United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

World Heritage 44 COM

WHC/21/44.COM/8B
Paris, 4 June 2021
Original: English / French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Extended forty-fourth session

Fuzhou (China) / Online meeting
16 – 31 July 2021

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 World Heritage Committee at its extended 44th session (Fuzhou (China) / Online meeting, 2021). It is divided into four 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
II.A Nominations submitted for examination in 2020
II.B Nominations submitted for examination in 2021
Part III Examination of minor boundary modifications of natural, mixed and cultural properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List proposed for examination in 2020
Part IV Record of the physical attributes of each site being discussed at the extended 44th session

The document presents for each nomination the proposed Draft Decision based on the recommendations of the appropriate Advisory Body(ies) as included in documents WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1 and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B2, and it provides a record of the physical attributes of each site being discussed at the extended 44th session.

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

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

A. At the request of the Australian authorities, the Committee is asked to approve a change to the English and French name of the property **Fraser Island**, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1992.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.1

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC/21/44.COM/8B,*

2. *Approves the name change to Fraser Island as proposed by the Australian authorities. The name of the property becomes **K'gari (Fraser Island)** in English and **K'gari (Île Fraser)** in French.*

B. At the request of the Kazakh authorities, the Committee is asked to approve a change to the English and French name of the property **Petroglyphs within the Archaeological Landscape of Tamgaly**, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2004.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.2

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC/21/44.COM/8B,*

2. *Approves the name change to the Petroglyphs within the Archaeological Landscape of Tamgaly as proposed by the Kazakh authorities. The name of the property becomes **Petroglyphs of the Archaeological Landscape of Tanbaly** in English and **Pétroglyphes du paysage archéologique de Tanbaly** in French.*

C. At the request of the Saudi Arabian authorities, the Committee is asked to approve a change to the English and French name of the **Al-Hijr Archaeological Site (Madâin Sâlih)**, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2008.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.3

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC/21/44.COM/8B,*

2. *Approves the name change to the Al-Hijr Archaeological Site (Madâin Sâlih) as proposed by the Saudi Arabian authorities. The name of the property becomes **Hegra Archaeological Site (al-Hijr / Madāʾin Ṣāliḥ)** in English and **Site archéologique de Hegra (al-Hijr / Madāʾen Ṣāliḥ)** in French.*

D. At the request of the Spanish authorities, the Committee is asked to approve a change to the English and French name of the property **Archaeological Ensemble of Tárraco**, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2000.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.4

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC/21/44.COM/8B,*

2. *Approves the name change to the Archaeological Ensemble of Tárraco as proposed by the Spanish authorities. The name of the property becomes **Archaeological Ensemble of Tarraco** in English and **Ensemble archéologique de Tarraco** in French.*

II. EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL SITES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST PROPOSED FOR EXAMINATION IN 2020 AND 2021

Summary

At its extended 44th session, the Committee will be examining a total of 45 nominations. 26 nominations were foreseen to be examined in 2020 and 19 in 2021.

Out of the 45 nominations 36 are new nominations, having not been presented previously, three are significant boundary modifications and six nominations were deferred or referred by previous sessions of the Committee.

Of these nominations, ICOMOS and IUCN are recommending 18* nominations for inscription on the World Heritage List.

* Please note that the Draft Decisions of eight nominations, for which, due to the exceptional sanitary situation, the Technical Evaluation Missions took place in December 2020 and January 2021 and extraordinary sessions of the Advisory Body World Heritage Panels had to be organized in January, as well as one nomination referred back by a previous session of the Committee, are included in the Addendum document [see: WHC/21/44.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:

- Egypt: The Coptic Monasteries of Wadi al-Natrun

Nominations not evaluated for the extended 44th session

The following nominations were not evaluated for the extended 44th session:

- Cameroon, Chad, Niger, Nigeria: Lake Chad cultural landscape

  For security reasons, the evaluation of this site and the examination of the nomination by the World Heritage Committee are postponed.

- China: Badain Jaran Desert - Towers of Sand and Lakes

  Following the request from the State Party linked to the ongoing global COVID-19 situation, the evaluation of this site is postponed. In accordance with Decision **14 EXT.COM 4**, this nomination will be examined by the World Heritage Committee at its 45th session.

Presentation of Nominations

The nominations are presented in two parts according to the year in which their examination by the Committee was foreseen (2020 and 2021). Within the natural, mixed and cultural groups, nominations are presented by IUCN and ICOMOS 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: the 2020 nominations on page 3, and the 2021 nominations on page 4.

Alphabetical Summary Table and Index of Recommendations of the 2020 nominations by IUCN and ICOMOS to the extended 44th session of the World Heritage Committee (16 - 31 July 2021)

State Party	World Heritage nomination	ID No.		Recommendation	Criteria proposed by the State Party	Pp
	NATURAL SITES					
Georgia	**Colchic Rainforests and Wetlands**	**1616**		**I**	**(ix)(x)**	**10**
Japan	**Amami-Oshima Island, Tokunoshima Island, Northern part of Okinawa Island, and Iriomote Island**	**1574**		**I**	**(x)**	**7**
Republic of Korea	**Getbol, Korean Tidal Flat**	**1591**		**D**	**(viii)(ix)(x)**	**9**
Slovenia	**Classical Karst**	**1615**		**N**	**(vii)(viii)(ix)(x)**	**12**
Thailand	Kaeng Krachan Forest Complex	1461	Rev	See 8B.Add	(x)	9
	MIXED SITES					
Ethiopia	***Holqa* Sof Umar: Natural and Cultural Heritage (Sof Umar: Caves of Mystery)**	**1516**		**N/N**	**(iii)(v)(vi)(vii)(viii)**	**12**
	CULTURAL SITES					
Austria / Belgium / Czechia / France / Germany / Italy / United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	**The Great Spas of Europe**	**1613**		**I**	**(ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)**	**17**
Austria / Germany / Hungary / Slovakia	Frontiers of the Roman Empire – The Danube Limes (Western Segment)	1608	Rev	I	(ii)(iii)(iv)	25
Belgium / Netherlands	Colonies of Benevolence	1555	Rev	I	(ii)(iv)	28
Brazil	**Sítio Roberto Burle Marx**	**1620**		**I**	**(ii)(iv)**	**32**
China	Quanzhou: Emporium of the World in Song-Yuan China	1561	Rev	I	(ii)(iii)(iv)	15
Dominican Republic	**Historical and Archaeological Site of La Isabela**	**1628**		**N**	**(ii)(v)**	**33**
France	**Cordouan Lighthouse**	**1625**		**I**	**(i)(iv)**	**19**
Germany	**Mathildenhöhe Darmstadt**	**1614**		**R**	**(ii)(iv)**	**21**
Greece	**Fortress of Spinalonga**	**1617**		**N**	**(iv)(vi)**	**21**
India	**The Glorious Kakatiya Temples and Gateways – Rudreshwara (Ramappa) Temple, Palampet, Jayashankar Bhupalpally District, Telangana State**	**1570**		**D**	**(i)(ii)(iii)**	**13**
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	**Trans-Iranian Railway**	**1585**		**D**	**(ii)(iv)**	**14**
Italy	**'Padova *Urbs picta'*, Giotto's Scrovegni Chapel and Padua's fourteenth-century fresco cycles**	**1623**		**I**	**(i)(ii)(iii)**	**22**
Mongolia	**Deer Stone Monuments and Related Sites, the Heart of Bronze Age Culture**	**1621**		**R**	**(i)(iii)(iv)**	**14**
Netherlands	Dutch Water Defence Lines [extension of "Defence Line of Amsterdam", inscribed in 1996]	759	Bis	R	(ii)(iv)(v)	25
Peru	**Chankillo Solar Observatory and ceremonial center**	**1624**		**I**	**(i)(v)**	**34**
Romania	Roșia Montană Mining Landscape	1552	Rev	I	(ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)	30
Saudi Arabia	**Cultural Rock Arts in Ḥimā Najrān**	**1619**		**R**	**(i)(ii)(iii)(v)**	**12**
Spain	**Paseo del Prado and Buen Retiro, a landscape of Arts and Sciences**	**1618**		**D**	**(ii)(iv)(vi)**	**23**
Turkey	**Arslantepe Mound**	**1622**		**R**	**(ii)(iii)(iv)**	**24**
Uruguay	**The work of engineer Eladio Dieste: Church of Atlántida**	**1612**		**I**	**(iv)**	**35**

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.

Alphabetical Summary Table and Index of Recommendations of the 2021 nominations by IUCN and ICOMOS to the extended 44th session of the World Heritage Committee (16 - 31 July 2021)

State Party	World Heritage nomination	ID No.		Recommendation	Criteria proposed by the State Party	Pp
	NATURAL SITES					
Gabon	**Ivindo National Park**	**1653**		**R**	**(vii)(ix)(x)**	**37**
Bosnia and Herzegovina / Czechia / France / Italy / Montenegro / North Macedonia / Poland / Serbia / Slovakia / Switzerland	Ancient and Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and Other Regions of Europe [extension of "Ancient and Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and Other Regions of Europe", inscribed in 2007, extensions in 2011 and 2017, criterion (ix)]	1133	Quarter	See 8B.Add	(ix)	38
	CULTURAL SITES					
Chile	**Settlement and Artificial Mummification of the Chinchorro Culture in the Arica and Parinacota Region**	**1634**		**See 8B.Add**	**(iii)(v)**	**52**
Côte d'Ivoire	**Sudanese style mosques in northern Côte d'Ivoire**	**1648**		**D**	**(ii)(iv)(v)**	**38**
France	**Nice, capital of Riviera tourism**	**1635**		**R**	**(ii)(iv)(vi)**	**42**
Germany	**ShUM Sites of Speyer, Worms and Mainz**	**1636**		**I**	**(ii)(iii)(vi)**	43
Germany / Netherlands	**Frontiers of the Roman Empire – The Lower German Limes**	**1631**		**I**	**(ii)(iii)(iv)**	44
India	**Dholavira: A Harappan City**	**1645**		**See 8B.Add**	**(ii)(iii)(iv)**	**38**
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	**Cultural Landscape of Hawraman/Uramanat**	**1647**		**I**	**(iii)(iv)(v)**	39
Italy	**The Porticoes of Bologna**	**1650**		**D**	**(ii)(iv)**	**46**
Japan	**Jomon Prehistoric Sites in Northern Japan**	**1632**		**I**	**(iii)(v)**	**40**
Jordan	As-Salt - The Place of Tolerance and Urban Hospitality	689	Rev	See 8B.Add	(ii)(iii)	38
Latvia	**Grobiņa archaeological ensemble**	**1637**		**See 8B.Add**	**(iii)**	**47**
Mexico	Franciscan Ensemble of the Monastery and Cathedral of Our Lady of the Assumption of Tlaxcala [extension of "Earliest 16th-Century Monasteries on the Slopes of Popocatepetl", inscribed in 1994, criteria (ii)(iv)]	702	Bis	See 8B.Add	(ii)(iv)	52
Poland	**Gdańsk Shipyard – the birthplace of "Solidarity" and the symbol of the Fall of the Iron Curtain in Europe**	**1629**		See 8B.Add	**(iv)(vi)**	**47**
Russian Federation	**Petroglyphs of Lake Onega and the White Sea**	**1654**		**R**	**(i)(iii)(iv)**	**47**
Slovenia	**The works of Jože Plečnik in Ljubljana – Human Centred Urban Design**	**1643**		**I**	**(i)(iv)**	**48**
Spain	**Ribeira Sacra**	**1639**		**N**	**(iii)(iv)(v)**	**50**
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	**The Slate Landscape of Northwest Wales**	**1633**		**I**	**(ii)(iv)(v)**	**50**

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 2020 nominations to be examined at the extended 44th session of the World Heritage Committee

Order	State Party		World Heritage nomination	Recomm.	Draft Decision
1	Ethiopia	C/N	*Holqa* Sof Umar: Natural and Cultural Heritage (Sof Umar: Caves of Mystery)	N/N	44 COM 8B.10
2	Saudi Arabia	C	Cultural Rock Arts in Himā Najrān	R	44 COM 8B.11
3	Austria / Belgium / Czechia / France / Germany / Italy / United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	C	The Great Spas of Europe	I	44 COM 8B.16
4	France	C	Cordouan Lighthouse	I	44 COM 8B.17
5	Germany	C	Mathildenhöhe Darmstadt	R	44 COM 8B.18
6	Greece	C	Fortress of Spinalonga	N	44 COM 8B.19
7	Italy	C	'Padova *Urbs picta*', Giotto's Scrovegni Chapel and Padua's fourteenth-century fresco cycles	I	44 COM 8B.20
8	China	C	Quanzhou: Emporium of the World in Song-Yuan China	I	44 COM 8B.15
9	India	C	The Glorious Kakatiya Temples and Gateways – Rudreshwara (Ramappa) Temple, Palampet, Jayashankar Bhupalpally District, Telangana State	D	44 COM 8B.12
10	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	C	Trans-Iranian Railway	D	44 COM 8B.13
11	Mongolia	C	Deer Stone Monuments and Related Sites, the Heart of Bronze Age Culture	R	44 COM 8B.14
12	Spain	C	Paseo del Prado and Buen Retiro, a landscape of Arts and Sciences	D	44 COM 8B.21
13	Turkey	C	Arslantepe Mound	R	44 COM 8B.22
14	Netherlands	C	Dutch Water Defence Lines [extension of "Defence Line of Amsterdam", inscribed in 1996]	R	44 COM 8B.23
15	Austria / Germany / Hungary / Slovakia	C	Frontiers of the Roman Empire – The Danube Limes (Western Segment)	I	44 COM 8B.24
16	Belgium / Netherlands	C	Colonies of Benevolence	I	44 COM 8B.25
17	Romania	C	Roșia Montană Mining Landscape	I	44 COM 8B.26
18	Japan	N	Amami-Oshima Island, Tokunoshima Island, Northern part of Okinawa Island, and Iriomote Island	I	44 COM 8B.5
19	Republic of Korea	N	Getbol, Korean Tidal Flat	D	44 COM 8B.6
20	Thailand	N	Kaeng Krachan Forest Complex	See 8B.Add	44 COM 8B.7
21	Georgia	N	Colchic Rainforests and Wetlands	I	44 COM 8B.8
22	Slovenia	N	Classical Karst	N	44 COM 8B.9
23	Brazil	C	Sítio Roberto Burle Marx	I	44 COM 8B.27
24	Dominican Republic	C	Historical and Archaeological Site of La Isabela	N	44 COM 8B.28
25	Peru	C	Chankillo Solar Observatory and ceremonial center	I	44 COM 8B.29
26	Uruguay	C	The work of engineer Eladio Dieste: Church of Atlántida	I	44 COM 8B.30

Order of presentation of 2021 nominations to be examined at the extended 44th session of the World Heritage Committee

Order	State Party		World Heritage nomination	Recomm.	Draft Decision
1	Côte d'Ivoire	C	Sudanese style mosques in northern Côte d'Ivoire	D	44 COM 8B.33
2	India	C	Dholavira: A Harappan City	See 8B.Add	44 COM 8B.35
3	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	C	Cultural Landscape of Hawraman/Uramanat	I	44 COM 8B.36
4	Japan	C	Jomon Prehistoric Sites in Northern Japan	I	44 COM 8B.37
5	Jordan	C	As-Salt - The Place of Tolerance and Urban Hospitality	See 8B.Add	44 COM 8B.34
6	France	C	Nice, capital of Riviera tourism	R	44 COM 8B.38
7	Germany	C	ShUM Sites of Speyer, Worms and Mainz	I	44 COM 8B.39
8	Germany / Netherlands	C	Frontiers of the Roman Empire – The Lower German Limes	I	44 COM 8B.40
9	Italy	C	The Porticoes of Bologna	D	44 COM 8B.41
10	Latvia	C	Grobiņa archaeological ensemble	See 8B.Add	44 COM 8B.42
11	Chile	C	Settlement and Artificial Mummification of the Chinchorro Culture in the Arica and Parinacota Region	See 8B.Add	44 COM 8B.48
12	Mexico	C	Franciscan Ensemble of the Monastery and Cathedral of Our Lady of the Assumption of Tlaxcala [extension of "Earliest 16th-Century Monasteries on the Slopes of Popocatepetl"]	See 8B.Add	44 COM 8B.49
13	Poland	C	Gdańsk Shipyard – the birthplace of "Solidarity" and the symbol of the Fall of the Iron Curtain in Europe	See 8B.Add	44 COM 8B.43
14	Russian Federation	C	Petroglyphs of Lake Onega and the White Sea	R	44 COM 8B.44
15	Slovenia	C	The works of Jože Plečnik in Ljubljana – Human Centred Urban Design	I	44 COM 8B.45
16	Spain	C	Ribeira Sacra	N	44 COM 8B.46
17	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	C	The Slate Landscape of Northwest Wales	I	44 COM 8B.47
18	Gabon	N	Ivindo National Park	R	44 COM 8B.31
19	Bosnia and Herzegovina / Czech Republic / France / Italy / Montenegro / North Macedonia / Poland / Serbia / Slovakia / Switzerland	N	Ancient and Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and Other Regions of Europe [extension of "Ancient and Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and Other Regions of Europe"]	See 8B.Add	44 COM 8B.32

II.A Nominations to be examined at the extended 44th session of the World Heritage Committee submitted for examination in 2020

In the presentation below, ICOMOS Recommendations and IUCN Recommendations are both presented in the form of Draft Decisions and are extracted from documents WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1 (ICOMOS) and WHC/21/44.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.

Disclaimer

The Nomination files produced by the States Parties are published by the World Heritage Centre at its website and/or in working documents in order to ensure transparency, access to information and to facilitate the preparations of comparative analysis by other nominating States Parties.

The sole responsibility for the content of each Nomination file lies with the State Party concerned. The publication of the Nomination file does not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever of the World Heritage Committee or of the Secretariat of UNESCO concerning the history or legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its boundaries.

A. NATURAL SITES

A.1. ASIA - PACIFIC

A.1.1. New Nominations

Property	**Amami-Oshima Island, Tokunoshima Island, Northern part of Okinawa Island, and Iriomote Island**
ID. N°	**1574**
State Party	**Japan**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(x)**

See IUCN Evaluation Book, 2021, page 3.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.5

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B2,*
2. *Inscribes* ***Amami-Oshima Island, Tokunoshima Island, Northern part of Okinawa Island, and Iriomote Island, Japan,*** *on the World Heritage List on the basis of* ***criterion (x)****;*
3. *Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:*

Brief synthesis

Amami-Oshima Island, Tokunoshima Island, the northern part of Okinawa Island, and Iriomote Island is a terrestrial serial property covering 42,698 ha comprised of five component parts on four different islands (with Tokunoshima Island having two component parts). Influenced by the Kuroshio Current and a subtropical high-pressure system, the property has a warm and humid subtropical climate and is covered mainly with evergreen broadleaved subtropical rainforests.

The formation of the Okinawa Trough in late Miocene resulted in the separation of a chain from the Eurasian Continent, forming an archipelago of small islands. Terrestrial species became isolated on these small islands and evolved to form unique and rich biota. The islands included in the property support many examples of endemic species of terrestrial vertebrate groups and plants that were not able to cross between these islands or adjoining landmasses.

Thus, the property is of high global value for the protection of many endemic and globally threatened species, and contains the most important and significant remaining natural habitats for in-situ conservation of the unique and rich biodiversity of the central and southern part of the archipelago.

Criterion (x): *The property contains natural habitats of outstanding importance for in-situ conservation of the unique and diverse biodiversity of the central and southern part of the archipelago in which the property is located. The five component parts constituting the property are located in one of the 200 ecoregions considered most crucial to the conservation of global biodiversity. The subtropical rainforests of the property are the largest remaining in the region and harbour a very rich flora and fauna, boasting at least 1,819 vascular plants, 21 terrestrial mammals, 394 birds, 267 inland water fish, 36 terrestrial reptiles and 21 amphibians. These include approximately 57% of the terrestrial vertebrates of the biodiversity hotspot of Japan, including 44% of species endemic to Japan as well as 36% of Japan's globally threatened vertebrates.*

Among species listed on IUCN Red List of Threatened Species are the Amami Rabbit, only found on Amami-Oshima and Tokunoshima Islands and the only species in its genus, with no close relatives anywhere in the world, and the flightless Okinawa Rail, endemic to the Northern part of Okinawa Island. Spiny rats form an endemic genus consisting of three species endemic to each of the respective three islands, and the Iriomote Cat, which only inhabits Iriomote Island.

Speciation and endemism are high for many taxa. For example, 188 species of vascular plants and 1,607 insect species are endemic within the four islands of the property. Rates of endemism among terrestrial mammals (62%), terrestrial reptiles (64%), amphibians (86%), and inland water crabs (100%) are also high. Twenty species are identified as Evolutionarily Distinct and Globally Endangered

(EDGE) species, including the Okinawa Spiny Rat, Ryukyu Black-Breasted Leaf Turtle, and Kuroiwa's Ground Gecko.

Integrity

The property is the best representation of the archipelago in which it is located and contains the richest biota in Japan, one of the world's biodiversity hotspots. The boundaries of the five component parts have been carefully selected to ensure that the entire property is strictly protected and that they capture the key values and demonstrate a generally high degree of connectivity, wherever it is possible to achieve this. It will be crucial to ensure that buffer zones are actively managed to support the attributes of the property's OUV and that activities such as logging do not create adverse impacts.

The four islands that host the property consist of mountains and hills with intact and contiguous subtropical rainforests that secure particularly stable habitats for approximately 90% of native species, endemic species and globally threatened species of the central and southern part of the archipelago. There are important naturally functioning freshwater systems, but with some natural values that have been impacted by hard, engineered infrastructure and which could be restored to a more natural function.

The five component parts of the property have intact subtropical forests and other habitats, including many areas of substantial size. These are selected to include the most important current and potential distributional areas of endemic species and threatened species, and are key attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value of this property.

Protection and management requirements

The property is under the strictest protection in the Japanese system of nature conservation areas, and its component parts are designated as Special Protection Zones or Class I Special Zones managed by the Ministry of the Environment and/or Preservation Zones of Forest Ecosystem Reserves managed by the Forestry Agency. In addition, the property is designated as a National Wildlife Protection Area and Natural Monument Protection Area. The property thus receives adequate management resources and appropriate long-term protection. Some of the endemic species and/or threatened species of the property, such as the Amami Rabbit, three species of the Spiny Rat, Okinawa Rail and Iriomote Cat, have been designated and legally protected as National Endangered Species and/or National Natural Monuments.

The four islands of the property are inhabited, with residential areas and industrial activities located close to the habitats for endemic and threatened species. Buffer zones are included adjacent to the property, mainly in the Class II Special Zone of a national park and/or the Conservation and Utilization Zone of a Forest Ecosystem Reserve. In addition, Surrounding Conservation Areas encompassing the property and the buffer zones are designated under the Comprehensive Management Plan.

Administrations at all levels, i.e. the Ministry of the Environment, the Forestry Agency, the Agency for Cultural Affairs, Kagoshima and Okinawa Prefectures, and 12 municipalities, have established a Regional Liaison Committee to *facilitate and coordinate management of multilayered protected areas and the protection of designated species. They manage the property according to a Comprehensive Management Plan, which covers conservation measures not only in the property but also in the buffer zones and surrounding conservation areas.*

Key threats to the property include potential impacts from tourism, posing significant threats to wildlife in some areas, including Iriomote Island. Further threats include impacts from invasive alien *species such as the small Indian Mongoose and cats, wildlife roadkill and the illegal collection of wild rare and threatened species. In order to address these threats, the risks to the property are prevented or mitigated by various measures implemented through collaboration among related administrative agencies, private organizations and local communities. In recent years, the tourism industry has increased and sustainable levels of tourism need to be fully assessed and continuously monitored. Invasive alien species and roadkill, especially the potentially critical impact of traffic on endangered species including the Iriomote Cat, need to be kept at an absolute minimum and strictly monitored, and illegal collection of wild rare and threatened species prevented. There is the need to develop a comprehensive river restoration strategy in order to transition wherever possible from hard infrastructure to employ nature-based techniques and rehabilitation approaches. Activities in the buffer zones, including very limited traditional timber extraction that takes place, also require continued vigilance and to be strictly limited and monitored.*

4. *Commends the State Party for its commitment towards the conservation of this property and for its efforts in revising its original nomination to address questions of integrity;*

5. *Requests the State Party to take immediate steps to improve the protection and management of the property, including by:*

   a) *Capping or reducing levels of tourist visitation from current levels, especially on Iriomote Island, until a critical evaluation of tourism carrying capacity and impacts can be conducted and integrated into a revised tourism management plan,*

   b) *Urgently reviewing the effectiveness and strengthening if necessary, the traffic management measures designed to reduce road fatalities of endangered species (including but not limited to Amami Rabbit, Iriomote Cat, and Okinawa Rail),*

   c) *Developing a comprehensive river restoration strategy in order to transition wherever*

possible from hard, engineered infrastructure to employ nature-based techniques and rehabilitation approaches such as replenishment, vegetation, and the formation of different habitat types,

d) Capping or reducing logging operations in the buffer zones from current levels, both in number and combined size of individual harvesting areas, and ensuring that any logging remains strictly limited to the buffer zones;

*6. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2022**, a report on the implementation on the above-mentioned recommendations for review by IUCN.*

Property	**Getbol, Korean Tidal Flat**
ID No.	**1591**
State Party	**Republic of Korea**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(viii)(ix)(x)**

See IUCN Evaluation Book, 2021, page 15.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.6

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B2,

*2. Defers the examination of the nomination of **Getbol, Korean Tidal Flat, Republic of Korea,** taking note of the significant biodiversity values of this region that are potentially of Outstanding Universal Value, in order to allow the State Party to prepare a new nomination focused on criterion (x), and taking account of the need to:*

a) Critically review the selection of the component parts and configurations from the perspective of conservation of biodiversity and threatened species, taking into account species occurrence and abundance, particularly with respect to migratory birds and endemic marine invertebrates, and including appropriate areas of recognized international conservation significance,

b) Revise the justification of Outstanding Universal Value in line with a reconfigured nomination focused on criterion (x),

c) Critically review, for a reconfigured nomination, buffer zone design and effectiveness, expanding proposed buffer zones beyond 100 meters wherever possible, and ensuring that buffer zone regimes mitigate the potential impact of activities in areas surrounding the nominated property,

d) Further develop the integrated management plan for a reconfigured nomination, with an increased emphasis on the protection and management of biodiversity and threatened species;

3. Requests the State Party to indicate in the new nomination its intentions regarding further phases of extension, through a clearly defined and timetabled approach, envisioning the incorporation of more critical habitats within the Eastern Asian-Australasian Flyway;

4. Expresses its appreciation of the extensive efforts to date regarding this nomination process, including the contributions at all levels, especially with local communities, and encourages the State Party to build on this investment in completing a revised and updated nomination dossier;

*5. Also encourages the State Party, following Decision **43 COM 8B.3**, to further strengthen collaboration with other concerned States Parties to improve the conservation of critical habitats within the Eastern Asian-Australasian Flyway in relation to potential future transnational serial nominations, and/or extensions and, in particular, to coordinate with the State Party of China in relation to the anticipated Phase II nomination for Migratory Bird Sanctuaries Along the Coast of Yellow Sea-Bohai Gulf of China, potentially through the 2007 Korea-China Agreement on the Protection of Migratory Birds.*

A.1.2. Nominations deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	**Kaeng Krachan Forest Complex**
ID No.	**1461 Rev**
State Party	**Thailand**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(x)**

See document WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B2.Add

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.7

[See Addendum: WHC/21/44.COM/8B.Add]

A.2. EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

A.2.1. New Nominations

Property	**Colchic Rainforests and Wetlands**
ID No.	**1616**
State Party	**Georgia**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(ix)(x)**

See IUCN Evaluation Book, 2021, page 29.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.8

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B2,*
2. *Inscribes the **Colchic Rainforests and Wetlands, Georgia,** on the World Heritage List on the basis of **criteria (ix)** and **(x)**;*
3. *Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:*

Brief synthesis

The property is situated in Georgia, within the Autonomous Republic of Adjara as well as the regions of Guria and Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti. It comprises a series of seven component parts, which are located close to each other within an 80 km long corridor along the warm-temperate and extremely humid eastern coast of the Black Sea. They provide an almost complete altitudinal series of the most typical Colchic ecosystems running from sea level to more than 2,500 m above sea level. The main ecosystems are ancient deciduous Colchic rainforests and wetlands – particularly percolation bogs and other mire types of the Colchic mire region, a distinct mire region within Europe and Eurasia.

The Colchic Rainforests and Wetlands are relict forests, which have survived the glacial cycles of the ice age. The extremely humid nemoral broad-leaved rainforests comprise a highly diverse flora and fauna, with very high densities of endemic and relict species. This is the result of millions of years of uninterrupted evolution and speciation processes within the Colchic Pliocene refugium. The peatlands of the Colchis mire region, which are closely interlinked with lowland Colchic rainforests, also reflect the mild and extremely humid conditions there. These allow for the existence of percolation bogs, the simplest functional type of mires, only occurring in the Colchis mire region. In addition to percolation bogs, there is a complete series of other succession stages of mire development in the Colchic wetlands.

***Criterion (ix):** The property comprises ancient Colchic rainforests with their characteristic vertical zoning and ecological succession, and wetlands, particularly Colchic mires, with their supporting processes and succession. A unique combination of influences from three mountain ranges to the north, east and south, with the Black Sea to the west, plus high precipitation and a narrow range in seasonal temperature variations results in conditions that have created outstandingly complex and diverse forest structures, peatland accumulations, high levels of endemism and intra species diversity.*

The Colchic rainforests are highly humid temperate deciduous rainforests, and among the oldest nemoral broad-leaved forests globally. While they are distinguished from other temperate forests by their rich evergreen understoreys, they also display a remarkably dense mosaic of forest types, with 23 forest associations co-existing within an area of only about 200 km^2. Together with the Hyrcanian Forests, they are the most important relicts of Arcto-Tertiary forests in western Eurasia. This peculiar and diverse community, which has survived the Pleistocene glacial cycles, includes a multitude of relict and endemic species. It reflects exceptionally constant climatic conditions and is an invaluable example of the manifold long-term evolutionary processes of forest biota over at least 10-15 million years.

The extensive paludified areas along the Black Sea coast are a result of evolutionary and ecological processes related to climate variability in an ancient warm-temperate ecoregion continuously vegetated since the Tertiary period. The exceptional character of the mires has led to the recognition of a distinct Colchis mire region. Their percolation bogs are of particular global importance as they do not exist anywhere else in the world. They can be considered the simplest and hence ideal-typical mire, due to almost permanent water supplied exclusively by precipitation. Percolation bogs are essential for the functional understanding of all mires, and hence of terrestrial carbon storage in general.

***Criterion (x):** The property represents a distinctive area of outstanding biodiversity within the wider Caucasus Global Biodiversity Hotspot, where a rich flora and fauna adapted to warm-temperate and extremely humid climate is concentrated. It belongs to one of the two most important refuge areas of Arcto-Tertiary geoflora in western Eurasia. The property is characterized by a high level of floral and faunal diversity with significant numbers of globally threatened species and relict species, which survived the glacial cycles of the Tertiary.*

The property is home to approximately 1,100 species of vascular and non-vascular plants, as well as almost 500 species of vertebrates, and a high number of invertebrate species. It hosts an extremely high proportion of endemic species for a non-tropical, non-island region. There are 149 species of plants with a restricted range and almost one third of mammals, amphibians and reptiles are endemic. The contribution of endemic species to amphibians, reptiles and mammals of the region is at 28%.

Forty-four globally threatened or near-threatened species of vascular plants, 50 of vertebrates, and 8 of invertebrates have been recorded in the Colchic

Rainforests and Wetlands. The property also harbors sturgeon species, including the Colchic Sturgeon, and serves as a key stopover for many globally threatened birds that migrate through the Batumi bottleneck.

Integrity

The component parts of the Colchic Rainforests and Wetlands have been selected based on a careful regional analysis. The boundaries of component parts incorporate attributes necessary to convey the Outstanding Universal Value, mostly following natural features such as mountain ridges. The component parts cover most of the existing mires of the Colchis mire region, and the best preserved and most representative rainforests. The property includes more than 90% of the altitudinal range at which Colchic rainforests occur, and the great majority of typical forest associations. They also comprise a complete successional series of the mires characteristic of the Colchis mire region. The property as a whole holds the great majority of the Colchic flora and fauna, and an even greater proportion of the endemic plant species found in the wider region is concentrated here.

There were significant losses to the Colchic rainforests and mires across the Colchic region until the late 20th Century. In contrast, the forests and mires inside the property have remained fully intact both structurally and functionally, as shown by their community structure and ecological processes. While some of the Colchic mires were slightly degraded by nearby draining in the past, their current hydrological intactness and resilience is ensured by their dependence on atmospheric precipitation, high mire oscillation capacity, the stabilizing effect of the nearby sea, and extensive upstream buffer zones.

Protection and management requirements

The component parts of the property are effectively protected against local anthropogenic threats. Only small parts of some of the buffer zones are slightly affected by an acceptable level of traditional natural resource use. All the component parts of the property, and all but 208 ha of the buffer zone, are situated on state-owned land within legally designated protected areas. These are either strictly protected areas (IUCN Protected Area category Ia), or those zones of National Parks (IUCN Protected Area category II) that afford the highest levels of protection. Only a very small part of the property belongs to a protected landscape (IUCN Protected Area category V). The boundaries of these protected areas are known and accepted by the local population.

The protected areas that cover the property are managed by the Agency of Protected Areas of the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture of Georgia, through its local Protected Area Administration. Sustainably funded integrated management of the entire property is required in addition to the implementation of comprehensive management plans for all four protected areas. Coordination of component areas is enabled as all are managed by the Agency of Protected Areas. An integrated management framework of the property has been developed and requires finalization.

There is scope for the protected areas to be expanded further, based on strategic conservation planning using Key Biodiversity Areas, which may provide an additional layer of protection to the property, and possibly allow for future extensions to both the property and buffer zones to be considered. This is particularly important in view of existing and potential developments in proximity of the property and along the Black Sea coast. Any development projects need to be subject to rigorous Environmental Impact Assessment procedures, and should not go ahead in case of potential negative impacts on the property's Outstanding Universal Value.

4. *Commends the State Party for its commitment to expand the buffer zones of the property and to consider further enhancement of the conservation of the property by potentially adding additional areas, especially to protect critically endangered sturgeon through plans for a new protected area adjacent to the property;*

5. *Strongly encourages the State Party to submit the proposed extensions of the buffer zones of the Churia component part towards the North and of the Nabada component part to support the conservation of the sturgeon population as a minor boundary modification, if possible, by **1 February 2023**;*

6. *Requests the State Party to:*

   a) *Continue to assess the feasibility of expanding the buffer zones around component parts 4, 5, 6, and 7 to ensure that they have higher connectivity, and to provide further details of the conclusions of this feasibility study to the World Heritage Centre, for review by IUCN, by **1 December 2022**,*

   b) *Continue to assess the feasibility of expanding the buffer zone to protect coastal dunes that provide a barrier between the unique percolation mires and the Black Sea,*

   c) *Finalize the Joint Management Plan for the entire serial property as a matter of priority and submit it to the World Heritage Centre for review by IUCN;*

7. *Acknowledges with thanks the support provided by donors and international development agencies to the protection and management of the property and encourages these donors to maintain and, if feasible, strengthen this support to contribute to the effective management and governance of this property in the long term.*

Property	**Classical Karst**
ID No.	**1615**
State Party	**Slovenia**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(vii)(viii)(ix)(x)**

See IUCN Evaluation Book, 2021, page 41.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.9

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B2,*
2. *Decides not to inscribe the* ***Classical Karst, Slovenia,*** *on the World Heritage List;*
3. *Strongly encourages the State Party to consider an extension and re-nomination of the Škocjan Caves World Heritage property under criteria (vii), (viii) and (x) in order to:*
   a) *Include a revised configuration of the Classical Karst in an extended serial property nomination with a single connected buffer zone to strengthen Outstanding Universal Value under criteria (vii) and (viii) by adding other attributes such as poljes,*
   b) *Consider including criterion (x) to recognise the potentially global significance of Škocjan Caves and the Classical Karst for flora and fauna, especially cave-dwelling animals,*
   c) *Confirm the Outstanding Universal Value of such a reconfigured nominated property through a revised and more in-depth comparative analysis based on the identification of a revised definition of the attributes conveying value,*
   d) *Enhance management and protection so as to respond to high levels of private land ownership and to adequately address threats, such as water pollution, tourism development and others,*
   e) *Strengthen the level of protection and management capacity especially regarding the conservation of biodiversity values;*
4. *Also encourages the State Party to continue to explore the interest of other relevant States Parties in advancing a transnational serial nomination of the Dinaric Karst which would recognize wider karst and associated values.*

B. MIXED SITES

B.1. AFRICA

B.1.1. New Nominations

Property	***Holqa* Sof Umar: Natural and Cultural Heritage (Sof Umar: Caves of Mystery)**
ID No.	**1516**
State Party	**Ethiopia**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(iii)(v)(vi)(vii)(viii)**

See IUCN Evaluation Book, 2021, page 67.
See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 21.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.10

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B, WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1 and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B2,*
2. *Decides not to inscribe* **Holqa *Sof Umar: Natural and Cultural Heritage (Sof Umar: Caves of Mystery), Ethiopia,*** *on the World Heritage List;*
3. *Encourages the State Party to conduct further research on the nominated property's ecological and biodiversity values, with a view to considering alternative means to appropriately protect and promote its biological importance at regional or international level.*

C. CULTURAL SITES

C.1. ARAB STATES

C.1.1. New Nominations

Property	**Cultural Rock Arts in Ḥimā Najrān**
ID No.	**1619**
State Party	**Saudi Arabia**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(i)(ii)(iii)(v)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 30.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.11

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*
2. *Refers the nomination of* ***Cultural Rock Arts in Ḥimā Najrān, Saudi Arabia****, back to the State Party to allow it to:*
   a) *Provide a map showing the precise location of the inventoried heritage sites reported from the nominated areas and buffer zone,*

b) *Complete and make internally accessible to staff a database of site records for every known rock art and rock inscription site inventoried in the nominated property and the buffer zone with clear maps, within a GIS,*

c) *Carrying out Heritage Impact Assessments for any projects related to tourism activities at Najd Khayrān before they are implemented,*

d) *Enlarge the buffer zone to include Jabal al-Kawbab and parts of Jabal al-Qāra,*

e) *Create and implement a conservation program and engaging additional staff with specialist training in heritage management, archaeology and rock art conservation,*

f) *Create and implement a monitoring program that identifies measurable key indicators, periodicity and responsible authorities;*

3. *Recommends that the State Party considers undertaking restoration of the above-ground walling for the wells and water channels at Ḥimā, based on comprehensive archival and archaeological research;*

4. *Also recommends that the name of the nominated property be changed to become "Ḥimā Cultural area".*

C.2. ASIA-PACIFIC

C.2.1. New Nominations

Property	**The Glorious Kakatiya Temples and Gateways – Rudreshwara (Ramappa) Temple, Palampet, Jayashankar Bhupalpally District, Telangana State**
ID No.	**1570**
State Party	**India**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(i)(ii)(iii)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 40.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.12

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*

2. *Defers the examination of the nomination of* ***The Glorious Kakatiya Temples and Gateways - Rudreshwara (Ramappa) Temple, Palampet, Jayashankar Bhupalpally District, Telangana State, India****, 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) *Redefine the nomination approach to include the wider context of Rudreshwara (Ramappa) Temple and accordingly enlarge the boundaries and buffer zone of the nominated property to include the architectural and engineering structures as well as natural features which form the historic dharmic context as well as the economic and functional basis of the temple,*

   b) *Develop the comparative analysis in line with the selected nomination approach to compare the nominated property with all other testimonies of the Kakatiya Dynasty and other dynasties in Deccan India to support its revised approach as a representation of the way Kakatiya temples were developed as part of large landscape complexes with water tanks and towns, and which fully portrays the architectural, artistic and engineering testimony of this productive dynasty,*

   c) *Revise the justification for inscription based on the most appropriate criteria and amend the title to match the revised focus of the nomination,*

   d) *Provide adequate legal protection to the wider complex of Rudreshwara Temple and expand the programmed conservation approach to cover the additional architectural and engineering features, including Ramappa Lake bund, the water distribution and irrigation channels, and the smaller temples in the wider temple setting,*

   e) *Following the redefinition of boundaries, review the stipulations of the proposed special development zone in terms of their ability to protect the visual integrity of the extended temple complex,*

   f) *Finalize the integrated conservation and management plan as well as update the tourism development plan, to integrate risk preparedness strategies, visitor management at festive events with overcrowding, and cautious assessment criteria for approving any additional visitor infrastructure in and around the nominated property,*

   g) *Undertake Heritage Impact Assessments for any projects located near the nominated property, in particular the development projects near the Ramappa Lake,*

   h) *Provide a schedule and detailed methodology for the reassembly and conservation of Kameshwara Temple,*

   i) *Expand the monitoring system to include more detailed indicators on factors affecting key attributes of the nominated property, namely the stability of the structures and leakages in the sand-box as well as visitor number and behaviour related indicators and tourism-related developments in the wider surroundings of the nominated property;*

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) *Launching conservation initiatives to revise the previous unsatisfactory conservation results on*

a parapet and canopy by more appropriate methods and materials,

b) Involving more closely as partners and stakeholders, local priests and community members into the management system of the nominated property,

c) Re-evaluating critically the need for disassembly and anastylosis in the conservation of mandapas and temples, including smaller structures outside the nominated property that would need to be subjected to conservation measures in the near future.

Property	**Trans-Iranian Railway**
ID No.	**1585**
State Party	**Iran (Islamic Republic of)**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(ii)(iv)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 52.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.13

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*
2. *Defers the examination of the nomination of **Trans-Iranian Railway, 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) Reconsider the scope of the nomination on the basis of an expanded and augmented exploration of the role of Trans-Iranian Railway in the modernization of the country,

   b) Create a complete inventory and thorough documentation of all the tangible features that could support a revised justification for inscription, deeply analyse their cultural significance in relation to the revised scope of the nomination; and, in a more holistic way, address the cultural heritage elements (such as buildings) with the same level of detail as the engineering elements,

   c) Revise the comparative analysis, the justification for inscription and the criteria, focussing on the most appropriate ones in relation to the potential of the nominated property and the revised focus of the nomination,

   d) Establish a conservation plan to complement the existing Management Plan, with the objective of better ensuring the appropriate balance between measures that address the safety and operational viability of the railway, and the conservation of the nominated property as cultural resource,

   e) Reconsider the organizational hierarchy to ensure that decision-making regarding the nominated property's cultural heritage is positioned at the most effective level;

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) Documenting, monitoring and conserving the historic buildings and other elements that are no longer in use,

   b) Preparing a Heritage Impact Assessment of the planned electrification of the Tehran—Garmsar—Bandar-e Torkaman line,

   c) Encouraging community involvement by means of the full and effective participation of a wide variety of stakeholders and rights-holders.

Property	**Deer Stone Monuments and Related Sites, the Heart of Bronze Age Culture**
ID No.	**1621**
State Party	**Mongolia**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(i)(iii)(iv)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 63.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.14

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*
2. *Refers the nomination of **Deer Stone Monuments and Related Sites, the Heart of Bronze Age Culture, Mongolia**, back to the State Party to allow it to:*

   a) Revise the overall narrative of the nominated property to reflect the whole of the archaeological complexes, portraying a greater balance regarding deer stones and the other substantial attributes notably the khirgisuurs,

   b) Consolidate the information provided for the comparative analysis with clear criteria used consistently, and with summary findings in a table,

   c) Review the justification for inscription of the nominated property based on a revised overall narrative which will provide an adequate understanding of the various attributes, their relationships and meaning; in the case of criterion (i), this should also include the cultural role of the design qualities of the deer stones,

   d) Extend the buffer zone to the south of the Uushigiin Övör component part to include the area where there is currently a tent hotel, with the objective of relocating the hotel outside of the extended buffer zone,

e) *Take all necessary steps to provide comprehensive legal protection to the component parts of the nominated property as soon as possible,*

f) *Fully implement the management plan,*

g) *Provide personnel and resources for the administration in charge of the protection of the nominated property;*

3. *Recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following:*

a) *Completing the planned survey and documentation work as soon as possible, and extending documentation to include the important elements in the landscape setting,*

b) *Adopting a landscape management approach for the setting of the nominated property,*

c) *Preparing and implementing a risk management plan and a tourism plan,*

d) *Implementing additional conservation measures as part of the national programme,*

e) *Avoiding further re-erection of deer stones without a robust methodology consistent with best conservation practice, and consideration of remedial measures as needed,*

f) *Giving emphasis in the monitoring arrangements to the actual state of conservation of the identified attributes,*

g) *Defining the carrying capacity of the land for grazing, and reviving traditional methods of pasture rotation,*

h) *Establishing a timetable for the removal of the remnant machinery of the disused coal mine in the southwestern part of the buffer zone of the Khoid Tamir component part,*

i) *Improving the interpretive materials for the nominated property,*

j) *Updating the figures of the surfaces of areas and buffer zones according to the revised boundaries for the nominated property;*

4. *Also recommends that the name of the nominated property be amended according to the revised narrative and that the "Heart of Bronze Age Culture" be removed from the title.*

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

Property	**Quanzhou: Emporium of the World in Song-Yuan China**
ID No.	**1561 Rev**
State Party	**China**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(ii)(iii)(iv)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 220.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.15

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*

2. *Inscribes **Quanzhou: Emporium of the World in Song-Yuan China, China**, on the World Heritage List on the basis of **criterion (iv)**;*

3. *Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:*

Brief synthesis

Located on the southeast coast of China, the serial property Quanzhou: Emporium of the World in Song–Yuan China reflects in an exceptional manner the spatial structure that combined production, transportation and marketing and the key institutional, social and cultural factors that contributed to the spectacular rise and prosperity of Quanzhou as a maritime hub of the East and South-east Asia trade network during the 10th – 14th centuries AD. The Song-Yuan Quanzhou emporium system was centred and powered by the city located at the junction of river and sea, with oceans to the south-east that connected it with the world, with mountains to the far north-west that provided for production, and with a water-land transportation network that joined them all together.

The component parts and contributing elements of the property include sites of administrative buildings and structures, religious buildings and statues, cultural memorial sites and monuments, production sites of ceramics and iron, as well as a transportation network formed of bridges, docks and pagodas that guided the voyagers. They comprehensively reflect the distinguishing maritime territorial, socio-cultural and trade structures of Song-Yuan Quanzhou.

***Criterion (iv)**: Quanzhou, Emporium of the World in Song–Yuan China outstandingly illustrates, through its component parts, the territorial integrated structure and the key institutional, transportation, production, marketing and socio-cultural factors that turned it into a global-level emporium and key commercial hub during a highly prosperous stage of Asia's maritime trade in the 10th - 14th centuries AD. The property demonstrates Quanzhou's great contributions to the economic and cultural development of East and South-east Asia.*

Integrity

The serial property includes the necessary components and attributes that reflect Quanzhou as a premier maritime emporium of the world of the 10th - 14th centuries AD. The component parts and contributing elements maintain close functional, social, cultural and spatial links with each other, altogether illustrating the integrated territorial system and key facets and factors of Quanzhou's maritime trade system in the Song and Yuan periods. The immediate setting of the property, important views and other supporting areas or attributes, are all included in the buffer zone; areas sensitive to visual impacts and background environments demonstrating overall association with the serial property are all contained in demarcated wider setting areas and placed under effective protection. Urban development pressures, impacts from climate change, natural threats, and tourism pressures appear under effective control, through a set of protective and management measures.

Authenticity

The series as a whole, comprised of its component parts and contributing elements, credibly conveys the overall territorial layout, functions of the historical trade system, historical social structure, and historical chronological information of Quanzhou as a global maritime emporium in the Song and Yuan periods. Surviving original locations; information of historical functions that can be clearly recognized and understood; historical information of forms, materials, processes and traditional maintenance mechanisms and technical systems reflected in physical remains and their historical records, as well as surviving beliefs and cultural traditions that these monuments and sites carry; all testify to a high degree of authenticity and credibility of the component parts. The physical evidence can be confirmed by a wealth of historical documentation and Chinese and international research results.

Protection and management requirements

All the component parts of the serial property of Quanzhou are subject to the protection of relevant laws and regulations at the national and provincial level (Law of the People's Republic of China on the Protection of Cultural Relics and its Implementation Regulations and the Regulations of Fujian Province on the Protection and Management of Cultural Property). They are all owned by the state and granted with often multiple protective designations as per laws and regulations governing Famous Historical and Cultural Cities, religious affairs, marine affairs, and Scenic Areas. Traditional maintenance and conservation mechanisms also play an active role in this regard. For protection and management effectiveness, the buffer zone and the wider setting have been incorporated into the property's protection and management system and are covered by the Management Plan for the Serial Property of Quanzhou, prepared and implemented, and the Rules of Fujian Province for the Protection and Management of Historic Monuments and Sites of Ancient Quanzhou (Zayton), as revised.

The property's management system is designed following China's administrative mechanism for cultural heritage and incorporated into the four-level administrative framework at national, provincial, city/county, and property levels. It is based on the principles of responsibilities designated at different levels, localized administration, and active community participation. A coordinated management system at the municipal level integrates management measures and implementation plans for each component part. A management working group meets quarterly and guarantees overall coordination. Management entities provide sufficient financial, human and technical guarantees and enable continuous and proper conservation of the authenticity and integrity of the serial property as a whole and each of its component parts. A long-term protection and management strategy, indicating specific requirements, has been prepared for the series and its progressive implementation is crucial for the overall management effectiveness.

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

   a) *Providing the real extent of the component parts areas, as some of the provided surfaces are related to a contributing element only, and not to the whole surface of the component forming the series,*

   b) *Further developing the analysis of the attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value of the property for management purposes,*

   c) *Strengthening and making more explicit from an operational point of view the links between the overall management plan for the property and the other plans existing for individual component parts or other designations,*

   d) *Further developing the archaeological research programme and implementing it,*

   e) *Closely monitoring visitor pressures and implementing redressing measures where necessary,*

   f) *Implementing steadily the Long-Term Protection and Management Strategy;*

5. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2022**, a report on the implementation on the above-mentioned recommendations and on the Long-Term Protection and Management Strategy for review by ICOMOS.*

C.3. EUROPE - NORTH AMERICA

C.3.1. New Nominations

Property	**The Great Spas of Europe**
ID No.	**1613**
States Parties	**Austria / Belgium / Czechia / France / Germany / Italy / United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland**
Criteria proposed by States Parties	**(ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 74.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.16

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*
2. *Inscribes* ***The Great Spas of Europe, Austria, Belgium, Czechia, France, Germany, Italy, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland****, on the World Heritage List on the basis of* ***criteria (ii)*** *and* ***(iii)****;*
3. *Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:*

Brief synthesis

The Great Spas of Europe bear an exceptional testimony to the European spa phenomenon, which gained its highest expression from around 1700 to the 1930s. This transnational serial property comprises eleven spa towns located in seven countries: Baden bei Wien (Austria); Spa (Belgium); Karlovy Vary, Františkovy Lázně and Mariánské Lázně (Czechia); Vichy (France); Bad Ems, Baden-Baden and Bad Kissingen (Germany); Montecatini Terme (Italy); and City of Bath (United Kingdom). The series captures the most fashionable, dynamic and international spa towns among the many hundreds that contributed to the European spa phenomenon.

Whilst each spa town is different, all the towns developed around mineral water sources, which were the catalyst for a model of spatial organisation dedicated to curative, therapeutic, recreational and social functions. Ensembles of spa buildings include baths, pump rooms, drinking halls, treatment facilities and colonnades designed to harness the water resources and to allow its practical use for bathing and drinking. 'Taking the cure', externally and internally, was complemented by exercise and social activities requiring visitor facilities such as assembly rooms, casinos, theatres, hotels, villas and related infrastructures (from water piping systems and salts production to railways and funiculars). All are integrated into an overall urban context that includes a carefully managed recreational and therapeutic environment of parks, gardens, promenades, sports facilities and woodlands. Buildings and spaces connect visually and physically with their surrounding landscapes, which are used regularly for exercise as a contribution to the therapy of the cure, and for relaxation and enjoyment.

Criterion (ii): *The Great Spas of Europe exhibits an important interchange of innovative ideas that influenced the development of medicine, balneology and leisure activities from around 1700 to the 1930s. This interchange is tangibly expressed through an urban typology centred on natural mineral springs and devoted to health and leisure. Those ideas influenced the popularity and development of spa towns and balneology throughout Europe and in other parts of the world.*

The Great Spas of Europe became centres of experimentation which stayed abreast of their competitors by adapting to the changing tastes, sensitivities and requirements of visitors. Other than physicians, the principal agents of transmission were the architects, designers and gardeners who created the built and 'natural' environments framing spa life. As a result, the property displays important examples of spa architecture such as the 'kurhaus' and 'kursaal', pump rooms, drinking halls ('trinkhalle'), colonnades and galleries designed to harness the natural mineral water resource and to allow its practical use for bathing and drinking.

Criterion (iii): *The Great Spas of Europe bears exceptional testimony to the European spa phenomenon, which has its roots in antiquity, but gained its highest expression from around 1700 to the 1930s. 'Taking the cure', either externally (by bathing) or internally (by drinking, and inhaling) involved a highly structured and timed daily regime and a combination of medical aspects and leisure, including entertainment and social activities (e.g. gambling, theatre, music, dancing) as well as taking physical exercise within an outdoor therapeutic spa landscape.*

These parameters directly influenced the spatial layout of spa towns and the form and function of spa buildings or 'spa architecture'. Urban parks and promenades allowed people taking the cure "to see and be seen" by others.

Integrity

The eleven component parts that comprise the serial property represent the most exceptional examples of European spa towns. All component parts share a set of determining characteristics formed during the most significant "culture-creating" phase of their history and development, the heyday period from around 1700 to the 1930s. Each and every one continues to function for the purpose for which it was originally developed.

The series illustrates the main stages of the development of the spa phenomenon, starting with the most influential spa towns in the 18th century, to the development of model spa towns in the 19th century, to towns that are testimony to the last stages of the phenomenon in the early 20th century.

Boundaries are determined in relation to the mapping of the attributes that convey Outstanding Universal Value, namely: the most important spa

structures and buildings used for thermal-related activities; the social facilities and buildings for leisure and pleasure; accommodation facilities; related spa infrastructure; and the surrounding therapeutic and recreational spa landscape. Buffer zones are drawn both for the protection of spring catchments and important setting.

All component parts and their constituent elements are generally in good condition. Elements requiring conservation either have works already planned, or are awaiting alternative uses, with their current state of conservation maintained. Upgrades and redevelopments made to keep pace with standards of services, hygiene and new spa technology, can create tensions with their conservation as historic buildings, and need to be carefully addressed. Challenges in the adaptive reuse and technical upgrading of industrial structures pose similar challenges.

Authenticity

The property meets the conditions of authenticity in terms of form and design, materials and substance, use and function, traditions, and location and setting.

All component parts express the Outstanding Universal Value of the property through a variety of common and highly authentic attributes: mineral springs, of great diversity, which maintain their natural physical qualities, including substance, location and setting; a distinct and highly legible spatial layout and a well-maintained location and setting that combine to retain an enduring spirit and feeling; spa architecture, that remains authentic in form and design, original materials and substance, even though some buildings have experienced change of use; the spa therapeutic landscape, which retains its form, design and function, and continues to be used for the purpose for which it was designed; spa infrastructure, much of which is either original or evolved on original principles and remains in use; continuing spa use and function despite the need to meet today's standards.

The veracity and credible expression of attributes embodied in structures that date from around 1700 to the 1930s, the principal period of contribution to Outstanding Universal Value, is further evidenced during substantial and sustained conservation works that are informed by expansive archival collections of plans, documents, publications and photographs held at each component part.

Protection and management requirements

Responsibility for the protection and management of each of the eleven component parts of the property rests with the national/regional government (in the case of Germany, with the government of the Länder, and local authorities of that State Party). Each component is protected through legislation and spatial planning regulations applicable in its State Party or individual province, as well as by a significant degree of public/charitable ownership of key buildings and landscapes. Each component part has a property manager or coordinator and a Local Management Plan in place conforming to the overall Property Management Plan.

An overall management system for the whole property has been established, with a Property Management Plan and Action Plan agreed by all stakeholders. An Inter-Governmental Committee, made up of national World Heritage Focal Points and/or a representative of the highest monument or heritage protection authority, keeps track of matters relating to the property. A Great Spas Management Board (GSMB), made up of the Mayors of the eleven components, is responsible for the operational coordination and overall management of the property in close consultation with the Inter-Governmental Committee. The Board sets and manages the budget for the overall management functions, monitors and reviews the Action Plan, approves and publishes an Annual Report, employs the Secretariat, and directs other activities for the property as a whole.

The Site Managers Group includes site managers for each component part, the Secretariat, and any specialist advisors. The Site Managers Group is essentially an expert group for debate and exchanges of experience and to advise the GSMB on relevant management issues. The international structure is supported and serviced by a Secretariat jointly funded by all the component parts.

An important concern will be to continue to develop cooperation and collaboration between the individual component parts and to ensure that the property as a whole is effectively managed and the overall management system is adequately resourced. Development pressures may be an issue since these are living cities which will need to continue to adapt and change to maintain their role as spa towns. Managing tourism so that it is truly sustainable may also become a challenge. A management approach at the landscape level, which considers the relationship between each component part, the buffer zone, and the broader setting is also needed to maintain views to, and from, the picturesque wider landscape.

4. *<u>Recommends</u> that the States Parties give consideration to the following, by means of a submission of a minor boundary modification:*

   a) *Adjusting the boundaries of the property in the Mitterberg and Badener Berg areas in Baden bei Wien and extending the protection zone under the Construction Plan to include the entirety of the property in this component part,*

   b) *Adjusting the boundaries of the component part that are still drawn down the middle of streets in Montecatini Terme to include the building plots on the other side of the street and extending the protection statute to the entirety of this component part,*

   c) *Extending the northern part of the buffer zone of Karlovy Vary to ensure adequate protection from future development, particularly from a visual perspective,*

d) Extending the buffer zone around the train station in Vichy, taking into account the protected perimeters of the surroundings of existing historic monuments;

5. *Also recommends that the States Parties give consideration to the following:*

   a) Confirming that the component parts of Bad Ems and Bad Kissingen are legally protected in their entirety as urban conservation areas,

   b) Extending the ZPU in Spa to cover the entirety of the World Heritage property in this component part,

   c) Formally approving and implementing the Local Management Plans for the three Czech component parts and ensuring their articulation with existing planning documents,

   d) Implementing the Local Management Plans at Vichy and Bad Ems,

   e) Reviewing the management plan of the City of Bath so that its fourth iteration takes into account both its inscription on the World Heritage List in its own right and its inscription as one of the component parts of The Great Spas of Europe,

   f) Appointing site managers for all component parts that have not yet done so and ensuring that their role is clear and adapted to the needs of managing a World Heritage property,

   g) Extending and further detailing the monitoring programme for the property as a whole,

   h) Introducing Heritage Impact Assessment procedures into the management system of each component part to address the potential impacts of development projects,

   i) Considering how the role of the Great Spas Management Board might be refined to allow full understanding by all States Parties of major development proposals in all component parts, in relation to their potential cumulative impacts on the property as a whole;

6. *Requests the States Parties to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 December 2022** a report on the implementation of the above-mentioned recommendations for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 46th session;*

7. *Decides that the name of the property in English be changed to "**The Great Spa Towns of Europe**".*

Property	**Cordouan Lighthouse**
ID No.	**1625**
State Party	**France**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(i)(iv)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 92.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.17

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*

2. *Inscribes the **Cordouan Lighthouse, France**, on the World Heritage List on the basis of **criteria (i)** and **(iv)**;*

3. *Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:*

Brief synthesis

Erected in the open sea on a rocky plateau where the Atlantic Ocean meets the Gironde Estuary, in a highly exposed and hostile environment that is hazardous for shipping, which is also its raison-d'être, Cordouan Lighthouse has been a beacon for ships engaged in trade between Bordeaux and the rest of the world since the 16th century.

Its monumental tower in limestone dressed blocks, decorated with pilasters, columns and sculptures, has 8 levels that rise to a height of 67 metres above sea level. It is the result of two complementary construction campaigns in the 16th and then the 18th century to enhance the technical capacities of the lighthouse, which is still in use today. The Cordouan Lighthouse was conceived from the outset as a monument, both in its stylistic features and expression, and in the engineering techniques employed.

Initial construction was undertaken in 1584 by engineer Louis de Foix, at the behest of the king of France, Henri III. Henri IV, eager to stress his legitimacy, commissioned original and unexpected features at the frontier of his kingdom: apartments for the king and a chapel. A concrete expression of political will intended to impress all the European sea powers and local communities, the Cordouan Lighthouse thus became a monumental lighthouse dedicated to the affirmation of the king's power. The height of the lighthouse was raised in 1788-1789 by engineer Joseph Teulère, who remained true to the original conception and remodelled the lighthouse in keeping with the architectural form invented in the 16th century by Louis de Foix.

Not only is the form exceptional, but also the quality of the style. The tower of Louis de Foix clearly reflects the influence of antiquity and Italy, evoking in the open sea the forms of Roman mausoleums, and the domes and most elegant features of Renaissance mannerism. Joseph Teulère, to his credit, achieved a masterpiece of French stereotomy in the language of late-18th century neoclassicism.

Cordouan Lighthouse, in its intentional monumentality, is a grandiose and unique creation, in which the human genius is not only architectural, stylistic and technical, but also symbolic and conceptual.

Criterion (i): *The Cordouan Lighthouse is a masterpiece of maritime signalling, which has remained in use from the 17th century until today. Since it was first built, this lighthouse has represented a symbolic endowment to the glory of the King of France of the time. In the 18th century, Joseph Teulère heightened and strengthened the lighthouse. The masterly application of the stereometry and stereotomy has allowed for a superb integration between the existing fabric and the new addition, which confirmed also its symbolic function. The aggressive natural environment it was erected in consolidates the status of this building as an eminent example of artistic, technical and technological human ingenuity.*

Criterion (iv): *The Cordouan Lighthouse embodies in an outstanding manner the great stages of the history of lighthouses. It was built with the ambition to continue the tradition of famous beacons of antiquity and illustrates the art of building lighthouses in a period of renewed navigation between the 16th and the 17th centuries, when beacons played an important role as territorial markers and as instruments of safety. Finally, the increase of its height, in the late 18th century, and the changes to its light chamber, attest to the progress made by science and technology of the period. Thanks to its fame, the Cordouan Lighthouse witnessed several experiments to improve lighthouses' capacity to assist navigation.*

Integrity

The conditions of integrity of Cordouan Lighthouse are very good. The monumental nature of its appearance has, in line with the conception of Louis de Foix, always guided the architectural and technical interventions necessary for its maritime signalling function. The raising of the height of the frustoconical tower in the 18th century by engineer Joseph Teulère, although it changed the original outline, respected the conception of the initial lighthouse by maintaining the symbolic significance of its guiding principles, with the chapel and the king's apartments. Its monumentality in isolation is a key element of the integrity of Cordouan Lighthouse.

Authenticity

Cordouan Lighthouse is structurally authentic and continues to be used for its original function. Its authenticity cannot be understood without taking into account its geographical situation in an extreme maritime and meteorological environment, which makes constant renovations essential. Its authenticity must also be assessed in the light of its role as an active maritime signalling unit, requiring regular technical adaptations. Similarly, the restorations in the 19th and 20th centuries have had only a slight impact on the authenticity of the lighthouse with the addition of the annular buildings and the restoration of the interior spaces. The monument has thus retained its strong visual and symbolic presence, while undergoing a process of technical modernisation in order to maintain its activity.

Protection and management requirements

Classified as a Historic Monument since 1862, Cordouan Lighthouse, a state property, is supported by conservation measures funded and directly implemented by the Ministry of Culture. The property is thus protected under the Code du Patrimoine, Code de l'Environnement *and* Code général de la propriété des personnes publiques *(Environment and Heritage Codes, and General Code on Public Property). Maintaining and managing the functional elements of the lighthouse are the responsibility of the Inter-Regional Directorate of the* Mer Sud-Atlantique*. The whole of the property – except for Cordouan Lighthouse itself – is located in the* Parc Naturel Marin de l'Estuaire de la Gironde et de la Mer des Pertuis *and is thus covered by the natural park's management plan. Lastly, the Domaine public maritime inside which the property is located (except for the lighthouse itself) is protected by a principle of non-constructability, and only small-scale works may be carried out, subject to authorisations relating to the use of public property.*

The property buffer zone on the land is covered by various conservation, protection, enhancement and planning measures (Coastline law, Historic monuments, Classified and inscribed sites, Outstanding heritage sites, Landscape planning, SCoTs and PLUs) which contribute, under the terms of the Heritage Code and Environment Code, to the preservation of the environment and landscape of the property. The parts of the buffer zone in the sea are covered by the same measures as the natural elements located within the boundaries of the property.

*The lighthouse is today the responsibility of the Ministry of Ecological and Solidarity-based Transition, while the natural elements of the property form part of the maritime public domain. The SMIDDEST (*Syndicat mixte pour le Développement durable de l'Estuaire de la Gironde*) has developed a project for the management, tourist enhancement and promotion of the Cordouan site, and organises paid visits to the lighthouse, to the spaces included in the project, and to the plateau surrounding the site. The SMIDDEST is also required to ensure that the site is guarded, to prevent any vandalism or damage to the built structure, and any damage to the fauna and flora of the natural elements.*

The management framework revolves around an envisaged Local Commission for World Heritage, which is expected to supersede the pilot local commission set up for the nomination. The efficiency, effectiveness and good results of the Management Plan depend on a constant, strong and continuously-tuned coordination among all the involved authorities, organisations and technical bodies. The role of the "Commission locale du patrimoine mondial", and in particular of SMIDDEST is thus essential. A management plan

has been developed on the basis of objectives and actions planned by all key actors: a formal commitment by all relevant parties to implement its provision will strengthen the management system in place.

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

   a) *Promptly informing, as per the provisions of Law 2016-925, all planning authorities of the objectives and content of the management plan for the property, to ensure the rapid conformation of the SCoTs and of PLUs related to the property and its buffer zone to its provisions,*

   b) *Ensuring that the process of revision of both the SCoTs and the PLUs is completed as soon as possible,*

   c) *Strengthening the management system through a formal commitment among all key state, regional and local stakeholders to implement the updated management plan,*

   d) *Ensuring that no concession for gravel extraction be renewed or issued within the property and the buffer zone until the knowledge of the hydro-sedimentary system of the Gironde Estuary has improved sufficiently to allow for an accurate assessment of the potential negative impacts,*

   e) *Guaranteeing that adequate resources be allocated to continue the research on the hydro-sedimentary system of the Gironde Estuary,*

   f) *Carrying out a rigorous geometric-architectural survey of the Lighthouse and link it to a GIS-based relational database for the management of all information,*

   g) *Elaborating a "structural model" in order to allow further studies of the stability and of the structural behaviour of the Lighthouse under the external demands, especially those of a dynamic nature,*

   h) *Giving consideration to changing the fuel of the lighting system to avoid the presence and use of diesel fuel for environmental reasons;*

5. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2022**, a report on the implementation on the above-mentioned recommendations.*

Property	**Mathildenhöhe Darmstadt**
ID No.	**1614**
State Party	**Germany**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(ii)(iv)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 104.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.18

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*

2. *Refers the nomination of **Mathildenhöhe Darmstadt, Germany**, back to the State Party to allow it to relocate the proposed visitor centre outside the boundaries of the nominated property with careful consideration to the nominated property's integrity regarding sightlines and vehicular traffic impact;*

3. *Recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following:*

   a) *Developing a conservation management plan to guarantee a consistent conservation approach and strategy for all buildings of the nominated property,*

   b) *Strengthening the link between the private owners and conservation services,*

   c) *Ensuring an appropriate balance between development and conservation activities in budget allocations,*

   d) *Including in the interpretation and presentation of the different buildings of the nominated property the history of their conservation.*

Property	**Fortress of Spinalonga**
ID No.	**1617**
State Party	**Greece**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(iv)(vi)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 114.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.19

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*

2. *Decides not to inscribe the **Fortress of Spinalonga, Greece**, on the World Heritage List.*

Property	**'Padova *Urbs picta'*, Giotto's Scrovegni Chapel and Padua's fourteenth-century fresco cycles**
ID No.	**1623**
State Party	**Italy**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(i)(ii)(iii)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 125.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.20

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*
2. *Inscribes* ***'Padova* Urbs picta', *Giotto's Scrovegni Chapel and Padua's fourteenth-century fresco cycles, Italy****, on the World Heritage List on the basis of* ***criterion (ii)****;*
3. *Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:*

Brief synthesis

The fresco cycles housed in eight complexes of buildings within the old city centre of Padua illustrate how, over the course of the 14th century, different artists, starting with Giotto, introduced important stylistic developments in the history of art. The eight building complexes are grouped into four component parts: Scrovegni and Eremitani (part 1); Palazzo della Ragione, Carraresi Palace, Baptistery and associated Piazzas (part 2); Complex of Buildings associated with the Basilica of St. Anthony (part 3); and San Michele (part 4). The artists who played a leading role in the creation of the fresco cycles were Giotto, Pietro and Giuliano da Rimini, Guariento di Arpo, Giusto de' Menabuoi, Altichiero da Zevio, Jacopo Avanzi and Jacopo da Verona. Working for illustrious local families, the clergy, the city commune or the Carraresi family, they would – within buildings both public and private, religious and secular – produce fresco cycles that gave birth to a new image of the city.

Whilst painted by different artists for different types of patron within buildings of varying function, the Padua fresco cycles maintain a unity of style and content. Within the artistic narrative that unfolds in this sequence of frescoes, the different cycles reveal both diversity and mutual coherence.

The property illustrates an entirely new way of depicting allegorical narratives in spatial perspectives influenced by advances in the science of optics and a new capacity in capturing human figures, including individual features displaying feelings and emotions. Innovation in the depiction of pictorial space involved explorations of the possibilities of perspective and trompe-l'oeil effects. The innovation in the depiction of states of feeling is based on a heightened interest in the realistic portrayal of human emotions and the integration of the new role of commissioning patron as the patrons begin to appear in the scenes depicted, and ultimately even take the place of figures participating in the biblical narrative. In effect, the works illustrate the adaptation of sacred art to serve the secular celebration of the prestige and power of the ruling powers and associated noble families.

Criterion (ii): *The Padua fresco cycles illustrate the important interchange of ideas which existed between leading figures in the worlds of science, literature and the visual arts in the pre-humanist climate of Padua in the early 14th century. New exchanges of ideas also occurred between clients commissioning works and the artists from other Italian cities that had been called to Padua to collaborate on the various fresco cycles inspired by scientific and astrological allegories or ideas on sacred history gleaned from contemporary intellectuals and scholars. The artists showed great skill in giving these ideas visual form and their technical abilities allowed the Padua fresco cycles not only to become a model for others but also to prove remarkably resistant to the passage of time. The group of artists striving for innovation who gathered within Padua at the same time fostered an exchange of ideas and know-how which led to a new style in fresco illustration. This new fresco style not only influenced Padua throughout the 14th century but formed the inspirational basis for centuries of fresco work in the Italian Renaissance and beyond. With this veritable rebirth of a pictorial technique, Padua supplied a new way of both seeing and depicting the world, heralding the advent of Renaissance perspective. The innovations mark a new era in the history of art, producing an irreversible change in direction.*

Integrity

The four component parts comprise eight complexes of buildings in the centre of Padua – some publicly, some privately owned, some secular, some religious – which present an overall shared approach in terms of techniques, themes, dating and style, and bear witness to new programmes of narrative and figurative choices in fresco painting. They illustrate the complete range of the various aspects of innovation in Italian frescoes in the 14th century.

The institutional bodies (Padua City Council, the Ministry for Cultural Heritage and Activities, the University of Padua) that own the different sites have promoted research, maintenance and restoration work necessary to maintain the various fresco cycles in a good state of conservation. Such work means that each of the single parts can still be read and understood, both individually and in relation to each other.

Authenticity

The attributes of the property illustrate authenticity in material, design, in particular workmanship, setting and to a certain extent spirit and feeling in relation to the religious concepts they evoke. The authenticity is further expressed in the inseparable bond between the frescoes and the interior architectural spaces they are part of as well as the architectural construction of the historic buildings.

All components retain authentic evidence of the fresco cycles, the material support on which the frescoes are painted, the plaster surfaces, the pigments and binding agents used in fresco work, and the paints themselves. Although fragments of these frescoes have in the past suffered localized detachments, for example in Scrovegni Chapel, the Cathedral Baptistery, or Carraresi Chapel, these fragments were all replaced in their original positions during past conservation treatments.

The Padua fresco cycles are still fully legible, and the iconography used within them can be identified as authentic works of known 14th century artists. All frescoes are still in their original locations, which means the very place in and for which they were painted. The overall context within which they exist – that is, the area containing the buildings which house the different cycles – is still that which was the heart of the city enclosed within the old city walls and now coincides with the centre of the historic city.

Protection and management requirements

All of the buildings and complexes of buildings which house the frescoes in the property are under the strictest protective measures laid down by Italian law (listed buildings), the main expression of which is the law decree 22/01/2004 n. 42, known as the Codice dei Beni Culturali e del Paesaggio *(Code for the Cultural Heritage and Landscape). There are further protective measures in the instruments for territorial administration that exist at both regional, provincial and city level, all guaranteeing the protection and conservation of the buildings and their surroundings. The buffer zone is bound by the perimeter of Padua's old city centre, an area that comes under special protective measures laid down in Padua City Council's "Works Ordinance".*

An overall management system has been introduced, establishing close coordination between the different bodies that own the complexes of buildings which house the fresco cycles. Thus from independent management by four different bodies, a model of co-governance has been established, in which the City Council presides over a Committee whose members represent those bodies as well as representatives of the Regional Government of the Veneto, the Ministry for Cultural Heritage and Activities, the University of Padua (present as scientific consultants) and the Orto Botanico. The overall coordination of the partners is facilitated by the Council's Cultural Affairs Department, through a specially-created agency, called the World Heritage Office, which acts as a secretariat to the management group. A Memorandum of Understanding for the joint implementation of a management plan has been signed. The management plan is under elaboration based on a first draft document submitted.

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

   a) *Augmenting the management plan to include concrete strategic objectives and timeframes, which allow for the assessment of its progress in implementation and to include missing subject areas such as visitor management as well as risk preparedness and disaster management,*

   b) *Consistently monitoring relative humidity in all component parts, including spaces where visitors are not currently expected to cause negative impacts, and augment the monitoring system to ensure monitoring of all prevalent risk factors based on measurable or qualitative indicators,*

   c) *Installing fire detectors also in the church-owned properties and ensure that fire-fighting installations are tailored to cause least possible negative impacts in the event of use,*

   d) *Clearly communicating in the interpretation of the component part of Palazzo della Ragione that the upper three bands of fresco cycles reflect 15th century reconstructions aimed at recreating the content of the earlier Giotto frescoes, which were lost due to fire in 1420 and were painted by Niccolò Miretto, Stefano da Ferrara and Antonio di Pietro;*

5. *Decides that the name of the property be changed to "**Padua's fourteenth-century fresco cycles**".*

Property	**Paseo del Prado and Buen Retiro, a landscape of Arts and Sciences**
ID No.	**1618**
State Party	**Spain**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(ii)(iv)(vi)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 136.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.21

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*

2. *Defers the examination of the nomination of **Paseo del Prado and Buen Retiro, a landscape of Arts and Sciences, Spain**, 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) *Reconsider the nomination strategy for the site, on the basis of an expanded and augmented exploration of the concept of Hispanic alameda (tree-lined avenue) and its influence in Latin America and beyond,*

   b) *Revise the comparative analysis, the justification for inscription, the criteria, focusing on the most appropriate ones, and the boundaries, accordingly to the revised focus of the nomination,*

c) *Ensure that the revised boundaries of the nominated property include the buildings facing urban spaces,*

d) *Delineate a buffer zone for the nominated property based on the Historical Centre in the Madrid General Urban Development Plan;*

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) *Further developing and implementing the full monitoring system, with special care to achieve an integrated approach,*

b) *Completing the documentation of the historic buildings within the nominated property, such as the headquarters of the Ministerio de Marina,*

c) *Finalising the listing process for all buildings,*

d) *Developing an interpretation strategy for the overall nominated property within the management system,*

e) *Enhancing the role and independence of the Civic and Social Board as a means of ensuring community involvement.*

Property	**Arslantepe Mound**
ID No.	**1622**
State Party	**Turkey**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(ii)(iii)(iv)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 148.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.22

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*

2. *Refers the nomination of **Arslantepe Mound, Turkey**, back to the State Party in order to allow it to:*

a) *Prepare a conservation strategy and plan for the site, which determines protocols, priorities and procedures for all forms of conservation and maintenance interventions needed,*

b) *Prepare within the context of the conservation plan a cautious strategy for anticipated archaeological researches and excavations in the next decades, predominantly based on non-invasive research methodologies, and the designation of undisturbed areas, which are not planned to be excavated,*

c) *Augment the management plan to include local management roles and responsibilities, decision-making processes, a comprehensive risk assessment and risk preparedness plan,*

d) *Strengthen the local management capacity through the appointment of a local site manager,*

e) *Provide clarifications on the new arrangements allowed in A3 zone with the enlargement of the buffer zone,*

f) *Reconsider the design of the proposed new roof shelter by providing more views of different sections, detailing the connection between the old and new roof and how the new roof will address places where the rain water mostly accesses the site, and submit it for further review;*

3. *Recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following:*

a) *Undertaking further surveys to determine the exact extension of archaeological findings towards the north and west of the nominated property and on that basis, if necessary, extend the boundaries of the nominated property in line with the indications of archaeological ground surveys in these directions,*

b) *Studying unsheltered areas previously excavated and the edges of the present protective shelter to ensure minimum exposure of earthen architectural remains to weathering phenomena,*

c) *Undertaking a periodical detailed photographic documentation of all the site structures and objects, where needed, augmented by drawings indicating positions and exact features of elements of specific significance, as a baseline for monitoring and risk and disaster management processes,*

d) *Undertaking Heritage Impact Assessments for any new visitor infrastructure or museum buildings before any decision is taken, to assess their potential impacts on the potential Outstanding Universal Value of the nominated property.*

C.3.2. Significant boundary modifications of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List

Property	**Dutch Water Defence Lines [extension of "Defence Line of Amsterdam"]**
ID No.	**759 Bis**
State Party	**Netherlands**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(ii)(iv)(v)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 160.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.23

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*
2. *Refers the proposed extension of the **Defence Line of Amsterdam** to include the **New Dutch Waterline** and become the **Dutch Water Defence Lines, Netherlands**, back to the State Party in order to allow it to:*
   a) *Revise the boundaries of the proposed extension in the section near Utrecht in order to include all elements that make up the waterline and the reciprocal visual relationships between these elements,*
   b) *Exclude from the proposal for reduction the area B2.2 – Geniedijk,*
   c) *Include all other six proposed reductions within the buffer zone and provide them with ad-hoc mechanisms that prevent further pressures and offer the opportunity to recover in the medium- or long-term, at least part of the memory of their past conditions through careful design and landscaping,*
   d) *Revise thoroughly the boundaries of the buffer zone, both on the inner and outer sides of the nominated property, by expanding it on the inner side, including all prohibited circles and the inundation areas; as well as the area of Maarschalkerweerd, one of the few places where the continuity and visual relationship between the inner and outer ring of Utrecht is still perceivable, redefining the boundaries on the outer side in order to make them coincide with physical elements or administrative and property delimitations,*
   e) *Equip the buffer zone with ad-hoc protection measures, if and where necessary by making use of distinct zoning, so as to ensure an effective added layer of protection,*
   f) *Make an inventory of all current planning previsions in force for the inscribed property as well as the nominated extension and the whole buffer zone, and assess whether they are coherent to sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the Defence Line of Amsterdam and the proposed Outstanding Universal Value of the extension;*
3. *Recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following:*
   a) *Strengthening the protection of the landscape dimension, particularly in key sections of the Dutch Water Defence Lines, e.g. in the Utrecht area and Laagraven especially, through ad-hoc plans that enhance the historic landscape features and mutual visibility among the defence elements,*
   b) *Revising as a matter of urgency the project of the housing development near Woudrichem,*
   c) *Providing the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS with upcoming projects, including the final option for the A8-A9 junction, for review,*
   d) *Finalising all sensitive area analyses and embed their conclusions in planning instruments,*
   e) *Strengthening the visibility and interpretation of the Defence Line of Amsterdam and its proposed extension.*

C.3.3. Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	**Frontiers of the Roman Empire – The Danube Limes (Western Segment)**
ID No.	**1608 Rev**
States Parties	**Austria / Germany / Hungary / Slovakia**
Criteria proposed by States Parties	**(ii)(iii)(iv)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 234.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.24

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*
2. *Inscribes the **Frontiers of the Roman Empire – The Danube Limes (Western Segment), Austria, Germany, Hungary** and **Slovakia,** on the World Heritage List on the basis of **criteria (ii), (iii)** and **(iv)**;*
3. *Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:*

   Brief synthesis

   The Frontiers of the Roman Empire – The Danube Limes (Western Segment), ran for almost 1000 km along the Danube, following the northern and eastern boundaries of the Roman provinces of Raetia (eastern part), Noricum and Pannonia, from Bad Gögging in Germany through Austria and Slovakia to Kölked in Hungary.

   For more than 400 years from the 1st century CE, it constituted the middle European boundary of the

Roman Empire against what were called 'barbarians'.

First defined in the Flavian dynasty (69-96 CE) and later further developed, the fortifications consisted of a continuous chain of military installations almost all along the southern banks of the river. The backbone of the defence system was a string of six legionary fortresses, each housing some 5,500 to 6,000 Roman citizens as soldiers. The provinces of Raetia and Noricum had one legion, while there were four in Pannonia. The larger number reflected Roman anxiety about powerful neighbours: the Germanic peoples in the north and the Sarmatians in the east. Between the legionary fortresses, were forts, fortlets, and watchtowers linked by access roads and serviced by the Pannonian fleet that patrolled the River Danube under the control of Rome. To serve soldiers and civilians, sizeable civilian towns were developed around the legionary fortresses and some forts, and these towns also spread Roman culture to the edges of the Empire.

The form and disposition of the fortifications reflects the geo-morphology of the river as well as military, economic and social requirements. For most of its length the Danube frontier crosses wide floodplains, separated from each other by high mountain ranges that force the meandering river into deep, narrow gorges. These natural conditions are reflected in the size and positioning of military installations, with the gorges being secured by small elevated posts, and the plains by larger forts at river crossings or other strategic points overlooking the plains. Although primarily for defence, in peaceful times the Limes also controlled trade and access across the river with, in the west, Germanic peoples and, in the east, Iranian Sarmatians with whom the Roman Empire had diplomatic treaties.

The Danube Limes finally broke down the 5th century CE. During the Middle Ages, many still standing Roman buildings were reused and served as nuclei for the development of villages and towns many of which exist today.

The 175 component sites, selected from a far larger number that still remain, together reflect in an outstanding way all elements of the well balanced complex River Danube defensive system, linked by the military road parallel to the river. They also offer a clear understanding of the way military strategies evolved over time to counter threats considered by the Romans emanating from sustained large-scale migrations in the later years of the Roman Empire, particularly through the remains of bridgeheads that served as fortified river ports, more than 40 temporary camps on both sides of the river, and the closely spaced watchtowers in what is now Hungary.

The large number of civilian settlements present a profound and vivid understanding of the lives of the military and civilians, and how defensive installations became the focus for trade and engagement with areas beyond the frontier, all of which bought about profound and long-lasting changes to the landscape of this part of Europe.

Criterion (ii): *The legionary fortresses, forts, fortlets, watchtowers, linked infrastructure and civilian architecture that made up the Roman military system of the western segment of the Danube Limes extended technical knowledge of construction and management to the very edges of the Empire.*

This segment did not constitute an impregnable barrier, but controlled and allowed the movement of peoples: not only military units, but also civilians and merchants. This triggered profound changes and developments in terms of settlement patterns, architecture and landscape design and spatial organisation in this part of the frontier which has persisted over time. The frontier landscape is thus an exceptional reflection of the imposition of a complex military system on existing societies in the northern part of the Empire.

Criterion (iii): *The Frontiers of the Roman Empire – The Danube Limes (Western Segment) presents an exceptional manifestation of Roman imperial policy and the Empire's ambition to dominate the world in order to establish its law and way of life in the long-term. The segment reflects specifically how the Empire consolidated its northern frontiers at the maximum extension of its powers.*

It also witnesses Roman colonization through the spread of culture and different traditions – military engineering, architecture, art, religion, management and politics–from the capital to the remotest parts of the Empire.

The large number of human settlements associated with the defences, contribute to an exceptional understanding of how soldiers and their families, and also civilians, lived in this part of the Empire, with all the accoutrements of Roman culture such as baths, religious shrines and, at the largest settlements of Aquincum and Carnuntum, amphitheatres and a governor's palace, decorated with frescoes and sculpture.

Criterion (iv): *The materials and substance of the Frontiers of the Roman Empire – The Danube Limes (Western Segment) can be seen as a vivid testimony to the way Roman military systems were influenced by geography and, over four centuries, were developed and adapted to meet changing threats to the Empire.*

Military campaigns are reflected by temporary camps built around existing forts, a series of bridgeheads built on both banks of the Danube River, and horseshoe and fanshaped towers and strongly fortified fortlets developed as a response in Late Roman times to changes in warfare.

In Mediaeval times, many of the defensive constructions became the nuclei of later settlements and, through their continuous use until till today, have shaped the form of medieval towns along the Danube.

Integrity

The series of component sites as a whole reflects all the elements which once constituted the frontier system– that is the continuous chain of military

installations along the southern banks of the river consisting of six legionary fortresses, the backbone of the system, around which forts, fortlets, and watchtowers were laid out at varying distances – as well as the linking infrastructure and civilian settlements.

The ensemble of sites represents the long period in which the Western segment of the Danube operated as part of the frontiers of the Roman Empire as well as all its main periods of construction from its establishment in the 1st century BP until its disintegration in the 5th century CE, and the extraordinary complexity and coherence of its frontier installations.

Although some individual component sites are fragmentary and have been affected by changes of land use, natural processes, and in some cases over-building, the visible remains and buried archaeological features are both sufficient in scope to convey their contribution to the overall series.

The boundaries of all individual component sites encompass the relevant attributes necessary to support their contribution to Outstanding Universal Value. Later development overlaying parts of the frontier remains are treated as vertical buffer zones.

In a few component sites, integrity is impacted by infrastructural development and windfarms and these impacts need to be addressed, when opportunities arise, and further impacts prevented.

Authenticity

The western segment of the Danube Frontier clearly reflects the specificities of this part of the overall Roman Frontier through the way selection of sites has encompassed all the key elements from the legionary fortresses and their associated settlements to small forts and temporary camps, and the way they relate to topography.

All the component sites have been subject to intensive study and research. Sources deployed include the full array of archaeological research techniques (past and present excavation, field survey, aerial photography, geophysics etc.) as well as archival evidence. The component sites have the capacity to clearly reflect their inherent value and their contribution to the Outstanding Universal Value.

The one area where the value is less well articulated is in terms of the relationship of component sites to the River Danube, as the frontier and as a longitudinal transport artery for military support, goods and people. All the component sites originally had a dynamic relationship with the river. As the Danube in places has shifted its course considerably since Roman times, some components have lost this link. In places the original course has not been identified. This link needs strengthening on the basis of more research on the original course of the river.

Overall, the fabric of the upstanding remains is in a good state of conservation. Some of the underground components are very fragile and highly vulnerable to damage and erosion from continuing cultivation.

Reconstruction has been undertaken at 21 components and in most cases, it is slight and historical. There is though little consistency of approach on how the difference between original and reconstructed fabric is revealed. The most extensive reconstruction is at of Carnuntum, where work is still in progress and, although reversible, is in places conjectural. At Iža (Kelemantia) parts of the fort have been rebuilt in a way that is not readily distinguishable from original material.

There is a need for a clear and consistent approach to reconstruction across the whole series. Large-scale conjectural reconstruction on top of original fabric needs to be avoided. As much reconstruction work will require renewal as part of ongoing conservation programmes, there are opportunities for improvement.

The landward side of some of the component sites has not always been protected adequately. At Carnuntum the close proximity of an extensive windfarm is visually intrusive, while at Budapest the setting of many of the very significant components of Aquincum Municipium and legionary fortress are severely impacted by transport infrastructure.

Protection and management requirements

Each of the four participating States Parties has a discrete legal system and administrative processes for heritage protection at national, regional, and local levels, and in the federal states of Germany and Austria there are also discrete statutory frameworks for each federal component (the German component sites are confined to the Federal State of Bavaria). Although the detailed legal provisions and terminology for designation and protection vary in each State, the function and effect of the different national provisions is the same: they should ensure adequate long-term protection of the nominated component sites and their setting, if both are appropriately defined, if landowners are cooperative and if the measures are effectively implemented by regional and local governments.

Within each State Party an appropriate management system has been developed, expressed through national Management Plans. The aim of these plans is to ensure that individual parts of the nominated property are managed within an agreed overall framework of co-operation to achieve common standards of identification, recording, research, protection, conservation, management, and presentation in an interdisciplinary manner and within a sustainable framework.

The plans will be regularly updated. The national management systems address also the interests and involvement of all stakeholders and the sustainable economic use of the property.

At the international level the participating States Parties have agreed a Joint Declaration for running and expanding the property. This sets out the terms of reference for an Intergovernmental

Committee to coordinate at an international level the management and development of the whole World Heritage property and to work to common aims and objectives and a Danube Limes Management Group to provide the primary mechanism for sharing best practice for those directly responsible for site management.

On a supra-national level, the Frontiers of the Roman Empire – The Danube Limes aims to cooperate intensively with the existing Frontiers of the Roman Empire properties, to create a cluster. The existing Bratislava Group, an international advisory body for the Frontiers as a whole, will also provide a supportive technical network.

4. *Recommends that the States Parties give consideration to the following:*

   a) *Completing, approving and submitting to the World Heritage Centre by **January 2023** management plans for the component parts and their settings in Hungary, and ensuring that these include the Aquincum Palace site in the setting of the property to ensure it is protected and managed for its own intrinsic importance and for the way it supports Outstanding Universal Value,*

   b) *Establishing buffer zones for the small number of component parts without them and submit these as minor boundary modifications by **1 February 2023**,*

   c) *Continuing on-going research and documentation on the Roman course(s) of the River Danube, encouraging where possible connections between relevant component parts and the original river course to which they were related, and make the outcomes of this research work accessible,*

   d) *Developing a clear and consistent approach to reconstruction works for all component parts in the series in relation to limited reconstruction for the purposes of consolidation, conservation or presentation, in order to ensure that reconstruction above original materials is avoided as a general rule, that when used, it is adequately justified; that reconstruction does not dominate any of the component parts; and that differences between original and reconstructed material are distinguished in a consistent manner; such a defined approach should be submitted in draft to ICOMOS for review; and any further reconstruction work in the property should be halted until an approach agreed by ICOMOS and all States Parties is in place,*

   e) *Developing and approving a long term strategy to allow all component parts and their buffer zones to be taken out of ploughing,*

   f) *Strengthening coordinated management with the appropriate water and river authorities to develop flood prevention or flood management measures (such as water retention zones) as well as active measures to control the flow of the Danube (dredging etc.) to prevent the flooding of component parts and their settings, and submit any proposals for major flood defence schemes, including for the site of Aquincum Palace and its harbour, to the World Heritage Centre for review by ICOMOS, in line with paragraph 172 of the* Operational Guidelines*, before any work is approved or undertaken,*

   g) *Continuing on-going work on the development of a common database as well as on a comprehensive research framework,*

   h) *Surveying and documenting the entire ensemble of temporary camps as an archaeological landscape,*

   i) *Undertaking where possible targeted re-excavations at Eining Weinberg and further investigations at St Peter's church,*

   j) *Ensuring that when wind turbines in the setting of Carnuntum come to the end of their useful life they are not replaced and introducing regulations to ensure that the landscape settings of other component parts are not compromised by new wind farms or other infrastructure projects,*

   k) *Expanding the current site-based community engagement to more component parts,*

   l) *Ensuring that Heritage Impact Assessments are used routinely for assessing the impact of proposed changes that might impact on component parts or their settings, and ensuring that all projects that might have an impact on Outstanding Universal Value are submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by ICOMOS, in line with paragraph 172 of the* Operational Guidelines*;*

5. *Requests the States Parties to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2023**, a report on the implementation on the above-mentioned recommendations for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 47th session.*

Property	**Colonies of Benevolence**
ID No.	**1555 Rev**
States Parties	**Belgium / Netherlands**
Criteria proposed by States Parties	**(ii)(iv)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 252.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.25

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*

2. *Inscribes the **Colonies of Benevolence, Belgium** and the **Netherlands,** on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape on the basis of **criteria (ii)** and **(iv)**;*

3. *Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:*

Brief synthesis

The Colonies of Benevolence were an Enlightenment experiment in social reform which demonstrated an innovative, highly influential model of pauper relief and of settler colonialism – the agricultural domestic colony. Beginning in 1818, the Society of Benevolence founded agricultural colonies in rural areas of the United Kingdom of the Netherlands (now the Netherlands and Belgium). The Colonies of Benevolence created a highly functional landscape out of isolated peat and heath wastelands through the domestic colonisation of paupers. In the process, colonists would become morally reformed ideal citizens, adding to the nation's wealth and integrating marginal territories in emergent nation states.

Over a seven-year period, almost 80 square kilometres of wastelands, domestic territory considered unfit for settlement, were reclaimed in Colonies. The colonies featured orthogonal roads, ribbons of houses and small farms, and communal buildings. From 1819 onwards, 'unfree' colonies were also founded, the last in 1825; these featured large institutions and larger farms again set in an orthogonal pattern of fields and avenues, and housed particular groups of disadvantaged people with support from the State. At their peak some 18,000 people lived in the colonies, including those within the property.

The process of transforming its poorest landscapes and citizens through a utopian process of social engineering went on until well into the 20th century. After 1918, the colonies lost their relevance and evolved into 'normal' villages and areas with institutions for custodial care.

The property comprises four former colonies in three component parts: the free colonies of Frederiksoord and Wilhelminaoord, the colony of Wortel which was a free colony that evolved into an unfree colony, and the unfree colony of Veenhuizen.

Criterion (ii): *The Colonies of Benevolence bear testimony to an exceptional and nationwide Enlightenment experiment in social reform, through a system of large agricultural home colonies. They proposed a model of social engineering based upon the notion of 'productive labour', with the aim of transforming poor people into 'industrious' citizens and uncultivated 'wastelands' into productive land. In addition to work, education and moral upliftment were considered essential contributions to the aim of transforming poor people into self-reliant citizens.*

The Colonies of Benevolence were developed as systematic self-sustaining agricultural settlements with state-of-the-art social facilities. As such, the Colonies of Benevolence pioneered the domestic colony model, attracting considerable international attention. For more than a century, they exerted an influence on various types of custodial care in Western Europe and beyond.

Criterion (iv): *The Colonies of Benevolence are an outstanding example of domestic agricultural colonies created in the 19th century with the social aim of poverty alleviation. Deliberately cultivated as 'islands' in remote domestic heath and peatland areas, the Colonies implemented the ideas of a panoptic institution for the poor in their functional and spatial organisation.*

They are an outstanding example of a landscape design that represents an agricultural home colony with a social aim. The landscape patterns reflect the original character of the different types of Colonies and their subsequent evolution, and illustrate the extent, the ambition and the evolution of this social experiment in its flourishing period (1818-1918).

Integrity

The property contains all the attributes which convey the Outstanding Universal Value. It includes key examples of both free and unfree colonies. All component parts consist of a combination of relict landscape layers which together illustrate the flourishing period of the Colony model. In the case of the free colonies, attributes include the long ribbons of houses and small farms set in a pattern of orthogonal roads and fields. The unfree colonies include larger building complexes, housing, and larger farms set in an orthogonally organised landscape of avenues and fields. Features of the landscapes include their orthogonal structure with roads, avenue plantings, other plantings, meadows, fields and forests, and with the characteristic houses, farms, institutions, churches, schools and industrial buildings.

While there have been changes and evolution over time, the property reflects the best-preserved cultural landscapes of the free and unfree colonies.

Authenticity

The authenticity of the property is based on its location, form and design, and materials. The distinctive cultural landscape with its structured form, plantings, surviving buildings and archaeological sites from the period when the colonies were created and flourished, truthfully and credibly tell the story of the Colonies of Benevolence and reflect the Outstanding Universal Value.

The use of the Colonies for agriculture and the social objectives formulated by the Society of Benevolence over two centuries were mainly continued and supplemented with new functions, which redefined the original social significance of the Colonies, in the spirit of the Colonies and adapted to changing times. The connecting factor is not one single 'authentic' period, but the landscape structure which has developed in two determining phases: the first phase of the creation (1818-1859), the phase of the further evolution, the phase of state institutions and privatisation (1860-1918).

Protection and management requirements

The property is protected by various and very different tools that range in scale from national laws to municipal codes, covering both natural and cultural values. These provide sectorial guidelines or criteria for intervention and conservation of the property.

Legal protection is adequate for individual buildings. In both countries, representative buildings have been granted monument status and are protected. This includes a number of buildings and building ensembles within the colonies which are protected as individual monuments.

At the national level, all the Dutch colonies are fully or partially protected as villagescapes. In Belgium, Wortel is a protected cultural heritage landscape. Consideration should be given to ensuring the national villagescape protection should cover the full extent of Wilheminaoord.

In the Netherlands, a new Environment & Planning Act will enter into force in 2021 to regulate the protection of heritage values, replacing the existing Spatial Planning Act. The new Act provides opportunities for the integral protection of Outstanding Universal Value, and for the assessment of new developments.

The organisation of the management system for the property seems effective. This includes an intergovernmental committee to address issues between the States Parties, a transnational steering group, the designation of site holders in each country, a technical advisory committee, site managers and staff.

There is a management plan consisting of a main document related to the whole property, as well as three specific plans for the component parts. The focus of the management plan is the preservation and reinforcement of the Outstanding Universal Value for the series as a whole and for the individual colonies. Risk preparedness is addressed through existing mechanisms rather than a specific strategy.

Visitor management is achieved through a range of measures including visitor centres, interpretive materials and support facilities, and further measures are planned. Traffic management is recognised as an issue.

Local communities and residents are closely involved in the management of the property through formal and other means.

An ongoing challenge will be to manage the property as a unified whole, especially to ensure that conservation approaches evolve in the same direction.

4. *Recommends that the States Parties give consideration to the following:*

   a) *Establishing a buffer zone, in order to ensure the protection of the component parts from any potential threats, through a minor boundary modification process, to be submitted to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2023**,*

   b) *Ensuring the national villagescape protection for the full extent of Wilheminaoord,*

   c) *Ensuring the form, scale and placement of new buildings closely adheres to those of the original buildings in each component part,*

   d) *Ensuring the conservation of the grid dimensions that characterize each colony,*

   e) *Ensuring management of the property as a unified whole, especially that conservation approaches evolve in the same direction,*

   f) *Enhancing the mapping of the property to document current ownership patterns and the extent of the existing prisons and state institutions.*

Property	**Roșia Montană Mining Landscape**
ID No.	**1552 Rev**
State Party	**Romania**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 264.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.26

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*

2. *Inscribes the **Roșia Montană Mining Landscape, Romania,** on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape on the basis of **criteria (ii), (iii)** and **(iv)**;*

3. *Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:*

   Brief Synthesis

   Roșia 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). Roșia 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 small mountains (Cârnic, Lety, Orlea and Cetate) that visually dominate the landscape of Roșia Montană, itself surrounded on three sides by dividing ridges and peaks. Roman archaeology in the surrounding landscape is prolific and pervasive, comprising ore-processing areas, living quarters, administrative buildings, sacred areas and necropoli, 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):** Roșia 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 Roșia Montană that they likely represent pioneering aspects in the technical history of mining.

Criterion (iii): *Roșia Montană Mining Landscape embodies the cultural traditions of one of the oldest documented mining communities in Europe, anciently founded by the Romans, as manifested in extant underground mining works, chronologically differentiated by distinctive technical features; and a socio-technical mining landscape consisting of ore-processing areas, habitation areas, sacred places and necropoli. The interpretation of its history is enriched by Roman wax-coated wooden writing tablets discovered in the mines during the 18th and 19th centuries. Together with prolific stone epigraphic monuments, they provide an authentic picture of daily life and cultural practice in this ancient frontier mining community.*

Combined with outcomes of recent, intensive and systematic archaeological investigation, an exceptional reflection of Roman mining practices has emerged.

Criterion (iv): *Roșia 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, Roșia 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.*

Integrity

Roșia 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.

Protection and management requirements

Roșia Montană Mining Landscape is legally protected in accordance with Romanian law as a World Heritage property.

The protection of Roșia Montană is supported by listing under the Law for the protection of historic monuments (L. 422/2001) which allows for the development of urban planning measures. Currently there are no planning controls in place and these need to be urgently developed. Currently there are active mining licences on the property and inadequate controls to stop these being extended. To activate these, permits need to be approved. There is clearly a need for the development of a General Urban Plan (Plan Urbanistic General) and a Zonal Urban Plan (Plan Urbanistic Zonal) to restrict approvals for mining permits.

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 augmented by an internationally supported conservation plan and a tourism strategy should be implemented.

4. *Also inscribes the* ***Roșia Montană Mining Landscape, Romania,*** *on the List of World Heritage in Danger;*

5. *Recommends that the State Party invite a reactive monitoring mission to the property to establish a desired state of conservation and a programme of corrective measures to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger;*

6. *Also recommends that the State Party give urgent consideration to the following:*

   a) *Halting approval of mining permits at the property,*

   b) *Developing as soon as possible planning controls for the property, in the form of a General Urban Plan (Plan Urbanistic General) and a Zonal Urban Plan (Plan Urbanistic Zonal), that prevents further mining at the property and submit these in draft to the World Heritage Centre for review by ICOMOS,*

   c) *Approving, submitting and implementing the management plan of the property, and augmenting through:*

      i) *An internationally supported conservation plan for the Roman remains,*

      ii) *A management tourism strategy, to improve visitor management and interpretation and presentation of the site,*

      iii) *The involvement of the stakeholders in the management of the property,*

iv) *A commitment for adequate human and financial resources for its implementation,*

d) *Developing an inspection and maintenance plan for the header ponds to ensure their long term stability,*

e) *Developing and implementing a monitoring programme for the property;*

7. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 December 2022** a report on the implementation of the above-mentioned recommendations for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 46th session;*

8. *Encourages international cooperation to support the protection and conservation of the property.*

C.4. LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

C.4.1. New Nominations

Property	**Sítio Roberto Burle Marx**
ID No.	**1620**
State Party	**Brazil**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(ii)(iv)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 176.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.27

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*

2. *Inscribes **Sítio Roberto Burle Marx, Brazil**, on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape on the basis of **criteria (ii)** and **(iv)**;*

3. *Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:*

Brief synthesis

Sítio Roberto Burle Marx, located in the west zone of the City of Rio de Janeiro, comprises extensive landscape gardens and buildings set between mangroves and native Atlantic forest in a mountainous area of the district of Barra de Guaratiba.

The property was a 'landscape laboratory' for landscape architect and artist Roberto Burle Marx (1909-1994). Over a period of more than forty years, he experimented with fusing artistic Modernist ideas and native tropical plants to create garden designs as living works of art.

Burle Marx introduced the aesthetics of painting to landscape design. Drawing inspiration from the key founders of the Modern Art movement, he created abstract paintings that included modernist images based on abstractions of Portuguese/ Brazilian folk culture, and used these as a basis of garden designs in which plants became components of three dimensional living works of art. Burle Marx popularised the use of native tropical plants, many of which he collected and cultivated.

The Sítio is thus important as a physical manifestation of Burle Marx's approaches, his principles and his plants, as well as for the way it allows an understanding of the key design characteristics that he used again and again in his designs such as sinuous forms, exuberant mass planting, architectural arrangements of plants, dramatic colour contrasts, a focus on tropical plants, and the incorporation of elements of traditional Portuguese-Brazilian folk culture.

The Sítio is a remarkable survival as a landscape laboratory that illuminates the way one of the great landscape designers of the 20th century evolved his influential designs. That led to the development of what became known as the Modern tropical garden, an important expression of the Modern Movement in the field of landscape design and one that has largely influenced the shaping of parks and gardens since the mid-20th century in Brazil and throughout the world.

***Criterion (ii):** Sítio Roberto Burle Marx demonstrates an important interchange of ideas on landscape design related to the importation of ideas of the Modernist art movement from Europe, their shaping and adaptation through experimentation to a landscape form based on the use of native tropical flora, and their use in a huge number of parks and gardens around the world, which together have had a profound impact on the development of what is now known as Modernist Tropical garden design.*

***Criterion (iv):** Sítio Roberto Burle Marx is an outstanding example of a landscape that demonstrates the development of a new type of landscape design that fused creative ideas of the Modern art movement with local typologies and tropical plants to create a style that ultimately became known as the modern tropical garden.*

Integrity

The property contains all the attributes that are central to the Outstanding Universal Value. The boundaries enclose all the land acquired by Roberto Burle Marx for his landscaping activities, and the property is of an adequate size.

Although none of the attributes are under threat, they are vulnerable to incremental change in the absence of Conservation Plan, based on clear documentation of the property and on a detailed delineation of the attributes.

Authenticity

The authenticity of the property is related to its form, design, and materials, including living plant materials, the interaction between all of these to create artistic works, and the ideas that they convey.

The documentation related to the attributes needs to be greatly improved to guide conservation to ensure there is no gradual erosion over time.

The historical role the property had as a laboratory for the development of design ideas has ended and it is therefore essential that there is a clearer understanding of full scope of the attributes and how they will be sustained.

Protection and management requirements

The property is legally protected at all available levels. At the national level it is protected by the National Institute of Historic and Artistic Heritage (IPHAN). At the state level it has protection under the State Institute of Cultural Heritage (INEPAC). At the local level the property and buffer zone are integrated into the Rio de Janeiro State Conservation Strategy. These protective measures will be supplemented by a municipal law on urban development, and regulations to address urban pressure around the property.

There are effective management structures and processes in place for the property and buffer zone at the three levels of government, with offices and personnel experienced with heritage properties and urban planning.

A proposed new management plan will update and improve the existing Strategic Plan (2012-2018), which is operationalised through annual Action Plans. The new plan, scheduled for completion in 2020, is intended to embody World Heritage principles and concepts.

It is proposed to create a management committee involving IPHAN (National Institute of Historic and Artistic Heritage) and a range of relevant institutions for the property and buffer zone, including those from the non-governmental sector, civil society and external experts.

The property is adequately resourced, including with appropriate staff.

To address the vulnerability of the attributes to incremental change over time, there is a need to develop a Conservation Plan.

4. *Recommends that the State Party, with the advice of ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre, if requested, give urgent consideration to the following:*

   a) *Delineating in detail, through a collaborative multi-disciplinary approach, the attributes of the property and their degree of intactness on the basis of an analysis of:*

      i) *Maps, surveys and illustrative materials relating to the property at the time of Burle Marx's death,*

      ii) *Maps, surveys and photographic documentation of the property at the present time,*

      iii) *Research and analysis of archives and art collections,*

   b) *On the basis of completed definition of attributes of Outstanding Universal Value, producing a Conservation Plan for the designed landscapes of the property,*

   c) *Strengthening the Management Plan to reflect the defined attributes and to ensure that the cultural design aspects of the garden are taken into consideration in the management of the property,*

   d) *Strengthening risk preparedness within the property, and in the setting of the property, especially in relation to fire prevention,*

   e) *Strengthening protection for the buffer zone and the immediate setting of the property to control urban development pressures and to ensure protection of views from the property into the surrounding landscape,*

   f) *Ensuring that Heritage Impact Assessments are undertaken for any proposals that might have the potential to impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and submit these to the World Heritage Centre for review in line with paragraph 172 of the* Operational Guidelines*;*

5. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2023**, a report on the implementation on the above-mentioned recommendations for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 47th session.*

Property	**Historical and Archaeological Site of La Isabela**
ID No.	**1628**
State Party	**Dominican Republic**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(ii)(iv)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 188.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.28

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*

2. *Decides not to inscribe the **Historical and Archaeological Site of La Isabela, Dominican Republic,** on the World Heritage List;*

3. *Recommends the State Party, with the advice of ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre, if requested, to identify an appropriate focus for a new nomination.*

Property	**Chankillo Solar Observatory and ceremonial center**
ID No.	**1624**
State Party	**Peru**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(i)(v)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 198.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.29

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*
2. *Inscribes the **Chankillo Solar Observatory and ceremonial center, Peru**, on the World Heritage List on the basis of **criteria (i)** and **(iv)**;*
3. *Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:*

Brief synthesis

The Chankillo Solar Observatory and ceremonial center is a prehistoric site, located on the north-central coast of Peru, in the Casma Valley, comprising a set of constructions in a desert landscape that, together with natural features, functioned as a calendrical instrument, using the sun to define dates throughout the seasonal year.

The property includes a triple-walled hilltop complex, known as the Fortified Temple, two building complexes called Observatory and Administrative Centre, a line of thirteen cuboidal towers stretching along the ridge of a hill, and the Cerro Mucho Malo that complements the Thirteen Towers as a natural marker.

***Criterion (i):** Chankillo Archaeoastronomical Complex is an outstanding example of ancient landscape timekeeping, a practice of ancient civilizations worldwide, which used visible natural or cultural features. Incorporated in the Thirteen Towers, it permitted the time of year to be accurately determined not just on one date but throughout the seasonal year. Unlike architectural alignments upon a single astronomical target found at many ancient sites around the world, the line of towers spans the entire annual solar rising and setting arcs as viewed, respectively, from two distinct observation points, one of which is still clearly visible above ground. The astronomical facilities at Chankillo represent a masterpiece of human creative genius.*

***Criterion (iv):** Chankillo was in use for a relatively brief period of time between 250 and 200 BC, during a late phase of the Early Horizon Period (500-200 BC) of Peruvian prehistory, after which it was destroyed and abandoned. The Chankillo Complex is a very particular type of building representing an early stage in the development of native astronomy in the Americas. It shows great innovation by using the solar cycle and an artificial horizon to mark the solstices, the equinoxes, and every other date within the year with a precision of 1-2 days. The solar observatory at Chankillo is thus a testimony of the culmination of a long historical evolution of astronomical practices in the Casma Valley.*

Integrity

All the elements necessary to express the Outstanding Universal Value of Chankillo Complex centred on calendrical observations of the sun are included within the property boundaries. Chankillo and the wider setting of related monuments that form the property take advantage of built and natural horizon markers to track the progressive passage of the sun along the horizon throughout the entire year. The natural environment and climatic conditions, that are the basis of the good visibility needed for astronomical observations at the site, are maintained to a large extent. The viewsheds that contain the main astronomical sightlines are generally unobstructed, but their preservation has to be monitored closely. Also, the visual integrity of the general setting of the property has to be maintained. Any infringement on the property by urban development or expansion of agricultural areas has to be avoided.

The advancing collapse of structural elements, with the loss of clear edges (e.g. at the tower buildings and the observatories), jeopardises the exactness of the astronomical observations. The conservation of monumental elements is fragile and needs to be closely monitored in the future.

In case the information from future research indicates relationships of the central monuments with other elements of the property and beyond, a boundary adjustment should be considered.

Authenticity

The position of the Western and Eastern Observation Points in relation to the Thirteen Towers at Chankillo, identified by archaeological excavation and geophysical survey, and supported by archaeoastronomical data, suggests that the primary purpose of all these structures was to act together as a calendrical instrument. Since the 3rd century BC the sun has shifted slightly at and around the solstices, less at other times in the year. This small change has a negligible effect on the solar and possibly lunar alignments around the site but does not affect the ability of a present-day spectator to observe and understand the way in which the Chankillo functioned. Some aspects of the archaeoastronomical interpretations of the property may need further discussion.

Since no invasive conservation and reconstruction campaigns have changed the material substance of the property, the conditions of authenticity in terms of material and form, are met.

Protection and management requirements

The property has been declared as National Cultural Heritage, through National Direction Resolution 075/INC of January 18, 2008. The property has been inventoried nationally by the Ministry of Culture and is registered in the National Superintendence of Public Registry (SUNARP). The property is reinforced by a buffer zone that extends around the site and includes part of the

San Rafael Valley, Cerro Mongón, Lomas Las Haldas, Pampa Los Médanos, Cerro Manchán, Cerro San Francisco, and Cerro Monte Grande.

The Management Plan, recently approved, identifies the current conservation and management conditions of the property and its context, the risks and threats to the cultural and natural features of the property and its surroundings, and establishes the policies that govern conservation and heritage management, the strategies and protection measures, and the regulation of the use of the property and its buffer zone through zoning, as well as the programmes and projects focused on sustainability in the conservation of the property.

The effectiveness of the management system will have to be proven in practice. Participation of local communities in future planning should be reinforced, and protection and conservation efforts, which will be key in avoiding any negative impacts through, for example, inadequate tourism development, should be closely monitored.

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

   a) *Developing a long-term conservation program which should include preventive actions such as reinforcements and construction of temporary roofs, as well as conservation, restoration and maintenance works, and, according to intervention phases, specific procedures, follow-up routines and monitoring,*

   b) *Implementing the Management Plan and setting in motion all the elements of the Management Structure,*

   c) *Securing the necessary funds to ensure the implementation of the conservation measures for the property,*

   d) *Taking the necessary measures to face potential increased visitation to the property and undertake a Heritage Impact Assessment before any infrastructure project is implemented,*

   e) *Involving local communities in the protection, conservation and promotion of the property, as well as in all of the planning processes,*

   f) *Continuing archaeological research and analysis of the data for the understanding of the wider archaeological context of the area;*

5. *Decides that the name of the property be changed to "**Chankillo Archaeoastronomical Complex**".*

Property	**The work of engineer Eladio Dieste: Church of Atlántida**
ID No.	**1612**
State Party	**Uruguay**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(iv)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 209.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.30

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*

2. *Inscribes **The work of engineer Eladio Dieste: Church of Atlántida, Uruguay**, on the World Heritage List on the basis of **criterion (iv)**;*

3. *Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:*

   Brief synthesis

   The Church of Atlántida of engineer Eladio Dieste with its belfry and underground baptistery is located in Estación Atlántida, a low-density locality, 45 km away from Montevideo. Inspired by Italian paleo-Christian and medieval religious architecture, the Church with its belfry and baptistery, all built in exposed bricks, exhibit forms dictated by the effort to achieve greater robustness with limited resistant sections and use of material.

   The property is an emblematic example of the application of a new building technique, reinforced ceramic, which Dieste developed by drawing on a thousand-year long tradition of brick construction, while applying modern scientific and technological knowledge, and thus opening up new structural and expressive possibilities for architecture.

   Designed from the outset to be built with local materials by local people, the Church of Atlántida, located in a lower middle-class semi-rural community, has its roots in long-established building traditions, while embodying the scientific and technical achievements of modernity. The Church of Atlántida reflects efforts to optimise the use of resources and ensure sustainability. The property is imbued with the humanistic principles that constantly guide the spatial and material concepts of engineer Dieste.

   ***Criterion (iv)**: The Church of Atlántida of engineer Eladio Dieste represents the highest spatial and aesthetic expression of a construction and technological innovation – the reinforced brickwork coupled with the mobile formwork – that draws from tradition, whilst reinterpreting and innovating it, and opens up structural and formal opportunities in architecture impossible to conceive and achieve up to that date with traditional masonry. The property embodies the post-war search for a renewed architectural language, expressing a modernity rooted in tradition and in the vernacular in Latin America and worldwide. It also reflects the locale and its people who built it. The church illustrates the confluence of geometry, of the static*

conception of the building, of the form expressed by the chosen building material.

Integrity

The Church of Atlántida includes all the elements linked to the history of the location and the period over which the building has been functioning. Its dimensions are sufficient to provide a comprehensive representation of the characteristics and processes that embody its Outstanding Universal Value. The church, which is in constant use, is currently in a good state of conservation. Thanks to a recent conservation programme, the building does not face any risks, and the pathologies affecting it can be treated.

Authenticity

The property is authentic in terms of location, time, construction materials, surroundings, and the substance of its creation and liturgical use.

Protection and management requirements

Requirements for the protection of the property are linked to its designation as a National Historic Monument by virtue of Heritage Law no. 10.040 of August 1971, amended in 2008 and 2015, and of Regulatory Decree 536/72. Conservation is the responsibility of the Heritage Commission, under the Ministry of Education and Culture. The Partial Land Use Plan for the commune of Atlántida and Estación Atlántida, which constitutes the legal land use instrument, recognises the heritage property status of the Church of Atlántida. Ownership is currently shared by the Bishopric of Canelones and the Congregation of the Rosarian Nuns, two institutions of the Catholic Church; however, steps have been undertaken to gather all elements of the property into the Bishopric's ownership.

The Church is administered by the Management Unit, which incorporates an Executive Committee, and a Deliberative Committee consisting of a set of institutional and social stakeholders who ensure the participation of citizens in the management of the heritage property. The Executive Committee, which takes decisions relating to intervention of all types on the property, is composed of the Ministry of Education and Culture, the Heritage Commission and the Bishopric of Canelones. The Deliberative Committee provides direct support to the Executive Committee; it consists of stakeholders involved in the routine management of the church as regards operational and material matters and its surroundings. The technical, administrative and economic resources are provided by State institutions and by the Catholic Church.

4. *<u>Recommends</u> that the State Party give consideration to the following:*

   a) *Digitize according to international requirements the historic archival documentation of the design and construction phases of the property,*

   b) *Ensure a steady flow of financial resources for the implementation of the management conservation plan, beginning with the next budget period (2021-2026),*

   c) *Strengthen the role of the Deliberative Committee within the Management system,*

   d) *Consider a more direct participation of the local community of Estación Atlántida in the property's management structure,*

   e) *Include, in the management structure, a heritage impact assessment mechanism for projects that could have an impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and on its integrity and authenticity,*

   f) *Develop indicators useful for the monitoring of the state of conservation of the property,*

   g) *Strengthen the visitor management and provide simple facilities for them.*

II.B Nominations to be examined at the extended 44th session of the World Heritage Committee submitted for examination in 2021

In the presentation below, ICOMOS Recommendations and IUCN Recommendations are both presented in the form of Draft Decisions and are extracted from documents WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1 (ICOMOS) and WHC/21/44.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.

Disclaimer

The Nomination files produced by the States Parties are published by the World Heritage Centre at its website and/or in working documents in order to ensure transparency, access to information and to facilitate the preparations of comparative analysis by other nominating States Parties.

The sole responsibility for the content of each Nomination file lies with the State Party concerned. The publication of the Nomination file does not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever of the World Heritage Committee or of the Secretariat of UNESCO concerning the history or legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its boundaries.

D. NATURAL SITES

D.1. AFRICA

D.1.1. New Nominations

Property	**Ivindo National Park**
ID. N°	**1653**
State Party	**Gabon**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(vii)(ix)(x)**

See IUCN Evaluation Book, 2021, page 93.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.31

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B2,*
2. *Refers the nomination of **Ivindo National Park, Gabon**, back to the State Party, noting the strong potential for this nominated property to meet criteria (ix) and (x), in order to allow it, with the advice of IUCN and the World Heritage Centre, if requested, to:*
   a) *Complete and provide the new and revised management plan for Ivindo National Park, and to ensure that this plan:*
      i) *takes into account the protection of the potential Outstanding Universal Value of the nominated property, including through proper inventories and a monitoring plan for its freshwater biodiversity and Caesalpinioideae forests,*
      ii) *is developed through a fully participatory process, including consultations with local communities both in the buffer zone and adjacent to Ivindo National Park,*
      iii) *is supported by secure, sufficient and sustainable funding for the management of Ivindo National Park,*
   b) *Ensure any potential infrastructure projects outside the nominated property will not negatively impact the potential Outstanding Universal Value of the nominated property, and would be subject to prior assessment in line with the IUCN World Heritage advice note on Environmental Assessment,*
   c) *Increase the area of the buffer zone that would not be subject to logging regimes to the greatest extent possible, to reduce any edge effects on the natural systems inside the nominated property, and ensure that all concessions in the buffer zone of Ivindo National Park have received FSC certification and that they will be strictly controlled and managed without any significant impacts on the potential Outstanding Universal Value of the nominated property,*
   d) *Ensure that any future internal zonation of Ivindo National Park is based on inventories of the biodiversity values and does not allow tourism infrastructure, such as hotels, to be located inside the park;*
3. *Expresses its appreciation for the designation of Ivindo National Park and the extensive efforts to date regarding the nomination of this site.*

D.2. EUROPE - NORTH AMERICA

D.2.1. Significant boundary modifications of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List

Property	**Ancient and Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and Other Regions of Europe [extension]**
ID. N°	**1133 quater**
States Parties	**Bosnia and Herzegovina / Czechia / France / Italy / Montenegro / North Macedonia / Poland / Serbia / Slovakia / Switzerland**
Criteria proposed by States Parties	**(ix)**

See document WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B2.Add

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.32

[See Addendum: WHC/21/44.COM/8B.Add]

E. CULTURAL SITES

E.1. AFRICA

E.1.1. New Nominations

Property	**Sudanese style mosques in northern Côte d'Ivoire**
ID. N°	**1648**
State Party	**Côte d'Ivoire**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(ii)(iv)(v)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 316.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.33

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*
2. *Defers the examination of the nomination of **Sudanese style mosques in northern Côte d'Ivoire, Côte d'Ivoire,** 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) *Enlarge the boundaries for each component part to encompass the full extent of communal and associated functional spaces around each mosque,*
   b) *Enlarge the buffer zones to encompass the immediate urban setting of the mosques to allow the mosques to be perceived as dominant structures,*
   c) *Strengthen the protection for buffer zones, through amending Local Plans and relevant local regulations, particularly in relation to development that is currently permitted,*
   d) *Operationalise the proposed management system and augment it to encompass capacity building for local masons,*
   e) *Develop a road map with actions and a timeframe within which traditional conservation practices will be robust enough to reverse the current decline,*
   f) *Complete conservation plans for each mosque setting out its current state of conservation and the interventions needed,*
   g) *Define an overall conservation approach for the whole series that includes proposals for major projects,*
   h) *Design as a matter of urgency projects to reverse recent inappropriate interventions at Kouto, Kaouara, Sorobango and Samatiguila mosques;*
3. *Considers that any revised nomination would need to be considered by an expert mission to the site;*

E.2. ARAB STATES

E.2.1. Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	**As-Salt - The Place of Tolerance and Urban Hospitality**
ID. N°	**689 Rev**
State Party	**Jordan**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(ii)(iii)**

See document WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1.Add

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.34

[See Addendum: WHC/21/44.COM/8B.Add]

E.3. ASIA-PACIFIC

E.3.1. New Nominations

Property	**Dholavira: A Harappan City**
ID. N°	**1645**
State Party	**India**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(ii)(iii)(iv)**

See document WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1.Add

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.35

[See Addendum: WHC/21/44.COM/8B.Add]

Property	**Cultural Landscape of Hawraman/Uramanat**
ID. N°	**1647**
State Party	**Iran (Islamic Republic of)**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(iii)(iv)(v)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 327.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.36

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*
2. *Inscribes* ***Cultural Landscape of Hawraman/Uramanat, Islamic Republic of Iran****, on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape on the basis of* ***criteria (iii)*** *and* ***(v)****;*
3. *Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:*

Brief synthesis

The Cultural Landscape of Hawraman/Uramanat is located at the heart of the Zagros Mountains in the provinces of Kurdistan and Kermanshah along the western border of Iran. It is comprised of two component parts: the Central-Eastern Valley (Zhaverud and Takht, in Kurdistan Province); and the Western Valley (Lahun, in Kermanshah Province). The mode of human habitation in these areas has been adapted over millennia to the rough mountainous environment.

Archaeological findings dating back about 40,000 years, caves and rock shelters, ancient paths and ways along the valleys, motifs and inscriptions, cemeteries, mounds, castles, settlements, and other historical evidence attest to the continuity of life in the Hawraman/Uramanat region from the Paleolithic to the present time and to the endurance of the semi-nomadic lifestyle and agropastoral practices of the area's inhabitants.

The Cultural Landscape of Hawraman/Uramanat is an exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition of the semi-nomadic agropastoral way of life of the Hawrami people, a Kurdish tribe that has resided in the Zagros Mountains for millennia. This outstanding cultural tradition is manifested in the ancestral practices of transhumance, the mode of seasonal living in Havars, steep-slope terraced agriculture, soil and water management, traditional knowledge for planning and constructing steeply terraced villages, and a rich diversity of intangible heritage, all reflecting a harmonious co-existence with nature.

Criterion (iii)*: The Cultural Landscape of Hawraman/ Uramanat bears exceptional testimony to the evolution over millennia of the traditional semi-nomadic agropastoral way of life of the Hawrami people. This cultural tradition is expressed in tangible and intangible elements of the landscape that have persisted up to the present day and continue to be the foundation of the local socio-economic system, including steep-slope terraced villages and gardens, transhumance routes, seasonal dwellings, and the traditional knowledge and practices associated with them. The property provides outstanding living testimony to various traditions that bear witness to a well-organized social, rural, semi-nomadic realm.*

Criterion (v)*: The Cultural Landscape of Hawraman/Uramanat constitutes an outstanding example of human interaction with, and adaptation to, the surrounding environment. In the high Zagros Mountains, a challenging setting where there is little fertile soil, the Hawrami people, through a skillful application of agricultural technology and an enlightened ecological world view, have developed an extraordinary semi-nomadic agropastoral way of life. They have successfully created an efficient, harmonious, and sustainable socio-economic system.*

Integrity

The serial property includes all the attributes required to convey its Outstanding Universal Value. Its component parts exemplify the complexity of the cultural, residential, architectural, environmental, and agropastoral aspects that are evidence of the property's centuries-old traditions. The morphology and architectural fabric of the thirteen villages – which are among the essential attributes of the property – are mostly intact. The historical environment and the natural landscape remain relatively well-preserved, in large part because of the existence of a rural population engaged in farming and animal husbandry activities that have optimal interaction with the challenging environment.

Modern infrastructure, amenities, and building materials in some cases have a negative effect on the historic character of the villages. However, their overall visual and functional impacts are not excessive. The deterioration process is controlled, and in some instances has been reversed. The overall intent is to preserve to the greatest extent possible the dynamic historic functions and vitality of the villages and the cultural landscape.

Authenticity

The Cultural Landscape of Hawraman/Uramanat retains a high degree of authenticity in terms of materials, forms and designs, uses and functions, locations and setting, and spirit and feeling, as well as traditions, customs, and lifestyle. A significant body of resources provides documentary and visual evidence of the importance of Hawraman/Uramanat – and of its culture and traditions more generally – in this region from ancient times.

The authenticity of the morphology and layout of the built fabric in the thirteen villages of the property is preserved. The characteristic organization of the villages and the public space features, such as public rooftops, continue to be dominant.

Most historic buildings have kept their traditional form and design, and these types of forms and designs are usually followed in the infrequent occasions when new houses are constructed. Most

buildings retain authentic materials, including in traditional interiors, although in some cases repairs or extensions have been made using modern materials such as concrete blocks, metal doors and windows, and aluminum sheets for roofing.

Traditional dry-stone terracing and water management practices are retained and practiced, as well as seasonal migration to Havars, livestock breeding, and traditional agriculture. The local economy continues to produce an important supply of fresh agricultural produce for Iranian markets. This factor, coupled with sensitive and sustainable tourism management, will play a key role in the long-term conservation of the property.

Management and protection requirements

The Cultural Landscape of Hawraman/Uramanat is registered in the National Monuments List of Iran. Several national acts and bylaws, as well as strategies, support the long-term conservation of the property.

The Cultural Landscape of Hawraman/Uramanat (CLH/U) Base, under the Ministry of Culture, Heritage, Tourism and Handicrafts of Iran, is tasked with providing support, expertise, and funding for the research and conservation of the property. The Base manages the area in collaboration with the local communities, provides advice and consent on the major developments, regulates and controls permits for buildings and alterations, and provides financial support for conservation. Decision-making is facilitated by a cross-sectoral steering committee composed of local, regional, and national participants and a technical committee established within the CLH/U Base. All local management actions and programmes in the villages are carried out through village councils and village council heads (Dehyar). The Integrated Management and Conservation Plan of the CLH/U Base is a primary tool for the management and conservation of the property.

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

   a) *Strengthening the comprehensive study*, inter alia*, of the spatial characteristics and interrelationships of all the features within the serial property and its buffer zone, including archaeological sites and mounds which are currently outside the buffer zone, in order to assist in the management of the property and broaden its understanding,*

   b) *Preventing tourism or other modern economic activities from overtaking the local traditional economy and disrupting the ancient agropastoral social system,*

   c) *Developing a strategy for the management of change in the property, based on the analysis of all possible natural or human-made risks and pressures in this specific geo-spatial context, and identifying relevant indicators for the long-term monitoring of local development processes. A specific focus should be placed on the risks associated with climate change and its consequences with regard to the water regime, the vegetation of the area, and the grazing system,*

   d) *Ensuring strict control over the installation of modern infrastructure and equipment in order to prevent any negative visual impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and ensuring that any such interventions respect the local character of the place,*

   e) *Avoiding any intervention, including mining and the extraction of minerals, which could potentially have a direct or indirect impact on the Outstanding Universal Value, authenticity and integrity of the property, and putting in place appropriate legal provisions to ensure the prevention of such interventions over the long term,*

   f) *Conducting a Heritage Impact Assessment or Environmental Impact Assessment for any planned development project that may have an impact on the Outstanding Universal Value, authenticity or integrity of the property, in line with paragraph 118bis of the* Operational Guidelines*;*

5. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2023**, a report on the implementation on the above-mentioned recommendations.*

Property	**Jomon Prehistoric Sites in Northern Japan**
ID. N°	**1632**
State Party	**Japan**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(iii)(v)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 339.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.37

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*

2. *Inscribes **Jomon Prehistoric Sites in Northern Japan, Japan**, on the World Heritage List on the basis of **criteria (iii)** and **(v)**;*

3. *Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:*

Brief synthesis

Jomon Prehistoric Sites in Northern Japan consists of 17 archaeological sites that represent the pre-agricultural lifeways and complex spiritual culture of a prehistoric people. Located on the southern part of Hokkaido Island and across the Tsugaru Strait on the northern part of the Tohoku region, this serial property attests to the emergence, development, and maturity of a sedentary hunter-fisher-gatherer society that developed in Northeast Asia from about 13,000 BCE to 400 BCE. The series of settlements, burial areas, ritual and ceremonial sites, stone circles, and earthworks is located in a variety of landforms such as

mountains, hills, plains, and lowlands, as well as near inner bays, lakes, and rivers.

This area of northern Japan had rich arborous and aquatic resources, with deciduous broad-leaved forests that featured abundant nut-bearing trees, as well as ideal fishing conditions created by the intersection of warm and cold currents off the coast. Over a period of more than 10,000 years, the Jomon people continued hunter-fisher-gatherer lifeways without changing to an agrarian culture, adapting to environmental changes such as climate warming and cooling and the corresponding marine transgression and regression.

The Jomon people initiated a sedentary way of life about 15,000 years ago, as indicated tentatively at first by the use of pottery, and later by the construction of more permanent dwellings and ritual sites, and the year-round exploitation of nearby resources. Already in the very early stage of sedentary life, the Jomon people developed a complex spiritual culture. They made graves and also created ritual deposits, artificial earthen mounds, and stone circles that were probably used for rituals and ceremonies, and confirmed a social bond across the generations and between the settlements.

***Criterion (iii)**: The Jomon Prehistoric Sites in Northern Japan bears exceptional testimony to a globally rare prehistoric sedentary hunter-fisher-gatherer society which nurtured a complex spiritual culture, as revealed by archaeological artefacts such as clay tablets with the impression of feet and the famous goggle-eyed dogu figurines, as well as remains including graves, ritual deposits, artificial earthen mounds, and stone circles.*

***Criterion (v)**: The Jomon Prehistoric Sites in Northern Japan are an outstanding example of sedentary modes of settlement and land-use from the emergence of sedentism through its subsequent development and ultimate maturity. The Jomon people maintained an enduring hunter-fisher-gatherer way of life by adapting to a changing climate without altering the land significantly, as was the case with agrarian societies. To secure food in a stable manner, diverse locations were selected for settlements, including near rivers where fish swimming upstream could be caught, in tidelands where brackish shellfish could be gathered, and near colonies of nut-bearing trees where nuts and berries could be collected. Skills and tools for obtaining food were developed in accordance with the specific conditions of different locations.*

Integrity

The integrity of the serial property is based on archaeological remains that exemplify the cultural traits and site types of the ancient Jomon culture in northern Japan. The property is comprised of archaeological sites that show the initiation of sedentism and the eventual separation between the residential area and burial areas; sites that show the diversity of settlement facilities during the warm marine transgression period, as well as hub settlements that have ritual places; and sites that demonstrate the maturity of sedentism through stone circles, cemeteries, and settlements. The sites also include, to a degree, their interaction with the environment. The component parts of the serial property are of adequate size individually, and as a group they include all important archaeological remains that constitute settlements and ceremonial spaces as well as landforms or features showing their locations and environment. The serial property is protected by law and does not suffer from the negative impacts of natural disasters or large-scale developments. There are, however, several modern constructions, referred to as "non-compliant elements", that have impacts on the views to and/or from the component parts. Plans to mitigate such impacts by planting tree covers, for example, or by removing the non-compliant elements in the future have been developed.

Authenticity

The serial property maintains a high level of authenticity in terms of locations, forms and designs, materials and substances, uses and functions, traditions and techniques, and spirit and feeling, most of the archaeological remains having been buried untouched for thousands of years; some remains, such as stone circles, are visible above ground. The archaeological remains can thus be said to credibly and truthfully convey the Outstanding Universal Value of the property as relates to the ancient Jomon culture in northern Japan.

In some cases, local authorities have developed life-size interpretive models of some key features, especially pit dwellings and shell middens. These models are intended to help explain to visitors some of the authentic elements that are otherwise concealed under a protective layer of soil. While the life-size models are presented as replicas, not reconstructions, and constructed so as not to have any impact on the archaeological deposits, new technologies are nevertheless explored to help visitors visualize some of the authentic archaeological features that must remain buried.

Management and protection requirements

All component parts of the property are designated and protected under the Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties as Historic Sites or Special Historic Sites, and strict long-term measures for protection and conservation are in place. In addition, an appropriate buffer zone has been delineated around each component part in which legal regulatory measures are in place to control activities with a view to ensuring the proper protection of the property.

A Comprehensive Preservation and Management Plan sets out the basic policies for sustaining the Outstanding Universal Value, authenticity, and integrity of the serial property in its entirety. Based on this plan, the Council for the Preservation and Utilization of World Heritage Jomon Prehistoric Sites and other organizations have been established. The conservation and management of the component parts is promoted in a comprehensive manner under the supervision of

the national government of Japan and in coordination with other related organizations. The local and prefectural governments in Hokkaido, Aomori, Iwate, and Akita in charge of each component part have developed individual management and utilization plans and have also incorporated the conservation, management, and utilization of the individual component parts in their basic administrative plans. The state of conservation of the individual component parts is monitored periodically and systematically, based on specific key indicators.

The key issue that requires long-term attention is that six of the component parts include privately owned areas. Acquiring the entirety of each component part will better ensure the implementation of correct and timely conservation activities.

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

   a) *Advancing the plan to acquire all areas of the component parts currently in private ownership,*

   b) *Removing non-compliant infrastructural elements or mitigating their impact,*

   c) *Extending the information on the archaeological records and the inventory of archaeological objects from the component parts (description of excavation and registration processes, and excavation reports),*

   d) *Adhering to the principles of good governance by maintaining an open mind concerning the inclusion of stakeholders not yet participating in the protection and management of the property, in line with paragraphs 40 and 117 of the* Operational Guidelines*,*

   e) *Supplying maps of all component parts of the serial property, showing a clear delimitation of the inscribed property, the buffer zones, the areas protected as (Special) Historic Sites, and the "Land Known to Contain Buried Cultural Properties".*

E.4. EUROPE - NORTH AMERICA

E.4.1. New Nominations

Property	**Nice, capital of Riviera tourism**
ID. N°	**1635**
State Party	**France**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(ii)(iv)(vi)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 350.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.38

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*

2. *Refers the nomination of* ***Nice, capital of Riviera tourism, France****, back to the State Party, in order to allow it to:*

   a) *Further revise the boundaries of the nominated property to reflect the historical timeframe between 1760 and the 1930s and the mapping of the key attributes that significantly express the interchange of influences, mainly in relation to developments in architecture,*

   b) *Finalise and officially approve the designation of the* Site Patrimonial Remarquable*, to ensure an adequate legal protection for the nominated property;*

3. *Recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following:*

   a) *Completing the ongoing inventory of built heritage, which will serve as a solid basis for conservation and management purposes,*

   b) *Documenting the interiors of the buildings and put measures in place for their protection, particularly in relation to adaptations to accommodate modern living and hospitality standards,*

   c) *Reinforcing monitoring indicators for slow changes to the attributes which can have negative cumulative effects over the long-term,*

   d) *Ensuring that mechanisms are in place to facilitate coordination between multiple actors with responsibilities for the management of the nominated property, its buffer zone and the wider setting,*

   e) *Carrying out a mid-term review of the management plan and evaluating its adequateness to effectively guide the protection and management of the nominated property and its buffer zone;*

4. *Also recommends that the name of the nominated property be changed to become "Nice, Winter Resort Town of the Riviera".*

Property	**ShUM Sites of Speyer, Worms and Mainz**
ID. N°	**1636**
State Party	**Germany**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(ii)(iii)(vi)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 363.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.39

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*
2. *Inscribes the **ShUM Sites of Speyer, Worms and Mainz, Germany**, on the World Heritage List on the basis of **criteria (ii), (iii)** and **(vi)**;*
3. *Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:*

Brief synthesis

ShUM Sites of Speyer, Worms and Mainz are located in the state of Rhineland-Palatinate, Germany. It is a serial property of four component parts, which are located in the Upper Rhine cathedral cities of Speyer, Worms and Mainz: Speyer Jewry-Court, Worms Synagogue Compound, Old Jewish Cemetery Worms, and Old Jewish Cemetery Mainz. The property is an exceptional testimony of Jewish communal diasporic life, from the 10th century onwards. The community centres and cemeteries date back to the origins of Jewish history beyond the Mediterranean region. ShUM is a traditional Hebrew acronym for the league of prominent qehillot of Ashkenazi Jews in Speyer, Worms and Mainz, made up from the initial letters of their Hebrew city names. The ShUM communities were uniquely connected by joint community ordinances, passed around 1220 and known as the Taqqanot Qehillot ShUM. The fundamentals of Ashkenazic Judaism were established between the 10th and 13th centuries: the scholars of Speyer, Worms and Mainz played a prominent role in this process. Their statutes are vividly reflected in the property by its architecture and the associated development of culture.

The unique community centres and cemeteries have had a lasting impact on the material Ashkenazic culture and are directly and tangibly associated with the creative achievements of the early Ashkenazic scholars.

***Criterion (ii):** The ShUM Sites of Speyer, Worms and Mainz are pioneering ensembles of Jewish diasporic community centres and cemeteries from the High Middle Ages. Their form and design influenced Jewish architectural design, ritual buildings and burial culture across Central Europe north of the Alps and northern France and England.*

***Criterion (iii):** The ShUM Sites of Speyer, Worms and Mainz provide a unique and exceptional testimony to the formation of European Jewish cultural tradition and identity. There is no other property with a comparable range of elements that can bear witness to such profound developments in the formation phase of the continuing cultural tradition of Ashkenazic Judaism. Their community centres and cemeteries form an exceptional complex of early religious sites that contributed profoundly to the creation of a distinctive cultural identity.*

***Criterion (vi):** The ShUM Sites of Speyer, Worms and Mainz, as the cradle of Ashkenazic Jewish living tradition, are directly and tangibly associated with a major group of the Jewish diaspora which settled in Europe in the High Middle Ages. There is no other location with a comparable range of Jewish community centres and cemeteries to bear witness to the cultural achievements of Ashkenazic Jews. The ShUM sites were treated as prime places of Jewish identity and of reflection on Jewish-Christian relations. The joint ordinances (Taqqanot ShUM) around 1220 constitute the most comprehensive corpus of Jewish community ordinances from medieval Ashkenaz. The writings of ShUM scholars, poets and community leaders during the 10th to the 13th centuries provide evidence of profound influence at a crucial point at the crossroads of cultural developments in Ashkenazic Judaism. Their writings are still part of Jewish tradition to this day.*

Integrity

The ShUM Sites of Speyer, Worms and Mainz include all elements necessary to express the Outstanding Universal Value. Altogether, they represent the closely linked cultural tradition of the qehillot ShUM in the cities of Speyer, Worms and Mainz and reflect the special contribution of each component part to the series. None of the component parts are threatened by development or neglect, each being afforded the strongest possible legal protection under the Monuments Protection Act of Rhineland-Palatinate (in accordance with Article 8 DSchG), and ongoing conservation of the property being adequately funded and well-supported by local communities.

Authenticity

The form and design, essential layout, spatial organisation of the ShUM Sites of Speyer, Worms and Mainz and the respective interrelationships and visual links between the elements within the component parts, together with their architectural forms and designs, reflect the significant and influential development of these sites in the High Middle Ages in a clear and unambiguous manner. Elements are well-preserved according to historical development from the 11th to the 14th centuries, with additions in the 17th century and interventions in the 20th century; post-trauma reconstructions have been carried out respectfully and have retained the heritage significance of the monuments. As early as the late-19th century, measures towards the protection of the substance were introduced. Each component part and their elements have been scientifically investigated from the middle of the 18th century, and their signification increasingly realised. Existing documentation is thorough, and research

continuous, thus enhancing knowledge of the property.

Management and protection requirements

The ShUM Sites of Speyer, Worms and Mainz are protected by national instruments of protection. The central instrument for the protection of the property at national level is the Federal Building Code (Baugesetzbuch – BauGB), and the State Building Ordinance of Rhineland-Palatinate (Landesbauordnung – LBauO) and the Monuments Protection Act of Rhineland-Palatinate (Denkmalschutzgesetz – DSchG). Being placed under protection in accordance with Article 8 DSchG, the property enjoys the strongest possible legal protection. The legal principles of regional and urban planning and the municipal legal regulations and statutes provide effective additional protection to the property, so as to guarantee that the attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value are protected from development, particularly in more dynamic urban areas.

A single Management Plan has been developed so that the protection and the integrated and coordinated management of the property are ensured. For implementing this plan, centrally coordinated management and monitoring groups have been organised in cooperation with the owners and other stakeholders. The cooperation of all those involved guarantees that statutory and legal provisions will be respected, and that ShUM Sites of Speyer, Worms and Mainz will be sustainably protected.

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

   a) *Approving and implementing the revised local building and construction plans,*

   b) *Monitoring closely potential developments in the setting of the component parts, particularly the cemeteries, given the high dynamicity of these urban areas,*

   c) *Finalising the joint interpretation strategy for the ShUM sites to ensure a coherent presentation of the whole property at each component part, and including in the presentation programme the reconstruction processes that have occurred at the Worms Synagogue Compound,*

   d) *Considering adopting mitigation measures for the potential visual impact of the upper part of the Hotel "Das Wormser", being built immediately outside the buffer zone of the Old Jewish Cemetery Worms,*

   e) *Considering developing performance indicators for the Management Plan.*

Property	**Frontiers of the Roman Empire – The Lower German Limes**
ID. N°	**1631**
States Parties	**Germany / Netherlands**
Criteria proposed by States Parties	**(ii)(iii)(iv)**

See IUCN Evaluation Book, 2021, page 375.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.40

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*

2. *Inscribes **Frontiers of the Roman Empire – The Lower German Limes, Germany** and the **Netherlands**, on the World Heritage List on the basis of **criteria (ii), (iii)** and **(iv)**;*

3. *Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:*

   Brief synthesis

   Frontiers of the Roman Empire – The Lower German Limes ran for 400 km along the Lower Rhine, along the north-eastern boundary of the Roman frontier province of Germania Inferior (Lower Germany), from the Rhenish Massif south of Bonn (Germany) to the North Sea coast (the Netherlands). For more than 450 years from the late 1st century BC, it protected the Roman Empire against Germanic tribes. The first military bases were built in the last decades BC for the conquest of Germanic territories across the Rhine. Once this ambition had failed the left river bank was converted into a fortified frontier. Military installations of varying types and sizes and associated civil structures and infrastructures were built on the edge of the river. The frontier shared the phased disintegration of the Western Roman Empire until the mid-5th century. The remains of the Frontier illustrate the important impacts of the Roman military presence on the landscape and society of the periphery of the Empire.

   The serial property of 102 component parts in 44 clusters illustrates the innovative responses of Roman military engineers to the challenges posed by the dynamic landscape of a lowland river, as witnessed by the positioning and design of the military installations and by water management works. Large early bases and small later strongholds are represented, reflecting strategic adaptation and development of military engineering. These first military bases represent the very beginning of the linear perimeter defence of the Roman Empire, which would develop into a coherent frontier system extending over three continents in the 2nd century AD. The wetland conditions have led to an outstanding preservation of timber and other organic remains, providing unparalleled insights into military construction, shipbuilding, logistics and supply of the Empire.

   ***Criterion (ii):** The extant remains of Frontiers of the Roman Empire – The Lower German Limes*

constitute significant elements of the Roman Frontiers present in Europe. With its legionary fortresses, forts, fortlets, watchtowers, linked infrastructure and civilian architecture, it exhibits an important cultural interchange at the height of the Roman Empire, through the development of Roman military architecture, extending the technical knowledge of construction and management to the very edges of the Empire. It reflects the imposition of a complex frontier system on the societies of the north-western part of the Roman Empire, introducing military installations and related civilian settlements, linked through an extensive supporting network. The frontier did not constitute an impregnable barrier, but controlled and allowed the movement of peoples including civilians and merchants, and profound changes and developments in settlement patterns, architecture, landscape design and spatial organisation.

Criterion (iii): *As part of the Roman Empire's system of defence, the Lower German Limes bears an exceptional testimony to the maximum extension of the power of the Roman Empire through the consolidation of its north-western frontiers. The Frontier constitutes a physical manifestation of Roman imperial policy, and the spread of Roman culture and its traditions – military, engineering, architecture, religion, management and politics. The large number of human settlements associated with the defences contribute to an understanding of how soldiers and their families lived in this part of the Roman Empire.*

Criterion (iv): *Frontiers of the Roman Empire – The Lower German Limes was the earliest linear frontier of the Roman Empire, created as an answer to Rome's inability to control its northern neighbours by means of diplomacy. Its military installations illustrate the development of the large operational bases of a field army to the smaller installations required by an extended frontier line. Situated in an area which has always been a wetland, with outstanding preservation conditions, Frontiers of the Roman Empire – The Lower German Limes exhibits water management strategies and constructions employed by the military command of the Roman Empire. The component parts contain organic materials and artefacts bearing information of exceptional value to understandings of frontier life and on vanished traditions such as river boat building.*

Integrity

The component parts of the serial property have been selected to represent the linearity and attributes of the Frontier, demonstrating the early development of the perimeter defence. They include the range of military installations and associated structures of a frontier system, explaining its functioning and development. The general state of conservation is good to very good. Most archaeological materials and structures are buried and are not exposed to significant threats. The component part boundaries and buffer zones are generally appropriate, although a number of minor revisions to the boundaries and buffer zones are recommended.

Authenticity

The archaeological sites that comprise the Frontiers of the Roman Empire – The Lower German Limes have a high level of authenticity. Virtually all the remains were buried during or soon after the Roman period and have been protected from later developments. The authenticity of form and design of nearly all elements is unaffected by changes after the Roman period. Stone walls, timber and organic remains have been preserved to a high level. The location and setting of the elements of the frontier have in most cases changed considerably by changes to the Rhine and changes in land use, including urbanisation. At four sites the present setting is reminiscent of the Roman landscape. Reconstructions occur at five sites and at others, interpretive visualisations have been established.

Management and protection requirements

The transnational serial property is legally protected by national and state laws on heritage protection of Germany (federal states of North Rhine-Westphalia and Rhineland-Palatinate) and the Netherlands. Management is coordinated by a joint Dutch-German Management Group, which is overseen by an Intergovernmental Committee. The joint Management Group sets out the main lines of the management and supervises the implementation of the national management plans and the periodic reporting, based on a Joint Declaration. The management organisation will cooperate with counterparts of the existing and future inscribed segments of the Frontiers of the Roman Empire. A framework for this international cooperation is provided by the Frontiers of the Roman Empire World Heritage Cluster set up in 2018 to support international collaboration in those fields relevant to the overall management and development of the Frontiers of the Roman Empire in Europe as World Heritage.

The Management Plan is strategic and high-level, and sets out the elements required for a common framework for the transnational serial property. Much of the needed detail will be developed at a later stage, including the development of individual site management plans. Recommendations for strengthening the management include the development of frameworks for research, interpretation and sustainable tourism, and establishment of Heritage Impact Assessment processes (for the component parts in Germany). Development of policy guidance on reconstructions and visualisations should be advanced through the transnational cooperation mechanisms established for the Frontiers of the Roman Empire.

4. *Recommends that the States Parties give consideration to the following:*

   a) *Completing the processes for legal designation of all component parts,*

   b) *Providing a timeframe for agreed minor revisions to the boundaries and buffer zones*

and any needed revisions to legal designations and municipal policy provisions,

c) Further developing the Management Plan to:

i) present the two national parts in a common format to assist clarity and integration,

ii) confirm the process and schedule for the timely development of site management plans for each of the component parts,

iii) provide active measures to mitigate the impact of agriculture on the component parts (and their buffer zones) located in areas subject to agricultural land uses (e.g. Kalkar-Bornsches Feld),

iv) conduct detailed deposit/cellar surveys for all component parts in urban areas to provide baseline data about the extent of surviving archaeological remains,

d) Developing a formal inter-agency management agreement between the Municipal Association of the Rhineland-Palatinate Service for Archaeological Heritage and the State Forestry Agency that includes an overarching plan and approach for managing all the component parts located within forests,

e) Developing a joint sustainable tourism strategy as part of the management system,

f) Establishing consistent baseline information for each component part and establishing a basis for consolidated information about the documentation and curation of cultural materials excavated from the sites (including repositories) to be accessed and shared as part of the management system,

g) Continuing to research and articulate a comprehensive and contextual appraisal of the character of the river corridor landscape, including changes to it during and after the Roman period, and the known locations of settlements in the wider setting,

h) Supporting continued research and interpretation that gives greater prominence to the historical peoples of the Lower Rhine regions, and articulating the interactions and exchanges between these peoples and Roman culture along the frontier,

i) Developing the overarching research strategy (2021-2024) for the Lower Limes as a whole, providing a framework for national strategies and partnerships,

j) Ensuring that active monitoring of water levels and water quality occurs for all component parts / clusters with waterlogged archaeological deposits, and that rigorous monitoring of the state of conservation of all organic materials is undertaken on a regular basis,

k) Prioritising further development of the detailed interpretation framework to:

i) present the linearity and the environmental context of the Lower German Limes, and the interconnectedness of the individual sites,

ii) review the proposals for component part Dormagen within the context of the Lower German Limes framework for interpretation and presentation,

iii) explore opportunities for the interpretation of component parts located in nature conservation areas and landscape protection areas, including engagement with younger-generation volunteers who have a strong interest in nature conservation,

l) Developing Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) processes for the component parts located in Germany in line with the ICOMOS HIA guidance document,

m) Subjecting the proposed business park development associated with the component parts at Valkenburg-De Woerd to a full HIA in relation to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property,

n) Establishing a process to develop an over-arching policy framework and guidance for reconstructions and visualisations through the transnational mechanisms of cooperation for existing and future segments of the Frontiers of the Roman Empire inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Property	**The Porticoes of Bologna**
ID. N°	**1650**
State Party	**Italy**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(ii)(iv)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 390.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.41

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*

2. *Defers the examination of the nomination of **The Porticoes of Bologna, Italy**, 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) Further research, document and explain the role that the Municipal Statutes of 1288 had on the relationship between public and private spaces in the medieval city, marking one of the decisive moments in the history of the capacity of the public authorities to assert their power and political control over the administration of a city,

b) Further research and document the evolution of the porticoes as a typology, from an

architectural element of a building into covered walkways with an urban function,

c) Refocus the justification for inscription from a catalogue of porticoes to a city of porticoes and reflect an urban system of covered walkways, which defines the urban identity of the city of Bologna, contributing to the sense of place and social dynamics,

d) Revise the boundaries to reflect not only the elements but also the interconnections of that system, by incorporating the functional links between the covered walkways within the perimeter of the nominated property,

e) Ensure that all component parts that would constitute the nominated property will have the highest level of protection available,

f) Revise and strengthen the management and monitoring system in light of the refocus of the nomination;

3. Considers that any revised nomination would need to be considered by an expert mission to the site.

Property	**Grobiņa archaeological ensemble**
ID. N°	**1637**
State Party	**Latvia**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(iii)**

See document WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1.Add

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.42

[See Addendum: WHC/21/44.COM/8B.Add]

Property	**Gdańsk Shipyard – the birthplace of "Solidarity" and the symbol of the Fall of the Iron Curtain in Europe**
ID. N°	**1629**
State Party	**Poland**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(iv)(vi)**

See document WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1.Add

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.43

[See Addendum: WHC/21/44.COM/8B.Add]

Property	**Petroglyphs of Lake Onega and the White Sea**
ID. N°	**1654**
State Party	**Russian Federation**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(i)(iii)(iv)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021 page 402.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.44

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,

*2. Refers the nomination of the **Petroglyphs of Lake Onega and the White Sea, Russian Federation**, back to the State Party, in order to allow it to:*

a) Adjust the boundaries of the nominated areas of both component parts, and consequently their buffer zones, to include archaeological heritage, including settlements, to ensure that all necessary attributes of the proposed justification for inscription of the petroglyphs at Lake Onega and the White Sea are included in the nominated areas,

b) Complete the process of legal designation of the component parts in the State Code of Especially Valuable Properties of Cultural Heritage of the Peoples of the Russian Federation,

c) Complete the process of establishing two Remarkable Places of Federal Significance cultural heritage sites, whose boundaries coincide with the buffer zones of both component parts,

d) Complete the process of establishing a centralised management system to ensure coordinated and integrated management of the two component parts,

e) Finalise the approval of the Management Plan with a set timeframe for policies and measures to be implemented,

f) Establish a conservation plan and a monitoring programme for the petroglyphs, dedicated to the systematic monitoring of the conservation of the nominated property;

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

a) Setting up an adequate documentation system and developing an operational and up-to-date database for the nominated property to ensure monitoring of its conservation,

b) Conducting a study on the impact of the alcohol solution used to remove lichen on the rock art,

c) Developing a specific Tourism Strategy for the nominated property,

d) Developing a Risk Preparedness Plan for the nominated property in order to address the

environmental pressures, and developing measures responding to potential natural disasters. This is particularly urgent at the Pavilion of Besovy Sledki and at Zalavruga to ensure their long-term conservation,

e) Submitting all projects planned at the nominated property and its buffer zones to an overall Heritage Impact Assessment, to ascertain whether they and the expected increase of tourism could have adverse impacts on the nominated component parts and on their setting, particularly where it is intact, as at Lake Onega,

f) Developing an ongoing programme of research within a research framework and linked with conservation strategies.

Property	**The works of Jože Plečnik in Ljubljana – Human Centred Urban Design**
ID. N°	**1643**
State Party	**Slovenia**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(i)(iv)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 414.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.45

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*
2. *Inscribes **The works of Jože Plečnik in Ljubljana – Human Centred Urban Design, Slovenia**, on the World Heritage List on the basis of **criterion (iv)**;*
3. *Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:*

Brief synthesis

The urban design for Ljubljana was conceived by Architect Jože Plečnik (1872–1957) in the period between the two World Wars. Following World War I and the disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, a desire to create independent nation states triggered various State and town building projects in Central and South-Eastern Europe. In the changed social contexts, the urban planners and architects introduced new urbanistic and architectural approaches under the influence of the Modernist movement. The transformation of Ljubljana from a peripheral town of the former Empire into a national capital emerged during the introduction of these modernist guidelines, although from entirely different architectural starting points.

The urban design of "Plečnik's Ljubljana" is based on an architectural dialogue between his interventions and the existing older city. Based on the man-made cityscape and its natural features, two urban axes were conceived: the land axis and the water axis. These two axes are connected by transversal axes, which help to form the urbanistic network of the city. The land axis – the Green Promenade starts at the Trnovo Bridge and runs through the Square of the French Revolution, along Vegova Street with the National and University Library, and ends at the Congress Square with Zvezda Park. Running parallel is the water axis – the Promenade along the Embankments and Bridges of the Ljubljanica River – which extends from the Trnovo district to the Sluice Gate. The historical city centre is connected with vital points in both the rural and urban suburbs, and with the broader spatial network of Ljubljana: the Church of St. Michael, the Church of St. Francis of Assisi, Plečnik's Žale – Garden of All Saints.

The city centre was interpreted anew and developed into a series of public spaces (squares, parks, streets, promenades, bridges) and public institutions (library, churches, markets, funerary complex).

The property is an outstanding example of urban renewal developed in the context of existing buildings and spaces and tailored to suit the inhabitants. Together, Plečnik's interventions have created a different type of urban space and architecture, which is not limited to a certain specific use, but instead gives rise to a connecting of the different uses and meanings and creates a new identity for the space. The architectural elements, types and spaces of classical architecture are innovatively summarised, transformed and modernised.

***Criterion (iv):** The interventions designed by the architect Jože Plečnik throughout the city of Ljubljana in the short period between the two World Wars combine to become an outstanding example of human-centred urban renewal for the purpose of nation building after the demise of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. They are based on a harmonic relationship with the context of the space and its natural possibilities. The city is not built anew but improved with small- or large-scale interventions – new architectural ensembles, buildings and urban accents. The relationship with the past is established in various ways, from adapting the urban network and incorporating existing structures through architectural reminiscences and by establishing new cityscapes. The new urban space is not limited to a specific use but has various functions and the whole is thus imbued with new meanings.*

Integrity

The urban design in Ljubljana, as a result of the intervention by Jože Plečnik, includes the readily identifiable characteristics of a symbolic capital city created between the two World Wars by the architect. Ljubljana's urban landscape comprehensively illustrates an upgrade of the existing space with regards to the topography and based on its continuous use and interpretation of historical layers. The topography of the space is expressed through the urban landscape design of the two axes: the land axis and the water axis. The design of both promenades originates and draws from the continuous use of the space, which

defines the positions and use of squares, markets, bridges, parks and other public spaces as well as buildings. A series of public spaces endows the city with public amenities, from spiritual spaces (the Churches of St. Michael and St. Francis of Assisi, Plečnik's Žale – The Garden of All Saints), spaces for relaxation (archaeological park along the Roman Walls, and promenades along the embankments of the Ljubljanica River, Trnovo Quay), to market activities (Plečnik's Market), socialising (Congress Square, the Three Bridges, the Cobblers' Bridge), and intellectual and cultural activities (Vegova Street, National and University Library).

A unified protection regime ensures that the currently unbuilt upon areas remain building-free, that the space preserves its traditional use, and provides comprehensive protection from interventions that could potentially endanger the integrity of the serial property.

Authenticity

The serial property has maintained its original urban design and characteristics, in which the preservation and enhancement of the context of the space are reflected. The serial component parts have faithfully preserved their original design in the exterior arrangements, in the interiors as well as on the facades, in the interior furnishings and the masterful attention to detail. The building materials were reinforced in most components in the 1990s, but regardless of the individual repairs or conservation and restoration interventions, which were a consequence of continuous use, material authenticity in general has not been compromised. Larger urbanistic areas have remained unchanged; in some cases, repairs were performed in order to meet the requirements of modern use and ensure the greater safety and structural stability of the property. With few exceptions, the original functions and uses of all components and their features are preserved and the outdoor spaces are accessible to the public. The characteristics of the original urban design have been preserved as well, although partial changes have appeared due to the overgrowth of the original vegetation and in some places the pressure of local traffic, which has been strategically addressed over the course of the previous decade.

Management and protection requirements

Plečnik's architectural heritage is a monument of national importance and is protected by the Ordinance designating the Ljubljana work of the architect Jože Plečnik as a cultural monument of national importance (Official Gazette RS, Nos. 51/09, 88/14, 19/16, 76/17 and 17/18). The Ordinance represents a single comprehensive protection mechanism for the entire immovable and movable heritage of the serial property.

All of the serial component parts have conservation plans that form the basis for any interventions on the monuments. Works are coordinated by the Institute for the Protection of Cultural Heritage (IPCHS) and supervised by the specially-appointed conservator for Plečnik's heritage. The management system complements the existing system for the preservation of architect Jože Plečnik's heritage in Ljubljana from the professional, organisational as well as legal and financial perspectives, and involves owners, managers and public bodies alike. The management of the property operates on two levels. All component parts have their specific management plans and procedures for the implementation and approval of such plans. State of conservation is monitored by the IPCHS, with a special emphasis on the factors likely to affect the property, in particular development pressures and tourism. The coordination of individual owners, managers, public institutions and professional bodies that form the Management Body is ensured by a joint manager that has overall responsibility for the implementation of a joint management plan. The Museum of Architecture and Design of Ljubljana, as an appointed joint manager, cooperates with those institutions at the state and local level that are responsible for protection, monitoring, presentation, education and research, promotion and cultural tourism.

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

   a) *Submitting a minor boundary modification of the extended buffer zones, when formalised, with an updated map showing the property and the buffer zones' boundaries, indicating the total area of the buffer zones in hectares; considering submitting in the future a minor boundary modification with a view to including relevant transversal axes, if their state of conservation could be improved to fully meet the conditions of authenticity and integrity,*

   b) *Submitting to the World Heritage Centre a complete Heritage Impact Assessment for the planned new library building in Emonska Street for review by the Advisory Bodies, before irreversible decisions are made,*

   c) *Retaining or reinstating original vegetation species of the landscaping designs wherever possible and appropriate,*

   d) *Ensuring subtle differentiation of additions and repairs from the original substance, where appropriate, and avoiding mimetic additions that would try to complete Plečnik's original work,*

   e) *Developing a joint visitor and interpretation scheme that will link the serial component parts in the suburbs to those in the city centre,*

   f) *Undertaking further detailed identification of the relationships between Plečnik's interventions and pre-existing buildings and spaces, to allow appropriate protection measures to be put in place for the latter, relative to the role they play in supporting the Outstanding Universal Value,*

g) *Carrying out Heritage Impact Assessments for all development proposals within the property or its buffer zones.*

Property	**Ribeira Sacra**
ID. N°	**1639**
State Party	**Spain**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(iii)(iv)(v)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 425.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.46

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*
2. *Decides not to inscribe* ***Ribeira Sacra, Spain,*** *on the World Heritage List.*

Property	**The Slate Landscape of Northwest Wales**
ID. N°	**1633**
State Party	**United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(ii)(iv)(v)**

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 437.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.47

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*
2. *Inscribes* ***The Slate Landscape of Northwest Wales, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland****, on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape on the basis of* ***criteria (ii)*** *and* ***(iv)****;*
3. *Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:*

Brief synthesis

The Slate Landscape of Northwest Wales is located in the United Kingdom, in the mountains of Snowdon massif. Six areas together represent an exceptional example of an industrial landscape which was profoundly shaped by quarrying and mining slate, and transporting it for national and international markets. From 1780 to 1940 this industry dominated world production of roofing slates, transforming both the environment and the communities who lived and worked here. The quarries and mines are monumental in scale, comprising stepped hillside workings, deep pits and cavernous underground chambers, massive cascading tips, ingenious water systems, and a range of industrial buildings. Outstanding technical equipment and major engineering features survive. Innovative transport systems linked quarries and processing sites with purpose-built coastal export harbours and with main-line railways. Grand country houses and estates built by leading industrialists contrast with workers' vernacular settlements, with their characteristic chapels and churches, band-rooms, schools, libraries and meeting-places.

By the late 19th century, the region produced about a third of the world output of roofing slates and architectural slabs. Its use in terraced houses, factories, warehouses and elite architecture contributed to rapid global urbanization. It influenced building styles, encouraging the shallow-pitched roofs of the Georgian order. Technologies that were innovated, adopted and adapted in the property include the ingenious application of waterpower, the development of bulk handling systems and the first known application of the circular saw for cutting stone. These were diffused by specialists and by emigration of skilled Welsh quarrymen to the developing slate industries of the United States, continental Europe and Ireland. The Snowdon massif's narrow-gauge railway systems gained global influence and were adopted from Asia and America to Africa and Australasia.

Criterion (ii)*: The Slate Landscape of Northwest Wales exhibits an important interchange, particularly in the period from 1780 to 1940, on developments in architecture and technology. Slate has been quarried in the mountains of Northwest Wales since Roman times, but sustained large-scale production from the late 18th to the early 20th centuries dominated the global market as a roofing element. This led to major transcontinental developments in building and architecture. Technology, skilled workers and knowledge transfer from this cultural landscape was fundamental to the development of the slate industry of continental Europe and the United States. Moreover, its narrow-gauge railways – which remain in operation under steam today – served as the model for successive systems which contributed substantially to the social and economic development of regions in many other parts of the world.*

Criterion (iv)*: The Slate Landscape of Northwest Wales is an outstanding example of a stone quarrying and mining landscape which illustrates the extent of transformation of an agricultural environment during the Industrial Revolution. Massive deposits of high-quality slate defined the principal geological resource of the challenging mountainous terrain of the Snowdon massif. Their dispersed locations represent concentrated nodes of exploitation and settlement, of sustainable power generated by prolific volumes of water that was harnessed in ingenious ways, and brought into being several innovative and technically advanced railways that made their way to new coastal ports built to serve this transcontinental export trade. The property comprises the most exceptional distinct landscapes that, together, illustrate the diverse heritage of a much wider landscape that was created during the era of British industrialisation.*

Integrity

The property contains all of the essential elements that convey attributes of Outstanding Universal Value. Its boundaries capture the principal non-active slate-producing areas in Northwest Wales, together with their associated industrial heritage that includes the most significant processing facilities, settlements and transport routes. The protective mechanisms in place should be consistently used to strengthen the integrity of the property and its setting.

Authenticity

The well-preserved cultural landscape retains a high level of authenticity, and has experienced little intervention since the main period of industrial operation. Attributes of Outstanding Universal Value are conveyed by physical elements that are clearly identified and understood in terms of date, spatial distribution, use and function (including living communities and operational railways), form and design, materials and substance, and their interrelationships including connectivity and overall functional and compositional integrity of the series. The serial property further embodies a vibrant cultural tradition, including slate-working skills and the continued widespread use of the Welsh language. Key attributes are reflected in landscape qualities and features of quarrying including the relict working areas, tips and transport routes, together with associated settlements and social infrastructure. The historical settlements present different yet acceptable levels of authenticity, which need to be closely monitored and controlled by the management system and respective Local Management Plans.

Management and protection requirements

The serial property and its setting are afforded the highest levels of protection through the implementation of existing legislation: The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, The Town and Country Planning Act 1990, The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, The Historic Environment (Wales) Act 2016 and through implementation of policies within the Gwynedd and Anglesey Joint Local Development Plan and Snowdonia National Park Authority Local Development Plan.

Attributes of Outstanding Universal Value have been defined and articulated in The Slate Landscape of Northwest Wales Property Management Plan which establishes the over-arching strategies and mechanisms by which the serial property will be managed. This is complemented at local level by a series of Local Management Plans, developed in collaboration with landowners, which include site-specific information and practical recommendations. Responsibility for the implementation of the Management Plan will sit with a multi-organisational Partnership Steering Group established by the lead organization, to which an appointed World Heritage Coordinator will report. All of the serial component parts of the property lie within areas of Wales that are already subject to strong levels of landscape protection through designation as a National Park and registration as Landscapes of Outstanding Historic Interest. These will serve as an added layer of protection to the setting and key views into and out of the serial property, through a strict enforcement of the statutory mechanisms in place. There is no active quarrying or mining within the serial property; mineral activity takes place in the wider protected area outside the boundaries of the serial property. The application of existing statutory management procedures will ensure this does not negatively impact upon the Outstanding Universal Value of the serial property.

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

   a) *Developing an in-depth analysis and inventory of the key views of the serial property to serve as a basis for the conservation of the setting,*

   b) *Addressing the conservation issues in the relict quarries, industrial buildings and relict roads,*

   c) *Completing the scheduling and listing of the proposed Scheduled Monuments and Conservation Areas,*

   d) *Completing the Local Management Plans,*

   e) *Completing the Tourism Strategy and implementing the Interpretation Strategy and visitor Management Plan in order to present the World Heritage values at serial component parts level,*

   f) *Monitoring the effectiveness of the planning system to protect the living urban areas, and considering extending the Conservation Areas in the historical settlements within the serial property,*

   g) *Setting up a monitoring framework and key indicators to assess the management effectiveness of the property,*

   h) *Integrating the World Heritage attributes in the existing online databases and documentation to inform at an early stage about the World Heritage property, ensuring the consideration of these in all planning processes,*

   i) *Agreeing with the companies undertaking mineral operations in the wider protected area at an early stage on the restoration measures to be undertaken after the cessation of the activity to avoid negative impacts on the integrity and authenticity of the property.*

E.5. LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

E.5.1. New Nominations

Property	**Settlement and Artificial Mummification of the Chinchorro Culture in the Arica and Parinacota Region**
ID. N°	**1634**
State Party	**Chile**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(iii)(v)**

See document WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1.Add

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.48

[See Addendum: WHC/21/44.COM/8B.Add]

E.5.2. Significant boundary modifications of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List

Property	**Franciscan Ensemble of the Monastery and Cathedral of Our Lady of the Assumption of Tlaxcala [extension of "Earliest 16th-Century Monasteries on the Slopes of Popocatepetl"]**
ID. N°	**702 Bis**
State Party	**Mexico**
Criteria proposed by State Party	**(ii)(iv)**

See document WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1.Add

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.49

[See Addendum: WHC/21/44.COM/8B.Add]

III. EXAMINATION OF MINOR BOUNDARY MODIFICATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES ALREADY INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST SUBMITTED FOR EXAMINATION IN 2020

Alphabetical Summary Table and Index of Recommendations by ICOMOS and IUCN to the extended 44th session of the World Heritage Committee (16 - 31 July 2021)

State Party	World Heritage property	ID No.		Recommendation
	NATURAL PROPERTIES			
China	Hubei Shennongjia	1509	Bis	OK
Russian Federation	Volcanoes of Kamchatka	765	Ter	NA
	CULTURAL PROPERTIES			
Canada	Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump	158	Bis	OK
France	Abbey Church of Saint-Savin sur Gartempe	230	Quater	R
France	Paris, Banks of the Seine	600	Bis	R/NA
Holy See / Italy	Historic Centre of Rome, the Properties of the Holy See in that City Enjoying Extraterritorial Rights and San Paolo Fuori le Mura	91	Quater	R
Honduras	Maya Site of Copan	129	Bis	OK
Italy	Historic Centre of Florence	147	Ter	OK
Italy	Ivrea, industrial city of the 20th century	1538	Bis	OK
Ukraine	Kyiv: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra	527	Ter	OK
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Durham Castle and Cathedral	370	Ter	R

KEY

OK Approval Recommended
R Referral
NA Approval Not recommended

A. NATURAL PROPERTIES

A.1. ASIA - PACIFIC

Property	Hubei Shennongjia
ID No.	1509 Bis
State Party	China

See IUCN Evaluation Book, 2021, page 53.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.50

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B2,*
2. *Recalling Decision **40 COM 8B.7** adopted at its 40th session (Istanbul/UNESCO Headquarters, 2016),*
3. *Approves the proposed minor boundary modification for **Hubei Shennongjia, China**;*
4. *Encourages the State Party to continue enhancing connectivity conservation measures, so as to fully implement Decision **40 COM 8B.7**, and including in particular the connection between the two component parts of the property;*
5. *Recalling its request to the State Party on relocation from the property made in Decision **40 COM 8B.7**, requests the State Party to apply this request also in the modified property ensuring that any relocation activities are voluntary and fully respect international norms, and that further relocation activities should not be undertaken unless they are fully justified;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit by **1 February 2022** the revised management plan for the property, including a confirmation of national park status for the property and on how potentially increased demands for visitation will be managed, including through the current Tourism Master Plan.*

A.2. EUROPE - NORTH AMERICA

Property	Volcanoes of Kamchatka
ID No.	765 Ter
State Party	Russian Federation

See IUCN Evaluation Book, 2021, page 59.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.51

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B2,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **20 COM VIIIA**, **25 COM XB**, **32 COM 7B.23**, **35 COM 8D** and **42 COM 7B.79** adopted at its 20th (Mérida, 1996), 25th (Helsinki, 2001), 32nd (Quebec City, 2008), 35th (UNESCO Headquarters, 2011) and 42nd (Manama, 2018) sessions respectively,*
3. *Does not to approve the proposed minor boundary modification of the **Volcanoes of Kamchatka, Russian Federation.***

B. CULTURAL PROPERTIES

B.1. EUROPE - NORTH AMERICA

Property	Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump
ID No.	158 Bis
State Party	Canada

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 276.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.52

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*
2. *Approves the proposed minor boundary modification of **Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump, Canada**.*

Property	Abbey Church of Saint-Savin sur Gartempe
ID No.	230 Quater
State Party	France

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 288.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.53

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*
2. *Refers the proposed buffer zone for the **Abbey Church of Saint-Savin sur Gartempe, France**, back to the State Party in order to allow it to:*
   a) *Provide a map of the revised buffer zone boundaries at a more appropriate scale, in accordance with the* Operational Guidelines*,*
   b) *Provide a timetable for taking the enlarged buffer zone into account in the tools for planning and heritage / landscape protection,*
   c) *Clarify the way in which the buffer zone will be managed and how coordination with the management of the property will be organized.*

Property	Paris, Banks of the Seine
ID No.	600 Bis
State Party	France

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 278.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.54

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*
2. *Does not to approve the proposed minor modification to the boundary of **Paris, Banks of the Seine, France;***
3. *Refers the proposed buffer zone for **Paris, Banks of the Seine, France**, back to the State Party in order to allow it to set out more clearly the rationale for the delineation of buffer zone boundaries, in relation to*

views, potential threats, and to how they might support the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;

4. *Recommends that before any new proposals are submitted, either for the property boundaries or for a buffer zone, a Management Plan for the property is prepared.*

Property	Historic Centre of Rome, the Properties of the Holy See in that City Enjoying Extraterritorial Rights and San Paolo Fuori le Mura
ID No.	91 Quater
States Parties	Holy See / Italy

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 290.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.55

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*
2. *Refers the proposed buffer zone of the **Historic Centre of Rome, the Properties of the Holy See in that City Enjoying Extraterritorial Rights and San Paolo Fuori le Mura, Holy See** and **Italy**, back to the States Parties in order to allow them to:*
   a) *Consider extension of the proposed boundary of the buffer zone based on further examination of the conceptual and physical interconnections between the property and its immediate setting,*
   b) *Provide further details on the mechanisms in place in the proposed buffer zone to assess the impact of development projects on the World Heritage property,*
   c) *Indicate how and when the delimitations of the proposed buffer zone will be transcribed into existing local and national regulations in order to provide a statutory status to its boundaries;*
3. *Recommends that the States Parties complete the Management Plan of the World Heritage property urgently.*

Property	Historic Centre of Florence
ID No.	147 Ter
State Party	Italy

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 282.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.56

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*
2. *Approves the proposed minor modification to the boundary of the **Historic Centre of Florence, Italy.***

Property	Ivrea, industrial city of the 20th century
ID No.	1538 Bis
State Party	Italy

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 284.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.57

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*
2. *Approves the proposed minor modification to the boundary of **Ivrea, industrial city of the 20th century, Italy**;*
3. *Requests the State Party to provide the surface areas of the inscribed property and its buffer zone in number of hectares following the minor boundary modification;*
4. *Recommends that the State Party provide maps with updated cadastral information that show the existing building stock of the inscribed property and its buffer zone.*

Property	Kyiv: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra
ID No.	527 Ter
State Party	Ukraine

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 293.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.58

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*
2. *Approves the proposed buffer zone for **Kyiv: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra, Ukraine;***
3. *Recommends that the State Party gives consideration to the following:*
   a) *Updating the management plan as soon as possible, and submitting it to the World Heritage Centre for examination,*
   b) *Implementing the rules of the buffer zone and ensuring that the protection and management provisions are strictly implemented and enforced,*
   c) *Ensuring that the effectiveness of the buffer zone is monitored.*

Property	Durham Castle and Cathedral
ID No.	370 Ter
State Party	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 286.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.59

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*
2. *Refers the proposed minor modification of the boundaries of the **Durham Castle and Cathedral, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland**, back to the State Party in order to allow it to:*
   a) *Consider an extension to the proposed limits on the outer riverbanks of the Wear so as to include not only the wooded areas but also the spaces in between,*
   b) *Clarify the protection measures to be applied to the enlarged area;*
3. *Recommends that the State Party give consideration to creating a buffer zone, based on the existing Conservation area, in order to protect all the "key views to and from the Castle, Cathedral and town".*

B.2. LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

Property	Maya Site of Copan
ID No.	129 Bis
State Party	Honduras

See ICOMOS Evaluation Book, 2021, page 296.

Draft Decision: 44 COM 8B.60

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/21/44.COM/8B and WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B1,*
2. *Approves proposed buffer zone for the **Maya Site of Copan, Honduras;***
3. *Recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following:*
   a) *Closely working with the private owners of the land included in zone 2 in order to achieve the best possible protection of the World Heritage property and its value,*
   b) *Applying as strictly as possible the Law for the Protection of Cultural Heritage with the aim to protect all relevant elements pertaining to the National Monument within the Copan Valley.*

IV. RECORD OF THE PHYSICAL ATTRIBUTES OF EACH SITE BEING DISCUSSED AT THE EXTENDED 44TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Of the 45 sites being discussed, 27 are serial proposals, containing a total of 464 component parts.

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
43 COM (2019)	38	21%N/M – 79%C	70 mil. ha	99.8%N/M – 0.2%C	23
44 COM (2020)	26	23%N/M - 77%C	0.33 mil ha	69%N/M - 31%C	13
44 COM (2021)	19	11%N/M - 89%C	0.5 mil ha	75%N/M - 25%C	14

The tables below present the information in four 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 of the 26 sites proposed for examination in 2020; and

B. a set of separate tables presenting the component parts of each of the 13 proposed serial sites proposed for examination in 2020;

C. 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 of the 19 sites proposed for examination in 2021; and

D. a set of separate tables presenting the component parts of each of the 14 proposed serial sites proposed for examination in 2021.

A. Table of the surface areas and buffer zones of sites proposed for examination in 2020

-- = 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					
Georgia	Colchic Rainforests and Wetlands	1616		31253	26850	See serial nomination table
Japan	Amami-Oshima Island, Tokunoshima Island, Northern part of Okinawa Island, and Iriomote Island	1574		42698	24467	See serial nomination table
Republic of Korea	Getbol, Korean Tidal Flat	1591		128411	74592	See serial nomination table
Slovenia	Classical Karst	1615		25461	58339	N45 46 07 E14 21 39
Thailand	Kaeng Krachan Forest Complex	1461	Rev	408.9	242.778	N12 51 56.4 E99 24 00.6
	TOTAL			**228231.9**	**184490.8**	
	MIXED SITES					
Ethiopia	*Holqa* Sof Umar: Natural and Cultural Heritage (Sof	1516		793.02	1307.35	N6 54 22.7 E40 50 41.6

State Party	World Heritage nomination	ID N		Area (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Centre point coordinates
	Umar: Caves of Mystery)					
	TOTAL			**793**	**1307**	
	CULTURAL SITES					
Austria / Belgium / Czech Republic / France / Germany / Italy / United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	The Great Spas of Europe	1613		7006	11319	See serial nomination table
Austria / Germany / Hungary / Slovakia	Frontiers of the Roman Empire – The Danube Limes (Western Segment)	1608	Rev	1580.0483	4485.1674	See serial nomination table
Belgium / Netherlands	Colonies of Benevolence	1555	Rev	2012	--	See serial nomination table
Brazil	Sítio Roberto Burle Marx	1620		40.53	575	S23 01 20.56 W43 32 46.4
China	Quanzhou: Emporium of the World in Song-Yuan China	1561	Rev	536.08	11126.02	See serial nomination table
Dominican Republic	Historical and Archaeological Site of La Isabela	1628		44.13	278.81	N19 53 16.8 W71 04 48.5
France	Le phare de Cordouan	1625		17015.0957	83879.8361	N45 35 10.7 W1 10 24
Germany	Mathildenhöhe Darmstadt	1614		5.37	76.54	See serial nomination table
Greece	Fortress of Spinalonga	1617		8.5	1555.4	E25 44 17.65 N35 17 52.29
India	The Glorious Kakatiya Rudreshwara (Ramappa) Temple at Palampet (Mulugu District), Telangana State, India	1570		5.93	66.27	N18 15 32.88 E79 56 35.54
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Trans-Iranian Railway	1585		5784	32755	N35 39 29.9 E51 23 54
Italy	'Padova *Urbs picta*', Giotto's Scrovegni Chapel and Padua's fourteenth-century fresco cycles	1623		19.96	530	See serial nomination table
Mongolia	Deer Stone Monuments and Related Sites, the Heart of Bronze Age Culture	1621		9768.03	32325.19	See serial nomination table
Netherlands	Dutch Water Defence Lines [extension of "Defence Line of Amsterdam", inscribed in 1996]	759	Bis	54779.02	191722.64	See serial nomination table
Peru	Chankillo Solar Observatory and ceremonial center	1624		4480	43990	See serial nomination table
Romania	Roșia Montană Mining Landscape	1552	Rev	ng	341.42	N46 18 22 E23 07 50
Saudi Arabia	Himā Cultural Precinct	1619		242.17	31757.83	See serial nomination table
Spain	Paseo del Prado and Buen Retiro, a landscape of Arts and Sciences	1618		218.91	--	N40 24 55.2 W3 41 13.4
Turkey	Arslantepe Mound	1622		4.85	74.07	N38 22 58.00 E38 21 47.43
Uruguay	The work of engineer Eladio Dieste: Church of Atlántida	1612		0.56	69.5	S34 44 38.11 W55 45 59.07
	TOTAL			**103551.2**	**4446927.7**	

B. Serial nomination tables of sites proposed for examination in 2020

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

Natural sites

	Georgia			
N 1616	Colchic Rainforests and Wetlands			
Serial ID No.	**Name**	**Property (ha)**	**Buffer zone (ha)**	**Centre point coordinates**
1616-001	Kintrishi-Mtirala	20150	9140	N41 42 08.2080 E41 57 04.3200
1616-002	Ispani	248	531	N41 51 43.2720 E41 48 05.5080
1616-003	Grigoleti	125	328	N42 03 11.7720 E41 44 19.6080
1616-004	Imnati	3418	13386	N42 06 35.8920 E41 47 19.6800
1616-005	Pitshora	2393		N42 10 52.0932 E41 48 36.3024
1616-006	Nabada	2976	2586	N42 14 27.0924 E41 39 57.8916
1616-007	Churia	1943	879	N42 17 58.0920 E41 39 44.2440
	TOTAL	**31253**	**26850**	

	Japan			
N 1574	Amami-Oshima Island, Tokunoshima Island, 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	11640	14663	N28 16 44.969 E129 22 41.886
1574-002	Tokunoshima Island (a)	1724	1813	N27 45 48.136 E128 58 01.962
1574-003	Tokunoshima Island (b)	791	999	N27 51 48.4 E128 55 46.2
1574-004	Northern part of Okinawa Island	7721	3398	N26 43 29.212 E128 13 12.382
1574-005	Iriomote Island	20822	3594	N24 19 34.257 E123 48 31.486
	TOTAL	**42698**	**24467**	

	Republic of Korea			
N 1591	Getbol, Korean Tidal Flat			
Serial ID No.	**Name**	**Property (ha)**	**Buffer zone (ha)**	**Centre point coordinates**
1591-001	Seocheon Getbol	6809	3657	N36 02 43.01 E126 36 49.69
1591-002	Gochang Getbol	5531	1880	N35 33 06.67 E126 32 01.35
1591-003	Shinan Getbol	110086	67254	N34 49 43.76 E126 06 16.00
1591-004	Boseong-Suncheong Getbol	5985	1801	N34 48 15.6 E127 26 08.4
	TOTAL	**128411**	**74592**	

Cultural sites

	Austria / Belgium / Czechia / France / Germany / Italy / United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland				
C 1613	The Great Spas of Europe				
Serial ID No.	**Name**	**State Party**	**Property (ha)**	**Buffer zone (ha)**	**Centre point coordinates**
1613-001	Baden bei Wien	Austria	343	555	N48 00 36 E16 14 01
1613-002	Spa	Belgium	772	1536	N50 29 32 E05 52 01
1613-003	Frantiskovy Lazne	Czech Republic	367	872	N50 07 02 E12 21 02
1613-004	Karlovy Vary	Czech Republic	1123	1029	N50 13 23 E12 53 01
1613-005	Marianske Lazne	Czech Republic	835	3677	N49 58 38 E12 42 24
1613-006	Vichy	France	68	253	N46 07 25 E03 25 13
1613-007	Bad Ems	Germany	80	155	N50 19 50 E07 43 43
1613-008	Baden-Baden	Germany	230	2377	N48 45 27 E08 14 33
1613-009	Bad Kissingen	Germany	212	524	N50 11 52 E10 04 30
1613-010	Montecatini Terme	Italy	114	341	N43 53 19 E10 46 46
1613-011	City of Bath	United Kingdom	2870	--	N51 22 52.7 W2 21 32.6
	TOTAL		**7006**	**11319**	

	Austria / Germany / Hungary / Slovakia				
C 1608 rev	Frontiers of the Roman Empire – The Danube Limes (Western Segment)				
Serial ID No.	**Name**	**State Party**	**Property (ha)**	**Buffer zone (ha)**	**Centre point coordinates**
1608rev-001	Bad Gögging – Heilbad	Germany	0.3100	--	N48 49 33.3 E11 46 52.8
1608rev-002	Eining-Weinberg – Wachtturm und Heiligtum	Germany	0.9600	27.14	N48 51 50.9 E11 47 18.8
1608rev-003	Weltenburg-Am Galget – Kleinkastell	Germany	0.8400	0.86	N48 53 20.4 E11 49 31.9
1608rev-004	Regensburg Großprüfening – Kastell und Vicus	Germany	16.8600	3.28	N49 01 05.4 E12 02 15.7
1608rev-005	Regensburg Kumpfmühl – Kastell und Vicus I	Germany	3.3000	--	N49 00 28.9 E12 05 00.7
1608rev-006	Regensburg Kumpfmühl – Kastell und Vicus II	Germany	1.7300	--	N49 00 26.3 E12 05 05.3
1608rev-007	Regensburg – Legionslager I	Germany	0.0279		N49 01 12.5 E12 05 55.5
1608rev-008	Regensburg – Legionslager II	Germany	0.0122		N49 01 12.4 E12 05 57.4
1608rev-009	Regensburg – Legionslager III	Germany	0.0021		N49 01 11.7 E12 06 05.7
1608rev-010	Regensburg – Legionslager IV	Germany	0.0062		N49 01 11.3 E12 06 05.9
1608rev-011	Regensburg – Legionslager V	Germany	0.0336		N49 01 10.2 E12 06 05.8
1608rev-012	Regensburg – Legionslager VI	Germany	0.0265	124.0635	N49 01 00.7 E12 06 04.1
1608rev-013	Regensburg – Legionslager VII	Germany	0.0080		N49 00 57.4 E12 06 03.9
1608rev-014	Regensburg – Legionslager VIII	Germany	0.0625		N49 00 54.6 E12 06 02.6
1608rev-015	Regensburg Niedermünster – Legionslager	Germany	0.1433		N49 01 10.3 E12 06 03.2
1608rev-016	Regensburg – Westliche Canabae	Germany	0.2773		N49 01 11.7 E12 05 16.4
1608rev-017	Regensburg – Östliche Canabae	Germany	1.3578		N49 01 08.0 E12 06 27.9
1608rev-018	Regensburg – Großes Gräberfeld	Germany	0.1015	--	N49 00 43.6 E12 05 11.8
1608rev-019	Straubing – Ostkastell	Germany	5.5237	44.1279	N48 53 17.1 E12 35 43.8

1608rev-020	Straubing – Kastell St. Peter	Germany	0.7558	--	N48 53 10.9 E12 35 17.6
1608rev-021	Künzing – Amphitheater und Vicus	Germany	2.6661	25.8821	N48 40 00.2 E13 04 58.0
1608rev-022	Passau Altstadt – Kastell	Germany	0.9327	6.6417	N48 34 27.4 E13 28 18.3
1608rev-023	Passau Boiotro – Kastell	Germany	0.2300	0.6826	N48 34 11.8 E13 27 43.5
1608rev-024	Passau Haibach – Burgus	Germany	0.0145	0.0825	N48 34 28.3 E13 29 51.7
1608rev-025	Oberranna – Kleinkastell	Austria	0.1484	--	N48 28 17.3 E13 46 26.4
1608rev-026	Schlögen– Vicus	Austria	0.4159	--	N48 25 23.0 E13 52 01.3
1608rev-027	Schlögen– Kastell	Austria	0.9276	--	N48 25 28.1 E13 52 12.6
1608rev-028	Hirschleitengraben–Wachtturm	Austria	0.1647	0.2093	N48 18 27.6 E14 13 29.0
1608rev-029	Linz – Siedlung Martinsfeld	Austria	0.1538	0.7875	N48 18 16.7 E14 16 46.8
1608rev-030	Linz – Befestigung Schlossberg	Austria	0.0653	--	N48 18 18.9 E14 16 53.3
1608rev-031	Enns – Gräberstraße	Austria	1.2377		N48 13 02.3 E14 27 36.1
1608rev-032	Enns – CanabaESüdwest	Austria	3.0686		N48 13 00.2 E14 27 56.7
1608rev-033	Enns – St. Laurenz	Austria	0.1117		N48 13 06.8 E14 28 00.0
1608rev-034	Enns – CanabaENordwest	Austria	9.2920	74.1935	N48 13 27.6 E14 27 59.6
1608rev-035	Enns – CanabaENordost	Austria	15.3126		N48 13 25.7 E14 28 32.7
1608rev-036	Enns – Legionslager Zentralbereich	Austria	3.1341		N48 13 13.1 E14 28 33.9
1608rev-037	Enns – Legionslager Nordecke	Austria	2.3113		N48 13 19.8 E14 28 30.8
1608rev-038	Albing – Legionslager	Austria	21.9472	4.2234	N48 13 34.3 E14 33 02.5
1608rev-039	WallseE– Kastell	Austria	0.6875	10.3598	N48 10 00.4 E14 42 56.9
1608rev-040	WallseE– Kleinkastell	Austria	0.2282		N48 10 00.1 E14 43 02.5
1608rev-041	Ybbs – Kleinkastell	Austria	0.2317	--	N48 10 39.5 E15 05 09.1
1608rev-042	PöchlarN– Kastell Hufeisenturm West	Austria	0.0207	--	N48 12 43.6 E15 12 39.7
1608rev-043	PöchlarN– Kastell Zentralbereich	Austria	0.1670	--	N48 12 44.6 E15 12 42.3
1608rev-044	PöchlarN– Kastell Hufeisenturm Ost	Austria	0.0200	--	N48 12 43.6 E15 12 43.7
1608rev-045	PöchlarN– Vicus und Kastellbad	Austria	1.6957	--	N48 12 42.3 E15 12 50.5
1608rev-046	Blashausgraben – Wachtturm	Austria	0.2623	1.2699	N48 16 35.0 E15 23 45.5
1608rev-047	St. JohanNim Mauerthale– Wachtturm	Austria	0.0250	0.2209	N48 20 12.8 E15 24 35.3
1608rev-048	Bacharnsdorf – Wachtturm	Austria	0.0237	0.0567	N48 22 10.3 E15 26 41.6
1608rev-049	St. Lorenz – Wachtturm	Austria	0.0340	0.4540	N48 23 33.3 E15 28 31.6
1608rev-050	Windstallgraben–Wachtturm	Austria	0.1823	1.0607	N48 22 60.0 E15 31 17.7
1608rev-051	Mautern– Kastell Westbereich	Austria	1.6034	27.9293	N48 23 38.6 E15 34 31.1
1608rev-052	Mautern– Kastell Ostbereich	Austria	0.9144		N48 23 41.6 E15 34 37.9
1608rev-053	Traismauer – Kastell südwestlicher Fächerturm	Austria	0.0086	0.0321	N48 20 57.8 E15 44 32.5
1608rev-054	Traismauer – Kleinkastell	Austria	0.2423	0.5085	N48 21 02.6 E15 44 34.7
1608rev-055	Traismauer – Kastell Zentralbereich	Austria	0.7928	3.5258	N48 20 58.2 E15 44 38.9
1608rev-056	Traismauer – Kastell Hufeisenturm	Austria	0.1379	0.5515	N48 21 03.3 E15 44 41.5
1608rev-057	Traismauer – Kastell Römertor	Austria	0.0564	0.2887	N48 21 00.0 E15 44 44.2
1608rev-058	Zwentendorf – Kastell, Vicus, Gräberfelder	Austria	44.3185	33.0231	N48 20 40.9 E15 53 22.8
1608rev-059	TullN– Kastell Hufeisenturm	Austria	0.0087	0.7432	N48 20 00.4 E16 03 16.4
1608rev-060	TullN– Kastell Zentralbereich	Austria	1.3318	4.0131	N48 19 59.3 E16 03 23.8
1608rev-061	Zeiselmauer – Kleinkastell	Austria	0.0610		N48 19 47.5 E16 10 35.2
1608rev-062	Zeiselmauer – Kastell Zentralbereich	Austria	0.3304		N48 19 44.4 E16 10 38.1
1608rev-063	Zeiselmauer – Kastell Hufeisenturm	Austria	0.0363	10.5465	N48 19 42.6 E16 10 36.0
1608rev-064	Zeiselmauer – Kastell Kastentor, Fächerturm, Ostmauer	Austria	0.1463		N48 19 47.9 E16 10 41.9
1608rev-065	Klosterneuburg – Kastell und Vicus	Austria	3.6871	1.4587	N48 18 25.5 E16 19 37.8
1608rev-066	Wien – Canabae West und Gräberfeld	Austria	2.1019		N48 12 55.7 E16 21 32.6
1608rev-067	Wien – Canabae Südwest	Austria	0.4468		N48 12 28.7 E16 21 59.5
1608rev-068	Wien – Legionslager Umwehrung	Austria	1.3542	137.7790	N48 12 30.7 E16 22 12.5
1608rev-069	Wien – Legionslager Zentralbereich	Austria	0.2373		N48 12 41.8 E16 22 10.7
1608rev-070	Wien– Legionslager Zentralbereich	Austria	0.5081		N48 12 39.9 E16 22 21.3
1608rev-071	Carnuntum – Legionslager, Kastell, Befestigungen, Zivilstadt, Vici, Gräberfelder	Austria	1440.0711	--	N48 06 54.7 E16 51 41.1
1608rev-072	Rusovce– Gerulata, rímsky vojenský tábor (kastel)	Slovakia	0.4071		N48 03 20.2 E17 08 57.6
1608rev-073	Rusovce – Gerulata, dom s hypocaustom a pohrebisko	Slovakia	0.0385	367.1372	N48 03 22.1 E17 08 45.4
1608rev-074	Rusovce – Gerulata, vicus	Slovakia	0.4152		N48 03 23.1 E17 08 50.4
1608rev-075	Bezenye Büdöskúti-szántók – Gerulata 4. Őrtorony	Hungary	0.0928	160.7000	N47 56 20.6 E17 11 23.4
1608rev-076	Lébény/Mosonszentmiklós Barátföld-puszta – Quadrata segédcsapat tábor, vicus, limesút	Hungary	11.5790	34.5580	N47 46 37.5 E17 25 01.3
1608rev-077	Kunsziget Toronyvári-dűlő – Quadrata 2. Kikötőerőd	Hungary	0.4950	30.6720	N47 45 23.7 E17 30 16.4
1608rev-078	Öttevény – limesút	Hungary	7.8870	129.3000	N47 42 58.4 E17 31 03.4
1608rev-079	Abda Közép-gyep – Quadrata 3. örtorony és limesút	Hungary	4.1110	10.04360	N47 42 04.1 E17 32 59.8

1608rev-080	Győr Káptalandomb – Arrabona segédcsapat tabor és vicus	Hungary	24.3110	3.7080	N47 41 17.9 E17 38 02.9
1608rev-081	Győr-Győrszentiván Károlyháza – Arrabona 4. őrtorony	Hungary	1.0960	5.3830	N47 44 02.6 E17 45 41.5
1608rev-082	Gönyű Nagy-Sáros-dűlő – Arrabona 11. Útállomás	Hungary	0.5490	2.9960	N47 44 02.5 E17 48 24.8
1608rev-083	Ács Vaspuszta – Ad Statuas segédcsapat tábor	Hungary	3.8130	148.6000	N47 44 02.5 E17 48 24.8
1608rev-084	Ács Bum-Bum kút – Ad Mures segédcsapat tabor	Hungary	19.5302	15.70346	N47 44 30.8 E17 59 09.6
1608rev-085	Komárom – Brigetio V. menettábor	Hungary	3.1112		N47 43 15.9 E18 09 50.5
1608rev-086	Komárom/Mocsa – Brigetio XIX. Menettábor	Hungary	3.7413		N47 42 31.7 E18 09 13.6
1608rev-087	Komárom/Mocsa – Brigetio XX. Menettábor	Hungary	7.1636	139.4507	N47 42 42.2 E18 08 54.5
1608rev-088	Komárom/Mocsa – Brigetio XXI. Menettábor	Hungary	6.6690		N47 42 27.0 E18 08 06.8
1608rev-089	Mocsa – Brigetio, XXVII. menettábor	Hungary	10.1071		N47 41 29.3 E18 07 21.6
1608rev-090	Mocsa – Brigetio VI. menettábor	Hungary	2.3891		N47 42 25.8 E18 10 36.8
1608rev-091	Mocsa – Brigetio XXII-XXIII. menettáborok	Hungary	7.4490	140.1556	N47 41 58.4 E18 09 19.3
1608rev-092	Mocsa – Brigetio, XXIV. menettábor	Hungary	3.1592		N47 42 15.4 E18 10 01.3
1608rev-093	Mocsa – Brigetio, XXV-XXVI. menettáborok	Hungary	3.1592		N47 41 50.1 E18 07 30.1
1608rev-094	Komárom – Brigetio, VIII-XI, XXXII. menettáborok	Hungary	18.8686		N47 43 15.6 E18 13 17.4
1608rev-095	Naszály – Brigetio, XII, XXXIII. menettáborok	Hungary	6.2644	223.4081	N47 42 50.5 E18 14 05.8
1608rev-096	Naszály – Brigetio, XIII-XIV. menettáborok	Hungary	8.7836		N47 43 08.2 E18 14 39.8
1608rev-097	Naszály – Brigetio XV, menettábor	Hungary	2.7110		N47 43 27.9 E18 14 38.9
1608rev-098	Naszály – Brigetio XXXIV, menettábor	Hungary	3.7231		N47 43 14.6 E18 15 22.4
1608rev-099	Komárom-Szőny – Brigetio municipium	Hungary	34.7880	6.3000	N47 44 08.0 E18 09 25.3
1608rev-100	Komárom-Szőny – Brigetio legió tábor és katonaváros	Hungary	96.4288	62.48487	N47 43 54.7 E18 11 29.9
1608rev-101	Iža – "Kelemantia", rímsky vojenský tábor (kastel)	Slovakia	6.7768	161.5428	N47 44 42.0 E18 11 53.5
1608rev-102	Iža – "Kelemantia", dočasné tábory (západ)	Slovakia	44.6203		N47 44 45.3 E18 11 22.6
1608rev-103	Iža – "Kelemantia", dočasné tábory (východ)	Slovakia	21.9383		N47 44 54.8 E18 12 31.0
1608rev-104	Neszmély Kalin-hegy – Azaum/Odiavum 4. őrtorony	Hungary	0.4540	6.1750	N47 44 22.6 E18 23 38.4
1608rev-105	Neszmély – Azaum/Odiavum 5. Őrtorony	Hungary	0.4310	18.7750	N47 44 40.3 E18 24 31.4
1608rev-106	Nyergesújfalu Sánc-hegy – Crumerum segédcsapat tábor	Hungary	4.3080	9.92434	N47 45 31.4 E18 32 07.8
1608rev-107	Tokod/Tokodaltáró Várberek – erődített raktárbázis, villa és vicus	Hungary	17.5490	18.2750	N47 43 38.5 E18 40 35.3
1608rev-108	Esztergom Várhegy – Solva segédcsapat tábor	Hungary	4.7290	4.3980	N47 47 57.8 E18 44 11.3
1608rev-109	Esztergom Búbánatvölgy – Solva 8. Őrtorony	Hungary	0.0200	0.2190	N47 48 48.9 E18 48 43.2
1608rev-110	Esztergom/Pilismarót Hideglelős-kereszt – magaslati erőd	Hungary	0.5815		N47 48 47.8 E18 49 14.8
1608rev-111	Esztergom/Pilismarót Hosszú-hegy oldala – limesút	Hungary	1.5185	217.83	N47 48 45.1 E18 49 15.9
1608rev-112	Pilismarót Basaharc – Solva 10. Őrtorony	Hungary	0.0111		N47 48 42.4 E18 50 04.1
1608rev-113	Pilismarót Basaharc Emerenciások – Solva 11. őrtorony	Hungary	0.0347		N47 48 37.7 E18 51 06.8
1608rev-114	Pilismarót Basaharc – Solva 13. Őrtorony	Hungary	0.0415	74.713	N47 48 36.2 E18 51 38.7
1608rev-115	Pilismarót Basaharc – Solva 14. Őrtorony	Hungary	0.0520		N47 48 34.4 E18 52 11.3
1608rev-116	Pilismarót Malom-patak – Solva 19. Kiserőd	Hungary	0.6880	15.0970	N47 47 26.2 E18 54 05.5
1608rev-117	Pilismarót Kis-hegy – Ad Herculem magaslati erőd	Hungary	3.8510	6.38855	N47 46 54.3 E18 52 40.9
1608rev-118	Dömös – téglaégető kemencék	Hungary	0.0960	0.4330	N47 45 47.7 E18 54 42.8
1608rev-119	Visegrád Gizellamajor – kiserőd	Hungary	0.2960	3.8760	N47 45 39.2 E18 55 49.7
1608rev-120	Visegrád Lepence– Solva 35. őrtorony	Hungary	0.7370	1.3200	N47 45 58.0 E18 57 12.2
1608rev-121	Visegrád Kőbánya – Solva 24. őrtorony	Hungary	0.0350	0.4890	N47 46 32.5 E18 57 57.1
1608rev-122	Visegrád Sibrik-domb – magaslati erőd	Hungary	2.0765	3.25102	N47 47 53.4 E18 58 48.7
1608rev-123	Visegrád Szentgyörgy-puszta – Solva 28. Őrtorony	Hungary	0.0340	0.1740	N47 48 16.0 E18 59 53
1608rev-124	Verőce Dunamező-dűlő, Solva 38. kikötőerőd	Hungary	0.2200	70.56906	N47 49 07.0 E19 03 04.0
1608rev-125	Dunabogdány Váradok-dűlő – Cirpi segédcsapat tabor	Hungary	10.8598	35.34224	N47 46 15.7 E19 04 30.8
1608rev-126	Leányfalu Benzinkút – Cirpi 2. őrtorony	Hungary	0.1230	0.5330	N47 43 01.7 E19 05 18.5
1608rev-127	Göd Bócsaújtelep – erőd	Hungary	10.4570	3.4899	N47 40 58.4 E19 09 47.9
1608rev-128	Szigetmonostor-Horány – Ulcisia 8. Kikötőerőd	Hungary	0.2294	23.8687	N47 39 30.3 E19 06 44.6
1608rev-129	Dunakeszi Duna sor – Ulcisia 9. Kikötőerőd	Hungary	0.2233		N47 39 29.6 E19 07 10.2
1608rev-130	Szentendre Ulcisia – segédcsapat tábor	Hungary	6.6653	1.7900	N47 39 52.0 E19 04 25.6
1608rev-131	Budapest III. kerület – Aquincum polgárváros,	Hungary	89.7356	38.20411	N47 34 03.2 E19 02 52.7

	amfiteátrum, szentély, vízvezeték				
1608rev-132	Budapest III. kerület Nánási út 3. – Ulcisia 16. Őrtorony	Hungary	0.0375		N47 34 01.6 E19 03 50.8
1608rev-133	Budapest III. kerület Flórián tér és környéke – Aquincum legió tábor, canabae, erőd,	Hungary	74.9008		N47 32 27.1 E19 02 24.3
1608rev-134	Budapest III. kerület – canabae, Hercules-villa	Hungary	0.9994	225.3056	N47 32 56.5 E19 02 22.3
1608rev-135	Budapest III. kerület – Katonavárosi amphitheatrum	Hungary	1.3088		N47 31 58.1 E19 02 20.3
1608rev-136	Budapest V. kerület Március 15. tér – Contra Aquincum ellenerőd	Hungary	4.0910	1.5820	N47 29 33.6 E19 03 07.0
1608rev-137	Budapest XI. Kerület Albertfalva – segédcsapat tábor	Hungary	11.80621	3.24828	N47 26 16.9 E19 02 46.2
1608rev-138	Budapest XXII. Kerület Nagytétény – Campona segédcsapat tabor és vicus	Hungary	18.3692	13.62038	N47 23 26.8 E18 59 04.1
1608rev-139	Érd – limesút	Hungary	2.9750	19.1850	N47 20 53.0 E18 55 49.0
1608rev-140	Százhalombatta-Dunafüred – Matrica segédcsapat tabor	Hungary	10.25715	3.96327	N47 17 59.3 E18 55 05.1
1608rev-141	Százhalombatta-Dunafüred – Matrica vicus és fürdő	Hungary	0.0313		N47 18 07.6 E18 55 13.0
1608rev-142	Ercsi – limesút	Hungary	9.5100	159.1000	N47 13 22.2 E18 52 54.3
1608rev-143	Rácalmás Szesszió II. – Vetus Salina 8. őrtorony és limesút	Hungary	2.4270	4.9493	N47 01 05.2 E18 55 29.0
1608rev-144	Dunaújváros Öreg-hegy – Intercisa segédcsapat tábor, vicus és katonai fürdő	Hungary	12.9127	6.2290	N46 58 34.6 E18 56 11.3
1608rev-145	Dunaújváros Öreg-hegy – Intercisa vicus	Hungary	0.0076		N46 58 31.2 E18 56 04.4
1608rev-146	Dunaújváros Öreg-hegy – Intercisa vicus	Hungary	0.0396		N46 58 24.7 E18 56 04.3
1608rev-147	Dunaújváros Öreg-hegy – Intercisa vicus és fazekaskemence	Hungary	0.0402		N46 58 21.4 E18 55 59.1
1608rev-148	Kisapostag – Intercisa 5. őrtorony	Hungary	0.4472	57.6760	N46 54 54.8 E18 55 39.7
1608rev-149	Kisapostag – Intercisa 6. őrtorony	Hungary	0.5805		N46 53 54.3 E18 55 20.8
1608rev-150	Kisapostag – Intercisa 10 őrtorony	Hungary	0.7589		N46 54 10.8 E18 55 22.8
1608rev-151	Baracs – Annamatia segédcsapat tábor és vicus	Hungary	28.7519	14.9960	N46 52 15.8 E18 55 04.1
1608rev-152	Dunaföldvár 6. főút, 86-86 kmsz. - limesút	Hungary	7.4426	17.6641	N46 49 24.5 E18 54 20.7
1608rev-153	Dunaföldvár Alsó-homokiszőlő - limesút	Hungary	5.6686	26.8798	N46 47 49.4 E18 54 04.8
1608rev-154	Dunaföldvár Buncsik - limesút	Hungary	6.6888	35.8182	N46 46 17.3 E18 53 45.0
1608rev-155	Solt Duna meder – Annamatia 12. Kikötőerőd	Hungary	2.5780	74.0815	N46 44 27.0 E18 59 01.5
1608rev-156	Bölcske Leányvár – Annamatia 7. Őrtorony	Hungary	0.7430	4.4110	N46 44 15.2 E18 52 54.3
1608rev-157	Bölcske Gabonás – Annamatia 8. Őrtorony	Hungary	0.7490	13.7210	N46 43 18.4 E18 53 03.7
1608rev-158	Paks – Annamatia 9. őrtorony és limesút	Hungary	2.9020	30.8080	N46 41 06.6 E18 52 59.9
1608rev-159	Paks-Dunakömlőd Sánc-hegy – Lussonium segédcsapat tábor és vicus	Hungary	2.6050	5.5620	N46 39 22.0 E18 52 54.5
1608rev-160	Paks Püspökhalom – Lussonium 3. Őrtorony	Hungary	0.4160	0.8020	N46 33 17.3 E18 49 11.5
1608rev-161	Dunaszentgyörgy 6-os út 119 kmsz. – Lussonium 12. őrtorony	Hungary	0.7000	1.6900	N46 32 41.3 E18 48 52.2
1608rev-162	Fadd Bodzás-dűlő – Lussonium 9. őrtorony és limesút	Hungary	10.9530	79.4350	N46 29 27.4 E18 47 36.6
1608rev-163	Szekszárd/Tolna Mözsi-dűlő – Alta Ripa 2. Őrtorony	Hungary	0.7340	12.2580	N46 23 31.9 E18 42 33.1
1608rev-164	Őcsény/Szekszárd Ördögvettetés E– limesút	Hungary	4.2467	17.6641	N46 20 11.2 E18 43 40.6
1608rev-165	Őcsény Ördögvettetés D – limesút	Hungary	2.0249		N46 19 54.7 E18 44 11.7
1608rev-166	Őcsény Ördögvettetés (Mözs - M6-M56 5. lelőhely) C – limesút	Hungary	2.0251	7.0026	N46 19 39.3 E18 44 52.6
1608rev-167	Őcsény Ördögvettetés (Mözs - M6-M56 5. lelőhely) B – limesút	Hungary	2.3445	1.7393	N46 19 37 E18 44 60
1608rev-168	Őcsény Ördögvettetés (Oltoványi-dűlő) A – limesút	Hungary	2.1060	9.1660	N46 19 33.2 E18 45 28.2
1608rev-169	Őcsény Gábor-tanya – Alisca segédcsapat tábor és vicus	Hungary	17.5710	15.9030	N46 19 25.1 E18 45 59.7
1608rev-170	Őcsény Soványtelek – Alisca 3. Őrtorony	Hungary	0.8060	8.2320	N46 18 12.5 E18 41 30.8
1608rev-171	Bátaszék Kanizsa-dűlő – útállomás	Hungary	0.2820	1.2340	N46 12 37.2 E18 41 49.4
1608rev-172	Báta – Ad Statuas 2-3. őrtornyok és limesút	Hungary	15.2960	35.9190	N46 07 29 E18 44 36
1608rev-173	Dunafalva – Contra Florentiam Lugio 1. kikötőerőd	Hungary	0.4720	19.5470	N46 05 16.8 E18 46 08
1608rev-174	Dunaszekcső Halena – téglaégető kemence	Hungary	3.80987	9.48760	N46 03 49.6 E18 44 15.6
1608rev-175	Kölked Hajlok-part – Altinum segédcsapat tábor	Hungary	17.1240	45.0640	N45 57 20 E18 40 58.2
		TOTAL	**1580.0483**	**4485.1674**	

	Belgium / Netherlands				
C 1555 Rev	Colonies of Benevolence				
Serial ID No.	**Name**	**State Party**	**Property (ha)**	**Buffer zone (ha)**	**Centre point coordinates**
1555rev-001	Frederiksoord-Wilhelminaoord	The Netherlands	555	--	N52 51 26.236 E6 10 1.805
1555rev-002	Wortel	Belgium	550	--	N51 24 10.2 E4 49 27.5
1555rev-003	Veenhuizen	The Netherlands	907	--	N53 2 31.59 E6 23 29.72
		TOTAL	**2012**	**--**	

	China			
C 1561 Rev	Quanzhou: Emporium of the World in Song-Yuan China			
Serial ID No.	**Name**	**Property (ha)**	**Buffer zone (ha)**	**Centre point coordinates**
1561rev-001	Kaiyuan Temple	9.03	709.78	N24 54 51.1 E118 35 07.3
1561rev-002	Site of Southern Clan Office	7.12		N24 54 52 E118 34 52
1561rev-003	Confucius Temple and School	13.60		N24 54 20.4 E118 35 24.0
1561rev-004	Qingjing Mosque	3.23		N24 54 09.5 E118 35 30.3
1561rev-005	Site of Maritime Trade Office	3.65		N24 54 14.8 E118 35 12.9
1561rev-006	Tianhou Temple	0.73		N24 53 43.2 E118 35 20.2
1561rev-007	Site of Deji Gâte	1.21		N24 53 40.6 E118 35 19.1
1561rev-008	SiteofShunji Bridge	13.64		N24 53 35.6 E118 34 59.5
1561rev-009	Zhenwu Temple	4.17	56.99	N24 52 47.7 E118 37 15.6
1561rev-010	Estuary Docks	21.83		N24 52 42 E118 37 26
1561rev-011	Shihu Dock	3.62	5617.56	N24 48 25.1 E118 42 55.3
1561rev-012	Liusheng Pagoda	2.37		N24 48 28.2 E118 43 31.1
1561rev-013	Wanshou Pagoda	16.36	2080.87	N24 43 21 E118 40 22
1561rev-014	Anping Bridge	139.86	342.94	N24 42 37 E118 26 39
1561rev-015	Statue of Mani in Cao'an Temple	2.68	76.32	N24 46 24 E118 31 46
1561rev-016	Luoyang Bridge	109.28	568.29	N24 57 16 E118 40 34
1561rev-017	Islamic Tombs	4.72	19.22	N24 54 24.1 E118 37 14.0
1561rev-018	Statue of Lao Tze	8.11	178.64	N24 56 52 E118 35 41
1561rev-019	Jiuri Mountain Wind-Praying Inscriptions	11.37	45.14	N24 5708.5 E118 31 45.3
1561rev-020	Sites of Cizao Kilns (Jinjiaoyishan Kilns)	6.87	68.23	N24 51 13 E118 28 04
1561rev-021	Sites of Dehua Kilns (Weilin-Neiban Kilns)	57.74	332.08	N25 28 28.5 E118 17 47.5
1561rev-022	Sites of Dehua Kilns (Qudougong Kiln)	4.89	52.07	N25 29 23 E118 15 04
1561rev-023	Xiacaopu Iron Production Site of Qingyang Village in Anxi	89.98	977.89	N25 11 10 E117 57 20
	TOTAL	**536.08**	**11126.02**	

	Germany			
C 1614	Mathildenhöhe Darmstadt			
Serial ID No.	**Name**	**Property (ha)**	**Buffer zone (ha)**	**Centre point coordinates**
1614-001	Exhibition grounds 1901, 1908, 1914	5.21	76.54	N49 52 35 E8 40 3
1614-002	Exhibition grounds 1904	0.16		N49 52 30 E8 39 50
	TOTAL	**5.37**	**76.54**	

	Italy			
C 1623	'Padova *Urbs picta'*, Giotto's Scrovegni Chapel and Padua's fourteenth-century fresco cycles			
Serial ID No.	**Name**	**Property (ha)**	**Buffer zone (ha)**	**Centre point coordinates**
1623-001	Scrovegni Chapel Church of the Eremitani	7.18	530	N 45 24 42.8148 E11 52 46.6284
1623-002	Palazzo de la Ragione Chapel of the Cararesi Palace Cathedral Baptistery	7.34		N 45 24 27.3852 E11 52 23.1996
1623-003	Basilica and Monastery of St. Anthony Oratory of St. George	5.19		N 45 24 05.1480 E11 52 51.1068
1623-004	Oratory of St.Michael	0.25		N 45 24 04.8708 E11 52 08.6952
	TOTAL	**19.96**	**530**	

	Mongolia			
C 1621	Deer Stone Monuments and Related Sites, the Heart of Bronze Age Culture			
Serial ID No.	**Name**	**Property (ha)**	**Buffer zone (ha)**	**Centre point coordinates**
1621-001	Bronze Age complex Site with Deer Stones at Khoid Tamir (KT)	9256.64	24420.08	N47 45 37.3 E101 20 34.3
1621-002	Bronze Age Complex Site with Deer Stones at Jargalantyn Am (JA) – 1st protected area	100	5329.12	N48 10 20.9 E101 5 36.3
1621-003	Bronze Age Complex Site with Deer Stones at Jargalantyn Am (JA) – 2nd protected area	364.14		N48 06 04.8 E101 02 34.8
1621-004	Bronze Age Complex Site with Deer Stones at Uushigiin Ovor (UO)	47.25	2575.99	N49 39 19.3 E99 55 42.0
	TOTAL	**9768.03**	**32325.19**	

	Netherlands			
C 759 Bis	Dutch Water Defence Lines [extension of "Defence Line of Amsterdam", inscribed in 1996]			
Serial ID No.	**Name**	**Property (ha)**	**Buffer zone (ha)**	**Centre point coordinates**
759bis-001	Dutch Water Defence Lines, consisting of existing The Defence Line of Amsterdam and the extension New Dutch Waterline	54746.78	191630.82	N52 33 18.0 E4 47 29.1
759bis-002	Coastal Fort near Ijmuiden	6.30		N52 27 53.73 E4 34 33.60
759bis-003	Fort near Heemstede	1.52		N52 20 12.62 E4 37 56.36
759bis-004	Fort along the Pampus	2.64		N52 21 53.24 E5 4 8.18
759bis-005	Works along the IJ before Durgerdam (Vuurtoreneiland)	1.81		N52 22 20.58 E5 0 49.28
759bis-006	Fort Werk IV	1.13		N52 16 17.03 E5 10 33.65
759bis-007	Tiel Inundation Canal	15.54		N51 52 35.20 E5 24 26.17
759bis-008	Works along the IJ before Diemerdam	2.30	4.53	N52 20 34.61 E5 0 49.25
759bis-009	Fort Pannerden	1	87.29	N51 52 51.33 E6 1 36.15
	TOTAL	**54779.02**	**191722.64**	

	Peru			
C 1624	Chankillo Solar Observatory and ceremonial center			
Serial ID No.	**Name**	**Property (ha)**	**Buffer zone (ha)**	**Centre point coordinates**
1624-001	Chankillo	2112	43990	S9 33 22.8 W78 14 01.4
1624-002	Cerro Mucho Malo	2368		S9 31 06 78 10 53
	TOTAL	**4480**	**43990**	

	Saudi Arabia			
C 1619	Himã Cultural Precinct			
Serial ID No.	**Name**	**Property (ha)**	**Buffer zone (ha)**	**Centre point coordinates**
1619-001	Hima Wells	1.22	31757.83	N18 14 57.26 E44 27 06.62
1619-002	Saidah	1.70		N18 14 37.5 E44 27 46.3
1619-003	'An Jamal	3.66		N18 17 49.00 E44 30 52.56
1619-004	Dhibah	4.59		N18 18 10.95 E44 30 54.21
1619-005	Minshaf	119		N18 19 00.16 E44 32 43.21
1619-006	Najd Khayran	112		N18 21 02.65 E44 30 57.23
	TOTAL	**242.17**	**31757.83**	

C. Table of the surface areas and buffer zones of sites proposed for examination in 2021

-- = 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					
Gabon	Parc national de l'Ivindo	1653		298758	182268	N0 24 22 E12 38 27
Bosnia and Herzegovina / Czech Republic / France / Italy / Montenegro / North Macedonia / Poland / Serbia / Slovakia / Switzerland	Ancient and Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and Other Regions of Europe [extension of "Ancient and Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and Other Regions of Europe", inscribed in 2007, extensions in 2011 and 2017, criterion (ix)]	1133	Quarter	111049.71	321854.19	See serial nomination table
	TOTAL			**409 807.71**	**504 122.19**	
	CULTURAL SITES					
Chile	Settlement and Artificial Mummification of the Chinchorro Culture in the Arica and Parinacota Region	1634		364.05	672.31	See serial nomination table
Côte d'Ivoire	Mosquées de style soudanais du nord ivoirien	1648		0.12977	2.32934	See serial nomination table
France	Nice, capitale du tourisme de riviera	1635		533	4232	N43 42 06.1 E7 16 20.3
Germany	ShUM Sites of Speyer, Worms and Mainz	1636		5.56	16.43	See serial nomination table
Germany / Netherlands	Frontiers of the Roman Empire – The Lower German Limes	1631		ng	ng	See serial nomination table
India	Dholavira: A Harappan City	1645		103	4865	N23 53 18.27 E70 12 47.89
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Cultural Landscape of Hawraman/Uramanat	1647		106307	303623	See serial nomination table
Italy	The Porticoes of Bologna	1650		52.18	1125.62	See serial nomination table
Japan	Jomon Prehistoric Sites in Northern Japan	1632		141.9	984.8	See serial nomination table
Jordan	As-Salt - The Place of Tolerance and Urban Hospitality	689	Rev	24.68	71.12	N32 02 33.4 E35 43 41.9
Latvia	Grobiņa archaeological ensemble	1637		25.35	97.79	See serial nomination table
Mexico	Franciscan Ensemble of the Monastery and Cathedral of Our Lady of the Assumption of Tlaxcala [extension of "Earliest 16th-Century Monasteries on the Slopes of Popocatepetl", inscribed in 1994, criteria (ii)(iv)]	702	Bis	24.38	32.96	See serial nomination table
Poland	Gdańsk Shipyard – the birthplace of "Solidarity" and the symbol of the Fall of the Iron Curtain in Europe	1629		52.94	135.37	N54 21 51 E18 38 48
Russian Federation	Petroglyphs of the Lake Onega and the White Sea	1654		7049.54	15557	See serial nomination table
Slovenia	The works of Jože Plečnik in Ljubljana – Human Centred Urban Design	1643		ng	ng	See serial nomination table
Spain	Ribeira Sacra	1639		16973.16	53177.29	See serial nomination table
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	The Slate Landscape of Northwest Wales	1633		3259.01	--	See serial nomination table
	TOTAL			**134 915.87**	**384 593**	

D. Serial nomination tables of the sites proposed for examination in 2021

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

Natural sites

	Bosnia and Herzegovina, Czechia, France, Italy, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Poland, Serbia, Slovakia, Switzerland				
N 1133 Quarter	Ancient and Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and Other Regions of Europe				
Serial ID No.	**Name**	**State Party**	**Property (ha)**	**Buffer zone (ha)**	**Centre point coordinates**
1133-001	Chornohora – inscribed in 2007	Ukraine	2476.8	12925	N48 8 25 E24 23 35
1133-002	Kuziy-Trybushany – inscribed in 2007	Ukraine	1369.6	3163.4	N47 56 21 E24 8 26

1133-003	Maramarosh – inscribed in 2007	Ukraine	2243.6	6230.4	N47 56 12 E24 19 35
1133-004	Stuzhytsia – Uzhok – inscribed in 2007	Ukraine	2532	3615	N49 4 14 E22 3 1
1133-005	Svydovets – inscribed in 2007	Ukraine	3030.5	5639.5	N48 11 21 E24 13 37
1133-006	Uholka – Shyrikyi Luh – inscribed in 2007	Ukraine	11860	3301	N48 18 22 E23 41 46
1133bis-007	Jasmund – inscribed in 2011	Germany	492.5	2510.5	N 54 32 53 E 13 38 43
1133bis-008	Serrahn – inscribed in 2011	Germany	268.1	2568	N 53 20 24 E 13 11 52
1133bis-009	Grumsin – inscribed in 2011	Germany	590.1	274.3	N 52 59 11 E 13 53 44
1133bis-010	Hainich – inscribed in 2011	Germany	1573.4	4085.4	N 51 04 43 E 10 26 08
1133bis-011	Kellerwald – inscribed in 2011	Germany	1467.1	4271.4	N 51 08 43 E 8 58 25
1133ter-012	Lumi i gashit – inscribed in 2011	Albania	1,261.52	8,977.48	N42 28 53 E20 3 26
1133ter-013	Rrajca – inscribed in 2011	Albania	2,129.45	2,569.75	N41 12 11 E20 30 2
1133ter-014	Dürrenstei – inscribed in 2011	Austria	1,867.45	1,545.05	N47 46 12 E15 2 51
1133ter-015	Kalkalpen – Hintergebirg – inscribed in 2011	Austria	2,946.20	14,197.24	N47 44 58 E14 28 56
1133ter-016	Kalkalpen – Bodinggraben – inscribed in 2011	Austria	890.89		N47 47 14 E14 21 12
1133ter-017	Kalkalpen – Urlach – inscribed in 2011	Austria	264.82		N47 48 15 E14 14 22
1133ter-018	Kalkalpen – Wilder Graben – inscribed in 2011	Austria	1,149.75		N47 49 60 E14 26 1
1133ter-019	Sonian Forest – Forest Reserve "Joseph Zwaenepoel" – inscribed in 2011	Belgium	187.34	4,650.86	N50 45 23 E4 24 60
1133ter-020	Sonian Forest – Grippensdelle A – inscribed in 2011	Belgium	24.11		N50 46 54 E4 25 36
1133ter-021	Sonian Forest - Grippensdelle B – inscribed in 2011	Belgium	37.38		N50 47 1 E4 25 57
1133ter-022	Sonian Forest – Réserve forestière du Ticton A – inscribed in 2011	Belgium	13.98		N50 44 3 E4 26 13
1133ter-023	Sonian Forest – Réserve forestière du Ticton B – inscribed in 2011	Belgium	6.50		N50 43 37 E4 25 51
1133ter-024	Central Balkan – Boatin Reserve – inscribed in 2011	Bulgaria	1,226.88	851.22	N42 48 10 E24 16 9
1133ter-025	Central Balkan - Tsarichina Reserve – inscribed in 2011	Bulgaria	1,485.81	1,945.99	N42 46 32 E24 24 18
1133ter-026	Central Balkan – Kozya stena Reserve – inscribed in 2011	Bulgaria	644.43	289.82	N42 47 47 E24 31 29
1133ter-027	Central Balkan – Stara reka Reserve – inscribed in 2011	Bulgaria	2,466.10	1,762.01	N42 44 43 E24 42 26
1133ter-028	Central Balkan – Severen Dzhendem Reserve– inscribed in 2011	Bulgaria	591.20	1,480.04	N42 42 11 E24 49 8
1133ter-029	Central Balkan - Dzhendema Reserve – inscribed in 2011	Bulgaria	1,774.12	2,576.63	N42 41 44 E24 58 23
1133ter-030	Central Balkan – Severen Dzhendem Reserve– inscribed in 2011	Bulgaria	926.37	1,066.47	N42 44 44 E24 56 5
1133ter-031	Central Balkan – Peesh skali Reserve – – inscribed in 2011	Bulgaria	1,049.10	968.14	N42 45 54 E25 4 29
1133ter-032	Central Balkan – Sokolna Reserve – inscribed in 2011	Bulgaria	824.90	780.55	N42 41 52 E25 8 18
1133ter-033	Hajdučki i Rožanski kukovi – inscribed in 2011	Croatia	1,289.11	9,869.25	N44 45 59 E15 0 39
1133ter-034	Paklenica National Park - Suva draga-Klimenta – inscribed in 2011	Croatia	1,241.04	414.76	N44 20 26 E15 30 1
1133ter-035	Paklenica National Park - Oglavinovac-Javornik – inscribed in 2011	Croatia	790.74	395.35	N44 23 4 E15 26 59
1133ter-036	Abruzzo, Lazio & Molise - Valle Cervara – inscribed in 2011	Italy	119.70	751.61	N41 49 56 E13 43 43
1133ter-037	Abruzzo, Lazio & Molise - Selva Moricento – inscribed in 2011	Italy	192.70		N41 50 49 E13 42 20
1133ter-038	Abruzzo, Lazio & Molise - Coppo del Morto – inscribed in 2011	Italy	104.71	415.51	N41 51 37 E13 50 48
1133ter-039	Abruzzo, Lazio & Molise - Coppo del Principe – inscribed in 2011	Italy	194.49	446.62	N41 47 15 E13 44 39
1133ter-040	Abruzzo, Lazio & Molise - Val Fondillo – inscribed in 2011	Italy	325.03	700.95	N41 45 15 E13 53 9
1133ter-041	Monte Cimino – inscribed in 2011	Italy	57.54	87.96	N42 24 31 E12 12 11
1133ter-042	Monte Raschio – inscribed in 2011	Italy	73.73	54.75	N42 10 25 E12 9 40
1133ter-043	Sasso Fratino – inscribed in 2011	Italy	781.43	6,936.64	N43 50 40 E11 48 11
1133ter-044	Cheile Nerei-Beușnița – inscribed in 2011	Romania	4,292.27	5,959.87	N44 54 19 E21 48 40

1133ter-045	Codrul secular Șinca – inscribed in 2011	Romania	338.24	445.76	N45 40 0 E25 10 14
1133ter-046	Codrul Secular Slătioara – inscribed in 2011	Romania	609.12	429.43	N47 26 36 E25 37 39
1133ter-047	Cozia - Masivul Cozia – inscribed in 2011	Romania	2,285.86	2408.83	N45 19 54 E24 19 32
1133ter-048	Cozia – Lotrisor – inscribed in 2011	Romania	1,103.30		N45 17 43 E24 15 33
1133ter-049	Domogled - Valea Cernei - Domogled-Coronini-Bedina – inscribed in 2011	Romania	5,110.63	51461.28	N44 56 31 E22 28 7
1133ter-050	Domogled – Valea Cernei- Iauna Craiovei – inscribed in 2011	Romania	3,517.36		N45 6 31 E22 34 41
1133ter-051	Domogled - Valea Cernei- Ciucevele Cerne – inscribed in 2011	Romania	1104.27		N45 14 40 E22 49 23
1133ter-052	Grosii Țibleșului – Izvorul Șurii – inscribed in 2011	Romania	210.55	563.57	N47 32 59 E24 11 9
1133ter-053	Grosii Țibleșului – Preluci – inscribed in 2011	Romania	135.82		N47 32 5 E24 13 13
1133ter-054	Izvoarele Nerei – inscribed in 2011	Romania	4,677.21	2494.83	N45 7 21 E22 3 59
1133ter-055	Strimbu Băiuț – inscribed in 2011	Romania	598.14	713.09	N47 37 33 E24 4 23
1133ter-056	Krokar – inscribed in 2011	Slovenia	74.50	47.90	N45 32 31 E14 46 8
1133ter-057	Snežnik-Ždrocle – inscribed in 2011	Slovenia	720.24	128.80	N45 35 5 E14 27 19
1133ter-058	Hayedos de Ayllon - Tejera Negra – inscribed in 2011	Spain	255.52	13880.86	N41 143 W3 23 19
1133ter-059	Hayedos de Ayllon – Montejo – inscribed in 2011	Spain	71.79		N41 6 44 W3 29 58
1133ter-060	Hayedos de Navarra – Lizardoia – inscribed in 2011	Spain	63.97	24494.52	N43 0 23 W1 6 46
1133ter-061	Hayedos de Navarra - Aztaparreta – inscribed in 2011	Spain	171.06		N42 54 39 W0 48 58
1133ter-062	Hayedos de Picos de Europa - Cuesta Fria – inscribed in 2011	Spain	213.65	14,253.00	N43 10 21 W4 59 16
1133ter-063	Hayedos de Picos de Europa - Canal de Asotin – inscribed in 2011	Spain	109.58		N43 10 16 W4 53 21
1133ter-064	Gorgany – inscribed in 2011	Ukraine	753.48	4,637.59	N48 28 19 E24 17 58
1133ter-065	Roztochya – inscribed in 2011	Ukraine	384.81	598.21	N49 57 44 E23 38 58
1133ter-066	Satanivska Dacha – inscribed in 2011	Ukraine	212.01	559.37	N49 10 26 E26 14 56
1133ter-067	Synevyr – Darvaika – inscribed in 2011	Ukraine	1,588.46	312.32	N48 29 14 E23 44 56
1133ter-068	Synevyr – Kvasovets – inscribed in 2011	Ukraine	561.62	333.63	N48 23 6 E23 42 46
1133ter-069	Synevyr – Strymba – inscribed in 2011	Ukraine	260.65	191.14	N48 27 11 E23 47 48
1133ter-070	Synevyr – Vilshany – inscribed in 2011	Ukraine	454.31	253.85	N48 21 20 E23 39 36
1133ter-071	Zacharovanyi Krai – Irshavka – inscribed in 2011	Ukraine	93.97	1,275.44	N48 27 9 E23 5 23
1133ter-072	Zacharovanyi Krai - Velykyi Dil – inscribed in 2011	Ukraine	1,164.16		N48 25 21 E23 9 42
1133quarter-073	Prašuma Janj	Bosnia and Herzegovina	295.04	380.74	N44 8 48 E17 16 52
1133quarter-074	Forêt de la Bettlachstock	Switzerland	195.43	1,094.16	N47 13 22 E7 24 43
1133quarter-075	Valli di Lodano, Busai and Soladino Forest Reserves	Switzerland	806.78	2330.74	N46 15 49 E8 39 11
1133quarter-076	Jizera Mountains	Czechia	444.81	2279.40	N50 51 30 E15 9 20
1133quarter-077	Aigoual	France	75.03	90.11	N44 8 3 E3 32 47
1133quarter-078	Chapitre	France	371.30	41.65	N44 38 4 E5 59 55
1133quarter-079	Chizé Component 1 North- West	France	93.69	571.92	N46 07 35.4 W0 27 29.4
1133quarter-080	Chizé Component 2 South	France	62.43		N46 05 38.2 W0 25 22.4
1133quarter-081	Fontainebleau	France	248.48	152.20	N48 25 29 E2 40 55
1133quarter-082	Grand Ventron	France	319.67	1328	N47 58 20 E6 56 23
1133quarter-083	Massane	France	239.5	1551.33	N42 28 58 E3 1 45
1133quarter-084	Sainte-Baume	France	128.63	215.11	N43 19 45 E5 45 40
1133quarter-085	Saint-Pé-de-Bigorre	France	924.71	296.87	N43 20 47.5 E5 47 21.3
1133quarter-086	Falascone	Italy	254.30	3486.29	N41 48 21 E15 58 41
1133quarter-087	Pavari-Sfilzi	Italy	667.13		N41 50 20 E16 1 25
1133quarter-088	Cozzo Ferriero	Italy	95.75	2851.83	N39 54 19 E16 6 4
1133quarter-089	Pollinello	Italy	477.94		N39 53 43 E16 11 54
1133quarter-090	Valle Infernale	Italy	320.79	2191.36	N38 7 55 E15 57 41
1133quarter-091	Biogradska Gora 1	Montenegro	390.81	3632.82	N42 54 35 E19 35 25
1133quarter-092	Biogradska Gora 2	Montenegro	1913.48		N42 53 2 E19 37 5

1133quarter-093	Dlaboka Reka	North Macedonia	193.27	234.70	N41 45 47 E20 35 16
1133quarter-094	Border Ridge and Gorna Solinka valley	Poland	1506.05	24330.52	N49 5 58 E22 33 24
1133quarter-095	Polonina Wetlinska and Smerek	Poland	1178.03		N49 10 51 E22 30 12
1133quarter-096	Terebowiec stream valley	Poland	201.00		N49 5 37 E22 43 29
1133quarter-097	Wolosatka stream valley	Poland	586.66		N49 4 1 E22 44 41
1133quarter-098	Fruška gora – Papratski do	Serbia	65.36	847.86	N45 8 21 E19 38 20
1133quarter-099	Fruška gora – Ravne	Serbia	93.43		N45 8 26 E19 37 5
1133quarter-100	Kopaonik – Kozje stene	Serbia	451.47	959.89	N43 20 19 E20 44 27
1133quarter-101	Tara – Rača	Serbia	215.94	4091.99	N43 55 3 E19 31 0
1133quarter-102	Tara – Zvezda	Serbia	1873.67		N43 59 15 E19 17 4
1133quarter-103	Havešová Primeval Forest	Slovakia	167.86	6470.84	N49 0 35 E22 20 14
1133quarter-104	Rožok	Slovakia	74.35	1138.71	N48 58 40 E22 27 52
1133quarter-105	Stužica - Bukovské Vrchy	Slovakia	1742.26	5694.11	N49 5 3 E22 29 42
1133quarter-106	Udava	Slovakia	455.79	814.62	N49 10 31 E22 13 39
1133quarter-107	Kyjovský prales	Slovakia	289.35	104.44	N48 51 5 E22 0 59
1133quarter-108	Vihorlat	Slovakia	1552.75	853.91	N48 54 56 E22 11 13
		TOTAL	**111 049.71**	**321854.19**	

Cultural sites

	Côte d'Ivoire			
C 1648	Mosquées de style soudanais du nord ivoirien			
Serial ID No.	**Name**	**Property (ha)**	**Buffer zone (ha)**	**Centre point coordinates**
1648-001	Mosquée de Tengréla	0.0081	0.0583	N10 29 25.2 W06 24 36.6
1648-002	Mosquée de Kouto	0.0035	0.2783	N09 53 35 W06 24 52
1648-003	Mosquée de Sorobango	0.0100	0.1844	N08 10 22.6 W02 42 38.5
1648-004	Mosquée de Samatiguila ou Missiriba	0.0411	0.1526	N09 49 07.9 W07 33 33.8
1648-005	Mosquée de Nambira ou Namboura missiri koro	0.0076	0.1344	N10 07 44.3 W05 54 15.6
1648-006	Grande Mosquée de Kong	0.0506	1.1102	N09 08 57.0 W 04 36 34.2
1648-007	Petite Mosquée de Kong	0.00397	0.37694	N09 08 53.2 W04 36 39.8
1648-008	Mosquée de Kaouara	0.0049	0.0342	N10 05 24.9 W05 11 41.5
	TOTAL	**0.12977**	**2.32934**	

	Chile			
C 1634	Settlement and Artificial Mummification of the Chinchorro Culture in the Arica and Parinacota Region			
Serial ID No.	**Name**	**Property (ha)**	**Buffer zone (ha)**	**Centre point coordinates**
1634-001	Faldeo Norte del Morro de Arica	4.78	234.52	S18 28 55.06 W70 19 17.66
1634-002	Colón 10	0.035		S18 28 50.68 W70 19 17.52
1634-003	Desembocadura de Camarones	359.23	437.79	S19 11 23.29 W70 15 43.22
	TOTAL	**364.05**	**672.31**	

	Germany			
C 1636	ShUm Sites of Speyr, Worms and Mainz			
Serial ID No.	**Name**	**Property (ha)**	**Buffer zone (ha)**	**Centre point coordinates**
1636-001	Speyer Jewry-Court	0.2	4.67	E8 26 22.37 N49 18 58.36
1636-002	Worms Synagogue Compound	0.27	3.36	E8 21 58.60 N49 38 0.93
1636-003	Old Jewish Cemetery Worms	1.93	2.11	E8 21 19.60 N49 37 46.14
1636-004	Old Jewish Cemetery Mainz	3.16	6.29	E 8 15 1.776 N50 0 18.646
	TOTAL	**5.56**	**16.43**	

	Germany, Netherlands				
C 1631	Frontiers of the Roman Empire -The Lower German Limes				
Serial ID No.	**Name**	**State Party**	**Property (ha)**	**Buffer zone (ha)**	**Centre point coordinates**
1631-001	Valkenburg-Centrum	Netherlands	??	??	N52 10 49.2 E4 25 58.8
1631-002	Valkenburg-De Woerd | North	Netherlands	0.97	12.18	N52 10 19 E4 26 17
1631-003	Valkenburg-De Woerd | South	Netherlands	3.26		N52 10 12 E4 26 24
1631-004	Voorburg-Arentsburg	Netherlands	11.89	6.48	N52 3 36 E4 21 0
1631-005	Corbulo's canal | Vlietwijk	Netherlands	3.31	167.09	N52 7 30 E4 27 36
1631-006	Corbulo's canal | Starrenburg	Netherlands	1.31		N52 6 32 E4 26 13
1631-007	Corbulo's canal | Knippolder	Netherlands	2.76		N52 6 18 E4 25 44
1631-008	Corbulo's canal | Vlietvoorde	Netherlands	2.3		N52 6 4 E4 25 23
1631-009	Corbulo's canal | Rozenrust	Netherlands	0.75		N52 5 28 E4 24 32
1631-010	Corbulo's canal | Romeinsepad	Netherlands	0.44		N52 5 2 E4 23 56
1631-011	Leiden-Roomburg | Park Matilo	Netherlands	8.16	??	N52 9 0 E4 31 1
1631-012	Leiden-Roomburg | Besjeslaan	Netherlands	2.61	??	N52 8 53 E4 31 8
1631-013	Woerden-Centrum	Netherlands	1.44	5.94	N52 5 10 E4 53 2
1631-014	Utrecht-Limes road | Zandweg	Netherlands	0.39	12.45	N52 5 28 E4 59 46
1631-015	Utrecht-Limes road | Veldhuizen	Netherlands	0.46		N52 5 8.1 E5 0 29.5
1631-016	Utrecht-Limes road | De Balije	Netherlands	3.32		N52 4 48 E5 1 19
1631-017	Utrecht-Hoge Woerd	Netherlands	??	??	N52 05 11 E5 02 33.1
1631-018	Utrecht-Groot Zandveld	Netherlands	0.83	2.84	N52 5 42 E5 3 4
1631-019	Utrecht-Domplein	Netherlands	2.64	8.96	N52 5 28 E5 7 19
1631-020	Bunnik-Vechten | Marsdijk	Netherlands	80.83	51.88	N52 3 29 E5 9 58
1631-021	Bunnik-Vechten | Provincialeweg	Netherlands	0.94		N52 3 47 E5 10 26
1631-022	Arnhem-Meinerswijk	Netherlands	2.75	4.12	N51 58 16 E5 52 26
1631-023	Elst-Grote Kerk	Netherlands	0.39	0.5	N51 55 11.4 E5 50 57.4
1631-024	Nijmegen-Valkhof area | Valkhofpark	Netherlands	2.43	??	N51 50 53 E5 52 12
1631-025	Nijmegen-Valkhof area | Hunnerpark	Netherlands	2.37		N51 50 49 E5 52 19
1631-026	Nijmegen-Hunerberg	Netherlands	??	??	N51 50 21.2 E5 52 56.2
1631-027	Nijmegen-Kops Plateau | West	Netherlands	4.03	??	N51 50 17 E5 53 31
1631-028	Nijmegen-Kops Plateau | North	Netherlands	0.86		N51 50 20 E5 53 42
1631-029	Nijmegen-Kops Plateau | East	Netherlands	0.77		N51 50 10 E5 53 42
1631-030	Nijmegen-Kops Plateau | Kopse Hof North	Netherlands	0.16		N51 50 10 E5 53 46
1631-031	Nijmegen-Kops Plateau | Kopse Hof South	Netherlands	0.93		N51 50 6 E5 53 46
1631-032	Berg en Dal-aqueduct | Mariënboom	Netherlands	1.53	??	N51 49 34 E5 53 17
1631-033	Berg en Dal-aqueduct | Swartendijk	Netherlands	0.66		N51 49 23 E5 53 28
1631-034	Berg en Dal-aqueduct | Cortendijk	Netherlands	0.26		N51 49 12 E5 53 24
1631-035	Berg en Dal-aqueduct | Louisedal	Netherlands	5.86		N51 49 5 E5 54 0
1631-036	Berg en Dal-aqueduct | Kerstendal	Netherlands	9.71		N51 49 1 E5 54 50
1631-037	Berg en Dal-De Holdeurn | North	Netherlands	0.56	??	N51 49 1 E5 55 59
1631-038	Berg en Dal-De Holdeurn | South	Netherlands	7.03		N51 48 58 E5 55 55
1631-039	Herwen-De Bijland	Netherlands	2.07	1013.14	N51 52 52 E6 5 56
1631-040	Kleve-Keeken	Germany	4.52	374.71	N51 50 28 E6 4 41
1631-041	Kleve-Reichswald | West	Germany	0.42	7.31	N51 47 28 E6 5 35
1631-042	Kleve-Reichswald | East	Germany	0.17		N51 47 28 E6 6 22
1631-043	Till	Germany	75.84	150.98	N51 46 37 E6 14 20
1631-044	Kalkar-Kalkarberg	Germany	1.83	5.05	N51 43 44 E6 17 6
1631-045	Kalkar-Bornsches Feld	Germany	47.18	??	N51 42 50 E6 19 8
1631-046	Uedem-Hochwald | Hochwald 1	Germany	2.93	106.16	N51 41 31 E6 21 7
1631-047	Uedem-Hochwald | Hochwald 2	Germany	1.34		N51 41 38 E6 21 14
1631-048	Uedem-Hochwald | Hochwald 3	Germany	2.45		N51 41 31 E6 21 25
1631-049	Uedem-Hochwald | Hochwald 4	Germany	1.47		N51 41 31 E6 21 36
1631-050	Uedem-Hochwald | Hochwald 5	Germany	1.63		N51 41 35 E6 21 47
1631-051	Uedem-Hochwald | Hochwald 6	Germany	0.66		N51 41 28 E6 22 1
1631-052	Uedem-Hochwald | Hochwald 7.1	Germany	0.57		N51 41 21.5 E6 21 59.3
1631-053	Uedem-Hochwald | Hochwald 7.2	Germany	0.56		N51 41 20 E6 22 5
1631-054	Uedem-Hochwald | Hochwald 8.1	Germany	0.16		N51 41 18.4 E6 21 52.9
1631-055	Uedem-Hochwald | Hochwald 8.2	Germany	0.69		N51 41 17 E6 21 54
1631-056	Uedem-Hochwald | Hochwald 9	Germany	1.27		N51 41 24 E6 21 54
1631-057	Uedem-Hochwald | Hochwald 10	Germany	1.31		N51 41 20 E6 21 43
1631-058	Uedem-Hochwald | Hochwald 11	Germany	1.55		N51 41 17 E6 21 32
1631-059	Uedem-Hochwald | Hochwald 12	Germany	0.86		N51 41 20 E6 21 18
1631-060	Uedem-Hochwald | Hochwald 13	Germany	1.65		N51 41 20 E6 21 4
1631-061	Wesel-Flüren | Flürener Feld 1	Germany	1.50	84.86	N51 40 55 E6 33 32
1631-062	Wesel-Flüren | Flürener Feld 2	Germany	1.17		N51 40 59 E6 33 40
1631-063	Wesel-Flüren | Flürener Feld 3	Germany	2.51		N51 41 6 E6 33 43

1631-064	Wesel-Flüren | Flürener Feld 4	Germany	2.67		N51 41 6 E6 33 50
1631-065	Xanten-CUT	Germany	90.19	39.86	N51 40 1 E6 26 38
1631-066	Xanten-Fürstenberg	Germany	126.17	137.08	N51 38 23.3 E6 28 10.8
1631-067	Alpen-Drüpt	Germany	36.20	53.7	N51 35 13 E6 32 46
1631-068	Moers-Asberg	Germany	7.56	40.61	N51 25 55 E6 40 12
1631-069	Duisburg-Werthausen	Germany	0.31	1.13	N51 25 19.6 E6 42 40.9
1631-070	Krefeld-Gellep	Germany	3.36	12.14	N51 19 59 E6 40 55
1631-071	Neuss-Koenenlager	Germany	28.51	141.13	N51 10 55 E6 43 26
1631-072	Neuss-Reckberg | Wachtturm	Germany	0.01	37.83	N51 10 33.4 E6 45 56
1631-073	Neuss-Reckberg | Kleinkastell	Germany	0.27		N51 10 27.5 E6 46 7
1631-074	Monheim-Haus Bürgel	Germany	2.48	8.61	N51 7 44 E6 52 23
1631-075	Dormagen	Germany	5.81	35.42	N51 5 35 E6 50 24
1631-076	Köln-Praetorium	Germany	1.32	97.66	N50 56 17 E6 57 32
1631-077	Köln-Deutz	Germany	2.39	32.61	N50 56 17 E6 58 12
1631-078	Köln-Alteburg	Germany	6.03	55.43	N50 54 18 E6 58 37
1631-079	Kottenforst Nord | Am Weißen Stein 1	Germany	2.68	??	N50 44 6 E6 58 37
1631-080	Kottenforst Nord | Am Weißen Stein 2	Germany	0.72		N50 43 52 E6 58 59
1631-081	Kottenforst Nord | Domhecken 5	Germany	1.65	??	N50 42 50 E6 57 40
1631-082	Kottenforst Nord | Domhecken 1	Germany	3.79		N50 42 50 E6 58 23
1631-083	Kottenforst Nord | Domhecken 2	Germany	2.11		N50 43 1 E6 58 41
1631-084	Kottenforst Nord | Domhecken 3	Germany	1.90		N50 42 54 E6 58 55
1631-085	Kottenforst Nord | Domhecken 4	Germany	1.90		N50 42 58 E6 59 10
1631-086	Kottenforst Nord | Dürrenbruch 3	Germany	0.45	??	N50 42 32 E6 59 10
1631-087	Kottenforst Nord | Dürrenbruch 2	Germany	1.68		N50 42 29 E6 59 17
1631-088	Kottenforst Nord | Dürrenbruch 1	Germany	3.05		N50 42 25 E6 59 28
1631-089	Kottenforst Nord | Pfaffenmaar 1 and 2	Germany	6.04	??	N50 42 22 E6 58 34
1631-090	Bonn	Germany	31.01	210.98	N50 44 42 E7 6 0
1631-091	Kottenforst Süd | Oben der Krayermaar	Germany	1.9	??	N50 41 35 E7 2 38
1631-092	Kottenforst Süd | Villiper Bach	Germany	1.09	??	N50 39 40 E7 4 52
1631-093	Kottenforst Süd | Professorenweg 1	Germany	0.94		N50 39 32 E7 5 20
1631-094	Kottenforst Süd | Professorenweg 2	Germany	0.77		N50 39 32 E7 5 38
1631-095	Kottenforst Süd | Riesenweg	Germany	1.09		N50 39 25 E7 5 42
1631-096	Kottenforst Süd | Wattendorfer Allee 2	Germany	1.56		N50 39 54 E7 6 0
1631-097	Kottenforst Süd | Wattendorfer Allee 1	Germany	1.79		N50 39 50 E7 6 29
1631-098	Kottenforst Süd | Bellerbuschallee	Germany	1.52		N50 39 58 E7 7 5
1631-099	Kottenforst Süd | Villiprot	Germany	1.78	??	N50 38 42 E7 4 12
1631-100	Kottenforst Süd | Heiderhof	Germany	1.46	??	N50 39 25 E7 8 35
1631-101	Iversheim	Germany	0.08	10.72	N50 35 17.5 E6 46 26.1
1631-102	Remagen	Germany	??	??	N50 34 26.6 E7 14 40.3
		TOTAL	**ng**	**ng**	

	Iran			
C 1647	Cultural Landscape of Hawraman/Uramanat			
Serial ID No.	**Name**	**Property (ha)**	**Buffer zone (ha)**	**Centre point coordinates**
1647-001	Central-Eastern Valley	77905	303623	N35 6 26.49 E46 28 40.26
1647-002	Western Valley	28402		N34 56 46.66 E46 8 11.46
	TOTAL	**106 307**	**303 623**	

	Italy			
C 1650	The Porticoes of Bologna			
Serial ID No.	**Name**	**Property (ha)**	**Buffer zone (ha)**	**Centre point coordinates**
1650-001	Santa Caterina e Saragozza	2.67	1089.37	N44 29 29 E11 19 58
1650-002	Santo Stefano e Mercanzia	2.39		N44 29 32 E11 20 53
1650-003	Galliera	3.58		N44 29 50 E11 20 30
1650-004	Baraccano	1.71		N44 29 8 E11 21 17
1650-005	Pavaglione, Banchi e Piazza Maggiore	7.07		N44 29 33 E11 20 36
1650-006	San Luca	1.60		N44 29 7.4 E11 18 6.9
1650-007	Università e Accademia	6.53		N44 29 48 E11 21 5
1650-008	Certosa	8.44		N44 29 44.2 E11 18 37.9
1650-009	Cavour, Farini e Minghetti	2.62		N44 29 28 E11 20 39
1650-010	Strada Maggiore	10.99		N44 29 26.3 E11 21 20.6

1650-011	Treno della Barca	1.33	36.25	N44 29 43 E11 17 5
1650-012	MamBo	3.25	(part of 1089.37)	N44 30 9 E11 20 12
	TOTAL	**52.18**	**1125.62**	

	Japan			
C 1632	Jomon Prehistoric Sites in Northern Japan			
Serial ID No.	**Name**	**Property (ha)**	**Buffer zone (ha)**	**Centre point coordinates**
1632-001	Odai Yamamoto Site	0.7	49.1	N4103 56 E140 33 08
1632-002	Kakinoshima Site	7.6	53.5	N41 55 45 E140 56 54
1632-003	Kitakogane Site	14.4	32	N42 24 08 E140 54 42
1632-004	Tagoyano Site	6.3	261.5	N40 53 16 E140 20 16
1632-005	Futatsumori Site	10.1		N40 44 55 E141 13 45
1632-006	Sannai Maruyama Site	4.3	41.9	N40 48 37 E140 41 56
1632-007	Ofune Site	23.5	69.7	N41 57 27 E140 55 30
1632-008	Goshono Site	3.5	18.3	N40 11 53 E141 18 21
1632-009	Irie Site	5.5	65.5	N42 32 34 E140 46 31
1632-010	Komakino Stone Circle	2.4	34	N40 44 15 E140 43 40
1632-011	Isedotai Stone Circles	2.8		N40 12 11 E140 20 48
1632-012	Oyu Stone Circles	8.8	26.9	N40 16 17 E140 48 16
1632-013	Kiusu Earthwork Burial Circles	15.6	108.8	N42 53 12 E141 43 00
1632-014	Omori Katsuyama Stone Circle	15.7	37	N40 41 56 E140 21 30
1632-015	Takasago Burial Site	10.9	22.9	N42 32 48 E140 46 11
1632-016	Kamegaoka Burial Site	8.5	115.3	N40 53 02 E140 20 12
1632-017	Korekawa Site	1.3	48.4	N40 28 25 E141 29 27
	TOTAL	**141.9**	**984.8**	

	Latvia			
C 1637	Grobiņa archaeological ensemble			
Serial ID No.	**Name**	**Property (ha)**	**Buffer zone (ha)**	**Centre point coordinates**
1637-001	Grobiņa hillfort (Skābarža kalns) and settlement	6.24	39.14	N56 31 59.2 E21 10 1.8
1637-002	Smukumi burial ground	1.02		N56 31 51.3 E21 11 19.1
1637-003	Priediens burial ground	15.66	47.44	N56 31 51.3 E21 11 49.9
1637-004	Atkalni burial ground	0.41		N56 31 41.5 E21 9 45.1
1637-005	Porāni (Pūrāni) burial ground	2.02	11.21	N56 32 56 E21 10 32
	TOTAL	**25.35**	**97.79**	

	Mexico			
C 702bis	Franciscan Ensemble of the Monastery and Cathedral of Our Lady of the Assumption of Tlaxcala [extension of "Earliest 16th-Century Monasteries on the Slopes of Popocatepetl", inscribed in 1994, criteria (ii)(iv)]			
Serial ID No.	**Name**	**Property (ha)**	**Buffer zone (ha)**	**Centre point coordinates**
702-001	Temple and Former Convent of Saint Mathhew the Apostle – inscribed in 1994	1.23	0.13	N18 56 5.00 W98 53 52.00
702-002	Temple and Former Convent of the Assomption, Cuernavaca Cathedral – inscribed in 1994	1.57	1.43	N18 55 2.00 W99 14 42.00
702-003	Temple and Former Convent of Saint Dominic de Guzman – inscribed in 1994	0.91	0.5	N18 53 10.00 W98 41 25.00
702-004	Temple and Former Convent of Saint Dominic de Guzman – inscribed in 1994	0.99	1.14	N18 54 25.00 W98 58 15.00
702-005	Temple and Former Convent of Saint James the Apostle – inscribed in 1994	0.62	1.28	N18 52 37.00 W98 46 32.00
702-006	Ancient Convent of the Nativity – inscribed in 1994	1.42	1.31	N18 59 4.00 W99 8 3.00
702-007	Temple and Former Convent of Saint John the Baptist – inscribed in 1994	1.19	2.89	N18 53 31.00 W98 43 46.00
702-008	Temple and Former Convent of Saint John the Baptist – inscribed in 1994	0.62	1.36	N18 57 20.00 W98 58 52.00
702-009	Temple and Former Convent of Saint William – inscribed in 1994	3.61	1.23	N18 59 24.00 W98 55 6.00
702-010	Temple and Former Convent of Saint John the Baptist – inscribed in 1994	1.2	3.13	N18 53 3.00 W98 51 47.00
702-011	Temple and Former Convent of the Immaculate Conception – inscribed in 1994	1.94	0.24	N18 47 11.00 W98 46 5.00
702-012	Temple and Former Convent of Saint Andrew – inscribed in 1994	1.51	0.75	N19 6 0.00 W98 27 54.00
702-013	Temple and Former Convent of Saint Michael the Archangel – inscribed in 1994	3.65	1.29	N19 9 27.00 W98 24 13.00
702-014	Temple and Former Convent of the Assumption of Our Lady – inscribed in 1994	1.1	2.4	N18 53 28.00 W98 34 21.00
702bis-015	Franciscan Ensemble of the Monastery and Cathedral of Our Lady of the Assumption of Tlaxcala	2.82	13.88	N19 18 50.34 W98 14 15.57
	TOTAL	**24.38**	**32.96**	

	Russian Federation			
C 1654	Petroglyphs of the Lake Onega and the White Sea			
Serial ID No.	**Name**	**Property (ha)**	**Buffer zone (ha)**	**Centre point coordinates**
1654-001	Petroglyphs of the Lake Onega	6944.14	15100	N61 43 47.64 E36 00 45.5
1654-002	Petroglyphs of the White Sea	105.4	457	N64 29 29.12 E34 40 14.17
	TOTAL	**7049.54**	**15557**	

	Slovenia			
C 1643	The works of Jože Plečnik in Ljubljana – Human Centred Urban Design			
Serial ID No.	**Name**	**Property (ha)**	**Buffer zone (ha)**	**Centre point coordinates**
1643-001	Trnovo Bridge	??	??	N46 02 36 E14 30 08
1643-002	Green Promenade along Vegova Street	??		N46 02 52 E14 30 12
1643-003	Roman Walls in Mirje	??		N46 02 45 E14 29 54
1643-004	Promenade along the Embankments and Bridges of the Ljubljanica River	12388		N46 02 56 E14 30 20
1643-005	Church of St. Michael	0281	??	N46 00 44 E14 30 21
1643-006	Church of St. Francis of Assisi	1079	30230	N46 04 06 E14 29 49
1643-007	Plečnik's Žale – Garden of All Saints	1323	??	N46 04 03 E14 31 43
	TOTAL	**ng**	**ng**	

	Spain			
C 1639	Ribeira Sacra			
Serial ID No.	**Name**	**Property (ha)**	**Buffer zone (ha)**	**Centre point coordinates**
1639-001	Ribeiras	16470.87	53177.29	N42 27 14 W7 43 50
1639-002	Heredad de Rocas	452.09		N42 20 30.72 W7 42 48.36
1639-003	Heredad de Ferreira de Pantón	39.86		N42 30 30.63 W7 37 10.96
1639-004	Heredad de Montederramo	10.34		N42 16 28.03 W7 30 7.80
	TOTAL	**16973.16**	**53177.29**	

	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland			
C 1633	The Slate Landscape of Northwest Wales			
Serial ID No.	**Name**	**Property (ha)**	**Buffer zone (ha)**	**Centre point coordinates**
1633-001	Penrhyn Slate Quarry and Bethesda, and the Ogwen valley to Port Penrhyn	763.85	--	N53 10 34 W04 04 25
1633-002	Dinorwig Slate Quarry Mountain Landscape	1252.98	--	N53 07 15 W04 06 54
1633-003	Nantlle Valley Slate Quarry Landscape	320.32	--	N53 03 24 W04 14 10
1633-004	Gorseddau and Prince of Wales Slate Quarries, Railways and Mill	142.43	--	N52 59 12 W04 08 45
1633-005	Ffestiniog: its Slate Mines and Quarries, 'city of slates' and Railway to Porthmadog	685.94	--	N52 59 42 W03 56 27
1633-006	Bryneglwys Slate Quarry, Abergynolwyn Village and the Talyllyn Railway	93.49	--	N52 38 18 W03 57 57
	TOTAL	**3259.01**	--	