listing of <b>El Pinacate</b> and Gran Desierto de Altar Biosphere Reserve (Mexico), the phenomenon of the <b>monogenetic volcanic field</b> is more extensive, in greater natural state and better exposed than that in the present nomination.”</p>	<p>As specified in their application dossier, El Pinacate and Gran Desierto de Altar Biosphere Reserve is <b>not a monogenetic field, but a shield volcano</b>.</p>	<p><b>Apparent factually incorrect statement by the State Party.</b></p> <p>IUCN considers its report is factually correct, and the State Party “correction” is factually incorrect.</p> <p>As noted above, Pinacate is referenced in at least three of the above mentioned overviews on monogenetic volcanism as a <u>monogenetic field</u>. It thus appears, in the literature, that <u>Pinacate is noted consistently as hosting a monogenetic volcanic field</u>. It would have been helpful if the State Party had indicated the references they were using to justify the suggestion that Pinacate is not a monogenetic site, and also to explain why many authors, including international lead authors, list Pinacate as a monogenetic volcanic field.</p> <p>According to references consulted by IUCN Pinacate includes both a shield volcano and a monogenetic volcanic field. For instance a field guide to the Field Trip to the <b>Pinacate Volcanic Field</b> (<a href="http://rock.geosociety.org/pub/repo/sit/2011/2011323_AnswerKey.pdf">http://rock.geosociety.org/pub/repo/sit/2011/2011323_AnswerKey.pdf</a>) states:</p> <p><b>“Pinacate Volcanic Field:</b> The Pinacates contain diverse volcanic</p>

					<p>landforms, including a shield volcano, a tuff cone, maars, cinder cones, and lava flows. Two different alkalic rock series are represented: One constitutes the &gt;400 monogenetic cones and craters formed over the last 1.2 Ma or more; the other forms the extinct Santa Clara shield volcano.”</p> <p>Thus the Pinacate site apparently contains a numerous and diverse range of monogenetic volcanic features. In terms of a simple numerical comparison, the Chaîne des Puys includes c.80 edifices, whilst Pinacate includes more than 400 cones, maars and craters. IUCN further notes that these features of Pinacate <u>are noted in the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value of this property, that was adopted by the World Heritage Committee on inscription in 2013</u>, as values supporting the renowned desert landscapes of this property.</p>
69	Right	17 to 19	« The monogenetic volcanic field of <b>Wudalianchi</b> National Park (China) <b>is a larger [...] area</b> than the present nomination »	The Wudalianchi site has a larger surface area due to the greater dispersion of the volcanic field, but comprises <b>many fewer edifices</b> than the Chaîne des Puys. Wudalianchi contains 14 cones and 11 shield volcanoes.	<p><b>Clarification.</b></p> <p>The State Party comment confirms that Wudalianchi is a larger site than the Chaîne des Puys nominated property.</p> <p>IUCN's point here is to recall that a previous monogenetic volcanic field, with attributes comparable to Chaîne des Puys, and, whilst with fewer edifices, being of a more natural form, and larger geographical extent was previously nominated. IUCN did not regard that nomination as meeting natural criteria, and the nomination was withdrawn at the request of the State Party of China. This (like the inscription of Pinacate described above - Pinacate has many more edifices than both Puys, and Wudalianchi, and is also in a more natural state than both of these sites as well) is a material consideration and a technical and policy precedent in the evaluation of the present nomination.</p>
69	Right	31 to 34	« the nominated property is located within PNRVA (...) <b>IUCN Category V</b> »	The majority of the site falls within an area which is classified nationally under the highest regulatory protection in France (“classified natural monument and landscape”,	<p><b>Clarification and difference of opinion.</b></p> <p>According to this statement, only part of the whole nominated site is an area suggested by the State</p>

				category III of the IUCN).	Party to conform to management category III. It is not clear to IUCN that this area, in its entirety would meet fully the definition of Category III: (Category III protected areas are set aside to protect a specific natural monument, which can be a landform, sea mount, submarine cavern, geological feature such as a cave or even a living feature such as an ancient grove. They are generally quite small protected areas and often have high visitor value).
70	Left	16 to 18	« The boundaries of the nominated property encompass <b>more than 90% of the volcanic features in the Chaîne des Puys</b> »	Volcanism represents about <b>70% of the site's total surface area</b> (73.42%). Here the report once again omits the three other components of the tectono-volcanic assemblage: the Limagne Fault (7.41% of the surface area), the ancient basement (12.31% of the surface area), and the inverted relief (Montagne de la Serre, 6.87% of the surface area).	<b>Clarification</b>  This appears to be a misreading of the IUCN text. The comment by France is making a different point to the point in the IUCN report. Not a factual error
70	Left	23-24	“the <b>plan for coherent management of Greater Clermont</b> [...]”	The correct name of the document is the <b>Territorial Coherence Scheme for Greater Clermont</b> (Schéma de Cohérence Territoriale du Grand Clermont, ScoT),	<b>Clarification.</b>  The IUCN text is a description of the plan and not the title. There is of course no dispute on the correct title. Not a factual error.
70	Right	3 to 4	«The Conseil General of the Puys-de-Dôme has a unit of <b>5 staff</b> dedicated to World Heritage issue in anticipation of inscription »	As indicated on page 516 of the application dossier, and explained during the field visit, there is already a workforce of <b>9 people working full-time</b> for the Conseil Général on the World Heritage project, to which can be added <b>21 field agents</b> from the Conseil Général who <b>work part-time</b> on the upkeep, promotion and events held in this area.	<b>Probable factual error</b>  IUCN is agreeable to amend the number 5 to 9 in the report.  “ <b>The Conseil General of the Puys-de-Dôme has a unit of 9 staff dedicated to World Heritage issue in anticipation of inscription</b> ”
70	Right	10 to 20	« There is a <b>two-year</b> (2012-2013 management plan for the nominated property (...) IUCN notes that the management plan only has a short timeframe »	The management plan <b>has been in place for two years</b> , but has identified the threats hanging over the site in the medium- and long-term, as well as a detailed <b>6-year action plan</b> which corresponds to the UNESCO periodic reporting process.  This programming is clearly laid out on pages 56, 90 and 130 of the management plan, which presents a detailed 6-year agenda of the actions to be undertaken for each of the points of focus.	<b>Factual error and clarification.</b>  According to the nomination the management plan is in place since 2011 (i.e. 3-4 years). There is only currently a short time frame remaining (to 2016) in implementing the plan as it stands.  A corrected statement in this regard would be as follows, although IUCN notes confirmation of the position between IUCN and the State Party would be desirable, given the comment

					provides a different timescale to that indicated in the nomination:  “ <b>The management plan presented in the nomination is established on a timetable of 2011-2016. [...]</b> ”
70	Right	36-38	« The most significant weakness relating to management and enforcement is the <b>lack of enforcement capacity on privately-owned land</b> »	The laws and regulations already in place, such as those covering the <b>classified site, planning documents, and regulations on woodland, are all equally applicable to the public as well as the private domain.</b> Hence interventions on private land are submitted either to reporting or authorising regimes depending on their importance.  In addition, the <b>major measures</b> carried out since 2003 in terms of mitigating erosion and managing tourist flux on the main volcanic edifices attest to the capacity to intervene in the private domain (cf. pages 355 – 359 of the application dossier).	<b>Clarification and difference of opinion.</b>  The field mission noted that enforcement on site in privately owned land is weaker than on public land. This information came from stakeholder comments received during the mission. The mission heard that there is limited capacity for rangers to patrol and enforce on private land or for local “gendarmes” to address issues of legal compliance on the ground.
71	Left	17 to 18	« The largest landownership association is the <b>Puy de Dome Association</b> »	The name of the association is <b>Dôme Union.</b>	<b>Factual error.</b>  Correction agreed to read :  “ <b>The largest landownership association is the Dôme Union</b> ”
71	Left	30 to 31	« [...] The landscape of the property has been <b>heavily managed for more than 10,000 years</b> »	Sedentary human occupation of the site has been attested to from Neolithic times, thus less than 5,000 years ago for the first settlers, and this human presence only became significant from the period of the Roman occupation around <b>2,000 years ago</b> , and even though, it <b>cannot be qualified as “heavily managed” for 2,000 years.</b>	<b>Clarification and factual error.</b>  This is the same point as was discussed above. The same amendment could be made:  “ <b>The landscape of the property is heavily managed. It has seen human presence for c.5000 years, and with significant presence for over 2,000 years since the Roman occupation.</b> ”
71	Left	33 to 34	« [...] <b>degradation and erosion</b> of the cones (Puys) <b>from grazing</b> , agricultural practices, <b>forest growth</b> [...] »	<b>Pasturing</b> does not pose a threat nowadays, on the contrary it is <b>beneficial.</b>  The <b>forest does not generate erosion</b> ; it protects the form of the volcanoes.	<b>Difference of opinion.</b>  The IUCN mission noted that grazing and agricultural practices have caused degradation and erosion in the past and has the potential to cause degradation and erosion in the future.  Grazing erosion is prevented where there are qualified shepherds to manage the herds.

					As noted the impacts of forestry are complex, and IUCN discussion was not limited only to protecting the form of volcanoes.
71	Left	43	« About 30 communes are included in the property »	The 30 communes are not just included within the site, but cover <b>the whole site and its buffer zone.</b>	<p><b>Clarification.</b></p> <p>This is not a factual error but the text is perhaps ambiguous. IUCN would propose to amend this statement, to remove any ambiguity:</p> <p><b>« About 30 communes are encompassed by the nominated property, including its buffer zone »</b></p>
71	Right	1-2	« There are several active quarries within the boundaries of the property (Puy de Toupe, <b>Puy de Cliersou, and Puy de Nugere</b> )»	<p>There are three active quarries in the Chaîne des Puys: one on the puy de Toupe, one on the puy de Tenusset, and one on the lava <b>flow deriving from the puy de la Nugère</b> rather than on the edifice itself.</p> <p>The puy de Cliersou contains a former Merovingian quarry which was <b>only worked in the early Middle Ages.</b></p>	<p><b>Clarification and factual error.</b></p> <p>Factual amendment noted regarding correction to the name of one of the active quarries inside the nominated property.</p> <p>The IUCN report:</p> <p><b>« There are several active quarries within the boundaries of the property (Puy de Toupe, Puy de Tennuset, and on the lava flow deriving from the Puy de Nugere) »</b></p>
71	Right	17-19	« Urbanization and growth of Clermont-Ferrand. <b>In particular pressure on the Limagne Fault and its forests and vegetation</b> »	The Territorial Coherence Scheme for Greater Clermont (Schéma de Cohérence Territoriale du Grand Clermont, ScoT), an urban regulation document, defines the Limagne Fault as “a <b>high-quality unspoilt forest to be preserved</b> as a transition zone between the countryside and the urban area”, thus protecting it from all urban pressure. The ScoT <b>forbids all construction on the fault</b> (cf. pages 350 – 354 of the application dossier).	<p><b>Clarification.</b></p> <p>There is de facto a pressure, and the territorial scheme aims to manage this pressure. The mission noted negative effects on the connectivity of the forest and vegetation with the neighbouring landscape. There is also the effect in terms of noise, visual impact and visitation.</p> <p><b>MONOGENETIC VOLCANISM SITES</b></p> <p>I. The below is a provisional list of Monogenetic volcano sites included in the following recent reviews, overviews and synthesis papers on Monogenetic Volcanism:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nemeth, K. (2010) 'Monogenetic volcanic fields: origins, sedimentary record,</li> </ul>



					<p>and relationship with polygenetic volcanism', Geological Society of America, Special Paper, 470, 43-66</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• De la Cruz-Reyna, Servando and I. Yokoyama (2011) 'A geophysical characterisation of monogenetic volcanism', Geofisica Internacional, 50, 4, 465-484</li> <li>• Kereszturi, G. and K. Nementh (2012) 'Monogenetic basaltic volcanoes: genetic classification, growth, geomorphology, and degradation' in K. Nementh (ed) (2012) Updates in Volcanology – New advances in Understanding Volcanic systems, InTech, 3-88</li> <li>• Valentine, G.A. and T.K.P. Gregg (2008) 'Continental basaltic volcanoes – processes and problems', Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research, 177, 857-873</li> <li>• J.D.L. White, P.-S. Ross, Maar-diatreme volcanoes: A review, Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research, Volume 201, Issues 1–4, 15 April 2011, Pages 1-29, ISSN 0377-0273.</li> </ul> <p>These papers do not mention the Chaîne des Puys, but do mention a large number of other sites globally. IUCN has not fully cross checked the below for some potential overlaps (same site but with different names) so conservatively would describe the below list as "more than 40 sites":</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Auckland Volcanic Field, New Zealand</li> <li>2. Jorullo, Mexico</li> <li>3. Paricutin, Mexico</li> <li>4. Los Morados, Argentina</li> <li>5. Al Haruj, Libya</li> <li>6. Snake River Plain, USA</li> <li>7. Quaternary Llanquanelo Volcanic Field, Argentina</li> <li>8. Oligocene Messel Maar, Germany</li> <li>9. West Eifel Volcanic Field, Germany</li> <li>10. Chubut, Argentina</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>11. Southern Slovak Basaltic Volcanic Field, Slovakia</p> <p>12. Hopi Buttes, USA</p> <p>13. Crater Hill tuff ring, New Zealand</p> <p>14. La Brena maar, Mexico</p> <p>15. Ukinrek Maar, USA</p> <p>16. East-Izu Volcano group, Japan</p> <p>17. Jeju, Korea</p> <p>18. Xitle, Mexico</p> <p>19. Monte Nuovo in Campi Flegrei, Italy</p> <p>20. Wudalianchi, China</p> <p>21. Canary Islands, Spain</p> <p>22. Waiowa, Papua</p> <p>23. Mount Etna, Italy</p> <p>24. Craters of the Moon, USA</p> <p>25. El Pinacate, Mexico</p> <p>26. Southwestern Nevada Volcanic Field</p> <p>27. Taupo Volcanic Zone, New Zealand</p> <p>28. Bakony Balaton Highland VF, Hungary</p> <p>29. Mexican Volcanic Belt, Mexico</p> <p>30. San Francisco Volcanic Field (Sunset Crater)</p> <p>31. Pali Aike Volcanic Field, Argentina</p> <p>32. Sierra Chichinautzin Volcanic Field, Mexico</p> <p>33. Michoacan- Guanajuato VF, Mexico</p> <p>34. Payun Matru, VF, Argentina</p> <p>35. Springerville VF, USA</p> <p>36. Hawaiian Islands, USA</p> <p>37. Missouri River Break, USA</p> <p>38. Peulik Volcano, USA</p> <p>39. Seward Peninsula, USA</p> <p>40. Aeolian Islands, Italy</p> <p>41. Harrat Al Madinah, Saudi Arabia</p> <p>42. Antarctic exposure at Coombs Hills and Allan Hills</p> <p>43. Nilahue (Chile)</p> <p>44. Volcano Island in Lake Taal (Philippines)</p> <p>45. Orapa A/K1 kimberlite in Botswana</p> <p>46. Kleinsaubernitz maar in eastern Saxony, Germany</p> <p>47. Kimberlites in Angola</p> <p>48. Kimberlites in Siberia,</p> <p>49. Maegok diatreme, Korea.</p> <p>50. Ship Rock, New Mexico.</p> <p>51. Gross Brukkaros, Namibia.</p> <p>52. At Igwisi Hills, Tanzania</p> <p>53. Wesselton Mine (Kimberley area, South Africa).</p> <p>II: Monogenetic Volcanic Sites included in papers in Maars and scoria cones: the enigma of</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>monogenetic volcanic fields, Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research, Volume 201, Issues 1–4, 15 April 2011. This was a special edition of the journal, supported by the IAVCEI Commission on Monogenetic Volcanism, and based on papers presented at two international conferences - the 3rd International Maar Conference (CMV's inaugural event) and the Jorullo 250 Conference on Monogenetic Volcanism.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Suoana crater in Miyakejima Volcano, Japan</li> <li>2. Cinder cones in Guatemala and El Salvador</li> <li>3. Payenia volcanic province in the Southern Andes (NB noted as an appraisal of an exceptional Quaternary tectonic setting)</li> <li>4. Michoacán-Guanajuato Volcanic Field (Mexico) (two papers)</li> <li>5. Calatrava Volcanic Province (Spain)</li> <li>6. No mention in title. Abstract refers to The Main Ethiopian Rift (MER), part of the East African Rift System(- geochemical data from scoria cones in the Wonji Fault Belt (WFB) and Silti-Debre Zeyit Fault Zone (SDFZ)</li> <li>7. Jorullo Volcano region, Michoacán, México</li> <li>8. The Parícutin calc-alkaline lavas (2 papers)</li> <li>9. Auckland Volcanic Field, New Zealand</li> <li>10. Pelagatos, Cerro del Agua, and Dos Cerros monogenetic volcanoes in the Sierra Chichinautzin Volcanic Field, south of México City</li> <li>11. Cerro Chopo basaltic cone (Costa Rica)</li> <li>12. Catalan Volcanic Zone (NE of Spain)</li> <li>13. Ambrym Volcano, Vanuatu (SW-Pacific),</li> <li>14. České středohoří Mountains (Czech Republic)</li> <li>15. Mio/Pleistocene continental volcanic field in western Hungary</li> <li>16. Bakony–Balaton Highland Volcanic Field (presumed the same site as previous ref)</li> <li>17. Hverfjall eruptive fissure, north Iceland:</li> <li>18. Pali Aike volcanic field, Argentina,</li> <li>19. Pliocene Grad Volcanic Field,</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>North-east Slovenia,</p> <p>20. The Lami pyroclastic succession (Lipari, Aeolian Islands)</p> <p>21. Tolbachik volcanic field, Kamchatka,</p> <p>22. Sirinia Basin (SW Romania–Eastern Europe),</p> <p>23. Tepexitl tuff ring (Eastern Mexican Volcanic Belt),</p> <p>24. Hule and Río Cuarto maars, Costa Rica,</p> <p>25. Potrok Aike (southern Patagonia, Argentina),</p> <p>26. Vulcano (Aeolian Islands, Southern Italy)</p> <p>27. Ilchulbong 'wet' tuff cone, Jeju Island, South Korea,</p> <p>28. Birket Ram, the Golan heights,</p> <p>29. Vrancea seismic zone (keyword, not in title).</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--



FORMULAIRE POUR LA SOUMISSION DES  
ERREURS FACTUELLES DANS LES ÉVALUATIONS  
DES ORGANISATIONS CONSULTATIVES



(conformément au paragraphe 150 des Orientations)

ÉTAT(S) PARTIE(S) : France

ÉVALUATION DE LA PROPOSITION D'INSCRIPTION DU SITE : Ensemble tectono-volcanique de la Chaîne des Puys et de la faille de Limagne

ÉVALUATION DE L'ORGANISATION CONSULTATIVE CONCERNÉE<sup>5</sup> : UICN

Page / Colonne	Ligne	Phrase incluant l'erreur factuelle (l'erreur factuelle devrait figurer en gras)	Correction proposée par l'État partie	Commentaire (s'il y en a) de l'Organisation consultative et/ou du Centre du patrimoine mondial
				<p>Introduction générale : L'UICN remercie l'État partie de la France de ses propositions concernant les erreurs factuelles analysées ci-dessous. L'UICN reconnaît quelques erreurs factuelles dans son rapport, mais la plupart des points soulevés ne sont pas des erreurs de ce genre. Qui plus est, l'UICN juge certains points de la lettre de l'État partie comme étant eux-mêmes inexacts.</p> <p>Les commentaires de l'UICN utilisent les termes suivants pour étudier les informations figurant dans la lettre suggérant des erreurs factuelles :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• erreur factuelle</li><li>• défense des propositions</li></ul>

<sup>5</sup> Pour les propositions d'inscription de sites mixtes, en cas d'erreur dans les deux évaluations des Organisations consultatives, des formulaires séparés devraient être soumis pour chacune des Organisations consultatives en indiquant à laquelle de ces Organisations chaque formulaire se réfère.

Page de couverture		Photographie	Ce cliché <b>ne représente ni la Chaîne des Puys, ni la faille de Limagne</b> , mais une portion limitée de la Montagne de la Serre, un des attributs secondaires de l'ensemble tectono-	<p>faites dans le dossier de proposition d'inscription</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reprend les arguments/la justification présentés/(ée) dans le dossier de proposition d'inscription et déjà complètement étudiés(e) par les Organisations consultatives</li> <li>• nouvelles informations qui ne peuvent être prises en compte à ce stade</li> <li>• différence d'opinion</li> <li>• clarification</li> <li>• nouvelles informations contredisant les informations fournies à des stades antérieurs de la procédure d'évaluation</li> </ul> <p>L'UICN croit savoir que des informations complémentaires, y compris des points non mentionnés ci-dessous, ont également été fournies directement par l'État partie aux membres du Comité. L'UICN a eu connaissance, au moins partiellement, de ces informations et les a étudiées dans la mesure du possible. Par principe, l'UICN considère que ces informations devraient être disponibles de manière transparente aux membres du Comité en suivant le processus d'erreurs factuelles, afin de faciliter autant que possible le dialogue et la résolution des problèmes.</p> <p>Enfin, l'UICN a proposé de poursuivre le dialogue avec l'État partie de la France concernant la proposition d'inscription. L'UICN est prête à poursuivre ce dialogue à la demande de l'État partie.</p> <p><b>Clarification</b></p> <p>Il est évident qu'il ne s'agit pas d'une erreur factuelle. Le dossier de proposition d'inscription disponible au Comité fournit de nombreuses</p>
--------------------	--	--------------	--	--

				volcanique (- de 7% de la surface du bien).	photographies.
74	Gauche	36-37	« Le bien proposé [...] se trouve dans la région française du <b>Massif Central</b> »	Le bien se trouve dans la région administrative française de l' <b>Auvergne</b> . Le Massif central est une <b>aire géologique</b> .	<b>Clarification</b>  Le document de l'UICN ne fait pas allusion à la région administrative, mais nous reconnaissons que le site se trouve dans la région administrative de l'Auvergne.
74	Gauche	37-40	« Les limites du bien proposé ont été tracées de manière à inclure toutes les caractéristiques géologiques et les paysages qui caractérisent cette <b>région</b> »	Les éléments retenus dans la proposition sont ceux qui caractérisent spécifiquement <b>l'ensemble tectono-volcanique et non la région dans son ensemble</b> .	<b>Clarification.</b>  Le texte de UICN va exactement dans le sens de la correction proposée (le texte de l'UICN n'utilise pas les mots « dans son ensemble » mais renvoie aux caractéristiques des Puy/de la Limagne).
74	Gauche	48	« [...] La Chaîne des Puy, un champ volcanique <b>éteint</b> dont les dernières éruptions datent d'environ 8'000 ans ».	Les volcans de la Chaîne des Puy, âgés de moins de 10 000 ans, ne sont pas éteints mais <b>endormis</b> , c'est-à-dire <b>toujours potentiellement actifs</b> au regard de la classification internationale de la Smithsonian Institution.	<b>Erreur factuelle.</b>  L'UICN est d'accord qu'il convient d'amender « éteint » en « endormi ». L'état de dormance a été abondamment étudié et discuté – y compris à propos de questions comme la gestion des risques – lors de la mission d'évaluation.  (Note : L'UICN estime que la correction proposée en français est inexacte et qu'il faudrait dire : « âgés de moins de <u>100 000 ans</u> » et non « âgés de moins de 10 000 ans » – étant entendu que l'âge des volcans du bien proposé pour inscription varie entre 95 000 et 8 400 ans avant le présent.)  <b>Révision :</b>  « [...] un <b>champ volcanique endormi</b> [...] »
74	Droite	17-19	« [...] Depuis <b>plus de 10'000 ans</b> , le paysage du bien est et a toujours été <b>profondément modifié</b> »	La présence humaine sédentaire sur le site est attestée depuis le Néolithique donc moins de 5 000 ans pour les premiers établissements et cette présence humaine n'a été significative qu'à partir de l'occupation romaine, donc <b>2 000 ans</b> , et même depuis lors, il est <b>faux de dire que le paysage a été profondément modifié</b> .	<b>Clarification et erreur factuelle</b>  L'UICN convient que le texte a été trop simplifié dans sa formulation et lors de sa révision ; elle propose le texte amendé ci-dessous pour clarifier ce point.  Cette correction n'a pas d'incidence sur le point essentiel qui est qu'il s'agit d'un paysage très géré, avec une très longue et complexe histoire

					d'occupation humaine.  L'amendement de l'UICN au rapport serait le suivant, sans incidence sur les conclusions essentielles du rapport de l'UICN : « <b>Le paysage du bien est très géré. La présence humaine y est attestée depuis environ 5000 ans, avec une présence significative depuis plus de 2 000 ans, à partir de l'occupation romaine</b> ».
74	Droite	34	« [...] La plupart des <b>80 cônes</b> [...] »	<p>Comme démontré dans tout le dossier, la Chaîne des Puys se distingue au niveau international par la variété de ses appareils volcaniques qui ne se réduisent pas aux simples cônes mais couvrent toute la gamme des édifices volcaniques (<b>dômes, maars, cônes, anneaux de tuf</b>) et leurs déclinaisons spécifiques.</p> <p>Cette formulation dénature la diversité fondamentale de ce champ monogénique dont la variabilité est bien l'un des aspects distinctifs à l'échelle mondiale.</p>	<p><b>Clarification et différence d'opinion</b></p> <p>Il s'agit d'une question de rédaction et les valeurs du bien sont décrites dans le texte précédent du rapport d'évaluation de l'UICN. L'UICN convient que le terme « édifices » (terme utilisé en français) serait plus exact, bien que moins accessible. Le site Internet même du site utilise le terme « volcans » comme terme général, ce qui serait aussi un meilleur choix.</p> <p>Il est incontestable que le champ volcanique comprend un ensemble de caractéristiques, comme l'a mentionné l'État partie, et l'UICN a pris en compte la question de la diversité lors de son processus d'évaluation, comme l'une des composantes de l'évaluation.</p>
75	Gauche	20-21	« [...] La chaîne des Puys (avec <b>ses cônes</b> et ses coulées de laves) [...] »		
75	Gauche	22-24	« <b>L'analyse comparative</b> du dossier <b>se concentre presque exclusivement sur les caractéristiques volcaniques</b> du site »	<p>Toute la démonstration de l'étude comparative du dossier de candidature (p.257 à 289) repose sur la spécificité tectono-volcanique du bien proposé et s'emploie à démontrer la conjugaison de ces deux phénomènes géologiques. Sur les <b>33 pages</b> que compte cette étude, seulement <b>6</b> sont exclusivement consacrées au <b>volcanisme</b>, contre <b>5</b> exclusivement consacrées à la <b>tectonique</b> et <b>22</b> à la <b>combinaison géologique</b>.</p>	<p><b>Clarification et différence d'opinion</b></p> <p>C'est une question rédactionnelle et la clarification n'est pas discutée.</p> <p>La « spécificité tectono-volcanique » (par son caractère même) est une caractéristique que l'UICN ne considère pas comme pouvant appuyer une revendication de Valeur universelle exceptionnelle, compte tenu de la nature spécialisée et complexe de la justification. De tels arguments sur la « spécificité » constituent inévitablement une base</p>



					<p>inappropriée pour envisager la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle, car cette analyse s'éloigne du concept « d'une liste sélectionnée des plus exceptionnels d'entre eux du point de vue international ». (§ 52 des Orientations). Compte tenu des directives claires et répétées du Comité du patrimoine mondial concernant les propositions d'inscriptions de volcans, cette question est particulièrement importante.</p> <p>(Ce type d'argument peut être tout à fait approprié pour soutenir l'option du statut de géoparc).</p> <p>L'UICN a adopté des méthodes comparatives prenant en compte les évaluations et décisions passées, ainsi que les directives passées du Comité du patrimoine mondial, définies dans les Orientations.</p> <p>L'UICN a aussi pris en compte le cadre fourni par l'étude thématique sur les volcans et les paysages volcaniques (qui ne recommandait pas le site comme prioritaire pour combler une lacune, et qui ne prévoit pas qu'un site montrant une « spécificité tectono-volcanique associée au volcanisme monogénique » soit considéré comme une lacune sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial).</p> <p>L'analyse comparative mondiale (ACM) de l'UICN a aussi été centrée sur les caractéristiques volcaniques de ce bien car l'ACM de la proposition d'inscription portait aussi dans une large mesure sur les caractéristiques volcaniques (y compris sur leurs relations avec la tectonique). Les principales caractéristiques de ce bien, qui en expliquent la célébrité, sont les édifices volcaniques (cônes, dômes, maars et coulées de lave).</p> <p>La proposition d'inscription précise en effet que le « fondement » (c'est-à-dire la géologie pré-volcanique) est une importante partie de « l'ensemble ». Les affleurements et expositions de la géologie du « fondement » ne se voient que dans des coupes routières ou des carrières abandonnées, couvertes de forêts ou</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					de végétation agricole, ou usées par les intempéries et peu facilement reconnaissables. S'agissant du secteur de l'ensemble constitué par la faille, les quelques expositions étudiées se trouvaient essentiellement dans d'anciennes carrières. La faille pourrait aussi être imaginée à partir d'un niveau paysager lorsque l'on en a une vue aérienne ou depuis un autre point de vue approprié.
75	Gauche	14-16	“Les études mondiales récentes du volcanisme monogénique dans la littérature revue par des pairs (Nemeth, 2010 ; de la Cruz-Reyna et Yokoyama, 2011 ; Kereszturi et Nemeth, 2012 ; Valentine et Gregg, 2008)”	Il n'y a pas d'études globales récentes sur le volcanisme monogénique. La littérature citée n'a pas objet l'exhaustivité mais l'étude d'aspects spécifiques du volcanisme monogénique.	<p><b>Clarification, différence d'opinion, nouvelle information</b></p> <p>Ce commentaire semble être en partie une question de sémantique (c'est-à-dire qu'est-ce réellement qu'une « étude globale » ?) et traite ensuite de plusieurs points fondamentaux sur la raison pour laquelle l'UICN n'a pas considéré qu'il convenait de démontrer les arguments en faveur de la VUE du bien proposé pour inscription.</p> <p>L'UICN prend note de la déclaration de l'État partie selon laquelle il n'y a pas eu à ce jour d'étude mondiale du volcanisme monogénique. En cela, l'UICN suppose qu'il est suggéré qu'il n'y a pas eu d'étude <u>exhaustive</u> sur ce sujet. Prendre au pied de la lettre cette nouvelle information contribue immédiatement à décrédibiliser l'assertion selon laquelle une analyse comparative mondiale rigoureuse est actuellement possible, et suffisante pour guider le classement d'un champ volcanique monogénique (y compris ses relations tectono-volcaniques).</p> <p>Concernant les études citées, l'UICN ne souhaite pas insister sur le mot « études » en laissant entendre que tous ces rapports sont des vues d'ensemble mondiales exhaustives, estimant que les auteurs ne jugent pas ces termes appropriés pour leurs rapports. L'UICN considère toutefois que tous ces rapports sont effectivement des vues d'ensemble sur des aspects du volcanisme monogénique, et que certains des rapports tels que présentés semblent à l'évidence être des études mondiales (l'un inclut même des cartes du monde montrant la diversité</p>

					<p>des sites cités).</p> <p>Ces rapports sont certainement des « vues d'ensemble » ou des « résumés » d'un ensemble d'aspects du volcanisme monogénique par de grands auteurs citant une sélection d'exemples de différentes régions. L'UICN juge raisonnable de s'attendre à ce que les auteurs utilisent ce qu'ils considèrent comme d'importants exemples de volcanisme monogénique pour illustrer leur point de vue dans ces rapports, en se fondant sur leur très grande connaissance du terrain, comme de la littérature concernée. Nous avons également estimé que si la Chaîne des Puys était considérée comme particulièrement exceptionnelle par rapport à d'autres sites volcaniques monogéniques, y compris les champs volcaniques monogéniques, elle aurait de grandes chances d'être abondamment citée dans les principaux rapports sur le sujet.</p> <p>L'UICN ajoute qu'à eux tous, les quatre rapports cités mentionnent plus de 40 autres exemples de sites de volcanisme monogénique, et que plus de 10 de ces exemples (environ 14) sont explicitement cités comme champs volcaniques monogéniques (y compris le Pinacate, mentionné dans 3 des 4 rapports en tant que champ volcanique monogénique). Les sites suivants, indiqués comme étant des champs volcaniques monogéniques, sont mentionnés dans plus d'un de ces rapports :</p> <p>Auckland (Nouvelle-Zélande), le Llancanelo du Quaternaire (Argentine), l'Eifel-Ouest (Allemagne), l'Izu-Est (Japon), El Pinacate (Mexique), le sud-ouest du Nevada (États-Unis).</p> <p>(De plus, bien que n'étant pas mentionnés en tant que champs volcaniques monogéniques, l'UICN fait remarquer que plusieurs autres sites déjà classés au patrimoine mondial et comportant des caractéristiques monogéniques sont également cités dans ces rapports, comme par exemple Jeju, en Corée.)</p> <p><b>L'UICN attire en outre l'attention</b></p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p><b>sur l'édition spéciale extrêmement référencée de la Commission sur le volcanisme monogénique (CMV) de l'IAVCEI (Association internationale de volcanologie et de chimie de l'intérieur de la Terre). C'est l'une des vingt commissions de spécialistes de l'IAVCEI.</b></p> <p>Le volume, publié en 2011, est intitulé <i>Maars and scoria cones: the enigma of monogenetic volcanic fields</i> (Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research, Volume 201, Issues 1-4).</p> <p>Selon la CMV de l'IAVCEI, ce volume présente des rapports des deux événements mondiaux inauguraux soutenus et organisés par la CMV après sa création en 2009. L'UICN fait aussi remarquer que ce volume comprend une « étude impartiale » sur un aspect plus détaillé du volcanisme monogénique (White, J., Ross, P.-S. (2011) Maar-diatreme volcanoes: a review. Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research, v. 201, p. 1-29)</p> <p>La Chaîne des Puys ne semble pas faire l'objet d'un rapport sélectionné pour publication dans cette édition spéciale (les rapports de ce volume traitent de plus de 25 sites), et elle n'est pas non plus mentionnée dans l'étude sur les volcans de type maar-diatrème dans la publication de la CMV.</p> <p>L'UICN conclut donc qu'un examen de la littérature scientifique de pointe disponible semble montrer qu'il existe beaucoup de sites comparables avec au moins l'équivalent ou davantage de reconnaissance internationale que la Chaîne des Puys. Parmi ces sites, plusieurs sont déjà inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. La documentation spécialisée ne plaide pas en faveur de la VUE pour la Chaîne des Puys.</p> <p>L'évaluation de l'UICN fait déjà remarquer que le très actif groupe local de recherche, à proximité du bien, a généré ces dernières années un nouvel ensemble documentaire. Cela n'est pas contesté, et est tout à fait méritoire.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Pour en revenir à la question précise de la formulation dans le rapport d'évaluation, l'adoption du mot « vues d'ensemble » apporterait une clarification, en respectant les opinions exprimées par les estimés auteurs des études mentionnées dans l'évaluation, mais l'UICN ne considère pas cela comme une erreur factuelle.</p> <p>On pourrait proposer une reformulation dans ce genre :</p> <p><b>“[...] Les vues d'ensemble récentes (citer les références) sur des aspects du volcanisme monogénique dans la littérature évaluée par des pairs ne mentionnent généralement pas le bien proposé pour inscription. À l'inverse, ces rapports citent en exemple de nombreux autres sites volcaniques monogéniques (plus de 40) au niveau mondial, dans plus de 30 pays différents. Plusieurs de ces autres sites ont été mentionnés à plusieurs reprises dans diverses études. Les sites mentionnés incluent un ensemble de sites actuellement inscrits comme sites naturels du patrimoine mondial [...].”</b></p> <p>Pour aider le Comité, l'UICN a inclus en annexe la liste des sites mentionnés dans les rapports susmentionnés sur le volcanisme monogénique, en ajoutant une liste distincte des sites mentionnés dans le volume spécial de la CMV de l'AVCEI sur les Champs volcaniques monogéniques (2011).</p>
75	Droite	31 à 37	<p>“En ce qui concerne l'inscription récente de <b>la Réserve de biosphère El Pinacate et Grand désert de l'Altar (Mexique), le phénomène de champ volcanique monogénique</b> est plus étendu, son état naturel est plus important et il est mieux exposé que celui de la proposition qui nous intéresse.”</p>	<p>Comme établi dans le dossier de candidature d'El Pinacate and Gran Desierto de Altar Biosphere Reserve, il ne s'agit pas d'un champ monogénique mais d'un volcan bouclier.</p>	<p><b>Déclaration de l'État partie apparemment incorrecte dans les faits</b></p> <p>L'UICN considère que son rapport est exact dans les faits, et que la « correction » de l'État partie est inexacte dans les faits.</p> <p>Comme cela a été noté plus haut, le Pinacate est cité dans au moins trois des vues d'ensemble susmentionnées sur le volcanisme monogénique comme <u>champ monogénique</u>. Il apparaît donc, dans</p>

					<p>la littérature, que <u>le Pinacate est systématiquement mentionné comme abritant un champ volcanique monogénique</u>. Il aurait été utile que l'État partie indique les références qu'il a utilisées pour justifier la suggestion selon laquelle le Pinacate ne serait pas un site monogénique, et qu'il explique également pourquoi de nombreux auteurs, y compris les principaux auteurs internationaux, citent le Pinacate comme champ volcanique monogénique.</p> <p>Selon les références consultées par l'UICN, le Pinacate comprend à la fois un volcan bouclier et un champ monogénique. Ainsi, comme l'indique un guide pratique de voyage d'étude dans le Champ volcanique du Pinacate :  <a href="ftp://rock.geosociety.org/pub/reposit/2011/2011323_AnswerKey.pdf">ftp://rock.geosociety.org/pub/reposit/2011/2011323_AnswerKey.pdf</a></p> <p>“<u>Champ volcanique du Pinacate</u> : Le Pinacate contient divers formes terrestres volcaniques, dont un volcan bouclier, un cône de tuf, des maars, des cônes de cendres et des coulées de lave. Deux séries différentes de roches alcalines sont représentées : l'une constitue plus de 400 cônes monogéniques et de cratères formés il y a 1,2 million d'années ou plus ; l'autre forme le Santa Clara, volcan bouclier éteint.”</p> <p>Ainsi, le site du Pinacate comprend une série nombreuse et diversifiée de caractéristiques volcaniques monogéniques. En termes de simple comparaison numérique, la Chaîne des Puys comprend environ 80 édifices, alors que le Pinacate compte plus de 400 cônes, maars et cratères. L'UICN ajoute que ces caractéristiques du Pinacate <u>figurent dans la Déclaration de Valeur universelle exceptionnelle de ce bien, adoptée par le Comité du patrimoine mondial lors de l'inscription en 2013</u>, en tant que valeurs justifiant la candidature des célèbres paysages désertiques de ce bien.</p>
75	Droite	40-42	« Le champ volcanique monogénique du Parc national de <b>Wudalianchi</b> (Chine) <b>est plus vaste</b> [...] que	La superficie du site de Wudalianchi est plus large du fait de la dispersion du champ volcanique mais comprend bien <b>moins d'édifices</b> que la Chaîne des Puys. Wudalianchi possède 14 cônes et	<p><b>Clarification.</b></p> <p>Le commentaire de l'État partie confirme que Wudalianchi est un site plus vaste que la Chaîne des Puys,</p>

			la proposition actuelle »	11 volcans boucliers.	<p>bien proposé pour inscription.</p> <p>L'UICN tient ici à rappeler qu'un précédent champ volcanique monogénique, possédant des attributs comparables à ceux de la Chaîne des Puys, et, bien que comportant moins d'édifices, étant d'une forme plus naturelle, et d'une superficie géographique plus vaste, a été précédemment inscrit. L'UICN n'a pas considéré que cette proposition d'inscription répondait aux critères naturels, et ladite proposition a été retirée à la demande de l'État partie de la Chine. Cela (comme l'inscription du Pinacate décrite plus haut – le Pinacate possède beaucoup plus d'édifices que les Puys et Wudalianchi, et est aussi dans un état plus naturel que ces deux sites) est une considération matérielle et un précédent technique et de politique générale dans l'évaluation de la présente proposition d'inscription.</p>
76	Gauche	5-6	« le bien proposé se trouve dans le PNRVA (...) <b>catégorie V</b> de l'UICN »	L'essentiel du bien se trouve en site classé loi de 1930 sur les monuments naturels et les sites, qui est la plus forte protection réglementaire au niveau français ( <b>catégorie III</b> de l'UICN).	<p><b>Clarification et différence d'opinion</b></p> <p>Selon cette déclaration, seule une partie de l'ensemble du site proposé pour inscription est une aire que l'État partie juge se conformer à la catégorie de gestion III. Il n'est pas très clair pour l'UICN si cette aire, dans sa totalité, répondrait complètement à la définition de la catégorie III : (Les aires protégées de la catégorie III sont mises en réserve pour protéger un monument naturel spécifique, qui peut être un élément topographique, une montagne ou une caverne sous-marine, une caractéristique géologique telle qu'une grotte ou même un élément vivant comme un îlot boisé ancien. Ce sont généralement des aires protégées assez petites et elles ont souvent beaucoup d'importance pour les visiteurs).</p>
76	Gauche	48-49	« les limites du bien proposé comprennent <b>plus de 90% des caractéristiques volcaniques de la Chaîne des Puys</b> »	Le volcanisme représente <b>environ 70%</b> de la surface totale (73,42%). Le rapport omet encore ici les trois autres composantes de l'ensemble tectono-volcanique : la faille de la Limagne (7,41% de la surface), le socle ancien (12,31% de la surface) et le relief inversé (Montagne de la Serre 6,87% de la surface du bien).	<p><b>Clarification</b></p> <p>Cela semble une mauvaise interprétation du texte de l'UICN. Le commentaire de la France traite d'autre chose que de ce qu'indique le rapport de l'UICN. Ce n'est pas une erreur factuelle.</p>

76	Droite	2-3	« le <b>plan de gestion cohérente du Grand Clermont</b> [...] »	Le nom du document est le <b>Schéma de Cohérence Territoriale du Grand Clermont</b> , (ScoT),	<b>Clarification</b>  Le texte de l'UICN est une description du plan et non le titre du document. Nul ne conteste évidemment le titre exact. Ce n'est pas une erreur factuelle.
76	Droite	33-35	« Le Conseil <b>régional</b> du Puy-de-Dôme a formé un groupe de <b>cinq</b> employés qui se consacreront aux questions du patrimoine mondial en cas d'inscription »	Il ne s'agit pas du Conseil régional mais du <b>Conseil Général (erreur de traduction)</b> , et comme indiqué page 516 du dossier de candidature et expliqué lors de la mission de terrain, les effectifs du Conseil général dédiés au patrimoine mondial s'élèvent d'ores et déjà à <b>9 personnes</b> qui s'y consacrent pleinement auxquels viennent s'ajouter <b>21 agents de terrain du département partiellement dédiés</b> à l'entretien, à la valorisation et l'animation de ces espaces.	<b>Erreur factuelle probable</b>  L'UICN est disposée à amender le nombre 5 en 9 dans le rapport.  « <b>Le Conseil Général du Puy-de-Dôme a un groupe de 9 personnes qui se consacrent à la question du patrimoine mondial en prévision de l'inscription.</b> »
76	Droite	40-41	« un plan de gestion de <b>deux ans</b> (2012-2013) a été conçu pour le bien proposé (...) l'UICN note que le plan de gestion n'a qu'une <b>brève durée de vie</b> »	Le plan de gestion est <b>mis en œuvre depuis deux ans</b> mais identifie les menaces pesant sur le bien à moyen et long terme ainsi qu'un <b>plan d'action détaillé courant sur six ans</b> , ce qui correspond aux rapports de suivi périodiques de l'UNESCO.  Cette programmation apparaît clairement dans les pages 56, 90 et 130 du plan de gestion qui présentent un calendrier détaillé sur six ans des actions pour chacun des axes.	<b>Erreur factuelle et clarification</b>  Selon la proposition d'inscription, le plan de gestion est en place depuis 2011 (c'est-à-dire depuis 3-4 ans). Il ne reste actuellement qu'une courte période (jusqu'à 2016) pour mettre en œuvre le plan actuel.  Une déclaration corrigée à cet égard serait formulée comme suit, bien que l'UICN fasse remarquer qu'une confirmation de la position entre l'UICN et l'État partie serait souhaitable, vu que le commentaire présente un calendrier différent de celui indiqué dans la proposition d'inscription :  « <b>Le plan de gestion présenté dans la proposition d'inscription est établi sur une période de 2011 à 2016. [...]</b> »
77	Gauche	12-13	« la principale faiblesse en matière de gestion est l' <b>absence de capacités d'applications sur le domaine privé</b> »	Les lois et règlements en vigueur, à commencer par le <b>site classé et les documents d'urbanisme et de réglementation des boisements s'appliquent de manière égale au domaine public comme au domaine privé</b> . De ce fait les interventions sur les parcelles privées sont soumises selon leur importance à des régimes de déclaration ou d'autorisation.	<b>Clarification et différence d'opinion</b>  La mission sur le terrain a noté que la mise en application sur les terrains privés est plus faible que sur les terrains publics. Ces informations proviennent de commentaires de partenaires concernés reçus lors de la mission. La mission a entendu dire que les gardes ont peu de possibilités de patrouiller et de faire respecter la



				Par ailleurs les <b>actions majeures</b> menées depuis 2003 en matière de lutte contre l'érosion et de gestion de la fréquentation touristique sur les principaux édifices volcaniques attestent de la capacité d'intervention sur le domaine privé (cf. pages 355 à 359 du dossier de candidature).	loi sur les terrains privés, et qu'il en est de même pour les gendarmes locaux pour traiter de questions de conformité à la loi sur le terrain.
77	Gauche	48	« Association du Puy-de-Dôme »	Le nom de l'association est <b>Dôme Union</b> .	<b>Erreur factuelle</b>  Correction acceptée pour la formulation qui deviendrait :  « <b>La plus grande Association de propriétaires est Dôme Union.</b> »
77	Droite	8-9	« [...] Le paysage du bien fait l'objet <b>d'une gestion importante depuis plus de 10 000 ans</b> »	La présence humaine sédentaire sur le site est attestée depuis le <b>Néolithique</b> donc moins de <b>5 000 ans</b> pour les premiers établissements et cette présence humaine n'a été significative qu'à partir de <b>l'occupation romaine</b> , donc <b>2 000 ans</b> .	<b>Clarification et erreur factuelle</b>  Ce point est le même que celui discuté plus haut. On pourrait faire le même amendement :  « <b>Le paysage du bien est très géré. La présence humaine y est attestée depuis environ 5000 ans, avec une présence significative depuis plus de 2 000 ans, à partir de l'occupation romaine.</b> »
77	Droite	11-12	« [...] la <b>dégradation et l'érosion</b> des cônes (puys) par le <b>pâturage</b> [...], <b>l'expansion des forêts</b> . »	Le <b>pâturage</b> n'est aujourd'hui pas une menace mais au contraire <b>une solution</b> . La <b>forêt ne génère pas de l'érosion</b> , elle en protège au contraire les formes volcaniques.	<b>Différence d'opinion</b>  La mission de l'UICN a noté que le pâturage et les pratiques agricoles ont causé une dégradation et de l'érosion dans le passé et peuvent causer une dégradation et de l'érosion à l'avenir.  L'érosion causée par le pâturage est évitée lorsqu'il y a des bergers qualifiés pour gérer les troupeaux.  Comme cela a été noté, les impacts de la foresterie sont complexes et le propos de l'UICN ne se limitait pas à la seule protection des formes volcaniques.
77	Droite	23-24	« environ 30 communes se trouvent <b>dans les limites du bien</b> »	Les 30 communes se situent <b>dans le bien et la zone tampon</b> .	<b>Clarification</b>  Cela n'est pas une erreur factuelle, mais le texte est peut-être ambigu. L'UICN est disposée à proposer cette déclaration pour supprimer toute ambiguïté :

					« Environ 30 communes sont incluses dans le bien proposé pour inscription, y compris dans sa zone tampon. »
77	Droite	35-37	« il y a plusieurs carrières actives dans les limites du bien Puy de la Toupe, <b>Puy de Cliersou, Puy de la Nugère</b> »	<p>Les carrières actives de la Chaîne des Puys sont au nombre de trois, une sur le puy de la Toupe, une sur le puy de Tenusset et une sur la <b>coulée de lave de la Nugère et non sur l'édifice.</b></p> <p>Le puy de <b>Cliersou</b> abrite une ancienne carrière merovingienne qui <b>n'a été active qu'au Moyen-Age.</b></p>	<p><b>Clarification et erreur factuelle</b></p> <p>Amendement factuel noté concernant la correction du nom d'une des carrières actives à l'intérieur du bien proposé pour inscription.</p> <p>Rapport de l'UICN :</p> <p><b>« Il y a plusieurs carrières actives dans les limites du bien (Puy de la Toupe, Puy de Tennuset et une sur la coulée de lave provenant du Puy de la Nugère). »</b></p>
77	Droite	53-54	« L'urbanisation et la croissance de Clermont-Ferrand. On constate en particulier les pressions sur la faille de Limagne, ses forêts et zones de végétation [...] »	<p>Le Schéma de Cohérence Territoriale du Grand Clermont (SCoT), document d'urbanisme à portée réglementaire, définit la faille de Limagne comme « <b>un écrin forestier de qualité à préserver</b> en tant que zone de transition entre les puys et l'agglomération », la mettant à l'abri de toute pression urbaine. <b>Le SCoT interdit toute construction sur la faille</b> (cf. Pages 350 à 354 du dossier de candidature.)</p>	<p><b>Clarification</b></p> <p>Il y a de facto une pression, et le Schéma de Cohérence Territoriale vise à gérer cette pression. La mission a noté des effets négatifs sur la connectivité des forêts et de la végétation avec le paysage environnant. Il y a également un effet en termes de bruit, d'impact visuel et de visites.</p> <p><b>SITES DE VOLCANISME MONOGÉNIQUE</b></p> <p>I. Ce qui suit est une liste provisoire de sites de volcans monogéniques figurant dans les études, vues d'ensembles et documents de synthèse récents sur le volcanisme monogénique :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nemeth, K. (2010) 'Monogenetic volcanic fields: origins, sedimentary record, and relationship with polygenetic volcanism', Geological Society of America, Special Paper, 470, 43-66</li> <li>• De la Cruz-Reyna, Servando and I. Yokoyama (2011) 'A geophysical characterisation of monogenetic volcanism', Geofísica Internacional, 50, 4, 465-484</li> </ul>

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kereszturi, G. and K. Nementh (2012) 'Monogenetic basaltic volcanoes: genetic classification, growth, geomorphology, and degradation' in K. Nementh (ed) (2012) Updates in Volcanology – New advances in Understanding Volcanic systems, InTech, 3-88</li> <li>• Valentine, G.A. and T.K.P. Gregg (2008) 'Continental basaltic volcanoes – processes and problems', Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research, 177, 857-873</li> <li>• J.D.L. White, P.-S. Ross, Maar-diatreme volcanoes: A review, Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research, Volume 201, Issues 1–4, 15 April 2011, Pages 1-29, ISSN 0377-0273.</li> </ul> <p>Ces articles ne mentionnent pas la Chaîne des Puys, mais citent un grand nombre d'autres sites au niveau mondial. L'UICN n'a pas totalement recoupé les informations ci-dessous pour rechercher d'éventuels chevauchements (même site mais sous des noms différents), aussi décrira-t-elle prudemment la liste ci-dessous comme citant « plus de 40 sites » :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Champ volcanique d'Auckland, Nouvelle-Zélande</li> <li>2. Jorullo, Mexique</li> <li>3. Paricutin, Mexique</li> <li>4. Los Morados, Argentine</li> <li>5. Al Haruj, Libye</li> <li>6. Snake River Plain, États-Unis</li> <li>7. Champ volcanique du Quaternaire de Llacanelo, Argentine</li> <li>8. Maar de l'Oligocène de Messel, Allemagne</li> <li>9. Champ volcanique d'Eifel-Ouest, Allemagne</li> <li>10. Chubut, Argentine</li> <li>11. Champ volcanique basaltique du Sud de la Slovaquie, Slovaquie</li> <li>12. Hopi Buttes, États-Unis</li> <li>13. Anneau de tuf de Crater Hill, Nouvelle-Zélande</li> <li>14. Maar de La Brena, Mexique</li> <li>15. Maar d'Ukinrek, États-Unis</li> <li>16. Groupe de volcans d'Izu-Est, Japon</li> <li>17. Jeju, Corée</li> <li>18. Xitle, Mexique</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>19. Monte Nuovo, Champs Phlégréens, Italie</p> <p>20. Wudalianchi, Chine</p> <p>21. Îles Canaries, Espagne</p> <p>22. Waiowa, Papouasie</p> <p>23. Mont Etna, Italie</p> <p>24. Cratères de la Lune, États-Unis</p> <p>25. El Pinacate, Mexique</p> <p>26. Champ volcanique du sud-ouest du Nevada, États-Unis</p> <p>27. Zone volcanique de Taupo, Nouvelle-Zélande</p> <p>28. Champ volcanique des hauteurs de Bakony-Balaton, Hongrie</p> <p>29. Ceinture volcanique mexicaine, Mexique</p> <p>30. Champ volcanique San Francisco (Sunset Crater), États-Unis</p> <p>31. Champ volcanique de Pali Aike, Argentine</p> <p>32. Champ volcanique de la Sierra Chichinautzin, Mexique</p> <p>33. Champ volcanique du Michoacan-Guanajuato, Mexique</p> <p>34. Champ volcanique de Payun Matru, Argentine</p> <p>35. Champ volcanique de Springerville, États-Unis</p> <p>36. Îles Hawaïennes, États-Unis</p> <p>37. Missouri River Breaks, États-Unis</p> <p>38. Volcan Peulik, États-Unis</p> <p>39. Péninsule de Seward, États-Unis</p> <p>40. Îles Éoliennes, Italie</p> <p>41. Harrat Al Madinah, Arabie saoudite (diatrèmes de kimberlite au Canada)</p> <p>42. Exposition antarctique à Coombs Hills et Allan Hills</p> <p>43. Nilahue (Chili)</p> <p>44. Île volcanique dans le lac Taal (Philippines)</p> <p>45. Kimberlite d'Orapa A/K1 au Botswana</p> <p>46. Maar de Kleinsaubernitz dans l'Est de la Saxe, Allemagne</p> <p>47. Kimberlites d'Angola</p> <p>48. Kimberlites de Sibérie</p> <p>49. Diatrème de Maegok, Corée</p> <p>50. Ship Rock, Nouveau-Mexique</p> <p>51. Gross Brukkaros, Namibie</p> <p>52. At Igwisi Hills, Tanzanie</p> <p>53. Mine de Wesselton (Région de Kimberley, Afrique du Sud)</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>II : Sites volcaniques monogéniques figurant dans des articles parus dans Maars and scoria cones: the enigma of monogenetic volcanic fields, Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research, Volume 201, Issues 1–4, 15 April 2011. Il s'agit d'une édition spéciale de cette revue, publiée avec le soutien de la Commission de l'IAVCEI sur le Volcanisme monogénique, à partir de rapports présentés à deux conférences internationales – la 3e Conférence internationale sur les Maars (manifestation inaugurale de la CMV) et la Conférence sur le Volcanisme monogénique pour les 250 ans du Jorullo.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cratère de Suoana du volcan Miyakejima, Japon</li> <li>2. Cônes de cendres au Guatemala et au Salvador</li> <li>3. Province volcanique de Payenia dans le Sud des Andes (Note : Jugée comme une évaluation d'un cadre tectonique exceptionnel du Quaternaire)</li> <li>4. Champ volcanique du Michoacán-Guanajuato (Mexique) (deux articles)</li> <li>5. Province volcanique de Calatrava (Espagne)</li> <li>6. Pas de mention dans le titre. Le résumé analytique se réfère au grand rift éthiopien, qui fait partie du système du grand rift est-africain (données géochimiques provenant de cônes de scories de la ceinture de failles de Wonji et de la zone de faille de Silti-Debre Zeyit</li> <li>7. Région volcanique du Jarullo, Michoacán, Mexique</li> <li>8. Les laves calco-alcalines du Parícutín (2 articles)</li> <li>9. Champ volcanique d'Auckland, Nouvelle-Zélande</li> <li>10. Volcans monogéniques du Pelagatos, du Cerro del Agua et de Dos Cerros dans le champ volcanique de la Sierra Chichinautzin, au sud de Mexico</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>11. Cône basaltique de Cerro Chopo, Costa Rica</p> <p>12. Zone volcanique catalane (NE de l'Espagne)</p> <p>13. Volcan Ambrym, Vanuatu (Pacifique SO)</p> <p>14. Hauts-plateaux de České středohoří, République tchèque</p> <p>15. Champ volcanique continental du miocène-pliocène de l'Ouest de la Hongrie</p> <p>16. Champ volcaniques de hauteurs de Bakony–Balaton (sans doute le même site que la référence déjà mentionnée)</p> <p>17. Fissure éruptive de Hverfjall, Nord de l'Islande</p> <p>18. Champ volcanique de Pali Aike, Argentine</p> <p>19. Champ volcanique du Pliocène de Grad, nord-est de la Slovénie</p> <p>20. Succession pyroclastique de Lami, Lipari, Îles Éoliennes</p> <p>21. Champ volcanique de Tolbachik, Kamchatka,</p> <p>22. Bassin de Sirinia (SO de la Roumanie – Europe de l'Est)</p> <p>23. Anneau de tuf de Tepexitl (Ceinture volcanique de l'Est du Mexique)</p> <p>24. Maars d'Hule et de Río Cuarto, Costa Rica</p> <p>25. Potrok Aike (Patagonie australe, Argentine)</p> <p>26. Vulcano (Îles Éoliennes, sud de l'Italie)</p> <p>27. Cône de tuf « humide » d'Ichulbong, Île de Jeju, Corée du Sud</p> <p>28. Birket Ram, plateau du Golan</p> <p>29. Zone sismique de Vrancea, Roumanie (mot-clé, n'apparaissant pas dans le titre).</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--



**FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS**



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the *Operational Guidelines*)

STATE PARTY: Germany

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Carolingian Westwork and Civitas Corvey

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS, No. 1447

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
Page 229, right column, the last but one line	"..., the monastic complex of Corvey lies along the <b>eastern</b> side of the river Weser in the <b>north-western outskirts</b> of the town of Hörter"	"..., the monastic complex of Corvey lies along the <b>western</b> side of the river Weser <b>east</b> of the town of Hörter"	ICOMOS considers that the correction can be accepted as a factual error.
Page 230, right column, the last but one line and last line	"..., the fluvial harbor – <b>now out of use</b> – ...,"	"..., the fluvial harbor – <b>used by the Waterway and Shipping Board Minden and as a marina</b> – ...,"	ICOMOS considers that the correction can be accepted as a factual error.
Page 230, left column, line 18, 19	"Finally ICOMOS notes that a railway line runs very close to the southern boundary of the nominated property: preparedness measures against accidents should be envisaged for the nominated property."	"Finally ICOMOS notes that a railway line ( <b>located in the buffer zone</b> ) runs very close to the southern boundary of the nominated property: preparedness measures <b>are part of the operating license and the safety concept of Deutsche Bahn (German Railways).</b> "	ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a clarification.
Page, 232, left column, 10 <sup>th</sup> paragraph	However, ICOMOS notes that the Benedictine library was largely destroyed and dispersed during the Thirty Years' War and part of <b>its collection</b> is now housed at the Archbishop's Academic Library in Paderborn.	However, ICOMOS notes that the <b>medieval</b> Benedictine library was largely destroyed and dispersed during the Thirty Years' War and part of <b>the monastery's baroque library</b> is now housed at the Archbishop's Academic Library in Paderborn.	ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a clarification.

<p>Page 235, right column, the last but one paragraph, last three lines</p>	<p>“The Ownership is mixed. The westwork, the church, the forecourt and the graveyard to the south of the church is owned by the Parish of St Stephanus and Vitus. The area included in the former monastery district and the buffer zone belong to the Duke of Ratibor and Prince of Corvey. The harbour and related buildings are owned by the Federal Republic of Germany, the railway lines belong to German Rail, whilst the roads belong to the municipality or the district authorities.”</p>	<p>“The Ownership is mixed. The westwork, the church, the forecourt and the graveyard to the south of the church is owned by the Parish of St Stephanus and Vitus. The area included in the former monastery district and the buffer zone belongs to the Duke of Ratibor and Prince of Corvey. The harbour and related buildings are owned by the Federal Republic of Germany, the railway lines belong to German Rail, whilst the roads belong to the municipality or the district authorities.</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a clarification.</b></p>
<p>Page 238, right column, 3rd paragraph, line 15 – 20</p>	<p>“Formally establish and enforce a management authority (1) for the nominated property and its buffer zone that involves all relevant stakeholders so as to co-ordinate and to integrate protection and enhancement goals, functions and actions carried out by owners and stakeholders;”</p>		<p><b>ICOMOS considers that the correction re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier and in the additional information that have been fully considered by the Ab's.</b></p>





**FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS**



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the *Operational Guidelines*)

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Republic of Ghana

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Tongo-Tengzuk Tallensi Cultural Landscape

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
P. 55, Item 5. Column 1, Paragraph 8	Protection: "...It does not enjoy any national conservation status..."	The reviewed 2005 Ghana Museums Bill is ready for promulgation soon. Meanwhile, Government through the District Assembly ensures the protection of the site with technical assistance from GMMB. The Bill when passed will take care of all protection and conservation issues and also all the issues indicated in the evaluation report. At present, the Traditional Management System for the protection of the site is still in place and effective.	ICOMOS considers that this re-iterates information provided in the nomination dossier
P.53, Column 2, Paragraph 7.	Integrity and Authenticity:	The site is surrounded by an outcrop of hills which provide effective protection from threats from surrounding areas. Traditional rituals, festivals and practices have survived over the years. The homesteads are still maintained using the traditional earthen materials. The shrines are also protected by the traditional sanctions and taboos. This is because the site is still protected by the traditional law.	ICOMOS considers that this re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
P. 53	Criteria under which inscription is proposed:	The cultural landscape has retained its human settlement pattern and land use inherited from the past. The shrines are still functional in their religious manifestations.	ICOMOS considers that this re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
P. 57 Column 2, Paragraph 2	Recommendations: .... "... a new nomination would need to encompass a large enough area ..."	The site should maintain its original area size to demonstrate its integrity. The rock out-crop surrounding the site and the Buffer Zone are protective enough from external interference.	ICOMOS considers that this represents a difference of opinion.



FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the *Operational Guidelines*)

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): India

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Rani-ki-Vav (The Queen's Stepwell) at Patan, Gujarat

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
Pg-126, Col-2, Lines 38-39 and 41-42	Several of these wells considered in the comparison <b>have rich ornamentation and religious associations</b> . ICOMOS considers however that the stepwells on the Indian Subcontinent constitute a <b>specific type of architectural structure</b> that cannot easily be compared with stepwell structures in other cultural contexts.	Several of these wells considered in the comparison are <b>considered holy and have non-ornamental surfaces</b> . ICOMOS considers however that the stepwells on the Indian Subcontinent constitute a <b>unique typology of subterranean water architecture</b> that cannot easily be compared with stepwell structures in other cultural contexts.	ICOMOS considers these corrections to be editorial changes.
Pg-127, Col-1, Line-44	ICOMOS considers that stepwells are an important architectural typology <b>on</b> the Indian subcontinent and that hundreds of examples, many of them well-preserved, still exist.	ICOMOS considers that stepwells are an important architectural typology <b>of</b> the Indian subcontinent and that hundreds of examples, many of them well-preserved, still exist.	ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.
Pg-127, Col-2, Line-41	However, ICOMOS considers that Patan like many Indian urban centres is experiencing rapid urban growth and that the western expansion of the city towards Rani-ki-Vav has to be carefully controlled .... to protect the integrity of the property in the future.	However, ICOMOS considers that Patan like many Indian urban centres is experiencing rapid urban growth and that the western expansion of the city towards Rani-ki-Vav has to be carefully controlled <b>by implementation of the Master Plan</b> to protect the integrity of the property in the future.	ICOMOS considers this correction to be a difference in opinion. The master plan is one of several aspects, which contribute to successful future development control.

Pg-129, Col-1, Line-17	The fact that the top storeys of the pavilions have been lost – <b>likely in an</b> earlier massive earthquake - leaves the side walls more vulnerable during earthquakes.	The fact that the top storeys of the pavilions have been lost – <b>due to the</b> earlier massive earthquake - leaves the side walls more vulnerable during earthquakes.	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be a clarification.</b>
Pg-129, Col-2, Line-34	The nominated property is <b>under State ownership administrated</b> by the Archaeological Survey of India, Ministry of Culture, as the sole authority for all aspects of management and protection.	The nominated property is <b>owned and administered</b> by the Archaeological Survey of India, Ministry of Culture, as the sole authority for all aspects of management and protection.	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.</b>
Pg-130, Col-2, Line-20-23	The primary source of finance for the site is <b>public funding through the contributions</b> to the ASI <b>which are complemented by resources from the National Culture Fund or other direct Government of India contributions.</b>	The primary source of finance for the site is <b>drawn from the budget allocated to the ASI by the Government of India.</b>	The corrected information was presented in the nomination dossier, page 5/10.  <b>ICOMOS considers that this correction represents new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.</b>
Pg-132, Col-2, Line-4-17	Criterion (iv): <b>Rani-ki-Vav is an outstanding example of a subterranean stepwell construction and represents a prime example of an architectural type of water resource and storage system which is widely distributed across the Indian subcontinent. It illustrates the technological, architectural and artistic mastery achieved at a stage of human development when water was predominantly resourced from ground water streams and reservoirs through access of communal wells. In the case of Raniki-Vav, the functional aspects of this architectural typology were combined with a temple-like structure celebrating the sanctity of water as a venerated natural element and the depiction of highest-quality Brahmanic deities.</b>	Criterion (iv): <b>Rani-ki-Vav is an outstanding example of subterranean water architecture unique to the north-western frontiers of the Indian subcontinent. It illustrates the innovation in technological, architectural and artistic skills mastered to source water perennially in a hot arid region. Rani-ki- Vav demonstrates the zenith in combining functional aspects of this architectural typology with associational values that rendered this structure equivalent to temple sanctifying water.</b>	<b>ICOMOS considers that this correction re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the AB's.</b>
Pg-132, Col-2, Line-20	Rani-ki-Vav is preserved with all its key architectural components and, despite <b>missing pavilion storeys</b> , its original form and design can still be easily recognized.	Rani-ki-Vav is preserved with all its key architectural components and, despite <b>having lost its upper storeys to an earthquake</b> , its original form and design can still be easily recognized.	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.</b>

Pg-132, Col-2, Line-25-27	Rani-ki-Vav is a very complete example of the stepwell tradition, even though after geotectonic changes in <b>the 13th century it does no longer function as a water well as a result of the change to the Saraswati River bed.</b>	Rani-ki-Vav is a very complete example of the stepwell tradition, even though it <b>ceases to function as a source of water since the 'disappearance' of River Saraswati through a geo-tectonic movement..</b>	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.</b>
Pg-132, Col-2, Line-27-29	It was however the silting of the <b>flood caused during this historic event, which allowed for the exceptional preservation of Rani-ki-Vav for over seven centuries.</b>	It was however the silting of the <b>site enabled</b> exceptional preservation of Rani-ki-Vav for over seven centuries.	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.</b>
Pg-132, Col-2, Line-32	All components including the immediate surrounding soils <b>which adjoin the vertical architecture</b> of the stepwell are included in the property.	All components including the immediate surrounding soils of the stepwell are included in the property.	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.</b>
Pg-132, Col-2, Line-32	However, Patan like many Indian urban centres is experiencing rapid urban growth and the western expansion of the city towards Rani-ki-Vav <b>has to</b> be carefully controlled <b>to</b> protect the integrity of the property in the future.	However, Patan like many Indian urban centres is experiencing rapid urban growth and the western expansion of the city towards Rani-ki-Vav <b>will</b> be carefully controlled <b>by the Master Plan</b> protect the integrity of the property in the future.	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be a difference in opinion.</b>
Pg-132, Col-2, Line-45	While it maintained its authentic material and substance, it also required some <b>punctual</b> reconstructions for structural stability.	While it maintained its authentic material and substance, it also required some reconstructions for structural stability.	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.</b>
Pg-132, Col-2, Line-47	In all instances reconstructed elements were only added <b>where structurally required</b> to protect remaining sculpture, and they are indicated by smooth surfaces and a lack of decoration which can be easily distinguished from the historic elements.	In all instances reconstructed elements were only added <b>to maintain structural stability and to</b> remaining sculpture, and they are indicated by smooth surfaces and a lack of decoration which can be easily distinguished from the historic elements.	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.</b>



**FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS**



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the *Operational Guidelines*)

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Iran (Islamic Republic of)

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Shahr-iSokhta

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS (1456)

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
138,2,14-16	<b>ICOMOS considers that the eastern buffer zone boundary could be modified so as to distinguish between the protective zone and the area used for site services.</b>	The site services are already located outside the core zone.	This is not disputed. The ICOMOS evaluation recommends that the service area be excluded from the buffer zone.
138, 2, last	<b>ICCHTO</b>	ICHHTO	ICOMOS acknowledges this typing error.
139, 1, 6 & 45	<b>ICCHTO</b>	ICHHTO	ICOMOS acknowledges this typing error.
139, 2, 26	<b>ICCHTO</b>	ICHHTO	ICOMOS acknowledges this typing error.
137, 1, 45	<b>Blocked doorways</b>	Incorrect Delete	ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a difference of opinion.
137, 1, 45	<b>The thick plaster makes all surfaces look the same and conceals the different architectural elements.</b>	And the traditional method of Kahgel ("mud and straw") plastering has resulted in maintaining the architectural elements while respecting the authenticity of the site.	ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a difference of opinion.

135, 2, 52	-	<p>Add the following:</p> <p>To obtain a better understanding on the relation between the site and the surrounding settlements, excavation activities have continuously followed without interruption, since 2009 until now.</p>	
136, 1, 49	<p>The published reports by the archaeologists who excavated the site conclude that the trade was not large-scale and there was no centralization of a trading network or centrally managed entrepreneurship.</p>	<p>Based on the available evidence and comparative studies by the archaeologists who excavated the site (including Maurizio Tosi, 1973, SeyyedSajjadi, 2008, among others) as well as others like Daniel Potts, it is concluded that the trade was large-scale and a centralized trading network used to function in Shahr-iSokhta. The publications and articles mentioned in the text of the Dossier, as well as those annexed to it, prove the trade relations between Shar-iSokhta, the Indian Subcontinent, Central Asia, Oman, Mesopotamia, and Elam, as well as the other sections of the Southern regions of the Iranian Plateau.</p>	<p>This information derives from the most recent publication available to the advisory bodies which brings together past results.</p> <p>ICOMOS considers that the proposed correction represents advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier</p>
138, 1, 7	<p>ICOMOS considers that the settlement has not been demonstrated to be multi-cultural,</p>	<p>Based upon the archaeological evidence obtained from studies on the burials in the cemetery of Shahr-iSokhta, and included in the submitted dossier, at least ten different burial structures have been discovered, each of which evidently point to a different belief framework, ideology and culture, that manifested in a different burial tradition; and these, in turn, collectively prove Shahr-iSokhta as an exemplar site with multi-cultural settlements during the 3<sup>rd</sup> Millennium BCE.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the proposed correction reflects a difference of opinion on the interpretation of burial practices.</p>
136, 2, 9	<p>... later mythology</p>	<p>Delete</p> <p>The Dossier has never talked about mythology</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a clarification.</p>



**FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS**



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the *Operational Guidelines*)

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Iraq

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Erbil Citadel

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
79, left, lines 19-21	In terms of categories of cultural property set out in Article I of the 1972 World Heritage Convention. This is a <b>group of buildings.</b>	In terms of categories of cultural property set out in Article I of the 1972 World Heritage Convention. This is a <b>site.</b>  (Explanation: Erbil Citadel is being nominated for its exceptional historic value, resulting from the works of man. This is an important factual error to be corrected since the entire evaluation made by ICOMOS misses entirely the point of the nomination. )	ICOMOS notes that the nomination highlights the aspects of Erbil Citadel as an urban settlement with strong continuity of occupation, the appropriate category for urban settlements is 'group of buildings' according to the World Heritage Convention.  <b>ICOMOS considers that the point made by the State Party represents a clarification.</b>
79, right, line 33	and a <b>tama</b> (portico)	and a <b>tarma</b> (portico)	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this as a factual error.</b>
79, right, line 36	as do the <b>tamas.</b>	as do the <b>tarmas.</b>	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this as a factual error.</b>
left, lines 40-42	Qalaat al-Madiq exhibits a similar road pattern and its <b>setting is less compromised by urban development,</b>	Qalaat al-Madly exhibits a similar road pattern <b>but its setting is substantially compromised by modern additions,</b>	Qalat al Madiq appears surrounded by a rural environment; the lower urban settlements are sparse and low density.  <b>ICOMOS considers that this point represents a difference of opinion.</b>

right, lines 25-29	<b>The relocation of all the Citadel inhabitants elsewhere has also unfavorably affected the social and functional integrity of the urban fabric as a traditional organically-evolved urban settlement.</b>	--- Delete sentence ---  (Explanation: the social and functional integrity of the urban fabric was already modified following the abandonments of the Citadel after the 1950's)	<b>ICOMOS considers that this point represents a difference of opinion.</b>  <b>The comment in brackets is a clarification.</b>
84, right, lines 2-6	<b>ICOMOS recommends that a cautious approach and clear guidelines for conservation interventions be adopted to ensure respect for the authenticity of the nominated property and to avoid unevenness in the results of conservation works.</b>	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges the State Party's cautious conservation approach and the production of Conservation Guidelines and Manual for Implementation prepared and finalized in November 2013. These documents are guiding the execution of all kinds of conservation and rehabilitation works at Erbil Citadel.</b>	ICOMOS recommendation is based on a careful assessment of the information collected on site by the mission and through the analysis of the dossier and its annexes.  <b>The correction proposed for the first part of the first sentence represents a difference of opinion. The part concerning the 2013 conservation guidelines is new information that cannot be taken into account at this stage.</b>
84, right, lines 10-11	<b>National Kurdistan Museum which is to be built on an area north of and directly facing the Citadel.</b>	<b>The proposed National Kurdistan Museum, originally to be built on an area north of and directly facing the Citadel, although this subject will be further discussed and studied by the Municipality and Governorate in order to decide whether to relocate it to another area or to revise its design.</b>	<b>ICOMOS considers that this point represents a clarification.</b>
85, left, lines 8-12	ICOMOS notes that the 2013 revised version of the Urban Design Guidelines for the Buffer Zone (made available to ICOMOS during the mission) contains a perimeter of the buffer zone which differs from the one contained in the nomination dossier. Clarification on this point is needed.	ICOMOS notes that the 2013 revised version of the Urban Design Guidelines for the Buffer Zone (made available to ICOMOS during the mission) contains a perimeter of the buffer zone which differs from the one contained in the nomination dossier. The perimeter of the buffer zone has always been the 30-meter road. The regulations were amended to apply to the building plots on the exterior/left side of the 30-meter road rather than just to the ones on the interior/right side of the road. This change was done in order to maintain a homogeneous aspect of the streetscape.	ICOMOS notes that in the documentation made available to the mission expert an analysis of views from the city towards the citadel (Annex H-Analysis and protection of external views) contains a map named 'buffer zone proposal'. This exhibits a buffer zone reaching the 60 ring road and is articulated in three zoning areas where different building heights are allowed.  <b>ICOMOS considers that this point represents a clarification.</b>



85, right, lines 9-10	to include both sides of ring-road 60	to include both sides of ring-road 30	The ICOMOS recommendation is based on the documentation cited in the box above (Annex H-Analysis and protection of external views) and therefore cannot be regarded as a factual error
85, right, lines 11-18	<b>The revised guidelines have not been adopted yet. ICOMOS underlines that implementation of the above measures constitutes the key point for an effective protection of the Citadel and its setting and considers that the approval of the drafted revised version of the Guidelines (2013) would improve the protection of the nominated property.</b>	<b>The revised guidelines were adopted in October 2013 and endorsed by both the Municipality Council and the Governorate of Erbil.</b>  (The Guidelines were not provided during the ICOMOS August mission as they were being finalized, but the expert was informed of their existence)	<b>ICOMOS considers that this point represents a clarification and new information that cannot be taken into consideration at this stage.</b>
86, left, lines 8-13	<b>ICOMOS further observes that, whilst the architectural and urban heritage of the Citadel has received much attention, the stability and conservation conditions of the Citadel mound and of its slopes should have been given priority and should be addressed urgently.</b>	A project (Studies for the Stabilization of the Erbil Citadel Slope and Perimeter Facades) was completed in 2012 (See Nomination file, Vol 1, pages 123-127), and a complementary project (Preparation of Bill of Quantities and Technical Specifications for the Consolidation of a Number of Facades at Erbil Citadel) was completed in 2013. Execution of the project is being planned for about 12 million USD to be provided through the Kurdistan Regional Government. In the meantime, facades along the slope that are under threat of collapse have been undergoing urgent interventions.	<b>ICOMOS considers that this point represents a clarification of arguments that have been fully considered.</b>
86, left, lines 46-49	<b>However, the current structure of the HCECR has not been defined nor has its mandate been established formally; in addition, its competencies have never been formalised.</b>	<b>HCECR's</b> management board was established since 2010 and meets periodically. HCECR's role was also institutionalized following the recommendations of the management plan. In addition the structure and the organization of HCECR was formally adopted and endorsed by the Ministry of Interior/Kurdistan Regional Government in December 2013	The ICOMOS recommendations concerning the HCECR structure and formalisation are based on the information provided in document Erbil Citadel Management Plan 1 of 2 document at pp. 53 – 56.  <b>ICOMOS considers that this point represents new information that cannot be taken into</b>

			<b>consideration at this stage.</b>
86, right, lines 7-11	<b>Financial resources to carry out the revitalization programme have been so far allocated only in modest percentages by the Iraqi national or Kurdistan regional governments, the majority deriving from international agencies and other donors.</b>	--- Delete sentence ---  (Explanation: On page 170, Vol.1 of the Nomination File it is mentioned that over 35 million dollars have been allocated by Iraq and the Kurdistan regional government, spanning the period 2008-2013)	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this as a factual error.</b>
86, right, lines 12-16	<b>ICOMOS considers that HCECR's configuration and role needs to be formalized as soon as possible; coordination mechanisms among the different relevant authorities, commissions and committees are also urgently required in order to ensure effective protection and management.</b>	---Delete sentence---  (See above, explanation for page 86, left, lines 46-49)	The ICOMOS recommendations concerning the HCECR structure and formalisation are based on the information provided in document Erbil Citadel Management Plan 1 of 2 document at pp. 53 – 56.  <b>ICOMOS considers that this point represents new information that cannot be taken into consideration at this stage.</b>
86, right, lines 21-23	ICOMOS observes that the technical staff of the HCECR management office should be integrated with at least <b>one archaeologist, and</b> one expert in project financing and public/private partnerships.	ICOMOS observes that the technical staff of the HCECR management office should be integrated with at least one expert in project financing and public/private partnerships.  (Explanation: <b>HCECR</b> staff includes four archaeologists since over a year)	The recommendation from ICOMOS is based on the organisational chart of HCECR presented at p. 54 of the document “Erbil Citadel management Plan 1 of 2”.  <b>ICOMOS considers that this point represents a clarification.</b>
<b>86,</b> right, lines 40-47	<b>ICOMOS notes that the management framework has been envisaged for the nominated property only very recently and under special conditions, thanks to the financial and institutional assistance of the UNESCO Iraq Office and other foreign partners. ICOMOS recommends that a capacity-building strategy for regional and local public institutions be set up to strengthen their long term effectiveness in managing the nominated property.</b>	--- Delete sentence ---  (Explanation: the management framework has been developed and financed by HCECR and KRG since 2010. Capacity building activities have been established and are ongoing.)	<b>ICOMOS considers that, exception made for the reference to financial support, which has been recognized as a factual error (see above), the amendment proposed by the State Party reiterates arguments put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the Ab’s.</b>  <b>Comments on capacity building activities represents a</b>

			<b>clarification.</b>
<b>87,</b> left, lines 19-24	<b>In conclusion, ICOMOS considers that the management system should be extended to include a capacity building strategy for regional and local institutions. Furthermore, ICOMOS recommends that the role, structure and organization of the HCECR be formalized urgently on the basis of the appropriate legal tools.</b>	--- Delete sentence ---  (Explanation: a wide range capacity building activities are established and ongoing, with the cooperation of international institutions and UNESCO; HCECR role, structure and organization has been formalized)	ICOMOS' recommendation concerning the HCECR derives from information contained in the document "Erbil Citadel Management Plan 1 of 2".  <b>ICOMOS considers that the amendment proposed by the State Party concerning the capacity building aspect represents a clarification.</b>
88, left, lines 46-48 and right, lines 1-2	<b>Undertaking juridical studies with a view to improving the existing legal framework by introducing mechanisms to support private owners in carrying out their maintenance duties for their heritage properties.</b>	--- Delete sentence ---  (Explanation: no private ownership exists for the Citadel buildings)	Private ownership does exist for protected buildings within the buffer zone.  <b>ICOMOS considers that this point represents a difference of opinion.</b>



**FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS**



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the Operational Guidelines)

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Italy

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: The Vineyard Landscape of Piedmont: Langhe-Roero and Monferrato

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
Page 309, column 1, line 44	<b>Derived from the Champagne method,</b> winemaking here produces the well-known aromatic sparkling wine Asti Spumante (DOCG).	Based on "Martinotti/Charmat" method, winemaking here produces the well-known aromatic sparkling wine Asti Spumante (DOCG). (1)	<b>ICOMOS considers that this correction contradicts information included in the nomination dossier.</b>  The explicit references to the influence of the Champagne method in the birth of Asti spumante during the second half of the 19 <sup>th</sup> Century are numerous and very clear; independently of the comparative analysis, let us mention: p. 48, 294, 320, 324, 345 (a long paragraph describing this influence) and 367.
Page 309, column 2, line 19	On the tops of the hills, Vignale Monferrato <b>and Montemagno</b> have fortified urban cores dating from the Middle Ages.	On the tops of the hills, Vignale Monferrato has a fortified urban core dating from the Middle Ages. (2)	<b>ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a clarification.</b>

*(1) The production of Asti Spumante DOCG is made for more than 80% with the Martinotti/Charmat method; the champenoise method can not be regarded as characterizing this component.*

*(2) The village of Montemagno is not included within the boundary of the component 6 "Monferrato of the Infernot", even though it is not very far from it.*



**FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS**



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the Operational Guidelines)

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Japan

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Tomioka Silk Mill and Related Sites

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
P 141, left title	Tomioka Silk Mill	Tomioka Silk Mill <b>and Related Sites</b>  (comment : Proposed name)	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.</b>
P141, left line 19-20 P141, right line 31 P142, left line 10-11 P143, right line 6-7 P144, left line 6-7 P144, right line 14 P144, right line 44 P145, left line 6-7 P145, left line 16-17 P146, left	<p>... for reeling <b>and mechanised spinning</b>.</p> <p>...reeling of <b>cocoons and spinning of the</b> raw silk...</p> <p>... machines <b>and those which spun the raw silk yarn</b> ...</p> <p>...to develop reeling <b>and raw silk spinning</b> mills.</p> <p>...and the reeling <b>and spinning</b> of raw silk, is not the subject...</p> <p>... cocoon reeling <b>and spinning</b> on a grand scale.</p> <p>...reeling <b>and spinning</b> machines and...</p> <p>... reeling of the cocoons <b>and spinning</b> in a large model...</p> <p>...to reeling <b>of the cocoons and spinning the hanks</b> of raw silk.</p> <p>...mechanised <b>cocoon</b> reeling <b>and raw silk spinning</b> mill, ...</p> <p>... <b>cocoon</b> reeling <b>and spinning of hanks</b> of raw silk.</p> <p>...reeling <b>and spinning</b> of raw silk</p> <p>... a large mechanised raw silk</p>	<p><b>Delete “spinning” and related words</b></p> <p>(comment : “Spinning” is not carried out in Tomioka Silk Mill that was a silk reeling mill.</p> <p>It seems a problem with translation of technical terms, since corresponding sentences in the evaluation document in French can be understood correctly..</p> <p>“Spinning” means to produce thread by twisting short fiber, generally using cotton, wool and other fibers.</p> <p>For example, “le dévidage du cocon et la filature de la soie grège”( p141, right,line 31) can be simply translated into English phrase “raw silk reeling.”)</p>	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this correction as a translation issue in the English version. The French version remains unchanged.</b>

line 52-53 P146, right line 34-35 P149, right line 6 P149, right line 23-24	reeling <b>and spinning</b> plant.		
P141, left line 10-11	...consisting of silkworm <b>farms</b> , a school and a cold storage facility...	...consisting of <b>a</b> silkworm <b>farm</b> , a school and a cold storage facility...  (comment : Its related sites consisting three sites:Tajima Yahei Sericulture Farm; Takayama-sha Sericulture School and Arafune Cold Storage.)	<b>ICOMOS considers that this correction contradicts the information included in the nomination dossier.</b>  <b>Takayama-sha is presented as a farm and a school.</b>
P141, right line 36-38	...with the contractual assistance of French <b>companies and</b> technicians	...with the contractual assistance of French technicians  (comment : It is not supported by any French company.)	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.</b>
P142, right line 22-23	...building, another for <b>larvae hatching</b> , ...	...building, another for <b>silkworm raising</b> , ...  (comment : There is no building for larvae hatching purpose.)	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.</b>
P142, right line 45	...silkworm raising <b>boxes</b> and their shelves....	...silkworm raising <b>trays</b> and their shelves...  (comment : Concerning its shape, the word "trays" would be more suitable.)	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this correction as a translation issue.</b>
P143, left line 2-3	This provided coolness from the <b>wet vegetation on the surface</b> of the rock pile.	This provided coolness from the <b>gaps</b> of the rock pile.  (comment : The coolness leaks out from the gaps in between each rock, not from the wet vegetation on the surface of the rock pile.)	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.</b>
P143, right line 3-4	The search for raw silk ready for <b>spinning</b> and...	The search for raw silk ready for <b>throwing</b> and...  (comment : "Throwing" would be better English translation for the French word "moulinage".)	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this correction as a translation issue in the English version. The French version remains unchanged.</b>

P143, right line 33-34	<u>Chogoro</u> worked with the Tomioka mill,	<u>Takayama-sha</u> worked with the Tomioka mill,  (comment : His successor at Takayama-sha worked with the Tomioka mill rather than Chogoro.)	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.</b>
P143, right line 45-46	...exporter of raw silk, notably to <u>France and Italy.</u>	...exporter of raw silk, notably to <u>Europe and the United States.</u>  (comment : The main export counterpart of the time was the United States.)	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.</b>
P143, right line 47-48	It was still owned by Kata <u>b</u> ura Industries Co...	It was still owned by Kata <u>k</u> ura Industries Co...	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this typing error.</b>
P145, left line 3	..., <u>in the heart of ancient Japan.</u>	<b>Delete</b>  (comment : The term "Ancient" is too remote and causes unnecessary misunderstanding.)	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.</b>
P147, right line 27-28	...support from the <u>Council</u> for Cultural Affairs, with national status...	...support from the <u>Agency</u> for Cultural Affairs, with national status...	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.</b>
P148, left line 18-19	... owner of Tajima Yahe <u>y</u> for the fourth.	... owner of Tajima Yahe <u>j</u> for the fourth.	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this typing error.</b>
P148, left line 19-20	... support from the <u>Council</u> for Cultural Affairs.	...support from the <u>Agency</u> for Cultural Affairs.	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.</b>
P148, left line 35-36	...the Coordinating Committee for the <u>Tomioka Mill</u> and Related Sites.	...the Coordinating Committee for the <u>Tomioka Silk Mill</u> and Related Sites.	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.</b>
P149, left line 45	... the <u>Tomioka raw silk mill and its related sites.</u>	... the <u>Tomioka Silk Mill and Related Sites.</u>	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.</b>
P149, right line 16	With its related sites including <u>two sericulture schools</u> ...	With its related sites including <u>a silkworm farm, a school</u> ...	<b>ICOMOS considers that this correction contradicts the information included in the nomination dossier.</b>  <b>Takayama-sha is presented as a farm and a school.</b>
P149, right line 33	... tradition of silkworm farming, which...	...tradition of silkworm farming <u>and silk reeling</u> , which...  (comment: Japan had long tradition of both silkworm farming and silk reeling.)	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.</b>
P150, left line 28-29	... <u>Commission</u> for Cultural Affairs <u>of</u> the Gunma Prefecture and...	<u>Agency</u> for Cultural Affairs, the Gunma Prefecture and...	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.</b>

Working Document WHC- 38.COM/8B P3, Japan	Criteria proposed by State Party <u>(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)</u>	Criteria proposed by State Party <u>(ii)(iv)</u>	
Working Document WHC- 38.COM/8B P28, Draft Decision:38 COM 8B.27,Japan	Criteria proposed by State Party <u>(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)</u>	Criteria proposed by State Party <u>(ii)(iv)</u>	





**FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS**



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the Operational Guidelines)

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Mexico

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Ancient Maya City and Protected Tropical Forests of Calakmul, Campeche

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party (Complemented with annex one)	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
P.43 COLUMN 2 LINE 7	The map provided with this list shows the buffer zone boundary running through the centre of Akalpetén in the north, Once de Mayo in the east, another site shown on the map but not listed called Plan de Ayala also in the east; and Dos Naciones is <b>actually shown outside the boundary</b>	We restate that <b>it is within the boundaries</b> of the nominated property, coupled with the natural values, where we can guarantee that interaction should contain mixed properties, without excluding or providing less protection, and in the future we may propose an extension of the property.	<b>ICOMOS considers that this is new information which contradicts the map provided at earlier stages of the evaluation procedure.</b>
P. 43, COLUMN 2, LINE 17	...This map shows many more centres outside the buffer zone boundary, and another map provided by the State Party showing the distribution of Mayan sites across the whole Campeche State, <b>indicates that the greatest concentration of these sites is in fact outside the nominated property area.</b>	The whole peninsula of Yucatan, not only the state of Campeche, is characterized by a high concentration of archaeological sites. <b>The nominated area, however, includes the sites that surround Calakmul and which were evidently in a close relationship with this Maya metropolis.</b>	<b>ICOMOS considers that this point represents a difference of opinion as to whether a close relationship is "evident" or has been demonstrated.</b>

<p>P.43, COLUMN 2, LINE 25</p>	<p>...However ICOMOS considers that there are <b>problems with the property and the buffer zone boundaries in that the selection of sites to be included in the property has not been explained in terms of their relationship with Calakmul...</b></p>	<p>Due mainly to the epigraphic research of hieroglyphic inscriptions found in the nominated area, it is quite clear that <b>most of the sites were in a close political relationship with Calakmul during the greater part of their flourishing.</b></p>	<p><b>ICOMOS considers that this point represents a difference of opinion as to whether a close political relationship is “quite clear”.</b></p>
<p>P.44, COLUMN 2, LINE 48</p>	<p>...ICOMOS considers that it would be useful however to know <b>how Calakmul interacted with its hinterland</b> and the value of the landscape to the already inscribed property.</p>	<p>The interaction between <b>Calakmul and its hinterland is attested in similarities in architecture, urban layouts and ceramics</b>, as to the epigraphic evidence.</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS considers that this point reiterates justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the Ab’s.</b></p>
<p>P.45, COLUMN 2, LINE 3</p>	<p><b>The integrity of the proposed extension is problematic in terms of whether it includes all elements necessary to reinforce the outstanding universal value of the already inscribed property</b>, because it has not been established whether <b>all the sites related to Calakmul</b> within its immediate sphere of influence are included within the boundary...</p>	<p><b>The integrity of the proposed extension has been demonstrated because it includes the elements, all of them related to Calakmul, that reinforce the outstanding universal value of the already inscribed property,</b></p> <p>The exact extent of the sphere of influence of Calakmul is still to be determined (the same applies for other Classic Maya polities).</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS considers that this point represents a difference of opinion as to whether the new property boundary includes all the necessary elements.</b></p>
<p>P.45 COLUMN 2 LINE 11</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS was not able to visit all the sites that are within the boundary, and has had to rely on the findings of archaeological surveys carried out in 2008.</b> However the State Party maintains that the sites are <b>generally</b> protected by their inaccessibility and are visited regularly by staff of the National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH). ICOMOS considers that the fact that these sites are buried within the tropical forest <b>means that relationships between them and Calakmul cannot be perceived, and they are vulnerable to deterioration processes caused by overgrowth.</b></p>	<p><b>All the sites within the boundaries can be visited and verified. Publications on the archaeological findings were presented that confirms the richness and integrity of the nominated property.</b></p> <p><b>Due to the extension, difficult access and limited time, an overfly was conducted to see some of the main sites.</b></p> <p><b>The State Party maintains that the sites are</b> protected by their inaccessibility, and are visited regularly by staff of the National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH).</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS considers that this point reiterates arguments put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the Ab’s.</b></p>

P.46, COLUMN 1 LINE 8	... <b>ICOMOS considers that an insufficient amount of information</b> about the stelae in the nominated extension <b>has been provided</b>	<b>There are a number of archaeological sites in the nominated area,</b> with monumental architecture and hieroglyphic inscriptions, and sufficient amount of information was provided: Altamira, Candzibaantun, Balakbal, Oxpemul, Champerico, La Muñeca, El Gallinero, Cheyokolnah, El Zacatal, Los Hornos and Uxul.	<b>ICOMOS considers that this point represents a difference of opinion as to whether a sufficient amount of information has been provided</b>
P.46 COLUMN 2 LINE 28	ICOMOS considers that the <b>attributes</b> of the proposed extension <b>have not been demonstrated</b> to significantly reinforce this criterion	The information provided, demonstrates that the nominated area, with its archeological features spanning over many centuries and sharing a number of common properties, <b>bears an exceptional testimony to the development of a cultural tradition within a vanished civilization.</b>	<b>ICOMOS considers that this point represents advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.</b>
P.46 COLUMN 2 LINE 25	However the location of <b>Dzibanché</b> is not shown on the boundary map.	<b>Dzibanche is far beyond the nominated area</b> (to the east, in the state of Quintana Roo).	<b>ICOMOS considers that this point represents clarification which support points made by the advisory bodies regarding the boundary location.</b>
P. 47 COLUMN 2 LINE 18	<b>However the other archaeological sites</b> within the proposed extension that are recorded in the inventory of sites of Campeche State <b>are vulnerable to looting and would appear to require better Federal archaeological protection by being officially declared as archaeological zones. The whole proposed extension requires protection as a natural and cultural zone at the Federal level.</b>	<b>All sites within the proposed property, by themselves are already provided with a dual system of Federal protection as natural area and archaeological zones.</b>	<b>ICOMOS considers that this point contradicts information provided at earlier stages of the evaluation procedure.</b>
P.48, COLUMN 1, LINE 47	A diagram is given in the nomination dossier showing the management structure for the Biosphere Reserve but this <b>does not show the involvement of INAH</b>	A diagram is given in the nomination dossier showing the management structure for the Biosphere Reserve by CONANP and <b>additional information provided explains the management structure of INAH and the relations between both federal agencies.</b>	<b>ICOMOS considers that this point reiterates information put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the Ab's.</b>

<p>P. 48, COLUMN 2, LINE 46</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the <b>Management Plan for Calakmul</b> the already inscribed property should be extended to cover the cultural sites of the proposed extension.</p>	<p>There are two different management plans for the natural protected area and the WH property. Both include considerations for natural and cultural aspects as a complement for their management. There is a clear government commitment to prepare an integrated management plan if the proposed renominated mixed property is inscribed in the WH List.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this point reiterates information put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the Ab's.</p>
---	---	--	---



**FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS**



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the Operational Guidelines)

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Mexico

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Ancient Maya City and Protected Tropical Forests of Calakmul, Campeche

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: IUCN

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party (Complemented with annex one)	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
Page 115, second column and line 12.	IUCN also considers it essential that the approach to demonstration that the natural criteria are met in the renomination, <b>needs to be harmonised</b> with the proposed extension of the existing cultural World Heritage property. The nominated property, with significant revisions, has potential to meet both criteria (ix) and (x).	IUCN also notes that the natural criteria are met in the renomination, and <b>have been harmonised with the proposed extension</b> of the existing cultural World Heritage property. The nominated property meets both criteria (ix) and (x).	<b>Difference of Opinion / Advocacy</b>  The original text conveys IUCN's evaluation, the proposal of the State Party is not related to a factual error, and is a difference of opinion. It is not the role of the State Party to express the opinion of IUCN.
Page 115, second column and line 54.	The logic of the boundaries of the nominated property and the configuration of the proposed buffer zone <b>are not clear with respect to how they protect and buffer the natural values of the nominated property</b> ; particularly the buffer zone area to the north of the property.	<b>The boundaries of the nominated property and the configuration of the proposed buffer zone, are the ones established for the natural protected area, the Calakmul Biosphere Reserve.</b>	<b>Reiterating argument in the nomination dossier</b>  The fact that the boundaries of the nomination coincides with those of the Biosphere Reserve is not an argument in favour of those boundaries being appropriate for World Heritage. IUCN concerns on boundaries in the evaluation report remain.
Page 116, first column and line 10.	In order to recognise the natural values of the property but also interactions that could be relevant to its potential status as a mixed property, <b>the boundary configuration of the nominated property would need to be adjusted.</b>	<b>The boundary configuration of the nominated property contains the natural values of the property and also interactions that are relevant to its potential status as a mixed</b>	<b>Difference of Opinion / Advocacy</b>  The original text conveys IUCN's evaluation, the proposal of the State Party is not related to a factual error,

		<b>property.</b>	and is a difference of opinion.
Page 116, first column and line 21.	The nominated property's cultural and natural assets are managed <b>independently</b> by different agencies.	The nominated property's cultural and natural assets are managed <b>coordinatedly</b> by the agencies INAH and CONANP.	<b>Difference of opinion</b>  The conclusion as originally worded is the view of IUCN taken based on the evidence of the evaluation of the nomination.
Page 116, first column and line 36.	Thus, CONANP <b>should have adequate capacity</b> to contribute effectively to an integrated approach to management of the re-nominated property. <b>Whilst the management of cultural aspects will be considered by ICOMOS, it is unclear to IUCN how INAH's current management capacity</b> would be enhanced to effectively support an integrated management approach over a significantly larger area.	<b>CONANP and INAH have adequate capacity</b> to contribute effectively to an integrated approach to management of the re-nominated mixed property.	<b>Difference of opinion</b>  The conclusion as originally worded is the view of IUCN based on the evidence of the evaluation of the nomination.
Page 116, first column and line 44.	<b>There is no integrated management plan for the proposed renominated mixed property.</b>	<b>There are two different management plans for the natural protected area and the WH property. Both include considerations for natural and cultural aspects as a complement for their management. There is a clear government commitment to prepare an integrated management plan if the proposed renominated mixed property is inscribed in the WH List.</b>	<b>Reiterates arguments in the nomination.</b>  The point from the State Party is coherent with IUCN's point on the lack of an integrated management plan.
Page 116, first column and line 50.	There is <b>no system in place for tracking and improvement of management effectiveness</b> , though some relevant indicators, such as changes in indicator species populations and dynamics and land use change are being tracked.	<b>There is in place the monitoring of several relevant indicators, such as changes in indicator species populations and dynamics and land use change are being tracked.</b>  CONANP and INAH have participated in a project to develop an information management system, a 4D GIS online system (now in the implementation phase)	<b>Reiterates arguments in the nomination.</b>  The point from the State Party is coherent with IUCN's point on the lack of a management effectiveness system.  The indicators mentioned by the SP are primarily for monitoring biodiversity and not specific to assessing management effectiveness.
Page 116, second column and line 33.	IUCN considers that the management of the nominated property, <b>as a mixed nomination, does not meet the requirements of the Operational Guidelines.</b>	IUCN considers that, <b>at present, the management of the nominated property meets the requirements of the Operational Guidelines.</b>	<b>Difference of Opinion / Advocacy</b>  The original text conveys IUCN's evaluation that the nomination does not currently meet the requirements of the Operational Guidelines. The proposal of the State Party is

			not related to a factual error, and is a difference of opinion. It is not the role of the State Party to express the opinion of IUCN.
Page 116, second column and line 43.	While governance arrangements for the existing Biosphere Reserve and cultural World Heritage Property are adequate, <b>there are inadequate mechanisms in place for integrated management of the natural and cultural resources</b> of the re-nominated mixed World Heritage Property.	<b>Governance arrangements for the existing Biosphere Reserve and cultural World Heritage Property are adequate.</b>  Mechanisms exist and will be <b>strengthened for integrated management of the natural and cultural resources of the re-nominated mixed World Heritage Property.</b>	<b>Reiterates arguments in the nomination.</b>  The point from the State Party reinforces IUCN's point on the need for integrated management to be strengthened.
Page 117, first column and line 33.	However, <b>one question for management is the degree to which archaeological sites may be cleared of vegetation</b> in order to facilitate research, preservation and interpretation of the nominated property's cultural values.	In order to facilitate research, preservation and interpretation of the nominated property's cultural values, <b>decisions on how many trees or vegetation shall be removed, will be based on the management requirements as a natural protected area and the techniques applied for archaeological excavations.</b>	<b>Clarification</b>  The statement by the State Party is coherent with the IUCN evaluation and mentions additional detail. It supports the fact that management of vegetation needs to be aligned with requirements for the protection and research of archeological sites.
Page 117, second column and line 10	Concerns exist related to the boundaries and integrated management requirements of the re-nominated and extended property; IUCN therefore <b>considers that the nominated property does not meet the requirements of the Operational Guidelines.</b>	<b>The nominated property meet the requirements of the Operational Guidelines related to the boundaries and management. No clear requirements are specified to be applied for mixed properties.</b>	<b>Difference of Opinion/Advocacy</b>  The original text conveys IUCN's evaluation that the nomination does not currently meet the requirements of the Operational Guidelines. The proposal of the State Party is not related to a factual error, and is a difference of opinion.
Page 117, second column and line 29	However, the nomination as currently <b>presented has not yet made a compelling case under this criterion with respect to a mixed site.</b>	The nomination as currently presented <b>made a case under this criterion with respect to a mixed site.</b>	<b>Difference of Opinion / Advocacy</b>  The original text conveys IUCN's evaluation that the nomination does not currently meet the requirements of the Operational Guidelines. The proposal of the State Party is not related to a factual error, and is a difference of opinion.
Page 118, first column and line 1.	As with criterion (ix), the consideration of the nominated property's values under criterion (x) <b>requires further consideration by the State Party, both in relation to the comparisons with other sites in the region, and</b>	As with criterion (ix), the nominated property's values under criterion (x) were analyzed and <b>the State Party presented the comparisons with other sites in the region, and</b>	<b>Difference of Opinion / Advocacy</b>  The original text conveys IUCN's evaluation that the nomination does not currently

	also regarding the configuration of the proposed extension and renomination, in relation to the much smaller existing cultural property of Calakmul and the reality that the forested areas are an essential part of this cultural context of Calakmul.	also with other mixed properties, particularly regarding the Maya culture, archaeological sites and tropical forests, all based on the available attributes information.	meet the requirements of the Operational Guidelines. The proposal of the State Party is not related to a factual error, and is a difference of opinion.
Page 118, first column and line 14.	In addition, IUCN notes that issues of boundaries of the nominated property, and its buffer zone in relation to both protection of natural values, and relationship to a possible mixed site need to be addressed, together with improvements to effectiveness of integrated management.	The State Party addressed the boundaries of the nominated property, and its buffer zone in relation to both protection of natural values, and relationship to its potential status as a mixed property.	<p><b>Difference of Opinion</b></p> <p>The original text conveys IUCN's evaluation. The proposal of the State Party is not related to a factual error, and is a difference of opinion.</p> <p>The boundaries of the Biosphere Reserve used in the nomination do not adequately address the requirements of protection of natural and cultural values, in the view of IUCN.</p>





**FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS**



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the Operational Guidelines)

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): The Republic of the Union of Myanmar

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Pyu Ancient Cities

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS (1444)

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
P.176, Col., 2, Lines 9-10.	<b>“This criterion was not suggested in the nomination dossier”.</b>	<p>The Advisory Body evaluation has made a serious factual error here regarding criteria (iii).</p> <p>In fact, three criteria were proposed in the Nomination Dossier: (ii), (iii) and (iv).</p> <p>This is a very serious misunderstanding on the part of the Advisory Body as in fact criterion (iii) is extremely relevant in terms of arguing the OUV of the Pyu Ancient Cities, and was a fundamental basis of the nomination dossier and management plan.</p> <p>The section in the Nomination Dossier proposing criterion (iii) can be found in various sections, including the most important sections as follows: Executive Summary (pages 5-6), Justification for Inscription (pages 88-100), and explanation of the conservation of various attributes at the three ancient cities associated with criteria (iii) page 191 on Halin, pages 203-205 on Beikthano and pages 213-215 on Sri Ksetra. In addition to these sections, criterion (iii) is also referred to in other parts of the Nomination Dossier.</p> <p>The State Party regrets that the Advisory Body evaluation document overlooked entirely Criterion (iii) which is a key part of the site's nomination.</p> <p>The State Party therefore expresses</p>	<p><b>Criterion (iii) was fully considered in the ICOMOS evaluation.</b></p> <p><b>It was erroneous to state that this criterion was not considered in the nomination dossier.</b></p>

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
		<p>concern about the possibility that, in addition to overlooking Criterion (iii) as one of three proposed criteria for the Pyu Ancient Cities, the Advisory Body may have also overlooked other important sections of the Nomination Dossier which directly address some of the concerns that ICOMOS has raised.</p> <p>In this spirit, the State Party would like to request the kind attention of the Chair of the Committee to please be informed of that a number of Advisory Body's concerns have already been explained in the Nomination Dossier, through text, maps, photographs and illustrations.</p>	
P.176, Col., 1, Lines 29-35.	<p><b>“ ICOMOS consider that this justification cannot on the basis of current evidence by fully justified in terms of cause and effect as there is no direct evidence of influence spreading from the Southeast India and Sri Lanka or of the direct influence the Pyu Cities had elsewhere in term of urban form and related Buddhist practice.”</b></p>	<p>However, this statement is not accurate as substantial justification is provided in the Nomination Dossier as to <u>both</u> (i) the influence received from Southeast India/Sri Lanka as well as (ii) impacts of the Pyu Ancient Cities in Southeast Asia.</p> <p>There is an ample body of evidence provided in the Nomination Dossier itself – and indeed, in the body scientific literature at large -- about the spread of influence from Southeast India and Sri Lanka into Southeast Asia, and more specifically to the Pyu Ancient Cities. The Dossier provides a range of archaeological, art historical, historical and epigraphic evidence on various aspects of the influences received from Southeast India and Sri Lanka, including in the multiple areas, including iron working, monumental architecture, Pali-based Buddhist inscriptions, and brick construction among others. (Sections in the Nomination Dossier relevant to this include pages 157-177.)</p> <p>A specific example regarding bricks is given here of the direct relationship that can be connected between India and Pyu. This text is excerpted from page 166 of the Nomination Dossier:</p> <p>“Pyu bricks were made to the dimensions that had become standardized in India around the time of the reign of the Emperor Asoka in the 3rd century BCE: ca. 50 cm x 26 cm x 8/9 cm. Many examples of such bricks were found in his capital, Pataliputra, in 3rd century BCE contexts. Such bricks were adopted in early brick-built Buddhist monasteries along the Andhra and Orissa coast. The</p>	<p><b>This re-iterates arguments / justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by ICOMOS but from which different conclusions have been drawn.</b></p>

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
		<p>oldest Pyu bricks found at Beikthano and Halin, dated to before the 1st century BCE, conformed to the Asokan standard. With time, Pyu bricks became slightly smaller, but it is highly significant that throughout a millennium of Pyu history, Pyu bricks retained the relative mathematical proportions of length:breathth:thickness of the Asokan standard.”</p> <p>A similar example from page 175 of the Nomination Dossier connecting developments at the Pyu Ancient Cities in the area of monumental architecture with their Southeast Indian coastal antecedents:</p> <p>“To take some concrete examples, Beikthano has a typical Andhra-style group of great stupa, shrine and monastery (labeled on site plans and listed in inventories as KKG 2, 3 and 4). Brick-built, the stupa anda has the cylindrical form typically depicted on stupa-shaped reliquaries and bas-relief slabs of the Andhra region.”</p> <p>Regarding the impact of the Pyu Ancient Cities in influencing the development of the “urban extended format” vis-à-vis various ancient cities in Southeast Asia, the Nomination Dossier provides substantial documentation on this.</p> <p>A specific example from pages 164-165 of the Dossier is provided regarding the ancient cities of the Dvaravati era, located in present-day Thailand, in order to give the Committee a sense of the kind of concrete archaeological evidence that supports this treatise:</p> <p>“In central Thailand the sample of Dvaravati sites includes Nakorn Pathom (740 hectares), U Thong (142 hectares) and Kubua (91 hectares). These three sites form a series in terms of urban space with U Thong intermediate in size between Kubua and Nakorn Pathom, suggesting that the extended urban format attained by Nakorn Pathom resulted from the impact of outside influences rather than from indigenous Dvaravati settlement forms. This is confirmed by the small original size of two other Dvaravati sites in central and northeast Thailand – Si Thep and Muang Fa Daed – and by the clear traces of their</p>	

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
		<p>subsequent irregularly-shaped urban enlargements. <u>Large quantities of Pyu silver coins have been found at Nakorn Pathom, U Thong, and Kubua. These and links such as finger-marked bricks indicate that the Pyu concepts of extended urban format prompted the moves towards an extended urban format among some of the Dvaravati sites. Other typical characteristics of the extended urban format can be recognized on the map of Nakorn Pathom: the core urban territory was defined by moats, irrigation canals cross the urban space, monuments occur in clusters both inside and outside the urban precinct and a strikingly uneven ratio of human exploitation per hectare within the urban precinct of Nakorn Pathom, similar to that of the three Pyu Ancient Cities.</u>"</p> <p>It can be concluded from the above that direct Pyu influence is evidenced in the formation of the later Dvaravati urban sites, which is emblematic of Southeast Asian early state formation in the post-Pyu period.</p> <p>These specific examples are meant to provide a glimpse into the range of scientific evidence and material that is contained the Nomination Dossier which contradicts the Advisory Body statement that "there is direct evidence of influence" to and from the Pyu Ancient Cities.</p>	
P.177, Col., 1, Lines 5-10.	<p><b>"ICOMOS considers that the three Pyu cities can be seen as an outstanding urban ensemble that reflects a fusion of religious ideas and technological developments that facilitated innovative response to urban planning. These cities do however need to be considered in relation to the irrigated landscape that was crucial to their support."</b></p>	<p>The Advisory Body has noted the relevance of Criterion (iv) but expressed the need to provide more concrete evidence about various attributes in each of the three cities which support this Criterion.</p> <p>The State Party would like to point out the Nomination Dossier contains detailed explanations on criterion (iv) and specific attributes which the Advisory Body may not have fully have overlooked this section. This includes documentation concerning the hydrological system which ICOMOS has pointed out specifically as an important part of Criterion (iv) justification.</p> <p>The State Party therefore wishes to refer the Committee to various sections, most importantly: the section that identifies attributes specific to Criterion (iv) are explained on pages 103-107 and the sections that explain (with text and with maps and pictures) how each of these</p>	<p><b>This re-iterates arguments / justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by ICOMOS.</b></p> <p><b>The issue relates to the amount of information provided and also to the degree of detail.</b></p>

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
		specific attributes are conserved at each of the three Pyu Ancient Cities on pages 191-197 for Halin, pages 206-209 for Beikthano and pages 215-219 for Sri Ksetra.	
<p>P.174, Col., 1, Lines 46- 49.</p> <p>P.177, Col., 1, Lines 5-10.</p> <p>P. 177, Col., 1, Lines 22-24.</p> <p>P. 177, Col., 1, Lines 26-28.</p>	<p><b>“ICOMOS considers that the comparative analysis justifies consideration of the representation of Pyu cities on the World Heritage List but has not provided a strong rationale for the inclusion of all three cities in terms of how they each contribute to the overall series.”</b></p> <p><b>“ICOMOS considers that the three Pyu cities can be seen as an outstanding urban ensemble that reflects a fusion of religious ideas and technological developments that facilitated innovative response to urban planning. These cities do however need to be considered in relation to the irrigated landscape that was crucial to their support.”</b></p> <p><b>“ICOMOS considers that this criterion has the capacity to be justified with more details of specific attributes and how each site contributes to the series.”</b></p> <p><b>“ICOMOS considers that the serial approach has been justified but that the choice to the site components has not been fully demonstrated.”</b></p> <p><b>“ICOMOS considers</b></p>	<p>The Advisory Body may not have fully understood the argument for the serial nomination with three cities that is argued at length in the Nomination Dossier. The parts in the Nomination Dossier which argues for the serial nomination, to clarify that it has already been strongly argued can be found on pages 51-52 of Nomination Dossier. Pages that explain specifically how Halin contributes to the serial nomination, especially with the argument of how Halin shows evidence of very early occupation and of the transition from Iron Age to proto-urbanism are pages 60-61 and 185-197 of Nomination Dossier.</p> <p>The list of reference documents provided in the Nomination dossier which specific journal articles, research papers and scholarly publications help to support this argument, especially regarding Halin can be found on pages 401, 403, 404, 407 of Nomination Dossier.</p>	<p><b>This re-iterates arguments/ justification/information put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by ICOMOS.</b></p>

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
<p>P. 181, Col., 2, Lines 29-36.</p> <p>P. 182, Col., 1, Lines 9-11.</p>	<p>that if the three sites are to justify Outstanding Universal Value then clarity on the scope and extent of the attributes of potential Outstanding Universal Value is needed. There is also a need to put in place much more proactive strategies to prepare for an increase in visitors, to prepare for ways to improve the living standards of local villages, and to manage increased numbers of pilgrims.”</p> <p>“Provide a deeper justification for the inclusion of all three cities in terms of how they each contribute to the overall series;”</p>		
<p>P.172, Col., 2, Lines 23- 30.</p> <p>P. 175, Col., 2, Lines 5-15.</p>	<p>“ICOMOS notes that no complete systematic survey of the water management system has been undertaken and no attempts made to date the various segments of the systems and there appears to be very little archaeological data. If the sites were indeed utilized for a millennium or more, a very complex pattern of development is likely to have formed, but of this possibility no mention is made.”</p> <p>“ICOMOS considers that the one area where integrity is weak is in terms of the hydraulic system. This is acknowledged to be of key importance as the Pyu system was never entirely abandoned and is still in parts used today by farmers. The best</p>	<p>While the Advisory Body says that there is inadequate information provided about the hydrological system, DANML wish to clarify that in fact <u>substantial information</u> has already been provided on the hydrological systems in the Nomination Dossier. Sections in the Nomination Dossier that provide information about the irrigated landscape (hydrological features) for each of the three cities can be found on pages 27, 29, 55, 59 of Nomination Dossier, for maps, pages 24, 26, 28, 57, 58, 59 of Nomination Dossier, for images, pages 191, 192, 193, 223, 137, 215 of Nomination Dossier.</p> <p>In any case, the State Party is committed to continue its research and conservation programme on the hydrological system. As a concrete example, further research/investigation/mapping about the irrigated landscape is planned now. An important contribution to this research is</p>	<p><b>The first part re-iterates information put forward in the nomination dossier that has been fully considered by ICOMOS.</b></p> <p><b>The second paragraph contains new information that cannot be taken into consideration at this stage.</b></p>

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
<p>P. 177, Col., 1, Lines 17-21.</p> <p>P. 177, Col., 1, Lines 28-30.</p> <p>P. 178, Col., 2, Lines 10-14</p>	<p>preserved system (that has not been impacted by various types of development ) is said to be that in the buffer zone at city Beikthano. There would seem to be a strong case for including this in the nominated area. Much clearer documentation is needed of these important facets of the landscape.”</p> <p>“ICOMOS considers that in order to fully justify this criterion more specific details would be needed on the detailed attributes related to planning and landscape engineering which are only currently described in general terms.”</p> <p>“ICOMOS considers that the condition of authenticity and integrity, and the criteria have not been fully demonstrated at this stage.”</p> <p>“ICOMOS considers that although the boundaries of the nominated property and of its buffer zones are adequate in relation to the walled cities, they need to be modified in Beikthano to include the best preserved remains of the hydraulic systems within the boundaries.”</p> <p>“ICOMOS considers that the conservation of certain aspects of the property is of concern and need urgent attention. The</p>	<p>the hydrological field investigation which will commence in May 2014 by international hydrological experts and archaeologists. Furthermore, further work being done to analyze the aerial photographs and satellite imagery obtained in 2013, as part of improving the maps and GIS of the Pyu Ancient Cities. Both these measures, using a combination of remote sensing and on-the-ground archaeological investigation will yield more detailed documentation of the irrigated landscape which will help to protect the nominated site in the future.</p>	

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
<p>P. 179, Col., 2, Lines 13-16.</p> <p>P. 181-182, Col., 2&amp;1, Lines 45-51/1-8.</p>	<p>conservation of the hydraulic features is unknown.”</p> <p>“Provide documentation to clarify the scope and extent of the attributes of potential Outstanding Universal Value of the three cities in relation to:</p> <p>The urban planning and the overall relationship of the various elements revealed;</p> <p>Details of the Pyu hydraulic system, what survives, what is still in use, and what needs conserving and how the best preserved parts might be included within the property boundaries;</p> <p>Sites of industrial production;</p> <p>Locations and details of monasteries;</p> <p>Locations of villages in the sites and buffer zones and details of those within the boundaries;”</p>		
<p>P. 178, Col., 1, Lines 32-33.</p> <p>P. 178, Col., 1, Lines 34-37.</p> <p>P. 178, Col., 2, Lines 40-44.</p>	<p>“ICOMOS considers that a disaster risk management plan needs to be prepared.”</p> <p>“ICOMOS considers that the main threats to the property are likely to be development pressures in the villages and the negative impacts of tourism if it increases rapidly and is unregulated.”</p> <p>“ICOMOS considers that what remains unclear is the degree of control over the development of villages both within</p>	<p>As Pyu Ancient Cities management plan was drafted and edited together with a strong team of international and local experts, DANML have already recognized and mentioned key management issues of the site in pages 113-187 of Pyu Ancient Cities Property Management Plan(PMP),laid down management objectives and related time-bound action plans to handle each and every issue such as: on pages 207-208 action plans 1a, 1b for control of village development, on pages 210-215 action plans 3a to 3f, 4a, 4b, 5a to 5c, 6a, 6b and 7 for conservation, on page 218, action plan 9 for disaster risk management plan, on page 219 action plan 10, page 224 action plan 13g, 13h and on page 225 action plan 14b and 14c for tourism/visitor management, on page 220 action plan 11c (i) for developing GIS data base with OUV carrying attributes and on page 226 action plan 14d and 14 e for improving</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that there is a difference of opinion on the appropriateness of the material provided in relation to how much has been completed rather than planned.</p> <p>The information on recent specific work under the Phase II work plan and on a recent workshop are new material that cannot be taken into account at this stage.</p>





Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
P. 182, Col., 1, Lines 17-23.	<b>manage an increased numbers of pilgrims;"</b>	"Myanmar-German Research Cooperation for the Myanmar Urban Network System". Recently, a workshop was held on 21 May 2014 at General District Administrative Office in Pyay, adjacent to Sri Ksetra, where all related issues of PMP in relation to urban planning of Pyay have been thoroughly discussed.	



**FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS**



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the Operational Guidelines)

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): The Netherlands

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Van Nellefabriek

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS (Nr. 1441)

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
P 251, col 1, line 7	... with <b>five</b> overhead bridges linking it to the factories, .....	... with <b>four</b> overhead bridges linking it to the factories, .....	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.</b>
P 251, col 1, line 29	It is completed by a <b>port area with cranes</b> for the direct loading of cargo ...	It is completed by a <b>quay</b> for the direct loading of cargo .....	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.</b>
P 251, col 1, line 42	... and the <b>CWIC</b> (Dutch West India Company) ...	... and the <b>WIC</b> (Dutch West India Company) ...	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.</b>
P 251, col 2, line 32	In the years 1910-20 the <b>Spaanse</b> was ....	In the years 1910-20 the <b>Spaanse Polder</b> was ....	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.</b>
P 256, col 1, line 4-8	The whole of the property and its buffer zone are included in the "Spaanse Polder" <b>protected zone</b> of the new Municipal urban development plan, <b>whose drawing up is nearing completion.</b>	The whole of the property and <b>part of its</b> buffer zone are included in the new municipal urban development plan "Spaanse Polder", <b>which is a conservational zoning plan, adopted by the council of Rotterdam on January 23<sup>rd</sup> 2014.</b>  (see Supplement to the nomination, p. 3 and p. 11)	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.</b>
P 256, col 1, line 11-14	<b>Five other zones surround the zone formed by the property and its buffer zone</b> , for which protection measures are also in preparation.	<b>The buffer zone also stretches over four other urban development plans annex to "Spaanse Polder"</b> , for which protection measures <b>have been taken or</b> are in preparation.  (see Supplement to the nomination, p. 11-12)	<b>ICOMOS considers that the correction re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the Ab's.</b>

P 256, col 2, line 1	The buffer zone covers <b>9 urban sector</b> plans.	The buffer zone covers <b>parts of five urban development plans (= zoning plans)</b> .  (see Supplement to the nomination, p. 11-12)	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.</b>
P 258, col 2, line 29-34	The overall protection of the whole ensemble <b>will be</b> guaranteed by the new Municipal urban development plan, <b>whose drawing up is nearing completion</b> , and by the inclusion of environmental preservation measures in the urban development plans for <b>the five</b> zones of its urban environment.	The overall protection of the whole ensemble <b>is</b> guaranteed by the new <b>and recently adopted</b> municipal urban development plan <b>“Spaanse Polder” (Januari 2004)</b> , and by the inclusion of environmental preservation measures <b>in four adjoining</b> urban development plans <b>in which the buffer zone is incorporated</b> .  (see Supplement to the nomination, p. 11-12)	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.</b>  <b>ICOMOS considers that the correction re-iterates arguments / justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the Ab’s.</b>



**FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS**



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the Operational Guidelines)

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Palestine

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Palestine, Land of Olives and Vines: Cultural Landscape of Southern Jerusalem, Battir

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS (1492)

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
Page 7 Column 1 Line 12-14	The landscape has become <b>vulnerable under socio-cultural</b> and geo-political transformations that may bring irreversible damage to its authenticity and integrity.	The landscape has become vulnerable due geo-political transformations that are directly affecting its socio cultural composition. These two factors may bring irreversible damage to its authenticity and integrity.	<b>ICOMOS considers that this reflects a slight difference of opinion.</b>
Page 8 Column 2 Lines 50-52	<b>A few limekilns survive in the property</b> , constructed to burn the local limestone for use as building mortar. All are now abandoned.	Although the limekilns were traditionally temporary structures that are made through digging a hole in the vicinity of the village by the farmers to burn the local limestone for use as building mortar. An industrial limekiln was constructed near the train station for the industrial production of lime; the lime was sold in Jerusalem. Hence here that lime is still produce in Palestine and is used in all rehabilitation projects that are implemented throughout the country.	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.</b>
<b>Page 9 Column 2 Lines 6-9</b>	Terraced landscapes are found in most parts of the world and the rational for the choice <b>of these four properties is not set out.</b>	Hence that Chapter 5 of the annexes contains a detailed "Annex to Comparative Analysis" where further comparative cases are proposed.	<b>ICOMOS understood that the comparisons with other inscribed sites in the Annex was background material for the details in the nomination dossier.</b>  <b>ICOMOS in its evaluation</b>

			stated that additional comparative analysis was needed not with more inscribed sites but with the many other terraced landscapes of the Eastern and wider Mediterranean area, and also between Battir and other landscapes of Palestine, particularly those of the Judean Hills.
Page 10 Column 2 Lines 21-24	These relate to constraints in repairing the physical features of the landscape, the decline in the market for produce.	These relate to constraints in repairing the physical features of the landscape; hence here that the market of Battir was redirected to Bethlehem and the fact that Bethlehemites started working in tourism and trade and abandoned the agriculture has contributed to creating an alternative market for the product of Battir and the villages of the western rural area of Bethlehem governorate.	<b>ICOMOS considers that this is clarification</b>
Page 12 Column 1 Lines 46-50 Page 12 Column 2 Lines 1-2	The Court Requested further clarification from the Israeli Railways and the Ministry of Transport, including whether gates access for farmers could be provided. The extra information was requested by 27 <sup>th</sup> March 2014. At the time of writing a final decision by the court remains pending. At the time of writing, a final decision by the Court remains pending.	Until the preparation of this report (3 June 2014) the Court decision is still pending. Hence here that the court decision is regarding two issues (1) the route of the barrier and (2) its material and shape.	<b>ICOMOS considers that this is clarification.</b>
Page 12 Column 2 Lines 23-27	In the nomination dossier the State Party acknowledges that the cultural landscape has already become vulnerable under the impact of socio-cultural and geopolitical change that may bring irreversible damage to its authenticity and integrity.	The landscape has become vulnerable due geo-political transformations that are directly affecting its socio cultural composition. These two factors may bring irreversible damage to its authenticity and integrity.	<b>ICOMOS consider that this reflects a slight difference of opinion.</b>
Page 12 Column 2 Lines 34-40	As a result of the abandonment of cultivation terraces and the loss of dry stonewalls, spruce and pine trees species have begun to colonies some of the slopes in the property. If this process continues uncontrolled, it will severely impact on the character of the property, with an open terraced landscape being transformed into one of trees and associated scrub.	After the 1967 War, Israelis worked on replacing the agricultural lands along the Armistice Line with pine and spruce species in order to prevent their original owner from cultivating them and thus be able to confiscate them under the Absentees Law.  These lands have become a major threat to the cultural landscape and have caused severe impact on the character of the property	<b>ICOMOS considers that this is clarification.</b>

		transforming it into one of trees and associated scrub.	
Page 13 Column 1 Lines 25-31	At the present time no decision has been made on whether the Fence will be constructed along the line of the railway and if so whether access for farmers and water necessary to irrigate fields on the Israeli side of the Fence will be allowed.  Furthermore no timetable is known for when a decision might be made.	The decision to construct the fence within the 50-90-metre strip of land shown on the maps submitted in digital form and hard copy during the visit of the ICOMOS Expert was already approved by the court; the only decisions that need to be taken is (1) the route of the barrier and (2) its material and shape.	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.</b>
Page 13 Column 2 Line 11-16	In visual terms, a 3.5 metre high fence with wire above would create a highly visible and highly damaging divide across the valley landscape. ICOMOS considers that although the visual impact of the fence would be highly negative, it might be reversed with the removal of the structure at some point in the future, but whether or not this were possible without irreversible damage would depend on the methods of construction and the extent of the interventions to the terraces.	The barrier (fence) shall directly affect the natural flow of rainwater to the valley and shall have an irreversible damage on the bio-diversity of the area.	<b>ICOMOS suggested that such damage might occur but would depend on the method and details of construction.</b>
Page 13 Column 2 Lines 53-55 Page 14 Column 1 Lines 1-2	The Fence would create a highly undesirable visual intrusion into the landscape, albeit one that might be reversed at some point in the future if its construction did not irreversibly impact on the terraces of the nominated area.	On the other hand, the damage that it shall bring to the biodiversity and on the integrity of cultural landscape is irreversible.	<b>ICOMOS suggested that the Fence might be reversible rather than irreversible but this would depend on the methods and details of construction.</b>



FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the Operational Guidelines)

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Republic of Korea

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Namhansanseong

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
183, 2, 34	north-west	south-west	ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.
184, 1, 13	defensive outposts	command posts	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
184, 1, 31	defensive posts	command posts	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
184, 1, 32	bastions	outworks	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
184, 1, 45	officers'	soldier-monks	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
184, 1, 47	living quarters	guard towers	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
184, 1, 53	(Jungdae)	(Jangdae)	ICOMOS acknowledges this typing error.
184, 2, 2	soldier-monks	soldiers	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
184, 2, 14	a ceremonial gateway	a main gate(Hannamnu)	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
184, 2, 15	a large entrance gate with outbuildings	a large entrance gate with outbuildings(Oesammun)	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
184, 2, 16	an independent hall (Jaedeokdang)	a Jaedeokdang hall	Nouvelle information qui tronque une donnée établie par le dossier initial, à conserver.
184, 2, 26	reception	lecture	ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.



184, 2, 36	citadel	fortress	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
185, 1, 38	town-citadel	fortress-town	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
185, 1, 48-49	citadel became the headquarters of the soldier-monks	fortress was managed by Sueocheong, army corps headquarter as well as soldier-monks	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
185, 2, 1	Cults of the first Korean dynasties	Rituals for the Baekje founder	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
185, 2, 5	citadel	capital	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
185, 2, 37	citadel	fortress	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
185, 2, 38	Geumlin	Geumlim	ICOMOS acknowledges this typing error.
186, 1, 14	atNamhansanseong	at Namhansanseong	ICOMOS acknowledges this typing error.
186, 1, 39	Pogiksik	Pogoksik	ICOMOS acknowledges this typing error.
187, 1, 9	animism	shamanism	ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.
187, 1, 44	citadel	capital	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
187, 1, 47	citadel	town	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
187, 2, 10-11	citadel of Namhansanseong	Namhansanseong fortress	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
187, 2, 13	animistic	shamanistic	ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.
188, 1, 41	citadels	fortresses	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
188, 2, 43	animist	shamanistic	ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.
190, 1, 31	Regional	Provincial	ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.
190, 2, 46	NCTI	Namhansanseong World Heritage Nomination Committee	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
191, 1, 10	List	Nomination	ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.
191, 1, 48	local authorities	provincial government	ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.
193, 1, 9	the citadel of Namhansanseong	Namhansanseong	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
193, 1, 11	animistic	shamanistic	ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.



**FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS**



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the Operational Guidelines)

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Russian Federation

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Bolgar Historical and Archaeological Complex (981 Rev)

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

No.	Section of the ICOMOS and the description of the error	Clarifications of the nominating party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
1	<p><b>3. Justification for inscription, integrity and authenticity</b> ... point for the establishment of Islam in Central Asia</p>	<p><b>Islam was formally and voluntarily adopted in 922 A.D. in Bolgar in Europe, and not in Central Asia.</b></p> <p>The Bolgar historical and archaeological complex is located within the Eastern Europe, in its north-east part (Spassky District, Republic of Tatarstan, Russian Federation). Its geographical coordinates are: longitude 49°03'23"E, latitude 54°58'44"N. Its distance to the borders of Asia is some 1100 kilometres to the east and 1500 kilometres to the south. Islam was formally adopted in 922 A.D., upon the arrival of the mission of the Baghdad Caliph's envoy, known in world history under the name of Ibn Fadlan, during the formation of a sovereign state, and this action meant its diplomatic recognition. However, the spread of Islam in the Volga region dates back to an earlier time. Beginning in the 8th century, there are known written sources (late 9th and early 10th centuries) of the existence of mosques and madrasas (religious and educational institutions) in Bolgar settlements.</p>	<p>The original and the revised nomination dossier (p. 34, 35) suggest that Islam expanded from Bolgar into Central Asia. This idea is expressed in various parts of the ICOMOS evaluation, "Bolgar plays a very important reference role for Islam in Tatarstan and wider parts of South-east Europe and Central Asia in relation to its role as the historic location in which Islam was first accepted by the Volga Bulgars and from where it spread to other parts of the region."</p> <p>The comparative analysis has proven this point. However, in the OUV statement the wider function as a reference point for Eurasia is recognized.</p> <p><b>ICOMOS considers this correction a clarification.</b></p>
2-4	<p><b>Recommended Statement of Outstanding Universal Value</b> Brief synthesis</p> <p>It contains evidence of the medieval city of Bolgar, an early settlement of the civilization of Volga Bulgars, which existed between the 7th and the 15th centuries. Bolgar was also the first capital of the Golden Horde</p>	<p>These facts do not correspond to the sources, submitted nomination materials, and the historical validity.</p> <p>2. The results of archaeological studies in the 19th and the 20th centuries within the Bolgar historical and archaeological complex revealed the 7th occupation layer of a pre-urban settlement attributed to the Azelino (2nd to 4th centuries A.D.)</p>	<p>With regard to point 2, ICOMOS understood that earlier occupations have been found on site, but the intention of the brief synthesis is to summarize the key issues and not to provide an exhaustive timeline.</p> <p>ICOMOS noted in its</p>

	<p>in the 13th century and remained an important trade centre in the time of the Kazan Khanate.</p>	<p>and the Imenkovo (4th to 7th centuries A.D.) archaeological cultures. Furthermore, if Azelino material evidences are mainly represented by ceramics, the Imenkovo culture yields a significant number of physical evidences, such as half-dugout shelters, remains of storage pits, stone fireplaces, numerous ceramic materials, and other archaeological artefacts submitted in the nomination in pp. 4-7 and illustrated with photographs in pp. 157-158.</p> <p>A total of 4 settlements attributed to the Imenkovo culture (artefacts of the 5th to the 7th centuries) have been explored in the Bolgar site within the historical rampart and moat. <b>Therefore, this means a historical period between the 5th and the 15th centuries, instead of that between the 7th and the 15th centuries as was mentioned in the evaluation by ICOMOS.</b></p> <p><b>3. Bolgar was the first capital of the Volga Bulgaria in the 10th and the 11th centuries. Later on, Batu Khan made it the first capital of the Golden Horde (Ulus Djuchi) after campaigns of the Mongolian troops to Europe in 1242.</b> The town's origins date back to the late 9th or early 10th centuries; it marked a transition of Bolgars from a nomadic way of life to a settled lifestyle and the formation of an urban culture, growth of cities in this geo-cultural region, new identity, and civilization. At the outset, Bolgar occupied an area of about 9 hectares. The Bolgar fortress hosted the ruler's residence, a mosque, a meeting place for ambassadors, merchant representations, and a mint. In the 10th and the early 11th centuries, this area saw the unprecedented construction of towns, fortresses, and castles (some 190 are known to date), which provides evidence of the state policy aimed at establishing a uniform economic and defensive system in the country. In the mid-11th century, Bolgar lost its privileged position of a capital due to the active military attacks, struggle for the Great Volga Way, and dynasty conflicts, which eventually resulted in the transition of the capital to Bilyar (Bular), but Bolgar retained its importance as a large economic centre and a patrimonial domain of the first Jaffarid dynasty. <b>Therefore, materials provide evidence that Bolgar became the first capital of the Volga Bulgaria in the 10th and 11th centuries and the first capital of the Golden Horde in the 13th century.</b></p> <p><b>4. At the time of the Kazan Khanate</b></p>	<p>evaluation in 2013 that the Volga Bolgars settlement dated to the 5<sup>th</sup> – 13<sup>th</sup> century, which was corrected by the factual error letter of the Russian Federation in 2013 dating their arrival to the 7<sup>th</sup> century.</p> <p><b>ICOMOS considers that the first correction provides information which contradicts information provided at earlier stages of the evaluation procedure.</b></p> <p>With regard to point 3, ICOMOS cannot see a difference in content between its original text and the explanation provided.</p> <p><b>ICOMOS considers that the explanation provided reiterates arguments/justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</b></p>
--	---	---	--

		<p><b>(1445-1552), Bolgar did not last as an important trading hub, but became a sacred centre, which is evidenced by relevant materials submitted in the nomination.</b></p> <p>In the late 14th and the first third of the 15th centuries, Bolgar found itself in difficult times. Internal strifes by khans in the Horde undermined the country's economy. Plague dealt a severe blow to the people in the town and the countryside. Bolgar became engulfed in a maelstrom of military and political conflicts, many of which ended in sieges and sometimes in sacking the town, as in 1399 and 1431.</p> <p>In the first third of the 15th century, the political activity of Bolgar gradually subsides. The 1431 campaign of the Moscow troops headed by Prince Fyodor Pesty became the last milestone in the political history of the town. The increasing role of Nogais and Nogai Horde, the rapid rise of Kazan, the emergence of the Kazan Khanate in 1445, and the final destruction of the economic and financial system of the Golden Horde undermined the economic foundations of the town. After 1431, the town of Bolgar only survived as a spiritual and religious centre. Small population lived there at the edge of the terrace, occupying no more than 5 hectares in the area of mausoleums. Therefore, there are no reasons to consider Bolgar an important trading hub in the Kazan Khanate period (1445-1552). During this period, the Trans-Kama region gradually came to desolation, remained almost deserted until the 17th century.</p>	<p>With regard to point 4, Bolgar was indeed a religious centre during the Kazan Khanate and its sacred role dominated its significant trade function.</p> <p><b>ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.</b></p>
5	<p><b>Integrity and authenticity</b></p> <p>The number of architectural and other interventions on site is substantial and has affected the authenticity of the overall complex and, in one instance, reduced the archaeological evidence providing testimony to the Volga Bolgar civilization. These also include past conservation activities at the property which included reconstructions and partial rebuilding works. In other places, restoration measures conducted were extensive, sometimes without clear justification and have reduced authenticity...</p>	<p>This claim seems to be a factual error and a subjective judgment in interpretation that does not match reality. The ICOMOS Advisory Mission noted in 2013: "In this respect, a good solution would be covers representing well-designed structures erected over the remains of the Khan's Palace, [...] the section of the Khan's Palace also has a visualization of archaeological remains, which, together with the reconstructed walls, can act as an open museum founded after the excavations in order to show the original architectural remains and archaeological exhibits of the complex".</p> <p><b>Minor conservation activities were undertaken to the Bath</b> located to the east of the Museum of Bolgar Civilization on the lower Volga terrace, which is also equipped with protecting covers, where, in our opinion, the ventilation should be</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS considers that this correction re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the AB's.</b></p> <p>In terms of the interpretation of this data, <b>ICOMOS considers that this correction is a difference of opinion.</b></p>

		<p>improved. However, it is an adequate solution for preserving the excavated structures. In other cases, stone mausoleums and other buildings were protected with a conservation masonry which at the same time would strengthen the structures. This procedure seems acceptable under the current climatic conditions, but should be done only when strictly necessary. In one instance, only a mark was placed on the surface thereby creating a good outline of the structure by means of a so-called "2D reconstruction". In accordance with a procedure obviously not used to the present day, the remains must be completely covered with ground immediately after excavation or even after the geophysical survey, and then their outlines should be reproduced on top of the original without having physical contact with the original structure.</p> <p>Finally, certain kilns from a pottery found and excavated near the former pilgrimage village are another example of archaeological remains which have been carefully conserved and protected with a well-designed cover.</p> <p>The rest of the excavation and research activities were consistent with conventional, internationally accepted standards of archaeological excavations. Non-destructive methods began to be used in order to map the entire property, and this work should be completed as soon as possible; this applies especially to the GPR survey of the entire site. These methods have already resulted in a large body of new information and allowed the scientists to make a strategic choice of new locations for excavation.</p> <p><b>The ICOMOS Advisory Mission proposed that the "Bolgar Historical and Archaeological Complex" would become an example of the state-of-the-art, non-destructive archaeological research.</b></p> <p>The bulk of the conservation activities have been undertaken at the architectural and archaeological structures of the property in the 1950s to the 1980s. The techniques for restoration and conservation of the ruins of the medieval monuments in the Volga region has been developed by Sayar Aidarov, the organiser of the Kazan restoration school, Doctor of Architecture, Professor, and Academician of the International Academy of Oriental Architecture.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Theoretical basis is the school of the "Scientific Background for Restoration of Architectural Monuments in Tatarstan (Great Bolgar)". The conservation techniques for architectural and archaeological structures were based on the 1964 Venice Charter with due account taken for the climatic characteristics of the Middle Volga region with temperature differentials from -40°C to +40°C. The survived portions of the original white stone masonry were consolidated with a small conservation layer (1-2 rows) of genuine stones to preserve the structures in the northern climate conditions that are detrimental for the identified archaeological structures (6-month winter and autumn period) and separated from the other layer with a signature of different colour. <b>The UNESCO Advisory Mission noted the methodologically correct approach to the conservation of the structures starting from 1960s-1980s.</b></p> <p>Examples of conservation and museumification of a number of monuments in 1950s to 1980s have become one of the first steps towards the preservation of Bolgar monuments and at the same time marked the property, even prior to including it in the 1998 Tentative List of the World's Cultural and Natural Heritage, as a site for employing various techniques mostly interpreted in the countries all over the world as exemplary ones.</p> <p>To date, the identified architectural and archaeological structures employ the approach, the basic principles of which have been formulated within the framework of the 1972 World Heritage Convention. Cautious and minimal approach to conservation is fundamental to the implementation of conservation and restoration activities on the monuments of the site.</p> <p>After the necessary examinations, the sequence of works has been determined. Their scope is limited. All works and techniques employed are aimed at respecting the authenticity and integrity of the property.</p> <p>All monuments undergo the process of eliminating cement used in 1960s to 1980s, as well as of replacing concrete, consolidating the historic material, and applying the conservation masonry with close material. To separate the small conservation masonry layer from the originally survived one, a special marker</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>joint of different colour is used.</p> <p>Within the period starting from 2001, conservation activities were only undertaken at the newly identified unique Khan's Palace complex illustrating the special status of the Golden Horde capital. Well-designed protective covers have been installed over its remains, thereby creating a visualization of its archaeological layers to act as an open museum. All other works were focused on the consolidation and conservation of the structures in the northern climatic conditions. In the past two years, added amounts of conservation masonry were reduced. Conservation activities are only undertaken when strictly necessary.</p> <p>More structured approaches are employed to the conservation of stone remains in the North Eurasia climate. State-of-the-art techniques are applied, in particular, by creating marks, mapping, and outlining a structure by means of the "2D reconstruction" without having physical contact with the original monument. In this case, the archaeological remains are completely covered with the ground immediately after excavations or even after the geophysical survey and then their outlines are reproduced on top of the buried structure.</p> <p>Under conditions of the critical temperature difference and the severe climate, some other methods are also applied to protect the archaeological cultural layer and revealed structures. The conservation of pottery kilns, remains of stone public baths with glass cladding and protective covers seems to be another good solution. The underground space is also used for the museumification of archaeological remains.</p> <p>We cannot agree with the statement about the reduction in the archaeological evidence of the Volga Bolgar civilization and affecting authenticity. No more than 3 per cent of the Bolgar's area has been studied during the past 150 years of archaeological research. The remainder is an integral and authentic property, with undisturbed archaeological cultural layer found throughout its area. The property survived without significant changes and contains information about structures, planigraphy, manufacturing facilities, many of which are not expressed visually, but preserved under the ground.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>With regard to the development projects, the ICOMOS Advisory Mission stated in 2013: “However, given the suggestion of the World Heritage Committee that this property may be further considered under criterion (vi), this impact can be considered as relatively minor and acceptable, once the evidence of the Outstanding Universal Value is changed to include similar values. The pilgrimage village is considered a peculiarity that helps evaluate the religious value of the site area during the pilgrimage season, but it can, and it would be more appropriate, be located outside of the boundaries of a future World Heritage Site. It is recommended to move it to an alternative location in the southern buffer zone and place it in close proximity to the Festival Hall”.</p>	
6	<p>ICOMOS considers that specific monitoring indicators should be developed to allow for anticipation of threats and challenges and adequate monitoring of the property.</p>	<p>Section 5 of the nomination submitted in January 2014 contains a developed monitoring system with precise indicators to observe and document the state of conservation of the property. The specific monitoring indicators for the conservation and excavation management section are: volume of excavation areas in accordance with Russian law, number of archaeological artefacts, their conservation and timely transfer to the museum reserve, conservation measures for archaeological structures, techniques and methods for conservation and museumification, non-destructive methods of research and their percentage in comparison with the traditional methods of excavation, etc. There are also specific monitoring indicators determined in such sections as visitor management, local community awareness, popularisation and promotion of the property, fund management, risk management, and organisational diagram of the property management structure that can be found in pp. 98-105 of the nomination dossier.</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS considers that this correction re-iterates arguments / justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the AB's.</b></p>
7	<p>Formally confirming its commitment to move the pilgrimage village outside of the site boundaries, as assured during the Advisory Mission in 2013 and presenting a plan and timeframe for the relocation.</p>	<p>The commitment to move the pilgrimage camp outside of the site boundaries has been confirmed during the ICOMOS Advisory Mission in 2013. In 2014, the relocation has been completed.</p>	<p>The commitment during the ICOMOS Advisory mission in 2013 was oral, The matter was not covered in the 2014 resubmission of the nomination dossier.</p> <p><b>ICOMOS considers that this correction contains new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage</b></p>
8	<p>Refraining from developing new projects or visitor infrastructure on the site, except following the explicit approval of the World Heritage Centre in consultation with the Advisory Bodies.</p>	<p>First Tatarstan President, State Advisor of the Republic of Tatarstan Mintimer Shaimiev has confirmed during the ICOMOS Advisory Mission in 2013 that <b>there will be no development of new projects or visitor infrastructure on the site except for the ones approved</b></p>	<p>ICOMOS appreciates the commitment, but does not see a contradiction in the two statements.</p> <p><b>ICOMOS considers this correction an editorial change.</b></p>



		<b>by the World Heritage Centre in consultation with the Advisory Bodies.</b>	
9	Creating a comprehensive site archive and store, which collects all data and reports and as far as possible all archaeological finds, in a centralized facility in the vicinity of the site.	<p>In the period of 2010 to 2014, the Bolgar Museum Reserve has implemented the work to identify the archival documents on the history of the property. In the Russian archives, mapping data and scientific reports of the previous studies were collected, a manageable database was compiled based on GIS technologies and made available for researchers. Further search and identification of new materials is included in the research plan as a part of the Site Management Plan.</p> <p>The Museum has completed the creation of an up-to-date store equipped with necessary facilities for storing exhibits in accordance with UNESCO requirements. An international research centre has been organised to comprise laboratories for conservation of archaeological collections and for scientific experiments to study old technologies and materials. The concept was elaborated for the virtual stock of the finds from the Bolgar site that are kept in museums of the Russian Federation and worldwide. These materials are displayed in the form of digital images, including 3D. This format of supplementing the museum stock also contributes to the integrity of the property, its information capabilities, and authenticity.</p> <p>All these features, taken together, formed a comprehensive site archive and store, which collects all data, reports, and archaeological finds.</p>	<b>ICOMOS considers this correction new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.</b>



**FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS**



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the Operational Guidelines)

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Turkey

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Bursa and Cumalıkızık: The Birth of the Ottoman Empire

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
Page 270, column 1, line 11-12	Bursa and Cumalıkızık is a serial nomination of <b>eight component sites</b> which illustrate the creation of an urban and rural system establishing the Ottoman Empire in the early 14th century.	<p><b>“Six component sites”</b></p> <p>1: Khans Area (Orhan Ghazi Külliye and its Surroundings)            2: Hüdavendigâr (Murad I) Külliye            3: Yıldırım (Bayezid I) Külliye            4: Yeşil (Mehmed I) Külliye            5: Muradiye (Murad II) Külliye            6: Cumalıkızık Village</p>	ICOMOS considers the number of site components based on sites with separate boundaries; accordingly the nomination has eight site components, of which in two cases two share a common buffer zone.
Page 270, column 1, line 28	In terms of categories of cultural property set out in Article I of the 1972 World Heritage Convention, this is a serial nomination of <b>8 sites</b> .	<p>See Nomination Dossier, page 1</p> <p><b>&gt;&gt;&gt; Eight core areas in six component sites</b></p> <p>See Additional Information, part 1, page 6</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt;Osman Ghazi and Orhan Ghazi Tombs are complete the Orhan Ghazi Külliye similar to the other sultan tombs of the other külliyes.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt;Eski Kaplıca (Old Turkish Bath) is the part of the Hüdavendigâr (Murad I) Külliye.</p>	
Page 270,	These include <b>commercial districts of khans</b> , külliyes (religious institutions) integrating	<b>“the commercial district of khans”</b>	ICOMOS agrees that the khans of Bursa are located in one connected commercial area and

column 1, line 17	mosques, religious schools, public baths and a kitchen for the poor as well as the tomb of Orhan Ghazi, the founder of the Ottoman dynasty.	See Nomination Dossier, page 6	the singular might be more appropriate. <b>ICOMOS considers this correction a factual error.</b>
Page 270, column 1, line 17-18  Page 270, column 1, line 17-18;  Page 271, column 1, line 18  Page 271, column 2, line 54  Page 273, column 1, line 12  Page 273, column 2, line 50  Page 276, column 2, line 26  Page 278, column 2, line 26-27,29	These include commercial districts of khans, <b>kulliyes (religious institutions)</b> integrating mosques, religious schools, public baths and a kitchen for the poor as well as the tomb of Orhan Ghazi, the founder of the Ottoman dynasty.  “religious focal point”  “religious institutions”  “religious complexes”  “five religious complexes”  “a few religious reference points”  “religious structures”  “religious complexes”	“religious and social institutions”  See Nomination Dossier - pages 4, 14,  Also see Additional Information, part 1, page 3  “Establishing the five Sultans' Külliyes, nuclei providing all public services, as infrastructure, built before the residents arrived and prior to the creation of the neighborhoods attracted the new inhabitants to build their houses nearby, created the city, its tissue and established its boundaries. They finally created the new town, the Ottomans' first capital.”	ICOMOS acknowledges that the kulliyes fulfilled various functions, including religious, educational and social. They were often referred to as “religious” due to their creation as an endowment in a religious context or motivation.  <b>ICOMOS considers this correction a clarification.</b>
Page 270, column 1, line 18-19	These include commercial districts of khans, kulliyes (religious institutions) integrating mosques, religious schools, <b>public baths and a kitchen</b> for the poor as well as the tomb of Orhan Ghazi, the founder of the Ottoman dynasty.	“public baths, <b>tombs</b> and kitchens”  “The Külliye includes always a mosque (religious services), a medrese (school - education), a hamam (public bath), <b>a tomb</b> of the Sultan or other dignitary (sometimes a cemetery), a kitchen for the poor, and public open space.”  See Additional Information, part 2, page 1	ICOMOS referred to the elements which are presented in the nomination, not the elements a complete kulliyeh would have traditionally had.  <b>ICOMOS considers that this correction is a difference of opinion.</b>
Page 270, column 1, line 20	<b>Orhan</b> Ghazi, the founder of the Ottoman dynasty.	“Osman Ghazi”  See Nomination Dossier , page 33  See Additional Information, part 1, page 1  See Additional Information, part 2, page 1	ICOMOS confirms that Orhan Ghazi is the son of Osman Ghazi. The nomination dossier refers to both as founders of the Ottoman State, “The existence of the graves of Osman Ghazi and Orhan Ghazi, the founders of the Ottoman State ..’ p. 41, or the Ottoman empire, “their ancestors Osman Ghazi and

			Orhan Ghazi, the founders of the Ottoman Empire”, OUV statement, p. 46  <b>ICOMOS considers this correction a clarification.</b>
Page 270, column 2, line 39-40	The Orhan Ghazi complex at the time of its creation consisted of a mosque, a madrasah (religious school) <b>a public kitchen and a public bath</b> constructed adjacent to the khan area, which include several typologies of commercial buildings.	“a public kitchen, a public bath and a <b>khan</b> ”  See Nomination Dossier,, pages 6,7,8	<b>ICOMOS considers these corrections as editorial changes</b> , given that the existence of the khan is mentioned in the continuation of the sentence.
Page 270, column 2, line 40-41	The Orhan Ghazi complex at the time of its creation consisted of a mosque, a madrasah (religious school), a public kitchen and a public bath constructed <b>adjacent to the khan area</b> , which includes several typologies of commercial buildings.	<b>&gt;&gt;&gt; The Orhan Ghazi Külliye triggered the development</b> of the Khans Area.  “Thus, Orhan Complex, which is the first urban core to be built outside the Byzantine Citadel in 1339/40, can be considered the mark for the beginning of the Ottoman Bursa and its commercial area. Today the Khan provides trading activities similar to its original function.”  See Nomination Dossier, pages 7  And also see page 8,9,10	<b>ICOMOS considers these corrections as editorial changes</b>
Page 271, column 1, line 3-4	These include the <b>Emir Khan or former covered bazaar</b> , which has burned down several times since its initial construction, the Bedesten which functioned as the historic banking quarter or stock exchange, Ipek Khan, Geyve Khan, Fidan Khan and Koza Khan as well as Piriñ Khan.	<b>“Emir Khan(former covered bazaar)”</b>  See Nomination Dossier, page 11	<b>ICOMOS considers these corrections as editorial changes</b>
Page 271, column 1, Line 12-13	Both Osman Ghazi and Orhan Ghazi are buried in Bursa and a <b>single memorial building</b> indicates the likely location of both of their graves.	<b>&gt;&gt;&gt; two separate buildings</b>  “The <b>tombs of Osman Ghazi and Orhan Ghazi</b> , founders of the Ottoman State, are located in the Citadel, in the area named today as Tophane Park, which is the best point overlooking the Khans Area.”  See Nomination Dossier- page 13;  Also see Additional Information, part 1, pages 9,10,11	ICOMOS confirms that the tombs are now two separate buildings, which replaced an earlier single building described in the nomination “the building, where the graves of Osman Ghazi and Orhan Ghazi are located, as one single building rather than two buildings”, p. 9 of Additional Information Document  <b>ICOMOS considers this correction a factual error.</b>
Page 271, column 1, line 52 to 55	<b>The hospital, which is included in this complex</b> , was recently reconstructed and continues to serve its original function as an ophthalmic hospital.	<b>“is no longer within the core area”</b>  “Darüşşifa continues to maintain its physical presence. However, due to recent reconstructions it no longer maintains its authenticity and <b>is no longer within the core area.</b> ”  See Nomination Dossier, page 52	ICOMOS notes that the hospital is described as part of the complex in the nomination dossier (cf. p. 18, 19).  <b>ICOMOS considers this correction a clarification.</b>

<p>Page 271, column 2, line 30 to 33</p>	<p><b>It is a waqf village, which implies that the village was the ruler's endowment to the population but at the same time generated income and provisions for the ruler's court.</b></p>	<p><b>&gt;&gt;&gt; The waqf village is misunderstood.</b></p> <p>"It was a Waqf Village – meaning that it belonged forever to a public institution (Complex) and served as a source of income for building the Complexes and the new town."</p> <p>See Nomination Dossier, pages 28-29, 36, 45-46</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS considers the first correction is an editorial change,</b> which shows no basis of misunderstanding, an endowment to the population is a public institution. The nomination highlights that the "villages (...) generate revenue for especially the Sultan complexes" (p. 28), which specifies that these revenue flows were purpose bound for public benefit. <b>ICOMOS considers the second part a clarification.</b></p>
<p>Page 271, column 2, line 33-34</p>	<p>Cumalıkızık is the <b>only surviving</b> one of previously several such waqf villages.</p>	<p><b>"Cumalıkızık is the best preserved and most authentic of these villages..."</b></p> <p>See Nomination Dossier, page 28</p>	<p>The nomination dossier states that "Except Cumalıkızık, the other Kızık villages have largely lost their historical characteristics in time because of wars, fires and unplanned developments." ICOMOS considers that while the other villages may still exist, they do not seem to "survive" as heritage resources. <b>This correction is a difference in opinion.</b></p>
<p>Page 271, column 2, line 48-49</p>	<p>The transition of Bursa from its earlier status as a principality to the new capital of the Ottoman Empire commenced with the surrender of Bursa to <b>Osman Bey</b> in 1326.</p>	<p><b>"Orhan Ghazi, the son of Osman Ghazi"</b></p> <p>See Nomination Dossier- page 33</p>	<p>This information was given in the nomination dossier, p. 34, which describes that the city surrendered to Osman Bey on 6 April 1326. However, the dossier also names Orhan Bey in this context on other pages. <b>ICOMOS considers this correction a clarification.</b></p>
<p>Page 272, column 1, line 13</p> <p>Page 272, column 1, line 15</p>	<p>According to the nomination dossier, in 1453 Istanbul was conquered and became the new capital of the Ottoman Empire, which gives the impression that Bursa remained the capital from <b>1335 to 1453.</b></p> <p>However, <b>what the nomination dossier fails to acknowledge is</b> that the capital had already been moved in <b>1413</b> to the second capital of Adrianople or Edirne, an event which was instrumental in Bursa's transformation before 1453.</p>	<p><b>&gt;&gt;&gt; Edirne issue</b></p> <p>"However, despite Edirne being the capital <b>until 1453 for 90</b> years from Murad I (Hüdavendigâr) to the conquest of İstanbul..."</p> <p>"One of the political events of this period is the conquest of Edirne .....in 1361."</p> <p>See Nomination Dossier, page 37</p>	<p>ICOMOS notes that Edirne mentioned once in the nomination dossier. However, the dossier seems to provide the impression that all site components were constructed while Bursa was the Ottoman capital, which is not the case. <b>ICOMOS considers this correction a difference in opinion.</b></p>
<p>Page 273, column 1, line 11 to 15</p>	<p>ICOMOS further considers that, apart from commercial and religious complexes, <b>residential quarters and Street patterns must</b> have had a decisive role and influence on the urban development of Bursa but are <b>neither included nor mentioned in the nomination dossier.</b></p>	<p><b>"The complexes are focal points which constitute the core of the districts that triggered development of residential areas. First a couple of houses were built based on the position of the mosque and the madrasah in the complex, which was followed by other houses within the course of time. Housing settlements around complexes were encouraged by</b></p>	<p><b>ICOMOS considers that this correction re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the AB's.</b></p>
			<p><b>ICOMOS considers that this correction re-iterates</b></p>

<p>Page 278, column 2, line 29 to 33</p>	<p>Not only commercial and religious complexes, but <b>also residential quarters and street patterns</b>, must have had a decisive role and influence on the urban development of Bursa but <b>are not included or even mentioned in the nomination dossier.</b></p>	<p>the state with a tax reduction incentive. The complexes contain buildings which have remained intact and which have had the most privileged position in the city as the symbols of the State, reflecting the power of religion and of the Sultans, while the housing settlements around the complexes consisted of buildings which could be changed based on the needs of their owners and the conditions of topography, and have temporary nature based on the characteristics of the materials used.”</p> <p>See Nomination Dossier- page 15</p>	<p>arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the AB's.</p>
<p>Page 276, column 1, line 30 to 33</p>	<p>Only approximately 60% of the houses in Cumalıkızık Village are currently occupied <b>by tenants</b>, which illustrates the effects of a global phenomenon of urban migration.</p>	<p><b>&gt;&gt;&gt; Only “9 % are tenants”</b></p> <p>See Management Plan page 121;</p> <p>See Nomination Dossier Page 114-115; Table 6.Cumalıkızık Village Ownership Status</p>	<p>Tenant refers to inhabitants and does not make a judgement on whether these inhabitants own the property or not, in other words 60% of the houses are currently inhabited.</p> <p><b>ICOMOS considers this correction a difference in opinion.</b></p>
<p>Page 276, column 2, line 51 to 54</p>	<p>No ownership data has been provided for the two recently-added components of Osman and Orhan Ghazi's Tombs and Eski Kaplıca (Old Turkish Bath).</p>	<p><b>&gt;&gt;&gt; Because of the added components were in the previous buffer zones:</b></p> <p>Map of Ownership - Khans Area (Orhan Ghazi Complex and its Surroundings)</p> <p>See Nomination Dossier, page 110</p> <p>Map of Ownership - Hüdavendigâr (Murad I) Complex</p> <p>See Nomination Dossier, page 111</p>	<p>As the buffer zone data provided was for larger areas than the added components, the ownership data is not meaningful for the additional site components.</p> <p><b>ICOMOS considers this correction a difference in opinion.</b></p>
<p>Page 277, column 1, line 7-8-9</p>	<p>No information has been provided about the two additional components added in the additional information provided on 27 November 2013.</p>	<p><b>&gt;&gt;&gt; Because of the added components were in the previous buffer zones, the given protection informations cover recently-added components, too.</b></p> <p>See Nomination Dossier, page 115, 116, 117</p>	<p>As the buffer zone data provided was for larger areas than the added components, the protection data is not fully provided for the additional site components.</p> <p><b>ICOMOS considers this correction a difference in opinion.</b></p>
<p>Page 272, column 1, line 56  and  Page 272, column 2,</p>	<p>In a subsequent international comparative analysis the State Party considers plans and developments of other Islamic cities and <b>Western urbanization models with a focus on cities in the Balkans after the 14th century.</b></p>	<p><b>&gt;&gt;&gt; International part of the comparative analysis held on three main title:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Examples of Islamic Urbanisation (Islamic World Cities In Terms of Planning)</b></li> <li>• <b>The Example of Western Urbanisation as a Model: Bursa and Ferrara (Italy)</b></li> <li>• <b>Examples of Cities After 14th Century In Balkans</b></li> </ul> <p>“Additionally, the city of Ferrara was also chosen to compare with Bursa's</p>	<p>ICOMOS cannot see any contradiction between its evaluation text and the comments provided.</p> <p><b>ICOMOS considers that this correction re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the AB's.</b></p>

line 1 to 4		<p>urban model due to the fact that it is a western city with an urban organization that is of outstanding universal value.“</p> <p>See Nomination Dossier, page 59</p> <p>Also see Nomination Dossier, page 72 and 73</p>	
Page 273, column 1, 4 to 7	<p>ICOMOS considers that this argument might be problematic as nine other kulliyes in Bursa were also built during the city's time as capital and probably also played roles in the urban development. <b>The State Party argues that these were not included as they were not commissioned by the rulers themselves but by other high ranking individuals.</b></p>	<p><b>&gt;&gt;&gt; The reason for selecting only the Sultan Külliyes in the nomination file is because of the undisputable impact of the top level administration as a role model.</b></p> <p>“The form of the city, determined by complexes and Khans Area within the walking distance, was transformed into neighbourhoods after people settled in the areas in between. These neighbourhoods were formed by small scale cores similar to the development around the complexes. At the centre of these small scale cores, mosques, schools and Turkish baths were constructed to meet the needs of the people. The cores were created by the <b>leading</b> people in the state, who were supported by the sultans and included within the waqf system.”</p> <p>See Nomination Dossier, page 15</p> <p>Also see Additional Information, part 2 page 6</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS considers that this correction re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the AB's.</b></p>
Page 273, column 1, line 31	<p>Bursa was shaped during the founding years of the Ottoman Empire and has been the urbanization <b>model for all Ottoman-Turkish cities</b> that were founded afterwards;</p>	<p><b>“a model for other Ottoman Turkic cities, which were established after Bursa”</b></p> <p>“.... Bursa was created as the first capital city of Ottomans. With its all historical components and the nearby Cumalıkızık village, established during the same period, Bursa has been founded with a unique urban planning system based on a waqf, complex (Külliye) and village relationship. This urbanization model in Bursa became a model for other Ottoman Turkic cities, which were established after Bursa, and also had an impact on other civilizations that had connections with Bursa during the same period.”</p> <p>See Nomination Dossier, page 92</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS considers that this correction re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the AB's.</b></p>

<p>Page 273, column 2, line 28 to 32</p>	<p>ICOMOS further considers that the relationship of the city and its agricultural hinterland, in particular the relationship between the urban components and the village of Cumalıkızık, has not been justified.</p>	<p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Cumalıkızık, which preserved its settlement fabric for 700 years was evaluated as an authentic example to emphasize the relationship of külliyes with the rural areas in the context of waqf system.</p> <p>The first külliyes, which include public buildings such as mosques, tombs, bathhouses, soup kitchens, hospitals, madrasahs, and are in relation with rural areas both the waqf system and also exchange of goods were constructed and targeted redefining the social, economic and cultural structure.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt;Also the connection proved with the historical records that took place in the dossier.</p> <p>“Waqf System” See Nomination Dossier, page 36</p> <p>“Examples of the villages and their income endowed to generate revenue for especially the Sultan complexes under the name of Sultan Waqfs are given as follows, based on the records of the waqfs:.....” See Nomination Dossier, page 28</p> <p>“In the Ottoman Waqf system it was prohibited to sell immovable registered on waqfs and also there was no development right on waqf lands. Since Yıldırım (Bayezid I) Complex was intended to be built on land owned by the Orhan Ghazi Waqf, an equivalent plot to these lands had to be found and therefore Cumalıkızık Village was allocated to Orhan Ghazi Waqf making it possible to construct the Yıldırım (Bayezid I) on its current location.” See Nomination Dossier, page 38</p> <p>“Image 82; The İstibdalname (interchange certificate) in the Vakfiye (foundation certificate-charter) of Yıldırım Bayezid dated 1400.” See Nomination Dossier, page 39</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this correction re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the AB's.</p> <p>ICOMOS considers that is also contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.</p>
<p>Page 274, column 2, line 39-40</p> <p>Page 274 and 275</p>	<p><b>The property is nominated on the basis of cultural criteria (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi).</b></p> <p><b>Criterion 1, Criterion 2, Criterion 3, Criterion 4, Criterion 6</b></p>	<p><b>“Following reviews, the state party has decided that Criterion iii can be removed from its nomination by improving the justification for meeting Criterion ii.”</b></p> <p>See Additional Information, part 1, page 3</p> <p><b>&gt;&gt;&gt;Explanations of other criteria were also revised.</b></p> <p>See Additional Information, part 1,</p>	<p>ICOMOS considered that criterion (iii) may have potential for justification in a future revised nomination focused on the character of Bursa as an Ottoman model city and has therefore not removed the criterion from its evaluation.</p> <p>ICOMOS considers that this correction re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully</p>



		page 3,4, 5	considered by the AB's.
Page 272, column 1, line 33	'model Ottoman city.'	<p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Bursa and Cumalikizik were nominated for their ingenious representation of a town planning methodology for the fast creation of a capital city and Sultans' seat, out of a Byzantine fortress. ICOMOS' perception of the file as a nomination of an Ottoman model city differs largely from the State Party's approach. It is believed that comments, questions and recommendations made by ICOMOS are based on a different approach to the nomination file.</p> <p>"Bursa in the 19<sup>th</sup> century" is another important interval in the history of Bursa, as the other history and development parts like "Bursa after İstanbul became capital" or "Bursa in the Republican Period". The State Party dealt with "the 19<sup>th</sup> century" as a part of the history and development.</p> <p>Because the Ottoman State's intervention during the expansion to the Marmara/Bithinia Region in the <b>14<sup>th</sup> Century respected</b> the social, natural and built environment. This shows a development characteristic, which at one hand includes the Byzantine population and at the other hand Muslim Turks, who settled to the region after raids. For this reason the first külliyes, which include public buildings such as mosques, tombs, bathhouses, soup kitchens, hospitals, madrasahs, and are in relation with rural areas thanks to both the waqf system and also exchange of goods were constructed and targeted redefining the social, economic and cultural structure.</p>	<p>ICOMOS did not perceive the file as presenting an Ottoman model city. On the contrary, ICOMOS considers that a presentation of Bursa as an Ottoman model city including the city's development from the 14<sup>th</sup> up to the 19<sup>th</sup> century might have potential for justification of Outstanding Universal Value on the basis of a different selection of site components in the future and accordingly suggests to the State Party to develop this approach further.</p> <p><b>ICOMOS considers that this correction re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the AB's.</b></p>
Page 272, column 1, Line38 -39	"19 <sup>th</sup> century "		
Page 273, column 1, Line 22	"Ottoman model city"		
Page 273, column 1, Line 51 to 57 and column 2, Line 1-2	ICOMOS considers that several parts of the city reflect the Ottoman characteristics as a result of planned conservation and reconstruction of Bursa as an <b>Ottoman model city in the 19<sup>th</sup> century</b> , which followed the unfortunate large scale destructions of the 1855 earthquake. However, ICOMOS considers that the <b>19<sup>th</sup> century</b> influence on the contemporary appearance of the city and its Ottoman components is not adequately explored in the nomination dossier.		
Page 273, column 2, Line 21 to 25	ICOMOS considers that Bursa might well have potential to demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value in relation to its function as the first Ottoman capital which evolved and was preserved over centuries, and in particular the <b>19<sup>th</sup> century</b> , as an Ottoman model city.		
Page 273, column 2, Line 36	"Ottoman model city"		
Page 274, column 2, Line 16	"Ottoman model city"		
Page 274, column 2, Line 21 to 28	ICOMOS considers that the city of Bursa and most of the serial components have the potential to meet authenticity with regard to the concept of Bursa as the first capital of the Ottoman Empire which developed towards an Ottoman model city, characterized initially in the 14 <sup>th</sup> century and enhanced as well as ottomanized in the <b>19<sup>th</sup></b> and <b>20<sup>th</sup></b> centuries.		

Page 274, column 2, Line 25-26	However, ICOMOS considers that the city of Bursa and most of the serial components have the potential to meet authenticity with regard to the concept of Bursa as the first capital of the Ottoman Empire which developed towards an <b>Ottoman model city</b> , characterized initially in the 14 <sup>th</sup> century and enhanced as well as ottomanized in the 19 <sup>th</sup> and 20 <sup>th</sup> centuries.		
Page 275, column 1, Line 22	ICOMOS considers that Bursa has potential to justify criterion (ii) as an <b>Ottoman model city</b> established in the 14 <sup>th</sup> century, and restored and ottomanized in the 19 <sup>th</sup> century.		
Page 275, column 2, Line 14	<b>“Ottoman model city “</b>		
Page 278, column 2, Line 14-15	Bursa is an important if not outstanding example of an Ottoman City and was often referred to as the <b>Ottoman model city</b> during its restoration and modernization in the 19 <sup>th</sup> century.		
Page 278, column 2, Line 16	<b>“19<sup>th</sup> century “</b>		
Page 278, column 2, Line 24-25 and Line 37-38	<b>“Ottoman model city “</b>		
Page 278, column 2, Line 54-55 and Page 279, column 1, Line 1 to 3	ICOMOS considers that the property and several of its serial components might be able to meet integrity and authenticity if the focus of the nomination was expanded to include the <b>reconstruction and modernization schemes of the Ottoman model city of Bursa.</b>		
Page 278, column 2, Line 49	<b>“Ottoman model city “</b>		
Page 279, column 1, Line 3	<b>“Ottoman model city “</b>		
Page 279, column 1, Line 24 and Line 33	<b>“19<sup>th</sup> century “</b>		

Page 274, column 1, Line 9 to 14	Several major repairs and reconstructions were necessary after the <b>1855 earthquake</b> in the kulliye complexes of Hüdavendigâr, Yıldırım and Orhan Ghazi. Also, the covering domes of Osman and Orhan Ghazi's tombs are post-earthquake constructions.	<p>&gt;&gt;&gt; However in the nomination file presented by the State Party the impact of the 1855 earthquake on külliye structures were clearly defined. In the definition there is no indication of a complete destruction of külliyes as stated. Külliye structures are preserved by restorations which use authentic building materials and technologies. Without doubt the details of the restorations are preserved in the archives of the concerned body. At the other hand, functional changes of the historical heritage due to changing public, economic and cultural structure is inevitable. As it is known both the preservation method and the changes of the functions conform to the international definitions in regulations.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this correction re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the AB's.</p>
Page 274, column 1, Line 36 to 44	In this context, it may be considered a limitation of authenticity that several of the architectural structures in the serial components are 19 <sup>th</sup> century reconstructions, in particular planned reconstructions of the earlier structures following the huge and destructive <b>1855 earthquake</b> . Other structures, such as several of the commercial units including the Emir Khan, experienced destruction and reconstruction following fire.		
Page 274, column 1, line 52 to 56	These changes reduce authenticity in use and function and some have required adaptive re-uses to the substance and design of the architectural structures which also reduces the authenticity of the physical attributes.		
Page 277, column 1, Line 42 to 44	Many of the monuments have been restored after the massive and destructive <b>earthquake in 1855</b> and others were restored or rehabilitated to allow for adaptive reuse.		

**Note:** Marks used in the table

“ ....” Contains words and sentences copied from the relevant document.

>>>... Contains summaries of relevant pages.



**FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS**



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the Operational Guidelines)

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Turkey

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Pergamon and its Multi-Layered Cultural Landscape

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
Page 280  Right Column  44 <sup>th</sup> line	The remains of the Athena Temple, Temple of Dionysus, Temple of Demeter, the Great (Zeus or Pergamon) Altar with its famous sculptural friezes (now in Berlin), the steep theatre cut into the side of the hill, the library, palaces, residential and commercial areas, arsenals, upper agora and stoa combine to illustrate the great achievement of the Attalid dynasty from 283 BC, developing the important trading and cultural centre <b>established under Alexander the Great.</b>	The remains of the Athena Temple, Temple of Dionysus, Temple of Demeter, the Great (Zeus or Pergamon) Altar with its famous sculptural friezes (now in Berlin), the steep theatre cut into the side of the hill, the library, palaces, residential and commercial areas, arsenals, upper agora and stoa combine to illustrate the great achievement of the Attalid dynasty from 283 BC, developing the important trading and cultural centre.	<b>The evaluation derives from information provided in the nomination dossier Section 2b, p. 186. However ICOMOS considers that the correction can be accepted as clarification.</b>
Page 281  Left Column  16 <sup>th</sup> Line	Further to the south-west the Asclepieion healing centre <b>was developed under the great physician and pharmacist Galen,</b> with its own theatre, temple to Zeus-Asclepius, sacred fountain, circular treatment building, and connected to Kale Hill by a 1km sacred way.	Further to the south-west the Asclepieion healing centre, with its own theatre, temple to Zeus-Asclepius, sacred fountain, circular treatment building, and connected to Kale Hill by a 1km sacred way	<b>The evaluation derives from information provided in the nomination dossier Section 2a, pp. 100-107. However ICOMOS considers that the correction can be accepted as clarification.</b>

<p>Page 283</p> <p>Right Column</p> <p>18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Lines</p>	<p>...., extensive development of the Asclepieion <b>under the famous physician Galen</b>, and the historical value of the Red Basilica (Kizil Avlu) constructed within the Serapeion.</p>	<p>...., extensive development of the Asclepieion and the historical value of the Red Basilica (Kizil Avlu) constructed within the Serapeion.</p>	<p><b>As above.</b></p>
--	--	---	-------------------------



**FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS**



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the Operational Guidelines)

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): United Arab Emirates

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Khor Dubai (Dubai Creek)

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
Page 101, column 2, line 32	Close to the banks however, there now runs a road, constructed in 1975 <b>following dredging to reclaim land for new infrastructure</b> , which reduced the width of the creek waterway by 20 meters.	Close to the banks however, there now runs a road, constructed in 1975 <b>following the dredging of the Khor carried out to counter its progressive silting up, to permit navigation, and to preserve its vital role as commercial waterway</b> , which reduced the width of the creek waterway by 20 meters.  <i>The dredging of Dubai Creek has been instrumental in preserving the commercial vitality of the Creek and its original historic role and was not aiming at reclaiming new land.</i>	The information was taken from the nomination dossier, which states that "...works [were] carried out on the creek in 1975, when a second dredging was completed to reclaim land and make way for new infrastructure and buildings ..." p. 26  <b>ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a clarification.</b>
Page 101, column 2, line 41	The souk of Deira was the largest in historic Dubai and its activity was closely linked to the creek. <b>Today the gold souk in Deira accommodates</b> more than 300 retailers ...	The souk of Deira was the largest in historic Dubai and its activity was closely linked to the creek. <b>Today the Spice Souk and the Gold Souk in Deira accommodate</b> more than 300 retailers ...  <i>Deira souk is not just composed of the Gold Souk as implicitly stated in the Report. In Deira, is also located the Spice Souk that has preserved its historic buildings and traditional shops.</i>	This information was taken from the nomination dossier, which states that "The Gold Souk in Deira is a traditional market with over 300 retailers that trade almost exclusively in jewellery." (p. 53)  <b>ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a clarification.</b>

<p>Page 103, column 1, lines 40, 41</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that Dubai shows remains of an urban and architectural development <b>which retains sporadic reminders</b> of the urban development of a pearl settlement on the southern Gulf coast ...</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that Dubai shows remains of an urban and architectural development <b>which retains more than 300 historic buildings, reminders</b> of the urban development of a pearl settlement on the southern Gulf coast ...</p> <p><i>Within the Nominated Property are located 303 historic Buildings (without considering the reconstructed houses of Shindagha), as detailed in the inventory submitted to ICOMOS on 6 November 2013.</i></p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that many of these buildings were subject to extensive conservation, which affected their capability to function as historic reminders. The inventories submitted at the request of ICOMOS have been taken into full account in the evaluation.</p> <p><b>ICOMOS considers that this correction re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the AB's</b></p>
<p>Page 103, column 2, lines 34, 35</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that <b>even the ambiguous status</b> of a maritime and hinterland trade centre <b>is only relevant</b> in the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century, when the lack of transport opportunities limited hinterland movement, and that this feature is no longer reflected in the urban structure.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that <b>the role of Dubai</b> as a maritime and hinterland trade centre, <b>relevant</b> in the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century, is no longer reflected in the urban structure.</p> <p><i>This status is relevant only for the 19th and early 20th century as this specific cultural maritime trans-boundary and transcultural environment developed and thrived only at that time. It has since disappeared, but it has left significant traces in the urban fabric and at the architectural level.</i></p>	<p><b>ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a difference of opinion.</b></p>
<p>Page 104, column 1, lines 1, 2</p>	<p>The present layout is the result of the works in the 1970s, <b>when land was reclaimed to allow for new infrastructure and buildings.</b></p>	<p>The present layout is the result of the works in the 1970s, <b>when the Creek was dredged to favour boat navigation.</b></p> <p><i>The dredging of the Khor was made to allow navigation, not to reclaim land. The dredging permitted the preservation and the continuity of the commercial use of the waterway and should be considered within this Nomination as a "conservation measure" and not as a "development" one. It did not substantially modify the overall "shape" of the Khor in this sector (cf. historic Photo n°54, p.61).</i></p>	<p>Please refer to first comment above.</p> <p><b>ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a clarification.</b></p>

<p>Page 104, column 1, lines 11-13.</p>	<p>On the northern bank, <b>the creek was substantially altered with the construction of contemporary wharfages north of al-Maktoum Bridge.</b></p>	<p>On the northern bank, <b>west of al-Maktoum Bridge, new contemporary wharfages have been built on a natural enlargement of the Creek to facilitate the loading/downloading of goods.</b></p> <p><i>The Creek shape was not radically altered by the construction of the contemporary wharfage. The modern piers are built over a natural enlargement of the Creek and preserve the commercial and economic role of the waterway (cf. historic photos presented in the Nomination File, ph.84. p.83).</i></p>	<p>The corrected statement does not refer to the shape but to general characteristics of the creek that have been substantially altered.</p> <p><b>ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a clarification.</b></p>
<p>Page 104, column 1, line 45</p>	<p>Whilst the traditional spice souk of <b>Bur Dubai</b> was partly demolished, the remaining part seems to also present an appearance which could be close to its historic outlook.</p>	<p>Whilst the traditional spice souk of <b>Deira</b> was partly demolished, the remaining part seems to also present an appearance which could be close to its historic outlook.</p> <p><i>There is a misunderstanding concerning the location of the souks. In Bur Dubai is located the "Old Souk", which preserves its original aspect. In Deira are found the Spice Souk, which is also a partially preserved vestige, and the Gold Souk, which indeed has been rebuilt and refurbished.</i></p>	<p><b>ICOMOS considers that the correction can be accepted as a factual error.</b></p> <p>The spice souk is correctly located in Deira.</p>
<p>Page 104, column 2, line 7</p>	<p>The majority of the three commercial and residential neighbourhoods included in the property were demolished from the 1960s onwards <b>and only few houses</b> have been preserved in their original design and substance.</p>	<p>The majority of the three commercial and residential neighbourhoods included in the property were demolished from the 1960s onwards, <b>but 303 buildings</b> have been preserved in their original design and substance.</p> <p><i>The only "demolished" neighbourhood (apart from its mosques) is Shindagha, which is now being reconstructed. The other two areas have suffered from partial demolitions that have affected their original fabric. However, the description of the report is at least "misleading": more than 300 preserved and restored historic buildings cannot be defined as "few houses".</i></p>	<p>The inventories of historic houses submitted at the request of ICOMOS have been taken into full account in the evaluation.</p> <p><b>ICOMOS considers that this correction re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the AB's</b></p>
<p>Page 105, column 1, line 52</p>	<p>... in particular that the <b>entrance and shape</b> of the creek was modified, ...</p>	<p>... in particular that the <b>entrance</b> of the creek was modified, ...</p> <p><i>The mouth of the Creek has been partially transformed by</i></p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the shape of the creek was modified.</p>



		<i>new modern developments, however the "shape" of the Creek in the nominated sector has not been modified (cf. above)</i>	<b>ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a difference of opinion.</b>
Page 106, column 1, line 23	<b>The Khor Dubai is affected by air pollution mostly</b> caused by the car and ship traffic along the creek.	<b>Khor Dubai is not particularly affected by air pollution mostly</b> caused by the car and ship traffic along the creek.  <i>Khor Dubai is not affected by air pollution. Dubai Municipality constantly monitors the quality of the air. Fine particles never reach dangerous peaks. Cars in Dubai have mostly modern low-pollution engines, and prevalent sea breezes daily "clean" the area from eventual air pollutants. Furthermore, there is no pollution created by heating the houses burning coal or fuel. The boats cruising on the Creek are also regularly controlled by Dubai Municipality relevant departments and should comply with strict regulations concerning the effectiveness of their engines.</i>	The nomination dossier states that "Air pollution in the centre of Dubai is caused essentially by boat and car traffic." P. 128.  ICOMOS shares this perception.  <b>ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a difference of opinion.</b>
Page 106, column 1, line 49 (last)	ICOMOS considers that the main threats to the property are continued large scale urban and infrastructure developments <b>and heavy water pollution of the creek.</b>	ICOMOS considers that the main threats to the property are continued large scale urban and infrastructure developments. <del><b>and heavy water pollution of the creek.</b></del>  <i>The precise data collected by Dubai Municipality show that the water is clean, even though punctual episodes (like the one referred to in the File) do happen. Dubai used waters are not discharged in the Creek. The very presence of a natural reserve (Ras-al-Khor Wildlife Sanctuary, a Ramsar site) at the end of the creek confirms the overall "good" quality of the water. Statistic data about pollutants and heavy metal concentration might appear high when compared to open seawaters, but are exceptionally low and positive when compared with rivers and lakes in and around major urban centres. The modification of residents and boat owners bad habits is tackled by awareness campaigns regularly organized by the Municipality that prove more and more effective.</i>	<b>ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a difference of opinion.</b>

<p>Page 107, column 1, line 58 (last), column 2, lines 1-5</p>	<p>However, the current state of conservation of the creek waterway raises concern with regard to its level of water pollution and the condition of the marine ecosystem. ICOMOS considers that efforts towards the improvement of the waste management system need to be urgently initiated.</p>	<p><b>Delete the paragraph</b></p> <p>This statement is not correct and not proven.</p> <p>Dubai Municipality water management is extremely advanced. The presence of an "urban" RAMSAR site within Dubai city at the end of the Khor provides an eloquent prove.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a difference of opinion.</p>
<p>Page 107, column 2, lines 12-14</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the state of conservation of the <b>few</b> historic and <b>the</b> reconstructed architectural structures is acceptable <b>but that the condition of the creek's marine environment requires urgent attention.</b></p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the state of conservation of the <b>few</b> historic and <b>the</b> reconstructed architectural structures is acceptable <b>but that the condition of the creek's marine environment requires urgent attention.</b></p> <p><i>Same remark as above</i></p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a difference of opinion.</p>
<p>Page 108, column 2, lines 25, 26</p>	<p>..., and <b>some of its reconstructed neighbourhoods</b> illustrate how the residential and commercial neighbourhoods of Dubai must have appeared half a century ago.</p>	<p>..., and <b>its partially preserved and reconstructed neighbourhoods</b> illustrate how the residential and commercial neighbourhoods of Dubai must have appeared half a century ago.</p> <p><i>There is only one reconstructed neighbourhood, Shindagha, as clearly presented in the Nomination File. The other two neighbourhoods proposed for inscription have partially preserved their original buildings that have been carefully restored by Dubai Municipality.</i></p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the correction is an editorial change.</p>



**FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS**



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the Operational Guidelines)

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): United States of America

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Poverty Point, No 1435

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
291, 2, 48	<b>Research has not clarified yet whether the complex had a steady residential function or was a campground occupied temporarily during ceremonies or trading fairs.</b>	As noted in the nomination dossier (e.g., pp. 88, 90) recent research indicates that the complex had a sizable, sedentary, permanent population.	<b>ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a difference of opinion.</b>
292, 1, 18	An artificial ridge connects mound <b>B</b> to the plaza.	An artificial ridge connects mound E to the plaza.	<b>ICOMOS considers that the correction can be accepted as a factual error.</b>
293, 1, 2	However, archaeological investigations have revealed that construction of Mounds B, A and E would have begun after the Middle Archaic occupation <b>and research on geometry, measurements and alignments shows that the same measurement system used to build Middle Archaic mound complexes has been adopted at Poverty Point.</b>	However, archaeological investigations have revealed that construction of Mounds B, A, and E would have begun after the Middle Archaic occupation. Mounds B, A, and E are aligned with the Middle Archaic Lower Jackson mound (2.9 km to the south), but the suggestion that the same geometric and measurement systems were used in their planning and construction is not accepted by the overwhelming majority of Archaic mound scholars.	<b>ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a difference of opinion.</b>

293, 1, 37	By 1972 <b>further land around</b> the archaeological site was acquired <b>and donated to</b> the Louisiana State Parks and Recreation Commission which transformed the site into an archaeological park, providing it with visitor facilities.	In 1972, the archaeological site was acquired by a local tourism development corporation and subsequently sold to the Louisiana State Parks and Recreation Commission which transformed the site into an archaeological park, providing it with visitor facilities.	<b>ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a clarification.</b>
294, 1, 41	However, ICOMOS notes that the 1962 designation of Poverty Point as a National Historic Landmark also includes Motley Mound (located 2.2 km north of the nominated property) as part of the designated site.	ICOMOS notes that the 1962 designation of Poverty Point as a National Historic Landmark (NHL) mentions Motley Mound (located 2.2 km north of the nominated property), but the designation does not include a formal site boundary. The 1962 NHL designation contains several points that are now known to be incorrect. Archaeological investigations in 1978, 2002, 2003 and 2008 have been unable to confirm that Motley and Poverty Point are of the same period.	<b>First sentence, second part and second sentence: ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a clarification.</b>  <b>Third sentence: ICOMOS considers that the correction re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the Ab's.</b>
294, 2, 1  Also applies to:  296, 2, 17  296, 2, 36	Furthermore, ICOMOS notes that in the immediate setting of the nominated property, other traces of Poverty Point culture, i.e. core encampments or residence sites and scatters of lithics, that relate to the earthworks complex, have been detected.	As noted in the nomination dossier, the majority of people who built the earthworks lived on the constructed ridges, but they used the entire landscape. Archaeological surveys of private property in the immediate and wider surrounding area have revealed surprisingly little evidence for significant settlements. Most remains were encampments, minor residence sites, or scatters of lithics. Isolated artifacts and small, low-density, surface scatters of stone tools are most common, and their function and age are difficult to establish. The nominated property includes the features that are the basis for the site's Outstanding Universal Value.	<b>ICOMOS considers that the correction re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the Ab's.</b>
294, 2, 20	On 25th September 2013, ICOMOS requested clarification from the State Party on this issue, which responded on 23rd October 2013 informing that this road serves local traffic and that no available traffic counts exist for the road crossing the nominated property.	On 25th September 2013, ICOMOS requested clarification from the State Party on this issue, which responded on 23rd October 2013 informing that this road serves local traffic and that traffic counts were in progress at that time. The average daily traffic count for Highway 577 is 340, or less than one vehicle every 4 minutes.	<b>First sentence, highlight: ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a clarification.</b>  <b>Second sentence: ICOMOS considers that the correction represents new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.</b>

<p>294, 2, 33</p> <p>Also applies to:</p> <p>295, 1, 9</p> <p>299, 1, 41</p> <p>299, 2, 3</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that Highway 577 presents a considerable interference to the experience of the site and is also a danger for visitors: solutions to divert it to outside the nominated property should be looked into.</p>	<p>Highway 577 presents, at most, a minor distraction to the experience of the site and has not proven to be a safety hazard for visitors in the 42 years since a park was established at the site. Louisiana keeps records of visitor incidents and there are none concerning Hwy 577. The road is not visible from most of the site and, in fact, photographs in the nomination dossier (p. 26) show that even from the center of the open plaza of the site, the road is imperceptible. Additionally, review of over five years of written visitor comments found no mention of the road. Interpretive rangers explain its historic nature, and visitors learn its place at the site (it follows the path of an earlier, unpaved farm road). There is no evidence that park visitors find it to be an interference. Further, re-routing the road has the potential to damage archaeological remains both on and off the nominated property.</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a difference of opinion.</b></p>
<p>294, 2, 52</p> <p>Also applies to:</p> <p>294, 2, 7</p> <p>297, 1, 46</p> <p>299, 1, 25</p> <p>299, 1, 44</p> <p>299, 2, 12</p>	<p>ICOMOS recommends that the State Party establish formalized mechanisms of regulatory protection and management to ensure that the immediate setting, including areas and features that functionally support the nominated property (i.e., Motley Mound, Lower Jackson Mound, Jackson Place and stretches of Bayou Maç on) be effectively protected.</p>	<p>ICOMOS recommends that the State Party establish formalized mechanisms of regulatory protection and management to ensure that the immediate setting be effectively protected. Motley and Lower Jackson mounds are well protected. Lower Jackson Mound, which is much older than Poverty Point, is owned by a non-profit archaeological conservation organization and is fully protected. Further, both Lower Jackson Mound and Motley Mound (which is not demonstrably of the same time period as Poverty Point) have historic cemeteries on top, so they are protected through the Louisiana Cemetery Preservation Act which declares that it is unlawful to disturb a historic cemetery. Bayou Maç on is protected through various Louisiana and federal laws. Jackson Place was mostly destroyed in the early 1960s, before the national movement to preserve historic and archaeological sites.</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a difference of opinion and new information that cannot be taken into consideration at this stage.</b></p>
<p>296, 1, 8</p>	<p>The consequences of injection, withdrawal and storage of gas and the technologies in use for these operations interact with the terrain of the site.</p>	<p>The injection, withdrawal and storage of gas and the technologies in use for these operations have not had a measurable impact on the terrain of the site, since the reservoir is deeply buried porous rock, not an open salt cavern or aquifer. Further, the storage and retrieval process does not involve hydraulic fracturing (fracking).</p>	<p><b>First sentence:</b></p> <p><b>ICOMOS considers that the correction re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the Ab's.</b></p> <p><b>Second sentence: ICOMOS</b></p>

			<b>considers that the correction represents new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.</b>
296, 1, 16  Also applies to:  296, 1, 28  297, 1, 35  297, 2, 35  297, 2, 39  297, 2, 53  299, 1, 35	ICOMOS notes that the legal framework in place does foresee impact assessment processes when national agencies or funds are involved, however these procedures do not apply to private initiatives and activities.	Extensive Louisiana and federal legal frameworks protect the nominated property. Its immediate and wider setting of private property is covered primarily by federal law, which foresees assessment and mitigation procedures whenever federal authorization or funds are involved. Review occurs for proposed private and governmental activities when they require federal permits; licenses; or financing, including grants and loans. This assessment would apply not only to a sizeable private industrial development, but also to a small private project, like a car wash. By law, those projects are reviewed for direct and indirect effects on Poverty Point and its setting. Relevant activities include those that: affect visual, atmospheric, or audible elements; lead to neglect and deterioration; or change the character of the property's use or setting.	<b>ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a clarification.</b>
296, 2, 1	The State Party holds that the existing physical buffers and the stable agricultural character of the setting as well as the legal framework in place, which affords adequate protection to the nominated property, are, taken together, factors that make a buffer zone unnecessary.	The State Party holds that the existing physical buffers and the stable agricultural character of the setting as well as the legal framework in place, which affords adequate protection to the nominated property, coupled with the lack of foreseeable threats to the property, make a buffer zone unnecessary at the current time. The State Party is exploring various mechanisms that can provide additional protections for the future.	<b>First sentence:</b> <b>ICOMOS considers that the correction re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the Ab's.</b>  <b>Second sentence: ICOMOS considers that the correction represents new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.</b>
298, 2, 14  Also applies to:  298, 2, 52	ICOMOS further recommends that as a formal part of the management system, capacity and expertise should be built in to that system to actively use and integrate baseline datasets through a Geographical Information Systems (GIS) approach, to facilitate the process of longer-	A Geographical Information Systems (GIS) approach has been in use at the site since 2004. It is used not only to record changes in features through time but also to document the locations of management and archaeological research projects on the property, to facilitate the process of longer-term planning and review. Additionally, the Louisiana State	<b>ICOMOS considers that the correction represents a difference of opinion.</b>

299, 1, 9	term planning and review.	Historic Preservation Office uses a comprehensive statewide GIS system to manage and review information about archaeological site locations, site records, surveyed areas, and reports.	
-----------	---------------------------	---	--



**FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS**



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the Operational Guidelines)

STATE PARTY: Viet Nam

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: TRÀNG AN LANDSCAPE COMPLEX

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
p.23, col.2, l.12	<b>Additional information requested and received from the State Party: None</b>	ICOMOS requested and received reports during the evaluation mission, including <i>Recommendations for a protocol on shoring archaeological excavations in Tràng An</i> . ICOMOS also received a supplementary report to the nomination document ( <i>Supplementary Report to World Heritage nomination of the Tràng An Landscape Complex (February 2014)</i> ), and the book <i>Human Adaptation in the Asian Palaeolithic</i> , published by Cambridge University Press.	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges that the word 'None' was an error as the additional information was received and fully considered</b>
p.23, col.2, l.42:	The recent archaeological research has revealed evidence of seasonal settlement in several caves <b>from c. 30,000 to 12,000 years BP . . .</b>	The recent archaeological research has revealed evidence of early human activity spanning more than 30,000 years, from about 1,200 BP back to about 33,100 BP ( <i>Nomination Document</i> p. 64).	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.</b>
p.24, col. 1, l.14:	Since 2007, archaeological <b>investigations have been undertaken in 9 of the 29 caves</b> that have been identified .	The <i>Nomination Document</i> (p.75, para.3) explains that cultural occupation layers have been identified in some 30 caves and to date 14 of these have been investigated.	<b>ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.</b>
p.24, col.2, l.1:	ICOMOS notes that <b>this work has currently only been directed at a small proportion of the potentially rich cave resources</b> of the Tràng An massif and is still continuing. <b>The lowest levels in the caves so far investigated have not yet been reached . . .</b>	This work has currently been directed at 47% (n = 14/30) of the archaeologically rich cave resources of the Tràng An massif and is still continuing. Persistently sterile or bedrock deposits have not been reached in some cases, which is promising for continuing research.	<b>ICOMOS considers this to be an editorial amendment</b>



p.24, col.2, l.30:	ICOMOS notes that although annotated photographs are supplied in the nomination dossier, <b>very few descriptive details have been provided for this area.</b>	Annotated photographs and a brief description of this area are provided within the <i>Nomination Document</i> (Figure 2.19 p.38; Figure 2.38 p.56; Figure 4.2 p.135; and p.136; p.147) and a full account is contained in a supplementary report from the State Party ( <i>Supplementary Report to the Tràng An Landscape Complex, February 2014, Sect. 2, p.6-9</i> ).	<b>ICOMOS has taken account of the additional information on Hoa Lu Ancient Capital and has a difference of opinion.</b>
p.25, col.2, l.10	There are more similarities with the Lenggong valley, although here <b>the research has primarily been focused on the past 10,000 years and particularly on the making of lithic tools, in contrast to the focus on behavioural adaptation at Trang An.</b>	The <i>Nomination Document</i> p.86 notes: 'Work in Lenggong has to date focused primarily on technological (lithic) studies, to a lesser extent (and confined only to the last 10,000 years) analysis of organic (including human remains) and more recently still pottery traditions. Only cursory attention has been applied to reconstructing palaeo-economy and forager mobility, whereas by contrast both concerns are at the heart of the cultural story from Tràng An.'	<b>ICOMOS is not clear what point is being made</b>
p.26, col.1, l.3:	ICOMOS considers that <b>the main difficulty with this comparative analysis lies in the fact that the work at Tràng An is comparatively recent . . .</b>	ICOMOS recognizes that the study of early human exploitation of the tropical environments of Southeast Asia has been a dominant concern of archaeological research in this region since the early 1970s. It notes that substantial gains have been made in the last decade, during the period of work at Tràng An, towards recognition that independent foraging was not only possible in tropical environments before that advent of agriculture, but that it was already well established by at least 45,000 years ago. ICOMOS further acknowledges that the wider pattern of early forager settlement in this region remains largely unknown. In light of these facts, the work being undertaken at Tràng An since 2007, and on which the criterion (v) justification is built, is closely in line with cutting-edge science in the rapidly developing field of environmental-archaeological research. While comparisons are not required to be made inter-regionally for cultural nominations, ICOMOS notes that the archaeological evidence emerging from Tràng An is already starting to be assessed at this scale (see <i>Human Adaptation in the Asian Palaeolithic</i> ). The following reference is a further example of inter-regional comparison, comparing Southeast Asia, (including with reference to Boi cave) and India: Rabett R. & Jones, S. 2014. Post-glacial transformations in South and South-East Asia, in the <i>Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology and Anthropology of Hunter-Gatherers</i> . Oxford University Press, pp. 492-506.	<b>ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion</b>

p.26, col.1, l.24:	<b>The nominated property is considered by the State Party to be of Outstanding Universal Value as a cultural property for the following reasons.</b>	ICOMOS understands that the nominated property is considered by the State Party to be of Outstanding Universal Value as a cultural property for the following reasons. (Note: the three reasons listed in the ICOMOS report in the bullets beneath this opening statement are <u>incorrect</u> and are not the ones put forward by the State Party as laid out in detail on p.64-66 of the <i>Nomination Document</i> ).	<b>The ICOMOS text reflects 3.1.a.2 and 3.1.b of the nomination dossier.</b>
p.26, col.2, l.22:	<b>Although some work has been published the results have not yet been the subject of a substantial publication that would allow them to be tested alongside other sites.</b>	The results of archaeological investigations in Trảng An providing direct comparison to other sites in Southeast Asia are documented in many peer-reviewed scientific papers (as listed in the <i>Nomination Document. References</i> ), and especially in a recently published book – copies of which were provided both to the ICOMOS evaluator (Aug. 2013) and delivered by hand to ICOMOS headquarters in Paris in June 2013. Reviews of this monograph by leading archaeological journals (e.g. see independent reviews in <i>Antiquity</i> or <i>Cambridge Archaeological Journal</i> ) consider it to be a definitive text on the subject of human adaptation to environmental change in Southeast Asia (Rabett, R.J. 2012. <i>Human Adaptation in the Asian Palaeolithic: Hominin dispersal and behaviour during the Late Quaternary</i> . Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, Chapters 6-8).	<b>ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion</b>
p.26, col.2, l.38:	<b>In terms of archaeological attributes, the boundaries do not follow the disposition of cave sites. Most of these are in the west of the property and some are currently outside the boundaries.</b>	The proposed boundaries of the nominated property encompass almost all the caves known at this stage to contain archaeological resources of significance for documenting the cultural values and attributes of the property under criterion (v). ICOMOS accepts that this is the maximum number of sites that could be included within the defined boundaries of the property given the balance of other considerations such as the location of key geological landforms in this mixed property.	<b>ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion related in part to other areas included in the boundaries.</b>
p.27, col.1, l.5:	<b>These include new roads and enlarged tunnels through the mountains.</b>	A road through the mountains was constructed 10 years ago. Four of the known 54 foot cave passages through the mountains have been enlarged as part of a risk management strategy, especially to allow emergency evacuation of visitors at times of storm and sudden flood, as was explained in a report provided to the evaluators during the field evaluation mission (see: <i>Long-term and recent changes in the hydrological system in the Trảng An limestone massif</i> ).	<b>ICOMOS considers that this is clarification.</b>

p.27, col.1, l.14:	<p><b>The relationship between people and changing climatic conditions has emerged from only nine caves and even in these is it as a result of analysis of comparative evidence. The landscape cannot be said to reflect these changes in any meaningful way.</b></p>	<p>This relationship between people and changing climatic conditions has emerged from 14 of 30 caves as the result of detailed comparative analysis. The cultural OUV of this nomination is found in the way early foraging communities responded to the changing state of the property. Aside from probable shifts in resource distribution and availability as a result of long-term harvesting/hunting (as explained in the <i>Nomination Document</i>, p.44), ICOMOS accepts that enduring impact on the terrain of the property from a probably seasonal, low-density hunting and gathering population would have been minimal. The record of that population is primarily expressed in Trảng An's many well-preserved archaeology-bearing sites.</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS accepts that 9 rather than 14 is a clarification.</b></p> <p><b>The further point is a difference of opinion.</b></p>
p.27, col.1, l.46:	<p>Although the nomination includes other cultural sites such as Hoa Lu Ancient City . . . <b>they are not included in the justification for this, the only cultural criterion.</b></p>	<p>ICOMOS acknowledges that the Hoa Lu Ancient Capital, together with numerous temples, pagodas and shrines, do not form part of the formal OUV of this property (see <i>Nomination Document</i> p.64-66). The nomination dossier, however, fairly presents this latter part of the archaeological record of Trảng An as evidence that: 'demonstrates continuity in the intimate relationship between this landscape and its inhabitants, whose roots extend deep into prehistory' (<i>Supplementary Report</i> p.7). Notably, the effects of political manoeuvring are imprinted on the landscape during the Dinh dynasty when isolated tower karst landforms were connected to the nearby cone karst mountain ranges in the NE margin of the property by a network of defensive ramparts – creating the symbolically-charged geography of the Hoa Lu Ancient Capital (see <i>Supplementary Report</i> p.6-9).</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS considers that this is a re-statement of what is in the nomination dossier and has been fully taken into account.</b></p>
p.27, col.2, l.1:	<p>ICOMOS notes that <b>the detailed archaeological analysis presented in the nomination dossier relates to excavations in nine caves in the Special Forest reserve (out of 29 caves so far identified as having the potential for further research).</b></p>	<p>The detailed archaeological analysis presented in the nomination dossier relates to excavations in 14 of the 30 caves so far investigated throughout the property.</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS considers that this is a clarification</b></p>
p.28, col.1, l.5:	<p><b>Also within a fully protected area (the Hoa Lu Special-Use Forest) a long 2-3m wide concrete path . . . has been constructed to the foot of the Hang Trong cave. It has been funded by a private tourism company in spite of the fact that the protective legislation does not allow unauthorized access to the protected area.</b></p>	<p>Within a fully protected area of the Hoa Lu Special-Use Forest two 1-2m wide paths (made of locally-sourced irregular-shaped paving stones) were constructed in 2006 and 2008-9, respectively by the lessee of the property to provide access for researchers to Boi and Trống caves, an endeavour undertaken with approval from the then relevant management authority, the Hoa Lu Forest Management Board (see: <i>Nomination Document</i>, p. 149).</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS considers that this is a clarification</b></p>

p.28, col.1, l.20	<b>A further negative change within the property is the creation of raised embankments on the paddy fields. These are apparently being created to allow either the construction of houses or the planting of trees, both of which would have a significant impact on views of the traditional farmed landscape.</b>	These embankments have been constructed over many generations to protect paddy fields from flooding, not for either the construction of houses or tree planting.	<b>ICOMOS considers that this is a clarification</b>
p.28, col.2, l.39:	<b>The Hoa Lu Special-Use Forest reserve . . . is thus not protected for its archaeological significance</b> although this is the part of the property where nearly all the key archaeological sites are located.	The Hoa Lu Special-Use Forest is protected under the Law on Forest Protection and Development as a multi-purpose area for conservation of natural ecosystems and biodiversity, <u>protection of historical and cultural relics and landscapes</u> , scientific research and for recreation and tourism (see Article 3, 49 & 50 of the law in Annex 2 of the <i>Nomination Document. Legal Documents</i> ; also see <i>Supplementary Report, p.15-17</i> ).	<b>ICOMOS considers that this is a clarification</b>
p.29, col.2, l.42	<b>. . . there is no evidence in the nomination dossier of the aim to involve local communities in the overall management of the property . . .</b>	The nomination dossier includes mention of several ways in which local residents are employed in management of the property, including as boat operators, forest rangers, security officers, maintenance staff, tour guides and other tourist service personnel. (See: <i>Nomination Document</i> Sect. 5.b.3, p.150, Figure 6.3 p.184).	<b>ICOMOS considers that this is a difference of opinion on how local communities can be involved in management.</b>



**FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS**



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the Operational Guidelines)

STATE PARTY: Viet Nam

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: TRẢNG AN LANDSCAPE COMPLEX

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: IUCN

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error  (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
p. 90, col. 2, l.54:	As such a <b>combination of natural and manmade features has been taken into account which is inconsistent with the interpretation of natural values</b> within criterion (vii) under the Operational Guidelines.	As such . . . which is inconsistent with IUCN's interpretation of natural values within criterion (vii) under the Operational Guidelines.	<b>Clarification</b>  As this is an IUCN evaluation it is implicit that the views represent IUCN's interpretation.
p.91, col.1, l.42:	<b>The Ha Long Bay World Heritage site is part of the same limestone karst system as the nominated property and indeed sits within the overall South China Karst system.</b>	The Ha Long Bay World Heritage site is part of a separate, and in some respects contrasting, limestone karst system from the nominated property, differing in terms of regional tectonic setting, geological characteristics and history as well as stage of geomorphological development (see. p. 112-13 of nomination document).	<b>Clarification</b>  The comparative analysis concludes that Trang An and Ha Long Bay are geomorphologically complementary. The IUCN evaluation explains both the larger regional context and the complementarities. The IUCN thematic study on Caves and Karst is also important context.
p.91, col.2, l.28:	Protection of the Hoa Lu Special Use Primary Forest is <b>through the Forest Law alone.</b>	Protection of the Hoa Lu Special Use Primary Forest is through the Law on Forest Protection and Development and several other protection statutes and regulations, including especially the Law on Cultural Heritage, Law on Environmental Protection, and the Regulation on Forest Management (Annex 2 of the nomination: Legal Documents).	<b>Factual error</b>  IUCN agrees that 'alone' does not fully convey the situation. Suggested text: Protection of the Hoa Lu Special Use Primary Forest is through the Forest Law <b>'and several other protection</b>

			statutes and regulations’.
p.91, col.2, l.29:	<b>The Forest Law identifies specific prohibited activities; however, the regulations under the law provide for certain ecotourism developments provided they do not impact on biodiversity.</b>	Article 12 of the Law on Forest Protection and Development identifies a wide range of prohibited activities aimed at preventing impact on biodiversity. Article 53.2 allows for environmental tourism activities, but these must comply with forest management regulations, forest protection rules, legislation on tourism, cultural heritage and environmental protection and other relevant legal provisions.	<b>Clarification</b>  IUCN considers its original text is not inaccurate.
p.91, col.2, l.55:	<b>A 70 year lease has been provided by the Ninh Binh Provincial People’ s Committee over the 3,000 hectares Tràng An – Tam Coc – Bích Dong Scenic Landscape within the nominated property.</b>  The lease has been awarded to a private business, the Xuan Truong Enterprise, <b>and is for the management of protection, conservation, tourist and promotional activities.</b>	The private Xuan Truong Enterprise has been provided with a 70-year lease by the Ninh Binh Provincial People’ s Committee to manage tourist operations in the Tam Coc – Bích Dong area, and an investment licence over the Tràng An area for management of tourist activities and associated conservation and promotion of heritage values. These agreements covering a total 3,000 ha are subject to supervision by the Management Board of Tràng An Landscape Complex and to the objectives and regulations of the property management plan. (Nomination Document, Section 5.g, p.169).	<b>Clarification</b>  The State Party comment provides additional information, but does not convey a factual error.
p.92, col.1, l.25:	<b>For example the eastern boundary encompasses new road developments, tunnel developments, tourism development and a major car park at Tràng An; major paddy field infill works that provide for re-settlement housing developments; major areas of cultural landscaping (not restoration); and, urban village development.</b> Similar <b>inappropriate commercial (sic.),</b> rural lands and villages are included within the southern and northern boundaries.	For example, the eastern boundary encompasses one main road incorporating two short tunnels (approximately 100m long) constructed 10 years ago; tourism facilities and a large car park at Tràng An; a limited area of reclaimed wetland; some roadside amenity tree planting to minimise the impact of traffic visibility and noise; and four villages. Rural lands and some transport infrastructure occur elsewhere in the property, along with two villages in the north and one in the south. There has been no conversion of rice paddy fields to other uses inside the property, which would require permission from Central Government, while planned housing re-settlement is occurring only in the buffer zone and not within the property (see Sect. 4.b.5, p.43 Nomination Document).	<b>Clarification</b>  The State Party comment provides additional information, but does not convey a factual error.
p.92, col.2, l. 25:	Land use and activities . . . including landscaping and <b>residential housing development.</b>	Land use and activities . . . including landscaping and building (mostly replacement) of private residences though this is confined to some villages and roadsides.	<b>Clarification</b>  The State Party comment provides additional information, but does not convey a factual error (residential housing development would encompass private resident construction/replacement).
p.92, col.2, l.42:	<b>There is no adequate vision statement for the protection of the possible outstanding</b>	The nomination document (p. 157) explains that the Board is mandated to exercise the powers of the Law on Cultural	<b>Clarification &amp; difference of opinion</b>

	<b>universal value of Tràng An, nor is there a specific Board mandate for the on-ground protection . . .</b>	Heritage and the Law on Forest Protection and Development (among others). As required under its founding Decision No.150/QĐ-UBND (5 March 2012), the Board carries out the functions of conservation (a term which in the Vietnamese language includes both protection and preservation), management, restoration and promotion. The on-ground protection management is conducted primarily under the Board's Environmental Management Division and the Centre for Preservation of the Hoa Lu Ancient Capital, and includes supervision of forest rangers and police staff within the property. The Board is also responsible for developing and implementing the property management plan, which includes in its overall vision and mission: protection of "the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, so that it may contribute in the short and long terms to the life and needs of the community . . . and in so doing to transfer intact, to the greatest extent possible, the heritage in its original form to future generations" (Annex 5 – Management Plan, p. 69).	This text is taken out of context – the IUCN evaluation acknowledges that the Board is legally mandated but that the functions, accountability & strategic direction of the Board could be improved. IUCN considers that there is currently not an <b>adequate</b> vision statement nor a specific mandate . . .which operates beyond general obligations to implement the Master Plan.
p.93, col.1, l.54:	<b>Most</b> comments focused on the benefits of enhanced tourism that would be linked to World Heritage status.	Some comments focused on the benefits of enhanced tourism that would be linked to World Heritage status.	<b>Difference of opinion</b>  IUCN evaluation understood that the majority of comments emphasized this point.
p.93, col.2, l.24:	<b>Agriculture dominates large parts of the property.</b>	Rice paddy fields cover an estimated 15% of the area of the property. However, rice cultivation is deeply embedded within Vietnamese culture, society and economy, and rice growing contributes to conservation of the lowland in the property.	<b>Difference of opinion</b>  The original text is appropriate.
p.93, col.2, l.44:	<b>Some of these changes have included a new dual highway; a major gateway; a landscaped highway route; the landscaping-infilling of paddy fields; a new high quality tourism visitor centre and an associated large car park.</b>	Some of these changes have included a landscaped road incorporating a constructed traditional- style gateway (situated outside the property buffer zone at the edge of Ninh Binh City), limited reclaimed swamp areas, and a new high-standard visitor centre with an associated large car park.	<b>Clarification</b>  IUCN is not able in the time available to verify if this is a factual matter, or a matter of interpretation, but is happy to suggest rewording that would avoid any need to consider the degree to which infilling is related to paddys or swamps. The key issue is to note that infilling of wetland areas is being undertaken.  Suggested text: Some of these changes have included a new dual highway; a major gateway; a landscaped highway route; the

			landscaping-infilling of <b>wetland areas</b> paddy fields; a new high quality tourism visitor centre and an associated large car park.
p.94, col.1, l.32:	<b>Active dredging work is undertaken within the nominated property for maintenance purposes.</b>	The evaluation team was provided with a written report advising that four (of the known 54) cave passages, located within the tourist development zone on the eastern margins of the Tràng An Eco-tourism Area, have been deepened by past sluicing, especially to allow emergency evacuation of visitors at times of sudden storms, as part of the property disaster risk management strategy and visitor safety programme (see: Long term and recent changes in the hydrological system in the Tràng An limestone massif).	<b>Clarification</b>  The State Party comment provides additional information, but does not convey a factual error.
p.94, col.1, l.40:	The management plan for the Landscape Complex recognises opportunities for growth in villages, <b>for the immediate resettlement of people within the nominated area and a future that includes the expansion of urban areas within the proposed property.</b>	The management plan for the Landscape Complex recognises limited opportunities for natural growth in villages but does not provide for re-settlement of people within the nominated area or expansion of urban areas within the proposed property (Annex 5, Management plan, section 5.5, p.86-89).	<b>Difference of opinion</b>  <b>The original text is considered accurate.</b>  The IUCN evaluation considered that the zoning plan (which is part of the management plan) supports this statement.
p.94, col.1, l.52:	<b>Extensive infilling of paddy fields and ornamental landscaping work</b> is being undertaken in the vicinity of the new Tràng An visitor centre and especially between the Ninh Binh City and Trang An. <b>It is indicated that this transformed area will be used for re-settlement of people displaced from elsewhere in the property and will be urbanized.</b>	Infilling of some wetlands and amenity landscaping work has occurred in the vicinity of the new Tràng An visitor centre, and especially between the Ninh Binh City and Tràng An, most of which is either within the buffer zone or outside it. However, no part of the transformed area will be used for re-settlement of displaced residents nor will it be urbanized.	<b>New information which contradicts information provided at earlier stages of the evaluation procedure.</b>  IUCN considers this information is contradictory to that explained in briefings during the mission. This may reflect a change in policy, and IUCN is not able to consider the actual situation without further exchange with the State Party.
p.95, col.1, l.30 & p.95, col.2, l.14:	The nominated property as presented includes <b>inappropriate</b> areas of development and human activity, and integrity, protection and management issues <b>need to be address</b> (sic.).	In common with a great number of existing natural and mixed World Heritage properties, the Tràng An nominated property includes areas of sustainable development and human activity. Some issues of integrity, protection and management should be further addressed, but these do not preclude inscription of the property on the World Heritage List at this time.	<b>Difference of opinion,</b> (and typographic correction)  On the substantive point, IUCN considers its assessment is factually accurate, and coherent in relation to the specificities of the nominated property.  “address” should be “addressed”. <b>This is a typo, but not a factual error.</b>





**FORM FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
FACTUAL ERRORS IN  
THE ADVISORY BODIES EVALUATIONS**



(in compliance with Paragraph 150 of the Operational Guidelines)

STATE PARTY: Zambia

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Barotse Cultural Landscape

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
P.68 left column, line 15 from bottom	There is also a lack of clarity as to the robustness of those traditions that are described and whether what is set out as a living landscape survives only in the memory of the Lozi and in academic documentation, or exists only in a weak form.	The ICOMOS Mission was on the ground and was flown across the landscape; physical observations were done. The State Party (Zambia) notes that the issue of lack of clarity of whether living landscape is in memory or not lacks merit; it is out of question and order considering that the Evaluation Mission on the ground should have confirmed this at the time the State Party availed the opportunity and services for the said Mission to do so.  This goes to prove that ICOMOS may not have considered the dossier with the seriousness it deserved.	<b>ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.</b>  <b>ICOMOS has fully considered the information set out in the dossier and provided by the Evaluation Mission.</b>
P. 68-77 Right column and line 23 from top	Almost all evaluative comments from ICOMOS featured within these pages.	Taken as a collective set, most of the evaluative comments by ICOMOS featured within these pages are appreciated but they unbelievably bring out a picture that is heavily lopsided towards negativity and, hence, rendering the comments less – than – credible.  Evaluations are expected to balance positive and negative features, but this is not the case here.	<b>ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.</b>
P. 68, right column and line 23 from top	Many villages are also located on the edges of the flood plains but it is not clear how many of these are within the nominated area.	A number of missing gaps on factual data indicated in the ICOMOS report are issues that are easy and straight forward to address by the State Party once the property is approved, such as the <b>quantitative census</b> of villages, canals or mounds or the <b>mapping</b> of site-specific features or	

		validating <b>historical dates</b> of when certain things occurred (e.g. founding of palaces and capitals of chiefs). To arrive at a decision of deferral as partly contributed by such elements is considered rather too harsh and extreme.	
P.68 left column Line 25 from top	Although the property is nominated as a living, evolving cultural landscape, not all aspects of the integrated cultural landscape are described in the nomination dossier.	<p>The integrated cultural landscape of the property is provided in great detail in the dossier as an interactive system of mutually supporting attributes involving natural, economic as well as social and political dimensions as illustrated in the nomination dossier. Natural elements include but are not limited to land, water, flooding, wild fowl, forest zones, wildlife, floodplains, fish, microclimates, lakes, wetlands, reptiles, amphibians, ecoregions, birdlife, reeds and other plant life, etc. Economic elements include but are not limited to agricultural practices, canals, National Parks, land reclamation, wetland fishing, canal – based activities like irrigation and transportation, flood control, wetland – based artisanal activities and artifacts, land ownership by local communities etc. Social aspects include but are not limited to village mound settlements, cultural identity, royal graves, sacred lagoons and groves, Kuomboka flood ceremony, ritual practices, Kufuluhela ceremony, royal palaces, transhumance, Litungaship, dual traditional leadership and other satellite royal leaderships, spirituality around Nyambe and Nasilele, taboos and other indigenous beliefs, networking relationships between Barotse Cultural Landscape and other social entities at various levels like the British, Zambian State etc. Political elements include but are not limited to the Barotse Royal Establishment and its historical and continuing relationship with various entities like the Zambia as a State Party, neighbouring ethnic groups or trading parties, robust traditional, legal and judicial system, communal feats like canal construction, royal decrees, institution of Litungaship and its supportive system etc.</p> <p>The interactive, evolving and living nature of these natural, economic as well as social and political dimensions of the property need to be appreciated as a collectivity as they help to preclude and clarify most of the negative comments noted at the head of this report. A systems approach to the property was used.</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS considers that most of this re-iterates information put forward in the nomination dossier that has been fully considered by ICOMOS.</b></p> <p><b>ICOMOS considers that this is new information cannot be taken into account at this stage.</b></p>

		<p><b>On Living Traditions</b> an attempt has been made by providing details relating to the Transhumance, Cattle rearing, agricultural practices and use of resources.</p> <p>On the exact date of founding the Limulunga Palace, information is available and can easily be provided as follows:</p> <p>The Limulunga Palace was built by <b>Litia Yeta III</b>. He was King Lewanika's first son. He surveyed Limulunga royal village in 1933. In 1937 he was invited by the British government to attend yet another coronation. The Litunga travelled with, among others, his Ngambela, his young brother and personal secretary Mbikusita Lewanika, and others. It was during this time that he got the plans (Drawings for the Limulunga Palace). <b>Yeta III</b> is credited for establishing Mwandi Royal village in Sesheke and Limulunga Royal village in Mongu. He also built the current palace at Limulunga, which he built between 1937 and 1939.</p> <p>As regards mapping of the various elements that constitute the landscape, this information can be provided from the various planning authorities as expounded by your response.</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS considers that this is new information cannot be taken into account at this stage.</b></p>
		<p><b>Page 69 (Social Structures between Lowland and Highland areas)</b></p> <p>This information is present and outlined in the dossier, as seen from the maintenance of names of village names, leadership (Indunas/Headmen) once on the highland. However, if this was not very clear, a detailed account of this system can still be presented by the state party.</p>	

<p><b>P. 70</b> , left column, line 18 from the top</p>	<p>ICOMOS notes that no details are provided as to the location or number of sacred lakes and forests. It is also clear that some major royal hunting grounds are outside the boundaries of the property to the north in the National Park.</p>	<p>The number of sacred lakes can be deduced from the description given in the text. Those mentioned are deemed critical. Indeed the State Party needs to map the Site accordingly. The numbers of sacred forests, lakes and lagoons is known and this can easily be provided by the State Party.</p> <p>The fact that some of the sacred features have not been mapped should not mask the truth that the State Party made great attempt on this by providing this information in the additional information which the State Party is convinced was ignored in the evaluation as no reference has been made anywhere apart from the acknowledgement in the introduction of ICOMOS report that this information was provided by the State Party</p> <p>The State Party approach as mentioned earlier was a feature approach and not a historical approach as guided by the various expert at the time, hence the reason for not including the hunting grounds in the core zone. This can be treated as a future extension.</p> <p>However, the king's historic traditional hunting grounds were mapped as Liuwa National Park on the Maps although it is in the buffer zone. The site is not under threat as it is already enjoying its maximum protection from the existing Zambia Wildlife Act as a National Park.</p> <p>Whilst the State Party agrees with ICOMOS and IUCN's observations on trying to bring a number natural aspects in trying to ensure the conservation and preservation of these various features and traditions, it must be noted that in certain cases this approach and excitement if not properly mitigated may be the very source of confusion and eventual disintegration in the light of variant and diametric interests of the different stakeholders. This would make the whole exercise managing this landscape a daunting task.</p>	
---	---	--	--

<p>P. 70 right column, line 22 from bottom</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the comparative analysis is insufficient to fully demonstrate that there are no other similar properties that might be nominated for the World Heritage List.</p>	<p>Can ICOMOS state other sites that we need to make a comparison on. The State Party wonders why this was not indicated in the additional comments that were requested.</p> <p>In addition the State Party would like to be guide on what is the standard or measure for terms used by ICOMOS like "Brief" and "Sufficient" which in real life may subject of value judgment and subjectivity. The State Party observes that it is possible to be brief and have sufficient information.</p> <p>The State Party also notes that this observation by ICOMOS was an afterthought considering that the body never indicated this in it request for additional information.</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS would be ready and willing to advise the State Party on measures needed, including for augmenting the comparative analysis, following a deferral by the World Heritage Committee.</b></p>
<p>P. 70 Right column, line 24 from bottom</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the comparative analysis is insufficient to fully demonstrate that there are no other similar properties that might be nominated for the World Heritage List</p>	<p>It is not known by the State Party why ICOMOS almost completely ignored "additional information" that was submitted on 5<sup>th</sup> November 2013 where a detailed comparative analysis was provided.</p> <p>Pages 38 – 44 under "additional information" provide details of a comparative analysis between the Lozi floodwater tradition and the dominant flood tradition currently prevailing in much of the world. Such comparative analysis is further supported by a number of illustrated publications featured under the above stated pages within this document</p>	<p><b>The additional information was fully considered by ICOMOS.</b></p>
<p>P.71 left column and line 20 from top</p>	<p>At the present time, Outstanding Universal Value has not been demonstrated</p>	<p>Pages 38 – 44 under "additional information" did provide and demonstrate that the Barotse Cultural Landscape is a property of Outstanding Universal Value principally because of the existence in the area of a rare floodwater tradition of a metaphorical nature which is uniquely and diametrically different from a floodwater heritage of much of the world. This Lozi floodwater tradition centrally and mutually permeates a host of other Lozi cultural and other practices by way of how metaphorical visions operate. Consider this statement from The Post, Sunday May 24, 2009: "the above is the case when at the height of the annual rainy season the flood plain, which is a subject of may eulogies and songs among its inhabitants, turns into an expanse of water. Surprisingly and paradoxically, this disruption of the social rhythm has not compelled those born on this 'green desert' to relocate to areas that</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS considers that the first part reflects a difference of opinion on the information provided.</b></p> <p><b>The second part is new information that cannot be considered at this stage.</b></p>

		are not flood prone. In fact, to overzealous traditionalists on the Barotse Floodplain, pride themselves on the extent to which they could endure the flood situation that has in a way transformed them into a nomadic people”.	
P. 71 Left column and line 29 from bottom	ICOMOS considers that from the information provided in the nomination dossier, the rationale for the boundaries is not clear	<p>With partnership from an expert mission from ICOMOS, the State Party is willing to critically review and provide a rationale for a revised boundary that would sustain key attributes distinctive to the property.</p> <p>However suffice it to state that this observation by ICOMOS is a clear demonstration that ICOMOS did not use the supplementary (additional) information on the big maps and boundary description which was sent to them in addition the State Party also flew with the one of the evaluators showing him all the clearly and generally marked boundaries defined by a road network and a river system and a buffer defined by the National Park system which includes Liuwa National Park and a Game Management Area and Protected Forests boundaries. This justification was also given to the Mission that was on the ground. The Ramsar Sites have also been to a greatest extent included as either part of the core and buffer. To this extent the State Party opines that ICOMOS observations are greatly exaggerated.</p> <p>Much as the State Party agrees with ICOMOS that the urban areas should be excluded from the proposed protected area, it must be noted that the suggestion to include larger area for protection comes with it very serious challenges of how much of Western Province of Zambia which comprises most of the landscape should be left for conservation whilst allowing sustainable development considering that the State Party also looks at this a living and therefore evolving landscape unlike the stance taken by ICOMOS which has considers this landscape like a monument or relic. The State Party is also extremely uncomfortable to bring the IUCN suggestion of broadening the size of the core as this will be recipe of tension between the various stakeholders who have already been assured that it being a living landscape the normal day to day activities shall be allowed.</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS welcomes the commitment of the State Party to engage with an Advisory Mission to address the key issues and recommendations in the evaluation report.</b></p> <p><b>ICOMOS confirms that it fully considered the additional information provided and the report of the evaluation mission. It also confirms that it evaluated the property as a living landscape.</b></p> <p><b>However ICOMOS noted that the nomination dossier provided less details on aspects of the integrated cultural landscape such as the on-going traditional economic and social interactions between the wider communities and their environment than on site specific Royal palaces, graves and sacred sites.</b></p> <p>ICOMOS recommended that a revised nomination should present more emphasis on traditional agricultural, political and religious structures based on the annual transhumance processes that have shaped, and still shape, habitation of the flood plains.</p>
P. 71 right column and line 1 from	Furthermore, there is concern that major developments such as mining (oil exploration ZICTA	The notion of a living and evolving cultural landscape, which unavoidably generates major or minor	

<p>top</p>	<p>telecom towers, high voltage power lines, urbanization) and road building could threaten the integrity of the landscape</p>	<p>developments such as these, is one that will demand ongoing constructive dialogue between the various concerned parties in a manner that safeguards the integrity, sustainability and authenticity of the distinctive features of the property. The State Party is convinced that it is too early to be rigidly prescriptive at this stage because, for instance, no confirmed oil deposits have been reported in the area yet. In short, each development project will critically be assessed for its own merit and discussed amicably among all concerned parties.</p> <p>It must be also noted that some of the observations made by ICOMOS defeat the essence of the State Party being part of this Convention if an area of the size of some countries should not even have a telephone mast in the name of cultural heritage conservation and yet it is <b>a living and evolving landscape</b>. It would have also been possible to still have these communication masts which are environmentally friendly like mimicking the palm trees. This is also considering that the landscape has palms in some cases.</p> <p>The State Party is also aware of a property within the region which is a Cultural Landscape which has vividly visible telephone mast tower adjacent to the site attributes of great significance. One great question is why is ICOMOS using this selective approach.</p>	
<p>P. 72 left column and line 26 from top</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the overall Lozi cultural landscape needs to be seen as an on-going, dynamic cultural tradition of <b>land management</b> involving transhumance, <b>land drainage</b> to allow arable cultivation and navigation and settlement mounds as well as the social, political and cultural structures that have allowed a communal response over some 400 years.</p>	<p>The State Party considers that the privileged position given to land management and land drainage here by ICOMOS is a foreign imposition on the property in view of the primacy of the phenomenon and process of flooding among the Lozi people noted above. Land management and land drainage are rooted in the flood - as - enemy tradition which is supportive of land-based civilizations whereas the Barotse Cultural Landscape thrives on the flood – as – patelo (friend ) tradition which supports a water-based civilization and which willingly allows floods to occupy the space of land for a multitude of positive opportunities such a flood brings about , such as transhumance, <i>Kuomboka</i> flood ceremony, natural cleansing properties like flushing out of diseases, fish breeding, wildfowl migration and so on. In this context, transhumance is practiced among the</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS agrees with the comments made by the State Party and considers that its own text fully supported this view.</b></p>

		<p>Lozi not so much to escape from the hazard of flooding per se but <b>to willingly allow floods to operate and occupy land space for positive opportunities</b>. This is the crux of the distinctiveness of the property from the received knowledge on flood.</p> <p>Such a flood approach among the Lozi has been sustained since time immemorial and it fits squarely within the given definition of Cultural Landscape as “cultural properties (that) represent the combined works of nature and of man designated in Article 1 of the Convention. They are illustrative of the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment (of flooding) and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal,” (UNESCO 2008, p.85). In this regard, the nomination of the property on the basis of cultural criteria has ably and clearly been justified.</p> <p>Arising from the observations made above the State Party is convinced that even when it comes to the consideration of the Outstanding Universal Value there are some elements of misdirection based on foreign imposition or ideologies.</p>	
<p>P. 71 Right column and line 25 from top</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the conditions of integrity and authenticity have not currently been met at this stage</p>	<p>The State Party is of the view that conditions of integrity and authenticity have been met currently, as long as ICOMOS reviews its evaluations in the light of the submitted “additional information” which it sidelined. It will be noticed then that the Lozi flood approach supports and provides for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities;</li> <li>• basis for delineating boundaries;</li> <li>• sustainability of the overall environment;</li> <li>• a package of mutually reinforcing social, economic and political forces that are at the heart of this nomination;</li> <li>• basis for comparative analysis</li> <li>• Justifying outstanding universal value;</li> <li>• integrity and authenticity;</li> <li>• transhumance and its related flood ceremonies of <i>Kuomboka</i> and <i>Kufuluhela</i>;</li> <li>• annual calendar of activities for the people;</li> <li>• key definitional features related to the nomination, such as</li> </ul>	<p><b>ICOMOS considers that this re-states proposals made in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by ICOMOS.</b></p>



		<p>cultural landscape and Outstanding Universal Value and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• some philosophical challenges for humanity to re-consider and re-think its interpretation of the flood story in readiness for ideals related to sustainable development.</li> </ul>	
P. 74 left column, line 10 from the bottom (section 5)	<p>ICOMOS considers that the logic for definition of the Boundaries is not clear in terms of why certain parts of the landscape are included and others not, as the areas subject to annual inundation are larger than the area included in the boundary. Exclusion of areas upstream from the nominated area could put the site at risk, though limiting control over the management of water sources to ensure the quality of water coming into the system. I</p>	<p>It be emphasized that these upper areas which also include Ramsar sites are already in the buffer and are also being protected under the Zambia Wildlife Authority Act as Ramsar Sites as well as Liuwa National Park and its surrounding/adjacent Game Management Areas. There are restrictions the use of natural resources in these areas in Zambia through existing legislative arrangements. There is also a Water Rights Act which also regulates the abstraction of waters. There also applicable laws which restrict river bank development regardless of where it is protected area or not.</p>	
P. 74 left column, line 6	<p>Although not mentioned in the nomination dossier, it is understood that mining is being explored within the Property.</p>	<p>This was clearly mentioned under threats; we wonder whether the documents was given due attention.</p> <p>The observation by ICOMOS gives the impression that the State Party was not being transparent yet the State Party went to the extent of showing the petroleum and gas exploration blocks in a map form as a sign of being open.</p> <p>The State Party now has a paradox of whether these Outstanding Universal Values should be left to destruction in the name of waiting for exploration which may even take more than 50 years from now to be discovered and possible rigging taking place at a low scale level and in locations with very minimal impacts on the overall Outstanding Universal Value and integrity and authenticity of the key attributes of the site.</p>	<p><b>ICOMOS noted in its evaluation that ‘The Management Plan also identifies blocks of land for <u>oil and gas</u> exploration in the property and in the buffer zone. It further states that an Environmental Impact Assessment has been undertaken but this did not take into account the nomination proposal or any cultural aspects. ‘</b></p> <p><b>This specific text referred to reports of active mining exploration for which no data was provided.</b></p>
Page 74 right column, line 7	<p>It is not clear if the boundary relates to clear physical points on the ground or has been marked in way. The current description is difficult to follow in places and lacking in GPS coordinates. For instance in several places the boundary is said to run through a settlement without making it clear if it is included or not. The resolution of the map included does not help clarity</p>	<p>Coordinates are subjective due changes in map scale whereas the descriptive approach is permanent and not subjective to changing scale. For instance if one uses a road junction it is a fixed point and can be proven on the ground.</p> <p>The clarity is due to shear size because this is a very large scale area An A3, A1 or AO Map would have been ideal. However State Party answered this problem through the exercise of the completeness of the</p>	

		dossier which was provided upon the request by the World Heritage Centre. Otherwise the boundary clearly shows the buffer extent in green and the core is isolated in red and it follows a combination of existing protection boundaries roads and rivers. These are like boundaries for a nation where you can not strictly follow a GPS coordinates.	
--	--	--	--