



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/8B

Paris, 14 May 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

8B. Nominations to the World Heritage List

SUMMARY

This document presents the nominations to be examined by the Committee at its 42nd session (Manama, 2018). It is divided into three sections:

- Part I** Changes to names of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List
- Part II** Examination of nominations of natural, mixed and cultural sites to the World Heritage List
- Part III** Record of the physical attributes of each site being discussed at the 42nd session

The document presents for each nomination the proposed Draft Decision based on the recommendations of the appropriate Advisory Body(ies) as included in WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1 and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B2, and it provides a record of the physical attributes of each site being discussed at the 42nd session. The information is presented in two parts:

- a table of the total surface area of each site and any buffer zone proposed, together with the geographic coordinates of each site's approximate centre point; and
- a set of separate tables presenting the component parts of each of the 13 proposed serial sites.

Decisions required:

The Committee is requested to examine the recommendations and Draft Decisions presented in this Document, and, in accordance with paragraph 153 of the *Operational Guidelines*, take its Decisions concerning inscription on the World Heritage List in the following four categories:

- (a) properties which it **inscribes** on the World Heritage List;
- (b) properties which it **decides not to inscribe** on the World Heritage List;
- (c) properties whose consideration is **referred**;
- (d) properties whose consideration is **deferred**.

I. CHANGES TO NAMES OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

- A. At the request of the Danish authorities, the Committee is asked to approve a change to the English and French names of the property **Jelling Mounds, Runic Stones and Church**, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1994.

ICOMOS Technical review

ICOMOS has reviewed the justification included in the letter submitting the proposal of a minor boundary modification provided by the State Party and considers that the terms “Viking Age” and “monuments” in a title are too general.

During the evaluation of the nomination dossier of “Viking Age Sites in Northern Europe” in 2015, ICOMOS had extensive discussions on the use of the term “Viking Age” and concluded that there was a need for greater clarity as to its scope and whether its chronological dimension implied as well an ethnic/cultural approach. Without such clarity, the use of the phrase “Viking Age” might create a precedent for other sites to include it in their names/titles.

In summary, ICOMOS considers that the proposed name change to “Jelling – Viking Age Monuments” cannot be supported.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.1

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC/18/42.COM/8B,
2. Does not approve the name change to *Jelling Mounds, Runic Stones and Church* as proposed by the Danish authorities.

- B. At the request of the Danish authorities, the Committee is asked to approve a change to the French name of the property **The par force hunting landscape in North Zealand**, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2015.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.2

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC/18/42.COM/8B,
2. Approves the name change to *The par force hunting landscape in North Zealand* as proposed by the Danish authorities. The name of the property in French becomes **Paysage de chasse à courre de Zélande du Nord**.

- C. At the request of the Eritrean authorities, the Committee is asked to approve a change to the English and French names of the property **Asmara: A Modernist City of Africa** inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2017.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.3

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC/18/42.COM/8B,
2. Approves the name change to *Asmara: A Modernist City of Africa* as proposed by the Eritrean authorities. The name of the property becomes **Asmara: A Modernist African City** in English and **Asmara : une ville africaine moderniste** in French.

- D. At the request of the Indian authorities, the Committee is asked to approve a change to the English and French names of the property **Archaeological Site of Nalanda Mahavihara (Nalanda University) at Nalanda, Bihar**, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2016.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.4

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC/18/42.COM/8B,
2. Approves the name change to *Archaeological Site of Nalanda Mahavihara (Nalanda University) at Nalanda, Bihar* as proposed by the Indian authorities. The name of the property becomes **Archaeological Site of Nalanda Mahavihara at Nalanda, Bihar** in English and **Site archéologique Nalanda Mahavihara à Nalanda, Bihar** in French.

II. EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL SITES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Summary

At its 42nd session, the Committee will be examining a total of 31 nominations.

Out of the total of 31 nominations, 24 are new nominations, having not been presented previously, one is a significant boundary modification, and 6 nominations were deferred or referred by previous sessions of the Committee.

Of these nominations, ICOMOS and IUCN are recommending 10* nominations for inscription on the World Heritage List.

* Please note that the Draft Decisions of five nominations referred back by a previous session of the World Heritage Committee are not included in this document [See Addendum: WHC/18/42.COM/8B.Add].

Nominations withdrawn at the request of the State Party

The following nominations have been withdrawn prior to the preparation of this document:

- Canada: Tr'ondëk-Klondike
- Germany: The Jewish Cemetery Hamburg-Altona

Presentation of Nominations

Within the natural, mixed and cultural groups, nominations are presented by ICOMOS and IUCN in English alphabetical and regional order: Africa, Arab States, Asia and the Pacific, Europe and North America, Latin America and the Caribbean. The Advisory Bodies' evaluation documents and this working document are presented in this order. As in the past, for ease of reference, an alphabetical summary table and index of recommendations is presented at the beginning of this document (p. 3-4).

**Alphabetical Summary Table and Index of Recommendations by IUCN and ICOMOS
to the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee (24 June - 4 July 2018)**

| State Party | World Heritage nomination | ID No. | Recommendation | Criteria proposed by the State Party | Pp | |
|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------|----------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------|
| NATURAL SITES | | | | | | |
| China | Fanjingshan | 1559 | | R | (vii)(ix)(x) | 6 |
| France | Chaine des Puys - Limagne fault tectonic arena | 1434 | Rev | see 8B.Add | (viii) | 9 |
| Iran (Islamic Republic of) | Arasbaran Protected Area | 1543 | | N | (ix)(x) | 7 |
| Japan | Amami-Oshima Island, Tokunoshima Island, the northern part of Okinawa Island, and Iriomote Island | 1574 | | D | (ix)(x) | 7 |
| Russian Federation | Bikin River Valley [extension of "Central Sikhote-Alin", inscribed in 2001, (x)] | 766 | Bis | | (x) | 8 |
| South Africa | Barberton Makhonjwa Mountains | 1575 | | R | (viii) | 6 |
| MIXED SITES | | | | | | |
| Canada | Pimachiowin Aki | 1415 | Rev | I/I | (iii)(vi)(ix) | 9 |
| Colombia | Chiribiquete National Park – “The Maloca of the Jaguar” | 1174 | | I/I | (iii)(viii)(ix)(x) | 12 |
| Mexico | Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley: originary habitat of Mesoamerica | 1534 | Rev | see 8B.Add | (iii)(iv)(vi)(x) | 14 |
| CULTURAL SITES | | | | | | |
| Belgium / France | Funeral and memorial sites of the First World War (Western Front) | 1567 | | Postponement | (iii)(iv)(vi) | 20 |
| Belgium / Netherlands | Colonies of Benevolence | 1555 | | D | (iii)(v)(vi) | 20 |
| Canada | Tr'ondëk-Klondike | 1564 | | Withdrawn | (iv)(vi) | |
| China | Historic Monuments and Sites of Ancient Quanzhou (Zayton) | 1561 | | N | (ii)(iii)(vi) | 15 |
| Czechia | Zátec – the Town of Hops | 1558 | | D | (ii)(iii)(iv) | 21 |
| Denmark | Aasivissuit – Nipisat. Inuit Hunting Ground between Ice and Sea | 1557 | | I | (iii)(v) | 21 |
| France | Historic Urban Ensemble of Nîmes | 1569 | | D | (ii)(iv) | 22 |
| Germany | Archaeological Border Landscape of Hedeby and the Danevirke | 1553 | | I | (iii)(iv) | 23 |
| Germany | The Jewish Cemetery Hamburg-Altona | 1554 | | Withdrawn | (ii)(ii)(iv) | |
| Germany | Naumburg Cathedral | 1470 | Rev | see 8B.Add | (i)(ii)(iv) | 29 |
| India | Victorian and Art Deco Ensemble of Mumbai | 1480 | | I | (ii)(iv) | 15 |
| Indonesia | Age of Trade: Old Town of Jakarta (formerly Old Batavia) and 4 Outlying Islands (Onrust, Kelor, Cipir and Bidadari) | 1524 | | N | (ii)(iii)(iv)(v) | 17 |
| Iran (Islamic Republic of) | Sassanid Archaeological Landscape of Fars Region | 1568 | | D | (i)(ii)(iii)(iv)(v) | 17 |
| Italy | Ivrea, industrial city of the 20th century | 1538 | | R | (ii)(iv)(vi) | 24 |
| Italy | Le Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano a Valdobbiadene | 1571 | | N | (iv)(v) | 25 |
| Japan | Hidden Christian Sites in the Nagasaki Region | 1495 | | I | (iii) | 17 |
| Kenya | Thimlich Ohinga Archaeological Site | 1450 | Rev | see 8B.Add | (iii)(iv)(v) | 14 |
| Oman | Ancient City of Qalhat | 1537 | | R | (iii)(v)(vi) | 14 |
| Republic of Korea | Sansa, Buddhist Mountain Monasteries in Korea | 1562 | | I | (iii)(iv) | 18 |
| Romania | Roşia Montană Mining Landscape | 1552 | | I | (ii)(iii)(iv)(vi) | 25 |
| Saudi Arabia | Al-Ahsa Oasis, an Evolving Cultural Landscape | 1563 | | N | (iii)(iv)(v) | 15 |
| Spain | Caliphate City of Medina Azahara | 1560 | | I | (iii)(iv) | 26 |
| Turkey | Göbekli Tepe | 1572 | | I | (i)(ii)(iii)(iv) | 28 |
| United Arab Emirates | Khor Dubai, a Traditional Merchants' Harbour | 1458 | Rev | see 8B.Add | (ii)(iii)(vi) | 15 |

KEY

| | |
|--------------|--|
| I | Recommended for inscription |
| R | Recommended for referral |
| D | Recommended for deferral |
| OK | Significant boundary modification recommended for approval |
| N | Not recommended for inscription |
| NA | Significant boundary modification recommended for non-approval |
| (i) (ii) etc | Cultural and/or Natural criteria proposed by the State Party |

Nominations in **bold** are considered "new", having not been presented to the Committee previously.

**Order of presentation of nominations to be examined at the 42nd session of the
World Heritage Committee**

| Order | State Party | World Heritage nomination | Recomm. | Draft Decision |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|---|--------------|----------------|
| CULTURAL SITES | | | | |
| 1 | Kenya | Thimlich Ohinga Archaeological Site | see 8B.Add | 42 COM 8B.14 |
| 2 | Oman | Ancient City of Qalhat | R | 42 COM 8B.15 |
| 3 | Saudi Arabia | Al-Ahsa Oasis, an Evolving Cultural Landscape | N | 42 COM 8B.16 |
| 4 | United Arab Emirates | Khor Dubai, a Traditional Merchants' Harbour | see 8B.Add | 42 COM 8B.17 |
| 5 | China | Historic Monuments and Sites of Ancient Quanzhou (Zayton) | N | 42 COM 8B.18 |
| 6 | India | Victorian and Art Deco Ensemble of Mumbai | I | 42 COM 8B.19 |
| 7 | Indonesia | Age of Trade: Old Town of Jakarta (formerly Old Batavia) and 4 Outlying Islands (Onrust, Kelor, Cipir and Bidadari) | N | 42 COM 8B.20 |
| 8 | Iran (Islamic Republic of) | Sassanid Archaeological Landscape of Fars Region | D | 42 COM 8B.21 |
| 9 | Japan | Hidden Christian Sites in the Nagasaki Region | I | 42 COM 8B.22 |
| 10 | Republic of Korea | Sansa, Buddhist Mountain Monasteries in Korea | I | 42 COM 8B.23 |
| 11 | Belgium / France | Funeral and memorial sites of the First World War (Western Front) | Postponement | 42 COM 8B.24 |
| 12 | Belgium / Netherlands | Colonies of Benevolence | D | 42 COM 8B.25 |
| 13 | Czechia | Žatec – the Town of Hops | D | 42 COM 8B.26 |
| 14 | Denmark | Aasivissuit – Nipisat. Inuit Hunting Ground between Ice and Sea | I | 42 COM 8B.27 |
| 15 | France | Historic Urban Ensemble of Nîmes | D | 42 COM 8B.28 |
| 16 | Germany | Archaeological Border Landscape of Hedeby and the Danevirke | I | 42 COM 8B.29 |
| 17 | Italy | Ivrea, industrial city of the 20th century | R | 42 COM 8B.30 |
| 18 | Italy | Le Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano a Valdobbiadene | N | 42 COM 8B.31 |
| 19 | Romania | Roşia Montană Mining Landscape | I | 42 COM 8B.32 |
| 20 | Spain | Caliphate City of Medina Azahara | I | 42 COM 8B.33 |
| 21 | Turkey | Göbekli Tepe | I | 42 COM 8B.34 |
| 22 | Germany | Naumburg Cathedral | see 8B.Add | 42 COM 8B.35 |
| MIXED SITES | | | | |
| 23 | Canada | Pimachiowin Aki | I/I | 42 COM 8B.11 |
| 24 | Colombia | Chiribiquete National Park – “The Maloca of the Jaguar” | I/I | 42 COM 8B.12 |
| 25 | Mexico | Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley: originary habitat of Mesoamerica | see 8B.Add | 42 COM 8B.13 |
| NATURAL SITES | | | | |
| 26 | South Africa | Barberton Makhonjwa Mountains | R | 42 COM 8B.5 |
| 27 | China | Fanjingshan | R | 42 COM 8B.6 |
| 28 | Iran (Islamic Republic of) | Arasbaran Protected Area | N | 42 COM 8B.7 |
| 29 | Japan | Amami-Oshima Island, Tokunoshima Island, the northern part of Okinawa Island, and Iriomote Island | D | 42 COM 8B.8 |
| 30 | Russian Federation | Bikin River Valley [extension of “Central Sikhote-Alin”, inscribed in 2001] | R | 42 COM 8B.9 |
| 31 | France | Chaîne des Puys - Limagne fault tectonic arena | see 8B.Add | 42 COM 8B.10 |

In the presentation below, ICOMOS Recommendations and IUCN Recommendations are both presented in the form of Draft Decisions and are extracted from documents WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1 (ICOMOS) and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B2 (IUCN).

Though Draft Decisions were taken from IUCN and ICOMOS evaluations books, in some cases, a few modifications were required to adapt them to this document.

A. NATURAL SITES

A.1. AFRICA

A.1.1. New Nominations

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Property | Barberton Makhonjwa Mountains |
| Id. N° | 1575 |
| State Party | South Africa |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (viii) |

See IUCN Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 3.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.5

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B2,
2. Refers the nomination of **Barberton Makhonjwa Mountains, South Africa**, back to the State Party, taking note of the clear potential of the nominated property to meet criterion (viii), in order to allow the State Party to:

- a) Complete the current process of legal protection of the geosites located outside of the nationally protected areas, including an appropriate wider zone of protection around each of these geosites,
- b) Commence the recruitment of the necessary geological staff, including at least one position at senior level, in order to ensure the necessary qualified capacity to assure the management of the geological values of the nominated property, and the protection of all of the geosites from illegal collection,
- c) Expedite the implementation of the proposed Barberton Makhonjwa Mountains Integrated Management Plan as an agreed joint management framework for the nominated property in anticipation of its legal adoption should the property be inscribed;

3. Requests the State Party to:

- a) Ensure that all the proposed additional financial commitments to the nominated property are expedited, and that ongoing additional resources are provided to assure adequate staffing, including specific geological expertise,

in the management bodies for the proposed property,

- b) Maintain and enhance vigilance regarding threats to the proposed property, and ensure that the nominated property as a whole, and all of the individual geosites, are effectively protected, conserved and presented,

- c) Evaluate the opportunities to further strengthen the buffer zone arrangements for the nominated property, and to give consideration to the specific creation of a World Heritage buffer zone, in collaboration with the relevant stakeholders;

4. Invites the States Parties of South Africa and Swaziland to continue their collaboration regarding protection, management and research on the key geosites in the greenstone belt that extends into Swaziland, and to evaluate further the possibility to include additional sites in Swaziland in a transboundary extension of the nominated property, should further research indicate this potential;

5. Commends the State Party, and the local stakeholders, for the participative process that has led to the creation of this nomination, and also requests the State Party to ensure that this strong community collaboration remains at the heart of management of the nominated property in the future.

A.2. ASIA - PACIFIC

A.2.1. New Nominations

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Property | Fanjingshan |
| ID No. | 1559 |
| State Party | China |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (vii)(ix)(x) |

See IUCN Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 15.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.6

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B2,
2. Refers the nomination of **Fanjingshan, China**, back to the State Party, taking note of the strong potential of the nominated property to meet criterion (x), in order to allow the State Party to undertake and document significant further work taking into account the need to:

- a) Clarify the process and measures taken concerning the relocation of residents living within the boundaries of the nominated property to ensure that this process is fully voluntary and in line with the policies of the Convention and relevant international norms, including principles related to free, prior and informed

consent, effective consultation, fair compensation, access to social benefits and skills training, and the preservation of cultural rights,

- b) Clarify measures taken to manage increasing visitation in relation to the possible inscription on the World Heritage List, and include adequate provisions to this effect in a revised management plan for the nominated property, and provide clear assurances that no expansion of tourism infrastructure and visitor numbers will be permitted inside the nominated property,
 - c) Clarify fully whether there are any plans for the future development of the western access to the nominated property, which is currently relatively free from visitation and associated human impact, and undertake a full assessment of any such plans, prior to any decision to proceed with their implementation;
3. Requests the State Party to provide further information regarding the measures taken to:
 - a) Regulate and monitor the reported taming of wild animals, and which species are included or excluded from this permitted activity, including any applicable quotas,
 - b) Manage potential impacts on wild Giant Chinese Salamander populations that could result from the presence of salamander farms in close proximity to the nominated property, including measures taken to avoid and mitigate the risk of transmission of diseases, including the risks of the devastating disease chytridiomycosis;
 4. Also requests the State Party to clarify how the boundaries of the nominated property relate to those of the Fanjingshan Biosphere Reserve, with the aim of ensuring that any developments permitted in the experimental zone of the Biosphere Reserve do not cause any negative impact on the nominated property, and further requests the State Party to rationalise, where feasible, the zones of the Biosphere Reserve to correspond with the boundaries of the nominated property and its buffer zone;
 5. Commends the State Party for its efforts to protect Fanjingshan through highly sophisticated visitor and ecological monitoring systems, including CCTV, camera traps, drones, and a GPS-based patrol system, and encourages the State Party to continue these efforts and to adopt an adaptive management system.

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Property | Arasbaran Protected Area |
| ID No. | 1543 |
| State Party | Iran (Islamic Republic of) |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (ix)(x) |

See IUCN Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 27.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.7

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B2,
2. Decides not to inscribe **Arasbaran Protected Area, Islamic Republic of Iran**, on the World Heritage List on the basis of natural criteria (ix) and (x);
3. Thanks the State Party for the efforts made to protect and enhance the natural values of Arasbaran Biosphere Reserve, and encourages it to:
 - a) Further enhance the effective management of the biosphere reserve to integrate conservation and sustainable development objectives taking advantage of the global network of UNESCO Biosphere Reserves and international best practice,
 - b) Develop and adopt an integrated management plan with clear targets and indicators on protection and sustainable utilization, as well as effective governance mechanisms for the Biosphere Reserve involving key stakeholders and interest groups,
 - c) Continue monitoring the transformation of the abandoned and reallocated farmlands back into naturally functioning ecosystems and the foreseen positive impacts on the area's biodiversity.

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Property | Amami-Oshima Island, Tokunoshima Island, the northern part of Okinawa Island, and Iriomote Island |
| ID No. | 1574 |
| State Party | Japan |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (ix)(x) |

See IUCN Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 37.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.8

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B2,
2. Defers the examination of the nomination of **Amami-Oshima Island, Tokunoshima Island, the northern part of Okinawa Island, and Iriomote Island, Japan**, to the World Heritage List, under natural criteria in order to allow the State Party to:

- a) Revisit the nominated property's configuration to more specifically focus on criterion (x), including in relation to the selection of, and the connectivity between component parts, and the viability of long-term protection of species,
 - b) Integrate the returned areas of the Northern Training Area on Okinawa Island into the nominated property, as appropriate, taking into consideration their contribution to the justification of criterion (x), and further develop the necessary coordination mechanisms to integrate the remaining areas of the Northern Training Area into the overall planning and management of the nominated property,
 - c) Proceed further with the strategy adopted for acquiring, protecting and integrating the enclaves of private lands into the nominated property along with the associated arrangements to secure the owners' and or users' involvement in the strategic and day-to-day management of the nominated property through effective decision-making platforms and processes;
3. Notes with appreciation the State Party's efforts on the control and management of invasive alien species (IAS), including through the adoption and foreseen activation of the Feral Cat Management Plan for Amami-Oshima Island, and encourages it to expand the existing programs on IAS to address all other species negatively impacting the nominated property's biodiversity;
 4. Recommends that the State Party pursue the activation of the tourism development plan and visitor management plan for key tourism development zones and attraction areas, according to their interest to visitors and carrying capacities, including the installation of adequate visitor control mechanisms, tourism management facilities, interpretation systems, and monitoring arrangements;
 5. Also recommends that the State Party complete the development and adoption of the integrated monitoring system focusing on the status and trends of threatened species as well as direct anthropogenic and climate change induced impacts.

A.3. EUROPE - NORTH AMERICA

A.3.1. Significant boundary modifications of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Property | Bikin River Valley [extension of "Central Sikhote-Alin"] |
| ID No. | 766 Bis |
| State Party | Russian Federation |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (x) |

See IUCN Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 51.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.9

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B2,
2. Refers the significant boundary modification of **Central Sikhote-Alin, Russian Federation**, to include **Bikin River Valley**, back to the State Party, taking note of the strong potential of the nominated significant boundary modification to meet criterion (x), in order to allow the State Party to:
 - a) Complete the process of configuration and designation of the nominated property's buffer zone in conformity with Clause 10 of Article 2 of Russian Federal Law and consistent with the requirements of Paragraph 104 of the Operational Guidelines, with the aim of providing the necessary protective measures to safeguard the property against current and foreseen anthropogenic impacts,
 - b) Finalize the preparation of the Integrated Management Plan for the nominated extension, to provide a single and cohesive framework for the management of Bikin National Park and the existing World Heritage property Central Sikhote-Alin as a whole;
3. Commends and encourages the continuation of the State Party's efforts to strengthen the involvement of local indigenous people in governance, planning and management of the nominated extension through, inter alia, the establishment of the Council of Indigenous Minority Groups, and to build on the achievements of the Consultative Working Group;
4. Also encourages the State Party to develop and adopt a long-term vision in order to ensure connectivity of Amur Tiger habitat at the landscape level, through a range of strategies, including building enhanced connectivity with other protected areas, and investigating conservation connectivity strategies outside the formal protected area system. The State Party may also wish to consider the possibility of nominating further such areas as extensions to the nominated property in the future.

A.3.2. Nominations deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Property | Chaine des Puys - Limagne fault tectonic arena |
| ID No. | 1434 Rev |
| State Party | France |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (viii) |

See document WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B2.Add

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.10

[See Addendum: WHC/18/42.COM/8B.Add]

B. MIXED SITES

B.1. EUROPE - NORTH AMERICA

B.1.1. Nominations deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

| | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| Property | Pimachiowin Aki |
| ID No. | 1415 Rev |
| State Party | Canada |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (iii)(vi)(ix) |

See IUCN Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 65.
See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 21.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.11

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B, WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1 and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B2,*
2. *Recalling Decisions 37 COM 8B.19 and 40 COM 8B.18 adopted at its 37th (Phnom Penh, 2013) and 40th (Istanbul/UNESCO, 2016) sessions respectively,*
3. *Inscribes Pimachiowin Aki, Canada, on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape on the basis of criteria (iii), (vi) and (ix);*
4. *Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:*

Brief synthesis

Pimachiowin Aki, part of the ancestral lands of the Anishinaabeg people at the headwaters of the Berens, Bloodvein, Pigeon and Poplar rivers, is an exceptional example of cultural tradition of Ji-ganawendamang Gidakiiminaan (Keeping the Land) that involves honouring the Creator's gifts, observing respectful interaction with aki (the land and all its life), and maintaining harmonious relations with other people. The forest landscape, dissected by free-flowing rivers, lakes and wetlands, includes portions of the lands of four

Anishinaabe First Nations: Bloodvein River, Little Grand Rapids, Pauingassi, and Poplar River First Nations and extends to 2,904,000 hectares. It encompasses slightly less than a quarter of the lands occupied by Anishinaabeg peoples.

The Anishinaabe world view of a symbiotic relationship between people and nature attributes animacy to objects in the natural world giving meaning to peoples' existence in this environment over time and through the seasons. Today, within Pimachiowin Aki, Anishinaabeg are based in four small permanent Anishinaabe communities, and they are highly mobile and make use of waterways and a complex network of often impermanent interlinked sites, routes and areas in this extensive natural landscape of multi-layered forest, to harvest animals, plants and fish, consistent with their traditional practices.

Ancient and contemporary livelihood sites, habitations and processing sites, travel routes, named places, trap lines, widely dispersed across the landscape, while being sacred and ceremonial sites, reflect the way they, and their Indigenous ancestors, have made use of this and adjacent landscapes for over 7,000 years. Pimachiowin Aki thus expresses an outstanding testimony to the beliefs, values, knowledge, and practices of the Anishinaabeg that constitute Ji-ganawendamang Gidakiiminaan; the persistence of Anishinaabe customary governance ensures continuity of these cultural traditions across the generations.

Through the cultural tradition of Ji-ganawendamang Gidakiiminaan, Anishinaabeg have for millennia lived intimately with this special place in the heart of the North American boreal shield. Pimachiowin Aki is a vast area of healthy boreal forest, wetlands, lakes, and free-flowing rivers. Waterways provide ecological connectivity across the entire landscape. Wildfire, nutrient flow, species movements, and predator-prey relationships are key, naturally functioning ecological processes that maintain an impressive mosaic of ecosystems. These ecosystems support an outstanding community of boreal plants and animals, including iconic species such as Woodland Caribou, Moose, Wolf, Wolverine, and Loon.

Criterion (iii): *Pimachiowin Aki provides an exceptional testimony to the continuing Anishinaabe cultural tradition of Ji-ganawendamang Gidakiiminaan (Keeping the Land). Ji-ganawendamang Gidakiiminaan guides relations between Anishinaabeg and the land; it is the framework through which the cultural landscape of Pimachiowin Aki is perceived, given meaning, used and sustained across the generations. Widely dispersed across the landscape are ancient and contemporary livelihood sites, sacred sites and named places, most linked by waterways that are tangible reflections of Ji-ganawendamang Gidakiiminaan.*

Criterion (vi): *Pimachiowin Aki is directly and tangibly associated with the living tradition and beliefs of the Anishinaabeg, who understand they were placed on the land by the Creator and given*

all they need to survive. They are bound to the land and to caring for it through a sacred responsibility to maintain their cultural tradition of Jiganawendamang Gidakiiminaan (Keeping the Land). This involves ceremonies at specific sites to communicate with other beings, and respect for sacred places such as pictograph sites, Thunderbird nests, and places where memegwesiwag (little rock people) dwell, in order to ensure harmonious relations with the other spirit beings with whom Anishinaabeg share the land, and to maintain a productive life on the land.

The beliefs and values that make up Jiganawendamang Gidakiiminaan are sustained by systems of customary governance based on family structures and respect for elders, and through vibrant oral traditions that are tangibly associated with intimate knowledge of the land through named places that serve as mnemonic prompts, including locations of resources, travel routes, and the history of Anishinaabe occupation and use.

The size of Pimachiowin Aki and the strength of these traditions make it an exceptional example of a belief that can be seen to be of universal significance.

Criterion (ix): Pimachiowin Aki is the most complete and largest example of the North American boreal shield, including its characteristic biodiversity and ecological processes. Pimachiowin Aki contains an exceptional diversity of terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems and fully supports wildfire, nutrient flow, species movements, and predator-prey relationships, which are essential ecological processes in the boreal forest. Pimachiowin Aki's remarkable size, intactness, and ecosystem diversity support characteristic boreal species such as Woodland Caribou, Moose, Wolf, Wolverine, Lake Sturgeon, Leopard Frog, Loon and Canada Warbler. Notable predator-prey relationships are sustained among species such as Wolf and Moose and Woodland Caribou, and Lynx and Snowshoe Hare. Traditional use by Anishinaabeg, including sustainable fishing, hunting and trapping, is also an integral part of the boreal ecosystems in Pimachiowin Aki.

Integrity

Pimachiowin Aki is of sufficient size to encompass all aspects of Anishinaabe traditional livelihood activities, customary waterways, traditional knowledge of the landscape and seasonal rounds of travel, for hunting, trapping, fishing and gathering, and sacred sites, (although some of these extend beyond the boundaries), and includes sufficient attributes necessary to convey its value. The key attributes are considered to be highly intact. Patterns of traditional use (fishing, gathering, hunting and trapping) and veneration of specific sites by the Anishinaabe First Nations have developed over millennia through adaptation to the dynamic ecological processes of the boreal forest, and appear to be ecologically sustainable.

Pimachiowin Aki also contains all the elements necessary to ensure continuity of the key ecological processes of the boreal shield. The robust combination of First Nation and provincial protected areas forms the largest network of contiguous protected areas in the North American boreal shield. The vast size of the property provides for ecological resilience, especially in the context of climate change, and extensive buffer zones further contribute to integrity. These provide as well a sufficiently large area to enable the continuity of the living cultural tradition of Jiganawendamang Gidakiiminaan.

The cultural and natural values of Pimachiowin Aki are free from the adverse effects of development and neglect. The very limited infrastructure includes a few power lines, seasonally functional winter roads, and the all-season East Side Road (under construction). All of these are subject to numerous protections concerning development. The whole property is protected from commercial logging, mining, and hydroelectric development, and all its waterways are free of dams and diversions.

Pimachiowin Aki exemplifies the indissoluble bonds between culture and nature. It is therefore vital that the integrity of customary governance and oral traditions be maintained in order to ensure continuity of the cultural tradition across generations and a continuation of the current high levels of stewardship which are evident within the property. With the free engagement and willing agreement of neighbouring First Nations, ecological integrity could be further enhanced by progressive addition of areas of high conservation value adjacent to the inscribed property.

Authenticity

The ability of the landscape to reflect its value relates to the robustness of the cultural traditions that underpin spiritual, social and economic interactions and their ability to function fully in relation to the adequacy of natural resources, as well as to the necessary freedom of movement needed for communities to respond to changing seasons and environmental conditions. Sites in the landscape (such as archaeological sites, sacred sites, waterways and hunting and harvesting sites) remain in use to a degree that the landscape reflects adequate interactions over time, and relates to the ability of the Anishinaabe communities to maintain their traditions across their vast landscape. In order to maintain authenticity, sustaining the resilience of these traditions will need to be an overt part of the management of the property.

Protection and management requirements

First Nations have played the leading role in defining the approach to protection and management of Pimachiowin Aki. The four First Nation communities have strong traditional mechanisms of protection that draw from the cultural tradition of Keeping the Land as articulated in the First Nations Accord, 2002. Protection and management of the property are achieved through

Anishinaabe customary governance grounded in Ji-ganawendamang Gidakiiminaan, contemporary provincial government law and policy, and cooperation among the four First Nations and two provincial government partners. A memorandum of agreement between the provincial governments provides assurances about protection and management of the property. The Pimachiowin Aki partners share a commitment to work together to safeguard the Outstanding Universal Value of Pimachiowin Aki for present and future generations.

The vast majority (c. 99.98 %) of the property is protected under provincial legislation that recognizes the designated protected areas identified in the First Nation land use plans and provincial parks legislation (provincial parks legislation applies to three provincial protected areas). There is supportive “enabling legislation” at federal and provincial levels relating to protecting species at risk, regulating resources and development, as well as to public consultation on proposed land-uses. The four First Nation settlements make up the remainder of the World Heritage area (c. 0.02 %) and are covered by Canada’s Indian Act. Additional national and provincial legislation applies, for example, to Lake Winnipeg, several rivers and with regards to specific terrestrial and aquatic species. In most cases the protection is primarily for nature conservation but the provincial park legislation allows cultural heritage to be taken into account. The entire World Heritage area is protected from all commercial logging, mining, peat extraction, and the development of hydroelectric power, oil and natural gas. Similar protections cover the management areas of the buffer zone.

First Nations and provincial partners have created the Pimachiowin Aki Corporation and developed a consensual, participatory governance structure, financial capacity, and management framework for the property. The Pimachiowin Aki Corporation acts as a coordinating management body and enables the partners to work in an integrated manner across the property to ensure the protection and conservation of all natural values. The property has an overall management plan that brings together key elements of the four First Nation land use plans and the park management plans of the provincial protected areas. The management plan and series of legal protections uphold the practices associated with the traditional land management system embedded in Ji-ganawendamang Gidakiiminaan. The management plan is a high level plan and it relates to more detailed management plans and land use strategies that are in place for the four First Nations’ areas.

The management framework is designed to meet potential challenges in the protection and conservation of the property, such as monitoring and mitigating the potential impacts of the construction of an all-season road [East Side Road] over the next 20 to 40 years. Climate change is also a challenge that requires adaptive management. A conservation trust fund has been

set up to secure long-term sustainable financing for the management of the property.

The management plan could be made more proactive and strengthened to address socio-economic issues by promoting diversification and support for local economies, and through the development of action plans for specific aspects such as visitor management, to ensure it is sustainable in terms of the landscape and its spiritual associations, is under the control of the communities, and offers benefits to them. The effectiveness of the complex and integrated management system should be carefully monitored over time.

5. Requests the State Party, through collaboration with the agreed governance body for the property, and with the consent of the First Nations to:
 - a) Encourage neighbouring First Nations to freely partner with the Pimachiowin Aki Corporation, and together with provincial authorities consider the possibility of further extensions of the property over time, in order to further improve the integrity of the property,
 - b) Ensure the continued protection of the property, which is founded in an enduring tradition of First Nation stewardship, including protection from future developments associated with hydroelectric power,
 - c) Continue to strengthen the overall management plan, and make it more proactive by:
 - i) Addressing specific over-arching themes such as socio-economic development, diversification and support for local economies,
 - ii) Developing action plans for specific aspects such as visitor management, to ensure it is sustainable in terms of the landscape and its spiritual associations, is under the control of the communities, and offers benefits to them,
 - iii) Harmonising zoning principles for land-use in the various component plans,
 - d) Ensure regular monitoring of the effectiveness of the management plan as a proactive tool for the benefit of communities,
 - e) Ensure that the construction of the new all-season road does not have adverse effects on the property, notably by carrying out full environmental impact assessments at each phase of the road construction and through effective monitoring of any ongoing impacts;
6. Expresses its deep appreciation for the combined efforts of the First Nations, working with provincial governments and the State Party, and for the joint dialogue undertaken with IUCN and ICOMOS, in deepening the understanding of nature-culture connections in the context of the World Heritage Convention, and for presenting a revised nomination which is a landmark for properties nominated to the World Heritage List through the commitment of indigenous peoples.

B.2. LATIN AMERICA - CARIBBEAN

B.2.1. New Nominations

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Property | Chiribiquete National Park – “The Maloca of the Jaguar” |
| ID No. | 1174 |
| State Party | Colombia |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (iii)(viii)(ix)(x) |

See IUCN Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 75.
See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 36.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.12

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B, WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1 and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B2,
2. Recalling Decision 29 COM 8B.3 adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),
3. Inscribes Chiribiquete National Park – “The Maloca of the Jaguar”, Colombia, on the World Heritage List on the basis of **criteria (iii), (ix) and (x)**;
4. Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:

Brief synthesis

Chiribiquete National Park – “The Maloca of the Jaguar” is in the Amazon rainforest in south central Colombia. Following its extension in 2013, the park is now the largest national park in Colombia at 2,782,354 hectares and is very large by global standards for protected areas. It is located at the western-most edge of the Guiana Shield and contains one of only three uplifted areas of the Shield called the Chiribiquete Plateau. One of the most impressive defining features of Chiribiquete is the presence of many tepuis which are table-top mountains, found only in the Guiana Shield, notable for their high levels of endemism. The tepuis found in Chiribiquete, whilst smaller when compared to others in the Guiana Shield, result nonetheless in dramatic scenery that is reinforced by their remoteness and inaccessibility. A particularly significant value of the property is its high degree of naturalness which makes it one of the most important wilderness areas in the world.

Some 75,000 rock pictographs have been listed on the walls of 60 rock shelters at the foot of tepuis. The portrayals are interpreted as scenes of hunting, battles, dances and ceremonies, all of which are linked to a purported cult of the jaguar, seen as a symbol of power and fertility. The practices are thought to reflect a coherent system of ancient sacred beliefs, forming the basis and explanation of relations between the cosmos, nature and man. The archaeological sites are believed to be accessed even today by indigenous groups that have no contact with the outside world.

Chiribiquete is home to many iconic species including Jaguar, Puma, Lowland Tapir, Giant Otter, Howler Monkey, Brown Woolly Monkey. A high level of endemism occurs in the property and the number of endemic species is likely to rise substantially once new research programmes are implemented.

The global significance of the property to biodiversity conservation is reflected by the fact that it is considered a Centre of Plant Diversity, an Important Bird Area, an Endemic Bird Area, a Key Biodiversity Area and it is the only site protecting one of the terrestrial ecoregions of flooded forests called “Purus Varze”, considered Critical/Endangered by WWF International. The biodiversity values of the property are inextricably linked to its significant cultural and archaeological values that are strongly associated to the beliefs and spiritual values of the indigenous peoples living in the property.

Criterion (iii): The rock art sites of Chiribiquete hold an exceptional testimony, by the large number of painted rock shelters around the foot of rare tepui rock formations, by the diversity of motifs, which are often realistic, and by the chronological depth and persistence up to the present-day of the purported frequentation of the sites by isolated communities. The first inhabitants of Amazonia practised their art on the rock walls of Chiribiquete, and these paintings constitute an exceptional testimony of their vision of the world. Chiribiquete is even today considered to be of mythical importance by several groups and is designated the “Home of the Animals”.

Criterion (ix): The property, due to its unique location in the middle of two Pleistocene refuges (Napo and Imeri) and its function as a corridor between three biogeographic provinces (Orinoquia, Guyana, and Amazonia), hosts unique species with distinctive adaptations that are thought to have resulted from its geographical isolation. It is located in the Chiribiquete-Araracuara-Cahuinari Region Centre for Plant Diversity and has been identified as a gap. The property overlaps entirely with Serrania de Chiribiquete, which is listed amongst the most irreplaceable protected areas in the world for the conservation of mammal, bird and amphibian species. The property is located in a unique biogeographical context where evolutionary processes have shaped the high floral and faunal diversity. It presents a mosaic of mainly Guyanese and Amazonian landscapes that provide a great variety of unique habitats that are critical for the survival of the property’s characteristic plants and animals.

Criterion (x): Despite the fact that limited scientific research has been undertaken in the property, data available shows that 2,939 species have been recorded. These include 1,801 species of vascular plants, 82 species of mammals (including 58 bat species and a bat species new to science) as well as a number of globally threatened species such as the Giant Otter, Giant Anteater, Lowland Tapir, Common Woolly Monkey and Jaguar, 60 species of reptiles, 57 species of amphibians, 492 species

and subspecies of birds (including a new endemic species, the Chiribiquete Emerald Hummingbird), 238 fish species and 209 species of butterflies (including to date at least 6 potentially new species). The number of species, including of endemic species (21 endemics reported) would most certainly rise as more scientific expeditions are undertaken in the future.

Integrity

Chiribiquete National Park contains all the elements necessary for the expression of its Outstanding Universal Value, and is of an appropriate size for the satisfactory preservation of the conditions of integrity. The isolated location of these sites, which are hard to access, and the cultural restrictions on access and the making of paintings ensure the comprehensive representation of the characteristics and processes that express the importance of the property.

The property overlaps with Serranía de Chiribiquete Natural National Park, which includes 13 geomorphologically distinct types of tepuis as well as arches, labyrinths, caverns and structural cracks more than 10 meters wide, all of which contribute to the biodiversity richness of the property. All of these landform features are intact as well as the surrounding forests and river systems.

The property is exceptionally large and adequately provides refuge for the many species and habits present. The boundaries of the property have been drawn to include the vast majority of the tepuis and other significant landforms. The national park was expanded in 2013 to include areas to the north that provide additional connectivity with the Andes and to the east providing additional connectivity with the Orinoco.

The property is remarkably well-preserved and is in excellent condition. No infrastructure has been built and none is planned. There are two main threats: those related to ensuring respect of rights for the uncontacted tribes living in voluntary isolation, and those related to the loss of habitats, biodiversity and connectivity. Tourism and scientific expeditions are a potential threat to the rights to self-determination, territory and culture of the uncontacted tribes. Threats potentially affecting the natural values of the property are habitat loss due to agricultural encroachment; however, these threats are mainly affecting the buffer zone and are subject to active management programmes. A temporary suspension of mining licenses in the buffer zone has been issued and should be maintained in the long-term to avoid this indirect threat. Small areas within the property have been occasionally used for illegal farming but they have been fully eradicated. At present, there is no tourism allowed inside the property and it is important to strictly control any tourism access.

Authenticity

The rock art sites are authentic in terms of situation and setting, intangible culture, spirit and impression, materials, form and conception. The chronological attribution of the paintings, and the assertion of a continuous sequence of rock art will

need to be confirmed, but this does not mean that the rock art itself lacks authenticity, but merely that there are questions about its interpretation.

Protection and management requirements

Chiribiquete National Park is legally protected by the Colombian government, as a national park that was listed in 1989. The property is administered by the System of National Natural Parks (SPNN). The authority responsible for the management of the archaeological sites is the Colombian Institute of Anthropology and History (ICANH). The buffer zone is made up entirely of reserves for indigenous groups and the Amazonia Forest Reserve. The zones surrounding the protected area are Type A Forest Reserve Zones inside which mining is prohibited. While there are no direct threats to the property itself, there are considerable threats to the buffer zone as agriculture and road building move closer to the buffer zone boundary.

The local communities whose territories lie in the buffer zone are still based on the traditional forms of organisation that have ensured the protection and conservation of the property over a long period of time. To guarantee the conservation of the archaeological sites, their monitoring is based on minimum intervention parameters and the safeguarding of the transmission of ancestral knowledge. Major legal measures have been taken to protect the isolated indigenous communities in the region. The management of the property includes respect for customary practices with regards to access to the property, as defined by the Amazon Area Directorate in the management scenarios for protected areas in national natural parks.

A management plan, drawn up by Colombia's System of National Natural Parks, is in place for the period 2016-2020. It includes provisions on management activities required for the different land use zones as well as expected biodiversity conservation outputs derived from these actions. The zones in the park are enabled through Decree 622 of 1977 that establishes six distinct zones for all National Natural Parks. Two aspects are prioritised: the first is the overlapping of Chiribiquete National Park with territories that are not recognised reserves; the second is overlapping with territories that have not been contacted or are in a situation of voluntary isolation. Given that there are no direct pressures inside the property, a significant proportion of the management is implemented in the buffer zone by the SPNN and by the ICANH.

Overall, the management of the property is well-organized with good capacity for planning and operations. Patrolling and protection activities are actively supported by the army that has played a key role for many years in assisting with the location and eradication of illegal coca plantations inside the property and in the buffer zone. Efforts should be directed at maintaining the good cooperation established with the army or anticipating the need to replicate this level of protection through other means should the military presence change. Funding to support the

management of the property results from a combination of financial and human resources provided by the State Party and also supported by international projects, thus the current level of financial resources is considered sufficient to implement key provisions of the management plan related to nature conservation, and should be maintained. However, available financial and human resources dedicated to management activities and for the development of infrastructure and the acquisition of equipment for patrolling and other management actions should be increased following inscription. New challenges, for example linked to tourism development, may arise from the inscription of the property which will require continued attention and further investment.

5. Commends the State Party for its commitment towards the conservation of this property and for its efforts in revising earlier proposals to submit a more comprehensive and compelling nomination;
6. Requests the State Party to:
 - a) Increase the financial support required for the effective management of the property,
 - b) Continue the archaeological investigations, the inventorying and the documentation of the rock art sites inside the boundaries of the property and the buffer zone, and using the "Strategic Priorities and Guidelines for archaeological and ethnographic research" drawn up by the Columbian Institute of Anthropology and History as the basis for the monitoring and conservation of the property, particularly in preparing a more detailed inventory of the archaeological sites,
 - c) Maintain and enhance existing regulations and management activities to control agriculture development, deforestation and road construction in the buffer zone that could, if not properly managed, result in serious threats to the integrity of the property,
 - d) Support the development of projects to enhance the natural and cultural heritage in the buffer zone, as proposed in the management plan,
 - e) Undertake a basic socio-economic study to assess the needs of local communities situated in the buffer zone,
 - f) Strictly apply the preventive measures in place so as to prevent possible contact between non-indigenous local communities or other external agents and the members of isolated communities who have no contact with the outside world;
7. Welcomes the support provided by donors and international development agencies to the protection and management of the property and encourages them to maintain, and if feasible, strengthen this support to contribute to the effective management and governance of this property.

B.2.2. Nominations deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Property | Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley: ordinary habitat of Mesoamerica |
| ID No. | 1534 Rev |
| State Party | Mexico |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (iii)(iv)(vi)(x) |

See document WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1.Add
See document WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B2.Add

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.13

[See Addendum: WHC/18/42.COM/8B.Add]

C. CULTURAL SITES

C.1. AFRICA

C.1.1. Nominations deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Property | Thimlich Ohinga Archaeological Site |
| ID No. | 1450 Rev |
| State Party | Kenya |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (iii)(iv)(v) |

See document WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1.Add

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.14

[See Addendum: WHC/18/42.COM/8B.Add]

C.2. ARAB STATES

C.2.1. New Nominations

| | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Property | Ancient City of Qalhat |
| ID No. | 1537 |
| State Party | Oman |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (iii)(v)(vi) |

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 47.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.15

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1,
2. Refers the nomination of the **Ancient City of Qalhat, Oman**, back to the State Party in order to:
 - a) Modify the boundaries of the proposed property to include the shoreline along the sea, which bears significance as a location facilitating the trade interaction as a transitional space

between the ancient city and the ocean and to exclude the section of the highway from the south-western borders of the proposed property,

- b) Finalize and officially adopt the Management Plan, including tourism management, risk preparedness and disaster-response strategies, and a joint excavation-conservation programme,
 - c) Strengthen the human resources capacities of the regional office responsible for the day-to-day management activities, in particular in terms of conservation and interpretation specialists as well as security guards, once the proposed property is reopened to the public;
3. Recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following:
- a) Utilizing the current commissioning of conservation tasks to foreign firms or institutions as a means of local capacity-building in order to train a site-specific team qualified to undertake ongoing conservation and maintenance tasks,
 - b) Undertaking Heritage Impact Assessments according to ICOMOS' Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage Properties for any site infrastructure envisaged within or outside the proposed property boundaries before such is given official approval, and communicating these to the World Heritage Centre in line with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines,
 - c) Applying a minimum intervention approach, in line with the largely untouched nature of this proposed property, to all future conservation projects in view of the negative impacts that extensive restoration could have on the Outstanding Universal Value of the proposed property,
 - d) Detailing further the indicators and mechanisms of the monitoring system and start its implementation at regular intervals.

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Property | Al-Ahsa Oasis, an Evolving Cultural Landscape |
| ID No. | 1563 |
| State Party | Saudi Arabia |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (iii)(iv)(v) |

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 56.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.16

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1,
2. Decides not to inscribe **Al-Ahsa Oasis, an Evolving Cultural Landscape, Saudi Arabia**, on the World Heritage List.

C.2.2. Nominations deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Property | Khor Dubai, a Traditional Merchants' Harbour |
| ID No. | 1458 Rev |
| State Party | United Arab Emirates |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (ii)(iii)(vi) |

See document WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1.Add

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.17

[See Addendum: WHC/18/42.COM/8B.Add]

C.3. ASIA-PACIFIC

C.3.1. New Nominations

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Property | Historic Monuments and Sites of Ancient Quanzhou (Zayton) |
| ID No. | 1561 |
| State Party | China |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (ii)(iii)(vi) |

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 68.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.18

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1,
2. Decides not to inscribe the **Historic Monuments and Sites of Ancient Quanzhou (Zayton), China**, on the World Heritage List.

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Property | Victorian and Art Deco Ensemble of Mumbai |
| ID No. | 1480 |
| State Party | India |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (ii)(iv) |

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 80.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.19

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1,
2. Inscribes the **Victorian and Art Deco Ensemble of Mumbai, India**, on the World Heritage List on the basis of **criteria (ii) and (iv)**;
3. Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:

Brief synthesis

Two waves of urban development of Mumbai in the 19th and 20th centuries transformed the city from a fortified trading outpost to the first city of India. The first expansion included the construction in the 1880s of a group of Victorian Gothic public buildings and the creation of the Oval Maidan.

The second expansion was the Backbay Reclamation Scheme in the early 20th century, which offered a new opportunity for Bombay to expand to the west with Art Deco residential, commercial and entertainment buildings and the creation of the Marine Drive sea front.

Today the Oval Maidan offers a spectacular ensemble of Victorian Gothic buildings on its eastern side, and another impressive ensemble of Art Deco buildings on its western side as a testimony to the modernization phases that Mumbai went through leading to a modern independent India in 1947.

Criterion (ii): Both the Victorian Gothic and the Art Deco ensembles exhibit an important exchange of European and Indian human values over a span of time. The Victorian assemblage of grand public buildings created an Indo-Gothic style by blending Gothic revival elements with Indian elements, with adaptations in response to the local climate by introducing balconies and verandas. Mumbai's Art Deco buildings of iconic cinema halls and apartment buildings blended Indian design with Art Deco imagery and created a unique style that became known as Indo-Deco. Its influence spread through the Indian sub-continent.

Criterion (iv): The Victorian Gothic and Art Deco ensembles reflect the developments in architecture and urban planning over two centuries. The two ensembles represent architectural styles, phases in the advancements of construction materials and techniques, urban planning philosophies, and historical phases which are distinctive and facing each other across the Oval Maidan. Both ensembles are the creation of the two major urban expansions of Bombay, which led to the development of the city to become the internationally important mercantile city of the twentieth century and up to the present.

Integrity

The assemblage of Victorian Gothic and Art Deco buildings retains a high degree of integrity in visual, spatial and planning terms with the Rajabai Clock tower as the visual high point and the Oval Maidan, which is a unifying element and a centrepiece offering to view both the Victorian and the Art Deco groups of buildings. It retains its integrity as a planned urban development. The wider settings of the property are vulnerable to urban development pressures.

Authenticity

The assemblage of Victorian Gothic and Art Deco buildings meets the conditions of authenticity in terms of architectural form, decorative motifs, design, scale and material. They also retain their original use. The Oval Maidan retains its

authenticity as an urban open space and Marine Drive retains its setting as a sea-facing Art Deco development.

Even if individual buildings may have experienced modifications, their living nature, form and design are still authentic in general; in particular the use and function of each building remains almost unchanged in both the Victorian district and the Art Deco district.

Management and protection requirements

The legal protection of the property and buffer zone is based on the statute of the Government of Maharashtra, most importantly by the Heritage Regulations for Greater Bombay 1995, Regulation No. 67 (DCR 67). Under this regulation, buildings of the property are listed as Grade I, IIA, IIB or III. The property and its buffer zone fall within the two heritage precincts: Fort Precinct and Marine Drive Precinct.

The property is managed according to Section 52 of the Greater Mumbai Development Plan by the Heritage Conservation Committee, which was created by DCR 67. The Site Management Plan identifies nine objectives and presents an action plan consisting of 13 actions, with an indication of the stakeholders or agencies involved for each action, and whether it is an ongoing, short-, medium- or long-term action. It should be strengthened to include an organizational chart, the legal provisions of the management of the property, an implementation mechanism for the management action plan and a management tourism strategy.

4. Recommends that the State Party gives consideration to the following:
 - a) Complete the 2013 inventory to include necessary documentation at architectural level, including conservation state and conservation history for each building, which will be necessary for effective management of the property,
 - b) Ensure the protection of the property from development pressures, paying special attention to its wider settings and maintaining the visual dominance of the skyline by the Rajabai Clock tower,
 - c) Undertake urgent conservation of the grade IIA building, the former Watson's Hotel (known at present as Esplanade Mansions),
 - d) Ensure revitalization of the Art Deco Eros Cinema, which is in a fair state of conservation but no longer functions as a cinema,
 - e) Back the actions of the Heritage Conservation Committee by documentation of the relevant buildings, the proposals and the implemented interventions,
 - f) Extend the site management plan to include an organizational chart showing responsibilities and decision-making processes, the legal provisions of the management of the property, an implementation mechanism for the

management action plan, including resources, staffing and training, and a management tourism strategy;

5. Decides that the name of the property be changed to: **Victorian Gothic and Art Deco Ensembles of Mumbai**.

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Property | Age of Trade: Old Town of Jakarta (formerly Old Batavia) and 4 Outlying Islands (Onrust, Kelor, Cipir and Bidadari) |
| ID No. | 1524 |
| State Party | Indonesia |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (ii)(iii)(iv)(v) |

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 90.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.20

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1,
2. Decides not to inscribe the **Age of Trade: Old Town of Jakarta (formerly Old Batavia) and 4 Outlying Islands (Onrust, Kelor, Cipir and Bidadari), Indonesia**, on the World Heritage List;
3. Recommends paying close attention to current investments and revitalization projects for 19th and 20th century architecture in Kotu Tua, as these projects need to be guided by heritage conservation concerns in order to preserve, in the long-term, the character of the city.

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Property | Sassanid Archaeological Landscape of Fars Region |
| ID No. | 1568 |
| State Party | Iran (Islamic Republic of) |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (i)(ii)(iii)(iv)(v) |

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 101.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.21

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1,
2. Regretting that the State Party did not follow the suggestions made in the Interim report,
3. Defers the examination of the nomination of the **Sassanid Archaeological Landscape of Fars Region, Islamic Republic of Iran**, to the World Heritage List in order to allow the State Party, with the advice of ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre, if requested, to:
 - a) Refocus the justification of Outstanding Universal Value on the exceptional testimony the proposed property provides in relation to

the commencement and early expansion of the Sassanid empire under Ardashir I and Shapur I (224 – 273 AD),

- b) Remove the serial site component of Sarvestan Monument from the serial nomination,
 - c) Adjust the boundaries of the remaining components, aimed at combining the five serial components of Firuzabad and the two serial components of Bishapur into one site component boundary for each, encompassing the previously separated archaeological features and the topographic landscape features between them, which constitute essential attributes of the potential Outstanding Universal Value,
 - d) Finalize an integrated conservation and management plan for the proposed property, including strategies on risk preparedness and disaster response,
 - e) As part of the overall conservation and management plan, prioritize immediate conservation activities at all serial components which are at risk of collapse or in a condition of serious deterioration;
4. Considers that any revised nomination would need to be considered by an expert mission to the site;
 5. Recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following:
 - a) Prioritizing the geophysical surveys envisaged for the site component of Ardashir Khurreh to restrict the permissibility of agricultural practices to areas which are ascertained to be free of archaeological remains,
 - b) Establishing a monitoring system based on assigned responsibilities and defined means of assessment and verification.

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Property | Hidden Christian Sites in the Nagasaki Region |
| ID No. | 1495 |
| State Party | Japan |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (iii) |

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 113.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.22

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1,
2. Inscribes the **Hidden Christian Sites in the Nagasaki Region, Japan**, on the World Heritage List on the basis of **criterion (iii)**;
3. Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:

Brief synthesis

Located in the Nagasaki and Kumamoto prefectures in the northwestern part of Kyushu Island of the Japanese Archipelago, the 'Hidden Christian Sites in the Nagasaki Region' is a serial property comprising 12 component sites, made up of ten villages, one castle, and one cathedral dating from between the 17th and 19th centuries. Together they reflect the earliest activities of Christian missionaries and settlers in Japan, including the earliest phase of the encounter, a subsequent era of prohibition and persecution of the Christian faith and settlers, as well as the final phase of the revitalization of Christian communities after the official lifting of the prohibition in 1873. Hidden Christians survived as communities that formed small villages sited along the seacoast or on remote islands to which Hidden Christians migrated during the ban on Christianity. Hidden Christians gave rise to a distinctive religious tradition that was seemingly vernacular yet which maintained the essence of Christianity, and they survived continuing their faith over the ensuing two centuries.

Criterion (iii): The Hidden Christian Sites in the Nagasaki Region bear unique testimony to a distinctive religious tradition nurtured by Hidden Christians who secretly transmitted their faith in Christianity during the time of prohibition spanning more than two centuries in Japan, from the 17th to the 19th century.

Integrity

The 12 components not only include all of the elements necessary to express the Outstanding Universal Value of the property but are also of an adequate size and in a good state of conservation. Thorough and complete protection measures have been taken for each of the components in accordance with all relevant national laws and regulations – including the Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties. Within the buffer zones of the property, appropriate protection is provided not only by the Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties but also by the Landscape Act and other relevant laws and regulations. Therefore, the property does not suffer from any adverse effects of development or neglect, and it has been effectively conserved together with its surrounding landscape.

Authenticity

Each component of the property maintains a high degree of authenticity based on the attributes selected according to its nature. The villages possess a high degree of authenticity based on their attributes of 'form and design', 'use and function', 'traditions, techniques and management systems', 'location and setting', and 'spirit and feeling'. The component, 'Remains of Hara Castle', has lost its authenticity related to 'use and function', as it is an archaeological site, but it retains a high degree of authenticity in regard to the other attributes. Oura Cathedral and the Egami Church in Egami Village on Naru Island possess a high degree of authenticity in terms of 'materials

and substance' in addition to the other attributes as they are architectural works.

Management and protection requirements

The property and its buffer zones are properly conserved under various laws and regulations including the Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties. Furthermore, Nagasaki Prefecture, Kumamoto Prefecture and relevant municipalities have formulated a robust Comprehensive Preservation and Management Plan from the perspective of safeguarding the Outstanding Universal Value of the property as a whole. The framework for implementing this plan comprises a World Heritage Preservation and Utilisation Council which works in cooperation with the owners of the components and other stakeholders. The Council is operated for the appropriate protection, enhancement and utilisation of the property. The Council receives guidance from, and consults with, experts comprising an academic committee (the Nagasaki World Heritage Academic Committee), as well as the Agency for Cultural Affairs, which is the principal agency in charge of protection of Japan's cultural properties.

4. Recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following:
 - a) Recording and archiving the fabric of abandoned villages, churches and cemeteries (such as those on Hisaka and Nozaki Islands) within the property using photogrammetry, Lidar and/or other similar techniques,
 - b) Developing a communication strategy to inform local community groups and individual owners about the financial assistance which is available for conservation projects from local, prefectural and national government,
 - c) Undertaking a study on the 'carrying capacity' and management of potential tourism having particular regard to the physical and social circumstances constraints of each component,
 - d) Assessing new developments within the property in accordance with the ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage Properties (2011).

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Property | Sansa, Buddhist Mountain Monasteries in Korea |
| ID No. | 1562 |
| State Party | Republic of Korea |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (iii)(iv) |

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 124.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.23

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1,
2. Inscribes **Sansa, Buddhist Mountain Monasteries in Korea, Republic of Korea,**

namely four of the seven nominated serial components: Tongdosa, Buseoksa, Beopjusa, and Daeheungsa, on the World Heritage List on the basis of **critterion (iii)**;

3. Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:

Brief synthesis

Sansa are Buddhist mountain monasteries located throughout the Korean Peninsula. Four temples – Tongdosa, Buseoksa, Beopjusa and Daeheungsa – established in the 7th to 9th centuries represent these ancient and continuing centres of spiritual practice. The four temples have historical associations with different schools of Buddhist thought and contain many individually notable historic structures, objects and documents, shrines and halls. The specific intangible and historical aspects of Korean Buddhism are based on the time-depth and continuity of the mountain monasteries, and the traditions of temple management, education of monks, Seon meditative practices and doctrinal study. The spatial arrangements within the monasteries reflect these characteristics, as well as the requirements for the self-reliance of monastic communities. They commonly include one or more ‘madang’ (open yard), flanked on four sides by structures (Buddha Hall, pavilion, lecture hall and dormitory), and natural mountain settings. The mountain monasteries have survived to the present as living centres of faith and daily practice despite centuries of suppression during the Joseon Dynasty, and the impacts of Japanese invasion in the late 16th century.

Criterion (iii): Buddhism has a long history that has traversed a number of historical eras in the Korean Peninsula. The four mountain monasteries – Tongdosa, Buseoksa, Beopjusa and Daeheungsa – offer a distinctively Korean instantiation of Buddhist monastic culture from the 7th century to the present day. These mountain monasteries are sacred places and provide an exceptional testimony to their long and continuing traditions of Buddhist spiritual practice.

Integrity

Together the four temples contain the elements necessary to express the Outstanding Universal Value of Korean Buddhist mountain monasteries, including their mountain settings, well-preserved buildings for religious practice and daily living, worship halls and shrines, meditation areas, monastic academy spaces and dormitories for monks. Few pressures threaten the components and they are intact, free of major losses and alterations during the modern period, and retain their original functions, despite changes through history.

Authenticity

The authenticity of the serial property is based on the long and continuing uses of the components for Buddhist spiritual practices and rituals, and is based on their location and setting; traditions, techniques and management skills; and intangible heritage. The architectural elements have been

carefully maintained according to principles of repair and restoration, using traditional construction techniques, although the functions of some buildings have changed to support the operations of the temples. The religious traditions and functions of the Buddhist temples maintain a high degree of authenticity.

Management and protection requirements

The four temples are designated as Historic Sites under the Cultural Heritage Protection Act; and under City/Provincial Government Cultural Heritage Protection Ordinances. Modern constructions to facilitate continuing use and developments around the temples are strictly controlled. Each of the four temples is also protected by the Korean Traditional Temples Preservation and Support Act

Cultural Heritage Zones and Historical and Cultural Environment Protection Zones established by the Cultural Heritage Protection Act are in place for each of the components and their buffer zones. The Cultural Heritage Protection Act applies within areas of 500-metres of the outer boundary of each Cultural Heritage Zone. Heritage Impact Assessments are prepared within the provisions of the Cultural Heritage Protection Act. Each temple has various designated elements (including artworks, relics and architecture) at the national or provincial level.

The ‘Conservation and Management Plan for Sansa, Buddhist Monasteries in Korea’ is in place, and the management system and conservation strategy will be overseen by ‘Sansa Conservation and Management’, with representation from religious and government authorities. Staff are provided for administration, conservation management, monitoring, research and promotion, as well as the monks, temple management staff, cultural heritage management staff and cultural tourism guides.

Each temple is under the responsibility of a chief abbot. The Cultural Affairs Department of the Administrative Headquarters of the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism is responsible for the management of cultural heritage, and the development and implementation of related projects. The Laity Association of each temple participates in volunteer work to support Buddhist practices, maintaining the temple landscapes and cleaning the temples. Visitor infrastructure is provided at each temple.

The Cultural Heritage Administration formulates comprehensive 5-year plans for the conservation and management of the temples in consultation with provincial governments. There is a Cultural Heritage Maintenance Plans in place for Buseoksa Temple, and plans for the remaining components will be established in 2018-2020.

4. Recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following:

a) Developing planning measures for the existing ‘non-cultural heritage elements’ within the temples, providing guidance about new

construction, renovation and renewal, and specifying approval procedures,

- b) *Establishing Cultural Heritage Maintenance Plans for Tongdosa, Beopjusa and Daeheungsa temples,*
- c) *Developing measures to mitigate future visitor pressures (particularly in peak periods) in order to maintain an appropriate atmosphere within the temples,*
- d) *Ensuring that all new construction projects within the temple complexes (including those mentioned in this evaluation report) that could impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the series are communicated to the World Heritage Centre in line with paragraph 172 of Operational Guidelines.*

C.4. EUROPE - NORTH AMERICA

C.4.1. New Nominations

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Property | Funeral and memorial sites of the First World War (Western Front) |
| ID No. | 1567 |
| States Parties | Belgium / France |
| Criteria proposed by States Parties | (iii)(iv)(vi) |

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 136.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.24

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1,*
2. *Recalling the reservations it has expressed concerning the inscription of sites related to negative memories,*
3. *Postpones consideration of the nomination of the **Funerary and Memorial sites of the First World War (Western Front), Belgium and France,** until a comprehensive reflection on whether and how sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories might relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention is undertaken, and, if considered necessary, guidance on how to assess the conformity of such sites with the requirements of the World Heritage Convention and its Operational Guidelines is provided.*

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Property | Colonies of Benevolence |
| ID No. | 1555 |
| States Parties | Belgium / Netherlands |
| Criteria proposed by States Parties | (iii)(v)(vi) |

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 155.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.25

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1,*
2. *Defers the examination of the nomination of **Colonies of Benevolence, Belgium and Netherlands,** to the World Heritage List, in order to allow the States Parties, with the advice of ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre, if requested, to:*
 - a) *Refocus the nomination on one or two free colonies that could clearly reflect the ideals relating to poverty reduction that guided their foundation,*
 - b) *Ensure that the nominated free Colonies reflect the scope and careful planning of the agricultural settlements and their ordered buildings and how these were integrated as a whole,*
 - c) *Re-draft the Management Plan so that it aims to evoke, through adequate protection and through careful management and presentation, the positive approaches of these colonies, their overall organisation, and the lives of their inhabitants;*
3. *Considers that any revised nomination would need to be considered by an expert mission to the site;*
4. *Recommends that the States Parties give consideration to the following:*
 - a) *Provide more detailed plans of the colonies, identifying all buildings,*
 - b) *Providing a better rationale for the delineation of buffer zones,*
 - c) *Strengthen planning controls to ensure the whole landscape of the colonies is protected,*
 - d) *Complete the monitoring system to include indicators related to the attributes of the proposed Outstanding Universal Value.*

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Property | Žatec – the Town of Hops |
| ID No. | 1558 |
| State Party | Czechia |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (ii)(iii)(iv) |

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 179.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.26

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1,
2. Defers the examination of the nomination of **Žatec – the Town of Hops, Czechia**, to the World Heritage List, in order to allow the State Party, with the advice of ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre, if requested, to deepen the research on the theme of hop growing and processing, as well as on the proposed property and its wider setting to bring into focus areas of potential significance and areas where traditional hop farming and processing and its impacts on the landscape can be identified and, if a robust case can be made, then reconsider the scope of the nomination;
3. Considers that any revised nomination would need to be considered by an expert mission to the site.

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Property | Aasivissuit – Nipisat. Inuit Hunting Ground between Ice and Sea |
| ID No. | 1557 |
| State Party | Denmark |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (iii)(v) |

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 190.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.27

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1,
2. Inscribes **Aasivissuit – Nipisat. Inuit Hunting Ground between Ice and Sea, Denmark**, on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape on the basis of **criterion (v)**;
3. Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:

Brief synthesis

Climate and topography in West Greenland along a vast west-to-east transect from the ocean and fjords to the ice sheet contains evidence of 4200 years of human history. Fisher-hunter-gatherer cultures have created an organically evolved and continuing cultural landscape based on hunting of land and sea animals, seasonal migrations and settlement patterns, and a rich and well-preserved material and intangible cultural heritage. Large communal winter houses and evidence of communal hunting of caribou via hides and drive

systems are distinctive characteristics, along with archaeological sites from the Saqqaq (2500-700 BC), Dorset (800 BC-1 AD), Thule Inuit (from the 13th century) and colonial periods (from the 18th century). The cultural landscape is presented through the histories and landscapes of seven key localities from Nipisat in the west, to Aasivissuit, near the ice cap, in the east. The attributes of the property include buildings, structures, archaeological sites and artefacts associated with the human history of the landscape; the landforms and ecosystems of the ice cap, fjords, lakes; natural resources, such as caribou, and other plant and animal species that support the hunting and fishing cultural practices; and the Inuit intangible cultural heritage and traditional knowledge of the environment, weather, navigation, shelter, foods and medicines.

Criterion (v): Aasivissuit-Nipisat and the transect of environments it contains demonstrates the resilience of the human cultures of this region and their traditions of seasonal migration. The abundant evidence of culture-nature interactions over several millennia, intact and dynamic natural landscape, intangible cultural heritage and continuing hunting and seasonal movements by Inuit people and other attributes combine in this distinctive cultural landscape. This is demonstrated through the continuing uses of the west/east routes, the rich archaeological record of Palaeo-Inuit and Inuit cultures, and the camps and hunting elements that enabled hunting-fishing-gathering peoples to live in the Arctic region.

Integrity

The integrity of the cultural landscape is based on the inclusion of areas of ocean, fjords, islands, inland and ice cap that can demonstrate the historical and present-day migrations and seasonal patterns of hunting and fishing. The property contains a sufficient sequence of environments, archaeological sites and settlements to demonstrate the cultural histories and significant intangible cultural heritage of this part of Greenland, including the settlements and the seasonal hunting, fishing and gathering activities of the present-day communities. Seven key localities have been specifically described, although attributes of Outstanding Universal Value occur throughout the property, and are potentially vulnerable due to pressures from climate change.

Authenticity

The authenticity of the cultural landscape is based on the inclusion of a complete landscape and seascape, the interdependence of the fishing-hunting-gathering lifeways with the natural processes and resources, and the tangible evidence of the hunting and settlement practices and patterns for 4200 years. The transect of environments from the sea, fjords, interior and the ice cap has been used by each phase of human culture for fishing and hunting of marine animals and caribou, according to seasonal movements. Archaeological sites and artefacts demonstrating a good state of preservation, and the ruins of historical structures bear witness to the history and

traditions of land and sea uses in the Arctic. The continuity of some of the seasonal hunting and migration practices, and the associated Inuit intangible cultural heritage and traditional knowledge contribute to the authenticity of the cultural landscape.

Management and protection requirements

The government of Greenland is responsible for decisions about land and sea use, and protection of the cultural landscape is subject to an Executive Order of the Government of Greenland (Naalakkersuisut) which came into force on 1 February 2018. This provides the basis of the legal protection for the property, including the formal establishment of the boundary, and provisions for access, protection, management, monitoring and uses. The regulations to the Executive Order and the Mineral Resources Act prevent the granting of licenses for mining prospecting or exploration. Further legal protection of the cultural landscape is provided by Greenland's Heritage Protection Act, Museum Act, and the Planning Act. The Greenland National Museum and Archives is responsible for decisions within the Heritage Protection Act. The Municipal Plan for the Qeqqata Municipality covers relevant planning regulations for the property, such as for local tourism, infrastructures, zoning for wilderness, summer houses, recreation and trophy hunting and matters concerning the settlement at Sarfannguit.

Protection of the landscape and natural attributes is provided by the Act on Environmental Protection and the Ramsar Executive Order (2016). There are regulations for catch quotas for fish, sea mammals and inland hunting species (such as caribou). There is a need to integrate the Ramsar criteria for the Eqalummiut Nunaat and Nassuttuup Nunaa area into the overall management plan for the property.

Because there is no buffer zone for this property, there are continuing needs to strengthen mechanisms for assessment and protection of the property from off-site activities, including the potential hydrological and geological impacts of future mining proposals, transportation infrastructure and wind turbine installations. Greater attention and detailed planning is needed for the area's future tourism management, including monitoring of the social and physical impacts of tourism.

The Management Plan (January 2017) provides a sound framework for decision-making, together with the operation of the 10-member World Heritage Steering Committee. The Management Plan outlines responsibilities of the Danish Agency for Culture and Palaces, the Government of Greenland, and the Qeqqata Municipality. The availability of the resources for implementation of the management system should be confirmed, including the timeline, expertise and financial resources to engage appropriately skilled site manager and rangers, and to develop the tourism and interpretation plans. Continuing documentation of cultural practices and intangible culture heritage,

and regular and cyclical monitoring and maintenance are needed as a priority.

4. Recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following:
 - a) Establishing the proposed Park Ranger service and ensure that sufficient annual funding is available to fully implement the management system,
 - b) Minimising the impacts of the new ATV track on the property, and ensuring as far as practicable the separation between the new ATV track and the Arctic Circle Trail,
 - c) Further developing and implementing the monitoring system with an explicit focus on the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value, including introduction of regular, pro-active and cyclical monitoring and maintenance; and indicators and processes to monitor the social and physical impacts of tourism,
 - d) Developing policies that clarify the conservation aims for the decaying buildings and other features from the historic period at Saqqarliit into the management system, and conclude the processes of the designation of historic buildings in Sarfannguit,
 - e) Continuing to actively engage with the cruise ship tourism sector regarding future plans as part of the tourism strategies for the property,
 - f) Working with the Qeqqata Municipality and local communities to enhance the benefits for Inuit people arising from World Heritage inscription, including capacity building programs for local people to take a strong role in future tourism and interpretation initiatives,
 - g) Ensuring that all major projects (including any planned future wind energy installations located outside the property boundary) that could impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property are communicated to the World Heritage Centre in line with paragraph 172 of Operational Guidelines.

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Property | Historic Urban Ensemble of Nîmes |
| ID No. | 1569 |
| State Party | France |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (ii)(iv) |

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 202.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.28

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1,
2. Defers the examination of the nomination of the **Historic Urban Ensemble of Nîmes, France**, to the World Heritage List, in order to allow the State Party, with the advice of ICOMOS and the World

Heritage Centre, if requested, to develop a thorough comparative analysis on the Roman buildings of the city of Nîmes to bring into focus whether potential significance can be identified and, if a robust case can be made, reconsider the scope of the nomination on this basis;

3. Considers that any revised nomination would need to be considered by an expert mission to the site;
4. Recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following:
 - a) Reconsidering the location of the Palais des Congrès and implementing a Heritage Impact Assessment before any development project into the historic core of the city,
 - b) Giving pre-eminence to archaeological considerations in any new development proposal. The approval process should be rearranged for projects that will impact potential archaeological remains, archaeological investigations should be executed early in the planning process so that their findings can inform any decision to approve a development,
 - c) Undertaking an active conservation program to improve the condition and setting of the Porte d'Auguste and the Porte de France while reducing the factors that can affect them negatively, especially vehicular traffic,
 - d) Preparing a tourism management plan to actively manage tourism and address the potential deleterious effects of tourism upon the proposed property,
 - e) Improving the monitoring program in order to focus on preservation of the built heritage.

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Property | Archaeological Border Landscape of Hedeby and the Danevirke |
| ID No. | 1553 |
| State Party | Germany |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (iii)(iv) |

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 212.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.29

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1,
2. Inscribes the **Archaeological Border Landscape of Hedeby and the Danevirke, Germany**, on the World Heritage List on the basis of **criteria (iii) and (iv)**;
3. Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:

Brief synthesis

The trading centre of Hedeby and the defensive system of the Danevirke consist of a spatially linked complex of earthworks, walls and ditches, a

settlement, cemeteries and a harbour located on the Schleswig Isthmus of the Jutland Peninsula during the 1st and early 2nd millennia CE. This singular geographic situation created a strategic link between Scandinavia, the European mainland, the North Sea and the Baltic Sea. A Baltic Sea inlet, rivers and extensive boggy lowlands constricted the north-south passage to the peninsula while, at the same time, providing the shortest and safest route between the seas across a narrow land bridge.

Because of its unique situation in the borderland between the Frankish Empire in the South and the Danish kingdom in the North, Hedeby became the essential trading hub between continental Europe and Scandinavia as well as between the North Sea and the Baltic Sea. For more than three centuries – throughout the entire Viking era – Hedeby was among the largest and most important among the emporia – the new trading towns that developed in Western and Northern Europe. In the 10th century, Hedeby became embedded in the defensive earthworks of the Danevirke which controlled the borderland and the portage.

The importance of the border and portage situation is showcased by large quantities of imports from distant places among the rich assemblages in Hedeby. The archaeological evidence, including large amounts of organic finds, provides an outstanding insight into the expansion of trading networks and cross-cultural exchange as well as into the development of northern European towns and the Scandinavian elites from the 8th to 11th centuries.

Attributes of the property include the archaeological remains of Hedeby including traces of roads, structures and cemeteries. In the harbour adjacent to the town are the archaeological deposits related to jetties that extended over the water and four known shipwrecks. Hedeby is surrounded by a semi-circular rampart and overlooked by a hill fort. Three runestones have been found nearby. Attributes related to the Danevirke include sections of the Crooked Wall, the Main Wall, the North Wall, the Connection Wall, the Kovirke, the offshore works, and the East Wall with either above ground vestiges or archaeological remains below the ground or underwater.

Criterion (iii): 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 and over several centuries. They bear outstanding witness to exchange and trade between people of various cultural traditions in Europe in the 8th to 11th centuries. Because of their rich and extremely well preserved archaeological material they have become key scientific sites for the interpretation of a broad variety of economic, social and historic developments in Viking Age Europe.

Criterion (iv): Hedeby facilitated exchange between trading networks spanning the European

continent, and – in conjunction with the Danevirke – controlled trading routes, the economy and the territory at the crossroads between the emerging Danish kingdom and the kingdoms and peoples of mainland Europe. The archaeological evidence highlights the significance of Hedeby and the Danevirke as an example of an urban trading centre connected with a large-scale defensive system in a borderland at the core of major trading routes over sea and land from the 8th to 11th centuries.

Integrity

Hedeby and the Danevirke encompass archaeological sites and structures of the 6th to 12th centuries which represent a trading town and an associated defensive wall complex. The area includes all elements that represent the values of the property – the monuments and ramparts, locations of significance, and all the archaeological remains that embody the long history of the Hedeby-Danevirke complex. The components representing the Danevirke reflect the stages of construction and the evolution of the defensive works, as sections were reconstructed and new portions of walls were built. The buffer zone is a protective and managerial entity that preserves important viewsheds and ensures that the core elements of the area will be maintained for the future.

Authenticity

The conditions of authenticity of the property regarding the form, design, materials and substance of the monuments has been met. Hedeby has not been inhabited or otherwise built upon since it was abandoned, ensuring the authenticity of its archaeological deposits. Some 95% of the town remains unexcavated and the other 5% has been studied using established archaeological methods and analyses. The Danevirke has also been thoroughly documented and has only seen rebuilding at the 19th century bastions, the remains of which are clearly distinguishable from the older sections of the wall.

Management and protection requirements

The property, its buffer zone and its wider setting are protected by the legal systems in place (e.g. listed monuments, nature protection areas, landscape protection areas). In addition, the majority of sites are owned by public bodies. The values of the sites are also considered and respected in public planning processes. The various protection and planning mechanisms and acts which apply directly to the landscape are sufficient to guarantee the protection and preservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Funding for the site management of the property is provided by the Federal State of Schleswig-Holstein and other public owners.

A site management plan was implemented in 2014. All the important stakeholders have committed to the aim of protecting, preserving, monitoring and promoting the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The values, attributes, integrity and authenticity of the property are safeguarded and

managed within the plan. In the long run, the core management issues are to increase awareness of the value of Hedeby and the Danevirke as an archaeological landscape and to retain that value by all important stakeholders participating in its management. The management plan aims at further integrating Hedeby and the Danevirke into their cultural, social, ecological and economic settings and to increase their social value to promote sustainable development in the region. Future threats to the landscape, such as wind turbines, land use, housing developments and visitor impact, as well as natural agents such as plants and animal activities, need to be tackled collaboratively. Some specific threats such as damage to Valdemar's Wall due to exposure or damage require monitoring and mitigation at regular intervals.

4. Recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following:
 - a) Keeping the World Heritage Centre informed of the result of the appeal of the refusal of permission to build houses near the Danevirke,
 - b) Continuing current management efforts to discourage urban development in the buffer zone, reduce the effect of agricultural practices upon the property, and to mitigate the effects of proposed wind turbines in the wider area,
 - c) Completing the planned conservation work at Valdemar's Wall and undertaking follow up monitoring and mitigation at regular intervals to reduce the future effects of frost damage and vegetation growth,
 - d) Closely monitoring tourism levels and potential impacts;
5. Decides that the name of the property be changed to: **Archaeological Border complex of Hedeby and the Danevirke.**

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Property | Ivrea, industrial city of the 20th century |
| ID No. | 1538 |
| State Party | Italy |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (ii)(iv)(vi) |

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 222.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.30

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1,
2. Refers the nomination of **Ivrea, industrial City of the 20th century, Italy**, back to the State Party in order to:
 - a) Finalise and confirm the national legal protection for the proposed property, and finalise the adoption by Ivrea Council of the regulation of the regional landscape plan,

integrating the guidelines and prescriptions directly relating to the protection, safeguard and enhancement of the proposed property into the municipal regulations,

- b) Streamline the legal protection of the proposed property, ensuring effective coordination between national, regional and local levels of protection,
 - c) Revise the boundary of the proposed property to exclude the site of the recent housing project facing the 'Red Brick building' (Fabbrica di Mattoni Rossi), and include it in the buffer zone,
 - d) Provide a strategic conservation plan for the proposed property, including the planned conservation outcomes for each building, strategies for new uses of vacant buildings, and resources for maintenance;
3. Recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following:
- a) Continuing to document the buildings of the proposed property and their architectural characteristics and interiors, and ensure their conservation,
 - b) Fully implementing and clearly setting out the monitoring system (including the frequency of measurement of indicators) in order to monitor the state of conservation of the attributes, and the mitigation of identified pressures,
 - c) Ensuring that all new construction projects (including adaptive reuse) that could impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the proposed property are the subject of Heritage Impact Assessment and are communicated to the World Heritage Centre in line with paragraph 172 of Operational Guidelines.

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Property | Le Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano a Valdobbiadene |
| ID No. | 1571 |
| State Party | Italy |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (iv)(v) |

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 231.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.31

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1,
2. Decides not to inscribe **Le Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene, Italy**, on the World Heritage List.

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Property | Roşia Montană Mining Landscape |
| ID No. | 1552 |
| State Party | Romania |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (ii)(iii)(iv)(vi) |

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 242.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.32

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1,
2. Inscribes the **Roşia Montană Mining Landscape, Romania**, on the World Heritage List on the basis of **criteria (ii) and (iv)**;
3. Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:

Brief Synthesis

Roşia Montană Mining Landscape contains the most significant, extensive and technically diverse underground Roman gold mining complex currently known in the world, dating from the Roman occupation of Dacia (106-271 CE). Roşia Montană is situated in a natural amphitheatre of massifs and radiating valleys in the Metalliferous range of the Apuseni Mountains, located in the historical region of Transylvania in the central part of Romania.

Roman gold mining occurred within four massifs (Cărnic, Lety, Orlea and Cetate) that visually dominate the landscape of Roşia Montană, itself surrounded on three sides by dividing ridges and peaks. Roman archaeology at surface is prolific and pervasive, comprising ore-processing areas, living quarters, administrative buildings, sacred areas and necropolises, some with funerary buildings with complex architecture, all set in relation to over 7 km of ancient underground workings that have been discovered to date.

Criterion (ii): Roşia Montană Mining Landscape contains the world's pre-eminent example of underground Roman gold mining and demonstrates an interchange of values through innovative techniques developed by skilled migrant Illyrian-Dalmatian miners to exploit gold in ways that suited the technical nature of the deposit. Multiple chambers that housed treadmill-operated water-dipping wheels for drainage represent a technique likely routed from Hispania to the Balkans, whilst perfectly carved trapezoidal-section galleries, helicoidal shafts, inclined communication galleries with stairways cut into the bedrock, and vertical extraction areas (stopes) superimposed above one another with the roof carved out in steps, are in a combination so specific to Roşia Montană that they likely represent pioneering aspects in the technical history of mining.

Criterion (iv): Roşia Montană Mining Landscape illustrates the strategic control and vigorous development of precious metals' mining by the Roman Empire, essential for its longevity and

military power. Following the decline of mining in Hispania, Roşia Montană located in Aurariae Dacicae (Roman Dacia) was the only significant new source of gold and silver for the Roman Empire, among the likely key motivations for Trajan's conquest of Dacia.

Integrity

Roşia Montană contains all the elements necessary to express the values of the property for the Roman mining period. The property is of adequate size to ensure the complete representation of the features and processes which convey its significance. Moreover, the property comprises an area in which future archaeological research will probably discover a large number of further surface and underground mining, ore processing and settlement sites of the Roman period. However, the current mining proposal means that the integrity of the property is highly vulnerable.

Authenticity

The property contains attributes that are high in authenticity in terms of the location and the form and materials of surviving historic features, with a clear sense of how, when and by whom mining shaped the land. In terms of knowledge, epigraphic and documentary evidence combined with a decade of intensive systematic archaeological investigation has provided a major contribution to the understanding of Roman mining techniques and organisation. There is considerable potential for future research and for new discoveries related to many periods of the region's mining history. However, the current mining proposal means that the authenticity of the property is highly vulnerable.

Management and protection requirements

The protection of Roşia Montană is granted by listing, especially with the Law for the protection of historic monuments. Under this protection framework, the responsibilities fall with the municipality, in respect to the protection through urban planning measures, for which specific zoning regulations are in the process of being enacted, and with the respective owners when it comes to listed properties. The management plan for the property is being finalized by the National Institute of Heritage who is also responsible for the monitoring of the property. The management plan should be developed to encompass an internationally supported conservation strategy and a tourism strategy should be implemented.

4. Also inscribes the **Roşia Montană Mining Landscape, Romania**, on the World Heritage List in Danger;
5. Recommends that the State Party invite a mission to visit the property as soon as possible, to agree on a desired state of conservation and program of corrective measures to remove the property from the World Heritage List in Danger;
6. Also recommends that the State Party give urgent consideration to the following:

- a) Enacting and implementing the protective measures for the property, that is to say the General Urban Plan and Urban Zonal Plan,
 - b) Submitting and implementing the management plan of the property, and develop it to:
 - i) include an internationally supported conservation strategy for the Roman remains,
 - ii) include a management tourism strategy, to improve visitor management and interpretation and presentation of the property,
 - iii) improve the involvement of the stakeholders into the management of the property,
 - iv) encompass the necessary staff and financial resources for its implementation,
 - v) include an inspection and maintenance plan for the header ponds to ensure their long term stability,
 - c) Implement the monitoring programme for the property;
7. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 December 2018** a report on the implementation of the above-mentioned recommendations for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 43rd session in 2019;
 8. Encourages international cooperation to support the protection and conservation of the property;
 9. Decides that the name of the property be changed to: **Roman Gold Mines of Roşia Montană**.

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Property | Caliphate City of Medina Azahara |
| ID No. | 1560 |
| State Party | Spain |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (iii)(iv) |

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 252.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.33

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1,
2. Inscribes the **Caliphate City of Medina Azahara, Spain**, on the World Heritage List on the basis of **criteria (iii) and (iv)**;
3. Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:

Brief synthesis

The Caliphate City of Medina Azahara is an archaeological site of a newly-founded city built in the mid-10th century CE by the western Umayyad dynasty as the seat of the Caliphate of Cordoba. The city was destroyed shortly afterwards, and

from that time remained hidden until its rediscovery in the early 20th century CE.

The site is a complete urban complex including infrastructure, buildings, decoration and objects of daily use, and provides in-depth knowledge about the material culture of the Islamic civilization of Al-Andalus at the zenith of its splendour but which has now disappeared. In addition, the landscape features which influenced the city's location are conserved.

The hidden character of the site over a long period has contributed to its preservation and it has not been rebuilt or altered in that time. The rediscovery has led to excavation, protection and conservation which has continued for a century, promoted by public institutions.

Criterion (iii): The abandoned Caliphate City of Medina Azahara, being a new city planned and built as a state initiative, attests in an exceptional way to the Umayyad cultural and architectural civilization, and more generally to the development of the western Islamic civilization of Al-Andalus.

Criterion (iv): The Caliphate City of Medina Azahara is an outstanding example of urban planning combining architectural and landscape approaches, the technology of urban infrastructure, architecture, decoration and landscape adaptation, illustrating the significant period of the 10th century CE when the Umayyad caliphate of Cordoba was proclaimed in the Islamic West.

Integrity

The site includes the entire Caliphate city, and its buffer zone preserves the context of the city in its natural environment, as well as the remains of the main infrastructure of roads and canals that radiated from it. The quarries where the building material for the city was extracted and the major country villas (*munya*) have also survived in the buffer zone.

Because the city remained hidden from the time of its destruction in the early 11th century CE to its rediscovery in the early 20th century CE, and since the area was used for grazing livestock, the remains are very well preserved. Only 10% of the site has been excavated and the remainder offers an exceptional opportunity for future research. As for the excavated part of the Qasr or fortified palace, continued excavation and conservation work has brought to light a set of well conserved buildings whose original walls reach a height of several meters.

Authenticity

The site meets the conditions of authenticity in relation to materials, design and location. As regards the authenticity of the materials, as noted most of the site has remained unchanged and hidden below ground. As for the excavated areas, the work of consolidation, made necessary by the fragility of the materials, has been progressing under the philosophy of minimal intervention, in order to ensure the stability of structures, protect them against the elements and conserve the

information produced during the excavation process.

This policy of minimal intervention has ensured that any new additions clearly differ from, but also blend in with, the original. Identifying the original position of the different materials used in building the city has made this work possible.

The authenticity of the site is also guaranteed by the conservation of its natural environment, where little has changed since the destruction of the city, except for a few small recent alterations. In addition, the descriptions of the buildings in a wide range of historical sources, the epigraphic evidence and the quality of research work carried out for over a century reinforce the authenticity of the site.

Management and protection requirements

The Caliphate City of Medina Azahara and its buffer zone have been protected almost continuously by the Administration since 1911, and the site has had its own management body since 1985. Accordingly, the site has a general framework of protection and management that guarantees the future maintenance of its Outstanding Universal Value.

Protection is assisted by the site being mostly in public ownership. The legal protection of Medina Azahara and its surroundings is also at the maximum level afforded by the Law of Spanish Historical Heritage, as a Property of Cultural Interest, under the category Archaeological Site.

The Special Plan for the Protection of Medina Azahara was approved in 1998, providing an urban planning law that regulated the boundaries of the protected area and established possible land uses for each defined category.

Various government and legal departments ensure strict compliance with this law, and thus avoid any potential threats.

The institutional framework for management is provided, since 1985, by a specific institution that manages the property and the buffer zone: the Archaeological Ensemble of Medina Azahara (CAMA). This institution has an organizational structure including areas of Administration, Conservation and Research/Publicity.

There are two planning instruments which have been developed and implemented to different degrees (the programmes of the Special Protection Plan and the Master Plan), which provide a solid basis for strategic guidelines to guarantee that Medina Azahara continues to be protected and appreciated.

The expected long-term results for management are to consolidate and increase human and budgetary resources for management, consolidating the public institution with its technical expertise as the main instrument for managing the site, providing it with greater functional autonomy and encouraging greater participation and coordination with other agencies and interested parties.

Another essential aim to ensure the preservation of the site is to update and have approved the Operational Plan for Medina Azahara.

4. **Recommends** that the State Party give consideration to the following:
 - a) Securing the appropriate and timely funding for the property,
 - b) Clarifying the timeframe for the implementation of the mitigation of the edges of the illegal settlements with hard and soft landscaping,
 - c) Carrying out special monitoring on the portion of Las Pintas beyond the Guadalquivir River Canal, where urban plots are still empty, with a view to avoiding development or at least ensuring development has minimal impact,
 - d) Improving the monitoring by developing indicators which directly measure the state of conservation,
 - e) Elaborating in detail the evidence of the evolution of conservation doctrine and criteria in the baseline documentation about the site,
 - f) Updating and approving the Operational Plan for Medina Azahara in order to ensure the preservation of the property;
5. **Decides** that the name of the property be changed, in order to keep the historical name, to: **Caliphate City of Madīnat al-Zahrā’**.

| | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Property | Göbekli Tepe |
| ID No. | 1572 |
| State Party | Turkey |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (i)(ii)(iii)(iv) |

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, May 2018, page 263.

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.34

The World Heritage Committee,

1. **Having examined** Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1,
2. **Inscribes** **Göbekli Tepe, Turkey**, on the World Heritage List on the basis of **criteria (i), (ii) and (iv)**;
3. **Adopts** the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:

Brief synthesis

Göbekli Tepe is located in Upper Mesopotamia, a region which saw the emergence of the most ancient farming communities in the world. Monumental structures, interpreted as enclosures, were erected by groups of hunter-gatherers in the Pre-Pottery Neolithic period (10th-9th millennia BC). The monuments were probably used in connection with public rituals, probably of a funerary nature. Distinctive T-shaped pillars are carved with a rich array of images, mainly of wild animals. Recent excavations have also enabled

the identification of a nearby built structure of lesser architectural complexity of what might be termed domestic structures.

Criterion (i): The communities that built the monumental megalithic structures of Göbekli Tepe lived at the time of one of the most momentous transitions in human history, from the way of life of hunter-gatherer subsistence to that of the first farmers. These architectural feats bear witness to the creative genius of Pre-Pottery Neolithic societies.

Criterion (ii): Göbekli Tepe is one of the first manifestations of human-made monumental architecture, and its building techniques (semi-subterranean architecture with pillars) and its imagery were disseminated and replicated at other sites in the Middle East from the earliest Neolithic periods, Pre-Pottery Neolithic A and Pre-Pottery Neolithic B, onwards.

Criterion (iv): Göbekli Tepe is an outstanding example of an ensemble of monumental megalithic structures illustrating a significant period of human history. The monolithic T-shaped pillars were carved from the adjacent limestone plateau and attest to new levels of architectural and engineering technology. They are believed to bear witness to the presence of specialised craftsmen, and possibly the emergence of more hierarchical forms of human society.

Integrity

Göbekli Tepe contains all the elements necessary for the expression of its Outstanding Universal Value. Recent infrastructure projects are concentrated around the southern boundaries of the management zone. The electricity pylons and the road network are visible, as are the irrigation channels to the south, and a limestone quarry north of the village of Örencik. Future development projects (railway line, motorway) and the increase in tourist numbers likely to be generated are currently causing very serious concern, making the property's integrity vulnerable.

Authenticity

The megalithic structures have largely retained the original form and design of their architectural elements, together with numerous decorative elements and craft works that provide an insight into the way of life of the societies that occupied the site. The results of more than twenty years of research and archaeological excavations on the site testify to its authenticity. The excavations under way and their analysis since the mid-1990s also provide a more balanced and detailed view of the relationship between the various aspects of usage and the prehistoric importance of the property. Future development projects and the limited nature of the documentation concerning the buffer zone and the management zone mean that authenticity is vulnerable.

Management and protection requirements

Göbekli Tepe is legally protected by Law 2863/1983 on the protection of the cultural and natural environment, amended in 1987 and 2004.

In 2005, the tell and the limestone plateau were inscribed as a 1st Degree Conservation Area by the decision of the Diyarbakır Council for Conservation of the Cultural and Natural Environment. In 2016, the buffer zone was registered as a 3rd Degree Conservation Area, by the decision of the Şanlıurfa Council for Conservation of the Cultural and Natural Heritage.

The institutional framework for the implementation of the protection measures consists at national level of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, at regional level of the Şanlıurfa Council for Conservation of the Cultural and Natural Heritage, and at local level of Şanlıurfa Museum. Since 2014 the Ministry of Culture and Tourism has granted an excavation permit to Şanlıurfa Museum in collaboration with the German Archaeological Institute (DAI).

The management plan was drawn up in 2015, revised in 2016 and finalised in 2017. Because of the property's status as an archaeological site and its recent transformation into a heritage site, the Director of Şanlıurfa Council for Conservation of Cultural and Natural Heritage has been appointed as the manager of the property. An Advisory Board, set up in 2016, examines the management plan and submits proposals for decision-making and the implementation of the plan. A Coordination and Audit Board, also set up in 2016, examines and approves the draft master plan.

4. Also inscribes Göbekli Tepe, Turkey on the World Heritage List in Danger;
5. Recommends that the State Party invite a mission to visit the property as soon as possible, to agree on a desired state of conservation with a view to removing the property from the World Heritage List in Danger, based on the cultural attributes of Outstanding Universal Value, and which must be achieved by means of a master plan so as to manage the development of infrastructure for sustainable tourism. Above all, it is essential to protect the property from inappropriate development, thanks to planning and "development control". It is crucial to preserve the character of the place and its singularity, and to reconcile heritage conservation and the demand for development;
6. Also recommends that the State Party give urgent consideration to the following:
 - a) Closely monitor developments around the property that threaten the landscape and visual integrity, and the archaeological potential, of the property. This includes monitoring the visual impact of possible "compulsory infrastructure" and measures to protect the agricultural land in the plain of Harran,
 - b) Carry out a study of the impact on the property of the proposed railway line at the site and of its development before its construction, and communicate the study to the World Heritage Centre in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines,
 - c) Take measures to ensure that the landscape treatment of the irrigation channel, in the

management zone and in the south-east of the property, is implemented so as to reduce its visual impact. Options should also be explored to reduce the visual impact of the quarry in the west,

- d) Strengthen the protection measures for the buffer zone by making it into a 1st Degree Conservation Area,
- e) Develop the management plan so as to:
 - i) include a full conservation plan (including an associated action plan and dedicated resources),
 - ii) include a maintenance work plan,
 - iii) appoint a manager based at the property all year round,
 - iv) include a long-term approach for the management of infrastructure development. Infrastructure must be adapted to allow for the future development of sustainable tourism, without damaging the property's Outstanding Universal Value,
 - v) finalise the detailed tourism management plan as an important and integral part of the property management system, with a schedule for its implementation,
 - vi) include a risk preparedness plan;
7. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 December 2018** a report on the implementation of the above-mentioned recommendations for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 43rd session in 2019.

C.4.2. Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Property | Naumburg Cathedral |
| ID No. | 1470 Rev |
| State Party | Germany |
| Criteria proposed by State Party | (i)(ii)(iv) |

See document WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1.Add

Draft Decision: 42 COM 8B.35

[See Addendum: WHC/18/42.COM/8B.Add]

III. RECORD OF THE PHYSICAL ATTRIBUTES OF EACH SITE BEING DISCUSSED AT THE 42ND SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Of the 31 sites being discussed, 13 are serial proposals, containing a total of 255 new component elements.

A total of 8 million hectares is proposed, of which the majority (94.3%) are for natural and mixed sites, although numerically natural and mixed sites represent 29% of the 31 nominations being discussed.

The following table displays the relevant figures for the last years:

| Session | Number of sites proposed (including extensions) | Ratio of Natural and Mixed to Cultural sites | Total hectares proposed for inscription | Ratio of Natural and Mixed to Cultural sites | Number of serial nominations (including extensions) |
|---------------|---|--|---|--|---|
| 27 COM (2003) | 45 | 33% N/M - 66% C | 7.8 mil. ha | 94.6% N/M - 5.4% C | 22 |
| 28 COM (2004) | 48 | 25% N/M - 75% C | 6.7 mil. ha | 94.4% N/M - 5.6% C | 18 |
| 29 COM (2005) | 47 | 30% N/M - 70% C | 4.5 mil. ha | 97.9% N/M - 2.1% C | 22 |
| 30 COM (2006) | 37 | 27% N/M - 73% C | 5.1 mil. ha | 81.9% N/M - 18.1% C | 16 |
| 31 COM (2007) | 45 | 29% N/M - 71% C | 2.1 mil. ha | 88.5% N/M - 11.5% C | 17 |
| 32 COM (2008) | 47 | 28% N/M - 72% C | 5.4 mil. ha | 97% N/M - 3% C | 21 |
| 33 COM (2009) | 37 | 22% N/M - 78% C | 1.3 mil. ha | 62% N/M - 38% C | 22 |
| 34 COM (2010) | 42 | 24% N/M - 76% C | 80 mil. ha | 99.7% N/M - 0.3% C | 18 |
| 35 COM (2011) | 42 | 31% N/M - 69% C | 3.4 mil. ha | 83.5% N/M - 16.5% C | 17 |
| 36 COM (2012) | 38 | 24% N/M - 76% C | 3.4 mil. ha | 94.9% N/M - 5.1% C | 19 |
| 37 COM (2013) | 36 | 36% N/M - 64% C | 10 mil. ha | 99.5% N/M - 0.5% C | 12 |
| 38 COM (2014) | 41 | 29% N/M - 71% C | 4.8 mil. ha | 80% N/M - 20% C | 16 |
| 39 COM (2015) | 38 | 16% N/M - 84% C | 3.3 mil. ha | 84% N/M - 16% C | 16 |
| 40 COM (2016) | 29 | 45% N/M - 55% C | 10 mil. ha | 99.7% N/M - 0.3% C | 14 |
| 41 COM (2017) | 35 | 23% N/M - 77% C | 8.4 mil. ha | 85.7% N/M - 14.3% C | 15 |
| 42 COM (2018) | 31 | 29% N/M - 71% C | 8 mil. ha | 94.3% N/M - 5.7% C | 13 |

The tables below present the information in two parts:

- A. a table of the total surface area of the site and any buffer zone proposed, together with the geographic coordinates of each site's approximate centre point; and
- B. a set of separate tables presenting the component parts of each of the 13 proposed serial sites.

A. Physical attributes of sites proposed for inscription at the 42nd session

-- = site has no buffer zone
ng = information not given

| State Party | World Heritage nomination | ID N | Area (ha) | Buffer zone (ha) | Centre point coordinates |
|----------------------------|---|----------|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| | NATURAL SITES | | | | |
| China | Fanjingshan | 1559 | 40.275 | 37.239 | N27 53 44 E108 40 48 |
| France | Haut lieu tectonique Chaîne des Puys-Faille de Limagne | 1434 Rev | 24223 | 16307 | N45 46 45.8 E2 57 54.4 |
| Iran (Islamic Republic of) | Arasbaran Protected Area | 1543 | 57.765 | 105.601 | N38 56 00 E46 50 00 |
| Japan | Amami-Oshima Island, Tokunoshima Island, the northern part of Okinawa Island, and Iriomote Island | 1574 | 37939 | 25945 | See serial nomination table |
| Russian Federation | Bikin River Valley [as an extension of "Central Sikhote-Alin", inscribed in 2001, (x)] | 766 Bis | 1566818 | 129509 | See serial nomination table |
| South Africa | Barberton Makhonjwa Mountains | 1575 | 113137 | -- | S25 58 26 E31 00 50 |
| | TOTAL | | 1742215 ha | 42524.349 ha | |

| State Party | World Heritage nomination | ID N | | Area (ha) | Buffer zone (ha) | Centre point coordinates |
|----------------------|---|------|-----|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| | MIXED SITES | | | | | |
| Canada | Pimachiowin Aki | 1415 | Rev | 2904000 | 35926000 | N51 49 35.1 W95 24 40.6 |
| Colombia | Chiribiquete National Park – “The Maloca of the Jaguar” | 1174 | | 2782354 | 3989682.82 | N0 31 31 W72 47 50 |
| Mexico | Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley: originary habitat of Mesoamerica | 1534 | Rev | 145255.2 | 344931.68 | See serial nomination table |
| | TOTAL | | | 5831609 ha | 40199923 ha | |
| | CULTURAL SITES | | | | | |
| Belgium/France | Funeral and memorial sites of the First World War (Western Front) | 1567 | | 879.91 | 29227.97 | See serial nomination table |
| Belgium/Netherlands | Colonies of Benevolence | 1555 | | 4266.81 | 4252.75 | See serial nomination table |
| China | Historic Monuments and Sites of Ancient Quanzhou (Zayton) | 1561 | | 101.14 | 632.82 | See serial nomination table |
| Czech Republic | Žatec – the Town of Hops | 1558 | | 45.96 | 72.03 | See serial nomination table |
| Denmark | Aasivissuit – Nipisat. Inuit Hunting Ground between Ice and Sea | 1557 | | 417800 | 417800 | N67 03 50.15 W51 25 59.54 |
| France | The Historic Urban Ensemble of Nîmes | 1569 | | 100 | 285.1 | N43 50 06.6 E4 21 34.6 |
| Germany | The Archaeological Border Landscape of Hedeby and the Danevirke | 1553 | | 227.55 | 2670 | See serial nomination table |
| Germany | Naumburg Cathedral | 1470 | Rev | 1.82 | 56.98 | N51 09 17.3 E11 48 14.4 |
| India | Victorian and Art Deco Ensemble of Mumbai | 1480 | | 66.34 | 378.78 | N18 55 47.3 E72 49 48.3 |
| Indonesia | Age of Trade: Old Town of Jakarta (formerly Old Batavia) and 4 Outlying Islands (Onrust, Kelor, Cipir and Bidarani) | 1524 | | 352 | 993.3361 | See serial nomination table |
| Iran | Sassanid Archaeological Landscape of Fars Region | 1568 | | 639.3 | 12715 | See serial nomination table |
| Italy | Ivrea, industrial city of the 20th century | 1538 | | 71.185 | 400.481 | N45 27 27 E7 52 9 |
| Italy | Le Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano a Valdobbiadene | 1571 | | 20334.2 | 23654 | N45 57 10.9 E12 13 34 |
| Japan | Hidden Christian Sites in the Nagasaki Region | 1495 | | 5569.34 | 10742.35 | See serial nomination table |
| Kenya | Thimlich Ohinga Archaeological Site | 1450 | Rev | 21 | 33 | S0 53 28.8168 E34 19 33.9852 |
| Oman | Ancient City of Qalhat | 1537 | | 69.314049 | 176.19544 | N22 41 42.8 E59 22 41.2 |
| Republic of Korea | Sansa, Buddhist Mountain Monasteries in Korea | 1562 | | 55.43 | 1323.11 | See serial nomination table |
| Romania | Roşia Montană Mining Landscape | 1552 | | 1663.65 | 341.42 | N46 18 22 E23 07 50 |
| Saudi Arabia | Al-Ahsa Oasis, an Evolving Cultural Landscape | 1563 | | 8544 | 21556 | See serial nomination table |
| Spain | Caliphate City of Medina Azahara | 1560 | | 111 | 2186 | N37 53 9.2 W4 52 3.7 |
| Turkey | Göbekli Tepe | 1572 | | 126 | 461 | N37 13 23.6712 E38 55 20.5104 |
| United Arab Emirates | Khor Dubai, a Traditional Merchants' Harbour | 1458 | Rev | 48.50 | 97.50 | N25 15 52.86 E55 17 38.60 |
| | TOTAL | | | 461094.5 ha | 530055.8 ha | |

B. Serial nominations to be examined by the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee

Serial component names are listed in the language in which they have been submitted by the State(s) Party(ies).

Natural sites

| Japan | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------------|------------------|------------------------------|
| N 1574 Amami-Oshima Island, Tokunoshima Island, the northern part of Okinawa Island, and Iriomote Island | | | | |
| Serial ID No. | Name | Property (ha) | Buffer zone (ha) | Centre point coordinates |
| 1574-001 | Amami-Oshima Island - a | 9293 | 14468 | N28 16 44.969 E129 22 41.886 |
| 1574-002 | Amami-Oshima Island - b | 1751 | | N28 12 26.893 E129 25 35.112 |
| 1574-003 | Amami-Oshima Island - c | 164 | | N28 16 40.687 E129 25 26.504 |
| 1574-004 | Amami-Oshima Island - d | 96 | | N28 15 20.993 E129 22 49.542 |
| 1574-005 | Amami-Oshima Island - e | 72 | | N28 11 27.022 E129 23 35.690 |
| 1574-006 | Amami-Oshima Island - f | 49 | | N28 16 53.282 E129 24 54.518 |
| 1574-007 | Amami-Oshima Island - g | 45 | | N28 15 35.162 E129 23 42.903 |
| 1574-008 | Amami-Oshima Island - h | 41 | | N28 14 11.265 E129 24 32.565 |
| 1574-009 | Amami-Oshima Island - i | 26 | | N28 13 18.441 E129 26 08.388 |
| 1574-010 | Tokunoshima Island - 1 | 1643 | 1853 | N27 45 48.136 E128 58 01.962 |
| 1574-011 | Tokunoshima Island - 2 | 791 | 999 | N27 51 56.053 E128 55 33.394 |
| 1574-012 | Northern part of Okinawa Island – 1a | 4219 | ng | N26 43 29.212 E128 13 12.382 |
| 1574-013 | Northern part of Okinawa Island – 1b | 34 | 2385 | N26 39 03.653 E128 11 41.015 |
| 1574-014 | Northern part of Okinawa Island – 1c | 6 | | N26 39 19.626 E128 11 29.668 |
| 1574-015 | Northern part of Okinawa Island – 1d | 5 | | N26 39 21.979 E128 11 43.241 |
| 1574-016 | Northern part of Okinawa Island – 1e | 3 | | N26 39 01.906 E128 12 02.403 |
| 1574-017 | Northern part of Okinawa Island – 2 | 355 | 131 | N26 45 52.953 E128 17 19.942 |
| 1574-018 | Northern part of Okinawa Island – 3a | 229 | 184 | N26 43 36.353 E128 16 26.244 |
| 1574-019 | Northern part of Okinawa Island – 3b | 77 | | N26 43 25.308 E128 15 26.700 |
| 1574-020 | Northern part of Okinawa Island – 4a | 84 | 327 | N26 41 06.970 E128 08 40.088 |
| 1574-021 | Northern part of Okinawa Island – 4b | 65 | | N26 40 44.575 E128 07 37.115 |
| 1574-022 | Northern part of Okinawa Island – 5 | 56 | 56 | N26 51 15.715 E128 15 17.122 |
| 1574-023 | Iriomote Island - a | 18829 | 5542 | N24 19 34.257 E123 48 31.486 |
| 1574-024 | Iriomote Island - b | 6 | | N24 18 28.492 E123 54 03.246 |
| TOTAL | | 37939 | 25945 | |

| Russian Federation | | | | |
|---|---|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| N 766 Bis Bikin River Valley [as an extension of “Central Sikhote-Alin”] | | | | |
| Serial ID No. | Name | Property (ha) | Buffer zone (ha) | Centre point coordinates |
| 766-001 | Sikhote-Alin Nature Reserve - inscribed in 2001 | 401600 | -- | N45 19 60 E136 10 0 |
| 766-002 | Goralij Zoological Preserve inscribed in 2001 | 4749 | -- | N45 07 42.7 E136 45 22 |
| 766-003bis | Bikin River Valley | 1160469 | 129509 | N46 41 00 E136 39 40 |
| TOTAL | | 1566818 | 129509 | |

Mixed sites

| Mexico | | | | |
|---|------------------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| C/N 1534 Rev Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley: originary habitat of Mesoamerica | | | | |
| Serial ID No. | Name | Property (ha) | Buffer zone (ha) | Centre point coordinates |
| 1534rev-001 | Zapotitlán - Cuicatlán | 136587.52 | 344 931.68 | N17 59 23.86 W97 11 13.75 |
| 1534rev-002 | San Juan Raya | 6106.64 | | N18 17 38 W97 35 13.75 |
| 1534rev-003 | Purrón | 2561.04 | | N18 12 01.41 W97 07 07.85 |
| TOTAL | | 145255.2 | 344931.68 | |

Cultural sites

| Belgium / France | | | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| C 1567 | | | | | | |
| Funeral and memorial sites of the First World War (Western Front) | | | | | | |
| Serial ID No. | Name | State Party | Property (ha) | Buffer zone (ha) | Centre point coordinates | |
| 1567-001 | Fort de Loncin | Belgium, Wallonie, Liège | 8.05 | 21 | N50 40 29 E5 29 31 | |
| 1567-002 | Carrés militaires de Robermont | | 0.89 | 17.59 | N50 37 55 E5 36 46 | |
| 1567-003 | Cimetière militaire français du Plateau | Belgium, Wallonie, Luxembourg | 0.52 | 442.22 | N49 44 18.9 E5 28 51.3 | |
| 1567-004 | Cimetière militaire français de l'Orée de la Forêt | | 0.65 | | N49 43 47.8 E5 28 51.5 | |
| 1567-005 | Cimetière militaire franco-allemand du Radan | | 0.53 | | 70.75 | N49 39 51.7 E5 30 52.9 |
| 1567-006 | Enclos des fusillés à Tamines | Belgium, Wallonie, Namur | 0.38 | 1.40 | N50 25 52 E4 36 51 | |
| 1567-007 | Cimetière militaire français de la Belle Motte | | 0.75 | 42.01 | N50 24 12.5 E4 36 10.2 | |
| 1567-008 | Cimetière militaire allemand et du Commonwealth de Saint-Shymporien | Belgium, Wallonie, Hainaut | 0.92 | 87.90 | N50 25 56.2 E4 00 37.8 | |
| 1567-009 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Hyde Park Corner Cemetery" | | 0.64 | 286.35 | N50 44 16.2 E2 52 55.5 | |
| 1567-010 | Cimetière militaire & monuments aux disparus du Commonwealth "Berks Cemetery Extension" et "Ploegsteert Memorial to the Missing" | | 0.10 | | N50 44 16.2 E2 52 57.7 | |
| 1567-011 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Strand Military Cemetery" | | 0.41 | | N50 43 58 E2 52 51 | |
| 1567-012 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Prowse Point Military Cemetery" | | 0.05 | | N50 44 38 E2 53 56 | |
| 1567-013 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Mud Corner Cemetery" | | 0.04 | | N50 44 31.7 E2 53 54.2 | |
| 1567-014 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Toronto Avenue Cemetery" | | 0.15 | | N50 44 26.7 E2 53 60 | |
| 1567-015 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Ploegsteert Wood Military Cemetery" | | 0.44 | | N50 44 14 E2 54 01.5 | |
| 1567-016 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Rifle House Cemetery" | | 0.17 | | N50 44 08.6 E2 54 03.2 | |
| 1567-017 | Monuments aux disparus du Commonwealth "Nieuport Memorial" | | Belgium, Flandre, Flandre-Occidentale | | 0.02 | 20.82 |
| 1567-018 | Cimetière militaire allemand de Vladslo | 1.26 | | | 46.06 | N51 04 14 E2 55 45 |
| 1567-019 | Crypte de la Tour de l'Yser | 0.19 | | 11.31 | N51 01 56 E2 51 13 | |
| 1567-020 | Cimetière militaire belge d'Oeren | 0.34 | | 6.08 | N51 01 27 E2 42 16 | |
| 1567-021 | Cimetière militaire belge d'Houthulst | 3.96 | | 69.12 | N50 58 00 E2 56 54 | |
| 1567-022 | Cimetière militaire allemand de Langemark | 1.86 | | 31.44 | N50 55 13 E2 55 00 | |
| 1567-023 | Monument national canadien "The Brooding Soldier" | 0.96 | | 25.10 | N50 53 59 E2 56 26 | |
| 1567-024 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Tyne Cot Cemetery" et monuments aux disparus du Commonwealth "Tyne Cot Memorial" | 3.48 | 74.32 | N50 53 14 E2 59 57 | | |
| 1567-025 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Polygon Wood Cemetery" | 0.16 | 80.52 | N50 51 27 E2 59 26 | | |
| 1567-026 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Buttes New British Cemetery" | 1.41 | | N50 51 21 E2 59 30 | | |
| 1567-027 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Essex Farm Cemetery" | 0.64 | | 7.15 | N50 52 15 E2 52 23 | |

| | | | | | |
|----------|--|--|-------|--------|------------------------|
| 1567-028 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Welsh Cemetery (Caesar's Nose)" | | 0.15 | 180.86 | N50 53 12 E2 52 55 |
| 1567-029 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "No Man's Cot Cemetery" | | 0.07 | | N50 53 02 E2 53 36 |
| 1567-030 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Track X Cemetery" | | 0.09 | | N50 52 41.4 E2 54 41.1 |
| 1567-031 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Buff's Road Cemetery" | | 0.13 | | N50 52 36 E2 54 59 |
| 1567-032 | Cimetière militaire français "Saint Charles de Potyze" | | 1.97 | 22.89 | N50 51 47 E2 55 35 |
| 1567-033 | Monument aux disparus du Commonwealth "Menin Gate" | | 0.12 | 10.51 | N50 51 07 E2 53 28 |
| 1567-034 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Bedford House Cemetery" | | 4.48 | 89.09 | N50 49 43 E2 53 26 |
| 1567-035 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Larch Wood Cemetery" | | 0.35 | 39.02 | N50 49 40 E2 55 25 |
| 1567-036 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Woods Cemetery" | | 0.34 | 34.40 | N50 49 21 E2 54 56 |
| 1567-037 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "1st D.C.L.I. Cemetery, The Bluff" | | 0.09 | | N50 49 15 E2 54 47 |
| 1567-038 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Hedge Row Trench Cemetery" | | 0.15 | | N50 49 10 E2 54 49 |
| 1567-039 | Ossuaire français du Mont Kemmel | | 0.23 | 57.48 | N50 46 44 E2 48 28 |
| 1567-040 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Spanbroekmolen British Cemetery" | | 0.06 | 62.94 | N50 46 42.1 E2 52 01.3 |
| 1567-041 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Lone Tree Cemetery" | | 0.08 | | N50 46 28.5 E2 51 42.7 |
| 1567-042 | Monument Irlandais "Island of Ireland Peace Tower" | | 0.86 | 80.04 | N50 45 35 E2 53 41 |
| 1567-043 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Lijssenthoek military cemetery" | | 2.92 | 22.06 | N50 49 46 E2 42 04 |
| 1567-044 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Fromelles (Pheasant Wood) Military Cemetery" | France, Hauts-de-France, Nord | 1.12 | 81.80 | N50 36 27.6 E2 51 03.8 |
| 1567-045 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth & Memorial australien "V.C. Corner Australian Cemetery and Memorial" | | 0.24 | 182.22 | N50 37 10 E2 50 01 |
| 1567-046 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Louveral Military Cemetery" & "Cambrai Memorial" | France, Hauts-de-France, Nord | 0.22 | 125.99 | N50 08 12 E3 00 54 |
| 1567-047 | Cimetière militaire allemand de la route de Solesmes & cimetière militaire du Commonwealth | | 2.78 | 147.85 | N50 10 41 E3 15 39 |
| 1567-048 | Nécropole nationale française d'Assevent & cimetière militaire allemand d'Assevent | | 0.69 | 94.51 | N50 17 30 E4 01 07 |
| 1567-049 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Le Quesnoy communal Cemetery extension" | | 1.85 | 79.33 | N50 15 21 E3 38 01 |
| 1567-050 | Mémorial indien du Commonwealth "Neuve Chapelle Memorial" | France, Hauts-de-France, Pas-de-Calais | 0.31 | 175.00 | N50 34 30 E2 46 29 |
| 1567-051 | Cimetière militaire portugais de Richebourg-l'Avoué | | 0.43 | | N50 34 25 E2 46 33 |
| 1567-052 | Mémorial national canadien "Vimy Memorial" | | 16.47 | 827.20 | N50 22 47 E 2 46 26 |
| 1567-053 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Canadian Cemetery n2" | | 1.16 | | N50 22 40 E2 45 48 |
| 1567-054 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Givenchy Road Canadian Cemetery" | | 0.86 | | N50 22 33 E2 45 53 |
| 1567-055 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Lichfield Crater Cemetery" | | 0.13 | | N50 21 34 E2 46 36 |

| | | | | | |
|----------|---|--------------------------------|-------|---------|------------------------|
| 1567-056 | Nécropole nationale française de la Targette & cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "La Targette British Cemetery" | | 5.24 | 272.51 | N50 21 00 E2 44 47 |
| 1567-057 | Cimetière militaire allemand de la Maison Blanche | | 8.97 | | N50 20 34 E2 45 15 |
| 1567-058 | Cimetière militaire tchécoslovaque de Neuville-Saint-Vaast | | 0.15 | 572.68 | N50 21 57 E2 44 39 |
| 1567-059 | Nécropole nationale française de Notre-Dame-de-Lorette | | 30.99 | 78.75 | N50 24 04 E2 43 10 |
| 1567-060 | Cimetière militaire & memoriaux du Commonwealth "Faubourg D'amiens Cemetery", "Arras Memorial" et "Arras Flying Services Memorial" | | 1.51 | 14.62 | N50 17 14 E2 45 35 |
| 1567-061 | Cimetière militaire & memorial du Commonwealth "Dud Corner Cemetery" et "Loos Memorial" | | 0.55 | 211.69 | N50 27 38 E2 46 17 |
| 1567-062 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Etaples Military Cemetery" | | 5.79 | 146.46 | N50 32 09 E1 37 23 |
| 1567-063 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Wimereux communal cemetery" | | 1.28 | 44.38 | N50 46 26 E1 36 51 |
| 1567-064 | Memoriaux du Commonwealth "Beaumont Hamel (Newfoundland) Memorial" & "29th Division Memorial", Parc du souvenir du Commonwealth "Beaumont Hamel (Newfoundland) Memorial Park" & cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Hunter's Cemetery" | France, Hauts-de-France, Somme | 30.00 | 2375 | N50 04 30 E2 39 00 |
| 1567-065 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Mill Road Cemetery" | | 0.35 | | N50 03 39 E2 41 01 |
| 1567-066 | Monument aux Disparus du Commonwealth "Thiepval Memorial" & cimetière militaire franco-britannique "Thiepval Anglo-French Cemetery" | | 14.00 | | N50 03 01 E2 41 08 |
| 1567-067 | Cimetière militaire & memorial du Commonwealth "Pozières British Cemetery" & "Pozières Memorial" | | 0.79 | | N50 02 02 E2 42 54 |
| 1567-068 | Mémorial National sud-africain "The South Africa (Delville Wood) National Memorial" et cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Delville Wood Cemetery" | | 5.48 | 58.10 | N50 01 32 E2 48 45 |
| 1567-069 | Nécropole nationale française & chapelle du Souvenir Français de Rancourt-Bouchavesnes-Bergen | | 3.03 | 199.30 | N49 59 53 E2 54 42 |
| 1567-070 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Rancourt Military Cemetery" | | 0.03 | | N49 59 53 E2 54 35 |
| 1567-071 | Cimetière militaire allemand de Rancourt | | 1.54 | | N49 59 48 E 2 54 17 |
| 1567-072 | Mémorial National australien "Villers-Bretonneux Memorial" & cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Villers-Bretonneux Military Cemetery" | | 5.65 | 3887.75 | N49 53 12 E2 30 41 |
| 1567-073 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Noyelles-sur-mer Chinese Cemetery" & memorial chinois "Noyelles-sur-mer Chinese Memorial" | | 0.32 | 137.60 | N50 11 10 E1 43 21 |
| 1567-074 | Cimetière militaire du Commonwealth "Louvecourt Military Cemetery" | | 0.14 | 54.31 | N50 05 21.3 E2 30 13.9 |
| 1567-075 | Nécropole nationale française de Cuts | France, Hauts-de-France, Oise | 1.03 | 1943.03 | N49 31 43 E3 05 32 |
| 1567-076 | Nécropole nationale française de Thiescourt & cimetière militaire allemande de Thiescourt | | 0.62 | 2044.60 | N49 34 08 E2 53 08 |

| | | | | | |
|----------|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------|------------------------|
| 1567-077 | Nécropole nationale française de Compiègne (Royallieu) | | 1.15 | 7.79 | N49 24 09 E2 48 53 |
| 1567-078 | Cimetière militaire & memorial américain "Aisne-Marne American Cemetery and Memorial" | France, Hauts-de-France, Aisne | 21.50 | 311.00 | N49 04 42 E3 17 30 |
| 1567-079 | Cimetière militaire allemand de Saint-Quentin & monument franco-allemand de Saint-Quentin | | 3.25 | 127.70 | N49 50 53 E3 15 40 |
| 1567-080 | Cimetière militaire allemand de Veslud | | 1.03 | 98.10 | N49 31 56 E3 44 04 |
| 1567-081 | Nécropole nationale française de Le Sourd & cimetière militaire allemande Le Sourd | | 0.76 | 187.00 | N49 51 19 E3 44 02 |
| 1567-082 | Nécropole nationale française de prisonniers d'Effry | | 1.09 | 8.57 | N49 55 26.8 E3 58 52.9 |
| 1567-083 | Cimetière militaire danois de Braine | | 0.14 | 121.50 | N49 20 05.2 E3 31 55.8 |
| 1567-084 | Nécropole nationale française de Cerny-en-Laonnois, cimetière militaire allemande de Cerny-en-Laonnois et chapelle-mémorial du Chemin des Dames | | 2.72 | 128 | N49 26 31 E3 39 56 |
| 1567-085 | Nécropole nationale française de Craonnelle | | 1.09 | 487.00 | N49 25 56 E3 46 23 |
| 1567-086 | Mémorial français "Les fantômes" | | 2.58 | 255.80 | N49 12 51 E3 24 32 |
| 1567-087 | Nécropole nationale française "La Grande Tombe de Villeroy" | | France, Ile-de-France, Seine-et-Marne | 0.35 | 1287.10 |
| 1567-088 | Mémorial français des batailles de la Marne | France, Grand Est, Mame | 9.85 | 28.00 | N49 04 17 E3 38 49 |
| 1567-089 | Cimetière militaire italien "de Bligny" | | 3.21 | 464.49 | N49 11 22 E3 50 26 |
| 1567-090 | Cimetière militaire & chapelle russe de Saint-Hilaire-le-Grand | | 0.60 | 4.10 | N49 09 30 E4 23 58 |
| 1567-091 | Nécropole nationale française, cimetière militaire allemand & cimetière militaire polonaise du "Bois du Puits" | | 3.86 | 99.80 | N49 11 36 E4 22 04 |
| 1567-092 | Cimetière communal français & chapelle française de Montdement-Montgivroux | | 0.08 | 7.31 | N48 47 11.7 E3 46 31.9 |
| 1567-093 | Nécropole nationale française & cimetière militaire allemand de la Crouée | | 7.16 | 66.15 | N49 11 18 E4 32 17 |
| 1567-094 | Nécropole nationale française de l'Opéra | | 0.24 | ng | N49 11 29.7 E4 33 20.9 |
| 1567-095 | Nécropole nationale française de la 28e Brigade "La ferme des Wacques" | | 0.44 | ng | N49 10 57 E4 30 37 |
| 1567-096 | Nécropole nationale française du monument-ossuaire de la Légion étrangère (Henri Fansworth) | | 0.46 | ng | N49 11 47.4 E4 33 56.6 |
| 1567-097 | Ossuaire français de Navarin: monument aux morts des armées de Champagne | | 1.90 | ng | N49 13 06.7 E4 32 31.6 |
| 1567-098 | Cimetière militaire allemand de Chestres et nécropole nationale française de Chestres | France, Grand-Est, Ardennes | 1.49 | 49.42 | N49 23 49 E4 43 39.8 |
| 1567-099 | Monument allemand du cimetière Saint-Charles | | 4.30 | 10.60 | N49 42 43 E4 56 36 |
| 1567-100 | Carré militaire français des morts du 11 novembre 1918 de Vrigne-Meuse | | 0.11 | 1.70 | N49 42 06 E4 50 35 |
| 1567-101 | Nécropole nationale française de Saint-Thomas en Argonne et nécropole nationale française du monument ossuaire de la Gruerie | France, Grand-Est, Mame | 2.40 | 52.86 | N49 12 02 E4 53 19 |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------|--|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| 1567-102 | Nécropole nationale française de La Hazarée | | 0.65 | 58.54 | N49 11 45 E4 54 59 | | |
| 1567-103 | Cimetière militaire allemand d'Aprémont | France, Grand Est, Ardennes | 0.53 | 54.62 | N49 15 21 E4 58 05 | | |
| 1567-104 | Monument ossuaire français de Haute-Chevauchée | France, Grand Est, Meuse | 0.56 | 859.30 | N49 11 21 E4 59 39 | | |
| 1567-105 | Nécropole nationale française de la Forestière | | 1.02 | | N49 10 03 E5 00 11 | | |
| 1567-106 | Cimetière militaire et memorial américain "Meuse-Argonne American Cemetery and Memorial" | | 37.42 | | 83.37 | N49 20 02 E5 05 36 | |
| 1567-107 | Nécropole nationale française de la Maize | | 1.52 | | 473.90 | N49 11 44 E5 04 31 | |
| 1567-108 | Ossuaire français, nécropole nationale française, monument israélite et monument musulman de Douaumont | | 16.67 | | 1627.00 | N49 12 26 E5 25 28 | |
| 1567-109 | Fort de Douaumont | | 9.49 | | | N49 13 01 E5 26 19 | |
| 1567-110 | Stèle française des fusillés de Fleury-devant-Douaumont | | 291.49 | | | N49 11 56 E5 25 35 | |
| 1567-111 | Tranchées des baïonnettes | | 0.69 | | | N49 12 50 E5 25 32 | |
| 1567-112 | Nécropole nationale française du Faubourg Pavé | | 1.95 | | | 5.30 | N49 09 56.5 E5 24 17.6 |
| 1567-113 | Cimetière militaire allemand de Consenvoye | | France, Grand Est, Meuse | | | 1.77 | 19.10 |
| 1567-114 | Nécropole nationale française du Trottoir | 0.84 | | 139.20 | | N49 03 56 E5 36 20.5 | |
| 1567-115 | Cimetière militaire allemand de Gobessart | 0.90 | | 13.37 | | N48 52 40 E5 36 29 | |
| 1567-116 | Cimetière militaire et memorial américain "St. Mihiel American Cemetery and Memorial" | France, Grand Est, Meurthe-et-Moselle | 5.46 | 160.00 | | N48 57 20 E5 51 07 | |
| 1567-117 | Carré français des victimes civiles de Gerbeviller | | 0.02 | 23.94 | | N48 30 14.9 E6 30 27.6 | |
| 1567-118 | Nécropole nationale française de Pierrepont | | 0.73 | 32.00 | N49 24 53 E5 42 15 | | |
| 1567-119 | Cimetière militaire allemand de Pierrepont | | 0.46 | 35.20 | N49 25 23 E5 42 18 | | |
| 1567-120 | Nécropole nationale française de Riche | | France, Grand Est, Moselle | 1.34 | 590.00 | N48 54 21 E6 37 48 | |
| 1567-121 | Cimetière militaire allemand de l'Hellenwald | | | 0.99 | 160.00 | N48 56 31.2 E6 39 52.1 | |
| 1567-122 | Nécropole nationale française de l'Espérance | | | 0.25 | 120.00 | N48 50 26 E6 50 07 | |
| 1567-123 | Cimetière national français de prisonniers de guerre de Sarrebourg | | | 5.72 | 1933.10 | N48 44 33 E7 02 05 | |
| 1567-124 | Nécropole nationale française de Chambière | 3.53 | | 164.70 | N49 08 03 E6 11 40 | | |
| 1567-125 | Nécropole nationale française de Lagarde | 0.18 | | 46.00 | N48 41 31 E6 41 59 | | |
| 1567-126 | Cimetière militaire allemand de Lagarde | 0.10 | | | N48 41 31 E6 42 39 | | |
| 1567-127 | Nécropole nationale française de la Fontenelle | France, Grand Est, Vosges | | 0.79 | 11.70 | N48 20 51 E6 59 59 | |
| 1567-128 | Nécropole nationale française de la Chipotte | | 0.70 | 17.26 | N48 22 11 E6 46 27 | | |
| 1567-129 | Nécropole nationale française des Tiges | | 0.80 | 4.27 | N48 17 13 E6 55 27 | | |
| 1567-130 | Nécropole nationale française du Wettstein | France, Grand Est, Haut-Rhin | 1.50 | 320.00 | N48 05 18 E7 07 04 | | |
| 1567-131 | Cimetière militaire allemand de Hohrod-Bärenstall | | 0.75 | | N48 04 44 E7 08 40 | | |
| 1567-132 | Cimetière militaire allemand Kahm | | 1.70 | | 520.00 | N48 09 36 E7 07 35 | |

| | | | | | |
|--------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| 1567-133 | Nécropole nationale française Duchesne | | 1.50 | | N48 08 55.3 E7 06 27.2 |
| 1567-134 | Nécropole nationale française du Silberloch, monument national français & crypte du Hartmannswillerkopf | | 166.69 | 904.00 | N47 51 32 E7 09 04 |
| 1567-135 | Cimetière militaire allemand des Uhlans | | 0.04 | | N47 51 10 E7 10 23 |
| 1567-136 | Cimetière militaire roumain de Soultzmat | | 0.91 | 224.00 | N47 57 22 E7 12 56 |
| 1567-137 | Cimetière militaire français Germania | | 1.32 | 71.00 | N48 02 22 E7 03 31 |
| 1567-138 | Nécropole nationale française de Moosh | | 0.31 | 195.00 | N47 51 34 E7 03 16 |
| 1567-139 | Ensemble de stèles et d'anciennes tombes individuelles allemandes et françaises du Petit Donon | France, Grand Est, Bas-Rhin | 62.08 | 863.00 | N48 31 00 E7 10 35 |
| TOTAL | | | 879.91 | 29227.97 | |

| Belgium / Netherlands | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| C 1555 | | | | | |
| Colonies of Benevolence | | | | | |
| Serial ID No. | Name | State Party | Property (ha) | Buffer zone (ha) | Centre point coordinates |
| 1555-001 | Colony I: Frederiksoord (1818-1820) | The Netherlands | 310.77 | 1577.09 | N52 50 47.11 E6 11 21.56 |
| 1555-002 | Colony II: Wilhelminaoord, Boschoord, Oostvierdeparten (1821-1823) | The Netherlands | 779.72 | | N52 51 43.75 E6 09 39.48 |
| 1555-003 | Colony III: Willemsoord (1820-1822) | The Netherlands | 131.06 | 613.50 | N52 49 28.78 E6 03 46.83 |
| 1555-004 | Colony IV: Ommerschans (1819) | The Netherlands | 427.63 | -- | N52 35 8.01 E6 23 42.19 |
| 1555-005 | Colony V: Wortel (1822) | Belgium | 403.55 | -- | N51 24 10.2 E4 49 27.5 |
| 1555-006 | Colony VI: Veenhuizen (1823) | The Netherlands | 1659.94 | 2062.16 | N53 02 31.59 E6 23 29.72 |
| 1555-007 | Colony VII: Merksplas (1825) | Belgium | 554.14 | -- | N51 21 20 E4 49 32.8 |
| TOTAL | | | 4266.81 | 4252.75 | |

| China | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------|------------------|--------------------------|--|
| C 1561 | | | | | |
| Historic Monuments and Sites of Ancient Quanzhou (Zayton) | | | | | |
| Serial ID No. | Name | Property (ha) | Buffer zone (ha) | Centre point coordinates | |
| 1561-001 | Wanshou Pagoda | 16.70 | 86.03 | N24 43 21.5 E118 40 21.6 | |
| 1561-002 | Liusheng Pagoda | 2.34 | 29.29 | N24 48 37.6 E118 43 17.1 | |
| 1561-003 | Shihu Dock | 3.13 | 11.23 | N24 48 31.2 E118 42 35.5 | |
| 1561-004 | Estuary Dock | 19.78 | 56.82 | N24 52 46.8 E118 37 15.9 | |
| 1561-005 | Jiuri Mountain Wind-Praying Carvings | 11.40 | 45 | N24 57 08.5 E118 31 18 | |
| 1561-006 | Zhenwu Temple | 3.84 | 72.76 | N24 52 57.8 E118 37 00.6 | |
| 1561-007 | Tianhou Temple | 0.78 | 4.31 | N24 53 53.3 E118 35 03.4 | |
| 1561-008 | The Kiln Sites at Jinjiaoyi Hill of Cizao Kilns | 6.45 | 61.70 | N24 51 13.9 E118 28 01.8 | |
| 1561-009 | Confucius Temple of Quanzhou | 3.59 | 8.15 | N24 54 31.6 E118 35 08.1 | |
| 1561-010 | Stone Statue of Lao Tze | 1.90 | 4.25 | N24 56 51.7 E118 35 40.8 | |
| 1561-011 | Kaiyuan Temple | 7.23 | 9.06 | N24 55 03.3 E118 34 51.6 | |
| 1561-012 | Islamic Tombs | 4.08 | 17.58 | N24 54 36.8 E118 36 55.6 | |
| 1561-013 | Qingjing Mosque | 2.15 | 5.23 | N24 54 20.7 E118 35 12.5 | |
| 1561-014 | Statue of Mani in the Cao'an Temple | 2.69 | 6.91 | N24 46 24.8 E118 31 46.7 | |
| 1561-015 | Site of Deji Gate | 0.39 | 4.70 | N24 53 50.2 E118 35 02.7 | |
| 1561-016 | Luoyang Bridge | 14.69 | 209.80 | N24 57 12.2 E118 40 30.6 | |
| TOTAL | | | 101.14 | 632.82 | |

| Czechia | | | | |
|--|---|---------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| C 1558 Žatec – the Town of Hops | | | | |
| Serial ID No. | Name | Property (ha) | Buffer zone (ha) | Centre point coordinates |
| 1558-001 | Historical centre of the town and the Prague Suburb | 43.95 | 60.97 | N50 19 28.552 E13 32 42.596 |
| 1558-002 | Dreher's Export Brewery | 2.01 | 11.06 | N50 20 12.968 E13 31 55.748 |
| | | 45.96 | 72.03 | |

| Germany | | | | |
|---|--|---------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| C 1553 The Archaeological Border Landscape of Hedeby and the Danevirke | | | | |
| Serial ID No. | Name | Property (ha) | Buffer zone (ha) | Centre point coordinates |
| 1553-001 | Crooked Wall Area 4 | 1.4 | ng | N54 27 20.3 E9 20 48.6 |
| 1553-002 | Crooked Wall Areas 3 to 4 | 16.1 | | N54 27 53.9 E9 23 11.7 |
| 1553-003 | Crooked Wall Areas 1 to 2 Main Wall Areas 4 to 5 | 25.2 | | N54 27 43 E9 27 14.8 |
| 1553-004 | Main Wall Areas 2 to 3 | 14.4 | | N54 28 41.7 E9 29 20.6 |
| 1553-005 | Main Wall Area 1 | 6.3 | | N54 29 14.1 E9 30 10.6 |
| 1553-006 | Connection Wall Area 9 North Wall Area 4 Arched Wall | 3.6 | | N54 29 37.4 E9 30 43.1 |
| 1553-007 | North Wall Areas 1 to 2 | 3.6 | | N54 29 57 E9 31 24.6 |
| 1553-008 | Arched Wall | 0.8 | | N54 29 39.5 E9 31 08.3 |
| 1553-009 | Connection Wall Area 8 | 2.5 | | N54 29 35.7 E9 31 04.3 |
| 1553-010 | Connection Wall Areas 5 to 7 | 5.8 | | N54 29 30.5 E 9 32 06.9 |
| 1553-011 | Connection Wall Area 3 | 0.6 | | N54 29 26 E9 33 10.4 |
| 1553-012 | Hedeby | 95 | | N54 29 28 E9 33 59 |
| 1553-013 | Kovirke Area 1 | 0.9 | | N54 27 46.9 E9 28 41.5 |
| 1553-014 | Kovirke Area 2 | 0.3 | | N54 27 50.1 E9 29 05.1 |
| 1553-015 | Kovirke Area 3 to 5 | 7.9 | | N54 28 05.4 E9 31 03.8 |
| 1553-016 | Kovirke Area 6 | 2.1 | | N54 28 25.2 E9 33 34.1 |
| 1553-017 | Kovirke Area 7 | 0.05 | | N54 28 27.6 E 9 33 58.6 |
| 1553-018 | Kovirke Area 8 | 0.5 | | N54 28 30.1 E9 34 16.6 |
| 1553-019 | Offshore Work | 36.2 | ng | N54 30 53.6 E9 38 28.9 |
| 1553-020 | East Wall Area 1A to 1C | 1.9 | ng | N54 28 51.3 E9 44 49.1 |
| 1553-021 | East Wall Area 2D | 0.5 | | N54 28 34.9 E9 46 23.8 |
| 1553-022 | East Wall Area 2E to 2F | 1.9 | | N54 28 35.9 E9 46 57.9 |
| TOTAL | | 227.55 | 2670 | |

| Indonesia | | | | |
|---|---|----------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| C 1524 Age of Trade: Old Town of Jakarta (formerly Old Batavia) and 4 Outlying Islands (Onrust, Kelor, Cipir and Bidadari) | | | | |
| Serial ID No. | Name | Property (ha) | Buffer zone (ha) | Centre point coordinates |
| 1524-001 | Kota Tua | 172.1160 | 277.5384 | S6 08 04.77 E106 48 47.39 |
| 1524-002 | 4 Islands: Onrust, Kelor, Kecipir, Bidadari | 180.5680 | 715.7977 | S6 01 59.1 E106 44 08.4 |
| TOTAL | | 352.684 | 993.3361 | |

| Iran (Islamic Republic of) | | | | |
|--|---|---------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| C 1568 Sassanid Archaeological Landscape of Fars Region | | | | |
| Serial ID No. | Name | Property (ha) | Buffer zone (ha) | Centre point coordinates |
| 1568-001 | Firuzabad: Qaleh Dokhtar | 71.2 | 4694 | N28 55 15.20 E52 31 48.31 |
| 1568-002 | Firuzabad: Ardashir investiture Relief | 0.7 | | N28 54 59.60 E52 32 14.62 |
| 1568-003 | Firuzabad: The Victory Relief of Ardashir | 0.5 | | N28 54 35.54 E52 32 27.30 |
| 1568-004 | Firuzabad: Ardashir Khurreh | 314 | | N28 51 7.73 E52 31 57.15 |
| 1568-005 | Firuzabad: Ardashir Palace | 5.9 | | N28 53 52.73 E52 32 21.17 |

| | | | | |
|----------|---|--------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| 1568-006 | Bishapur: The city of Bishapur and its related components | 194 | 7480 | N29 46 38.93 E51 34 13.62 |
| 1568-007 | Bishapur: Shapur cave | 28 | | N29 48 24.6 E51 36 47 |
| 1568-008 | Sarvestan: Sarvestan Monument | 25 | 541 | N29 11 43.94 E53 13 51.84 |
| | TOTAL | 639.3 | 12715 | |

| Japan | | | | |
|---|---|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| C 1495 | | | | |
| Hidden Christian Sites in the Nagasaki Region | | | | |
| Serial ID No. | Name | Property (ha) | Buffer zone (ha) | Centre point coordinates |
| 1495-001 | Remains of Hara Castle | 48.48 | ng | N32 37 44 E130 15 16 |
| 1495-002 | Kasuga Village and Sacred Places in Hirado (Kasuga Village and Mt. Yasumandake) | 320.5 | 1934.27 | N33 20 22 E129 26 38 |
| 1495-003 | Kasuga Village and Sacred Places in Hirado (Nakaenoshima Island) | 2.96 | | N33 22 25 E129 27 52 |
| 1495-004 | Sakitsu Village in Amakusa | 1.28 | 152.14 | N32 18 44 E130 01 33 |
| 1495-005 | Shitsu Village in Sotome | 35.07 | 479.25 | N32 50 42 E129 42 2 |
| 1495-006 | Ono Village in Sotome | 58.09 | 198.22 | N32 51 53 E129 41 9 |
| 1495-007 | Villages on Kuroshima Island | 458.99 | 1581.65 | N33 08 21 E129 32 13 |
| 1495-008 | Remains of Villages on Nozaki Island | 704.75 | 1824.4 | N33 11 13 E129 07 46 |
| 1495-009 | Villages on Kashiragashima Island | 111.48 | 934.76 | N33 00 44 E129 10 58 |
| 1495-010 | Villages on Hisaka Island | 3732.72 | 3589.98 | N32 48 8 E128 54 14 |
| 1495-011 | Egami Village on Naru Island (Egami Church and its Surroundings) | 94.11 | ng | N32 51 18.8 E128 54 14.9 |
| 1495-012 | Oura Cathedral | 0.91 | 47.68 | N32 44 3 E129 52 12 |
| | TOTAL | 5569.34 | 10742.35 | |

| Republic of Korea | | | | |
|---|--------------------|---------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| C 1562 | | | | |
| Sansa, Buddhist Mountain Monasteries in Korea | | | | |
| Serial ID No. | Name | Property (ha) | Buffer zone (ha) | Centre point coordinates |
| 1562-001 | Tongdosa Temple | 7.87 | 84.14 | N35 29 17 E129 03 56 |
| 1562-002 | Buseoksa Temple | 7.08 | 47.09 | N36 59 56 E128 41 15 |
| 1562-003 | Bongjeongsa Temple | 5.30 | 75.05 | N36 39 12 E128 39 47 |
| 1562-004 | Beopjusa Temple | 11.22 | 190.03 | N36 32 31 E127 50 00 |
| 1562-005 | Magoksa Temple | 3.91 | 62.66 | N36 33 32 E127 00 43 |
| 1562-006 | Seonamsa Temple | 9.67 | 246.16 | N34 59 45 E127 19 52 |
| 1562-007 | Daeheungsa Temple | 10.38 | 617.98 | N34 28 32 E126 37 01 |
| | TOTAL | 55.43 | 1323.11 | |

| Saudi Arabia | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| C 1563 | | | | |
| Al-Ahsa Oasis, an Evolving Cultural Landscape | | | | |
| Serial ID No. | Name | Property (ha) | Buffer zone (ha) | Centre point coordinates |
| 1563-001 | Eastern Oasis | 3885 | 5825 | N25 24 07.80 E49 37 50.05 |
| 1563-002 | Northern Oasis | 2010 | | N25 29 10.68 E49 35 25.93 |
| 1563-003 | As-Seef | 108 | | N25 22 42.67 E49 34 32.57 |
| 1563-004 | Qasr Ibrahim | 1.97 | 226.70 | N25 22 44.12 E49 35 12.51 |
| 1563-005 | Suq al-Qaysariyah | 0.93 | | N25 22 35.08 E49 35 20.93 |
| 1563-006 | Qasr Khuzam | 0.67 | | N25 22 04.89 E49 34 36.90 |
| 1563-007 | Qasr Sahood | 1.20 | 14.80 | N25 24 50.88 E49 35 00.12 |
| 1563-008 | Jawatha archaeological site | 284 | 4462 | N25 28 49.40 E49 40 13.75 |
| 1563-009 | Jawatha Mosque | 0.08 | | N25 28 11.31 E49 40 42.53 |
| 1563-010 | Al-Oyun village | 63.35 | 191 | N25 36 14.70 E49 34 14.97 |
| 1563-011 | Ain Qinas archaeological site | 18.80 | 56.50 | N25 35 32.41 E49 35 59.85 |
| 1563-012 | Al-Asfar Lake | 2170 | 10780 | N25 31 54.16 E49 47 39.69 |
| | TOTAL | 8544 | 21556 | |