



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization

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

# World Heritage

# 42 COM

**WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B4**

**Manama, 25 June 2018**  
**Original: English / French**

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

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

**WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**Forty-second session**

**Manama, Bahrain**  
**24 June - 4 July 2018**

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

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

## **SUMMARY**

This document contains the factual errors notifications received from States Parties by 8 June 2018 in compliance with paragraph 150 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

**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 42nd session of the  
World Heritage Committee (Manama, Bahrain, 24 June - 4 July 2018)**

State Party	World Heritage nomination	ID No.		Recommen.	Pp
	<b>NATURAL SITES</b>				
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Arasbaran Protected Area	1543		N	2
	<b>MIXED SITES</b>				
Canada	Pimachiowin Aki	1415	Rev	I/I	9
Mexico	Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley: originary habitat of Mesoamerica	1534	Rev	I/D	10
	<b>CULTURAL SITES</b>				
Belgium / France	Funeral and memorial sites of the First World War (Western Front)	1567		Postponement	20
Belgium / Netherlands	Colonies of Benevolence	1555		D	21
China	Historic Monuments and Sites of Ancient Quanzhou (Zayton)	1561		N	31
Denmark	Aasivissuit – Nipisat. Inuit Hunting Ground between Ice and Sea	1557		I	35
France	Historic Urban Ensemble of Nîmes	1569		D	36
Germany	The Archaeological Border Landscape of Hedeby and the Danevirke	1553		I	37
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Sassanid Archaeological Landscape of Fars Region	1568		D	38
Italy	Ivrea, industrial city of the 20th century	1538		R	42
Italy	Le Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano a Valdobbiadene	1571		N	44
Japan	Hidden Christian Sites in the Nagasaki Region	1495		I	72
Oman	Ancient City of Qalhat	1537		R	76
Republic of Korea	Sansa, Buddhist Mountain Monasteries in Korea	1562		I	79
Saudi Arabia	Al-Ahsa Oasis, an evolving Cultural Landscape	1563		N	83
Spain	Caliphate City of Medina Azahara	1560		I	86
Turkey	Göbekli Tepe	1572		I	87

**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):** Iran (Islamic Republic of)

**EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE:** Arasbaran Protected Area

**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
29-2-15	The nominated property covers a total of 57,764 ha which includes five small but strictly protected areas covering <b>7,188 ha</b> , and is surrounded by a larger buffer zone covering 105,601 ha.	The total strictly protected area has mentioned 7,188 ha, whereas total area is 7,288 hectares.	<b>Not a factual error.</b>  IUCN referenced the areas quoted within the nomination file which at page 9, states:  Shah-Heydar with an area of <b>1604</b> hectares a National Park in the northeast of the property;  Tazehkand with an area of <b>1418</b> hectares as a National Park and east of the property;  Kalan with an area of <b>2004</b> hectares in the southwest of the property;  Aynaloo with an area of <b>1081</b> hectares in western part of the property  Heresar with an area of <b>1081</b> hectares a National Park in the northwest area of the property.  This totals <b>7,188</b> hectares.
29-2-37	<b>785 plant species</b> belonging to 89 families (6 pteridophytes and 83 families of flowering plants) are recorded in the nominated property.	There is a mistake in the number of species and according to dossier, 1071 taxa belong to 451 genera and 89 families include 6 families of pteridophytes and 83 families of flowering plants (73 dicotyledons, 8 monocotyledons and 3 gymnosperms families respectively) were recorded (see description, P. 38, paragraph 2).	<b>Not a factual error.</b>  IIUCN's figures are quoted from the nomination dossier. On page 38, it states:  "The 1071 taxa belong to 451 genera and <b>89 families</b> , and these families include <b>6 families of pteridophytes and 83 families of flowering plants</b> (73 families are dicotyledonous, 8 families are monocotyledon and 3 families are gymnosperm)."  And on page 37 the dossier states:  "The floras have been studied by Assadi (1987 & 1988) with <b>785 species</b> between

			which...”
30-1-1	However, the nomination file mentions that <b>Georgian Oak has now been replaced in most parts by the invasive species Christ’s Thorns (Paliurus spina-christi - not evaluated).</b>	It should be noted that in the first sentence of this paragraph in Dossier (Description, P. 51) has been mentioned: The specific ecological conditions at altitudes of 650 to 1250 meters above sea level (a.s.l), in particular the southern slopes assault to the forest (i.e. cutting and grazing) has led to the differences in the flora of secondary woodlands from the primary woodlands. So, this secondary forest covers a small part of the total forests of the protected area with above ecological conditions. Expanding on this statement for the entire of the area does not represent the actual attributes of the property.	<b>Not a factual error.</b>  <b>Clarification.</b>
30-1-36	The nomination places much emphasis on its hosting of the <b>Persian Leopard</b> . However, the <b>status and trend of this charismatic mammal within the nominated property cannot be presently confirmed.</b>	<p>It is noted, the name of Iran and the presence of leopards in different parts of Iran has been mentioned several times in (Breitenmoser, U., Breitenmoser-Würsten, C., Zazanashvili, N. &amp; Heidelberg, A. (2014). International Experts Workshop “Conservation of the Leopard in the Caucasus“. Workshop Report. 9-10 October 2017, Tbilisi, Georgia), Tbilisi, Georgia) (pages 7, 8 and 10). The only tip in this reference, which led to a negative judgment, is the unknown number of the Leopard in Iran. The cited map of this report (page 8) illustrated the distribution pattern of Persian Leopard over the Caucasus eco region and Iran. In this map, the presence of the Leopard in the property has been confirmed by using tools such as dead, images, captured animals or genetic records, kills of livestock and wild animals, tracks.</p> <p>It should be mentioned that during the presence of IUCN evaluators in the area, a number of local residents were interviewed about Leopard. They were informed of the casualties by Leopard to the residential livestock.</p> <p>However, a considerable reference for the presence of the Leopard in the Property is addressed in the Dossier (Farhadinia, M. S., et al.</p>	<p><b>Not a factual error.</b></p> <p><b>Re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the Advisory Bodies.</b></p> <p>IUCN notes that the reference to an International Experts Workshop “Conservation of the Leopard in the Caucasus“. Workshop Report. 9-10 October 2017, Tbilisi, Georgia appears to be mistakenly dated 2017 when the report is from 2014. IUCN referenced a more recent workshop report dated 2017. Both these expert workshop reports were referenced and both include maps which show distribution maps indicating that Persian Leopards are only possibly extant within the nominated property. Based on numerous sources IUCN was unable to substantiate the claims that Persian Leopards are found within the property.</p> <p>IUCN also does not mention every single reference that it reviews in the list of literature consulted.</p>

		2015). In addition, another valuable article was published in Peer J (Andrew P. Jacobson, et al. 2016) showed the map of the Leopard distribution in the property. Unfortunately, these two references were not considered neither in the evaluation report of IUCN nor in their references.	
30-2-43	The faunal comparisons are drawn <b>nationally</b> to demonstrate the importance of Arasbaran within Iran. The comparative analysis does not provide clear arguments in support of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). The analysis also suffers from repetition and also plays down the high levels of land use and their impacts.	<p>Faunal comparisons internationally are clearly shown in the Dossier (Justification, page 214-215-Table 3.2-1). Property in terms of mammals, birds and reptiles was compared to other 16 World Heritage sites.</p> <p>In relation to OUV, according to CEPF (2005 -tables 60 and 63), a total of 16 species are threatened in the Arasbaran Corridor. Of which 8 important species are found in the property. In addition, there are two other bird species (Egyptian vulture and Sociable Plover) as well as Vormela peregusna in the property, which are addressed as threatened species in IUCN letter. Comparing the area of the property with other World Heritages indicates that this place can be one of the smallest areas of the world with a dramatic faunal threatened species. This highlights the extraordinary important of in-situ conservation of property.</p>	<p><b>Not a factual error.</b></p> <p><b>Re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the Advisory Bodies.</b></p> <p><b>Difference of opinion</b></p> <p>The important biodiversity values of the site are acknowledged but concluded to be of national and regional significance</p>
30- 2-50	Additional IUCN and UN Environment WCMC analysis of the nominated property indicates a regional level of importance, based on spatial analyses and literature review. <b>The analysis shows that the nominated property is situated within the Caucaso-Iranian Highlands Udvardy province, which is represented on the World Heritage List by the Western Caucasus World Heritage Site in Russia inscribed under biodiversity criteria. Additionally, 17 similar sites are inscribed</b>	<p>As it has been mentioned in the Dossier, property is comprehensively compared with Caucasian and Hyrcanian regions as well as many other similar areas in the world. This comparison includes distinctive differences of plants, vegetation and fauna (justification, Page 200-215). One of the characteristics of a World Heritage candidate in Operational Guideline 2015 is the different features in compare with other properties.</p> <p>Therefore the differences are sharply described.</p>	<p><b>Not a factual error.</b></p> <p><b>Re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the Advisory Bodies.</b></p> <p><b>Difference of opinion.</b></p>

	on the Tentative List of several State Parties.		
31-1-8	At the same time it is <b>inaccurate to say that the area is “the last refuge of the Caucasus hotspot</b> biodiversity in the northern hemisphere”.	The “last refuge” for emphasizing on the importance of property in the case of in-situ conservation, was used in the additional information letter which was submitted to IUCN in 25 February 2018. In-situ conservation is the main subject of criterion X. IUCN evaluators have encountered defects last refuge in the Dossier. They suggested unique eco region as a proper term. The additional information letter states that 61 plant species and two Caucasian species are located in the property, which cannot be found in other regions of Iran. The species came to the property from the Caucasus, Turkey, Europe and their distributions has been stopped in this area. So the property can be seen as a last dispersal in the northern hemisphere. It seems that the use of "Last Refugee" is better than the "eco region" term, which implies a transition zone between two ecological areas.	<p><b>Not a factual error.</b></p> <p><b>Re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the Advisory Bodies.</b></p> <p><b>Difference of opinion.</b></p> <p>As noted above IUCN has acknowledged the important biodiversity values of the site are but concluded to be of national and regional significance</p>
31-1-22	However, these on-going ecological and biological processes in the nominated property <b>are neither distinctive nor exceptional at either regional or global levels.</b>	This area is the surviving glacial vegetation (Justification, page 247). Moreover the most important evidence of criterion IX is the process of vegetation change over a 1500-year period based on palynological evidence (Description, page 163-169 & justification, page 175- 3.1.b -1. Criterion ix). This issue is described in criterion IX, which was explained in the additional information submitted to IUCN in 25 February 2018. So the vegetation changes along a range of altitude is not considered as a subject of criterion IX.	<p><b>Not a factual error.</b></p> <p><b>Clarification</b></p> <p><b>Difference of opinion</b></p>
31-1-48	Unfortunately <b>the population of Caucasian Black Grouse appears to be fragmented</b> , probably due to hunting and habitat fragmentation and disturbance.	It could be seriously stated that the Kalan protected area in the property, due to the presence of Black Grouse, is heavily protected. In 2017), according to the census conducted by the Environmental Department, 20 lek places were identified in the area and the number of Black Grouse was	<p><b>Not a factual error.</b></p> <p><b>Clarification</b></p> <p><b>New information which contradicts information provided at earlier stages of the evaluation procedure.</b></p> <p>Information within the nomination dossier provides confusing data. For example the table on page 105 states there are “37-67</p>

		<p>estimated 25 pairs, meanwhile may be their number is much higher than it.</p>	<p>breeding pairs”. Further, on page 107 it says: “The Arasbaran Protected Area, a tremendously important habitat for the Caucasian black grouse in Iran, has been home to 27 leks of this game bird, of which eight percent are currently inactive or deteriorated due to poaching and habitat loss (Habibzadeh et al., 2013).”</p> <p>IUCN notes that, whilst there are differences between the data provided in the nomination and the factual errors form, it remains of the view that the population of Caucasian Black Grouse within the property as a whole appears to be fragmented. IUCN’s field evaluators were made aware of work ongoing to better understand the population status of this species, however a 2017 census was not provided to the mission. IUCN notes that while the Black Grouse population in Arasbaran is important for Iran, the population in Iran is at the edge of its range. The IUCN Red List says “This species is endemic to the Greater and Lesser Caucasus mountains, where there are thought to be some 34,500-76,500 individuals spread between Russia (1,500-3,500 calling males), Georgia (7,551-15,759 calling males), Turkey (1,500-2,800 calling males), Armenia (200-400 calling males), Azerbaijan (700-3,000 calling males) and Iran (less than 500 individuals)”.</p>
31-2-1	<p>It is noteworthy that the Hirkan Forests of Azerbaijan was nominated in 2006 but the inscription was deferred to consider a renomination with other Hirkanian forest areas in Iran. This latter area is the subject of a nomination to be considered in 2019 and appears to <b>have a higher level of plant diversity than Arasbaran with an estimated 1,296 species.</b></p>	<p>The Hirkan National Park in the Republic of Azerbaijan, which its dossier was submitted in 2006 to the World Heritage Committee, is mostly covered by forest. Hyrcanian forests cover roughly two million hectares in Iran that in the justification (comparative analysis), the differences between the Hyrcanian vegetation and the property are listed.</p> <p>But in terms of flora richness, the Hirkan National Park has a number of 1296 plant species in its World Heritage file, which is a very high figure. In the submitted file for this national park, the authors countered only with a number of species without any list of plants, deposit place of specimens, as well as vouchers. Therefore, making a comparison between species richness of Hirkan National Park as</p>	<p><b>Not a factual error.</b></p> <p><b>Clarification.</b></p> <p><b>Re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the Advisory Bodies.</b></p>

		a forest ecosystem and Arasbaran Protected Area with several ecosystems is difficult.	
33-1-51	The IUCN field mission concluded that the <b>DOE is under severe financial pressure</b> , and struggles to effectively fund nature conservation given other competing national priorities.	However, the DOE have appropriate budget at the national level. In addition, in the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran, all of the World Heritages sites have an approved national and special budget. Therefore, these sites operate according to the management plan and will not suffer any financial limitation at all.	<p><b>Not a factual error.</b></p> <p><b>Difference of opinion.</b></p>
33-2-45	Regarding village infrastructure and facilities, <b>underground gas lines have been built throughout the property</b> so that many of the villages have piped liquid gas for heating and cooking.	Regarding to the threats of the construction of piped liquid gas in the property, it should be noted that the gas pipeline has been made only <b>outside the property</b> and has not entered to the area in any way.	<p><b>Possible factual error</b></p> <p>The basis of this statement in the evaluation derives from the field evaluation. Both field mission experts confirmed they were shown a firebreak, inside the property, and informed that there was a gas line at the same location.</p> <p>They also confirmed that they were told that villages located within the property were using piped gas, which is very positive as the inhabitants would then have less impact on the forest (cutting wood for cooking/heating).</p> <p>IUCN would be pleased to accept this as a factual error on the basis of the information provided by the State Party.</p>
34-1-13	<b>There are cases of serious negative impacts caused by the introduction and spread of invasive alien species. A clear example is the Christ's thorn tree (Paliurus spina-christi).</b> These trees spread and create virtually monotypic stands, possibly as a result of the fact that it is the only woody tree not subject to grazing due to its very sharp thorns.	As it has been clearly stated in the Dossier, this species is established in Secondary Woodland which is now changing to Primary Woodland and population of Christ thorn has been severe declined. Finally, this secondary forest contains a small part of the total forests of the protected area and most importantly, whether it is present or not, it does not play a major role in the criteria provided for the property.	<p><b>Not a factual error.</b></p> <p><b>Clarification.</b></p> <p><b>Difference of opinion</b></p> <p>The presence of alien invasive species relates to integrity concerns for the property.</p>
34-1-51	This view appears to be consistent with the statement within Iran's fourth national CBD report of 2010 which describes the <b>Arasbaran broadleaf deciduous forests</b> , to which the nominated	In this letter, pointed to a decline in Arasbaran forested area i.e. change from 500 thousand hectares to 60 thousand hectares due to destruction. It should be noted that destroyed areas are outside the property and property has been protected over the past 40 years. In	<p><b>Not a factual error.</b></p> <p><b>New information that cannot be taken into account at this stage.</b></p> <p>IUCN maintains its conclusion on the</p>

	<p>property belongs, as “located in the northwest of Iran, with many endemic species, <b>very degraded at present, with only 60,000 ha remaining of the original 500,000 ha</b>”. In conclusion, IUCN considers that the integrity, protection and management of the nominated property do not meet the requirements of the Operational Guidelines.</p>	<p>addition, according to a report issued by Organization of Forests, Range and Watershed of Iran (FRWO) the forested area is currently 174,838 hectares and not 60 thousand hectares (<a href="http://www.frw.org.ir/00/En/StaticPages/Page.aspx?tid=13237">http://www.frw.org.ir/00/En/StaticPages/Page.aspx?tid=13237</a>).</p>	<p>overall integrity of the Arasbaran broadleaf deciduous forests. The quoted final statement represents an overall conclusion on integrity, protection and management on the basis of diverse sources of evaluation. It should not be interpreted as a conclusion related solely to the CBD report of 2010.</p> <p>The additional reference to the FRWO report is undated and appears to provide a general description of the ecological regions of Iran. As such it states the areas of this region as 174,838ha but does not make clear if this is forest cover nor does it comment on the ecological condition of forest cover.</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):** Canada

**EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE:** Pimachiowin Aki

**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. 9 right, para 12, line 3	<b>The nominated area encompasses slightly less than a quarter of the lands occupied by Anishinaabeg people</b>	We are uncertain about the origin of this statement and believe it to be inaccurate. We suggest deleting this statement.	ICOMOS accepts this request.
P. 28, right, para 2, line 1	While commercial forestry is now prohibited within the nominated area, <b>small-scale community based commercial forestry is allowed in limited areas of the buffer zone.</b>	The latter highlighted phrase is not accurate. We suggest joining the second and third paragraphs as follows: <b>While commercial forestry is now prohibited within the nominated area, forest management plans for potential commercial forestry on parts of the buffer zone have been developed by communities and the provinces to protect both natural and cultural heritage.</b>	ICOMOS accepts this clarification.
P. 28 right, para 4, line 1	There is no mining in the nominated area and mineral exploration and development <b>are not allowed in the community land use plans.</b>	There is no mining in the nominated area and mineral exploration and development <b>is prohibited in the nominated area.</b>	ICOMOS accepts this clarification.
P. 28, right, para 5, line 2	<b>Two small areas</b> identified decades ago by the province for low-medium mineral potential in the <b>eastern</b> buffer zone are unlikely to be developed.	<b>One small area</b> identified decades ago by the province for low-medium mineral potential <b>in a western</b> buffer zone are unlikely to be developed.	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
P. 28 right, para 5, line 5	Gold mining already occurs in Red Lake <b>outside the buffer zone</b>	Gold mining already occurs in Red Lake, <b>some 30 kilometres east of the nominated area.</b>	ICOMOS accepts this clarification.
P. 29, right, para 1, line 2	<b>Only Bloodvein River will welcome tourism to its entire reserve area.</b>	This statement is inaccurate and should be deleted.	ICOMOS accepts this correction.
P. 33, right para 4, line 5	...extends to 2,904,000 <b>square kilometres.</b>	.....extends to 2,904,000 <b>hectares.</b>	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a 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):** Mexico

**EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE:** Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley: originary habitat of Mesoamerica

### 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 27, second column, Line 8	The re-submitted material reports an overall nominated area of 145, 255.20 ha with <b>two different measurements</b> provided for the buffer zone enveloping three components (344, 931.68 ha in the text, <b>and 284, 239.78 ha in the table</b> ).	<b>Clarification</b> There is discrepancy in the surfaces because those quoted in the table of supplementary information form are wrong. The correct surfaces confirmed are the ones provided in the nomination file: Surface of Components Parts Zapotitlán-Cuicatlán- 136,587.52 ha; San Juan Raya 6,106.64 ha; Purrón 2,561.04 ha. Total surface of the nominated Property 145,255.20 ha. <b>Buffer Zone surface: 344,931.68 ha</b> (correct in the text, wrong in the table).	<b>Not a factual error.</b>  <b>Clarification.</b>  IUCN welcomes this clarification. IUCN notes that the evaluation was undertaken on the basis of the property configuration as confirmed by the State Party in this clarification. The text therefore reflects this understanding at the time.
Page 28, First column, Table 1	<b>two different measurements</b> provided for the buffer zone enveloping three components (344, 931.68 ha in the text, <b>and 284, 239.78 ha in the table</b> ).	The correct surfaces confirmed are the ones provided in the nomination file: Surface of Components Parts in the Table 1: Zapotitlán-Cuicatlán- 136,587.52 ha; San Juan Raya 6,106.64 ha; Purrón 2,561.04 ha. Total surface of the nominated Property 145,255.20 ha. <b>Buffer Zone surface: 344,931.68 ha.</b>	<b>Not a factual error.</b>  <b>Clarification.</b>  As noted above these corrections should be accepted.
Page 28, First column, Line 24	The Zapotitlán-Cuicatlán component....Of its area of <b>136,588 ha</b> , ....	To adjust the surfaces of the elements, it will be suggested for the component:  The Zapotitlán-Cuicatlán component....Of its area of 136,587 ha,....	<b>Not a factual error.</b>  <b>Clarification.</b>  IUCN rounded up the 136,587.52 ha, figure to the figure shown and notes that the same approach was undertaken for the other components (San Juan Raya 6,106.64 ha rounded up to 6,107 ha and Purrón 2,561.04 ha rounded down to 2,561 ha). IUCN would

			be willing to include the exact figures to two decimal places.
Page 31, Second column, Line 4	The cultural criteria, including evaluation of the justification of the <b>nomination as a cultural landscape</b> , will be evaluated by ICOMOS. Whilst IUCN considers the natural values of this site make a strong case for inscription there remain conceptual shortcomings as to how the property <b>presents itself as a cultural landscape</b> in line with paragraph 47 of the Operational Guidelines.	The cultural criteria, including evaluation of the justification of the nomination as a mixed property, will be evaluated by ICOMOS. Whilst IUCN considers the natural values of this site make a strong case for inscription there remain conceptual shortcomings as to how the property presents itself as a mixed property.	<b>Not a factual error.</b>  This nomination has been put forward as a mixed site and as a Cultural landscape as well. See WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B 3.  IUCN has contacted the World Heritage Centre (WHC) in June 2018 and they have again confirmed that this nomination qualified as a Cultural Landscape.
Page 31, Second column, Line 28	Should TCV be inscribed as a cultural landscape, IUCN recommends further fundamental reflection on how linkages in the landscape are identified, presented and better managed in an integrated fashion.	<del>Should TCV be inscribed as a cultural landscape, IUCN recommends further fundamental reflection on how linkages in the landscape are identified, presented and better managed in an integrated fashion.</del>	<b>Not a factual error.</b>  See comment above.
Page 33, First column, Line 16	The institutions in charge of implementing protective measures are the <b>Ministry of Environment, the National Commission for Protected Areas (CONANP), the Federal Attorney General for Environmental Protection</b> and the National Institute for Anthropology and History (INAH).	The institutions in charge of implementing protective measures are the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, the National Commission for Natural Protected Areas (CONANP), the Federal Attorney for Environmental Protection and the National Institute for Anthropology and History (INAH).	<b>Not a factual error.</b>  <b>Clarification.</b>  IUCN accepts to modify the text in the SoOUV to say:  “...the Ministry of Environment <b>and Natural Resources</b> ,...”
Page 33, First column, Line 26	Ongoing efforts are needed to ensure full integration and institutional coordination across issues related to natural and cultural heritage in accordance with the respective mandates of CONANP and <b>IHAH</b> .	Ongoing efforts ensure full integration and institutional coordination across issues related to natural and cultural heritage in accordance with the respective mandates of CONANP and <b>INAH</b> .	<b>Not a factual error.</b>  IUCN accepts to correct this typographical error in the SoOUV to say: “... <b>INAH</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):** Mexico

**EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE:** Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley: originary habitat of Mesoamerica

**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
		General Statement.  It is discouraging that in his evaluation ICOMOS does not consider an integrated analysis of both attributes (natural and cultural) which is the essence of the OUV developed for this nomination, which will strongly contribute to the representativeness and balance of the WH List.	
Page 1, first column, line 5	<b>Zapotitlán-Cuicatlán, San Juan Raya and Purrón</b> States of Puebla and Oaxaca  Mexico	States of Puebla and Oaxaca  Mexico	ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change which does not modify the meaning of the sentence.
Page 1, first column, line 12	---characterized by <b>tall tubular cacti</b> . Its numerous----	---characterized by columnar cacti. Its numerous----	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
Page 1, first column, line 31	Included in the Tentative List  <b>11 December 2012 (category natural)</b>	Included in the Tentative List  11 December 2012 (category natural) Modification to mixed category and name, approved 27 November 2017	ICOMOS considers this correction to be a clarification.
Page 2, first column, line 1	The State Party submitted a <b>partially revised nomination dossier</b> on 18 January 2018	The State Party submitted on 18 January 2018, as requested by the WHC in Decision 41 COM 8B.9, additional information for clarification and recommendations	ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change, which does not modify the meaning of the sentence.
Page 2, first column, line 30	submitted on 18 January 2018 a <b>partially revised nomination dossier</b> .	submitted on 18 January 2018, as requested by the WHC in Decision 41 COM 8B.9, additional information for clarification and recommendations	ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change, which does not modify the meaning of the sentence.

Page 2, second column, lines 1 to 5	It should be noted by comparison with the text on natural aspects, the text on cultural aspects <b>remains less much detailed knowledge on the archaeological sites and their exact extent and location remains missing.</b>	The comparison between natural aspects and cultural aspects is not valid.  The archaeological sites in the nomination file and the supplementary information are geographically located and their extent as known, are referred.	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
Page 2, second column, lines 5 to 7	The management plan includes the need for ‘Studies on settlements, archaeological charts, that enable a diachronic understanding of the cultural manners of settlements, on official maps to a significant scale, in order to identify the extension, coherence and unity of the cultural identity of the human groups inhabiting the area’.	Remove.  This statement was not found in the management plan.	This information is a copy and paste from the original nomination dossier (p. 158, section Protection and Management Requirements).
Page 2, second column, lines 13 to 16	....the nomination for cultural criteria <b>would continue to be considered somewhat premature until further documentation on the exact location, number and type of archaeological sites become available</b>	....the nomination for cultural criteria contains exact locations (with UTM coordinates), number and type of archaeological sites provided and properly documented in the Nomination File and in the 2018 Additional Information Document	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
Page 2, second column, lines 34 to 36	... <b>archaeological sites</b> that bear witness to the conversion of nomadic hunter-gatherers to a sedentary lifestyle based on opportunities of irrigation over a course of 12,000 years.	In the former text of ICOMOS it was recognized that ...“Throughout the history, ecosystem diversity has been a major factor in converting nomadic hunter-gatherers to a sedentary lifestyle.....  The text has been changed and this is one of the few expressions on the relations between culture and nature in ICOMOS evaluation	ICOMOS takes note of this comment.
Page 2, second column, lines 37 to 42	<b>The mutual management agreement.....refers to 3,992 archaeological sites, archaeological zones and archaeological monuments zones within the NPA. However, only 22 archaeological sites are presented in the nomination dossier</b>	Remove.  This paragraph was misunderstood. It can't be compared the number of 3,992 registered by INAH at that moment (and the number increases constantly) in NPA in the whole country, against the 22 sites that were selected as representatives of the nomination, out of potential 624 sites detected for the entire Tehuacán-Cuicatlán region.	ICOMOS considers this correction to be a clarification.
Page 2, second column, lines 44 to 47	...the beginnings of agriculture, plant domestication and the development of human settlements; beliefs and rituals; <b>beginnings of agriculture, plant domestication and the development of human settlements.</b>	...the beginnings of agriculture, plant domestication and the development of human settlements; beliefs and rituals; and water management infrastructure. These are described in turn:  (This part was taken from the former evaluation because it was wrongly copied.	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
Page 3, first column, line 17	<b>No title</b>	Water Management Infrastructure (taken from the former evaluation)	ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change.

Page 3, first column, line 33	In its <b>revised nomination</b> of 2018 the State Party	In the additional information of 2018 provided by the State Party	ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change which does not modify the meaning of the sentence.
Page 3, first column, lines 39 to 43	<b>Despite</b> this new explanation provided, <b>very little remains known about the site's physical evidence as well as its interconnectedness, which is not clearly documented in a way that allows an understanding of how they functioned</b>	Clarification: This new explanation provided was properly documented with extensive bibliographical references in footnotes, web links included, in the 2018 additional information.	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
Page 4, first column, Line 42	<b>In its nomination amendments</b> presented in 2018...	In the additional information presented in 2018...	ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change which does not modify the meaning of the sentence.
Page 4, second column, Lines 1-2	The State Party considers that, when focusing on the context of <b>an arid lands in Mesoamerica...</b>	The State Party considers that, when focusing on the context of Mesoamerica...	ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change which does not modify the meaning of the sentence.
Page 4, second column, Lines 9-11	...filtration galleries and salt mines, which cover several <b>centuries</b> and attest to the extensive history of the region.	...filtration galleries and salt mines, which cover several millennial and attest to the extensive history of the region.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
Page 4, second column, Lines 14-20	<b>What remains missing is the consideration of the relationship between these water management sites and the impact they had on the formation and transition of an early cultivation and settlement process in the Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley, by means of a comparison of other early settlement sites in Mesoamerica.</b>	Clarification: The Committee in the decision 41 COM 8B.9 recommended: "a) Undertake an augmented comparative analysis of sites with evidence for irrigation within Mesoamerica". This ICOMOS consideration modifies the original recommendation.	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
Page 4, second column, Lines 29-32	In particular, also <b>an analysis of different sites within the valley remains absent</b>	Clarification: The analysis stipulates that the 22 selected sites have to be seen in a perspective of a holistic system (STC: Tehuacán-Cuicatlán System) which is dynamic space-temporally, which reaffirms the exceptional universal value of how people adapted to survive in a biocultural varied territory through millennia.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
Page 4, second column, Lines 34-36	It is therefore <b>not justified in which way the property as a whole and in combination of the selected sites and elements could be said to be exceptional</b>	Clarification: The main theoretical framework of the comparative analysis is actually seen from a holistic perspective (as a whole), where every site is in a precise area delimited (Tehuacán-Cuicatlán System) and are related to these dynamic societies along time.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
Page 5, first column, lines 26 to	<b>However, it is unfortunate that so little is documented on the various</b>	We disagree about this ICOMOS subjective judgement.	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of

31	<b>features and many archaeological sites....presents merely selected peaks into a much larger and broader evidence existing.</b>	The rigorously selected 22 archaeological sites are not merely selected peaks but are representatives of the outstanding evidence of the relationships between natural and cultural values within the nominated property.	opinion.
Page 5, first column, lines 31 to 35	<b>ICOMOS therefore considers that while the justification might likely be relevant at a theoretical level, the number of documented sites presented does not constitute the crucial mass required to underline and illustrate these very important historic phenomena.</b>	This consideration is subjective and not supported by factual evidence that have been provided in the Nomination File and the additional information.	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
Page 5, first column, lines 40 to 44	<b>Yet few of these are described and documented in detail, and it can be expected that further crucial evidence both inside and outside the current property boundaries adds to the historic process understanding</b>	The essence of the archaeological science is to generate and update the knowledge with new evidence as far as this becomes available, and there are several research projects in progress in the area.	ICOMOS considers this correction to be a clarification.
Page 5, first column, lines 44 to 49	<b>ICOMOS therefore continues to recommend better definition and documentation of the property, in particular my mean of extensive cultural heritage focused surveys of the valley, both in and outside the boundaries, which seem defined predominantly in view of natural heritage characteristics.</b>	The essence of the archaeological science is to generate and update the knowledge with new evidence as far as this becomes available, and there are several research projects in progress in the area.	ICOMOS considers this correction to be a clarification.
Page 5, second column, line 3	<b>The nominated serial property presents 22 sites out of potential 624 sites said to be contained in the valley.</b>	The nominated serial property presents 22 sites out of 624 sites located for the entire Tehuacán-Cuicatlán region.	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
Page 5, second column, line 6	<b>Unfortunately, the identification and description of the property as well as the comparative analysis is not yet approached in a holistic enough understanding....</b>	We disagree about this ICOMOS subjective judgement.  The Committee in the decision 41 COM 8B.9 recommended: "a) Undertake an augmented comparative analysis of sites with evidence for irrigation within Mesoamerica".  This ICOMOS consideration modifies the original recommendation.	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
Page 5, second column, line 50	<b>...six of the 22 sites proposed appear not currently listed in the national registry of the National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH), and hence do not yet enjoy legal protection under the provision of frameworks focused on cultural heritage concerns.</b>	All the sites are legally protected by the two federal laws, the environmental and the cultural.	ICOMOS considers that this correction provides information which contradicts information provided at earlier stages of the evaluation procedure.
Page 6, first column, line 41	<b>ICOMOS considers that the authenticity of the whole series and the serial components has not been demonstrated but that the authenticity of the individual archaeological sites appears</b>	The authenticity of the individual archaeological sites are satisfactory, therefore authenticity of the whole series has been demonstrated.  (← Contradictory statement)	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.

	satisfactory.		
Page 6, second column, lines 20, 35	<p>Criterion (iii)...</p> <p>"ICOMOS considers that the Otomanguean linguistic tradition is certainly an interesting phenomenon...</p> <p><b>Unfortunately, not enough documentation or information is provided in the nomination dossier to illustrate what attributes could be considered an outstanding or exceptional testimony of these early societies".</b></p>	<p>Otomanguean Linguistic tradition is one of the most solid traditions that still continue in Mesoamerica. It is a living example of the sophistication reached by these cultures.</p> <p>The Otomanguean linguistic tradition may be considered as one aspect of the civilization that developed in the Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley, and defines the cultural profile of the region.</p> <p>It is one of the few examples of long term linguistic traditions in the world that prevails nowadays.</p> <p>(See the vast bibliography provided in the Nomination Dossier)</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>
Page 7, first column, lines 21, 27	<p>Criterion (iv)...</p> <p><b>Unfortunately, however, the isolated 22 presented historic and archaeological sites belong to five different water management and irrigation systems cannot be said to represent the typology of a network...They can neither present a complete collection of all different water management solutions nor provide the completeness of an extensive irrigation network...</b></p>	<p>Criterion (iv)...</p> <p>The nomination file and the additional information illustrate significant stages of technological development of human adaptation in Mesoamerica and Aridoamerica throughout time, not meant to represent a preconceived neither a continuous network.</p> <p>It has been related to the plants domestication and anthropization.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>
Page 7, first column, line 51	<p>Criterion (vi)...</p> <p><b>ICOMOS continues to consider that the illustrated manuscripts of the Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley...provide little assistance to the understanding of the early plant domestication and settlement processes, which could be considered exceptional if based on ample physical evidence. It has therefore not been illustrated how the ideas embedded in the respective manuscripts could be considered of outstanding universal significance, as well as directly or tangibly associated with the property.</b></p>	<p>Criterion (vi)...</p> <p>The illustrated manuscripts of the Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley, as presented in the Nomination File, are the testimony of cultural development and social organization in the region, and are also related to agriculture and plant uses as practiced by original cultures and their descendants up to present day with a remarkable continuity.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>
Page 8, first column, line 11	<p>The property is made up of 3 components parts in which 22 <b>historical or</b> archaeological sites are presented...</p>	<p>The property is made up of 3 components parts in which 22 archaeological sites are presented...</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers this correction to be a clarification.</p>
Page 8, first column, line 23	<p><b>...ICOMOS notes a discrepancy between the property and buffer zone sizes provided in the text and those quoted in tabular form of the additional information document.</b></p>	<p>Clarification.</p> <p>Indeed there is discrepancy in the surfaces because those quoted in the tabular form are wrong.</p> <p>The correct surfaces confirmed are the ones provided in the nomination file:</p> <p>Surface of Components Parts</p>	<p>ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.</p>

		<p>Zapotitlán-Cuicatlán- 136,587.52 ha;</p> <p>San Juan Raya 6,106.64 ha;</p> <p>Purrón 2,561.04 ha.</p> <p>Total surface of the nominated property 145,255.20 ha.</p> <p>Buffer Zone surface: 344,931.68 ha.</p>	
Page 8, First column, Line 30	<b>It seems that the boundaries were defined predominantly based on natural heritage features and existing protection schemes</b>	The boundaries were originally defined jointly between CONANP, INAH and Experts considering both cultural and natural aspects, with an interdisciplinary approach as a mixed nomination.	ICOMOS considers this correction to be a clarification.
Page 8, Second column, Line 3 to 8	<b>ICOMOS considers that further cultural heritage sites contributing to the potential exceptional significance of the property are located in the buffer zone and that a judgement about the adequacy of boundaries and buffer zones relies on additional surveys and documentation to be provided.</b>	The rigorously selected 22 archaeological sites are representatives of the outstanding evidence of the relationships between natural and cultural values within the nominated property.	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
Page 8, second column, line 36 and 39 to 42	....notes that 6 described cultural heritage sites..... of the 22 proposed sites are currently not listed in the national registry of INAH, <b>which suggests that their protection status in cultural heritage terms is not yet at the highest national level.</b>	<p>The 6 archaeological sites are in process of documentation and inscription in the national registry of INAH.</p> <p>However, all archaeological sites in Mexico are protected at the highest national level by federal law.</p>	ICOMOS considers that this correction contains new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.
Page 8, second column, line 53 to 56	....the legal protection in place is appropriate in natural heritage terms, <b>but that 6 out of 22 archaeological sites do not yet enjoy highest national protection in cultural heritage terms</b>	All 22 archaeological sites in the property are protected at the highest national level by federal law, and the natural legal protection strengthens the conservation policies applied.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
Page 9, first column, line 1	<b>Most of the historical studies are dispersed, sometimes old, and several researched by official and academic institutions exist,....</b>	In the 2018 additional information provided, there is an extensive, detailed, and updated bibliographical references on the recent archaeological research within the nominated property.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
Page 9 First and second columns	<b>The state of conservation of the presented archaeological sites is good to fair but they remain vulnerable...</b>	The management plan includes conservation measures through the ongoing projects, and local authorities. This is a permanent and long-term task.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
Page 9, second column, lines 2 to 8	<b>Envisaged conservation measures should be included with clear information on methodologies, timeframe of intervention and resources allocated.</b>	<del>This information was already provided in the additional information with clear information on methodologies, timeframe of intervention and resources allocated.</del>	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
Page 9, second column, lines 9 to 14	Overall, the state of conservation of the presented archaeological sites is good to fair <b>but they remain vulnerable and a programmed overall</b>	All this is already considered in the currently operating management plans.	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.

	<b>conservation approach is needed and should be integrated as a conservation and maintenance strategy within the management plan</b>		
Page 9, second column, line 25	<b>INAH does not seem to have systematic presence within the property, where merely a few staff members are present at certain times</b>	INAH has a systematic and permanent presence within the property, through ongoing research projects, salvage archaeology, and strong participation with the local communities and cultural advisory to local authorities.	The nomination dossier does not provide enough details on the presence of the INAH Staff in the property.
Page 9, second column, line 34	PROFEPA and <b>INAH</b> co-manage so-called local Surveillance Committees which are composed of community members.	PROFEPA and CONANP co-manage so-called local Surveillance Committees which are composed of community members.	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
Page 10, first column, line 5	....of the plan, <b>cultural heritage is not treated as equal as for Natural heritage.</b>	The comparison between natural aspects and cultural aspects is not valid.  The nomination file was prepared as a mixed property proposal.	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
Page 10, first column, line 42	<b>ICOMOS has not been provided with clear understanding of the presence and involvement of cultural heritage professionals at the site.</b>	<del>ICOMOS has not been provided with clear understanding of the presence and involvement of cultural heritage professionals at the site.</del>	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
Page 10 Second column, line 8	[tourism possible threats]... <b>no further information is provided as to how and when the [they?] shall occur and what responses it might generate.</b>	Management plan includes prevention strategies, implemented according to human resources and factual situations.  INAH prioritizes research and protection of the sites over tourism activities.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
Page 10, second column, lines 34 to 38	ICOMOS considers that the management system <b>continues to lack focus on cultural heritage components and that current staffing levels are inadequate to respond to the immense challenge of documenting and monitoring the cultural heritage in the Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley.</b>	CONANP and INAH have a collaboration instrument (formal agreement) to attend different aspects for the management and conservation of archaeological sites and monuments inside the boundaries of natural protected areas, as Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
Page 11, first column, lines 12 to 24	The serial nomination <b>is not put forward as a cultural landscape but rather as an ensemble of 22 archaeological sites that pinpoint certain stages in the evolution of the Valley...The evidence is thus spread across the landscape with few clear inter-relationships between the sites.</b>  <b>Although some sites were excavated and recorded in the 1960s, many other sites await more detailed investigation as acknowledged by the State Party. Furthermore, the 22 sites are only the tip of the iceberg as overall over 600 sites are known to exist.</b>	The property is nominated as a <b>mixed serial site.</b>  This ICOMOS conclusion is biased by an evaluation approach where the integration of the cultural and natural components of the property nomination was not fully considered.  The 22 archaeological sites are not mere highlights in the nomination. They are historically and environmentally integrated in a complex matrix where nature and culture have evolved in a unique mixture as is described in the nomination.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.

Page 11, first column, line 50	In much greater detail <b>and via a landscape approach</b> , it might provide the basis for the Valley or parts of the Valley to be seen as an outstanding reflection.....	The property is nominated as a mixed serial site( not as a cultural landscape),  it might provide the basis for the Valley or parts of the Valley to be seen as an outstanding reflection.....	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
Page 11,	Conclusions	Statement:  Despite the detailed information and documentation provided in the nomination file, and the additional information, all the Conclusions and the two first paragraphs of the Recommendations are exactly the same as the ones of the evaluation of ICOMOS presented to the Committee in 2017, and that was modified by the Committee in Decision 41 COM 8B.9	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
Page 11 Second column, paragraphs a) and b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Consider a revised nomination in revised boundaries...</li> <li>b) Undertake further surveys, research and documentation of cultural heritage...</li> </ul>	<p>These recommendations do not apply according to the WHC in Decision 41 COM 8B.9.</p> <p>The Nomination is not only for cultural sites. The State Party nominates the property as Mixed Site. OUV of sites are presented as cultural and natural in the Nomination File and in the 2018 Additional Information Document.</p>	ICOMOS considers that this reflects 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):** Belgium / France

**EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE:** Funeral and memorial sites of the First World War (Western Front)

### 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 158, colonne 1, paragraphe 2, ligne 11	La série comprend également <b>quelques exemples</b> de cimetières et monuments dédiés aux victimes civiles.	La série comprend également <b>deux sites</b> de cimetières et monuments dédiés aux victimes civiles.	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification.
page 159, colonne 2, paragraphe 2, ligne 3	Instituée en <b>1928</b> , la « Commission nationale des sépultures militaires » adopta un plan-type symétrique et rectiligne pour tous les cimetières, qui fut mis en place de manière répétitive, et rarement modifié pour s'adapter à l'environnement.	Instituée <b>le 25 novembre 1918</b> , la « Commission nationale des sépultures militaires » adopta un plan-type symétrique et rectiligne pour tous les cimetières, qui fut mis en place de manière répétitive, et rarement modifié pour s'adapter à l'environnement.	L'ICOMOS accepte cette correction comme une erreur factuelle.
page 162, colonne 2, paragraphe 5, ligne 2	Le dossier se réfère à des précédents dans ce domaine, comme les dispositions adoptées après <b>1862</b> aux États-Unis, à la suite de la guerre de Sécession, pour les sépultures individuelles des soldats de l'Union dans des cimetières (bataille de Gettysburg – 1863 et cimetière d'Arlington – 1864), ou celles prises après la guerre franco-prussienne de 1870-1871.	Le dossier se réfère à des précédents dans ce domaine, comme les dispositions adoptées après <b>17 juillet 1862</b> aux États-Unis, à la suite de la guerre de Sécession, pour les sépultures individuelles des soldats de l'Union dans des cimetières (bataille de Gettysburg – 1863 et cimetière d'Arlington – 1864), ou celles prises après la guerre franco-prussienne de 1870-1871.	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification.
page 163, colonne 2, paragraphe 3, ligne 5	Des célébrations et rites commémoratifs commencèrent à avoir lieu de manière régulière dans les années <b>1930</b> et d'anciens combattants des côtés opposés tinrent leurs premières rencontres.	Des célébrations et rites commémoratifs commencèrent à avoir lieu de manière régulière dans les années <b>1920</b> et d'anciens combattants des côtés opposés tinrent leurs premières rencontres.	L'ICOMOS accepte cette correction comme une erreur factuelle.

## 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):** Belgium / Netherlands

**EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE:** Colonies of Benevolence

**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. 155 – 1 <sup>st</sup> column, 15 <sup>th</sup> – 19 <sup>th</sup> line	By moving this population to the countryside, the cities would be relieved of a major social problem and <b>poor families</b> would be given the opportunity to build up a beneficial and industrious life in the country.	By moving this population to the countryside, the cities would be relieved of a major social problem and <b>all poor (beggars, vagrants, orphans and poor families)</b> would be given the opportunity to build up a beneficial and industrious life in the country.	ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change which modifies the meaning of the sentence.
p. 155 – 1 <sup>st</sup> column, 19 <sup>th</sup> – 26 <sup>th</sup> line	The colonies were created out of heath and peatland and featured orthogonal roads, ribbons of houses and small farms, and communal buildings. <b>Later 'unfree' colonies were also, founded, the last in 1825;</b> these featured large institutions and larger farms again set in an orthogonal pattern of fields and avenues and housed particular groups of disadvantaged people with support from the State.	The Colonies were created out of heath and peatland and featured orthogonal roads, ribbons of houses and small farms, and communal buildings. <b>From 1819 onwards, 'unfree' Colonies were founded, the last in 1825;</b> these featured large institutions and larger farms again set in an orthogonal pattern of fields and avenues and housed particular groups of disadvantaged people with support from the State.	ICOMOS accepts this clarification.
p. 155, 1 <sup>st</sup> column, 33 <sup>th</sup> – 35 <sup>th</sup> line	In terms of categories of cultural property set out in Article I of the 1972 World Heritage Convention, <b>this is a transnational serial nomination of 7 sites.</b>	In terms of categories of cultural property set out in Article I of the 1972 World Heritage Convention, <b>this is a transnational serial nomination of 7 sites, more specifically seven living and continuing cultural landscapes that were designed and created intentionally by man and then organically evolved over time .</b>  → See Operational Guidelines, paragraph 47: definition of cultural landscapes	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification  ICOMOS considers that the following could be added:  In terms of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (July 2017) paragraph 47, it is nominated as a cultural landscape.

p. 155, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 40 <sup>th</sup> - 45 <sup>th</sup> line	Additional information provided by the States Parties in November 2017 included maps with more detail about the <del>structures</del> and time periods of construction of the buildings that contribute to the proposed Outstanding Universal Value, <del>but many modern structures were not identified on the maps.</del>	Additional information provided by the State Parties in November 2017 included maps with more detail about the <b>buildings</b> and time periods of constructions of the buildings that contribute to the proposed Outstanding Universal Value. <b>All modern buildings are clearly identified on the maps and legends added to the nomination file and in the nomination file itself and referred to as ‘modern buildings’.</b>	ICOMOS accepts this clarification.  However, ICOMOS considers that the information provided is not detailed enough.
p. 155, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 46 <sup>th</sup> – 47 <sup>th</sup> line	The three free colonies were created between 1818 and <del>1821</del> .	The three free Colonies were created between 1818 and <b>1823</b> .	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
p. 155, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 47 <sup>th</sup> line	<del>None survive in their entirety.</del>	<b>The landscape structure of each Colony has survived in its entirety. Over time initial constructions have disappeared and new ones have been added within the initial lay-out. These additions, often dating from crucial periods of the Colonies’ development, attest to the evolution of the Colonies and guaranteed that the Colonies of Benevolence could function for a period of over 150 years .</b>	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.  ICOMOS was referring to the entirety of the colonies in terms of whether their initial boundaries, layout and original buildings, had survived, not just their landscape structures.
p. 155, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 50 <sup>th</sup> – 51 <sup>th</sup> line	<del>He</del> only remaining original houses <b>are at Frederiksoord.</b>	<b>The only remaining original houses in the free Colonies are at Frederiksoord and Wilhelminaoord.</b>	ICOMOS acknowledges this typing error.  ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
p. 155, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 51 <sup>th</sup> - 52 <sup>th</sup> line  p. 156, 1 <sup>st</sup> column, 1 <sup>st</sup> – 2 <sup>nd</sup> line	In all colonies, farm buildings were improved in the mid-19 <sup>th</sup> century, and these still survive <del>at Frederiksoord and Wilhelminaoord.</del> At Willemsoord <del>no structures remain from the 19th century.</del>	In all Colonies, farm buildings were improved in the mid-19 <sup>th</sup> century, and these still survive <b>in all Colonies. At Willemsoord the church (1851) and rectory remain from the 19<sup>th</sup> century.</b>	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a clarification.
p. 156, 1 <sup>st</sup> column, 9 <sup>th</sup> – 11 <sup>th</sup> line	The layout of Veenhuizen has been <del>obscured</del> by a modern village and an ammunition depot, <del>and at Merksplas by a cemetery.</del>	The layout of Veenhuizen, has been <b>modestly affected</b> by a modern village, and by an ammunition depot <b>at the utmost boundary.</b>  <b>→ The historical colonists’ cemetery at Merksplas is an attribute!</b>	ICOMOS considered that the first part reflects a difference of opinion; it accepts the second part as a factual error.
p. 156, 1 <sup>st</sup> column, 11 <sup>th</sup> – 18 <sup>th</sup> line	Perhaps the greatest change at four of the component sites was brought about <b>in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century</b> by the use of institutional buildings as active prisons at Wortel, Veenhuizen, and Merksplas, and as a maximum security psychiatric hospital at Ommerschans, particularly from <del>the fences, walls and guard towers</del> and new ancillary buildings that have been constructed.	Perhaps the greatest change at four of the component sites was brought about <b>in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century</b> by the gradual use of some institutional buildings as active prisons at Wortel, Veenhuizen and Merksplas, and as a maximum security psychiatric hospital at Ommerschans, particularly from <b>the fences, a guard tower</b> and new ancillary buildings that have been constructed. As the institutions were not built as prisons, but institutions meant to elevate people, and are surrounded by a green landscape with avenues, the appearance is characteristic for the Colonies of Benevolence.	ICOMOS accepts the date as a factual error.  It considers the rest of the sentence reflects a difference of opinion.

p. 156, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 10 <sup>th</sup> – 12 <sup>th</sup> line	<del>Post-1918</del> staff housing is still in place at the north end long along with <del>two short streets of modern houses</del> .	Staff housing dating from the late-19 <sup>th</sup> century by W.C. Metzelaar is still in place at the north end along with the 62 staff houses from H. Burgmans, dating from 1910, at the Ommerweg and Boslaan.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
p. 156, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 12 <sup>th</sup> – 14 <sup>th</sup> line	The rest of the component is a series of large modern farms set in the grid of avenues, many of them lined with rows of trees.	The rest of the component is a well recognizable orthogonal grid pattern of avenues and waterways, many of them lined with rows of trees and with a series of large modern farms set in the grid and on the original location of their predecessors.	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference in emphasis.
p. 156, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 16 <sup>th</sup> line	Wortel was reorganized as an unfree colony in 1870.	Wortel was founded in 1822 as a free Colony and reorganized in 1870 as an unfree Colony.	ICOMOS accepts this clarification.
p. 156, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 17 <sup>th</sup> – 20 <sup>th</sup> line	The layout of roads and fields dates to the founding of the colony, but the oldest <del>structures are from the Belgian building programme that started in 1870</del> .	The layout of roads and fields dates to the founding of the Colony, but the oldest buildings are from 1870, when Wortel was adapted from a free Colony into an unfree Colony.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
p. 156, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 45 <sup>th</sup> – 48 <sup>th</sup> line	<del>No structures date before 1859 and,</del> as with Wortel, most structures, including the state institution in the centre of this colony date from the late 19 <sup>th</sup> century.	The orthogonal landscape structure with long avenues remained intact. As with Wortel, most buildings, including the state institution in the centre of this Colony date from the late 19 <sup>th</sup> century and are placed in the initial landscape pattern.	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference in emphasis and contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier relating to the primacy of the survival of landscape patterns.
p. 157, 1 <sup>st</sup> column, 29 <sup>th</sup> – 32 <sup>th</sup> line	Later colonies had larger family plots, although they never achieved the goal of self-sufficiency and the colonies had to rely on aid from the state.	Later Colonies had larger plots, although they never achieved the goal of self-sufficiency and the Colonies had to rely on aid from the state.	ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change which modifies the meaning of the sentence.
p. 157, 1 <sup>st</sup> column, 33 <sup>th</sup> – 34 <sup>th</sup> line	The Society of Benevolence sought other sources of revenue to support their activities.	The Society of Benevolence sought sources of revenue to support their activities.	ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change which modifies the meaning of the sentence.
p. 157, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 4 <sup>th</sup> – 6 <sup>th</sup> line	Both Belgian colonies seem to have been essentially deserted until 1870 when the state took them over as <del>workfarms</del> for beggars and vagrants.	Both Belgian Colonies seem to have been essentially deserted until 1870 when the state took them over as agricultural colonies for beggars and vagrants.	ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change which modifies the meaning of the sentence.  ICOMOS considers that workfarms reflect the change from colonies to penal institutions, as noted in the Nomination dossier.
p. 157, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 11 <sup>th</sup> – 12 <sup>th</sup> line	The number of inmates increased from 800 in 1879 to 5291 in 1911.	The number of colonists increased from 800 in 1879 to 5291 in 1911.	ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change which does not modify the meaning of the sentence/ which modifies the meaning of the sentence.  ICOMOS considers that inmates reflects the changes from colonies to penal institutions, as noted

			in the Nomination dossier.
p. 157, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 12 <sup>th</sup> – 15 <sup>th</sup> line	Wortel also saw a major building episode as it was converted from a free colony of <b>small houses and</b> small farms to an unfree one with <b>large institutions and large farms</b> .  In the 20 <sup>th</sup> century, special sections were set up to care for <b>epileptics and people with tuberculosis</b> .	Wortel also saw a major building episode as it was converted from a free Colony <b>with</b> small farms to an unfree one with <b>a large institution and a large farm</b> .  In the 20 <sup>th</sup> century, special sections were set up to care for <b>colonists who were epileptics and colonists with tuberculosis</b> .	ICOMOS accepts this clarification.
p. 157, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 17 <sup>th</sup> – 20 <sup>th</sup> line	<b>Merksplas</b> became a genuine penal institution <b>after the Second World War</b> with the addition of <b>fences, walls and guard towers</b> .	<b>A small part of the agricultural pauper colony of Merksplas</b> became a genuine penal institution <b>after 1993</b> with the addition of <b>fences and a guard tower</b> .	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
p. 157, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 24 <sup>th</sup> – 27 <sup>th</sup> line	Orphans were no longer accepted, <b>and</b> a major reorganization and rebuilding program began at the unfree colonies under direction of the state.	Orphans were no longer accepted <b>from 1869 onwards, and</b> a major reorganization and rebuilding program began at the unfree Colonies under direction of the state.	ICOMOS accepts this clarification.
p. 157, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 30 <sup>th</sup> – 31 <sup>th</sup> line	<b>Industrial activity</b> was added to the work program alongside the agriculture and forestry.	<b>Small-scale industrial activity</b> was added to the work program alongside the agriculture and forestry.	ICOMOS accepts this clarification.
p. 157, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 34 <sup>th</sup> – 38 <sup>th</sup> line	At Veenhuizen, the Ministry of Justice took over the management of the colony and a major building program began in <del>1884 with new ensembles of buildings replacing the old ones</del> .	At Veenhuizen, the Ministry of Justice took over the management of the Colony and a major building program began in <b>1875, adding a new ensemble of characteristic buildings, fitting in the landscape grid of 1823, while keeping most of the original buildings in place</b> .	ICOMOS accepts this clarification.
p. 157, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 38 <sup>th</sup> – 41 <sup>th</sup> line	A Roman Catholic Church, guard's <b>barracks</b> , new farms and <b>industrial buildings</b> were also erected. Agriculture was now combined with <b>industrial activity</b> at a grain mill and <b>slaughterhouse</b> .	A Roman Catholic Church, guard's <b>houses</b> , new farms and <b>workshops</b> were also erected. Agriculture was now combined with <b>small-scale industrial activity</b> at a grain mill and a <b>tiny slaughterhouse</b> .	ICOMOS accepts this clarification.
p. 157, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 41 <sup>th</sup> – 45 <sup>th</sup> line	Prisoners began to be housed at Veenhuizen after <del>1918</del> and a wide range of people were held there: conscientious objectors, smuggler, <b>Jewish refugees in 1938</b> , war criminals <b>after 1945</b> and violators of the Road Traffic Act.	<b>In 1938, Jewish refugees fleeing from Germany were received in Veenhuizen. After 1945</b> , prisoners began to be housed at Veenhuizen and a wide range of people were held there: conscientious objectors, smugglers, war criminals and violators of the Road Traffic Act.	ICOMOS considers that this correction contradicts information provided in the Nomination dossier.
p. 158, 1 <sup>st</sup> column, 8 <sup>th</sup> – 11 <sup>th</sup> line	Kempens Landschap, a land trust operating in the province of Antwerp, has been active in the Belgian colonies since 1997, owning land, conserving <b>structures</b> and encouraging contemporary use of the property.	Kempens Landschap, a land trust operating in the province of Antwerp, has been active in the Belgian Colonies since 1997, owning land, conserving <b>and managing the landscape</b> and encouraging contemporary use of the property.	ICOMOS considers that this is a difference in emphasis.
p. 158, 1 <sup>st</sup>	Additional information received	Additional information received from the	ICOMOS accepts this

column, 16 <sup>th</sup> – 20 <sup>th</sup> line	from the States Parties in February 2018 <b>describes</b> the social history of the colonies, illustrating the circumstances by which people could be admitted to or dismissed from the colonies, both free and unfree.	States Parties in February 2018 <b>provides an extensive addition to the already described</b> social history of the Colonies, illustrating the circumstances by which people could be admitted to or dismissed from the Colonies, both free and unfree.	clarification.
p. 158, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 28 <sup>th</sup> – 35 <sup>th</sup> line	The three sites of Mettray Agricultural colony, <del>Germany</del> (1839-1937), Rauhe Haus, Horn, Germany (1833-present) and Ruiselede, Belgium (1849-present) were all designed for difficult or disadvantaged youth. <del>The German</del> sites were large settlements, but they did not have the same degree of landscape organisation as did the Colonies of Benevolence.	The three sites of Mettray Agricultural colony, <b>France</b> (1839-1937), Rauhe Haus, Horn, Germany (1833-present) and Ruiselede, Belgium (1849-present) were all designed for difficult or disadvantaged youth. <b>These sites</b> were large settlements, but they did not have the same degree of landscape organization as did the Colonies of Benevolence.	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
p. 159, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 23 <sup>th</sup> – 29 <sup>th</sup> line	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Colonies of Benevolence are an early social experiment in poverty reduction</li> <li>- They operated at a national scale</li> <li>- Agriculture was meant to provide work and food for the colonist.</li> <li>- The project was rooted in the ideals of the <b>Enlightenment</b>.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Colonies of Benevolence are an early social experiment in poverty reduction</li> <li>- They operated at a national scale</li> <li>- Agriculture was meant to provide work and food for the colonists</li> <li>- The project was rooted in the ideals of the <b>Enlightenment</b>.</li> </ul> <p><b>These cultural landscapes therefore illustrate the extent, the ambition and the evolution of this experiment, that lasted one and a half century.</b></p> <p>➔ as has been stated in the (slightly adapted) OUV of February 2018, Supplement 2.</p>	ICOMOS provided a summary of the proposed Justification. It acknowledges that the full justification was longer than the sentences quoted.
p. 159, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 30 <sup>th</sup> – 41 <sup>th</sup> line	After its first Panel meeting, ICOMOS observed to the States Parties that what has been proposed in the justification of Outstanding Universal Value mainly relates to the founding period of the colonies (1818 to 1825-, while later periods represent an evolution of this original plan. However, ICOMOS also noted that large amounts of what is seen on the ground within the property today are the result of <b>later developments</b> that have led to the creation of prisons, and institutions that relate to <b>the roles of the State in social control, roles that are different from the original intent of the colonies, i.e. poverty reduction, which obscure the original layout.</b>	➔ <b>Although we do not contest that the ICOMOS panel may have observed what is stated here, we would like to emphasize that its assessment is <u>not correct</u>. As we explained in Supplement 2 (February 2018), the principles of the colony-model are <u>not</u> limited to the founding period, but stayed intact for about one and a half century. The later developments that are referred to by ICOMOS have not at all led to the creation of prisons and institutions. The introduction of these developments were the result of general changes in society: in the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the existence of the Colonies of Benevolence gradually became less urgent due to reduced levels of poverty among the population and the emergence of the welfare state. In several cases, prisons and other institutions were proposed as a suitable form of adaptive re-use. The former colony-buildings and structures were re-used for this new function.</b>	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.

p. 159, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 52 <sup>th</sup> – 55 <sup>th</sup> line  p. 160, 1 <sup>st</sup> column, 1 <sup>th</sup> – 3 <sup>th</sup> line	ICOMOS acknowledges that the characterisation of the late 19 <sup>th</sup> century developments in the unfree colonies are different from prisons, but it also notes that Wortel, Veenhuizen, and Merksplas became genuine penal institutions in the <b>early 20<sup>th</sup> century and thus have been used in this way for longer than they existed as unfree colonies.</b>	ICOMOS acknowledges that the characterisation of the late 19 <sup>th</sup> century developments in the unfree Colonies are different from prisons, but it also notes that Wortel, Veenhuizen, and Merksplas partly became genuine penal institutions, although only from the <b>middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century onwards, and thus have been used in this way for some decades.</b>	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.  ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change which modifies the meaning of the sentence.
p. 160, 1 <sup>st</sup> column, 8 <sup>th</sup> – 12 <sup>th</sup> line	ICOMOS does not consider that <b>the free and unfree colonies were created for the same reasons or to reflect the same ideology. The unfree colonies arose from the lack of sustainability of the free colonies but in changing the model departed from the original rationale.</b>	→ <b>This analysis or statement is incorrect: the free and unfree colonies were developed and built at the same time, and were part of a single strategy. Both types of Colonies were built for specific target groups. In tailoring the model to different groups, the Society of Benevolence did <u>not</u> depart from the original rationale.</b>	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
p. 160, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 3 <sup>th</sup> – 9 <sup>th</sup> line	Frederiksoord, Wilhelminaoord and Willemsoord retain avenues, with a rhythmic pattern of house placement reflecting the ribbon layout of the founding period of these colonies, but at Willemsoord part of the layout has been obscured by new housing, the layout of Veenhuizen has been <b>obscured</b> by a modern village, <b>and at Merksplas by a cemetery.</b>	Frederiksoord, Wilhelminaoord and Willemsoord retain avenues, with a rhythmic pattern of house placement reflecting the ribbon layout of the founding period of these Colonies, but at Willemsoord part of the layout has been obscured by new housing, The layout of Veenhuizen, has been <b>modestly affected</b> by a modern village.  → <b>The historical cemetery at Merksplas is an attribute.</b>	ICOMOS accepts the correction relating to the cemetery; the other correction reflects a difference of opinion.
p. 160, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 48 <sup>th</sup> – 49 <sup>th</sup> line	The Veldzicht building is part of this complex, and is <b>completely surrounded</b> by modern buildings.	The Veldzicht building is part of this complex, and is <b>flanked by</b> modern buildings.	ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change which modifies the meaning of the sentence.
p. 160 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 50 <sup>th</sup> - 52 <sup>th</sup> line	There is a small neighbourhood of modern houses adjacent to a row of <b>post-1918</b> staff houses at the north end of the component.	There is a small neighbourhood of modern houses adjacent to a row of <b>late-19<sup>th</sup> and early-20<sup>th</sup> century</b> staff houses at the north end of the component.	ICOMOS accepts this clarification.
p. 161, 1 <sup>st</sup> column, 10 <sup>th</sup> – 12 <sup>th</sup> line	For Merksplas, <b>many of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century central buildings</b> have been incorporated into a <b>modern</b> prison whose limits have not been mapped.	For Merksplas, <b>a few of the late-19<sup>th</sup> century central buildings</b> have been incorporated into <b>an active</b> prison whose limits have not been mapped.	ICOMOS accepts this clarification.
p. 161, 1 <sup>st</sup> column, 17 <sup>th</sup> – 22 <sup>th</sup> line	While the changes made during the 19 <sup>th</sup> century can be said to reflect the evolution of the colonies as social communities, the changes made during the <b>early 20<sup>th</sup> century</b> and since related to new housing, <b>cemeteries</b> , active prisons, state institutions and other complexes, <b>impact</b> on the coherence of the settlements.	While the changes made during the 19 <sup>th</sup> century can be said to reflect the evolution of the colonies as social communities, the changes made during the <b>middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century</b> and since related to new housing, active prisons, state institutions and other complexes <b>have a minor impact</b> on the coherence of the settlements.	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.  ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
p. 161, 1 <sup>st</sup> column, 45 <sup>th</sup> –	ICOMOS considers that <b>this justification for authenticity is</b>	→ <b>Although ICOMOS is of course free to consider that this justification for authenticity is not in every aspect in</b>	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of

53 <sup>th</sup> line p. 161, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 1 <sup>th</sup> – 2 <sup>th</sup> line	<b>not quite in line with the proposed Outstanding Universal Value</b> that does not encompass their evolution to the present day as ongoing social communities. If authenticity is narrowed to relate to the 80-90 year period when the free and unfree colonies flourished, then the changes that have taken place in many of the component sites impact adversely on their potential to convey the ideals and idealism associated with their founding. There is also a further issues as to whether the unfree colonies can reflect these ideals.	<b>line with the proposed Outstanding Universal Value, we would like to stress we have another interpretation.</b>  <b>As both types of Colonies have the same origin, all Colonies can – and do - reflect these ideals.</b>	opinion.
p. 162, 1 <sup>st</sup> column, 6 <sup>th</sup> – 10 <sup>th</sup> line	The Colonies of Benevolence were ultimately not wholly succesful but their scale meant that many tens of thousands of people lived in them <b>during the 80-90 years they were functioning</b> as housing for individuals and families.	The Colonies of Benevolence were ultimately not wholly successful but their scale meant that many tens of thousands of people lived in them <b>during the 150+ years they were functioning</b> as accommodation for individuals and families.	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
p. 162, 1 <sup>st</sup> column, 44 <sup>th</sup> – 53 <sup>th</sup> line	ICOMOS considers that this criterion is <b>more</b> appropriately used <b>for a property that</b> reflects the <b>traditional interaction of communities with their environment over time. Such a property would reflect the constraints and opportunities offered by the environment. In the case of</b> the Colonies of Benevolence, the settlement and their agricultural lands were designed to be implanted on the environment and <b>do not</b> reflect traditional practices <b>or any sort of traditional</b> interaction with the environment over time.	<b>→ We take note of the fact that ICOMOS considers that this criterion would be more appropriately used for a property that reflects traditional interaction of communities with their environment over time. However, this is an interpretation that is contradicted by past inscriptions based on this criterion. In that sense, we feel the Colonies of Benevolence fit the description of criterion (v) in the Operational Guidelines based on the following arguments.</b>  <b>1. The Colonies of Benevolence mark the beginning of a revolution in the European tradition of care for the poor. Therefore they can be seen as bearing testimony to the cultural tradition of poverty reduction in this region.</b>  <b>2. The property reflects the Dutch tradition to ‘implant’ settlements and landscape patterns on the natural environment, like they did in Beemster Polder (a former lake) and the Zuyderzee polders (a former sea), creating man-made cultural landscapes. In the Colonies of Benevolence, the settlement and their agricultural lands were designed to be implanted on the environment and they reflect the Dutch traditional practices of interaction with the environment over time.</b>	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
p. 162, 2 <sup>nd</sup>	Although the colonies are in	Although the Colonies are in rural areas,	ICOMOS considers that

column, 37 <sup>th</sup> – 43 <sup>th</sup> line	rural areas, <del>villages and towns</del> are close by, and <b>there is risk</b> of further urban development in and around the Colonies.	<b>villages</b> are close by, and <b>there is barely risk</b> of further urban development in and around the Colonies.	this reflects a difference of opinion.
p. 163, 1 <sup>st</sup> column, 6 <sup>th</sup> – 8 <sup>th</sup> line	Icomos notes that the full or final extent of <b>what construction will be allowed is not fully descibed in the documentation that has been provided.</b>	→ <b>All zoning plans in which this is set out were shared during the technical evaluation mission, and were part of the Annexes to Supplement 1, that was sent to ICOMOS in November 2017.</b>	ICOMOS notes that this specific information has been submitted in Dutch.
p. 163, 1 <sup>st</sup> column, 9 <sup>th</sup> – 12 <sup>th</sup> line	This issue <del>also applies</del> to the acceptable size of new <b>structures</b> , especially farm buildings, some of which are far larger than any building constructed in the 19th or early 20th century.	This issue <b>does not apply</b> to the acceptable size of new <b>buildings</b> , especially farm buildings, some of which are far larger than any building constructed in the 19th or early 20th century.  → <b>The relevant documentation was part of the Annexes to Supplement 1, that was sent to ICOMOS in November 2017.</b>	ICOMOS notes that this specific information has been submitted in Dutch.
p. 163, 1 <sup>st</sup> column, 21 <sup>th</sup> – 25 <sup>th</sup> line	The operational requirements of the current prison and detention uses (fences, exclusion zones, parking lots, potential redevelopment as security needs change) <b>also contributes to the loss of</b> spatial cohesion of the components.	The operational requirements of the current prison and detention uses (fences, exclusion zones, parking lots, potential redevelopment as security needs change) <b>do partly affect the</b> spatial cohesion of the components. <b>However, their impact is limited to a specific part of the former Colony.</b>	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
p. 163, 1 <sup>st</sup> column, 25 <sup>th</sup> – 26 <sup>th</sup> line	The incompatibility of detention facilities with tourism is <del>also</del> a factor.	The incompatibility of detention facilities with tourism is <b>not</b> a factor. <b>In 2011 Veenhuizen received the prestigious Eden Award for this, the European tourism award that awards and promotes sustainable tourism.</b>	ICOMOS accepts this clarification.
p. 163 1 <sup>st</sup> column, 39 <sup>th</sup> – 40 <sup>th</sup> line	There <del>has been no</del> analysis of the tourism carrying capacity of the nominated property.	There <b>have been several analyses</b> of the tourism carrying capacity of the nominated property <b>as part of policy plans and zoning plans.</b>  → see Management Plan, para 5.3.5.	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
p. 163, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 20 <sup>th</sup> – 22 <sup>th</sup> line	At Wortel, two greenhouses have been built just outside the property <b>and these structures about the boundary directly.</b>	At Wortel, two greenhouses have been built just outside the property. <b>By the planting of a green screen of hedges around the greenhouses, the visual impact of these structures on the property is significantly limited.</b>	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
p. 163, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 46 <sup>th</sup> – 47 <sup>th</sup> line	In Belgium, <del>the Kempens Landschap land trust is a major landowner.</del>	In Belgium, <b>the Colonies of Wortel and Merksplas are in communal hands. Kempens Landschap owns the farm in Wortel-Colony.</b>	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
p. 164, 1 <sup>st</sup> column, 44 <sup>th</sup> – 47 <sup>th</sup> line	ICOMOS considers that the legal protection in place is adequate for individual buildings, but needs strengthening for the overall landscape where some parts of the components <del>have no protection.</del>	ICOMOS considers that the legal protection in place is adequate for individual buildings, but needs strengthening for the overall landscape where some parts of the components <b>are protected by restrictive zoning plans.</b>	ICOMOS accepts this clarification.
p. 165, 1 <sup>st</sup>	As regards the design of new	As regards the design of new buildings,	ICOMOS accepts this

column, 6 <sup>th</sup> – 11 <sup>th</sup> line	buildings, there is generally a more conservative trend, for example one farm at Wortel where new buildings tend to follow a ‘traditional/historical’ design, <del>although a new steel shed at Merksplas is an exception to this trend.</del>	there is generally a more conservative trend, for example one farm at Wortel where new buildings tend to follow a ‘traditional/historical’ design. <b>A provisional steel roof covering was put in place at Merksplas to protect the historical buildings in anticipation of planned restoration.</b>	clarification.
p. 165, 1 <sup>st</sup> column, 43 <sup>th</sup> – 45 <sup>th</sup> line	<b>It appears that most responsibilities for the management of the property will be given to <del>existing staff, rather than new dedicated staff.</del></b>	<b>The responsibilities for the management of the property will be given to dedicated and trained staff.</b>	ICOMOS accepts this clarification.
p. 165, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 22 <sup>th</sup> – 25 <sup>th</sup> line	The plan states that site managers should be prepared for and be able to respond to risks and calamities, <del>but there is almost no analysis or discussion of specific risks.</del>	The plan states that site managers should be prepared for and be able to respond to risks and calamities, <b>and analyses and discussions of specific risks have taken place.</b>  → See Management Plan para 5.3.3 and 5.4.3, dealing with climate change, environmental impact and natural disasters, calamities and risk management.	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
p. 165, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 40 <sup>th</sup> – 42 <sup>th</sup> line	There <del>is an absence</del> in the management plan <b>of any</b> site-specific proposals for active conservation.	There <b>are several notions</b> in the management plan of site-specific proposals for active conservation.  → See Management Plan, part 2 (subsections), para 7 until 10.5.1.5 (Rehabilitation of landscape, nature and buildings), 7 until 10.5.2 (State of conservation) and 7 until 10.5.1.4. (concerning nature).	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
p. 166, 1 <sup>st</sup> column, 16 <sup>th</sup> – 17 <sup>th</sup> line	There is <del>little mention</del> in the dossier <b>of the involvement</b> of local communities in either country.	There is <b>detailed information</b> in the dossier <b>of the active involvement</b> of local communities in either country .  → See chapter 4 of the nomination file and chapters 7, 8, 9 and 10 of the Management Plan.	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
p. 166, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 1 <sup>st</sup> – 3 <sup>th</sup> line	<b>It appears that</b> the results of the various monitoring activities <b>will not be</b> gathered into one place, <b>except</b> in preparation for periodic reviews.	The results of the various monitoring activities <b>will continuously be</b> gathered into one place, <b>also when</b> in preparation for periodic reviews.	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
p. 166, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 42 <sup>th</sup> – 45 <sup>th</sup> line	<del>A second phase of the colonies</del> developed as ‘unfree’ communities that took in beggars, vagrants and people with medical problems, there were organized in an institutional manner.	<b>From the start, some</b> Colonies developed as ‘unfree’ communities that took in beggars, vagrants and people with medical problems, there were organized in an institutional manner.	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
p. 166, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 45 <sup>th</sup> – 48 <sup>th</sup> line	<del>Several of these unfree colonies were subsequently turned into prisons in the first quarter of the 20th century</del> and still maintain that role.	<b>In the unfree Colonies, a relatively small part was readapted into state-run correctional facilities. This evolution started mainly after the second World War, and these facilities still maintain that role.</b>	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference in emphasis.
p. 167, 1 <sup>st</sup>	<del>The lack of sustainability of</del>	<b>From the very start, the initiative to</b>	ICOMOS considers that

column, 3 <sup>th</sup> – 9 <sup>th</sup> line	<del>the original colonies led to later colonies becoming institutional rather than ‘free’ communities. This was an expedient solution to bring in the necessary funding from the State but it did change the fundamental approach of the colonies away from improving the lives of families and communities through agricultural work.</del>	found Colonies of Benevolence was supported by the state, by a number of senior government officials and by the royal family. All Colonies, whether free or unfree, had to rely on financial support by the state. The approach of improving the lives of all poor, both families and individuals, ‘decent’ as well as ‘indecent’ poor, continued until at least the middle of the 20 <sup>th</sup> century.	this reflects a difference of opinion.
p. 167, 1 <sup>st</sup> column, 9 <sup>th</sup> – 10 <sup>th</sup> line	<del>The unfree colonies cannot be seen as an evolution that supports the original ideas.</del>	Both the free and unfree Colonies express the original ideas of the Society of Benevolence with respect to the reduction of poverty. Both were initiated alternately by the Society, within the same time frame (1818-1825).	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
p. 167, 1 <sup>st</sup> column, 14 <sup>th</sup> – 15 <sup>th</sup> line	And in all sites the entirety of their farmland <b>has not</b> survived.	And in all sites the entirety of their farmland <b>has</b> survived.	ICOMOS accepts this correction.
p. following p. 167, photograph at the bottom	<del>Wilhelmina</del> oord, Netherlands	Willemsoord, Netherlands	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a 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):** China

**EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE:** Historic Monuments and Sites of Ancient Quanzhou (Zayton)

**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.69, column 1, para 2, line 2	Construction began in 1111 (Song Dynasty), and a restoration financed by a maritime businessman occurred in <b>1336-1369</b> (Yuan Dynasty), reflecting the prosperity of Quanzhou in the 14th century.	Construction began in 1111 (Song Dynasty), and a restoration financed by a maritime businessman occurred in <b>1336-1339</b> (Yuan Dynasty), reflecting the prosperity of Quanzhou in the 14th century.	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
p.69, column 1, para 3, line 4	In 1068 (Song Dynasty) an over-water fortress was built here, <b>along with</b> a bridge, paths and stairs.	In 1068 (Song Dynasty), an over-water fortress was built here. <b>Between 1086 and 1094</b> , a bridge, paths and stairs <b>were added</b> .	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
p.69, column 1, para 5, line 1	The Jiuri Mountain Wind-Praying Carvings are records of prayers and ceremonies for smooth sailing, <b>and reflect</b> the uncertainty of the winds.	The Jiuri Mountain Wind-Praying Carvings are records of prayers and ceremonies for smooth sailing, <b>which are important historical documents of events organized by official maritime trade management authorities. It reflects the time-honored maritime tradition of Quanzhou as well as the uncertainty of the winds.</b>  <i>Remark: The Jiuri Mountain Wind-Praying Carvings are valuable, because they are important physical evidence that records events and activities organized by maritime trade management authorities of ancient China, reflecting the unique maritime tradition of Quanzhou that respects the law of nature, rather than reflecting the uncertainty of the winds.</i>	ICOMOS considers that these corrections re-iterate arguments put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
p.69, column 2, para 1, line 4	The Song Dynasty stone foundation remains, and the wooden structure preserves the original features of the <b>Qing</b> Dynasty.	The Song Dynasty stone foundation remains, and the wooden structure <b>repaired in the Qing Dynasty</b> preserves the original features of the <b>Song</b> Dynasty.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
p.69, column 2, para 6, line 3	They were restored in the Yuan Dynasty, and <b>again</b> in 1962.	They were restored in the Yuan Dynasty, and <b>the tomb pavilion was repaired in 1962.</b>	ICOMOS considers this correction to be a clarification.

p.70, column 1, para 2, line 1	The Statue of Mani in the Cao'an Temple is the world's only remaining stone statue of Mani, the founder of Manichaeism or Zoroastrianism, which was introduced to China around the 6 <sup>th</sup> -7 <sup>th</sup> century. Originally <b>built in</b> a thatch building between 1131 and 1162 (Song Dynasty), <b>the stone temple was built</b> in the Yuan Dynasty.	The Statue of Mani in the Cao'an Temple is <b>the original piece carved in 1339. It is</b> the world's only remaining stone statue of Mani, the founder of Manichaeism or Zoroastrianism, which was introduced to China around the 6 <sup>th</sup> -7 <sup>th</sup> century. <b>Cao'an Temple was</b> originally a thatch building <b>built</b> between 1131 and 1162 (Song Dynasty), <b>and was rebuilt into a stone temple</b> in the Yuan Dynasty.  <i>Remark: The description of the evaluation report may cause confusion on the age of the statue.</i>	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
p.70, column 1, para 4, line 2	The Luoyang Bridge (Wan'an Bridge) was built between <b>1056</b> and 1059 ( <b>Yuan</b> Dynasty)	The Luoyang Bridge (Wan'an Bridge) was built between <b>1053</b> and 1059 ( <b>Song</b> Dynasty).	ICOMOS considers that this correction provides information which contradicts information provided at earlier stages of the evaluation procedure. Ref: Nomination Dossier Vol. 2, p. 269. However, there are other statements within the nomination dossier which contradict this statement in different ways Ref: Nomination Dossier Vol. 2, p. 314, 382. ICOMOS therefore considers this correction to be a clarification.
p.70, column 2, para 4, line 4	Chinese and Arab merchants settled in Quanzhou, facilitating exchanges between the Central Plain area and the southeast coastal area.	Chinese and Arab merchants settled in Quanzhou, facilitating <b>not only</b> exchanges between the Central Plain area the southeast coastal area, <b>but also the dissemination, interchange and fusion of the culture of Quanzhou and diverse cultures of the world.</b>  <i>Remark: The evaluation report should fully and precisely cite the original text.</i>	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
p.72, column 2, para 2, line 1	The serial approach is justified by the State Party in order to represent the most significant characteristics of three identified dimensions of Quanzhou's maritime trading prominence in the 10 <sup>th</sup> to 14 <sup>th</sup> centuries, namely: <b>the port and the city's infrastructure (docks, city gate, landmarks); the religious diversity of Quanzhou, including evidence of Confucianism, Buddhism, Taoism, Islam, Manichaeism, Nestorianism, Hinduism, and local belief systems; and the industrial production of trade products (porcelain kilns).</b>	The serial approach is justified by the State Party in order to represent the most significant characteristics of <b>"interchange"</b> in three identified dimensions of Quanzhou's maritime trading prominence in the 10 <sup>th</sup> to 14 <sup>th</sup> centuries, namely: <b>a) representative productions that provide needs and driving forces for interchange, both tangible and intangible (porcelain kilns etc.) ; b) infrastructure necessary for interchange, such as the unique sea-river-land transportation system contained in the serial nomination and the social form that features the fusion between maritime culture and land culture, belief and tradition (docks, navigation towers, etc.) ; and c) fruitful outcomes resulting from such interchange and their contribution to and significance for the progress of</b>	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.

		<p><b>human civilization as a whole (temples and tomb) .</b></p> <p><i>Remark: The citation in the evaluation report should be consistent with the original text of the additional information document.</i></p>	
p.73, column 1, para 2, line 11	...and many have been <b>reconstructed or substantially restored</b> since the period when Quanzhou played its pivotal role in the maritime trading networks.	<p><i>Remark: The so-called “Reconstructed or substantially restored” is actually the repair and conservation work carried out in light of their original state, on the basis of characteristics of Oriental wood-structured buildings. The description is ambiguous with respect to the time and nominated components referred to, and inconsistent with the fact. It has evoked serious misunderstanding and misinterpretation and should be further clarified or deleted.</i></p>	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
p.73, column 2, para 6, line 1	The tomb pavilion of the Islamic Tombs was restored in 1962, and there were <b>extensive conservation works</b> to the tombs in the 1990s.	The tomb pavilion of the Islamic Tombs was repaired in 1962, and there were <b>some treatment</b> to the <b>surroundings</b> in the 1990s.	ICOMOS considers this correction to be a clarification.
p.73, column 2, para 7, line 1	The statue of <b>Manu</b> in the Cao'an Temple <b>was built in the 12<sup>th</sup> century, but was rebuilt in 1339 in stone, with other elements rebuilt in the modern period.</b>	<p>The Statue of <b>Mani</b> in the Cao'an Temple <b>is the original piece carved</b> in 1339.</p> <p><i>Remark: The evaluation report confused the history of the statue and the building.</i></p>	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
p.73, column 2, para 10, line 1	ICOMOS notes that many components have been <b>extensively restored or reconstructed.</b>	<p><i>Remark: The so-called “Extensively restored or reconstructed” is actually the repair and conservation work carried out in a few parts of wooden structures, in light of their original state, on the basis of characteristics of Oriental wood-structured buildings. The description is ambiguous with respect to the time and nominated components referred to, and inconsistent with the fact. It has evoked serious misunderstanding and misinterpretation and should be further clarified or deleted.</i></p>	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
p.74, column 1, para 1, line 9	<p>[Criterion (ii)]:</p> <p>...</p> <p>In additional information, the State Party claims that the evidence for this criterion is based on the writings of Marco Polo, Odorico da Pordenone and Ibn Battuta, and the remains of the docks, shipwrecks and porcelain. The State Party also argues that the components can demonstrate the easternmost dissemination of several world religions during this period.</p>	<p><i>Remark: This is a misreading of the second additional information document, “the writings of Marco Polo, Odorico da Pordenone and Ibn Battuta, and the remains of the docks, shipwrecks and porcelain” and “the easternmost dissemination of several world religions during this period” are presented to justify criterion (vi), rather than criterion (ii).</i></p> <p><i>The original text in the second additional information document is as following:</i></p> <p><i>“The most famous ones are the epic journeys by Venetian Marco Polo and Moroccan Muslim scholar Ibn Battuta, which have been supported by ancient records in various languages and historical contexts as well as by dock remains and shipwrecks, porcelain and migration evidence in the serial nomination. In addition, the serial nomination also bears a testimony to the</i></p>	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.

		<p><i>easternmost dissemination of several world-famous religions over the period of the 10th to 14th centuries, among which the Statue of Mani in Cao'an Temple is the only existing of its kind in the world and the Islamic monuments and sites are the masterpieces rarely seen in their times.</i></p> <p><i>The State Party considers whether they can help to support the nomination as presented in criterion (vi): "...".</i></p>	
p.74, column 1, para 5, line 8	<p>[Criterion (iii)]:</p> <p>...</p> <p>In additional information, the State Party argues that the components demonstrate a fusion of diverse cultures, pointing to the different religions represented by the nominated components.</p>	<p><i>Remark: It is another misreading of the second additional information document. "the components demonstrate a fusion of diverse cultures" and "the different religions represented by the nomination components" are presented in order to justify criterion (ii), rather than criterion (iii).</i></p> <p><i>With respect to criterion (iii), the State Party further considered in the second additional information document that the serial nomination bears a testimony to three traditions that enable it to meet criterion (iii), including "an outstanding tradition of stone architecture and stonework craftsmanship in ancient East; a tradition of maritime culture based on the richness of culture and arts and the respect for religious beliefs in the agricultural empire of ancient China; and especially valuable, a tradition of mutual respect, inclusion, peaceful co-existence and common prosperity of diverse cultures which contributes to the spirit of human civilization."</i></p>	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
p.74, column 2, para 8, line 1	<p>[Criterion (vi)]:</p> <p>...</p> <p>In the additional information received in February 2018, the State Party added new strands to its justification of this criterion. The first is that the use and working of stone in the components is evidence of traditions that resulted in rare masterpieces of craftsmanship. The second makes reference to the sea-river-inland connectivity that underpinned Quanzhou's prominence and prosperity. ICOMOS considers that these arguments are both under-developed, and are not supported with sufficient evidence. Each of these requires thorough further attention to their comparative context.</p>	<p><i>Remark: It is again a misreading of the second additional information document. The two points elaborated in the second additional information document are expressed in a separate paragraph following the end part of the justification of criterion (vi). They are related to another topic, that is, cultural, social and functional links to recognize the nomination as a serial property, which is specified in the Operational Guidelines. They are not associated with the justification of criterion (vi).</i></p>	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
p.79, column 1, para 4, line 9	<p><b>...and little of the port itself remains.</b></p>	<p><i>Remark: The description is against the fact. There are two representative port sites in the sixteen components of the nomination submitted by the State Party – Shihu Dock and Estuary Docks. The latter is also a combination of two adjacent docks. This description should be therefore deleted.</i></p>	ICOMOS considers that this reflects 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):** Denmark

**EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE:** Aasivissuit – Nipisat. Inuit Hunting Ground between Ice and Sea

**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 191, column 1, line 22	'including tent rings and tent houses ....'	'including Inuit tent rings and tent houses...'	ICOMOS considers this to be a clarification.
Page 192, column 1, line 50	'accommodating 4-6 families.'	accommodating 4-6, but sometimes even more families.	ICOMOS considers this to be a clarification.
Page 193, column 2, line 47	'medicinal plants...'	nutritional plants...	ICOMOS considers this to be a clarification.
Page 194, column 2, line 45	'... large cache of caribou antlers...'	'... large midden of caribou antlers...'	ICOMOS considers this correction to be a clarification. However, the ICOMOS terminology is the one used by the State Party in the additional information provided on 22 February 2018, p. 11 "exposing a large cache of caribou antlers"

## 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:** Historic Urban Ensemble of Nîmes

**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 229 Col II L 32	Le quartier, l'Ecusson, forme presque triangulaire comporte un monument romain <b>à chaque</b> angle :	... un monument romain <b>presque (ou pratiquement) à chaque</b> angle. (L'angle exact est constitué par l'actuel square Antonin.)	L'ICOMOS accepte cette clarification.
P 230 Col I L 25	Deux portes des remparts romains originels subsistent : la Porte d'Auguste et la Porte de France, <b>toutes deux situées au sein de l'Ecusson</b>	<b>toutes deux situées au sein ou à proximité de l'Ecusson</b> (La Porte de France n'est pas dans l'Ecusson)	L'ICOMOS accepte cette correction comme une erreur factuelle.
P 231 Col II L 1	Après la fin des guerres de religion au début du XVII <sup>e</sup> siècle, <b>les fortifications médiévales commencèrent à être retirées, révélant ainsi les ruines romaines de l'Augusteum ( le temple de Diane) et la Tour Magne considérés comme des monuments majeurs situés à l'extérieur de la ville.</b>	<b>les fortifications de Rohan commencèrent à être retirées. Le rempart médiéval qui entourait la ville fut progressivement démolie entre 1787 et 1793. Le site de l'Augusteum fut redécouvert en 1738 à l'occasion des grands travaux d'aménagement du Jardin de la Fontaine qui intègrent le temple de Diane et la Tour Magne considérés comme des monuments majeurs situés à l'extérieur de la ville.</b>	L'ICOMOS accepte cette clarification.
P 231 Col I L 6	Plus tard au <b>XVII<sup>e</sup></b> siècle, une période d'investissement civique et de renouveau commença.	<b>XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle</b>	L'ICOMOS accepte cette correction comme une erreur factuelle.
P 231 Col I L 8	<b>La Maison Carrée fut restituée à l'Etat et restaurée.</b>	<b>La Maison Carrée fut restituée à l'Etat et restaurée au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle</b>	L'ICOMOS accepte cette clarification.
P 231 Col I L 43	La construction d'un nouveau musée, le musée de la Romanité, <b>a commencé</b> à côté de l'amphithéâtre.	<b>s'est achevée</b>	L'ICOMOS accepte cette clarification.
P 238 Col I L 19	Le quartier, l'Ecusson, forme presque triangulaire comporte un monument romain <b>à chaque</b> angle	... un monument romain <b>presque (ou pratiquement) à chaque</b> angle. (L'angle exact est constitué par l'actuel square Antonin.)	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification.
P 238 Col II L 49	L'ICOMOS encourage l'Etat partie <b>à se travailler</b> davantage à une analyse ...	<b>à travailler</b>	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette erreur de frappe.

## 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):** Germany

**EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE:** The Archaeological Border Landscape of Hedeby and the Danevirke

**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
220, left col, 3. Para, line 5	Hedeby in conjunction with the Danevirke were at the centre of the networks of mainly maritime trade and exchange between Western and Northern Europe as well as at the core of the borderland between the Danish kingdom the Frankish empire <b>and</b> over several centuries.	Hedeby in conjunction with the Danevirke were at the centre of the networks of mainly maritime trade and exchange between Western and Northern Europe as well as at the core of the borderland between the Danish kingdom <b>and</b> the Frankish empire over several centuries.	ICOMOS acknowledges this typing error.
223, Top photograph	<b>Arial view of Hedeby and the Semicircular Wall</b>	Arial view of the Crooked Wall, a levelled bastion from the 19 <sup>th</sup> century in the foreground	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a 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):** Iran (Islamic Republic of)

**EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE:** Sassanid Archaeological Landscape of Fars Region

**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
101-1-4	This serial nomination proposes 8 selected archaeological site components in three geographical area contexts at Firuzabad, Bishapur and Sarvestan, all located in the <b>south-eastern</b> Fars Province of Iran.	Please change the sentences to “... <b>Firuzabad, Bishapur and Sarvestan, all located in the south-western Fars Province of Iran.</b> ”	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
101-1-15	These fortification structures, palaces, reliefs and city plans date back to the <b>earliest and latest moments</b> of the Sassanian Empire, which stretched across the region from 224 to 658 CE.	Please change the sentences to “... <b>date back to the earliest, middle and latest moments of the Sassanian Empire....</b> ”	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
102-1-20	However, this ruined bridge is not only in an extremely poor state of conservation, it is also <b>not currently included in the property boundaries.</b>	The bridge is part of Component 2 “heading 2.a.1.2 Ardashir Investiture Relief” (check maps) and described in detail on p. 36. It has not been given a different component because it is at a very short distance from the relief and it is included in the property boundaries.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification. However, as the bridge is not shown on the maps, it is difficult to confirm that it is in the proposed nominated area.
102-2-2	these pillars are <b>repair measures</b> intended to strengthen the arch...	This is exactly the meaning of State Party line 102-2-1: the pillars are repairs, but ancient, as shown by the succession of floor levels in the Main Ivan and show the continuous use of the building.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
102-2-19	Much of this Sassanian city has been built <b>upon during the Islamic era...</b>	This acknowledges also that the city, after its foundation by Shapur, was inhabited throughout the Sassanian period!	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.

102-2-31	In the narrow gorge of Tang-e Chogan leading further eastwards, <b>seven</b> rock carved stone reliefs depicting different scenes and portraits are included in the nominated property.	In the narrow gorge of Tang-e Chogan leading further eastwards, <b>six</b> rock carved stone reliefs depicting different scenes and portraits are included in the nominated property.	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
103-1-20,21	<b>Sentence:</b> The remains at Naqsh-e Rostam, although located in the Fars region, <b>are not included in the serial nomination.</b>	The Sassanian remains at Naqsh-e Rostam <b>do not belong</b> to the “Sassanid archaeological landscape”, because they were added in the royal necropolis of the Achaemenid period. For this reason they have necessarily been left out of SALF project, despite their ideological importance which is however stressed in the project, in order to maintain the coherence of SALF	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
103-2-27	<b>Sentence:</b> The two so-called archaeological landscapes compared <b>are not well-known for landscape features...</b>	Even though Pasargadae and Persepolis are not registered in an Unitarian landscape project, they do give evidence of the same approach of the Achaemenid emperors towards landscape: recent geophysical and archaeological surveys have shown that land planning in the two sites was extremely similar. Thus the comparison was meant in order to show the difference between the Achaemenid and the Sassanid Archaeological Landscapes.  As for the other circular cities brought for comparison, Zincirli and Hatra were also meant to underline the diversity with the Sassanid foundations, despite the apparent similarity, while Darabgird and Baghdad were included to show how the Sassanid model persisted in the Post-Sassanid era.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
103-2-27	The two so-called archaeological landscapes compared are not well-known for landscape features and <b>predate the nominated property considerably. They therefore do not well compare in terms of typology or timeframe.</b>	Is this fact negative? An historical perspective is commonly part of a scientific approach and has been adopted as a methodological basis for the right historical appreciation of the Outstanding Universal Value of SALF.	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
103-2-54 to 57	ICOMOS does not consider that the proposed serial property includes a relevant selection of sites to represent what could be considered <b>the archaeological landscape of the Sassanid Empire.</b>	The archaeological landscape of the Sassanid Empire is not the subject of the project because it does not exist, given the extension of the Empire.  With reference to the sites mentioned as wrongly excluded on lines 44-46, Naqsh-e Rostam and Naqsh-e Rajab, even though in Fars and bearing evidence of Sassanid age, belong to an Achaemenid archaeological landscape and would have	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.

		not been consistent with the project. The palace of Taq Kasra (which archaeologists date to the 6 <sup>th</sup> century CE and not to Shapur I) is in Iraq, and the city of Gundeshapur, scarcely known, is in the Iranian province of Khuzestan: how could they be in Sassanid Archaeological Landscape of Fars Region?	
104-2-10	the State Party highlighted that the 8 components did provide evidence of various historic moments of the Sassanid Empire, highlighting in particular the presence of the 5th century Mihr Narseh Bridge in Firuzabad, <b>which is not currently included in the property boundaries</b> , and later repair works at Ardashirs Palace.	The bridge is part of Component 2 “heading 2.a.1.2 Ardashir Investiture Relief” (check maps) and described in detail on p. 36. It has not been given a different component because it is at a very short distance from the relief.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.  However, as the bridge is not shown on the maps, it is difficult to confirm that it is in the proposed nominated area.
104-2-28	<b>The focus on the Fars region is restrictive when aiming to represent an empire</b> that stretched far beyond....	As already stated, the aim was not to represent a whole empire, an effort which must be impossible. Besides, Fars region was the cradle of the Sassanid dynasty, which maintained an important ideological role for the dynasty even if the capital of the empire was in Mesopotamia, as shown by the many architectural and artistic creations produced throughout the duration of the Empire.	ICOMOS considers that this correction provides information which contradicts information provided at earlier stages of the evaluation procedure.
104-2-31	ICOMOS considers that the focus on the Fars region is restrictive when aiming to <b>represent an empire</b> that stretched far beyond the boundaries of this central region in the contemporary Islamic Republic of Iran.	The aim of the project is not this.	ICOMOS considers that this correction provides information which contradicts information provided at earlier stages of the evaluation procedure.
104-2-37	However, if the Sassanid era <b>is to be considered in its entirety...</b>	The aim of the project is not this.	ICOMOS considers that this correction provides information which contradicts information provided at earlier stages of the evaluation procedure.
104-2-41 to 43	ICOMOS considers that it is conceptually impossible to represent an ancient empire, which lasted over four centuries and spread over a few thousand kilometers through three areas, which are rather constrained in the timeframe and regional context they present. Such approach would provide the false impression that Sassanid architecture and urban planning was entirely homogeneous over these vast territories and time	We agree on ICOMOS’view, and just for this reason the theme of the project was restricted to Fars Region and to the three component sites which share several aspect making possible to use the term Sassanid Archaeological Landscape of Fars. The project does not aim to represent the Sassanid Empire, but to stress the originality of the selected Fars monuments and cities and their influence in other areas and periods.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.

	span, which in ICOMOS' view is not the case		
<b>104-2-52 to 57</b>	The focus on the Fars Region further hinders the ability to illustrate the interaction and cross-fertilization of Sassanid architecture with remains of the Parthian Empire, Roman, Islamic and other influences.	The SALF sites offer the possibility to stress the following relevant interaction and corss-fertilization: With the Parthian Empire: use of the ivan at Qal'a-ye Dokhtar and Ardashir Palace, use of rock reliefs by Ardashir and successors - With the Roman empire: orthogonal plan of Bishapur, Roman influences on rock reliefs of Bishapur - With Islamic period: Adoption of dome on squinches and ivan by Islamic architecture, as first shown by Sarvestan component site. Of all the regions of Sassanid empire, Fars is the only one where all these contacts are simultaneously present, differently from Khuzestan or Mesopotamia.	ICOMOS considers that this correction contains new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.
<b>105-1-31</b>	On the contrary, the sites gathered merely present its <b>very beginning and perhaps end</b> but by no means an evolution over four centuries.	merely present its very beginning, middle and perhaps end but ...	I ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
<b>108-4-3</b>	ICOMOS observes that the boundaries encompass all identified archaeological remains, with perhaps the <b>exception of the 5th century Mihr Narseh bridge foundation</b> near the bas relief of Ardashir's investment (component 2).	The bridge is part of Component 2 "heading 2.a.1.2 Ardashir Investiture Relief" (check maps) and described in detail on p. 36. It has not been given a different component because it is at a very short distance from the relief.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification. However, as the bridge is not shown on the maps, it is difficult to confirm that it is in the proposed nominated area.

## 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:** Ivrea, industrial city of the 20th century

**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 227, left column, lines 7 to 9	The nominated property and its buffer zone are protected according to legislative regimes <b>at the local, regional and national levels.</b>	The nominated property and its buffer zone are protected according to legislative regimes <b>at the national, regional and local levels.</b>  <b>Comment:</b> Listed in this order according to legislative regimes' priority	ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change which does not modify the meaning of the sentence.
Page 227, left column, lines 15 to 19	The national Cultural Heritage and Landscape Code, revised in 2004, makes a distinction between public and private property, <b>and is not intended to protect the heritage of the 20th century. It therefore has some limits in application.</b>	The national Cultural Heritage and Landscape Code, revised in 2004, makes a distinction between public and private property, <b>and protects heritage of the 20th century. In fact the national Cultural Heritage and Landscape Code provides overall protection on any typology of building (both interiors and exteriors)</b>  <b>Comment:</b> In Chapter 5b is written exactly the opposite (last paragraph of 5B and Box).	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
Page 227, left column, lines 46 to 51	ICOMOS considers that the system of legal protection is complex and that there are a number of specific arrangements that are not clear or well-coordinated. <b>The system seems to depend heavily on willingness at the local level, therefore the skills and resources in the relevant municipal departments are critically important.</b>	ICOMOS considers that the system of legal protection is complex and that there are a number of specific arrangements that are not clear or well-coordinated. <b>The National system of protection defines priorities for protection. These priorities are integrated in regional and local systems of protection, referred to the attributes of the nomination.</b>  <b>Comment:</b> The system of protection doesn't depend from local level but from the national system (Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities and Tourism), which has local offices all over the Italian territory. These Offices (Soprintendenze) assure conservation and protections of cultural heritage and guarantee the availability of experts in conservation (architects, archaeologists, art historians)	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.

		which provide assistance in defining intervention for restoration and reuse of listed buildings in accordance with the principles of conservation and restoration.	
Page 227, left column, lines 53 to 55	with a heavy reliance on the commitment, resources and expertise of the <b>municipal</b> authorities.	with a heavy reliance on the commitment, resources and expertise of the <b>national</b> authorities.	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
Page 227, right column, line 45	these archives <b>should be</b> clearly incorporated into the	these archives <b>are</b> clearly incorporated into the  <b>Comment:</b> Both in Nomination File (pp. 348-350) and in Management Plan, update no. 2 (B-3) documentation, p. 55)	ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.
Page 228, left column, line 40 to 44	The State Party estimates a <b>total cost of 3,710,285 Euros for the implementation of the actions identified in the Management Plan, including the costs of restoration, repair, maintenance and presentation of the buildings.</b>	<b>A cost of 3,710,285 Euros for the restoration of the nursery building.</b>  <b>Comment:</b> Planned in short term Action Plans of the Management Plan	ICOMOS considers that this correction provides information which contradicts information provided at earlier stages of the evaluation procedure.  Ref: Management Plan, p. 155, Total for Short-term Management Plan Delivery Budget
Page 229, right column, line 45 to 48	This situation poses considerable challenges which <b>are recognised by the State Party, by regional and local authorities, and by civil society organisations.</b>	This situation poses considerable challenges which <b>have already been undertaken by the State Party. Aiming at this purpose the State Party decided to submit the complete list of buildings of the Nominated Property to the highest level of protection (such as the national one), for both interiors and exteriors. The process has been completed for most of the building and it is ongoing for some of them.</b>  <b>Comment:</b> The listing process for the remaining residences is ongoing and some time more is needed because of the need to identify the single owners. The Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities and Tourism, in charge of this process, is working for completing the work.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.

## 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:** Le Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano a Valdobbiadene

**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 231, left, line 12-16 "Brief description"	<u>It is:</u> Located in the northern area of the province of Treviso, in the Veneto Region, the Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene comprises the vineyard landscape of Prosecco Conegliano Valdobbiadene Superiore DOCG appellation wine production area.	<u>It should read:</u> Located in the northern area of the province of Treviso, in the Veneto Region, the Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene comprises the <b>millenary natural historical, settlements and agrarian features of the Colline's agricultural and vineyard landscape, as represented by the Renaissance paintings and replicated along the migration routes by the scholars of Conegliano, encompassing most of the Prosecco Conegliano Valdobbiadene Superiore DOCG appellation wine production area.</b>	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
And  Page 231, right, line 34-39 "Description"	<u>It is:</u> Located in the northern area of the province of Treviso, in the Veneto Region, the <i>Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene</i> comprises the vineyard landscape of Prosecco Conegliano Valdobbiadene Superiore DOCG ( <i>Denominazione di Origine Controllata e Garantita</i> ) appellation wine production area.	<u>It should read:</u> Located in the northern area of the province of Treviso, in the Veneto Region, the <i>Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene</i> comprises the <b>millenary natural historical, settlements and agrarian features of the Colline's agricultural and vineyard landscape, as represented by the Renaissance paintings and replicated along the migration routes by the scholars of Conegliano, encompassing most of the Prosecco Conegliano Valdobbiadene Superiore DOCG (<i>Denominazione di Origine Controllata e Garantita</i>) appellation wine production area.</b>  <u>Comment</u> The boundaries of the nominated landscape cover the geomorphological system of the Colline, unique because for centuries inhabited and cultivated, and	

		<p>they are encompassing a millenary landscape construction and adaptation of its community; it should be also noted that the DOCG area doesn't perfectly match with the Colline, that the popular toponym "<i>Al prosecco</i>" was officialised already in 1811 and that the wine appellation is an effect of the quality of the nominated landscape and its productions, <u>and not vice versa</u>.</p> <p><u>The nominated area is an evolved landscape</u>, and consequently it is the result of a transformation (and precisely a low impact adaptation to the hard territory of the Colline) carried on through millenary efforts by its community.</p> <p>Therefore, the description should already take into account these key features and values proposed for the OUV, <u>such as the millenary adaptation to a tough and fragile territory, the balance between human activities and natural resources, the role of the nominated site both for the representation of the rural landscape in XV Renaissance paintings and for the construction of an agrarian landscape also replicated in new lands along the migration routes in XIX-XX centuries</u>.</p>	
<p>Page 231, left, lines 13-16, and page 231, right, lines 35-38</p> <p>Page 232, right, lines 40-42</p> <p>Page 235, left, lines 45-48</p> <p>Page 238, left, lines 9-11</p> <p>Page 238, right, lines 54-57</p>	<p><i>It is:</i></p> <p>the <i>Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene</i> <b>comprises</b> the vineyard landscape of Prosecco Conegliano Valdobbiadene Superiore DOCG</p> <p>the DOCG certification (<i>Denominazione di Origine Controllata e Garantita</i>) for Conegliano Valdobbiadene in <b>August 2010</b>.</p> <p>the determination of the nominated property has been based <b>mainly on the DOCG</b> appellation delimitation granted in 2010, <b>although not covering all of it</b>,</p> <p>The boundary of the nominated area covers <b>more or less</b> all the land within the recently designated (2009) Conegliano Valdobbiadene Prosecco Superiore <b>DOCG</b></p> <p>The property is also protected at the national level by the various regulations and orders introduced <b>since 1967</b> relating to guaranteed controlled appellation wines (<b>DOCG</b>).</p>	<p><i>Comment</i> <span style="float: right;"><b>Note 2</b></span></p> <p>For the mentioned lines, and in the rest of the evaluation report, the State party takes note of the confusion made about the DOCG area and the perimeters of the nominated landscape.</p> <p>As underlined in the nomination form, the area has been certified DOCG in 2010, and the nominated property doesn't match entirely within it; as ultra-centenary and complex agricultural landscape, the Colline comprises not only vineyards, but also natural, monumental and settlements areas. The nominated landscape, excluding the buffer zones, covers and of 20,334.20 ha, while the total area of vineyards covers about 5,690 ha.</p> <p>It should be noted also that lately in the report ICOMOS these perimeters while stating that "<i>The delimitation of the regional perimeter of the core zone essentially respects the topographic specificities that characterize the region of the Pre-alpine hills situated between the edge of the Alps and the plain.</i>" (page 238, left column, lines 13-16), also adding "<i>In conclusion, ICOMOS considers that <u>the boundaries of the nominated property could be considered adequate although they may benefit from a slight adjustment in some sections (south-west and north-east) to ensure more effective protection. The boundaries of the buffer zone are adequate</u></i>" (page 238, left column, lines 38-43).</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers this correction to be a clarification.</p>

<p>Page 231, left, line 29-31</p> <p><i>"Brief description</i></p>	<p><u><i>It is:</i></u></p> <p>which constitutes a redemption model for winemaking in marginal conditions.</p>	<p><u><i>It should read:</i></u> <span style="float: right;"><u><i>Note 3</i></u></span></p> <p>which constitutes a redemption model for winemaking in marginal conditions <b>because it was replicated, along the migration routes of its scholars and immigrants during the XIX-XX centuries, in other continents' areas and highly significant vineyards, such as Brazil, Argentina, Australia or New Zealand, presenting similar geomorphological and social difficulties, and reinforcing the sense of community and identity around the wine agricultural practice.</b></p> <p><b>On steep hills where viticulture is still today handily managed by a number of small farmers, the success of this model reflects as well in this bottom-up approach in the construction of the evolved landscape and in the preservation of the Colline's natural values and morphology, presenting a unique and lasting millenary relationship between man and nature, still ongoing today.</b></p> <p><u><i>Comment</i></u></p> <p>As already mentioned an overall description of the site and its key attributes about the Colline's values for OUV cannot be omitted in the description, also considering that these elements are consequently recalled in the report.</p> <p><u>These elements – the role of the scholars through the migratory flows to support agricultural in new continents as a vehicle of well-being, the high parcelled distribution of land among small farmers, their role in building this landscape without impact or reshaping the territory (which provide the unique adaptation model of the Colline), and the still ongoing balance between agricultural activities and natural features – offer the exceptional value of the nominated landscape and a unique agricultural landscape still not represented in the WHL.</u></p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>
<p>Page 231, right, lines 46-49</p> <p><i>2. The property "Description"</i></p>	<p><u><i>It is:</i></u></p> <p>The hills' geomorphology is characterised by steep hogbacks at the foothills of the Alps and "landri" (karst) formations in the southernmost section</p>	<p><u><i>It should read:</i></u> <span style="float: right;"><u><i>Note 4</i></u></span></p> <p>The hills' geomorphology is characterised by steep hogbacks at the foothills of the Alps <b>rare (hogback), of their geographical high complexity and worldwide unique because since centuries populated and cultivated,</b> and "landri" (karst) formations in the southernmost section <b>as well historically fragile and under exposition of earthquakes.</b></p> <p><u><i>Comment</i></u></p> <p>The natural dimension of the Colline (at the basis of the values here developed in centuries by its community and agriculture) should not be omitted the description. See nom. form pages: 34 <i>"The Natural Fragility of the Site and its Alternating Hard and Soft Rocks"</i>, 121</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>

		<p>“Geomorphology, Ecosystems and Agro- plant Biodiversity”, 256 “Natural Disasters and Preparative Measures (Earthquakes, Floods, Fires, etc.)” etc.</p> <p>The Hogback of the hilly ridge has a unique geomorphological configuration that is not reflected in any other wine- producing site or landscape. On these rough hills the agrarian hydraulic arrangements with “ciglioni” or “ciglione”, small terraces of ground without the use of dry stone, on which the rows of vines are set, configures unique a combination of soil arrangements and architectures of the vineyard which is not described in any other wine growing or agricultural landscape in the WHL.</p>	
<p>Page 232, left, lines 20-24</p> <p>“History and development”</p>	<p><u>It is:</u></p> <p>The historical development of the nominated property <b>appears largely to mirror</b> the much larger Veneto Region, as set out clearly in the dossier. <b>There is no suggestion that what happened in the nominated property evolved in a particular way.</b></p>	<p><u>It should read:</u> <b>Note 5</b></p> <p>The historical development of the nominated property <del>appears largely to mirror</del> <b>even if located in</b> the much larger Veneto Region, as set out clearly in the dossier, <b>shows its quality as a millenary borderland rural landscape. There is no suggestion that what happened in the nominated property evolved in a particular way. Differently from the rich merchant city of Venice, the evolution of the Colline retraces and reflects the historical events that have afflicted a poor area, as well as the age-old rural community’s vocation for working this sloping and difficult terrain.</b></p> <p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>The winemaking and the agrarian setting of the Colline does not concern the overall Region Veneto both historically and geographically: the <u>Colline’s landscape has a unique geomorphology and land not only in Veneto but on a world scale, and it is greatly different both from the regional one and for many other rural areas across Europe.</u></p> <p>As documented in the in the nomination form and additional information, it should be also noted that <u>the history of the Colline, a poor rural land is remarkably different from the rich Venice, as well as its mostly merchant economy.</u></p> <p>See nom. form, page 150 “2.b.1. A borderland: from ancient times to the early Middle Ages and the advent of Venetian rule” (namely “The Origins of the area’s Rural Civilisation: the 11th Century Benedictine monks” in page 151). See also page 158 “2.b.2. Italy, the end of the Serenissima, the invasions: the founding of the innovation district”.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.</p>
<p>Page 232, left, lines 46-49</p>	<p><u>It is:</u></p> <p>The earliest documentation concerning the cultivation of the Prosecco grape variety (Glera) in the Veneto</p>	<p><u>It should read:</u> <b>Note 6</b></p> <p><b>Even if the agricultural activities, including wine growing, date centuries earlier in a millenary effort to adapt to the hills’ rugged morphology, T—the earliest documentation concerning the</b></p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully</p>

	region dates back to 1754.	<p>cultivation of the Prosecco grape variety (Glera) in the Veneto region dates back to 1754.</p> <p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>The evolution of the rural civilisation of the landscape has been greatly illustrated in the nomination form (see page 42 et seq.) and additional information, as well as the origins of the Glera, <u>whose matching with the landscape's unique geomorphology bears another witness of the agrarian adaptation of the community to their Colline</u>. The rugged geomorphology and the history of border and poor land, provides <u>the framework where the community's unique adaptation developed</u>, with agrarian experimentations and solutions, being shared beyond the nominated area in far lands, and its unique relationship between agricultural activities and respect for the environment still ongoing today. <u>This adaptation and model is not yet represented in the WHL.</u></p>	considered.
<p>Page 232, left, lines 51-56</p> <p>continuing on Page 232, right, lines 1-5</p> <p><i>"History and development"</i></p>	<p><u>It is:</u></p> <p>After the fall of the Republic of Venice (1797) and the wars that followed, Napoleonic domination brought about the first major reorganisation of Veneto agriculture, including the division of properties, modernisation of the agricultural layout, and the training of farmers on the part of numerous scientific and technical institutions that were established in the area (the <i>Accademia degli Aspiranti di Conegliano</i> (1603/1812), ad hoc agricultural department of the <i>Accademia</i> (1768), <i>Scuola agraria di Gera</i> (1864/1867), and <i>Regia Scuola di Viticoltura ed Enologia</i> (1876), all make up today the Conegliano campus).</p>	<p><u>Comment</u> <span style="float: right;"><u>Note 7</u></span></p> <p>The Napoleonic domination dates 1797-1815, and certainly left its traces as well as the invasions which came before and after it in this border land. As explained in the nomination form, the agricultural development of the Colline and the origins of the creation of a knowledge district are not originated by Napoleon, as it appears obvious even in the exposed sentence (<u>having the Accademia degli Aspiranti been already founded in 1603</u>), and this bottom-up search for adaptation and innovation continuing after the French invasion, in the XIX and XX centuries.</p> <p><u>The statement of ICOMOS is therefore incorrect.</u> See nomination form page 158 et seq. and page 163 about the system of mutualism, credit and co-operation, as a social matrix confirming the millenary sense of the Colline's community. See also page 476 "3. <i>The oenology school and the institute of vinicultural research</i>".</p>	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
<p>Page 232, right, lines 8-14</p>	<p><u>It is:</u></p> <p>Specific technical and scientific knowledge regarding production developed in leaps and bounds <b>in the 20th century</b>, thanks <b>in part</b> to the School of Oenology in Conegliano Veneto, which perfected the production method (secondary fermentation technologies), enhancing the qualities of Prosecco.</p>	<p><u>It should read:</u> <span style="float: right;"><u>Note 8</u></span></p> <p>Specific technical and scientific knowledge regarding production developed in leaps and bounds <del>in the 20th century</del> <b>between the XIX and the XX centuries</b>, thanks <del>in part</del> to the School of Oenology in Conegliano Veneto <b>and the research institutes before and after it</b>, which perfected the production method (secondary fermentation technologies), <b>and investigated all the agrarian aspects of the Colline</b>, enhancing the qualities of Prosecco <b>exceeding the boundaries the nominated property hard</b></p>	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.

		<p>geomorphological conditions, where this system of agricultural techniques and experience was acquired and implemented.</p> <p><b>In fact, the migration of its scholars moved in the late 1800s and early 1900s to Europe, Americas and Oceania, (as documented in the school archives and, by the role of the scholars in the scientific literature and viticulture institutions in these continents), to adapt new territories to agriculture on the basis of the model and spirit of sacrifice of the Colline in a bottom-up model by the farmers and for the farmers.</b></p> <p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>As described in the nomination materials, the School represented one of the major steps in the developing a research centre for the wine culture, as well as for the complex of agrarian knowledge and technique related in the nominated area (which were exported, along with the sense of identity and community, in other continents by the migrants).</p> <p>On the other hand, the nomination form proves that in these remarkable agricultural landscapes in Americas and Oceania (such as Vale do Vinhedos or Mendoza), former students of the Conegliano oenology school, like Celeste Gobbato or Leopoldo Suárez, provided their contribute in adapting new lands to agricultural and vineyards landscape, thanks to the techniques and experience acquired in the School and in the tough territory of the Colline.</p> <p>It should be noted that this movement of scholars and workers, bearing also witness of the migrations flows (out of colonial dominations and top-down agrarian settings), was very hard at the time. <u>This diffusion through migratory flows not of a wine (as ICOMOS often refers to), but of a knowledge system and its native agrarian model strictly related to a sense of identity and community, represents a domain not investigated in the WHL</u> (as underlined in the comparative analysis) and not represented.</p> <p><u>The Colline therefore provides an outstanding example of construction of landscapes through migrations of workers and scholars</u> and their system of knowledge and sense of community, addressing the adaptation of new lands as it was for the Colline, by replicating its landscape.</p> <p>See nomination form, namely the paragraphs: “<i>The Dissemination of Specialist Agricultural Knowledge through the Intellectual Migration of Alumni and Teachers</i>” (page 83), “<i>The Recreation of the Wine Landscape and Culture in the</i></p>	
--	--	--	--

		<i>Footsteps of the Migrants</i> ” (page 87) as well as the South American case studies of “ <i>Mendoza: a viticulture success story and symbol of the hills</i> ” in Argentina, and “ <i>Exploring Brazil: Vale dos Vinhedos</i> ” in Rio Grande do Sul (pages 88 et seq.).	
Page 232, right, lines 15-20.  and  Page 234, right, lines 17-20	<p><u><i>It is:</i></u> Following the destruction caused by World War I, a major research facility (<i>Stazione Sperimentale di Viticoltura e di Enologia di Conegliano</i>) was established in 1923 aimed at providing farmers with adequate scientific support and new expertise, in order to restore the territory's vineyards destroyed by phylloxera.</p> <p><u><i>It is:</i></u> This can be said for numerous European vineyards that have experienced mildew and phylloxera outbreaks, and many wars, especially the last two World Wars.</p>	<p><u><i>It should read:</i></u> <b>Note 9</b> Following the destruction caused by World War I, a major research facility (<i>Stazione Sperimentale di Viticoltura e di Enologia di Conegliano</i>) was established in 1923 <b>in continuity with the research centres previously founded since XVII century and the School</b>, aimed at providing farmers with adequate scientific support and new expertise, in order to restore the territory's vineyards destroyed by phylloxera. <b>These calamities represented just another additional challenge to the community of small farmers of the Colline, in the millenary story of the nominated agricultural landscape.</b></p> <p><u><i>It should read:</i></u> This can be said for numerous European vineyards that have experienced mildew and phylloxera outbreaks, and many wars, especially the last two World Wars.</p> <p><b>However, in the nominated area these calamities were addressed by the community of the Colline not only through the intensification of the research and experimental activities, but also through an outstanding worldwide cooperation led by its scholars and workers, bringing their system of agrarian knowledge and sense of identity in new continents along the migration routes.</b></p> <p><u><i>Comment</i></u> Oidium, peronospora and phylloxera, which invaded the viticulture in Europe represented in that historical moment, just one more challenge for the community, in a continuum with its quality as borderland rural landscape and its natural rugged morphology. In this framework, which has been in detail described in the dossier, the <u>innovation centres, to sustain to local agriculture and its ability to let this system of knowledge going beyond the landscape's boundaries through the migrations, represented an unprecedented answer with direct effects on other farmers communities of new far lands.</u> This represents an exceptional value for the WHL and also a key factor to understand the millenary attachment of the community to the territory and the persistence, today still alive and expressing in the heroic viticulture.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p> <p>ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.</p>
Page 232, right, lines 36-42	<p><u><i>It is:</i></u> In 2003, through the regional law that regulates</p>	<p><u><i>It should read:</i></u> <b>Note 10</b> In 2003, through the regional law that regulates Production Districts, <b>and a system of innovation and knowledge in</b></p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/</p>

	<p>Production Districts, the Conegliano Valdobbiadene territory was recognized as the first oenological district of the Veneto Region. <b>This recognition was</b> crucial for gaining the DOCG certification (<i>Denominazione di Origine Controllata e Garantita</i>) for Conegliano Valdobbiadene in August 2010.</p>	<p><b>agricultural techniques dating centuries and expressing the attachment of the community of the landscape of the Colline</b> the Conegliano Valdobbiadene territory was recognized as the first oenological district of the Veneto Region. <b>The quality of the landscape, its century lasting protection and along with the reduced land use and the balance between agricultural activities and natural resources, were all</b> <del>This recognition was</del> <b>crucial factors</b> for gaining the DOCG certification (<i>Denominazione di Origine Controllata e Garantita</i>) for Conegliano Valdobbiadene in August 2010</p> <p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>The origins of the certification of quality of the productions of the Colline lies in its century old quality landscape, playing their role to obtain the DOC and DOCG, along with other strict technical requirements established at European and national legislation. <u>The sentence is therefore incorrect.</u></p>	<p>justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>
<p>Page 232, right, lines 45-47</p>	<p><u>It is:</u></p> <p>As for the nominated property, which accounts for less than one- fifth of all Prosecco production, the growth of vine hectares was <b>more moderate</b>.</p>	<p><u>It should read:</u> <b>Note 11</b></p> <p>As for the nominated property, which accounts for less than one-fifth of all Prosecco production <b>and where the viticulture is still manually carried out by 3,000 small farmers offering a historically grounded example of “heroic viticulture”</b>, the growth of vine hectares was <del>more moderate</del> <b>even decreasing</b>.</p> <p><b>This is due to the attention paid to the balance between nature and human activities since centuries, and its fragmented community of small farmers, with a documented minor soil use and preservation of Colline’s bio-cultural agricultural patchwork along its landscape attributes (geomorphology and settlements, vineyards, environmental assets, habitats, and ecological network) and components, which reflects in its wine productions.</b></p> <p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>The State party once again takes note that <u>ICOMOS overlaps the nominated landscape whose vineyards area even reduced</u> (with a documented reduction of cultivated surface of 6,200 ha in 1960 to 5,690 ha in 2014; see nomination form pages 245 et seq) in the past 50 years (where only the DOCG Prosecco Superiore wine productions are still carried on manually and by small farmers) <u>with the broader area which is not part of the nomination.</u></p> <p>Therefore, <u>the ICOMOS statement is incorrect.</u></p> <p>The documented historical fragmentation expresses both in the small farmers (and properties) struggling with a hard territory</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>

		<p>since centuries, and the cultivated patches respectful of the original conformation of the Colline and of its natural values. These specific aspects – highly relevant in the current international debate about the consume of land – makes <u>the nominated agricultural evolved landscape of the Colline a unique, century-long and still lasting, model as balance between natural activities and agricultural activities.</u></p> <p>See nomination form, respectively pages: 91 (Complex Structure of the Hills’ Bio-cultural Agricultural Patchwork), 98 (soil use multidecade analysis) and 134 (“a summary of the components: the site’s landscape description units, LDU”).</p>	
<p>Page 233 right, lines 6-9</p> <p>“Comparative analysis”</p>	<p><u>It is:</u></p> <p>For instance, the cultural landscapes where there are no vineyards are not necessary to be compared, since there are enough vineyards in the world to find good comparative examples.</p>	<p><u>Comment</u> <span style="float: right;"><u>Note 12</u></span></p> <p>ICOMOS evaluation of the comparative analysis is contradictory, as it considers “sound” its methodology, but eventually requires further areas for comparison. First, it should be noted that 36 rural and viticulture landscapes (a number further improved in the Additional information) have been analysed, according to the nominated site’s values, both in WHL, tentative lists and other relevant vineyards worldwide.</p> <p>Secondly, in its interim report sent on 18 January 2018, ICOMOS recommended to include, for example, Val d’Orcia <u>which is not a landscape recognized in the WHL for its wine production</u>; the need to include other agricultural cultural landscapes (as ICOMOS does itself in this report while quoting Amalfi Coast and Cinque Terre, <u>other WHS not inscribed as vineyard landscapes</u>) is directly connected to the quality of the landscape as a millenary rural civilization of the Colline whose heritage is still today visible and mostly intact, as appreciated by ICOMOS (“<i>ICOMOS considers that the primary interesting feature of the nominated property is its scenic aspects</i>”, page 233, right, lines 29-30).</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.</p>
<p>Page 233 right, lines 9-11</p>	<p><u>It is:</u></p> <p>The DOC <b>has been used as a main attribute, but</b> the comparative analysis does not include a table with DOC world areas.</p>	<p><u>It should read:</u> <span style="float: right;"><u>Note 13</u></span></p> <p>The DOC <del>has been used as a main attribute, but</del> <b>and DOCG have been used as attributes to illustrate the values of an agricultural landscape and part of its redemption model significance; since a comparison of wines, or their certifications, is not crucial to assess the OUV</b> but the comparative analysis does not include a table with DOC world areas <b>but a selection of agricultural landscape whose international productions are significant.</b></p> <p><u>Comment 1</u></p> <p>The nomination form already contains a comparison on international productions</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>

		<p>(see page 210 "<i>The initial selection of cases</i>" et seq.), namely as per their significance for their native site. <u>The ICOMOS's statement is incorrect and reveals an uncomplete evaluation.</u></p> <p>Agricultural productions can play a role in properly explaining the value of a landscape as this is the case; it also provides relevant information about the quality of the management and the maintenance of the biodiversity patch as ICOMOS recognized for the nominated area. However, the release of the certification of agricultural production, even at its high degree as it is the case of Prosecco, concerns the national or regional criteria regulations as well as national led evaluations.</p> <p><u>Comment 2</u></p> <p>It should be also remarked that while the most relevant and protected productions of the Prosecco Superiore offer one of the key aspect of its redemption model (as well as its landscape quality reflecting in its agriculture), the nominated area regards only the Colline singular geomorphology and historical agricultural landscape.</p> <p>The State party therefore would like to remind that the landscape of Colline is nominated here, and not a wine as ICOMOS itself underlined in this same report. "<i>The World Heritage Convention is a property-based Convention and therefore it is properties that are evaluated and inscribed as unique, exceptional or representative examples illustrating human endeavours, achievements and values, <u>and not the products that result from manufacturing or farming processes, although their quality and recognition may contribute to the understanding of the scope of certain aspects of human development and therefore reinforce other criteria</u></i>" as (lastly) underlined in the evaluation of Champagne's nomination (when ICOMOS asked France to include the Colline del Prosecco in their comparative analysis).</p> <p>It should be also remarked that differently from Champagne, and other vineyard recognized in the WHL, linked to a successful top-down process and expressing a symbol of richness and power (« <i>Aussi les cours royales et impériales ont-elles rivalisé pour s'approprier les meilleures productions des vignobles illustres : côte de Beaune ou de Nuits, grands crus bordelais, Champagne, Tokaj, etc.</i> », in "<i>Role de la vigne dans l'histoire mondiale et structures sociales</i>", ICOMOS Study 2005) <u>the story of the Colline (as well its wine production) is based on the struggle of small farmers</u> dealing since centuries with a hard land and foreign invasions.</p> <p>The redemption model offered by the agricultural landscape of the Colline is therefore <u>based upon both the development</u></p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>of a system of agrarian knowledge, as well as in its influence to sustain the agriculture and viticulture activities in new lands along the migration routes, and eventually symbolized by a worldwide known production. This system of values and attributes provides a contribution to the WHL and it paves the way to investigate agricultural system in other continents.</p>	
<p>Page 233, right, lines 55-57, continuing on</p> <p>Page 234, left, lines 1-7</p> <p>“Comparative analysis”</p>	<p><u>It is:</u></p> <p>In general, ICOMOS considers that it is more and more difficult to find, especially in Europe, vineyards or cultural landscapes linked to wine production, that present an Outstanding Universal Value. The reason for this is because the different cited attributes have already been recognised in the World Heritage List. The nominated property is a clear illustration of this scenario, as many attributes considered as outstanding in the nomination dossier are fairly common to most of the European vineyards inscribed on the World Heritage List.</p>	<p><u>Comment 1</u> <b>Note 14</b></p> <p>This consideration of ICOMOS, already anticipated in the interim report of last January (even before the complete evaluation of the nomination), <u>intends to block any new agricultural or vineyards proposition to the WHL while a great number of remarkable sites, and particularly the landscapes which are per definition complex systems, recognized by the State parties in tentative lists or national legislation, deserve to be investigated and evaluated, also for their contribute to sustainable development and reducing of land use, such as the Colline.</u></p> <p>WH Convention doesn't establish a rule of the “first mover” or “first to file”: it is irrelevant to consider the category closed and it is contrary to the spirit and rules of the Convention promoting the pluralism of the cultural identities. <u>Whereas accepted by the Advisory Body and the Committee, this same principle will block any possible inscription in the future,</u> instead at investigating the specific contribution the nominations can provide to the List and therefore enrich its representativeness, especially in the category of the cultural landscapes, and its agricultural versions.</p> <p><u>Comment 2</u></p> <p><u>The attributes and values the Colline expresses have not been included in the WHL:</u> namely the role of the innovation district and the bottom up approach for the agrarian settings in the nominated property, as well as its influence in other continents through the migratory flows of its scholars and workers, and the replication of a landscape – whose representation in the Renaissance art as original landscape dates the 15<sup>th</sup> century – which paved the way to offer opportunities and sense of identity in new continents' land through agricultural and viticulture activities.</p> <p>It should be also noted that while <u>the Colline should be inscribed in the WHL both for this centuries-long (and still ongoing) balance between nature and agricultural activities and for the role played for the agrarian settings and recreation of sense of identity and community in far lands,</u> its inscription also plays an important for the future enrichment of the WHL. The Colline offers an outstanding example of sustainable (and reduced) use of land and</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.</p>

		<p>it focuses to migrations' process and to other relevant vineyards in new territories, such as Brazil, Argentina, New Zealand and Australia, by enlightening the connections within the agricultural settings and system of knowledge along the migrants' routes. <u>This is without precedent in the WHL</u> currently reflecting only European vineyards and "exported" products. The agrarian specificities of the nominated site (such as ciglionature, reduced land use, other applied techniques) goes in the direction kept by the Committee to further investigate the agricultural landscapes and their role for the communities in a sustainable approach, keeping its roots in the past, thus providing an outstanding ongoing example of it.</p>	
<p>Page 234, right, lines 5-14</p> <p>"Justification of Outstanding Universal Value"</p>	<p><i>It is:</i></p> <p>In fact, many other vineyards have experienced the same conditions in many places across Europe, especially on islands and in harsh or mountainous regions. The "anthropization of a harsh nature" can be found in many other listed sites that include remote islands as well as mountainous places all around the world (e.g., Cinque Terre, Amalfi, Friuli or Aosta Valley, all in Italy; Lavaux in Switzerland; the Middle Rhine Valley in Germany; or Alto Douro in Portugal).</p>	<p><i>Comment</i></p> <p>In the historically borderland area of the Colline, the viticulture is still today handy managed on fragile "ciglionature" (grassy banks, and not drystone or walls terrace), which represents a unicity in the WHL agricultural cultural landscapes (as also mentioned in the "3rd International Conference on Terraced Landscapes and Cultures" hosted by Italy, and Conegliano, in 2016) by respecting the original conditions of the Colline and adapting the agrarian setting to it, without reshaping the land, through a documented low impact on its original morphology.</p> <p>As per the comparative analysis of the nomination form (taking into account most of these landscapes) and ICOMOS previous evaluations of the sites here mentioned: "Middle Rhine Valley has been one of the most important transport routes in Europe" where "<i>human transformation of the profile of its steep slopes into terracing</i>" like the "<i>terraces supported by hundreds of kilometres of drystone walls</i>" in Alto Douro; the same agrarian settlement is replicated in Cinque Terre, not inscribed in the WHL for its small wine productions (it is a national park), Amalfi Coast, and Lavaux (stone terrace) which "<i>is not a remote rural area</i>" as per ICOMOS evaluation and where after the phylloxera outbreak "<i>the growers changed their methods to allow easier access to the vines for chemical treatment</i>". Friuli, Aosta (as Piedmont and Tuscany to stick with the examples offered by ICOMOS in this report) are either not steep hills or mountainous vineyards or drystone terraced ones with a direct impact on their geomorphology and overall landscape.</p> <p><u>The Colline has no dry stone walls as all the sites quoted by ICOMOS, and its grassy embankments ("ciglionature") over steep hills underline (and draw) its unique adaptative and respectful landscape made</u></p>	<p><b>Note 15</b></p> <p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>

		<p>of fragmented agricultural patches, while tireless small farmers since generations manually cultivate this land and, together with it, their sense of community and identity developed around the agriculture, transmitted it to the new generations.</p> <p><u>This gentle adaptation model over a tough geomorphology, revealing a century lasting attention and care to their land, and replicated along the migration routes as a leverage for their well-being, is not represented in the WHL; therefore the landscape should be inscribed.</u></p>	
<p>Page 234, right, lines 21-22, and line 30</p> <p>and Page 236, right, lines 11-12</p>	<p><u>It is:</u></p> <p>"Scuola di <b>Coneglio</b> and Prosecco oenologists"</p> <p>The school, although based in <b>Coneglio</b>,</p> <p>"Scuola di <b>Coneglio and Prosecco oenologists</b>"</p>	<p><u>It should read:</u> <b>Note 16</b></p> <p>"Scuola di <del>Coneglio</del> <b>Conegliano</b> and Prosecco oenologists"</p> <p>The school, although based in <del>Coneglio</del> <b>Conegliano</b></p> <p>"Scuola di <del>Coneglio</del> <b>Conegliano and Prosecco oenologists</b>", and its scholars</p> <p><u>Comment</u></p> <p><u>The mistake recurs in many sectors of the evaluation;</u> it should also be noted that the School and the other centres and institutes of Conegliano dealt with a great number of agrarian settings and solutions, as underlined in the nomination form (ampelographic, phytopathological and genetic researches, and so on; see page 78 et seq.), applied by its scholars in experimental in Europe and beyond (Croatia, Romania, Chile, Argentina, Armenia, China, etc; see page 86 et seq).</p>	<p>ICOMOS acknowledges these typing errors.</p>
<p>Page 234, right, lines 24-34</p>	<p><u>It is:</u></p> <p>The Accademia movement, born in Renaissance Tuscany, had spread all over Europe from the 17th until the 19th century; it gave birth to many scientific, <b>agricultural and viticultural</b> schools in Europe, <b>one of which was the Veneto Regia Scuola di Viticoltura de Enologia di Conegliano</b> (1876). The school, although based in <b>Coneglio</b>, was interested in all the wine types <b>of the whole Veneto Region (which was the biggest Italian wine area)</b>, not just for the district of Conegliano and Valdobbiadene and its Prosecco wines.</p>	<p><u>It should read:</u> <b>Note 17</b></p> <p>The Accademia movement, born in Renaissance Tuscany, had spread all over Europe from the 17th until the 19th century; it gave birth to many scientific, <del>agricultural and viticultural</del> schools in Europe, <del>one of which was the Veneto</del> <b>while in the nominated area it specialized in an the agricultural school system established first with the Accademia degli Aspiranti degli Aspiranti in 1603 and paving the way to the Regia Scuola di Viticoltura de Enologia di Conegliano</b> (1876). The school, although based in <del>Coneglio</del>, <b>Conegliano</b> was interested in all the wine types <del>of the whole Veneto Region (which was the biggest Italian wine area)</del>, <b>known at that time and related agrarian aspect, and</b> not just for the district of Conegliano and Valdobbiadene and its Prosecco wines. <b>This is why its research activities and students went beyond the nominated landscape to play a major role in new continents and agricultural contexts.</b></p> <p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>The Accademia degli Aspiranti, established</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>

		<p>in the nominated area since 1603 (see page 232, right, lines 1-2), offered the agricultural version of the system of the "Accademia" as documented in the nomination form. <u>The report seems to reduce this phenomenon only to the establishment of the School almost 2 centuries after, in 1876, also omitting the continuity of the experience of the Accademia</u> (as it was the case, for example, of the "itinerant teaching" chairs to spread out the rural knowledge system or the Agricultural School of Gera in 1864; see nomination form pages 70-72, see also page 477 et seq.).</p> <p><u>The importance of the agricultural knowledge movement generated in the nominated landscape, expressed also by the need to investigate not only the local viticulture but the continental one, is documented also by the international students' attendance</u> (extraordinary for that time) <u>to the School since the XIX century enforcing an unprecedented international cooperation toward the agricultural knowledge and techniques</u> (see nomination form pages 81 et seq. namely "the origins of the Italian and international students"). This <u>international attendance</u> since the foundation of the School <u>proves the well-known relevance of the district of knowledge of Conegliano, and it also represents one of the reasons why the landscape of the Colline, and its system of knowledge and agrarian land adaptation, has been replicated in far lands along the migratory flows.</u></p>	
<p>Page 234, right, lines 21-24</p> <p>And</p> <p>Page 234, right, lines 35-40</p>	<p><u>It is:</u></p> <p>ICOMOS considers that the influence of the "<i>Scuola di Coneglio and Prosecco oenologists</i>" has been <b>overestimated, since it has followed a general movement occurring in Europe and all over Italy.</b></p> <p><u>It is:</u></p> <p>While it is indisputable that the <b>Coneglio</b> school certainly helped to improve <b>local</b> viticulture and contributed to its recent development, ICOMOS considers that its "world influence" has been</p>	<p><u>It should read:</u> <b>Note 18</b></p> <p>ICOMOS considers that the influence of the "<i>Scuola di <del>Coneglio</del> <b>Conegliano</b> and <del>Prosecco</del> <b>oenologists</b></i>" has been <b>overestimated documented, since it has followed a general movement occurring in Europe and all over Italy in its migratory dimension in XIX - XX century of workers and scholars.</b></p> <p><u>It should read:</u></p> <p>While it is indisputable that the <del>Coneglio</del> <b>Conegliano</b> school certainly helped to improve <del>local</del> <b>global</b> viticulture and contributed to its recent development, ICOMOS considers that its "world influence" has been <b>overestimated documented as has been the Prosecco region the workers' and the scholars' migration provided a remarking and their role in the launch of New World viticulture, and agrarian settings, thus providing a sense of community and identity in new territories and offering a chance of wellbeing through agriculture</b></p> <p><u>It should read:</u></p>	<p>ICOMOS acknowledges this typing error.</p> <p>ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.</p> <p>ICOMOS considers that this</p>
Page 234, right,	<u>It is:</u>	<u>It should read:</u>	

<p>lines 48-54</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that it is <b>not evident</b> that the emigrants from this area had <b>such</b> an important impact on the new territories <b>as is claimed in the nomination dossier, since many of the claims in it about emigration</b> and the constitution of the new vineyards <b>are sometimes either ambiguous or factually incorrect</b></p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that it is <del>not evident</del> <b>has been proved in the supplementary information provided</b> that the emigrants from this area had <del>such</del> an important impact on the new territories <del>as is claimed in the nomination dossier, since many of the claims in it about emigration</del> and the constitution of the new vineyards <del>are sometimes either ambiguous or factually incorrect</del></p> <p><u>Comment 1</u></p> <p>The contribute of the scholars toward have been documented: see once again nomination form at above mentioned pages 87 et seq. about the connection with Mendoza and Vale dos Vinhedos; see also in page 242 et seq. the role played by scholars of the School of Conegliano in Australia or New Zealand where since decades each year the largest '<i>Winegrowers annual conference</i>' is entitled under Romeo Bragato, a student of the School of Conegliano (<a href="http://www.bragato.org.nz/">www.bragato.org.nz/</a>).</p> <p>Indeed it's easy to follow the path of Colline's scholars in Brazil (Centro de Pesquisa Celeste Gobbato, <a href="http://www.fepagro.rs.gov.br">www.fepagro.rs.gov.br</a>), Argentina (<i>Museo de Botanica Y Famacognosia "Carlos Luis Spegazzini"</i> <a href="http://www.biol.unlp.edu.ar/museo-spegazzini.htm">www.biol.unlp.edu.ar/museo-spegazzini.htm</a>) and in other countries.</p> <p>The increased attention of the State parties toward the agricultural landscapes and their essential role in the contemporary times, also as a leverage for sustainable development and reduced land consume (as it is the proved case for the Colline), should not be omitted.</p> <p>As well <u>the nominated landscape offers an opportunity to look beyond Europe in the category of the agricultural and vineyard landscape and to deeply investigate the connections amid distant lands connected to the social phenomena of the migration</u>, in the case of the Colline because of the documented agrarian influence, <u>so providing its contribute to enrich the WHL with a landscape crucial to enlighten this process.</u></p> <p><u>Comment 2</u></p> <p>ICOMOS did not also evaluate the supplementary material provided in February: the Additional information A (on pages 15-16 but above all at Annex A.2 pages 37-41) clearly proves and bears witness about the international role played by the School of Conegliano in terms of transfer of knowledge which came along with the phenomenon of peasant migration and scholars. Even if quoting the supplementary documentation, the report does not seem to have analysed the information here</p>	<p>reflects a difference of opinion.</p>
--------------------	---	--	--

		contained (in particular the Annex A.2 “ <i>The international role played by the Oenology school</i> ”).	
Page 234, right, lines 40-48	<p><u><i>It is:</i></u></p> <p>The nomination dossier often <b>equates the whole Veneto Region with the small Prosecco area</b>, neglecting the fact that many other oenological schools in Italy, in Piedmont, Tuscany, Emilia-Romagna, and Naples, also launched didactic and research programs, and such was the case also in other European countries, such as Germany, Austria and France, <b>that had exported their wines since the Middle-Ages</b>, or even in the New World.</p>	<p><u><i>Comment</i></u> <span style="float: right;"><u><i>Note 19</i></u></span></p> <p>The whole paragraph is incorrect. There is no equation of the “small Prosecco area” with Veneto region as all the attributes and the values are strictly related to the Colline’s landscape, from its emblematic representation during the Renaissance, to the heritage here left by the civilization which affected the nominated property up to the creation of research and experimenting institutes in Conegliano and contiguous areas, directly influenced by the tough natural features of the Colline. This territory is remarkably different from the Italian Regions quoted and related vineyards as well as it is its history of borderland.</p> <p><u><i>Comment 2</i></u></p> <p>Further, as already remarked before, while considering the “<i>other European countries, such as Germany, Austria and France, that had exported their wines since the Middle-Ages, or even in the New World</i>” ICOMOS is <u>once again focusing its evaluation on the production</u> and not on nominated aspects of the landscape, such as the system of knowledge and sense of identity replicated (not a wine exported) in far lands with a bottom-up approach which marks the history and the influence of the Colline in new continents through the migrations of its scholars.</p> <p>About this bottom-up approach for agrarian setting and for its contribution to far lands’ local communities see also nomination form, page 165 (“<i>The migration of late 1800s and early 1900s: a model to be exported</i>”). ICOMOS states this is common, while in the ICOMOS Study of 2005 (see nomination form page 177, endnote no. 1), in the article «Rôle de la vigne dans l’histoire mondiale et structures sociales» was clearly stated that “<i>the wine landscape basically hides a potential model for equitable distribution of wealth, although this is rarely the case</i>”.</p> <p><u>Actually this was the extraordinary case for the Colline and the lands influenced by its adaptation model, sense of community and identity, and agrarian knowledge techniques, spread out thanks to scholars and workers’ migrations.</u></p> <p>On a natural challenging landscape, the Colline further expresses a collective consciousness, sense of community and identity (where “<i>rivers and valleys become memory</i>” in the words of the poet Andrea Zanzotto, see nom. form page 129) which paved the way to set a vehicle of wellbeing and social redemption differently from</p>	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.

		<p>other vineyards which remained, namely in Europe, a prerogative of big real estates, monarchies or aristocracy.</p> <p><u>The evolved agricultural landscape of the Colline, still highly fragmented in terms of cultivated (and natural) areas, has been built by small poor farmers through a bottom-up approach and further replicated, with the same approach and with no imposition to the hosting new countries, by its community of migrants who did not export products but knowledge and sense of community by their scholars and immigrant workers. An agricultural landscape bearing witness of all these values is not represented in the WHL; therefore the landscape of the Colline should be inscribed.</u></p>	
Page 234, right, line 56	<p><u>It is:</u></p> <p>small <b>producers</b> (nowadays 3,000)</p>	<p><u>It should read:</u> <b>Note 20</b></p> <p>small <del>producers</del> farmers (nowadays 3,000)</p> <p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>It is another recurrent mistake in the evaluation: the Colline accounts 3,000 small farmers, not producing farms, i.e., women and men by generation daily dedicated to the handy work on the vineyards since centuries.</p>	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
Page 235, left, lines 4-17	<p><u>It is:</u></p> <p><b>very recent development due to a high yield production at a relatively low cost, more than to its "innovation", whereas other vineyard landscapes such as Piedmont are much more representative of the Italian wine "Risorgimento" until the middle of the 19th century.</b></p> <p>ICOMOS notes that the reasons for which a landscape is considered as exceptional or outstanding depends on its own characteristics <b>and not on the product which is derived from that landscape</b> through manufacturing or farming processes. The quality and recognition of that product, however, can help situate the human endeavour associated with a landscape, demonstrating their development, achievements and values as a community.</p>	<p><u>It should read:</u> <b>Note 21</b></p> <p><del>very recent development due to a high yield production at a relatively low cost, more than to its "innovation", whereas other vineyard landscapes such as Piedmont are much more representative of the Italian wine "Risorgimento" until the middle of the 19th century.</del></p> <p><u>Comment 1</u></p> <p>The first sentence is incorrect. The reduction of the land use in the nominated area is documented since more than 50 years; here and again ICOMOS is probably referring to the external areas of the nominated landscape.</p> <p>See nomination form pages 245 et seq. "4.a.3. Soil Use and Viticultural Activity Vineyards and Plantations" where a reduction of the cultivated areas further emerge (from a surface of 6,200 ha in 1960 to 5,690 ha in 2014).</p> <p><u>Comment 2</u></p> <p>Regarding the last part of the same sentence it should first noted that the nominated landscape simply is not representative of the "Italian wine 'Risorgimento' ". On the other hand, the State party seriously is wondering what ICOMOS is referring to, since the <u>Risorgimento is not a wine, but an historical period symbolizing the Italian reunification, to be soundly respected by this Advisory Body.</u></p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.</p> <p>ICOMOS acknowledges this typing error (the word "from" is missing before "Risorgimento").</p>

		<p>Considering it as <u>another typo of this evaluation report</u>, even by meaning it as a recovery of the Italian viticulture productions, it should be noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the Colline never meant to be representative of the historical period of the Risorgimento and the message they transmit – of a poor land and farmers able to find in the agriculture and innovation a way to ensure the wellbeing of its community – is far distant from the one expressed by Piedmont landscape which is the expression of “<i>The desire for high-quality wine, and the presence of a landowning aristocracy linked to the political regime in the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia</i>” (2014 ICOMOS evaluation), belonging to its elites (as it is the case for many other vineyards in the WHL) and not to a community of poor farmers.</li> <li>- <i>the Colline agricultural landscape recalls a millenary adaptation to an hard territory, not comparable to the Piedmont characterized by “mild or slight slopes” (2014 ICOMOS evaluation).</i></li> <li>- <i>The nomination focuses on the development of the agrarian knowledge and know-how whose achievements have been influential during the migrations in XIX-XX centuries to be spread out this knowledge and sense of identity toward agriculture not only at local level but in other continents and far lands.</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Comment 3</u></p> <p>The State party considers very correct the last sentence about the role of the product and in line with the nominations examined in the past years. This is why, due to the mainly symbolizing role of the wine as also expressed in this nomination, <u>the State party wonders why, therefore, in this report and in the interim report ICOMOS insisted for a DOC comparison with other wines</u> in the comparative analysis (which already investigated the significant international productions because of their contribute help to demonstrate “<i>the human endeavour associated with a landscape, demonstrating their development, achievements and values as a community</i>” as it is exactly the case for the Colline) <u>and</u>, in its last January’s interim report, ICOMOS suggested to consider “<u>one of the main competitors of Prosecco wines on the International Italian wine market is Montalcino</u>” as well as “<i>Val d’Orcia, as part of the DOC Rosso di Montalcino and the Val d’Orcia DOC. Similarly, Cava, another significant sparkling wine producer, is not included in the comparison</i>”.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		By reminding that a landscape should be evaluated according to its values and not its productions (or market competitors) <u>the State party takes note once again of ICOMOS contradictions before and at the end of the evaluation process of this nomination.</u>	
Page 235, left, lines 45-50 “Integrity”	<u>It is:</u> <b>ICOMOS observes that the determination of the nominated property has been based mainly on the DOCG appellation delimitation granted in 2010, although not covering all of it, and that the boundaries of the nominated property thus reflect an area that was not delineated until the early 20th century.</b>	<u>It should read:</u> <b>Note 22</b> <del>ICOMOS observes that the determination of the nominated property has been based mainly on the DOCG appellation delimitation granted in 2010, although not covering all of it, and that the boundaries of the nominated property thus reflect an area that was not delineated until the early 20th century.</del>	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
And		<u>It should read:</u> Accordingly, the hills of Conegliano and Valdobbiadene are identified as a choice area for white wine production on the first wine maps dating <del>back to around 1870 at</del> <b>least since the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century</b> ; the area under vines that for the large part matches that of the nominated	ICOMOS considers this correction to be a clarification.
Page 235, right, lines 1-6 “Integrity” And	<u>It is:</u> Accordingly, the hills of Conegliano and Valdobbiadene are identified as a choice area for white wine production on the first wine maps dating <b>back to around 1870</b> ; the area under vines that for the large part matches that of the nominated property, was <b>clearly shown for the first time</b> on maps drawn up in 1936.	property, was <del>clearly shown for the first time</del> <b>fully shown</b> on maps drawn up in 1936, even though <b>its landscape’s feature and perimeters have been already traced both as witnessed in the 15th century Renaissance paintings and in the 1811 Napoleonic cadaster where the popular toponym “Al Prosecco” was as well officialised.</b>	ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change which which modifies the meaning of the sentence.
Page 235, right, lines 13-20	<u>It is:</u> <b>Although the State Party presents the Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene as a continuum and evolving landscape, ICOMOS considers that the nominated property comprises new vineyards, after a partial desertification due to large-scale emigration, the various vine plagues, economic crises and wars that have affected the nominated property, as is acknowledged in the nomination dossier.</b>	<u>It should read:</u> <del>Although the State Party presents the The Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene as is a continuum and evolving landscape, ICOMOS considers that the nominated property comprises new</del> <b>i.e. a complex system of vineyards mostly preserved since centuries, after despite a partial desertification due to large-scale emigration, the various vine plagues, economic crises and wars that have affected the nominated property, as is acknowledged in the nomination dossier.</b> <u>Comment 1</u> Once again ICOMOS is uncertain about the correct perimeters of the nominated area and the rationale of a landscape which evolved over centuries, <u>being its DOCG (not entirely included in the nominated area), only an effect and not the origin of it.</u> As mentioned above the DOCG applies – not entirely, as contradictory remarked by ICOMOS (“not covering all of it”) – to a landscape whose historical evolution has been explained in the whole nomination form and additional information, <u>its</u>	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.

		<p>toponym “Al Prosecco” dating since the French occupation in early 1800s, its viticultural maps being further reproduced in Marescalchi’s maps in 1936 (when a new earthquake stroke the area), and being portrayed since the XV century by the Renaissance Cima da Conegliano who represented the landscape’s key features in its popular and genuine manifestation.</p> <p><u>Comment 2</u></p> <p>Just like the representation of the rural landscape during XV-XVI centuries, <u>the 1811 Napoleonic cadaster (land use register) is objective testimony of a precise phase in a longer civilization of the site,</u> which took place over the preceding centuries, producing highly fragmented land holdings whose layout of small vined parcels has been conserved, remaining unchanged for centuries as documented in the cadaster. The Napoleonic cadaster in fact also bears witness of the highly fragmented land holdings <u>whose layout of small vined parcels has been conserved, remaining unchanged for centuries.</u></p> <p><u>This has been clearly specified in the Additional information A (page 2 et seq.)</u> See also the same document at page 33 et seq. “<i>Vineyards in 2017 that already existed in the 1811 Napoleonic cadaster – see Annex C</i>” and Additional information C “Cartography” page and table 8 on the permanent <u>vined cadastral parcels in the 1811 Napoleonic cadastre corresponding for 62 % with the 2017 AVEPA cadastre.</u></p> <p>These <u>additional materials documented the historicity of the site,</u> as the site was destined to winemaking at least since 1811, demonstrating the coincidence of the particles for 62% (the remaining part can be considered endogenous to the natural processes of transformation of a living evolutionary landscape). <u>The absence in the ICOMOS report of references to the Napoleonic cadastre shows that the supplementary documentation for this part was not taken into consideration</u> with the consequent incorrect date of the viticultural origins of the site, as documented.</p> <p>It should be also noted that the 1936 map (drawn up several decades before the DOC/DOCG) was meant to specifically address the landscape also due to the Cansiglio earthquake (in 1936), confirming the fragile and harsh area not comparable with other vineyards in Europe. See nomination form, particularly page 27 “Geomorphologic Uniqueness: the Ridge or “Landri” (karst) Landscape” and page 34 “The Natural Fragility of the Site and its Alternating Hard and Soft Rocks”. This natural complex scenario offers as well the framework where the strong attachment of the Colline’s community found its identity</p>	
--	--	--	--

		and agricultural vocation since centuries.	
Page 235, right, lines 26-31	<p><u>It is:</u></p> <p><b>The current vineyards therefore no longer correspond to the original ones. ICOMOS considers that the Prosecco landscape, as it exists today, cannot be readily linked to the layout of vineyards and production methods from the 18th century and earlier.</b></p>	<p><u>It should read:</u> <b>Note 23</b>  <del>The current vineyards therefore no longer correspond to the original ones. ICOMOS considers that the Prosecco landscape, as it exists today, cannot be readily linked to the layout of vineyards and production methods from the 18th century and earlier.</del></p> <p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>As already underlined before, it appears clear, <u>ICOMOS evaluation didn't take into account the additional information</u> provided by the State party, as well as sources and maps related to the 1811 Napoleonic cadastre above mentioned.</p> <p><u>The Colline landscape does reflect its continuous historical layout</u> as it is also shown by the Renaissance paintings representation of its fields, by the cadaster and maps and the number of scientific documentation developed by the schools, centres and institutes of the nominated landscape, as per the overall nomination form and as also reminded in the present document. Finally it should be remarked that that the wine making methods are not the subject of the nominated landscape, but its wider agrarian settings and evolution to adapt to a rough morphology, For an overview about the Colline's agrarian evolution, see nomination form pages 286 et seq. "Multi-Functionality of the Nominated Landscape – Dynamics, settlement structure, early management practices".</p>	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
Page 235, right, lines 32-35	<p><u>It is</u></p> <p><b>ICOMOS also notes that the landscape outside the property is turning into a wine-producing area on an industrial scale that has severe effects on the integrity of the broader cultural landscape</b></p>	<p><u>It should read:</u> <b>Note 24</b>  <del>ICOMOS also notes that the landscape outside the property is turning into a wine-producing area on an industrial scale that has severe effects on the integrity of the broader cultural landscape</del></p> <p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>As it is underlined many times in this annex, <u>the report makes confusions about the nominated area, often mixing the nominated landscape with an external area – not representing a landscape – which is not even included in the buffer zone.</u></p> <p>Further, once again, <u>ICOMOS seems to ignore the information provided by the State party in the additional information.</u></p> <p>Regarding the subject of agriculture it should be noted that <u>the EU Regulation 1308/2013 limits the increasing of vined surface areas to 1% per year.</u> This provides protection from the potential risk of significant increases in vine plantations therefore avoiding impacts on the landscape, including that of the nominated area.</p> <p>In fact, the consented transformations, after</p>	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.

		<p>the formation of new vineyards accounts for an absolutely negligible percentage, so small as to not threaten the distinctive characteristics of the nominated landscape that is characterized by a balance of cultivated and uncultivated parts. See Additional information B, page 6 et seq.</p> <p>Further, <u>it has already been clearly documented that in the nominated landscape the surface of the vineyards slightly reduced in 2014.</u></p>	
<p>Page 236, right, lines 1-6</p> <p>“Criteria under which inscription is proposed”</p>	<p><u>It is:</u></p> <p>redemption model of Prosecco cannot be considered as exceptional. <b>The success of this "redemption model", seen in the fact that everyone benefits from it, is the same in many successful vineyards. Moreover, the model only brought prosperity after World War II, which can be seen as relatively late.</b></p>	<p><u>It should read:</u> <b>Note 25</b></p> <p>redemption model of Prosecco cannot be considered as exceptional <b>as the The</b> success of this "redemption model", <del>seen in the fact that everyone benefits from it, is the same in many successful vineyards.</del></p> <p><del>Moreover, the model only brought prosperity after World War II, which can be seen as relatively late. spread out in new continents and rural lands as a well- being vehicle within the migration flows, thus offering a sense of identity and community.</del></p> <p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>ICOMOS minimizes the redemption model to the “fact that everyone benefits”, ignoring the previous ICOMOS studies (“the wine landscape basically hides a potential model for equitable distribution of wealth, <u>although this is rarely the case</u>” as already mentioned; see nomination form page 177, endnote no. 1.</p> <p>ICOMOS is also omitting the fact that <u>the redemption model is not only strictly related to the success of the wine, but to the replication of its rural and vineyard landscape and system of knowledge through the migrations</u> which generated sense of community and opportunities in new territories, often offering similar difficulties as in steep hills of the Colline. This was the case for the already mentioned beautiful sites of Vale do Vinhedos in Brasil or Mendoza in the Argentinian inland. Here it seems here <u>ICOMOS is underestimating the relevance of the South American or Oceania’s vineyards and their agricultural contexts as well as the importance of the vineyards in territories which are out of Europe, and their connections with the nominated landscape. The significance of the Colline is still alive in these communities as for the King Valley Prosecco Road in Australia</u> (<a href="http://www.winesofthekingvalley.com.au/king-valley-prosecco-road">www.winesofthekingvalley.com.au/king-valley-prosecco-road</a>) “<i>inspired by a childhood growing up in the town of Valdobbiadene, the birthplace of prosecco, Otto Dal Zotto</i>” or the Ruta del Vino in Brazil (<a href="http://www.ambito.com/677710-brasil-tambien-tiene-su-ruta-del-vino">www.ambito.com/677710-brasil-tambien-tiene-su-ruta-del-vino</a>) having in the emigration to Bento Gonçalves the start</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.</p>

		<p>of its itinerary thanks to the "<i>los viñedos fueron plantados por inmigrantes italianos</i>".</p> <p>These still living traces show the relevance of the Colline, the impact of its landscape, schools and migrants, and it shows how much it is important to investigate the relevant contribute the migrants are bearers in the exchange among countries; <u>for these reasons, also to pave the way for new nominations enlightening the outstanding contribute offered by the migrants and their influence in their hosting countries, the Colline should be inscribed in WHL.</u></p>	
<p>Page 236, right, lines 53-56</p> <p>continuing on</p> <p>Page 237, left, lines 1-4</p>	<p><u><i>It is:</i></u></p> <p>In fact, the "site's geographic position characterized by a natural fragility, with hard and soft rock" occurs in many European vineyards, especially in mountainous areas, such as the Pre-Alps, and this is what makes for interesting wines, each 'terroir' being different, adapted to various grape varieties, giving different tastes even among the same variety.</p>	<p><u><i>It should read:</i></u> <b><i>Note 26</i></b></p> <p>In fact, the "site's geographic position characterized by a natural fragility, with hard and soft rock" occurs in many European vineyards, especially in mountainous areas, such as the Pre-Alps, and this is what makes for interesting wines, each 'terroir' being different, adapted to various grape varieties, giving different tastes even among the same variety. <b>However, the nominated Colline offers a unique hard geomorphology being inhabited and cultivated since millennia and an historical framework of borderland, distinguishing its cultural landscape from the continental ones.</b></p> <p><u><i>Comment</i></u></p> <p><u>Once again ICOMOS focuses on the product and not on the nominated landscape aspects</u> where the natural dimension plays a major role with its unique inhabited geomorphology.</p> <p>ICOMOS also quotes a region, Alps and the Pre-Alps, where <u>the geomorphological landform of the Colline is unique not only because inhabited and cultivated since millennia</u> but also on a strict natural point of view, as other hogbacks can be found only in North Africa, Colorado, Iran and Australia; see nomination form page 32-33 "<i>the globally unique inhabited northern strip hogbacks</i>").</p> <p>Further the landscape history of the Colline, its agricultural adaptation and agrarian settings and solutions, greatly differs from other areas also because of the overall natural characteristics; see the comparative analysis of nomination form, page 211 et seq. where the morphology has been considered among the characteristics; see also the empowered comparative analysis provided in the Additional information A considering the major environmental challenges the geomorphology identity and the landscape structure (pages 21-22).</p> <p>From the point of view of the structure of the rural landscape, the landscape matrix is</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>

		<p>made up of a highly fragmented mosaic, composed of vineyards, vines and other land uses. <u>This high complexity of the landscape matrix represents an element of uniqueness that is not highlighted in any other wine landscape.</u> Associated with the landscape mosaic, there is an historical settlement patrimony, namely linked to the rural annexes serving agricultural activities, still present and punctuating the landscape, with a geometric layout on the territory, directly connected to a wise proportion between the number of service and the cultivated extension to which they refer.</p> <p><u>This arrangement is clearly visible in the photos annexed to the nomination,</u> as well as in one of the report. In particular, especially <u>when compared e.g. to French WHS of Burgundy or Saint Emilion, the landscape of Colline del Prosecco has nothing to do with vines or important wines,</u> but with a poor wine and agriculture which became a case of world success for its territory and far lands.</p> <p>More in general, it should be noted that the nomination of the Colline is not about a terroir, but about a landscape, a category by definition encompassing a number of features shared with some other landscapes, inscribed or not in the WHL, as it has been the case for the previous vineyards nominated (and inscribed) to the List. <u>The nomination proposes another unique theme in the context of the WHL since the Colline offer a unique bio-cultural landscape,</u> for the characteristics of its landscape matrix. Biocultural rural landscapes are the subject of the Florence Declaration on the common program between UNESCO and CBD on the links between biological and biocultural diversity on April 2014. This theme was included in the final declaration of the ICOMOS General Assembly held in Florence in 2014 and it has been mentioned in the decisions concerning the inclusion of Burgundy in the WHL: <u>the Colline del Prosecco's nomination is the first to present a biocultural landscape as a universal value.</u></p>	
Page 237, left, lines 14-35	<p><u>It is:</u></p> <p>ICOMOS considers that few details are provided to corroborate the suggestion that the nominated area, as a particular part of the Veneto, inspired particular artists and how views corresponding with their paintings remain largely unchanged. Rather the nomination dossier refers to “representation of the landscape in sacred art as of the 15th century, as</p>	<p><u>Comment 1</u></p> <p>The mentioned WHS of Val D’Orcia is not an example of adaptation to a tough morphological land, but a governed led reshaped site, with a top-down approach, the “Good Government” precisely. The same applies for the Landscape of Piedmont. The Colline, and its Renaissance paintings representation bears witness of a poor and rural landscape, with a bottom-up approach adaptation by its community of small farmers; whether they are both evocative, simply they evoke different</p>	<p><u>Note 27</u></p> <p>ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.</p>

	<p>evidence of the site and it's still visible local landmarks". ICOMOS further notes that other vineyard landscapes, such as the Vineyard Landscape of Piedmont: Langhe- Roero and Monferrato (Italy) also presents many examples of representations, much more evocative of the actual landscape than those shown for the nominated property. Val d'Orcia (Italy) has been listed as an exact and still-living representation, a prototype of the Renaissance landscape represented in the Sienna fresco of 'Good Government' by Lorenzetti (on which the vine labours are specifically reproduced), and of the 'bel paesaggio' represented by the greatest Renaissance painters. For these reasons, ICOMOS is not convinced by the arguments for the importance of the property in the Venetian art tradition.</p>	<p>messages and values.</p> <p>When dealing with authenticity ICOMOS recognizes the unchanged landscape since its representation in Renaissance painting masterpiece: "<i>The perception of the landscape, with its crops, semi-natural areas, castles, towers and steeples, can be readily observed in pictorial depictions dating back to the 1400s, including the sacred landscape works of Cima da Conegliano in particular</i>" (page 235, right column, lines 47-51) and "<i>ICOMOS notes that the nominated property is authentic as a whole, as far as the architectural forms, styles and materials are concerned</i>" (page 236, left column, lines 1-3).</p> <p>While it is unclear what the report is referring to about "Venetian art tradition" (unless it is a reference to the Venetian Renaissance), ICOMOS is also underestimating the role played by the Colline as iconic rural landscape, as represented by Cima da Conegliano and the other major artists who took inspiration from it (Titian, Giorgione, Lotto, etc.) to present a rural landscape.</p> <p>These masterpieces have been lately exhibited in Paris in 2012 at Luxembourg Museum "<i>Cima da Conegliano Master of the Venetian Renaissance</i>" (<a href="https://museeduluxembourg.fr/cima-da-conegliano-maitre-de-la-rennaissance-venitienne">https://museeduluxembourg.fr/cima-da-conegliano-maitre-de-la-rennaissance-venitienne</a>) while a cycle of conferences investigated further the role of "<i>Le paysage dans la culture de la Renaissance</i>" (<a href="https://www.grandpalais.fr/fr/article/cima-da-conegliano-maitre-de-la-rennaissance-venitienne-les-conferences">https://www.grandpalais.fr/fr/article/cima-da-conegliano-maitre-de-la-rennaissance-venitienne-les-conferences</a>). Since it seems ICOMOS underestimated the sources offered, it should be probably the case to quote directly from these last exhibition and researches' events "<i>Cima influenced Giorgione's tonal painting and became the master of the generation of Lorenzo Lotto, Titian and Sebastiano del Piombo. There was therefore a constant dialogue between several generations of artists around Cima (...) In his painting, Cima explored new compositional effects combining nature and architecture. He introduced asymmetry and unexpected vistas and made surprising openings. His paintings reveal his love of wide-open spaces, bathed in light and surrounded by hills and mountains reminiscent of his native countryside.</i>".</p> <p>The Colline and their landscape's features are visible in major world museums like the National Gallery of Art in Washington (<i>Saint Helena</i>, Cima da Conegliano, 1495), Galleria Borghese in Rome (<i>L'amor sacro, l'amor profano</i>, Titian, 1515), The Cleveland Museum of Art (<i>Virgin and Child with Saints and Donors</i>, Cima da Conegliano, 1515) or State Hermitage Museum of St. Petersburg (<i>Annunciation</i>, Cima da Conegliano, 1495) where it was</p>	
--	---	---	--

		<p>lately restored in 2011 with an analysis about its original landscape's features: "Even the landscape visible through the window has a real original; on the crown of a hill towers the fortress known as Castelvechio di Conelyano and a winding country road descends from it." (www.hermitagemuseum.org/wps/portal/hermitage/what-s-on/temp_exh/1999_2013/hm4_1_294/?lng=).</p> <p><u>Actually, in the Venetian Renaissance, the nominated landscape of the Colline played a major role in representing an iconic original and rural landscape</u>, as also ICOMOS appreciated stating about its authenticity.</p> <p>For all these reasons, it is surprising that the expert ICOMOS underestimated the value and the role of the nominated landscape to portray the rural landscape since the XV century.</p>	
<p>Page 237, right, lines 19-21</p> <p>And lines 55-57</p>	<p><u>It is:</u></p> <p>Recent vineyards have not always been created according to traditional structural criteria (planting parallel to the slope, landslides have also occurred).</p> <p><b>ICOMOS the success of Prosecco wines has encouraged agricultural land-use intensification, which may also threaten the landscape.</b></p>	<p><u>It should read</u> <b>Note 28</b></p> <p>Recent vineyards have not always been created according to traditional structural criteria <b>in the external areas of the nominated property</b> (planting parallel to the slope, landslides have also occurred).</p> <p><del>ICOMOS the success of Prosecco wines has encouraged agricultural land-use intensification, which may also threaten the landscape.</del></p> <p><u>Comment 1</u></p> <p>The conclusion of the Panel is that the Colline del Prosecco's landscape, as it exists today, cannot be readily linked to the layout of vineyards and production methods from the 18<sup>th</sup> century and earlier.</p> <p><u>Unless, once again, ICOMOS is probably referring to the external area out of the nominated landscape and its buffer zones; however, this statement, about a non-persistence of the traditional features of the cultivation plant does not match with what, on the contrary, is clearly shown and documented (lastly) in the Additional information (see document A, pages 1-7 and 29-36). The result is a landscape that has not, for at least two centuries, been affected by any significant simplifications, and has maintained its cultivated parcels almost intact in which, although the cultivation techniques and technological input may have varied, the lay out or the ownership systems have remain the same (see Additional information A, page 5).</u></p> <p>Namely figure 15 (page 33 of the same document) is an <u>example of a comparison</u></p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p> <p>ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.</p>

		<p>between the layout detectable from the maps of the Napoleonic cadaster and the 2017 AVEPA cadaster: “the Napoleonic cadaster with AVEPA surfaces that were vined in 1811 (permanence) in brown and AVEPA surfaces that were not wine grown in 1811 (transformation) in orange. Right: 2015 AGEA orthophoto with the historic vined surfaces in brown (permanence), and the new vineyard surfaces in orange (transformation). The two portions above clearly show row orientation, the surface’s reorganization through the unification of the parcels, and the new settlement”</p> <p>As far as it concerns the recent agricultural activities, it should once again remarked that the <u>detailed land use studies and monitoring</u> (since almost 60 years) on the <u>nominated area</u> documented a small <u>reduction of the cultivated areas</u> (from a surface of 6,200 ha in 1960 to 5,690 ha in 2014; for an overview See nomination form pages 245 et seq. “4.a.3. Soil Use and Viticultural Activity Vineyards and Plantations”).</p>	
<p>Page 238, left, lines 1-4</p> <p>And</p> <p>Page 239, left, lines 36-39</p> <p>And</p> <p>Page 239, left, lines 40-45</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the main factors liable to affect the property are the expansion of non-agricultural urban fabric, agricultural land-use intensification and transformation of agricultural terrain. (PAG. 238)</p> <p>In general, ICOMOS considers that the set of protective measures guarantees that both the nominated property and the buffer zone do not run the risk of being subjected to large-scale transformation. (PAG. 239)</p> <p>ICOMOS considers that the legal protection in place could be strengthened by the implementation of the “Piano Paesaggistico di Dettaglio (PPD)” at the regional level, the implementation of “Regolamento intercomunale di polizia rural” and the approval of the tool “Technical rule - Sole Article” by all municipalities. (PAG. 239)</p>	<p><u>Comment</u> <span style="float: right;"><u>Note 29</u></span></p> <p>Once again, also about the factors affecting the property, the evaluation report of ICOMOS looks contradictory, particularly about such the risk of large-scale transformations: <b><u>it looks unclear if these evaluations refer to the nominated area and its buffer zone</u></b>, deemed well managed and protected (“<i>ICOMOS considers that the general state of conservation of the property is adequate, and that the conservation measures adopted are generally effective</i>”, page 238, right column, lines 27-29; “<i>In conclusion, ICOMOS considers that the boundaries of the nominated property could be considered adequate although they may benefit from a slight adjustment in some sections (south-west and north-east) to ensure more effective protection. The boundaries of the buffer zone are adequate</i>” page 238, left column, lines 38-43), and whose land transformation are strictly ruled (and basically not viable) <b><u>or to the broader area which is external to the nominated landscape</u></b>.</p> <p>For an illustration about the overall system of protection, see additional information B, section B1, pages 1-10.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.</p>

<p>Page 238, left, lines 45-50</p> <p>"Ownership"</p>	<p><u>It is:</u></p> <p>The nominated property falls within the municipal territory of fifteen municipalities within the Veneto Region and is divided between private property, including vineyards and a number of historical and rural buildings, and the public domain consisting of, apart from its architectural elements, waterways, roadways and public spaces in general.</p>	<p><u>It should read:</u> <b>Note 30</b></p> <p>The nominated property falls within the municipal territory of fifteen municipalities <b>in the Province of Treviso</b>, within the Veneto Region, and is divided between private property, including vineyards and a number of historical and rural buildings <b>whose extension and modifications are strictly regulated whereas not forbidden at all by national and regional authorities and rules</b>, and the public domain consisting of, apart from its architectural elements, waterways, roadways and public spaces in general.</p> <p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>The integration is meant to underline the extent – in terms of limitation to private ownership as it is the case in this part – of the protection and the strict regulation of the Colline, including the remote possibility to expand vineyards or modify the key visual and historical aspect of the landscape, also because of the strict legal rules established as before mentioned.</p> <p>It is worthy to underline that this protection of the landscape and its key millenary features, dates however so far before the DOCG as viticulture and agricultural activities represent components of a complex landscape always defended by its community because providing their sense of identity, which is a consequence of this millenary attachment to this land.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers this correction to be a clarification.</p>
<p>Page 239, left, lines 31-33</p> <p>"Protection"</p> <p>And</p> <p>Page 240, right, lines 18-21</p> <p>"Management"</p>	<p><u>It is:</u></p> <p>it is important that the "<i>Regolamento intercomunale di polizia rurale</i>" enters into force soon.</p> <p>Nevertheless, with the general planning document and the "<i>Intercomunale Regolamento di Polizia Rurale</i>", the guidelines for a harmonious development exist today.</p>	<p><u>Comment</u> <b>Note 31</b></p> <p>The evaluation report appears contradictory; however, it should be noted that the <i>Regolamento intercomunale di polizia rurale</i> is already covering almost all the Municipalities of the nominated property which approved it.</p> <p><u>The Regulation is already in force</u>, and its role is clearly described in the nom. form (page 282 et seq.) and Additional Information B, pages 5 et seq. For the overall structure of the Regulation see pages 22 et seq. of the same document; please note that the last chapter of it (page 69 "Entry in force") is related to necessary <i>ad hoc</i> approval by the Council of any Municipality <u>as it already happened in almost all the nominated landscape</u>.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers this correction to be 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):** Japan

**EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE:** Hidden Christian Sites in the Nagasaki Region

**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 113, Column 1, Line 15	Hara Castle,	<b>Remains of</b> Hara Castle, <i>Just correction.</i>	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
Page 113, Column 1, Line 16-22	<b>Together</b> they reflect the <b>earliest activities of Christian missionaries and settlers in Japan, including the earliest phase of the encounter, a subsequent era of prohibition and persecution</b> of the Christian faith <b>and settlers</b> , as well as <b>the final phase of</b> the revitalization of Christian communities after the official lifting of the prohibition.	They reflect the era of prohibition of the Christian faith, as well as the revitalization of Christian communities after the official lifting of the prohibition.  <i>Just correction.</i> <i>Through the process of reconfiguration of the nomination, it is focused on the tradition of Hidden Christians nurtured in the period of the ban of Christianity and gradually transformed in the subsequent transition period.</i>	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
Page 113, Column 2, Line 34-40	<b>Together</b> they reflect the <b>earliest activities of Christian missionaries and settlers in Japan, including the earliest phase of the encounter, a subsequent era of prohibition and persecution</b> of the Christian faith <b>and settlers</b> , as well as <b>the final phase of</b> the revitalization of Christian communities after the official lifting of the prohibition in 1873.	They reflect the era of prohibition of the Christian faith, as well as the revitalization of Christian communities after the official lifting of the prohibition in 1873.  <i>Just correction.</i> <i>Through the process of reconfiguration of the nomination, it is focused on the tradition of Hidden Christians nurtured in the period of the ban of Christianity and gradually transformed in the subsequent transition period.</i>	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
Page 113, Column 2, Line 41-43	The 12 serial sites comprise an overall area of <b>5,569.34 ha</b> and are surrounded by buffer zones with a total area of <b>12,152.43 ha</b> .	The 12 serial sites comprise an overall area of <b>5,566.55 ha</b> and are surrounded by buffer zones with a total area of <b>12,252.52 ha</b> .  <i>Just correction.</i>	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.  In the additional information provided by the State Party in February 2018, the new maps

		<i>The area of the property and the buffer zone has been modified reflecting the Interim report from ICOMOS and the subsequent Additional Information by the State Party.</i>	did not mention the revised extent of the boundaries and the buffer zone.
Page 114, Column 1, Line 10	<b>48.48ha</b>	<b>45.69ha</b> <i>Just correction.</i> <i>The area of the property has been modified reflecting the Interim report from ICOMOS and the subsequent Additional Information by the State Party.</i>	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.  In the additional information provided by the State Party in February 2018, the new maps did not mention the revised extent of the boundaries and the buffer zone.
Page 114, Column 1, Line 14-15	<b>Amakusa Island</b>	<b>Amakusa</b> <i>Just correction.</i>	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
Page 114, Column 1, Line 24	on the <b>western</b> coast of Hirado Island	on the <b>north-western</b> coast of Hirado Island <i>Just correction.</i>	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
Page 114, Column 1, Line 56-58 Column 2, Line 1-6	It comprises several houses in which Hidden Christians' secret icons were kept, several Hidden Christian graveyards, the magistrate's office that controlled the village during the ban on Christianity, the beach on which Catholic missionaries landed after the 'Discovery of Hidden Christians', and the church that was constructed after the lifting of the ban in 1882, with extensions and structural additions added in 1891 and 1909.	It comprises <b>remains of</b> several houses in which Hidden Christians' secret icons were kept, several Hidden Christian graveyards, the <b>remains of</b> magistrate's office that controlled the village during the ban on Christianity, the beach on which Catholic missionaries landed after the 'Discovery of Hidden Christians', and the church that was constructed after the lifting of the ban in 1882, with extensions and structural additions added in 1891 and 1909.  <i>Just correction.</i> <i>The buildings themselves have already demolished but the immediate sites are identified in the both cases.</i>	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
Page 114, Column 2, Line 31-32	<b>between 1880 and 1902</b>	<b>in 1880</b> <i>Just correction.</i> <i>The first Kuroshima Church was constructed in 1880, and 1902 is the year when the present church was completed.</i>	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
Page 114, Column 2, Line 39-41	farmland with stone retaining walls; and the Nokubi Church and <b>the site of</b> the Setowaki Church	<b>former</b> farmland with stone retaining walls; and <b>the sites of</b> the Nokubi Church and the Setowaki Church  <i>Just correction.</i> <i>Farmland and the two churches are already not in actual use.</i>	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
Page 114, Column 2, Line 54-55	as well as the Kashiragashima Church	as well as the <b>first</b> Kashiragashima Church  <i>Just clarification.</i>	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
Page 115, Column 1, Line 27	in the <b>south</b> of the Nagasaki region	in the <b>middle</b> of the Nagasaki region  <i>Just correction.</i>	ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.
Page 115, Column 1, Line 49	<b>oversee</b> trade	<b>oversea</b> trade  <i>Just correction.</i>	ICOMOS acknowledges this typing error.
Page 115, Column 1, Line	When Japan was unified <b>in 1587</b> by Toyotomi Hideyoshi	When Japan was unified by Toyotomi Hideyoshi after	ICOMOS acknowledges this

54-57	after lengthy feudal wars, on the occasion of his triumphal return from battle he issued an edict expelling missionaries from Japan.	lengthy feudal wars, on the occasion of his triumphal return from battle he issued an edict expelling missionaries from Japan <b>in 1587</b> . <i>Just correction.</i>	factual error.
Page 115, Column 2, Line 4-5	In 1637 the <b>hidden</b> Christians of Arima and Amakusa	In 1637 the <b>Hidden</b> Christians of Arima and Amakusa <i>Just correction.</i>	ICOMOS acknowledges this typing error.
Page 116, Column 2, Line 16-22	the 12 sites do indeed reflect the <b>earliest activities of Christian missionaries and settlers in Japan, including the earliest phase of encounter, a subsequent era of prohibition and persecution</b> of the Christian faith <b>and settlers</b> , as well as the <b>final phase</b> of revitalization of Christian communities after the official lifting of the prohibition.	the 12 sites do indeed reflect the era of prohibition of the Christian faith, as well as the revitalization of Christian communities after the official lifting of the prohibition. <i>Just correction.</i> <i>Through the process of reconfiguration of the nomination, it is focused on the tradition of Hidden Christians nurtured in the period of the ban of Christianity and gradually transformed in the subsequent transition period.</i>	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
Page 117, Column 1, Line 53	including Oura Cathedral and <b>the eight churches</b>	including Oura Cathedral and <b>Egami Church</b> <i>Just clarification.</i> <i>Although a number of churches are included in the nominated property, only Oura cathedral and Egami Church are explicitly identified as component parts.</i>	ICOMOS notes that this paragraph does not relate to the nominated components in particular but to the major built structures that are comprised within the property. That is the reason why the eight churches are mentioned.
Page 117, Column 2, Line 2-3	the design <b>integrity</b>	the design <b>authenticity</b> <i>Just correction.</i>	ICOMOS acknowledges this typing error.
Page 119, Column 1, Line 32-34	The nominated property has a total area of <b>17, 721.77 ha</b> , which encompasses a property of <b>5,569.34 ha</b> and a buffer zone of <b>12,152.43 ha</b> .	The nominated property has a total area of <b>17,819.07 ha</b> , which encompasses a property of <b>5,566.55 ha</b> and a buffer zone of <b>12,252.52 ha</b> . <i>Just correction.</i> <i>The area of the property and the buffer zone has b modified reflecting the Interim report from ICOM and the subsequent Additional Information by the Party.</i>	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.  In the additional information provided by the State Party in February 2018, the new maps did not mention the revised extent of the boundaries and the buffer zone.
Page 119, Column 2, Line 48-49	The <b>National</b> Parks Act, <b>Nagasaki</b> City Planning Act	The <b>Natural</b> Parks Act, City Planning Act <i>Just correction.</i>	ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.
Page 120, Column 1, Line 1-2	apart from <b>Ono</b> Village	apart from <b>Egami</b> Village <i>Just correction.</i> <i>'Important Cultural Landscape' does not apply as a protection measure to Egami Village.</i>	ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.
Page 120, Column 1, Line 7	the <b>National</b> Parks Act	the <b>Natural</b> Parks Act <i>Just correction.</i>	ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.
Page 122, Column 1, Line 28	one castle	one castle <b>remains</b> <i>Just correction.</i>	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.

Page 122, Column 1, Line 48-51	<b>ICOMOS recommends, however, that Ono Village (component 006) should be designated as an 'Important Cultural Landscape' under the Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties.</b>	(delete) <i>Just correction. Ono Village has already selected as Important Cultural Landscape under the Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties on 13 February 2018</i> .	ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.
Page 122, Column 2, Line 21	one castle	one castle <b>remains</b> <i>Just correction.</i>	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
Page 122, Column 2, Line 22-27	<b>Together</b> they reflect the <b>earliest activities of Christian missionaries and settlers in Japan, including the earliest phase of the encounter, a subsequent era of prohibition and persecution</b> of the Christian faith <b>and settlers</b> , as well as <b>the final phase of</b> the revitalization of Christian communities after the official lifting of the prohibition in 1873.	They reflect the era of prohibition of the Christian faith, as well as the revitalization of Christian communities after the official lifting of the prohibition in 1873.  <i>Just correction. Through the process of reconfiguration of the nomination, it is focused on the tradition of Hidden Christians nurtured in the period of the ban of Christianity and gradually transformed in the subsequent transition period.</i>	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
Page 125, Caption	Map showing the location of the nominated <b>properties</b>	Map showing the location of the nominated <b>property</b>  <i>Just correction.</i>	ICOMOS acknowledges this typing 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):** Oman

**EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE:** Ancient City of Qalhat

**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 48, first column, second paragraph	This quarter is composed of buildings on both sides of a straight street which connects the harbour to a city gate in the northern fortification wall, <b>the key access to Qalhat from the direction of Muscat.</b>	This quarter is composed of buildings on both sides of a straight street, which connects the harbour to one of the city gates.  [The key access to Qalhat from Muscat is from the north west]	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
page 48, first column, last paragraph	The most ancient mention of Qalhat is found in the Kitab Ansab Al 'Arab attributed to Salama ibn Muslim Al-Awtabi Al-Suhari, which dates its foundation to the early Christian Era. <b>However, oral tradition dates its foundation centuries earlier</b> to the reign of Malik bin Fahm Al-Azdi, who is said to have established the first Omani capital at al-Qalhat.	The most ancient mention of Qalhat is found in the Kitab Ansab Al 'Arab attributed to Salama ibn Muslim Al-Awtabi Al-Suhari (end 11 <sup>th</sup> /beginning 12 <sup>th</sup> c.), which dates its foundation to the early Christian Era when Mâlik ibn Fahm, a mythic king of the 'Azd tribe, is reported to have migrated from Yemen to Oman, and to have established the first Omani capital at al-Qalhat.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
page 48, second column, third paragraph	In the <b>early 12th century AD</b> , the capital transferred to Jaron Island and ...	In the early 14 <sup>th</sup> century AD, the capital transferred to Jaron Island and ...  [We identified a misprint in the nomination file. It should be corrected as above.]	ICOMOS acknowledges this correction.
page 49, first column, last paragraph	It appears that the two former capitals share with Qalhat the fact that very little excavation and research has been undertaken and hence the full potential of these two sites cannot be estimated and is probably even less explored than that of Qalhat. ... as archaeological sites competing...	[The ancient city of Qalhat is well preserved and systematic archaeological explorations and studies started in 2008. The same cannot be said for Old Hormuz that was never identified (probably located near the shore and now silted) and New Hormuz was largely destroyed, except for large cisterns, by the Portuguese in the 15 <sup>th</sup> c., by the Persians in the 16 <sup>th</sup> century, and now it is encroached by modern occupation. For this, we do not see them as competing sites but we view	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.

		Qalhat as the site that provides most of the archaeological evidences about the Kingdom of Hormuz.]	
page 49, second column, first paragraph	.... with Qalhat representing the trade port connecting Hormuz across the Indian Ocean <b>and to East Africa</b> , and especially the trade in Arab horses.	..... with Qalhat representing the trade port connecting Hormuz across the Indian Ocean, and especially the .....  [The Hormuz empire controlled seafaring trade routes between East Africa and India but in Qalhat there is very small evidence of a relation with Africa.]	ICOMOS considers this correction to be a clarification.
page 52, second column, third and fourth paragraph	However, ICOMOS considers that it would be desirable that the nominated property delineation include at least the shoreline of the property,  Moreover, the highway which borders the western side of Qalhat is partially included in the property, in the southern/south-western area. It is not clear why this choice was made.	[A discrepancy was identified in the coordinates delivered by the Ministry of Housing. This was due to the projection used by the Ministry of Housing (Clarke 1880 instead of WGS84). This has been already addressed in the new property map (6-39-015-01-308 of May 22, 2018). The expressway is now out of the core zone and buffer zone A, and the shoreline is inside the nominated property. Please see the documents in the attached SMP amendment.]	ICOMOS considers that this correction contains new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.
page 53, first column, last paragraph	ICOMOS therefore recommends that a minimum intervention approach is applied to all future conservation projects.....	[The State Party would like to assure again ICOMOS that this is the approach decided for the Qalhat Development Project (QDP) that started in 2013.]	ICOMOS considers this correction to be a clarification.  However, the Qalhat Development Project (QDP) has not been submitted as part of the nomination dossier as such.
page 53, second column, second paragraph	... less good, such as the southern extra-muros cistern.	[The cistern was preserved with minimal intervention to maintain the authenticity of the building and site. This is the philosophy guiding since 2013 the QDP.]	ICOMOS considers this correction to be a clarification.  However, the Qalhat Development Project (QDP) has not been submitted as part of the nomination dossier as such.
page 53, second column, fifth paragraph	ICOMOS recommends that the current practice of contracting out conservation tasks to international firms or institutions should be used as a means of local capacity-building in order to train a site-specific team qualified to undertake ongoing conservation and maintenance works.	[This is indeed a priority of the QDP. Two staff of the Ministry of Heritage and Culture (MHC) participated as member of the conservation team during two past seasons. On-the-job training will continue during the next phases of the conservation work.  MHC staff were also part of the team that prepared the site management plan (SMP).]	ICOMOS considers this correction to be a clarification.  However, the Qalhat Development Project (QDP) has not been submitted as part of the nomination dossier as such.
page 54, first column, first paragraph	ICOMOS recommends that the management plan is finalized, officially adopted and submitted to the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS.	[The SMP was completed, submitted to ICOMOS on April 24, 2018, and officially endorsed by HRH the Minister of Heritage and Culture on May 31, 2018. Please see the document in the attached SMP amendment.]	ICOMOS considers that this correction contains new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.

page 54, first column, second paragraph	ICOMOS recommends that Heritage Impact Assessments are undertaken according to ICOMOS' Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage Properties.	[The Heritage Impact Assessment will be integrated in the visitation master plan whose preparation is a top priority for the MHC.]	ICOMOS considers that this correction contains new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.
page 54, first column, third paragraph	While stakeholder meetings have been held with the local resident community, there is no clear indication that community members will play an effective role in decision-making or future management of the property.	[The SMP addressed this point. The local community will be part of the management process being among the beneficiaries of a sustainable tourism development of Qalhat. Local traditions and intangible heritage will be valued during the process.]	ICOMOS considers that this correction contains new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.
page 54, first column, third paragraph	... human resources need to be strengthened...	[The SMP addressed this point. It will be put in place in the SMP implementation phase. It is a priority for the MHC that the members of the Qalhat Management Team will participate to training courses organized by international institutions based in the region.]	ICOMOS considers that this correction contains new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.
page 54, first column, fourth paragraph	... including a section on visitor management, risk preparedness and disaster-response, ....	[Visitor management is considered in the SMP but it will be developed more extensively in the visitation master plan, which is a top priority for the MHC. Risk preparedness and disaster response are developed in the Conservation Guidelines that will be finalized by the end of 2018.]	ICOMOS considers that this correction contains new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.
page 54, first column, sixth paragraph	The monitoring protocols will be executed <b>by the Sur office</b> of the Ministry of Heritage and Culture,...	The monitoring protocols will be executed by the Qalhat Management Team established by the Director General of Archaeology of the MHC,...  [As revised in the approved SMP. They will be put in place with the SMP implementation.]	ICOMOS considers that this correction contains new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.
page 54, second column, third paragraph	The <b>team at the regional Sur office</b> is responsible for the day-to-day management of the property.	The Site Manager under the supervision of the Director of the World Heritage Sites Department is responsible for the day-to-day management of the property.  [As revised in the approved SMP]	ICOMOS considers that this correction contains new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.

## 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:** Sansa, Buddhist Mountain Monasteries in Korea

**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. 126, left, line 7	Although many members of the royal family, <b>particularly women</b> , were Buddhists, Buddhism was suppressed and <b>the court ceased to patronise monasteries</b> .	<b>Clarification:</b> Although Buddhism was suppressed in accordance with the government's policy, many members of the royal family, <b>including the sovereigns</b> , remained as Buddhists, <b>and the royal patronage of Buddhism had continued through the Joseon period</b> . <i>See Dossier, pp. 54, 91, 122, 150; 2<sup>nd</sup> Additional Information, p. 12</i>	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
p. 126, left, line 31	and Buseoksa <b>and Bongjeongsa</b> were founded by the Silla monk Uisang from 676.	<b>Clarification:</b> Buseoksa was founded by the Silla Monk Uisang in 676 and <b>Bongjeongsa was founded by his disciple Neungin in 677</b> . <i>See Dossier, pp. 65, 69, 100</i>	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
p. 126, left, line 33	<b>Both Jajang and</b> Uisang were proponents of the Avatamsaka school (known as Hwaeom in Korean),	<b>Clarification:</b> <b>Master Jajang introduced Vinaya school to Korea, and Master Uisang served to propagate the Avatamsaka tradition (known as Hwaeom in Korean) in Korea</b> , <i>See Dossier, pp. 60, 65</i>	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
p. 126, left, line 34	and evidence of the importance of this Avatamsaka tradition is found at Buseoksa, Bongjeongsa, <b>and Beopjusa temples</b> .	<b>Clarification:</b> and evidence of the importance of this Avatamsaka tradition is found at Buseoksa and Bongjeongsa. <b>The foundation of Beopjusa was based on Beopsang (Dharma Characteristics) school</b> . <i>See Dossier, p. 89</i>	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.

p. 126, left, line 42	Research by art historians, has shown that the current building was probably <b>completed or at least significantly renovated during the Goryeo period.</b>	<p><b><u>Clarification:</u></b></p> <p>Research by art historians has shown that the current building <b>was constructed in 646 when Tongdosa was founded. Although the Platform was renovated five times through the Goryeo and Joseon periods, its archetype of the bell-shaped stupa and the steps of the lower terrace on the base has been preserved.</b></p> <p><i>See Dossier, pp. 95-6, Table 2-2</i></p>	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
p. 126, left, line 45	Buseoksa's Hall of Infinite Life, constructed in the 13th century <b>is the oldest extant wooden building</b> in Korea,	<p><b><u>Clarification:</u></b></p> <p>Buseoksa's Hall of Infinite Life, constructed in the 13<sup>th</sup> century, is <b>one of the oldest extant wooden buildings</b> in Korea,</p> <p><b><u>Comment:</u></b></p> <p>Bongjeongsa's Hall of Paradise, constructed in the early 13<sup>th</sup> century, is officially recognized as the oldest extant wooden building in Korea.</p>	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
p. 126, left, line 47	and contains a molded clay image of the Buddha <b>Amita<b>ab</b>ha</b> that probably dates from the late <b>Silla period</b> .	<p><b><u>Correction of typing error and clarification:</u></b></p> <p>and contains a molded clay image of the Buddha <b>Amitabha from the Goryeo period that succeeds the style of the Silla period.</b></p>	<p>ICOMOS acknowledges this typing error.</p> <p>ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.</p>
p. 127, right, line 29	<b>Bongjeongsa has a smaller scale than the other six components and cannot be considered to be a 'comprehensive monastery'. In terms of their historical significance, Bongjeongsa, Magoksa, and Seonamsa are weaker.</b>	<p><b><u>Delete</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Comment:</u></b></p> <p><b>1. Bongjeongsa's smaller scale</b></p> <p>Despite its smaller scale, Bongjeongsa is complete with key facilities required for a comprehensive monastery. Furthermore, the Hall of Arhats (Eungjinjeon) area is also complete with auxiliary facilities for worship and daily living.</p> <p><i>See Dossier, pp. 69-72</i></p> <p><b>2. Historical significance of Bongjeongsa, Magoksa, and Seonamsa</b></p> <p>Sansa comprised of the seven component temples in its entirety represents the historical evolution and sustainment of Korean Buddhism throughout the course of Korean history.</p> <p>Bongjeongsa, Magoksa, and Seonamsa are as important as the other four monasteries in terms of 'historical significance.' The three monasteries like the other four monasteries make themselves representative, signifying important phases of the long history of Korean Sansa.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.</p> <p>ICOMOS considers that these corrections re-iterate arguments put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p> <p>ICOMOS considers that these corrections re-iterate arguments put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>

		<p>Avoiding severe damage from the Japanese invasions and transformation from extensive post-war restoration of the monastery, <b>Bongjeongsa</b> was able to retain the Hall of Paradise, officially recognized as the oldest extant wooden building in Korea, and Hall of the Great Hero, the oldest building with multi-cluster bracket sets in the country. Therefore, the State Party selected Bongjeongsa as a rare and important component that retains the archetype of its spatial configuration and architectural layout before the Joseon period.</p> <p>Under the anti-Buddhism policy of the Joseon government, the Buddhist monks of Bongjeongsa, located in Andong, the center of the most prominent private Neo-Confucian academy in Korea, endeavored to sustain the monastery through continuous cultural exchanges with local Neo-Confucian scholars.</p> <p><i>See Dossier, p. 69, 100, 102; 2<sup>nd</sup> Additional Information, pp. 20-21</i></p> <p>The 14<sup>th</sup>-century five-story stone pagoda at Magoksa with a typical Korean-style stone pagoda combined with Tibetan-style finial, the only extant example of this type in Korea, demonstrates an active exchange between the Goryeo dynasty and the Chinese Yuan dynasty during the period.</p> <p>Unlike Bongjeongsa, <b>Magoksa</b> suffered severe damage during the Japanese Invasions of Korea because the temple served as a base for monks' militia for national defense. Since then, the monastery has been recognized as a symbol of nation-protecting Buddhism.</p> <p>For producing Buddhist paintings, most noticeably Gwaebul paintings for large-scale outdoor ritual, Magoksa ran the largest center educating the monk-painters' community, a distinctive aspect of Korean Buddhism. Their activity continued until the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, leading the modern circle of Buddhist artists. The Tea Ceremony at Magoksa continues to be held in memory of the monk-painters to this day.</p> <p><i>See Dossier, pp. 80, 107; 2<sup>nd</sup> Additional Information, pp. 12, 21</i></p> <p>The Buddhist monks of <b>Seonamsa</b> have cultivated a number of tea fields in its backyard up to the present day, thereby promoting traditional tea culture of the Seon mountain monastery and supporting its economic self-reliance. Bridge of Ascending</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that these corrections re-iterate arguments put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p> <p>ICOMOS considers that these corrections re-iterate arguments put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p> <p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p> <p>ICOMOS considers that these corrections re-iterate arguments put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>Immortals (Seungseongyo) at the monastery built by the monk-craft masters inherited the traditional architectural technology. Seonamsa as a center for monk education took the lead in reforming monk education system in the early modern era.</p> <p><i>See Dossier, pp. 83, 111; 2<sup>nd</sup> Additional Information, p. 22</i></p> <p>Wooden architectural structures and stone artifacts of the three monasteries well preserved in situ not only best attest to the authenticity of the nominated property but also are material witnesses of labor and endeavors of Buddhist monks for establishing economic self-reliance and striving to sustain the monasteries. Such toils of the monks were the driving force to maintain Korean Buddhism through its long history amid the crisis of the mountain monasteries.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that these corrections re-iterate arguments put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>
p. 130, left, line 22	<p><b>The Tea Gardens</b> in the buffer zone of the Seonamsa Temple are separated from the temples by the mountain ranges, and have no impact upon the temple landscape.</p>	<p><b><u>Correction:</u></b></p> <p><b>Suncheon Wild Tea Experience Center</b> in the buffer zone of the Seonamsa Temple are separated from the temples by the mountain ranges, and have no impact upon the temple landscape.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers this correction to be a clarification.</p>
p. 131, left, line 24	<p>The nominated components are <b>all designated as Historic Sites under the Cultural Heritage Protection Act; and under City/Provincial Government Cultural Heritage Protection Ordinances.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Clarification:</u></b></p> <p>The nominated components are <b>all being protected and managed as state- or city/province designated cultural heritage.</b></p> <p><i>See Dossier, pp. 192-196 Table 5-4</i></p>	<p>ICOMOS considers this correction to be a clarification.</p>
p. 132, left, line 23	<p><b>While</b> these offices are part of the temple, <b>the salaries of the staff are provided by the Cultural Heritage Administration.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Clarification:</u></b></p> <p>These offices are part of the temple, and <b>the salaries of the staff are also provided by the temple. Meanwhile, the salaries of cultural heritage managers who patrol the property are subsidized by the government.</b></p> <p><i>See Dossier, pp. 227-228, 273</i></p>	<p>ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.</p>
p. 133, left, line 25	<p>framed by the 3rd Tourism Development Master Plan drawn up by the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism (<b>2017-2021</b>).</p>	<p><b><u>Correction:</u></b></p> <p>framed by the 3rd Tourism Development Master Plan drawn up by the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism (<b>2012-2021</b>).</p> <p><i>See Dossier, p. 214</i></p>	<p>ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.</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):** Saudi Arabia

**EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE:** Al-Ahsa Oasis, an evolving 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 58, column 1, § 2, lines 8-11	The present day Jawatha mosque <b>is a complete reconstruction by SCTH in the location of the original mosque.</b>	The present day Jawatha Mosque, <b>recently reconstructed by SCTH, includes remains of the 15<sup>th</sup> c. mosque, built on</b> the location of the original mosque.  _____ <i>Cf. Nomination File p.102: "The mosque — built over the traditional site where stood the second mosque in Islam to hold a Friday prayer after the Prophet's Mosque in Madinah — was built in 1436 CE and probably restored in 1750. It has been recently reconstructed by SCTH. <u>Remains of arches, forming a colonnade surrounded by a deck built of bricks with an outdoor courtyard surrounded by a high wall, were preserved and have been included in the recent reconstruction works.</u>"</i>	ICOMOS considers that this correction could be considered as a clarification.  However, this information would need to be supplemented by adequate documentation of the remains of the second mosque before reconstruction and on how the old remains were differentiated from the new fabric in the reconstruction process, as these details have not been provided.
Page 59, column 1, § 3.	ICOMOS notes that the comparative analysis could be further enhanced by including some relevant examples on the World Heritage List, such as the Oasis of Gabes, Tunisia (2008, (iv), (vii), (x)), <b>and Island of Djerba, Tunisia (2012, (v), (vi))</b>	ICOMOS notes that the comparative analysis could be further enhanced by including some relevant examples on the World Heritage List, such as the Oasis of Gabes, Tunisia (2008, (iv), (vii), (x)), <b>and Island of Djerba, Tunisia (2012, (v), (vi))</b>  _____ <i>The island of Djerba is absolutely <u>not relevant</u> for the comparison with al-Ahsa.</i>	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
Page 59, column 1, § 4.	ICOMOS notes that some comparators <b>are not relevant in the sense that they</b> have been inscribed on the World Heritage List for different sets of attributes and values than those proposed for Al-	ICOMOS notes that some comparators <b>are not relevant in the sense that they</b> have been inscribed on the World Heritage List for different sets of attributes and values than those proposed for Al-Ahsa.  _____ <i>Even though some nominations do not necessarily refer to the same attributes and</i>	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.

	Ahsa.	<i>values, <u>all the oases included in the comparative analysis are relevant</u> and, when the sites are inscribed on the WHL, this aspect should be underlined.</i>	
Page 59, column 1, § 5.	Al-Ahsa is nominated as a cultural landscape as a single oasis including different plantations, settlements, buildings and archaeological sites <b>that were not considered to be included within a single oasis, or any single entity, before the post-oil large-scale developments of the 1960s and 1970s.</b>	<p>Al-Ahsa is nominated as a cultural landscape as a single oasis including different plantations, settlements, buildings and archaeological sites. <del>that were not considered to be included within a single oasis, or any single entity, before the post-oil large-scale developments of the 1960s and 1970s.</del></p> <p><i>The nomination file presents a very detailed and complex analysis of the history and evolution of the oasis and of its landscape throughout the past centuries (chapter 2.b.ii-iv).</i></p> <p><i>The coherence of the area of the oasis is fully demonstrated and is evident even though its extension and the location of the human settlements within and around shifted and moved according to the historic period. (Cf. File p. 176: "Inhabited since high antiquity, human presence in the area constantly moved and shifted its location to adapt to climatic changes, to the progressive transformation of the landscape resulting for the continuous human activity, and to the destructions caused by the wars that affected a region that has played for a time a relevant economic and political role in the Arabian Peninsula."</i></p> <p><i>The evolution of the site in the 1960s and 1970s did not <u>modify in any way the coherence of the ensemble</u> and did not "create a single entity" as wrongly stated in the report.</i></p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.</p> <p>According to the nomination dossier, different settlements and palm groves existed with different names and distances between them. Today they are connected by the modern urban sprawl of the post 1960s boom to form one unit.</p>
Page 60, column 1, § 5	<b>Because of the recent changes,</b> what has been nominated is <b>not the whole oasis or even a substantial part of it but a selection of isolated components that do not add up to the idea of an overall cultural landscape and cannot readily be seen to</b> reflects all aspects of the way the oasis functioned traditionally.	<p><del><b>Because of the recent changes,</b></del> What has been nominated is <del><b>not the whole oasis or even a substantial part of it but a selection of isolated components that do not add up to the idea of an overall cultural landscape and cannot readily be seen to the whole oasis</b></del> that reflects all aspects of the way the oasis functioned traditionally.</p> <p><i>The nominated property covers an area of 8,544 ha surrounded by 21,555 ha of Buffer Zone for a <u>total surface of 30.100 hectares!</u> Stating that this area is "not a substantial part of the oasis" is an <u>unacceptable mistake and a false statement</u> as clearly demonstrated by the maps presenting the limits of the property and by the large A0 Satellite view/Map of the ensemble of the area that permits to appreciate the sheer scale of the property.</i></p> <p><i>The isolated components quoted in the report concern only historic monuments, or urban sectors that contribute to the presentation of the oasias a complex and multiple environment composed of natural elements (lake, hills, caves) watered gardens and palm groves, and urban settlements.</i></p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.</p> <p>Although the nominated property covers a huge area, it remains a group of isolated component parts, separated mainly by modern urban developments that cannot be seen as a cultural landscape.</p>

<p>Page 67, Column 1, § 2</p>	<p>In the past 50 years, <b>Al-Ahsa has rapidly developed to become the largest oasis in the world</b> and one that now functions on an industrial scale.</p>	<p>In the past 50 years, <b>Al-Ahsa has rapidly developed to become a large settlement within and around the largest oasis in the world. <del>and one that now functions on an industrial scale.</del></b></p> <hr/> <p><i>The size of the oasis has not been substantially extended in the past 50 years. While the new canals have briefly permitted to extend the cultivated surface, this extension has not proven sustainable and present-day oasis palm grove surface is similar to the one before the 1960s (Nomination File: pp. 146-167). The oasis of al-Ahsa, with its different and interconnected sectors, <u>was the largest in the world even before the 1960s.</u></i></p>	<p>ICOMOS accepts the clarification related to the size of the oasis.</p> <p>ICOMOS considers that the oasis has changed in nature and the production of dates from the palm groves is now organized on industrial scale and using industrial methods.</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):** Spain

**EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE:** Caliphate City of Medina Azahara

**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 262 column 2 para c)	c) Carrying out special monitoring on the portion of <b>Las Pintas...</b>	<b>Las Pitas</b>	ICOMOS acknowledges this typing 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):** Turkey

**EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE:** Göbekli Tepe

**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
265, 2, 37-40	ICOMOS notes that the electricity pylons and road network are <b>visible</b> , as are the irrigation channels to the south, and a limestone quarry north of the village of Örencik.	ICOMOS notes that the electricity pylons and road network are <b>partially visible</b> , as are the irrigation channels to the south, and a limestone quarry north of the village of Örencik.	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
266, 1, 19-23	ICOMOS considers that future development projects (railway line, <b>motorway</b> ) and the increase in tourist numbers likely to be generated are a very serious concern, and that, in view of these threats, the integrity of the property is extremely vulnerable.	ICOMOS considers that future development projects (railway line, <b>motorway</b> ) and the increase in tourist numbers likely to be generated are a very serious concern, and that, in view of these threats, the integrity of the property is extremely vulnerable.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
267, 2, 17-19	The attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value of the property are the <b>tells</b> and the limestone plateau in the setting of the surrounding plain,	the <b>tell</b>	ICOMOS acknowledges this typing error.
267, 2, 34-37	ICOMOS considers that the new <b>transport lines</b> and the construction of infrastructure likely to modify and/or have an impact on the landscape must be carefully monitored.	ICOMOS considers that the new <b>railway line</b> and the construction of infrastructure likely to modify and/or have an impact on the landscape must be carefully monitored.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
268, 1, 3-6	It is stressed that some agricultural infrastructure, and “compulsory infrastructure” will be exempted from a heritage impact assessment.	It is stressed that some agricultural infrastructure, and “compulsory infrastructure” will be exempted from a heritage impact assessment <b>within the areas beyond the boundaries of the nominated World Heritage Property and its buffer zone determined as areas to be protected for its natural and ecological characteristics under the 1:100.000 scale Environmental</b>	ICOMOS considers this correction to be a clarification.

		<b>Plan of Adiyaman-Şanlıurfa-Diyarbakır.</b>	
268, 1, 7-15	In the additional information provided on 6 November 2017, the State Party refers to the possibility of building “compulsory infrastructure” <b>such as the railway network</b> mentioned in the nomination dossier, for which no assessment of visual impact on the site would be required. ICOMOS considers nevertheless that a heritage impact assessment is necessary, in order to evaluate the threats that could adversely affect the property’s values.	<p>The State Party would like to clarify at first that the ‘compulsory infrastructure’ – mentioned in the Principle Decision No. 658, 05/11/1999 of the High Council for the Protection of Cultural Properties, the Nom. Dossier and/or the Additional Info. provided to ICOMOS in Nov.2017 can only include minor infrastructure works in order to meet the needs of the site/visitors. This includes electric, water infra. and other basic tourism infrastructure such as walkways, ticket offices, WC, etc.</p> <p>The proposed railway network (located approx. 2.5 km of Göbeki Tepe on the south and south-east direction) mentioned in the Nom. Dossier on the other hand is not within the boundaries of the Nom. WH property, its buffer zone or the larger protected area (presented in the Management Plan and currently called the management area).</p> <p>So the State Party requests to revise this paragraph as follows:</p> <p>In the additional information provided on 6 November 2017, the State Party refers to the possibility of building “compulsory infrastructure” for which no assessment of heritage impact on the site would be required. ICOMOS considers nevertheless that a heritage impact assessment is necessary <b>for large scaled infrastructure projects such as railway network</b>, in order to evaluate the threats that could adversely affect the property’s values.</p>	<p>ICOMOS acknowledges part of this correction as a clarification.</p> <p>ICOMOS considers that in a highlight sensitive area such as the setting of the proposed nominated area, heritage impacts could also be necessary for infrastructure associated with proposed visitor services. It therefore does not accept the revised wording of the last sentence.</p>
269, 1, 27-30	ICOMOS notes with concern that infrastructure has been built inside the property itself, inscribed as a 1 <sup>st</sup> Degree Archaeological Conservation Area, for tourism purposes <b>and not only</b> to protect the excavation zone.	<p>ICOMOS notes with concern that <b>demountable infrastructure with no foundation</b> has been built inside the property itself, inscribed as a 1<sup>st</sup> Degree Archaeological Conservation Area, for tourism purposes (souvenir shop, system room and security office ) <b>but also</b> to protect the excavation zone after getting consent from the Şanlıurfa Regional Council for Conservation based on the principles of Superior Council for Conservation. <b>Furthermore two permanent shelters were constructed to protect the main excavation areas with the consent of the related Regional Council for the Protection of Cultural Properties.</b> Göbekli Tepe Visitor Center and the Interpretation /Exhibition Centre were constructed outside the Nominated WH Property.</p>	ICOMOS acknowledges this correction as a clarification.

270, 1, 54 270, 2, 1	Council for Conservation of Cultural <b>and Natural</b> Properties	Council for Conservation of Cultural <del>and Natural</del> Properties	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
270, 2, 24-25	Regional Council for Conservation of Cultural <b>and Natural</b> Properties	Regional Council for Conservation of Cultural <del>and Natural</del> Properties	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
270, 2, 28-29	Şanlıurfa Regional Council for Conservation of Cultural <b>and Natural</b> Properties	Şanlıurfa Regional Council for Conservation of Cultural <del>and Natural</del> Properties	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
270, 2, 57 271, 1,1	the Director of the Şanlıurfa Council for Conservation of Cultural <b>and Natural Heritage</b>	the Director of the Şanlıurfa Regional Council for Conservation of Cultural <del>and Natural Heritage</del> Properties	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
271, 1, 28-30	<b>Two</b> shuttles for visitor transport have been funded, and a new visitor centre <b>that is under construction.</b>	<del>Two</del> <b>Four</b> shuttles for visitor transport have been funded, and a new visitor centre <b>and an interpretation /exhibition centre were built.</b>	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
271, 2, 19-21	A visitor centre, an interpretation and exhibition centre and parking areas have been set up outside <b>the buffer zone and</b> the nominated property.	A visitor centre, an interpretation and exhibition centre and parking areas have been set up outside the <del>buffer zone and</del> -nominated property.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
271, 2, 38-41	ICOMOS notes that projects that could affect the property's Outstanding Universal Value, such as construction and infrastructure projects (railway, <b>motorway</b> , etc.) inside the boundaries of the property,	ICOMOS notes that projects that could affect the property's Outstanding Universal Value, such as construction and infrastructure projects (railway, <del>motorway</del> , etc.) inside the boundaries of the property,	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
272, 1, 42-43	Şanlıurfa Regional Council for Conservation of Cultural <b>and Natural</b> Properties	Şanlıurfa Regional Council for Conservation of Cultural <del>and Natural</del> Properties	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
272, 1, 47-49	The Şanlıurfa Regional Council for Conservation of Cultural <b>and Natural</b> Properties	The Şanlıurfa Regional Council for Conservation of Cultural <del>and Natural</del> Properties	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
272, 2, 16-19	As the site is being promoted as a major tourist destination in Turkey, infrastructure development projects are planned at Göbekli Tepe and its environs (railway line, <b>motorway</b> , etc.).	As the site is being promoted as a major tourist destination in Turkey, infrastructure development projects are planned at Göbekli Tepe and its environs (railway line, <del>motorway</del> , etc.).	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
273, 2, 8-11	The electricity pylons and the road network are <b>visible</b> , as are the irrigation channels to the south, and a limestone quarry north of the village of Örencik.	The electricity pylons and the road network are <b>partially visible</b> , as are the irrigation channels to the south, and a limestone quarry north of the village of Örencik.	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
273, 2, 11-15	Future development projects (railway line, <b>motorway</b> ) and the increase in tourist numbers likely to be generated are currently causing very serious concern, making the property's integrity vulnerable.	Future development projects (railway line, <del>motorway</del> ) and the increase in tourist numbers likely to be generated are currently causing very serious concern, making the property's integrity vulnerable.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.

273, 2, 37-38	Council for Conservation of the Cultural and Natural <b>Environment</b>	Council for Conservation of the Cultural and Natural <b><del>Environment</del> Properties</b>	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
273, 2, 40-41	Şanlıurfa Council for Conservation of Cultural <b>and Natural Heritage</b> .	Şanlıurfa Council for Conservation of Cultural <b><del>and Natural Heritage</del></b> Properties.	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
273, 2, 45-46	Şanlıurfa Council for Conservation of the Cultural <b>and Natural Heritage</b>	Şanlıurfa Council for Conservation of Cultural <b><del>and Natural Heritage</del></b> Properties	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
273, 2, 54-55	Şanlıurfa Council for Conservation of Cultural <b>and Natural Heritage</b>	Şanlıurfa Council for Conservation of Cultural <b><del>and Natural Heritage</del></b> Properties	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.