



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

Patrimoine mondial

44 COM

WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8B4

Paris, 17 juillet 2021

Original: anglais / français

**ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ÉDUCATION,
LA SCIENCE ET LA CULTURE**

**CONVENTION CONCERNANT LA PROTECTION DU
PATRIMOINE MONDIAL, CULTUREL ET NATUREL**

COMITÉ DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

Quarante-quatrième session élargie

**Fuzhou (Chine) / Réunion en ligne
16 – 31 juillet 2021**

Point 8 de l'Ordre du jour provisoire : Établissement de la Liste du patrimoine mondial et de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril

INF.8B4 : Notifications d'erreurs factuelles

RÉSUMÉ

Ce document contient les notifications relatives aux erreurs factuelles reçues de la part des États parties au plus tard le 2 juillet 2021 en conformité avec le paragraphe 150 des *Orientations*.

Liste alphabétique par état partie des notifications identifiant des erreurs factuelles dans les rapports d'évaluation des Organisations consultatives relatifs aux propositions d'inscription 2020 devant être examinées lors de la 44e session élargie du Comité du patrimoine mondial

Etat partie	Proposition d'inscription au patrimoine mondial	N° d'ordre	Recomm.	Pp
SITES NATURELS				
République de Corée	Getbol, étendue cotidale coréenne	1591	D	3
Thaïlande	Complexe des forêts de Kaeng Krachan	1461	Rev D	10
SITES CULTURELS				
Allemagne / Autriche / Belgique / France / Italie / Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande du Nord / Tchéquie (la).	Les grandes villes d'eaux d'Europe	1613	I	25 / 26
Chine	Quanzhou : emporium mondial de la Chine des Song et des Yuan	1561	Rev I	30
Allemagne	La Mathildenhöhe à Darmstadt	1614	R	33
Inde	Les glorieux temples et portes kakatiya - le temple Rudreshwara (Ramappa), Palampet, District de Jayashankar Bhupalpally, État du Telangana	1570	D	34
Iran (République islamique d')	Chemin de fer transiranien	1585	D	44
Mongolie	Monuments des pierres à cerfs et sites associés, le cœur de la culture de l'âge du bronze	1621	R	48
Arabie saoudite	Arts rupestres culturels de Ḥimā Najrān	1619	R	49
Espagne	Paseo del Prado et Buen Retiro, un paysage des arts et des sciences	1618	D	53
Turquie	Tell d'Arslantepe	1622	R	54
Uruguay	L'œuvre de l'ingénieur Eladio Dieste : Église d'Atlántida	1612	I	58

Les notifications d'erreurs factuelles sont présentées dans la langue dans laquelle les États parties les ont soumises et présentées selon l'ordre alphabétique anglais.

Liste alphabétique par état partie des notifications identifiant des erreurs factuelles dans les rapports d'évaluation des Organisations consultatives relatifs aux propositions d'inscription 2021 devant être examinées lors de la 44e session élargie du Comité du patrimoine mondial

Etat partie	Proposition d'inscription au patrimoine mondial	N° d'ordre	Recomm.	Pp
SITES NATURELS				
Gabon	Parc national de l'Ivindo	1653	R	59
BosnieHerzégovine / Tchéquie / France / Italie / Monténégro / Macédoine du Nord / Pologne / Serbie / Slovaquie / Suisse	Forêts primaires et anciennes de hêtres des Carpates et d'autres régions d'Europe [extension du bien « Forêts primaires et anciennes de hêtres des Carpates et d'autres régions d'Europe », inscrit en 2007, extensions en 2011 et 2017, critère (ix)]	1133	Quater OK	64
SITES CULTURELS				
Côte d'Ivoire	Mosquées de style soudanais du nord ivoirien	1648	D	65
France	Nice, capitale du tourisme de riviera	1635	R	86
Allemagne	Sites SchUM de Spire, Worms et Mayence	1636	I	88 / 91
Allemagne / Pays-Bas	Frontières de l'Empire romain – le limes de Germanie inférieure	1631	I	94
Japon	Sites préhistoriques Jomon dans le nord du Japon	1632	I	95
Jordanie	As-Salt – lieu de tolérance et d'hospitalité urbaine	689	Rev I	96
Mexique	Ensemble franciscain du monastère et de la cathédrale Notre-Dame-de-l'Assomption de Tlaxcala [extension du bien « Premiers monastères du XVIe siècle sur les versants du Popocatepetl », inscrit en 1994, critères (ii)(iv)]	702	Bis OK	97
Pologne	Le chantier naval de Gdańsk – berceau de « Solidarité » et symbole de la chute du rideau de fer en Europe	1629	N	99
Fédération de Russie	Péroglyphes du lac Onega et de la mer Blanche	1654	R	119
Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande du Nord	Le paysage d'ardoise du nord-ouest du pays de Galles	1633	I	122

Les notifications d'erreurs factuelles sont présentées dans la langue dans laquelle les États parties les ont soumises et présentées selon l'ordre alphabétique anglais.

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

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

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

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Getbol, Korean Tidal Flat

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: IUCN

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
Page 17 Left column Paragraph 2 Line 4	The State Party of the Republic of Korea submitted additional information, as well as a revised management plan.	The State Party of the Republic of Korea submitted the Responses to IUCN Interim Report which includes a participation plan of Ministry of Environment to the Integrated Management system as a cooperative institution. *The State Party didn't submit revised management plan	Factual error The additional information contains information on the "Revision of the Management Plans" and the "Implementation of the Integrated Management Plan. IUCN notes that the additional information in question was received before IUCN's interim report and therefore suggests that the amended text should read: "The State Party of the Republic of Korea submitted additional information, including on the revision of management plans and the Integrated Management system".
Page 18 Left column Paragraph 4 Line 7	It has a total area of 129,346 ha and the component parts are within buffer zones that total 74,497 ha.	It has a total area of 128,411 ha and the component parts are within buffer zones that total 74,592 ha. * The submitted Responses to IUCN Interim Report by the State party includes the revised size of the property area and the buffer zone in Gochang Getbol	Not a factual error New information IUCN notes that the additional information in question was received prior to IUCN's interim report and that this information contained a proposed boundary change for the nominated component part of Gochang Getbol. The additional information noted that the "change would result in a decrease in the property area size" (emphasis added); however, there was no information provided on the change in surface area that would result.

			As IUCN's deferral recommendation highlights the need for a substantial revision of boundaries of the present nomination, IUCN considers the area values as initially nominated to be the appropriate information to provide.
Page 18 Right column Table 1	Table 1 Gochang Getbol Area (ha): 6,466 Buffer Zone (ha): 1,785 Total Area (ha): 129,346 Buffer Zone (ha) : 74,497	Table 1 Gochang Getbol Area (ha): 5,531 Buffer Zone (ha): 1,880 Total Area (ha): 128,411 Buffer Zone (ha): 74,592 * The State Party submitted additional information, which includes revised size of the Gochang Getbol in Fig. 1 on page 9.	Not a factual error See above point.
Page 18 Right column Paragraph 2 Line 18	whilst the other two component parts, Gochang and Seocheon, show sand-dominant environments in an open-bay setting.	and the other two component parts, Gochang and Seocheon, also show the same geo-and geomorphological features of Shinan Getbol with a smaller scale. * Gochang and Seocheon Getbols show mixed and mud flats which are even much larger than sand flats in size. For more information, please refer fig. 2-41, page105 for Seocheon Getbol and fig. 2-46 page112 for Gochang Getbol in the nomination.	Not a factual error Clarification The sentence in question compares Gochang and Seocheon with Boseong-Suncheon. Table 2-2 on p.22 of the supplementary information submitted in February 2020 provides a comparison of the nominated component parts suggesting that, while all components have geomorphological features in common, they are distinct from each other, for instance in that sand plays a more important role in case of Gochang and Seocheon. Figure 2-2 on p.21 indicates an open-bay setting of Gochang Getbol and Seocheon Getbol, which does not appear to contradict the figures in the nomination dossier that have been referred to.
Page 19 Left column Paragraph 1 Line 6	stopover sites and breeding and feeding grounds. 22 globally threatened or near-threatened species,	stopover sites and breeding and feeding grounds. 27 globally threatened or near-threatened species, * WPE 5 th edition shows the total numbers are 27 in the property; Waterbird Population Estimates Fifth Edition - Summary Report (wetlands.org) .	Not a factual error New information IUCN notes that the document hyperlinked here was published in 2012, but this has neither been provided during the evaluation process, nor referenced in the nomination dossier. IUCN further notes that the version accessible via this hyperlink does not include any data in relation to the nominated property. IUCN finally notes that the nomination refers to "22 IUCN Red List species" on pp.153, 157, p.175 and p.176 as well as in table 3-5 on p.171.

<p>Page 19 Left column Paragraph 3 Line 18</p>	<p>but similarly the analysis cites the different geology, geomorphology and oceanography, and that this property has been inscribed under criterion (x) only.</p>	<p>but similarly the analysis cites the different geology, geomorphology and oceanography, and that this property has been inscribed under criterion (x) only.</p> <p>*In the last paragraph on page 170 of the nomination dossiers, the distinctive features of the nominated property are explained, but there is no sentence that Chinese property has been inscribed under criterion (x) only</p>	<p>Factual error</p> <p>The comparative analysis on page 170 of the nomination dossier does not make a statement on the inscription of the Migratory Bird Sanctuaries along the Coast of Yellow Sea-Bohai Gulf of China (Phase I) under criterion (x). IUCN therefore agrees with the amendment as suggested by the State Party.</p>
<p>Page 19 Left column Paragraph 4 Line 3</p>	<p>Firstly, there are some more sites in the region that could have been compared, such as the Mundok Migratory Bird Reserve, a Ramsar and East Asian-Australasian Flyway Partnership (EAAFP) site on the west coast (along Chongchon and Taeryong River estuaries) of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which appears to possess a similar tidal flat landscape and geodiversity.</p>	<p>Firstly, there are some more sites in the region that could have been compared, such as the Mundok Migratory Bird Reserve, a Ramsar and East Asian-Australasian Flyway Partnership (EAAFP) site on the west coast (along Chongchon and Taeryong River estuaries) of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which appears to possess a similar tidal flat landscape and geodiversity.</p> <p>*Detailed information for comparative analysis on the site in DPRK are not available and accessible except for some limited information. (This reason has been already explained in the additional information, page 5, submitted to IUCN following IUCN field mission.) As for the information about waterbirds, the limited information only shows the number of the species but no data like the populations</p>	<p>Not a factual error</p> <p>IUCN considers that the sites noted are appropriately referred to in the evaluation report.</p>
<p>Page 19 Left column Paragraph 1 Line 14</p>	<p>Some of them appear to contain similar geomorphological attributes and comparable or higher waterbird counts.</p>	<p>Some of them appear to contain similar geomorphological attributes and comparable or higher waterbird counts.</p> <p>* As for conservation of waterbirds, the serial components of the nominated property is the most important sites in ROK and apparently show comparative advantages to other major sites (refer to the Annex 1.)</p>	<p>Not a factual error</p> <p>The sentence in question is based on table 2-2 on p.22 of the supplementary information of February 2020, which was reported to be based on more recent data than the information contained in Annex 1 of the nomination dossier. According to table 2-2, five of the seven component parts from the Hangang River System for instance show higher numbers of waterbirds than three of the four nominated component parts.</p>
<p>Page 19 Right column Paragraph 2 Line 9</p>	<p>parts together make up only 5% of the area of Shinan.</p>	<p>parts together make up only 16.6% of the area of Shinan.</p> <p>* The size of the three components, reflected revised size of the Gochang Getbol, is up to 16.6% (18,325 ha) of the Shinan Getbol (110,086 ha).</p>	<p>Factual error and difference of opinion</p> <p>IUCN agrees this figure is in need of clarification, but the key point regarding the relatively small size of the nominated component parts remains. The sentence should read: "the three</p>

			other component parts together make up only 16.6% of the area of Shinan.”
Page 20 Left column Paragraph 1 Line 4	IUCN notes that the connection between terrestrial, coastal and marine parts of the ecosystem has been severely disturbed by anthropogenic modifications, and is not pristine (see section 4.5).	IUCN notes that the connection between terrestrial, coastal and marine parts of the ecosystem has been severely disturbed by anthropogenic modifications in the past , and is not entirely pristine (see section 4.5). * It can be stated that the nominated property itself maintains a naturally coastal and marine condition because most of the property area is surrounded by rocky coast which clearly distinguish coastal ecosystem from terrestrial environment.	Not a factual error Difference of opinion The property has also been nominated under criterion (ix) and based on the information assessed, it is clear in the view of IUCN that ‘ridge-to-reef’ continuity and connectivity is undermined. IUCN considers the wording in the evaluation is appropriate.
Page 20 Left column Paragraph 2 Line 1	Regarding criterion (x), the analysis could have been strengthened with comparisons to other Yellow Sea sites, especially with the Migratory Bird Sanctuaries in China. With the exception of the 110,086 ha component part of Shinan, the component parts provide very limited areas ranging from 5,985 ha to 6,809 ha, which do not compare with the two component parts of the Migratory Bird Sanctuaries of 144,839 ha and 43,804 ha respectively, or with the more extensive systems of the Wadden Sea.	Regarding criterion (x), the analysis could have been strengthened with comparisons to other Yellow Sea sites, especially with areas in the Migratory Bird Sanctuaries in China (Phase II). With the exception of the 110,086 ha component part of Shinan, the component parts provide very limited areas ranging from 5,985 ha to 6,809 ha, which do not compare with the two component parts of the Migratory Bird Sanctuaries of 144,839 ha and 43,804 ha respectively, or with the more extensive systems of the Wadden Sea. * The submitted Additional Information, page 29, has already included the comparative analysis on the Chinese World Heritage site with the items of waterbirds. As for the size of the components, it is not reasonable and scientific that the size of the components, even if all attributes are included, doesn’t meet the requirement of the integrity with only reason that the size is small. Among the 14 sites which are the objective sites for Phase II in the Chinese World Heritage, 5 sites are smaller than 5,900 ha.	Not a factual error Difference of opinion The first table of Appendix 1 of the additional information submitted in November 2019 is entitled “Comparison with Other World Heritage Sites” (p.27), but does not include the Migratory Bird Sanctuaries along the Coast of Yellow Sea-Bohai Gulf of China (Phase I), which appears to be included under a different name in the table on p.29 entitled “Comparison with Tidal Flats in the Yellow Sea”. In the sentence in question, IUCN is not commenting on, and does not hold any knowledge on the size and viability of the component parts under consideration for the second phase nomination of the Migratory Bird Sanctuaries along the Coast of Yellow Sea-Bohai Gulf of China. Integrity considerations are discussed in the subsequent chapter.
Page 20 Left column Paragraph 2 Line 10	the entire dossier lacks long-term status, occurrence and trend information on bird species and populations.	the entire dossier lacks long-term status, occurrence and trend information on bird species and populations. *As shown in Fig. 4-1 to Fig. 4-8 (from page 184 to page 193) in the nomination, the trend (2009-2015) of the waterbird species and population is presented. Especially, more detailed long-term status of the waterbird species and their populations is included in Fig.	Not a factual error Difference of opinion Fig. 4-1 to 4-8 of the nomination and Fig. 1-6 of the supplementary information indicate trends over a period of 10 years maximum, rather than long-term data.

		1-6, page 12, of the submitted IUCN Interim Report.	
Page 20 Right column Paragraph 3 Line 7	The nomination's approach to identify sites with attributes that match all three criteria at the same time, with a superimposed filter on protection and management , has resulted in a limited selection of four component parts	The nomination's approach to identify sites with attributes that match all three criteria at the same time, with a superimposed filter on protection and management , has resulted in a limited selection of four component parts *The State Party did not select only four sites to fulfill three criteria at the same time. All three criteria are intimately interrelated and these are the most representative sites to justify their OUVs. *The State Party completed the extension of Wetland Protected Area (WPA) on the sufficient area where include attributes in order to establish protection and management system, not selecting the existed WPA as the components	Not a factual error Difference of opinion IUCN's analysis is based on the dossier, and is additionally supported by Figure 2-1 and the argumentation on p.19 of the supplementary information...
Page 20 Right column Paragraph 3 Line 11	Three of these component parts are relatively small.	Three of these component parts are relatively small. *Even though three areas are expanded, they will still have the same attributes as the original ones	Not a factual error Difference of opinion See point above regarding the reality that three of the component parts are of a small size.
Page 21 Left column Paragraph 4 Line 5	but integrated management arrangements between these other designations do not appear to be in place.	But, as of now , integrated management arrangements between these other designations do not appear to be in some local governments. *The integrated management system of the whole nominated property is presented in the nomination (page 244), and the cases of integrated management including Biosphere Reserves and Ramsar sites and their spreading plan to other components is described in 6C, page 41, in the Responses to IUCN Interim Report.	Not a factual error Difference of opinion IUCN notes that neither pp.244 of the nomination dossier nor section 6C, p.41, of the supplementary information provide any information on integrated management arrangements between other designations. Section 6C discusses Ramsar sites and Biosphere Reserves in the context of an envisaged future expansion of buffer zones, but not in relation to integrated management arrangements. The intent of the proposed amendment is not clear to IUCN but it implies that if arrangements are in place this is only in some cases, and not throughout the nomination.
Page 21 Right column Paragraph 2 Line 9	The intactness of the overall mudflat system seems to be questionable in light of the fact that 22% of the tidal flats have been reclaimed according to the nomination dossier.	The intactness of the overall mudflat system seems to be questionable in light of the fact that only 8.3% of the tidal flats have been reclaimed according to the nomination dossier.	Not a factual error The sentence in question refers to the "overall mudflat system" and not to the nominated property and therefore

		*The pointed proportion, 22%, means a decreased area by reclamation in the tidal flats of the whole ROK (refer to page 195 in the nomination). Only 8.3% of tidal flat lost in the property area (refer to 1A, page 6, in the Responses to IUCN Interim Report.)	accurately reports the information provided on p.195 of the nomination dossier.
Page 21 Right column Paragraph 2 Line 11	31% of the coastline has been modified by constructed embankments,	24.7% of the coastline has been modified by constructed embankments, *The property area has 1,712 km (75.3%) of natural coastline which is described in the 1 st sentence on Page 7 in the Responses to IUCN Interim Report. ** Whilst we may regret that areas have been reclaimed, the property in itself represent a rather natural area; example the Wadden Sea where there hardly any natural coastline.	Not a factual error Same point as the previous edition.
Page 21 Right column Paragraph 4 Line 13	The result is that the boundaries appear to reflect an emphasis on the presentation of geoheritage values (related to the Geumgang River sedimentation system), and do not include many areas supporting biodiversity values justifying consideration under criterion (x).	The result is that the boundaries appear to reflect an emphasis on the presentation of geoheritage values (related to the Geumgang River sedimentation system) as well as biodiversity values, but do not include all areas like roosting sites for migratory birds under criterion (x).	Not a factual error Difference of opinion IUCN agrees with the point that the State Party is making, but this is part of the reason for IUCN's statement, regarding for instance roosting areas.
Page 21 Right column Paragraph 5 Line 1	Reviewers note that the nominated property does not include several tidal flats, and their hinterlands, which are internationally important for waterbirds, such as in Incheon (Ganghwa, Yeongjong, Song Do) and Gyeonggi (Hwaseong and Asan Bay).	Reviewers note that the nominated property does not include several tidal flats, and their hinterlands, which are internationally important for waterbirds, such as in Incheon (Ganghwa, Yeongjong, Song Do) and Gyeonggi (Hwaseong and Asan Bay) even though the State Party suggested the extension to those areas as a Phase II *Those sites are the second major sites for waterbirds in ROK, and the State Party suggests the extension of components on those sites in Phase II, recognizing their international importance.	Not a factual error It is factually correct that these areas were not included in the property as nominated, even if they are advanced as a possible Phase II of the nomination. IUCN reviewers are asked to assess nominations as submitted, and not potential future phases.
Page 22 Left column Paragraph 3 Line 11	Reviewers also noted that criterion (ix) is compromised by heavily altered shorelines, which would need to be restored.	Reviewers also noted that criterion (ix) is compromised by heavily altered shorelines, but Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries, ROK has conducted restoration projects in some parts.	Not a factual error Difference of opinion The evaluation report recognizes restoration efforts and plans, however the statement made is accurate, despite the restoration projects in some parts.
Page 22 Left column Paragraph 4 Line 1	Similarly, the proposed buffer zones do not function as a sufficient additional layer of protection that would capture adjacent habitat.	Similarly, the proposed buffer zones partially function as a fully sufficient additional layer of protection that would capture adjacent roosting sites at high tide.	Not a factual error Difference of opinion IUCN notes that the supplementary information recognizes the need to expand

		<p>*The boundary of each component encompasses all of feeding and breeding area for waterbirds to use East Asian-Australasian Flyway, and also includes most of all roosting areas at high tide.</p> <p>This means that the designed boundary is sufficient to contain the attributes related with waterbirds (refer to Annex 2.)</p>	<p>buffer zones. The information annexed to this factual error letter supports this assessment. It is accurate that the buffer zones are not sufficient.</p>
<p>Page 24 Left Column Paragraph 6 Line 4</p>	<p>Habitat loss has also been hypothesized to be a driver of decline for forest-dependent migrants such as flycatchers and thrushes overwintering in Southeast Asia.</p>	<p>Habitat loss has also been hypothesized to be a driver of decline for forest-dependent migrants such as flycatchers and thrushes overwintering in Southeast Asia.</p> <p>*This sentence is about forest-dependent migrant, but the nominated property supports waterbirds to visit to coastal wetland. This is not directly related with the nominated property.</p>	<p>Not a factual error</p> <p>Difference of opinion</p> <p>The nomination has been evaluated under criterion (ix) and the scope of the nomination clearly goes beyond waterbirds, which was the context for this point.</p>
<p>Page 24 Right Column Paragraph 3 Line 4</p>	<p>The approach to limit the selection to component parts that respond to all three criteria at the same time has resulted in a nominated property that is incomplete under each of the three criteria.</p>	<p>The approach to limit of the selection to component parts that respond to all three criteria at the same time has resulted in a nominated property that is incomplete under each of the two criteria.</p> <p>* It is fair to say that all the serial sites are the best representative on their own.</p> <p>Even based on migratory birds, these serial sites are the best representatives than any other sites in ROK.</p>	<p>Not a factual error</p> <p>Difference of opinion</p> <p>See point as already responded to above</p>
<p>Page 25 Right Column Paragraph 4 Line 4</p>	<p>There is a high proportion (31%) of artificially hardened coastlines</p>	<p>There still remains a high proportion (31%) of natural coastline with 1,712 km (75.3%) in the property area.</p> <p>*This fact is described in the 1st sentence on Page 7 in the Responses to IUCN Interim Report.</p>	<p>Not a factual error</p> <p>See point as already responded to above</p>
<p>Page 26 Left Column Paragraph 1 Line 12</p>	<p>The nominated property encompasses some of the critical stopover sites for several globally threatened species of migratory birds (at least one Critically Endangered, five Endangered and six Vulnerable) along the East Asian – Australasian Flyway (EAAF).</p>	<p>The nominated property encompasses some of the critical stopover sites for several globally threatened species of migratory birds (at least one Critically Endangered, six Endangered and eight Vulnerable) along the East Asian – Australasian Flyway (EAAF).</p> <p>* WPE 5th edition shows the total numbers are 27 in the property; Waterbird Population Estimates Fifth Edition - Summary Report (wetlands.org); a total of 27 IUCN Red List species like CR 1, EN 6, VU 8, and NT 12.</p>	<p>Not a factual error</p> <p>New information</p> <p>IUCN notes that the document hyperlinked here was published in 2012, but has neither been provided during the evaluation process, nor referenced in the nomination dossier. IUCN further notes that the version accessible via this hyperlink does not include any data in relation to the nominated property. IUCN finally notes that the nomination refers to 5 Endangered and 6 Vulnerable species on p.157.</p> <p>See also point above</p>

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

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

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Thailand

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Kaeng Krachan Forest Complex

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: IUCN

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
Page 6 Paragraph 3 Line 4	Regarding the reactivation ... The World Heritage Centre responded on 21 December 2021 ...	<u>Correction:</u> ... The World Heritage Centre responded on 21 December 2021 2020 ... (typo)	Not a factual error Typographic error
Page 6 Paragraph 3 Lines 7-9	Regarding the reactivation of the referral ... The World Heritage Centre responded on 21 December 2021 informing the State Party that the undertaking of an Advisory mission is not feasible at this stage. In this respect, IUCN recalls that the Committee, in its Decision 43 COM 8B.5 recommending the State Party to invite an IUCN Advisory mission, considered that the purpose of this mission would be to assist in the preparation of the additional information requested under paragraph 6 of the same Decision. Therefore, at present any IUCN Advisory mission can no longer fulfil the purpose foreseen in the request of the Committee, since additional information responding to paragraph 6 of Decision 43 COM 8B.5 had been submitted by the State Party on 31 January 2020. On 26 February 2021, the State Party submitted further additional information regarding the present nomination, and which has been considered in the present report.	<u>Correction:</u> Regarding the reactivation of the referral ... Therefore, at present any IUCN Advisory mission can no longer fulfil the purpose foreseen in the request of the Committee, since additional information responding to paragraph 6 of Decision 43 COM 8B.5 had been submitted by the State Party on 31 January 2020 <u>Explanation:</u> 1. Annex 6 of the Operational Guidelines indicates that “i) Prior to the evaluation mission, IUCN may request additional information on questions in the nomination document that require clarification, and will always contact the State Party to prepare for the evaluation mission.” and that “iii) After the evaluation mission, IUCN may discuss issues that have been identified by the mission team, and request further information from the State Party as required.”. In this respect, <u>the submission of additional information to the World Heritage Centre by the State Party</u>	Not a factual error <u>IUCN considers that t the evaluation report is factually correct in relation to the specific purpose of the Advisory mission as noted in Decision 43 COM 8B.5</u> <u>On point 1 of the Explanation:</u> IUCN notes that in the case of referrals an evaluation mission is specifically excluded from the process. Advisory Missions are not evaluation missions as per Annex 6 of the Operational Guidelines. In line with the referral procedure, IUCN has taken into account in its evaluation all information that was officially submitted by the State Party to the World Heritage Centre. IUCN further notes that all correspondence on this was directed through the World Heritage Centre, and WHC confirmed to the State Party that the Advisory mission was not feasible.

		<p>cannot be construed in anyway as <u>impeding IUCN in carrying out a field mission</u>. Furthermore, Annex 6 also suggests that IUCN must take into account in its evaluation all information that is officially submitted by the State Party to the World Heritage Centre by the specific deadline. And if deemed necessary, IUCN may request further information and/or updated information from the State Party even after a field mission. There is no specific injunction against the submission of additional pieces of information, whenever deemed necessary. Moreover, at no time did IUCN indicate to the State Party that an advisory mission would no longer fulfill its purpose, merely that it was not 'feasible'.</p> <p>2. On 28 November 2019 during the 22nd Session of the General Conference in Paris, the State Party was informed by Mr. Peter Shadie, Former Director of IUCN's World Heritage Programme, that he had received the Thai Government's invitation for an official field visit dated 18 November 2019 and IUCN was in the process of assigning two experts for an official field mission to the KKFC. However, such official field mission was later cancelled by the IUCN without any clear explanation.</p> <p>3. Moreover, to make an inclusive and non-biased evaluation report, IUCN should have also taken into account useful information on the ground, such as the livelihood management project in the KKFC implemented by the Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP) and UNDP through the GEF Small Grants Programme for which the <u>IUCN Regional Office in Bangkok acts as a facilitator.</u></p>	<p><u>On point 2:</u></p> <p>IUCN has at no point cancelled any Advisory mission. IUCN notes that the State Party's invitation of 18 November 2019, and at the time of the 2019 General Assembly, the Advisory mission was planned to take place between February and April 2020, for which IUCN immediately launched the preparations. However, on 25 December 2019, the State Party wrote to the World Heritage Centre requesting the mission to take place in January 2020 with a view to the State Party's planned submission of additional information by 1 February 2020. The World Heritage Centre wrote back to the State Party noting that the technical timelines necessary for establishing and finalizing an Advisory mission excluded the possibility of organizing such a mission within two weeks to meet the proposed mid-January 2020 timeframe. This letter furthermore, noted that, given the time needed to organize the Advisory mission, prepare the report and recommendations it would not allow for adequate time to integrate this advice into the information planned for resubmission before the 1 February 2020 deadline.</p> <p>IUCN notes that full record of the sequence and chronology of events in dealing with this evaluation are detailed in the background note of IUCN Evaluation.</p> <p><u>On point 3:</u></p> <p>In its evaluation report, IUCN has indeed assiduously taken account of all available information in the framework of a referral including information provided on the States Party's efforts to improve livelihoods.</p>
--	--	--	---

<p>Page Right Column Line 9</p>	<p>6 2. Summary of Natural Values</p> <p>Previous evaluations have documented, ... as a response from the Kingdom of Thailand (hereinafter referred to as Thailand) to territorial discussion that have been undertaken ...</p>	<p>Correction:</p> <p>Previous evaluations have documented, ... as a response from the Kingdom of Thailand (hereinafter referred to as Thailand) to territorial discussion <u>the discussion of the revised nominated area</u> that have been undertaken ...</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>Thailand and Myanmar reached a mutual understanding on the revised nominated area only for the purpose of the inscription of the KKFC as World Heritage Site. The discussion is not at all related to the boundary/territory of the two countries.</p>	<p>Not a factual error</p> <p>Clarification</p> <p>IUCN has no objection to this precision being adopted in the evaluation report.</p>																																																																		
<p>Page Left Column Table 1</p>	<p>7</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Name of protected area</th> <th colspan="3">Area (ha)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Original nomination in 2014; revised nomination in 2016*</th> <th>Revised nomination in 2019</th> <th>Revised nomination in 2020/2021</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mae Nam Phachi Wildlife Sanctuary</td> <td>48,931</td> <td>38,565</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chaloem Phrakiat Thai Prachan National Park</td> <td>32,924</td> <td>32,884</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kaeng Krachan National Park</td> <td>291,470</td> <td>256,870</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kui Buri National Park</td> <td>96,900</td> <td>73,641</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kui Buri Reserve under military control</td> <td>12,000</td> <td>9,953</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>482,225</td> <td>411,912</td> <td>408,940</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name of protected area	Area (ha)			Original nomination in 2014; revised nomination in 2016*	Revised nomination in 2019	Revised nomination in 2020/2021	Mae Nam Phachi Wildlife Sanctuary	48,931	38,565		Chaloem Phrakiat Thai Prachan National Park	32,924	32,884		Kaeng Krachan National Park	291,470	256,870		Kui Buri National Park	96,900	73,641		Kui Buri Reserve under military control	12,000	9,953		Total	482,225	411,912	408,940	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Name of protected area</th> <th colspan="3">Area (ha)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Original nomination in 2014; revised nomination in 2016*</th> <th>Revised nomination in 2019</th> <th>Revised nomination in 2020/2021</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mae Nam Phachi Wildlife Sanctuary</td> <td>48,931</td> <td>38,565</td> <td><u>38,502</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chaloem Phrakiat Thai Prachan National Park</td> <td>32,924</td> <td>32,884</td> <td><u>32,819</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kaeng Krachan National Park</td> <td>291,470</td> <td>256,870</td> <td><u>254,646</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kui Buri National Park</td> <td>96,900</td> <td>73,641</td> <td><u>73,017</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kui Buri Reserve under military control</td> <td>12,000</td> <td>9,953</td> <td><u>9,956</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>482,225</td> <td>411,912</td> <td>408,940</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Buffer zone</td> <td><u>242,778</u></td> <td>-</td> <td><u>157,255</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>Revised area for each of the protected areas and buffer zone of the nominated property have been included.</p>	Name of protected area	Area (ha)			Original nomination in 2014; revised nomination in 2016*	Revised nomination in 2019	Revised nomination in 2020/2021	Mae Nam Phachi Wildlife Sanctuary	48,931	38,565	<u>38,502</u>	Chaloem Phrakiat Thai Prachan National Park	32,924	32,884	<u>32,819</u>	Kaeng Krachan National Park	291,470	256,870	<u>254,646</u>	Kui Buri National Park	96,900	73,641	<u>73,017</u>	Kui Buri Reserve under military control	12,000	9,953	<u>9,956</u>	Total	482,225	411,912	408,940	Buffer zone	<u>242,778</u>	-	<u>157,255</u>	<p>Not a factual error</p> <p>New information that cannot be taken into account at this stage.</p> <p>The revised areas for each of the protected areas were not provided in the additional information.</p>
Name of protected area	Area (ha)																																																																				
	Original nomination in 2014; revised nomination in 2016*	Revised nomination in 2019	Revised nomination in 2020/2021																																																																		
Mae Nam Phachi Wildlife Sanctuary	48,931	38,565																																																																			
Chaloem Phrakiat Thai Prachan National Park	32,924	32,884																																																																			
Kaeng Krachan National Park	291,470	256,870																																																																			
Kui Buri National Park	96,900	73,641																																																																			
Kui Buri Reserve under military control	12,000	9,953																																																																			
Total	482,225	411,912	408,940																																																																		
Name of protected area	Area (ha)																																																																				
	Original nomination in 2014; revised nomination in 2016*	Revised nomination in 2019	Revised nomination in 2020/2021																																																																		
Mae Nam Phachi Wildlife Sanctuary	48,931	38,565	<u>38,502</u>																																																																		
Chaloem Phrakiat Thai Prachan National Park	32,924	32,884	<u>32,819</u>																																																																		
Kaeng Krachan National Park	291,470	256,870	<u>254,646</u>																																																																		
Kui Buri National Park	96,900	73,641	<u>73,017</u>																																																																		
Kui Buri Reserve under military control	12,000	9,953	<u>9,956</u>																																																																		
Total	482,225	411,912	408,940																																																																		
Buffer zone	<u>242,778</u>	-	<u>157,255</u>																																																																		
<p>Page Right Column Paragraph 2 Lines 17-20</p>	<p>7</p> <p>IUCN consulted with the UN Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) ... However, the precision of impacts of</p>	<p>Correction:</p> <p>IUCN consulted with the UN Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) ... However, the</p>	<p>Not a factual error</p> <p>Difference of opinion</p>																																																																		

	<p>the revised boundaries on values, as well as integrity considerations remains in need for further consideration.</p>	<p>precision of impacts of the revised boundaries on values, as well as integrity considerations remains in need for further consideration.</p> <p><u>Explanation:</u></p> <p>The revised nominated area does not at all affect biodiversity and species diversity and integrity of the property suitable for criterion (x) as the area adjustment of the KKFC is solely for the purpose of the nomination. It does not affect nor change the status, areas and the protection of the National Parks comprising the KKFC in accordance with Thailand’s domestic laws. The area is therefore fully protected and under a sound management plan under the National Parks Act B.E. 2562 (2019) and Wildlife Reservation and Protection Act B.E. 2562 (2019)</p>	<p>IUCN noted in the paragraph in question that “the nominated property’s species diversity would likely be very similar”, but maintains that further consideration is needed in light of the significant boundary change.</p> <p>The paragraph does not call into question the protection and management regime.</p>
<p>Page 7 Right Column Paragraph 3</p>	<p>The additional information submitted by the State Party in 2020 ... <u>Rather than comparing the nominated property with other similar biogeographical systems, this analysis appropriately compares the values of the originally nominated area with the revised area.</u> This analysis is considered further in relation to the evaluation of integrity, which are discussed in section 4.2.</p>	<p><u>Correction:</u></p> <p>The additional information submitted by the State Party in 2020 ... Rather than <u>focusing on</u> comparing the nominated property with other similar biogeographical systems, ...</p> <p><u>Explanation:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. During an unofficial visit to the KKFC during 9-13 September 2019, Mr. Peter Shadie, Former Director of IUCN’s World Heritage Programme, advised the Thai authorities concerned to undertake a data comparison of the integrity and the Universal Outstanding Values (OUV) <u>between the original nominated area and the revised nominated area.</u> 2. The Thai authorities concerned acted on the said advice and also took a comparative analysis of the nominated property with other natural heritage sites with similar characters. <u>The study, inter alia, shows that the KKFC houses a complex biodiversity, including some 461</u> 	<p>Not a factual error</p> <p>Clarification</p> <p>IUCN notes that the paragraph in question confirms the comparative analysis undertaken as appropriate (“this analysis appropriately compares”). In section 4.2, “IUCN welcomes the commendable technical depth of this additional comparative analysis”.</p> <p>IUCN notes that previous evaluations have concluded on the property’s global comparative biodiversity and ecosystem significance, however, the specific property comparisons noted here have not been included in any of the information submitted.</p>

		<p><u>species of birds, wildlife mammals such as 8 Felidae species which is more than other natural heritage sites in the region</u> including Manas Wildlife Sanctuary and Kaziranga National Park in India, Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra in Indonesia, Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Areas, China, and Atlantic Forest South-East Reserves, Brazil.</p>	
<p>Page 8 Left Column Paragraph 3</p>	<p>The additional information ... to support the resolution of land disputes and explore livelihood alternatives for Karen Communities.</p>	<p><u>Correction:</u> Additional information ... to support the resolution of land disputes and explore livelihood alternatives for Karen Communities <u>in Ban Bang Kloi, Petchaburi Province.</u></p>	<p>Not a factual error Clarification</p>
<p>Page 8 Left Column Paragraph 4</p>	<p>Based on the additional information provided by the State Party, it is difficult to ascertain whether this process has been effective and successful in resolving the deep-seated concerns expressed previously by local communities ...</p> <p>Whilst IUCN considers that the protection status of the nominated property meets the requirements of the Operational Guidelines, however, it is not possible to determine the effectiveness of recent legislative amendments relating to communities and use, without a new evaluation mission.</p>	<p><u>Explanation:</u> 1. Article 18 (3) of the National Park Act B.E. 2562 (2019) stipulates that the National Park Management Plan shall include operational details, management strategy and monitoring of land use. Public consultation and inclusive participation of stakeholders, relevant communities and citizens shall also be carried out on the implementation of the Plan. Thus, Thailand's domestic law has already ensured that the management of the property must involve a full participation of the local communities and in consultation with all stakeholders which is in accordance with Para 123 of the Operational Guidelines. 2. On 16 March 2021, the Thai Prime Minister set up an inter-agency committee chaired by the Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Cooperatives to explore appropriate measures to resolve land rights issues and enhance quality of life of the local communities, including the Karens, in Ban Bang Kloi. The committee convened its first meeting on 25 March 2021.</p>	<p>Not a factual error – there is no proposed amendment to text or stated error to respond to.</p> <p>Regarding the explanation, this is either: Advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier New information that cannot be taken into account at this stage</p>

		<p>3. On 2 April 2021, the Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Cooperatives set up five sub-committees to work on long-term solutions to resolve the concerns of the local communities. The sub-committees have held several meetings from May 2021 up to the present, and will report their findings to the Prime Minister.</p> <p>4. As an illustration of the progress made by the sub-committees, on 7 June 2021, the Sub-Committee on land use and the improvement of the quality of life of the Karen communities in Ban Bang Kloi has adopted the Nine-Pronged Approach livelihood development plan to enhance the livelihoods of the Karen communities in Ban Bang Kloi in a sustainable manner. The Nine-Pronged Approach comprises of: a comprehensive land survey; water resource management; soil improvement; demonstration plots; income generating and alternative occupations; development of cultural and natural tourism; community and public relations; census and related population information; and development of sustainable livelihoods. The Sub-Committee is scheduled to submit its findings to the Prime Minister in September 2021.</p>	
<p>Page 8 Right Column Paragraph 1 Line 4</p>	<p>the Special Rapporteur ... A “Public statement of the NGO Coordinating Committee on Development (NGO-COD)”, signed by 120 organisations, was received by UNESCO ...</p>	<p><u>Correction:</u></p> <p>the Special Rapporteur ... A “Public statement of the NGO Coordinating Committee on Development (NGO-COD)”, signed by 120 organisations, was received by UNESCO ...</p> <p><u>Explanation:</u></p> <p>1. The number of signatories behind the public statement should not be mentioned. <u>Two NGOs are mentioned twice, which would make the correct number 118.</u></p> <p>2. Of the 118, Thailand has verified that <u>only 34 organisations are</u></p>	<p>Not a factual error</p> <p>The letter in question lists 120 signatory organizations, with no organization apparently mentioned twice. The letter is a representation coming from civil society. The formal national level registration status of these organizations is noted, but there is no doubt that this letter provides views expressed by civil society which should appropriately be taken into account consistent with para 148 b) and Para 123 of the Operational Guidelines.</p>

		<u>officially registered as NGOs.</u> Therefore, <u>more information on unregistered organisations should be requested for a more accurate evaluation of their status.</u>	
Page 9 Left Column Paragraph 3 Lines 9-14	In terms of faunal diversity, ... The additional information by the State Party notes that the approximately 459 species of KKFC would all be still represented in the revised area. In this respect, IUCN notes however that previous submissions by the State Party reported 720 wild animal species, which also served as a key attribute in the global comparative analysis in 2014. The resubmitted 2020 information makes no reference to this number, thus IUCN is unclear on the species numbers.	<u>Explanation:</u> 1. Information presented in the original dossier in 2014 was based on various methods including ground survey and literature reviews extending many years. However, the information in the additional information submitted in 2019 was based on a new survey which took place during 2015-2019, which encompassed a limited timeframe and different methodologies and did not integrate all information. Nevertheless, all key and valuable species that were presented in the 2014 survey continue to be represented in the 2015-2019 survey, while additional species have also been identified. 2. The presence of key and valuable species suggests that the nominated areas still contain a highly suitable environmental condition that is suitable for flora and fauna to thrive.	Not a factual error – there is no proposed amendment to text to consider. Explanation is a clarification that re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the Advisory Bodies IUCN appreciates this clarification.
Page 9 Left Column Paragraph 4	The boundary change reduces ... More positive data was provided showing that most tiger sighting via camera trapping in the period of 2013-2019 were still within the revised nominated area.	<u>Explanation:</u> Camera trapping has identified, on regular basis, tigers in the nominated area from 2019 up to the present. The excluded area and the nominated area form part of the same forest area and receives the same protection under Thai law. The Evaluation Report recognizes “concentrations of many valuable species, including Critically Endangered and Endangered species.”	Not a factual error – there is no proposed amendment to text to consider. The explanation re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the Advisory Bodies
Page 9 Left Column Paragraph 5	Based on habitat ... However, the central and southern parts of the excluded areas contain highly suitable habitats with concentrations of many valuable species, including Critically Endangered and Endangered species.		
Page 9 Right Column Paragraph 1	In summary, ... Information and maps provided in the 2020 resubmitted information make no reference to this buffer zone, ...	<u>Explanation:</u> 1. Information and maps provided in the 2020 Additional Information show the revised nominated area as appears in Annex IV of the Agreed Minutes	Not a factual error – there is no proposed amendment to text to consider. The explanation is new information that cannot be taken

		<p>of the Thailand-Myanmar Technical Meeting regarding the Nomination of the KKFC for Inscription on the World Heritage List held in Bangkok between 25-25 April 2019, except for 3 coordinates which had already been readjusted in response to Myanmar’s concerns.</p> <p>The fact that they do not show a buffer zone merely reflects the status of the said map for bilateral purposes.</p> <p>2. A 3 kilometers buffer zone still exists, lying on the eastern boundary of the nominated property totaling 157,255 ha, <u>as appears in the attachment.</u></p>	<p>into account at this stage. While the status and area of the remaining buffer zone is clarified here, IUCN has not received any cartographic information and is unclear about the exact outline of the buffer zone. Whilst IUCN appreciates the clarification on the source of the map provided, the map omitted showing any buffer zone. IUCN is also not aware where the buffer zone “on the eastern boundary” ends towards on the northern and southern sides of the nominated property.</p>
<p>Page 9 Right Column Paragraph 4</p>	<p>4.3 Management</p> <p>The Patrol cover about half of the <u>KKFC. ...</u></p>	<p><u>Explanation:</u></p> <p>Thailand has been using the science-based SMART (Spatial Monitoring and Responding Tool) Patrol System to collect field data both in the forest complex and excluded national park areas. These are concentrated on areas of vulnerability to threats as well as high biodiversity areas. Less accessible areas are patrolled from the air with targeted drop-in patrol as well as foot patrols.</p>	<p>Not a factual error – there is no proposed amendment to text to consider.</p> <p>The explanation appears to be a clarification</p>
<p>Page 9 Right Column Paragraph 5 Lines 12-13</p>	<p>The 2020 resubmitted material confirms the State Party’s commitment and investment in implementing the roadmap ... The 2021 submission by the State Party makes <u>no further reference to the roadmap.</u></p>	<p><u>Explanation:</u></p> <p>The 2015-2018 Roadmap <u>was developed with the specific purpose to support strategies and activities in connection with efforts to inscribe the KKFC as World Heritage Site by 2019. The Thai authorities concerned have now completed implementation of the Roadmap’s four strategies.</u> Various activities have since been integrated into regular workplans, and thus the Roadmap is no longer referred to.</p>	<p>Not a factual error – there is no proposed amendment to text to consider.</p> <p>The explanation is new information that cannot be taken into account at this stage</p> <p>IUCN appreciates the clarification on the current status of the Roadmap</p>

<p>Page 9 Right Column Paragraph 6</p>	<p>Nevertheless, IUCN notes below continues serious unresolved concerns in relation to communities and the governance and management of the nominated property.</p>	<p><u>Explanation:</u> The core issue of the role of communities in governance and management have been addressed. The Thai authorities concerned have included representatives from the local communities in the Protected Area Committees (PAC) in the KKFC. More villagers have been recruited to work in the KKFC, including 41 Karens from Ban Bang Kloï. More Karens have also been recruited to work in the national parks during March to June 2021.</p>	<p>Not a factual error – there is no proposed amendment to text to consider. The explanation re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the Advisory Bodies The sentence refers to concerns noted in the subsequent section (“IUCN notes below”). The concerns do not refer to the levels of local community representation on PACs.</p>
<p>Page 10 Left Column Paragraph 3</p>	<p>4.4 Community The State Party reports that 42 out of 55 villages surveyed support the nomination. Based on the list of villages provided in the 2020 additional information by the State Party, <u>IUCN notes that the participation rate appears to be low:</u> <u>For instance, only a total of 2,204 villagers participated from a population of 23,140 in KKNP organised in 9,126 households.</u> 1,412 out of the 2,204 participants in KKNP expressed their support to the nomination, according to additional information provided by the State Party, i.e., <u>more than one third were not supportive at that stage.</u> In 2021, the State Party reported that community consultations indicated that 2,105 individuals from 42 villages out of 55 villages expressed their consent and support for the nomination.</p>	<p><u>Correction:</u> ... only a total of 2,204 3,028 villagers participated from a population of 23,140 33,552 in KKNP organised in 9,126 13,021 households. 1,412 2,078 out of the 2,204 3,028 participants in KKNP expressed their support to the nomination, ... that community consultations indicated that 2,405 2,078 individuals households from 42 villages out of 55 villages expressed their consent and support for the nomination.</p> <p><u>Explanation:</u> 1. Demographic data indicates that the number of children age under 15 and senior citizens people account for approximately 40-50 percent of the total population in the area. The data thus suggests that around 13,420-16,776 out of 33,552 individuals are either children or senior citizens.</p> <p>2. Some villagers that reside and/or work outside the property were not able to join the public hearings and agreed that their family members or other village representatives represent them and casted the votes on their behalf.</p> <p>3. A total of 3,038 households joined the public hearing, of which 2,078 supported the inscription of the KKFC as World Heritage Site, or 68.62</p>	<p>Not a factual error Difference of opinion and new information that cannot be taken into account at this stage The figures used in IUCN’s evaluation are fully in line with the additional information provided by the State Party. The additional information reported “2,078 people”, i.e. not households. IUCN appreciates this new information, however, the demographic information set out here was not previously provided.</p>

		<p><u>percent of those who participated in the public hearing.</u></p> <p>4. This figure is comparable to the level of participation in previous consultations on other issues related to the communities.</p>	
<p>Page 10 Left Column Paragraph 4 Lines 8-11</p>	<p>The State Party's additional information ... Measures have been drafted to address these concerns, but details on what these measures entail have not been provided in the 2020 submission by the State Party.</p>	<p><u>Correction:</u></p> <p>The State Party's additional information ... Measures have been drafted to address these concerns, but details on what these measures entail have not been provided in the 2020 submission by the State Party.</p> <p><u>Explanation</u></p> <p>1. Land tenure surveys in the KKFC conservation zone in accordance with the National Park Act B.E. 2562 (2019) and the Wildlife Preservation and Protection Act B.E. 2562 (2019) have been completed. For those without land, the Thai Government is preparing for adoption of the Royal Decree in conformity with Article 64 and 65 of the National Park Act B.E. 2562 (2019) to ensure land rights of local communities in the KKFC.</p> <p>2. Since 2011, long-term measures and projects have been implemented in the KKFC including community development projects, vocational training, the promotion of sustainable tourism strategic plan in line the UNESCO Sustainable Toolkit, development of basic infrastructure and improvement of sanitation as well as schools and medical centers.</p> <p>3. Such information and supporting details have already been included in the Additional Information of January 2020 and the Supplementary to Thailand's Additional Information of February 2021 submitted to the World Heritage Centre, but have not been reflected in the IUCN Evaluation Report.</p>	<p>Not a factual error</p> <p>Re-iterates arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered by the Advisory Bodies</p> <p>The measures reported here are reviewed in the evaluation report. The measures referred to in the sentence in question relate to the preceding phrase "A number of local people argued to resolve land allocations prior to the nomination process."</p>

<p>Page 10 - Left Column Paragraph 6 Line 4</p> <p>- Right Column Paragraph 3 Line 4</p> <p>- Right Column Paragraph 5 Line 4</p>	<p>IUCN recalls ... in line with the UNESCO policy on engaging with indigenous peoples...</p> <p>In this regard, ... concerns related to the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities ...</p> <p>IUCN has also been made aware ... the nomination and processes of consultation on the rights of indigenous peoples, ...</p>	<p>- indigenous ethnic peoples</p> <p>- indigenous ethnic peoples</p> <p>- indigenous ethnic peoples</p> <p><u>Explanation:</u> The term- “indigenous” should be replaced by “ethnic” in the entire report. In Thailand’s interpretation, the term “indigenous peoples” refers to those who are pre-settlers or had lived in the area in the pre-colonial period, which is not applicable in the case of Thailand. Moreover, all 62 ethnic groups residing in Thailand have been provided a firm legal recognition since the adoption of the 1997 Constitution and subsequent Constitutions.</p>	<p>Not a factual error.</p> <p>IUCN accepts Thailand’s nationally determined interpretation of the term ‘indigenous’ as opposed to ‘ethnic’, however, in this case considers that the internationally accepted term indigenous peoples remains valid and appropriate to the evaluation in terms of its advice to the World Heritage Committee.</p>
<p>Page 10 Right Column Paragraph 3 Point 3</p>	<p>3. There is a need to improve the representation of Local Communities in the Protected Area Committee, as noted by the National Human Rights Commission of Thailand and in the State Party’s additional information of 2021.</p>	<p><u>Explanation:</u> Local communities have been encouraged to join the Protected Area Committees (PAC) to work alongside other stakeholders in the management and development of the KKFC. The term of office of each PAC is 2 years. Upon the expiry of the term of office of each PAC in the constituent areas of the KKFC (ranging from October 2021 – March 2023), the plan is to increase the number of representatives of the local communities in the PACs, particularly for the KKNP PAC, to enhance the participation of local communities in the management of the KKFC.</p>	<p>Not a factual error</p> <p>Clarification</p> <p>The phrase in the evaluation report is based on the additional information provided and the recommendations by the National Human Rights Commission and does not question the State Party’s plan to increase the number of representatives of local communities. IUCN welcomes the plans noted to increase the levels of representation of local communities which are consistent with the statement made within the evaluation report.</p>
<p>Page 10 Right Column Paragraph 4</p>	<p>As previously, ... the Special Rapporteur noted that members from local communities have raised concerns regarding the meaningfulness of the government’s consultation with villagers in the nominated property pertaining to land issues, involvement in forest management and the nomination asserting that officials may have misled the villagers that the consultations and agreements concerned only land allocations and not the nomination. ... in particular regarding the lack of consultations and free, prior and informed consent.</p>	<p><u>Correction:</u> As previously, ... the Special Rapporteur noted that members from local communities have raised concerns regarding the meaningfulness of the government’s consultation with villagers in the nominated property pertaining to land issues, involvement in forest management and the nomination asserting that officials may have misled the villagers that the consultations and agreements concerned only land allocations and not the nomination. ... in particular</p>	<p>Not a factual error</p> <p>Clarification</p> <p>IUCN’s evaluation accurately conveys the communication to IUCN and the World Heritage Committee from the Special Rapporteur raising these concerns. IUCN further notes that the Special Rapporteurs sent a further communication to the World Heritage Committee, which IUCN received on 30 June 2021 for information, and</p>

		<p>regarding the lack of consultations and free, prior and informed consent.</p> <p><u>Explanation:</u></p> <p>1. In September 2020 during the HRC-45 session, Mr. José Francisco Calí Tzay, SR on the rights of indigenous peoples welcomed the response provided by the Thai Government that the consultation process for the nomination of KKFC as World Heritage Site was transparent and in conformity with the World Heritage Convention to ensure that the community’s acknowledgement of the nomination was received in an independent and transparent manner.</p> <p>2. Each consultation session to disseminate information and promote understanding of the KKFC nomination conducted during December 2019 and January 2020 made it clear that the consultation was for the purpose of the World Heritage Nomination. They were organised through community leaders in order to strengthen the local communities’ understanding and acknowledgement of the nomination. The hearings included briefings on land rights under the National Park Act B.E. 2562 (2019) and the Wildlife Conservation and Protection Act B.E. 2562 (2019). They were also held in a local language to ensure the local communities’ full comprehension and to avoid any possible confusion or misunderstanding. Moreover, the Thai authorities concerned also gathered concerns raised by the villagers to explore appropriate measures to ease their concerns.</p> <p>Meanwhile, different stakeholders were able to witness the process.</p>	<p>understands the State Party has received as well.</p>
<p>Page 10 Right Column Paragraph 5</p>	<p>IUCN has also been made aware of direct representations from concerned communities on the nomination and processes of consultation on the rights of indigenous peoples, including a letter sent in January 2021 by the Cross-Cultural Foundation supported by 120 signing</p>	<p><u>Correction:</u> IUCN has also been made aware of ... including a letter including a letter sent in January 2021 by the Cross-Cultural Foundation supported by 120 signing organisations a letter sent in January 2021 by the NGO Coordinating Committee on</p>	<p>Not a factual error</p> <p>See point above</p> <p>Factual error</p>

	<p>organisations, conveying a petition by Karen communities who are asking to be allowed to return to their traditional homelands from which they were evicted since 1996.</p>	<p><u>Development (NGO COD)</u> conveying a petition ...</p> <p><u>Explanation:</u></p> <p>1. The only community with which discussions have been on-going to address land use concerns is that of Ban Bang Kloi. Any attempt to indicate that more than one community is involved should be avoided.</p> <p>2. <u>The letter was sent to the World Heritage Centre from the NGO COD not from the Cross-Cultural Foundation. Moreover, of the 120 NGOs mentioned in the letter, the names of two NGOs are duplicated and only 34 organisations are officially registered as NGOs,</u> as explained in the proposed correction to factual errors by the State Party on</p> <p>Page 8 Right Column Paragraph 1 Line 4.</p>	<p>IUCN acknowledges that the letter was indeed received from the NGO Coordinating Committee on Development (NGO COD) and not from the Cross-Cultural Foundation.</p>
<p>Page 11 Left Column Paragraph Line 16 and 19</p>	<p>Considering this background, ... and the affected indigenous peoples and local communities ...</p> <p>Considering this background, ... with the affected indigenous peoples and local communities ...</p> <p>IUCN recalls that ... the affected indigenous peoples and local communities ...</p>	<p>- indigenous ethnic peoples</p> <p>- indigenous ethnic peoples</p> <p>- indigenous ethnic peoples</p> <p><u>Explanation:</u></p> <p><u>The term “indigenous” should be replaced by “ethnic” in the entire report.</u> In Thailand’s interpretation, the term “indigenous peoples” refers to those who are pre-settlers or had lived in the area in the pre-colonial period, which is not applicable in the case of Thailand. Moreover, all 62 ethnic groups residing in Thailand have been provided a firm legal recognition since the adoption of the 1997 Constitution and subsequent Constitutions.</p>	<p>Not a factual error</p> <p>See point above</p>
<p>Page 11 Right Column Paragraph 2 Line 16</p>			
<p>Page 11 Left Column Paragraph 4 Lines 7-11</p>	<p>IUCN reiterates that ... IUCN recommends that the State Party establish an independent, third-party, arbitration process, in consultation with UNESCO, and working closely with Special Procedures Branch of the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights. ...</p>	<p><u>Correction:</u></p> <p>IUCN reiterates that ... IUCN recommends that the State Party establish an independent, third-party, arbitration process, in consultation with UNESCO, and working closely with Special Procedures Branch of the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights. ...</p>	<p>Not a factual error</p> <p>Difference of opinion</p> <p>IUCN wishes to underline that this is a constructive recommendation to provide a means to address issues that remain unresolved with the</p>

		<p><u>Explanation:</u></p> <p>1. An arbitration process, where a neutral third party serves as a mediator for resolving the dispute, is not applicable in this case.</p> <p>The Thai Government does not consider that concerns raised by the local communities including villagers in the KKFC are “disputes” between the State Party and the local communities. The Thai authorities have already put in place a number of mechanisms to address remaining concerns with the widest participation from stakeholders.</p> <p>2. Under Article 5 of the World Heritage Convention, the State Party has the obligation to “ensure that effective and active measures are taken for the protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage situated in its territory”. Thailand therefore is of the view that it is not in the mandate of IUCN to propose actions that infringe on Thailand’s domestic affairs, especially without any prior consultation with the State Party, which is the principle embedded in the Operational Guidelines. The third party arbitration process clearly violates Thailand’s jurisdiction over the KKFC.</p> <p>3. Thailand has maintained an <u>on-going engagement with the UN human rights mechanisms</u>, but we deem it appropriate to separate the UN human rights mechanisms from the World Heritage mechanism, in view of the different competence and mandates.</p>	<p>nomination. The proposal is similarly made within the draft decision proposed for the World Heritage Committee. It is clear that the possible response to such recommendation is appropriately a matter for the State Party of Thailand, including ensuring such a mechanism would be convened in a way that would address the points raised in the Explanations provided by the State Party.</p> <p>IUCN’s recommendation is fully consistent with its obligations under para 148 a) of the Operational Guidelines to ensure its evaluations adhere to the principles of the World Heritage Convention and the relevant Operational Guidelines and any additional policies set out by the Committee in its decisions .</p> <p>In this respect it is important to note that several previous Committee Decisions have reinforced this connection which is unavoidable when the nomination itself is directly cited by the UN human rights mechanisms.</p>
<p>Page 11 Left Column Paragraph 5</p>	<p>4.5 Threats</p> <p>Threats affecting the property ... However, IUCN notes that almost seven years after the evaluation mission, a new assessment in the field is strongly recommended.</p>	<p><u>Correction:</u></p> <p>However, IUCN notes that almost seven years after the evaluation mission, a new assessment in the field is strongly recommended.</p> <p><u>Explanation:</u></p> <p>During 2019-2020, the DNP discovered certain man-made threats including forest and land conversion in the KKNP particularly in the northern part of the village of Ban Pong Luek-Bang Kloi, and the village of Huai Salika-Ban Mae Khamoei. These are results of increasing demands</p>	<p>Not a factual error</p> <p>Difference of opinion</p> <p>IUCN’s evaluation report does not advance increasing demands of villagers for more land plots as a primary reason for a new evaluation mission. It only notes that almost 7 years after the evaluation mission potential threats would need to be re-assessed including the levels of human interaction with the natural values of the nominated property.</p>

		of villagers for more land plots due to extended family size and the return to original villages of certain urban dwellers affected by COVID-19. These issues are not related to any need for new field assessment.	
Page 11 Right Column Paragraph 2	<p>5.1 Timescale for the nomination</p> <p>IUCN recalls that the original nomination was submitted in 2014, and that following three referrals by the Committee it is now approaching seven years since the original nomination was evaluated. This is now more than double the normal maximum timeline for a referral process. IUCN considers that the 2014 evaluation is now clearly too distant from the original nomination for adequate and up-to-date advice to be provided to the World Heritage Committee, and the situation now appears to be outside any norms for a credible evaluation process. For these reasons, and to maintain the credibility of the Convention, IUCN reiterates that the deferral mechanism now represents the only appropriate option to proceed. IUCN considers deferral would be in the direct interests of the State Party, the affected indigenous peoples and local communities, and the World Heritage Convention.</p>	<p><u>Explanation:</u></p> <p>1. Para 159 of the Operational Guidelines states that “A referred nomination which is not presented to the Committee <u>within three years of the original Committee decision</u> will be considered as a new nomination”. There is no provision in the Operational Guidelines that specifies a “normal maximum timeline for a referral process.”</p> <p>2. In accordance with the IUCN procedure for the evaluation of the natural properties as appears in Annex 6 of the Operational Guidelines, IUCN should “<u>undertake dialogue with the nominating States Party/ies at all stages of the nomination process</u> and “will use its best endeavours to allocate its available resources equitably, efficiently and effectively, to maximise the opportunities for dialogue with all nominating State Parties. To continue the dialogue between Thailand and IUCN in conformity with para 6 of Decision 43 COM 8B.5, Thailand has extended invitations for an IUCN Advisory Mission to carry out a field mission to the KKFC, TWICE, in January 2020 and February and March 2021. Both invitations were declined by IUCN.</p> <p>3. indigenous ethnic peoples</p> <p>The term “indigenous” should be replaced by “ethnic” in the entire report. In Thailand’s interpretation, the term “indigenous peoples” refers to those who are pre-settlers or had lived in the area in the pre-colonial period, which is not applicable in the case of Thailand. Moreover, all 62 ethnic groups residing in Thailand have been provided a firm legal recognition since the adoption of the 1997 Constitution and subsequent Constitutions.</p>	<p>Not a factual error</p> <p>The evaluation report refers correctly to the normal timeline (of three years) implied under paragraph 159 of the Operational Guidelines.</p> <p>On Explanation points 2 and 3, the factually accurate position is as already noted above and in the detailed sequence and chronology within the background note of the evaluation report.</p> <p>IUCN has been proactive and diligent in working to help the State Party of Thailand respond effectively and comprehensively to the various past decisions of the World Heritage Committee on this nominated property. IUCN has not declined any invitations to undertake an Advisory Mission.</p>

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

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

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Austria / Belgium / **Czechia** / France / Germany / Italy / United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: The Great Spas of Europe

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
76, 1, 52	The purposeful urban planning of constructing a spa began around 1815, when the Lobkowitz artistic gardener, Wenzel Skalník, began to construct a spa park.	Václav	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification but notes that the word used in the evaluation report is the one included on the nomination file, on page 393.

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

(conformément au paragraphe 150 des *Orientations*)

ÉTAT(S) PARTIE(S) : Allemagne / Autriche / Belgique / **France** / Italie / Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande du Nord / **Tchéquie (la).**

ÉVALUATION DE LA PROPOSITION D'INSCRIPTION DU SITE : Les grandes villes d'eaux d'Europe

ÉVALUATION DE L'ORGANISATION CONSULTATIVE CONCERNÉE : ICOMOS

Page, colonne, ligne de l'évaluation de l'Organisation consultative	Phrase incluant l'erreur factuelle (l'erreur factuelle devrait figurer en gras)	Correction proposée par l'Etat partie	Commentaire (s'il y en a) de l'Organisation consultative et/ou du Centre du patrimoine mondial
126, 1, 12-13	Franzensbad (Tchéquie) ; Karlovy Vary (Tchéquie) ; et Marienbad (Tchéquie).	Františkovy Lázně (Tchéquie), Karlovy Vary (Tchéquie), et Mariánské Lázně (Tchéquie)	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification/ considère cette correction comme étant une clarification.
127, 1, 29-30	Franzensbad (Tchéquie) ; Karlovy Vary (Tchéquie) ; et Marienbad (Tchéquie).	Františkovy Lázně (Tchéquie), Karlovy Vary (Tchéquie), et Mariánské Lázně (Tchéquie)	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification/ considère cette correction comme étant une clarification.
127,1, 37	Ces utilisations ont déterminé le développement de types spécifiques de bâtiments thermaux popularisés à travers l'Europe, tels que le pavillon des sources (par exemple à Franzensbad , Spa et Vichy), les salles de pompage, les halls des sources ou « trinkhalle » (par exemple dans la Ville de Bath, à Baden-Baden, Baden bei Wien, Bad Kissingen et Vichy).	Františkovy Lázně	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification.
127, 1, 47	L'exercice physique modéré était considéré comme faisant partie de la « cure », c'est pourquoi on avait construit de grandes colonnades, certaines incorporant des fontaines dont les curistes pouvaient boire les eaux tout en déambulant (par exemple la colonnade du Moulin à Karlovy Vary, le temple à colonnade à la source de Marienbad).	Mariánské Lázně	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification.

128, 1, 29	L'eau minérale de Franzensbad , dont la source fut protégée à partir de 1516, était exploitée pour être exportée vers toutes les cours d'Europe au XVIe siècle.	Františkovy Lázně	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification.
128, 2, 6	En 1779, lorsque les sources de Marienbad furent confiées à Johann Josef Nehr, médecin du monastère tchèque, la vallée existait dans son état naturel.	Mariánské Lázně	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification.
128, 2, 11	Le projet de construction d'une station thermale débuta vers 1815, lorsque le jardinier paysagiste de Lobkowitz, Wenzel Skalník , commença à construire un parc thermal.	Václav	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification mais note que le nom utilisé dans le rapport d'évaluation est celui mentionné dans le dossier d'inscription à la page 393.
128, 2, 31	En 1785, à la suite de la visite des filles du roi Louis XV, un établissement de bains et une arcade abritant les sources furent construits.	une galerie	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification.
128, 2, 36	Napoléon III devint le plus grand mécène de la ville, commandant la construction d'une église, de parcs le long de la rivière, construisant des chalets, assurant à la ville d'eaux une grande réputation internationale	bienfaiteur	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification/ considère cette correction comme étant une clarification.
128, 2, 40	Dans les années 1880 , la ville et ses équipements thermaux étaient devenus inadaptés au regard du nombre de visiteurs, nécessitant de nouveaux projets de rénovation.	1890	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification mais note que la date présente dans le rapport d'évaluation est celle mentionnée dans le dossier d'inscription à la page 342.
129, 1, 27	Une nouvelle Kurhaus et un jardin thermal furent construits en 1738, ce qui en fait le plus ancien parc thermal spécialement construit pour accueillir les curistes en promenade dans le cadre de leur cure de boisson accompagnée d'activités de loisirs.	Un nouveau Kurhaus	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification.
131, 2, 19	D'autres bâtiments sont actuellement vides, en attente d'une nouvelle utilisation, comme les anciens thermes de Spa, l'hôtel Kavkaz à Marienbad , la gare supérieure du funiculaire Malbergbahn à Bad Ems et le nouveau château à Baden-Baden.	Mariánské Lázně	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification.

131, 2, 21	À Franzensbad et Marienbad , les façades de plusieurs bâtiments historiques ont été peintes avec des couleurs inadaptées, pendant la période socialiste.	A Františkovy Lázně et Mariánské Lázně	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification.
135, 2, 58	Globalement, la série montre toutes les phases du développement du phénomène du thermalisme, depuis les villes d'eaux les plus influentes du XVIIIe siècle (par exemple, la Ville de Bath et Spa) jusqu'au développement de villes d'eaux modèles telles que Vichy et Franzensbad , en passant par des villes qui témoignent des dernières phases du phénomène au début du XXe siècle, comme Montecatini Terme.	Františkovy Lázně	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification.
139, 1, 27	Un Conseil de gestion des grandes stations thermales (CGGST) , composé du plus haut fonctionnaire de chaque élément constitutif, sera responsable de la coordination opérationnelle et de la gestion globale du bien en étroite collaboration avec le CIG.	Un Conseil de gestion des grandes villes d'eaux (CGGVE) , composé du plus haut responsable élu de chaque élément constitutif, sera responsable de la coordination opérationnelle et de la gestion globale du bien en étroite collaboration avec le CIG.	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification.
139, 1, 44	Le statut du système de gestion globale doit être convenu, actualisé et approuvé par le CGGST sur une base de six ans.	Le CGGVE	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification.
139, 1, 45	Le CGGST doit être consulté sur l'élaboration des plans d'action contenus dans les plans de gestion locaux et chaque élément constitutif doit présenter un rapport annuel sur leur mise en oeuvre, la révision des PGL étant formalisée sur un cycle de six ans.	Le CGGVE	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification.
140, 1, 12	La réponse des États parties ne précise pas si des gestionnaires de sites sont déjà en place à Baden bei Wien, Bad Ems et Montecatini Terme ; à Bad Kissingen, le poste a été créé mais n'est pas encore pourvu ; à Franzensbad et Vichy, des gestionnaires de site sont en poste mais seulement à temps partiel.	Františkovy Lázně	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification.
140, 2, 45	Parmi ceux-ci, des objectifs de sensibilisation ainsi que l'engagement des communautés locales dans la gestion du bien proposé pour inscription, notamment par leur participation aux Groupes directeurs locaux du patrimoine mondial ; ces groupes font partie du système global de gestion du bien proposé pour inscription.	Groupe de pilotage local du patrimoine mondial	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification.

141, 2, 7	L'ICOMOS suggère par conséquent que des mécanismes à cet égard soient mis en place dans le cadre du système de gestion global élaboré pour l'ensemble du bien, en demandant par exemple aux États parties concernés de soumettre des projets spécifiques à l'examen du Conseil de gestion des grandes stations thermales .	Conseil de gestion des grandes villes d'eaux	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification.
142, 2, 18-19	Franzensbad , Karlovy Vary, Marienbad (Tchéquie)	Františkovy Lázně , Karlovy Vary, Mariánské Lázně (Tchéquie)	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification.
142, 2, 28	Les ensembles de bâtiments thermaux comprennent des bassins , salles de pompage, halls de sources, équipements de traitements et colonnades conçus pour exploiter les ressources en eau et permettre de les utiliser pour les bains et les cures d'eau thermal.	bains	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification.
144, 1, 25	Un Conseil de gestion des grandes stations thermales (CGGST) , composé des maires des onze éléments constitutifs, est responsable de la coordination opérationnelle et de la gestion globale du bien, en étroite consultation avec le Comité intergouvernemental.	Conseil de gestion des grandes villes d'eaux (CGGVE)	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification.
145, 1, 5	examiner comment le rôle du Conseil de gestion des grandes stations thermales (CGGST)	Conseil de gestion des grandes villes d'eaux (CGGVE)	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification.

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

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

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): China

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Quanzhou: Emporium of the World in Song–Yuan China

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
Page 222 Left Column Line 11	..., and the wooden structure preserves the original features of the Qing Dynasty, and the wooden structure preserves the original features of the Ming and Qing Dynasties .	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
Page 222 Right Column Line 12-14	..., the mosque was restored by Ahmad hen Muhammed Quds and the famous al-Hajj Rukn Al-Shirazi, in 1310.	..., the mosque was restored by Ahmad hen Muhammed Quds who was the famous al-Hajj Rukn Al-Shirazi, in 1310.	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
Page 222 Right Column Line 21-22	They were renovated in 1322 (Yuan Dynasty) and restored in 1962.	The tombs were renovated in 1322 (Yuan Dynasty) and the stone shelters over the tombs were restored in 1962. (notes: the 1962 restoration only applied to the stone shelters that was built over the tombs.)	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification
Page 222 Right Column Line 27-28	Originally built as a thatched buildings, the stone temple was built in the Yuan Dynasty.	Originally built as a thatched buildings, the stone temple was built in the Yuan Dynasty, the same period when the Statue of Mani was carved. (notes: it is suggested to add the year in which the Statue of Mani was carved)	ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change which does not modify the meaning of the sentence.
Page 223 Left Column Line 33-35	In the 1068 (Song Dynasty) a fortress was built over the water here, along with a bridge, paths and stairs.	In the 1068 (Song Dynasty) a fortress was built here, and in the next few years (1086-1094) the Tongji Bridge was built.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification
Page 223 Left Column Line 47-48	... a restoration financed by a maritime businessman occurred in 1336- 1369 (Yuan Dynasty), a restoration financed by a maritime businessman occurred in 1336- 1339 (Yuan Dynasty), ...	ICOMOS acknowledges this typing error

Page 223 Right Column Line 13-14	The component was built between 1053 and 1059 (Yuan Dynasty) and ...	The component was built between 1053 and 1059 (Song Dynasty) and ...	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
Page 223 Right Column Line 25-26	It was built between 1128 and 1152 AD.	It was built between 1138 and 1152 AD.	ICOMOS acknowledges this typing error.
Page 224 Left Column Last five lines + Page 224 Right Column Line 1-3	ICOMOS considers that the State Party should clarify and harmonise the information related to the exact number of component parts of the series, as well as the number of contributing elements which are comprised within them. The State Party should also provide 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 component of the series.	ICOMOS considers that the State Party should convey in the maps the differences between component parts and contributing elements in a clearer way. (note: The nominated serial property contains 22 components, each of which contains one or more contributing elements. The State Party outlined the boundaries and highlighted the names of contributing elements of each component in the maps with the purpose to convey each component's contributions to the OUV. The surface areas calculated in Chapter 1 (Identification of Property) refer to each of the 22 components, rather than the contributing elements. In addition, each of the 7 components in the old city of Quanzhou has a defined boundary and area too. But the 7 components are adjunct to each other so that they seemed to be one part (which is not). In fact, shown in the maps, in between each of the 7 components there are fine lines separating each other. In conclusion, the surface area refers to the 22 components, not the contributing elements.)	ICOMOS considers that this correction contains clarifications that cannot be taken account of at this stage.
Page 229 Right Column last three lines + Page 230 Left Column Line 1-2	Religious places are managed following State Regulations on religious affairs (revised 2017) and on the basis of the Quanzhou management system for eight religious places , covering a variety of management tasks.	Religious places are managed following State Regulations on religious affairs (revised 2017) and on the basis of the Eight Regulations of Quanzhou City for the Management of Religious Places , covering a variety of management tasks.	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
Page 232 Right Column Line 37-40	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,	a) The differences of component parts and contributing elements should be conveyed in the maps in a clearer way. (note: The nominated serial property contains 22 components, each of which contains one or more contributing elements. The State Party outlined the boundaries and highlighted the names of contributing elements of each component in the maps with the purpose to convey each component's contributions to the	ICOMOS considers that this correction contains clarifications that cannot be taken account of at this stage.

		<p>OUV. The surface areas calculated in Chapter 1 (Identification of Property) refer to each of the 22 components, rather than the contributing elements. In addition, each of the 7 components in the old city of Quanzhou has a defined boundary and area too. But the 7 components are adjunct to each other so that they seemed to be one part (which is not). In fact, shown in the maps, in between each of the 7 components there are fine lines separating each other. In conclusion, the surface area refers to the 22 components, not the contributing elements.)</p>	
--	--	---	--

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

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

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Germany

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Mathildenhöhe Darmstadt

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
p. 104, column 1, line 22	It was established in 1897 by Ernst Ludwig, the Grand Duke of Hesse, as a centre for the new reform movements in architecture, arts and crafts then emerging.	The colony was established in 1899 by Ernst Ludwig, the Grand Duke of Hesse, as a centre for the new reform movements in architecture, arts and crafts then emerging.	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
p. 110, column 2, line 24–26	which requires elimination of the historical public toilet in the forecourt of the Wedding Tower;	which requires restoration of the historical public toilet in the forecourt of the Wedding Tower;	ICOMOS considers this correction to be a clarification.
p. 112, column 1, line 60	Construction is scheduled to begin in 2020 .	Construction is scheduled to begin in 2022.	ICOMOS considers this correction to be a clarification. However, the additional information provided during the evaluation process mentions that the “Start of construction works [of the visitor centre is] spring 2020”.

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

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

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): India

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: The Glorious Kakatiya Temples and Gateways – Rudreshwara (Ramappa) Temple, Palampet, Jayashankar Bhupalpally District, Telangana State

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
Page 40, Column 1, Line 5 to 7	The Glorious Kakatiya Temples and Gateways -Rudreshwara (Ramappa) Temple, Palampet, Jayashankar Bhupalpally District, Telangana State, India	Name of the Property: Kakatiya Rudreshwara (Ramappa) Temple Telangana, India	ICOMOS considers that this correction provides information which contradicts information provided at earlier stages of the evaluation procedure.
Page 42, Column 1, Line 18 to 23	ICOMOS therefore considers that the State Party should consider a significant property boundary extension in order to ensure that all important features of the potential Outstanding Universal Value are subject to adequate legal protection and management , and that subsequently an extended buffer zone needs to be defined around the revised boundary delineation.	Current legal protection and proposed management doesn't necessitate any extension to the property boundary as establishment of a Special Development Area outside the buffer zone is aimed at preventing inappropriate developments and promoting conservation sensitive development in a larger area following the Integrated Conservation and Management Plan (ICMP). This has been outlined in Draft ICMP forwarded along with Interim Report - Supplementary Information dated 28 th February, 2020. It is requested for revisiting this by the advisory. It is outlined in the dossier (Pg.No. 133 of Dossier) that the property is managed by an integrated management plan involving owners and stakeholders at different levels. For the conservation management of the property, the National Conservation Policy of the Ancient Monuments, Archaeological Sites and Remains (NPC- AMASR) under Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) is the guiding line.	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.

		<p>It doesn't necessitate any extension to the current boundaries of the property.</p> <p>For further management beyond the boundary of the property, ASI is in the process of acquiring lands in the surroundings of the property for a more sensitive development approach as seen in <u>Annexure – 1.</u></p>	
<p>Page 42 Column 1 Line 55 to 58</p>	<p>ICOMOS requested clarification on the reasons why a complete disassembly of the temple had been considered the preferred conservation methodology.</p>	<p>The Geotechnical Survey conducted in 1984-87 documented the profile and condition of foundations of Kameshwara Temple, before disassembling. Unlike Rudreshwara (Ramappa) Temple, the conservation of the Kameshwara Temple was impossible by the methods of in situ management.</p> <p>Due to the misaligned condition of Kameshwara temple, after the detailed documentation (Pg.No.138 of dossier) was disassembled for careful procedure of anastylosis.</p> <p>These were clarified and copies of these reports were handed over during ICOMOS expert's visit to the site in September, 2019 and for panel Presentation in November, 2019 at Paris.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>
<p>Page 42, Column 2, Line 34 to 38</p>	<p>The state of conservation of the important elements not currently included in the boundaries, such as the Kakatiya water distribution system from Ramappa Lake, in particular the Voger Channel, have also not been considered.</p>	<p>The Kakatiya water distribution system from Ramappa Lake is well protected and managed by the Irrigation and Command Area Development (CAD) Department. Considering their important role in the upkeep of the wider context. The department is part of the Institutional Stakeholders in the preparation and execution of the Integrated Conservation and Management Plan.</p> <p>The irrigation system falls outside the proposed boundary of the property.</p> <p>This was outlined as part of Draft ICMP too.</p> <p>A committee to this effect is already initiated as per <u>Annexure – 2</u></p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>
<p>Page 42 Column 2 Line 39 to 43</p>	<p>ICOMOS recommends that in the course of further documentation regarding the boundary extension, these and other essential elements in the enlarged property should be included in the revised Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan.</p>	<p>The Site Management Plan of Archaeological Survey of India in detail presented the initiatives for conservation and detailed documentation of the other smaller temples in the wider context.</p> <p>The temples that are not under the Archaeological Survey of India are being taken care by the Department of Heritage, Telangana along with the support of Kakatiya Heritage Trust, as</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.</p>

		<p>per the procedures, methods and guidelines of National Conservation Policy of India, 2014 included in the Site Management Plan of ASI.</p> <p>State party (India) holds the view that there is no need of changing the boundaries for proposed property and Buffer zone.</p>	
<p>Page 43 Column 1, Line 21 to 27</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the State Party should ensure that all the mentioned features that support the understanding of the temple ensemble as a much larger complex and setting, be incorporated into the revised nominated property and buffer zone, in order to provide these areas with adequate protection, which will mitigate the risks related to development pressures.</p>	<p>The nominated property and boundary holds all the attributes that define Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), statement of Integrity presented in the dossier for Scientific aspects, Cultural values and Puranic, Dharmic and Dance Traditions in Temple architecture. The areas beyond the buffer are planned under Special Development Authority.</p> <p>As already acknowledged in the dossier (Pg. Nos. 34 and 105 of Dossier) on the features that support the understanding of the temple ensemble as a much larger setting including development pressures is planned to be addressed by the Palampet Special Development Authority as mentioned in <u>Annexure- 2</u>.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.</p>
<p>Page 43, Column 1, Line 44 to 47</p>	<p>However, ICOMOS considers that following the redefinition of the boundaries, the stipulations of the special development zone would need to be reviewed</p>	<p>A committee has been constituted by the Government of Telangana to initiate the action plan under Special Development Authority Zone as per <u>Annexure – 2</u> to ensure the sensitive development and protection of the Palampet Special Area Development Zone.</p> <p>As such, there is no need of redefinition of the boundary.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.</p>
<p>Page 43, Column 2, Line 43 to 45</p>	<p>ICOMOS takes note of this proposal; however, the name appears very long with location details that are not necessary to the understanding of the property. ICOMOS suggests shortening the future name of the property</p>	<p>Name of the Property:</p> <p>Kakatiya Rudreshwara (Ramappa) Temple</p> <p>Telangana, India</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this correction contains new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.</p>
<p>Page 44, Column 2, Line 3 to 5</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the comparative analysis does not justify consideration of this nominated property for World Heritage Listing at this stage</p>	<p>State party (India) wishes to state that two decades of research and discovery that specifically outlined the attributes of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scientific knowledge of materials, - Interchange of Cultural (Dharmic and Puranic) values and - Dance treatise and traditions <p>While providing the additional information and supplementary information, state party included the scientific data discovered like sand box</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.</p>

		<p>technology, creation of floating bricks including the Dance treatise, Dharmic and Puranic traditions as displayed by the attributes of the property.</p> <p>The comparative analysis presented in the Nomination Dossier (Pg. Nos.127 to 132 of Dossier) shows the influences, evolution and the unique features of the nominated property in comparison to its contemporary and predecessors along with other WH Sites.</p> <p>State party (India) strongly holds the comparison is justified including the attributes of the property presented in the nomination dossier, additional information and supplementary information at various stages.</p>	
<p>Page 44, Column 2, Line 32 to 34</p>	<p>...in ICOMOS' view, it is difficult to understand how sculptures of a single temple could stand out for the entire artistic production of the Kakatiya dynasty.</p>	<p>Rudreshwara (Ramappa) Temple is the best surviving example in Kakatiya temples standing as testimony to the technological excellence and the fine technique fused in the craftsmanship. It is a most articulated fusion of the ardent insight of a fully conscious architect, articulated attention to detail of the sculptors and the designers, sensible application of materials, and impeccable execution.</p> <p>It is the zenith of Kakatiyan Temple Architecture, hence the single temple displays the feature of Kakatiyan Temple architecture in totality conveying its integrity and authenticity of all the attributes.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.</p>
<p>Page 44, Column 2, Line 52 to 53</p>	<p>ICOMOS therefore considers that criterion (i) has not been justified at this stage</p>	<p>Kakatiya Era holds many temples and other structures in the Telangana region. But as justified in the nomination dossier, for completeness of OUV and the state of authenticity and integrity of the attributes, the other properties are not listed in the nomination.</p> <p>Rudreshwara (Ramappa) Temple is a master piece of Kakatiyan style of Temple architecture with the use of engineering innovation by creating floating bricks, sand-box foundations, material selection knowledge and ingenuity in stone sculpting as technological ensemble.</p> <p>The sculptural and form modification, evolution of temple art, sculpture and use of technology in material selection and making as displayed in Rudreshwara Temple at Palampet, is a master piece of human creativity.</p> <p>Thus, Rudreshwara (Ramappa) Temple as a single property holds all the</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.</p>

		<p>attributes of Kakatiyan Temple Architecture representing the masterpiece of the era.</p> <p>Therefore, State Party (India) holds the view that Criteria (i) is justified.</p>	
<p>Page 45, Column 2, Line 26 to 31</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that criteria (iii) demonstrates strong potential to be met once the related attributes are fully included in the property. However, ICOMOS considers that criterion (ii) has not been met and that criterion (i) would require further comparative support to demonstrate its potential</p>	<p>The temple is the representation of the epitome of Kakatiyan Temple Architecture which has evolved from the Chalukyas and continued to the Vijaynagara Era. This has been explained in detail in the comparative analysis of the temples in the nomination dossier.</p> <p>The other related attributes like wider context of the temple, though represent the cultural landscape of Kakatiyas, the nomination clearly is proposed for the Science and Engineering in Temple Architecture, Cultural and Dance Traditions rather than the cultural landscape. Hence, as a representation of Temple Architecture, the nominated property alone fulfills the OUV, Integrity and authenticity.</p> <p>Hence State party holds strongly that Criteria (iii) stands justified.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.</p>
<p>Page 46, Column 2, Line 35 to 38</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that, with the exception of the Kameshwara Temple, the conditions of authenticity of the nominated property are acceptable. The conditions of integrity have not been met.</p>	<p>Conservation Management part outlined in the Site Management plan by ASI planned a careful anastylosis of Kameshwara Temple in accordance with integrity of the structure for its attributes and structural stability. ASI has started working on the restoration of Kameshwara Temple as per Site Management Plan already submitted.</p> <p>The conditions stand and hold good as per state party (India) status of management and protection systems.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.</p>
<p>Page 46, Column 2, Line 18 to 22</p>	<p>ICOMOS recommends that a detailed conservation programme is established within the revised integrated conservation and management plan, committed to be available in December 2021.</p>	<p>The Site Management Plan annexed along with the Integrated Conservation and Management Plan holds the details of the conservation program followed till date at the property followed by the plan for future conservation.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this correction provides information which contradicts information provided at earlier stages of the evaluation procedure.</p>
<p>Page 48, Column 1 Line 42 to 45</p>	<p>ICOMOS notes with concern that elements of the larger temple complex, such as the Kakatiyan heritage features surrounding the property within its wider setting, have not enjoyed the same level of documentation.</p>	<p>Archaeological Survey of India and Department of Heritage, Telangana are the custodians of most of the other Kakatiyan Heritage Properties situated in the wider context of the Property. They are documenting and preparing the Heritage Impact Assessment as well as restoration plan of the temples phase</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this correction contains new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.</p>

		<p>wise with the support of District Collector, Mulugu.</p> <p>For instance, Shivalayam near the Ramappa Lake front has already been documented and is being prepared for restoration.</p>	
<p>Page 48, Column 2, Line 35- 38</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the local communities should be considered for the daily management of the nominated property, and integrated into the management system.</p>	<p>The Palampet Special Development Authority under process of constitution has ensured the local community participation by incorporating the Village Panchayat (community), and the Temple Priest (member of Endowments Department) as an integral part of the development authority.</p> <p>Community being part of the management was already emphasized at various stages in the Dossier (Pg.No.133) and subsequently during Expert's visit, Additional information and Supplementary information submissions.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>
<p>Page 49, Column 1, Line 23 to 31</p>	<p>Risk management would mostly relate to the risks of extreme weather events, earthquakes, and crowds during festive occasions, as well as the overall protection of the setting around the site to preserve its pristine character and prevent visual disturbances. Likewise, the assessment criteria and mechanisms for the consideration of appropriateness of future visitor infrastructure in the property's wider setting should be defined more explicitly.</p>	<p>The site is located at a Seismic Zone II i.e. at a very low risk of earthquakes. However, the temple and its surrounding setting is planned considering the risks associated with the geography of the location. The risk management plan as given in the integrated conservation and management plan outlines the methods to be followed for the risk management at the special development zone.</p> <p>The visitor management Plan (Pg. No. 41 of ICMP) as provided in the Integrated Conservation and Management Plan provides the detailed report on the management of site during varying footfall at the property and its surroundings.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>
<p>Page 49, Column 2, Line 21 to 26</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this development would need to be reconsidered with an extremely cautious approach and that Heritage Impact Assessments should be undertaken before any such plans area approved or even implemented.</p>	<p>The development to be undertaken in the special development zone shall be in compliance considering the integrity and authenticity of the heritage precinct as outlined in ICMP (Pg. Nos. 12-15 of ICMP)</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>
<p>Page 50, Column 1, Line 13 to 16</p>	<p>ICOMOS recommends involving the local community and the priests as partners and stakeholders in the overall management system, particularly in relation to day-to-day maintenance.</p>	<p>As per the Integrated Conservation and Management Plan submitted in February 2020, the following local authorities are the stakeholders for the protection and management of the site: i. Local Government body constituting of the Panchayati Raj i.e. the Village chief</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier</p>

		<p>ii. Endowments Dept. which includes the priest and other temple staff. iii. Local NGO – Ramappa Parirakshana Committee</p> <p>Community being part of the management was already emphasized at various stages in the Dossier (Pg. No.133) and subsequently during Expert’s visit, Additional information and Supplementary information submissions.</p>	that have been fully considered.
Page 50, Column 1, Line 27 to 31	ICOMOS suggests to cautiously re-evaluate the anticipated Ramappa Lakefront Development, including through Heritage Impact Assessments, before any projects are approved or even implemented in this sensitive location.	<p>The Special Development Authority, being formed to undertake conservation sensitive development beyond the property buffer, is also incorporating Heritage Impact Assessment of every project to be developed in the region.</p> <p>Therefore, the Special Development Zone regulations will be applicable to every project including the lake front development around Ramappa Lake.</p>	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
Page 51, Column 1, Line 16 to 22	Redefine the nomination approach to include the wider context of Rudreshwara (Ramappa) Temple and accordingly enlarge the property boundaries and buffer zone 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;	<p>The nomination of the property is the representation of Kakatiya Temple Architecture. However, being aware of the significance of the wider context in the protection and management of the cultural integrity of the dharmic context of the Kakatiya Cultural Landscape, the wider context is being protected and managed by the Palampet Special Development Authority.</p> <p>For further management beyond the boundary of the property, ASI is in the process of acquiring lands in the surroundings of the property for a more sensitive development approach as seen in <u>Annexure – 1.</u></p>	ICOMOS considers that this correction contains new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.
Page 51, Column 1, Line 23 to 32	Develop the comparative analysis in line with the selected nomination approach to compare the 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;	<p>The comparative analysis provided in the nomination dossier (Pg. Nos.127 to 132 of Dossier) has very precisely compared the Kakatiyan temple of Rudreshwara (Ramappa) Temple with other temples in Deccan India like the Hoysala Temples, the Chola Temples, the Group of Monuments of Pattadakal and many other national and international comparable sites to showcase the unique features of Kakatiya temple as well as the evolution of the temple form.</p> <p>The wider context of Rudreshwara (Ramappa) Temple is also compared HWS Sambor Prei Kuk Archaeological and Cultural Landscape.</p> <p>These comparisons were made after an elaborate research by experts in Hindu Temple Architecture.</p>	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.

		State party holds the view that revised approach is not necessary, as the attributes and OUV was for Science and engineering of Kakatiya Temple Architecture along with Dharmic, Puranic Cultural values and Dance Traditions.	
Page 51, Column 1, Line 36 to 42	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;	Government of Telangana has initiated the process of creating a Special Development Zone (Authority) - Annexure -2 to regulate the development and to ensure such development to be in consonance with the Integrated Conservation and Management Plan.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
Page 51, Column 1, Line 43 to 46	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;	The boundaries of the property remain unchanged. The Special Development Authority is proposed to protect, manage and maintain as per the guidelines given in the Integrated Conservation and Management Plan (Pg. Nos.11-13 of ICMP), has specifically considered the viewing areas and ensured that no development to take place in that area to keep the visual integrity of the property intact.	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.
Page 51, Column 2, Line 1 to 7	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 property;	The Process of finalizing the Integrated Conservation and Management Plan is initiated by Government of Telangana. The Tourism Management Plan is prepared at the draft stage by the Youth Advancement, Tourism and Culture Department, Telangana and the Conservation Management Plan is part of the Site Management Plan prepared by Archaeological Survey of India, Hyderabad Circle with the advice and final approval by Palampet Special Development Authority.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
Page 51, Column 2, Line 8 to 10	Undertake Heritage Impact Assessments for any projects located near the property, in particular the development projects near the Ramappa Lake;	The development to be undertaken in the special development zone in particular near Ramappa lake shall be in compliance considering the integrity and authenticity of the heritage precinct as outlined in ICMP (Pg. Nos. 12-15 of ICMP) after approval by the Palampet Special Development Authority.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.

<p>Page 51, Column 2, Line 11 to 13</p>	<p>Provide a schedule and detailed methodology for the reassembly and conservation of Kameshwara Temple;</p>	<p>Schedule for restoration of Kameshwara Temple: Preparation of estimate/ site investigation/ soil testing an foundation design - June 2021 – July 2021 by the method of scientific conservation Execution – Aug 2021- March 2022 in consultation with NIT, Warangal. Estimation preparation for complete restoration of Kameshwara Temple – April 2022 – May 2022 to be approved s per designs by NIT, Warangal and the Director General, ASI. Tendering process for the execution of the restoration – June 2022 – March 2023 Execution of restoration of Kameshwara Temple by the method of scientific conservation – April 2023 – March 2025.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this correction contains new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.</p>
<p>Page 51, Column 2, Line 14 to 20</p>	<p>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 behavior related indicators and tourism-related developments in the wider surroundings of the property.</p>	<p>The nominated property and other heritage properties in the wider context belonging to the Archaeological Survey of India follow the Archaeological Manual to ensure the monitoring of the site.</p> <p>As per the Archaeological Manual and works code, the superintending Archaeologist including the team of Archaeological Engineers accompanied by field conservation staff periodically inspects the monument.</p> <p>During these inspections, the conservation problems are identified and documented. These documentations are further scrutinized by the authority and the Director General for Approval. Once approved, the said conservation practices are followed at the site.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>
<p>Page 51, Column 2, Line 21 to 22</p>	<p>Any revised nomination should be visited by a mission to the site.</p>	<p>State party (India) strongly holds the view that there is no requirement of Revising the Nomination.</p> <p>State party (India) holds the view to request the ICOMOS Panel to consider the factual corrections and observations noted in this document.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.</p>
<p>Page 51, Column 1, Line 33 to 35</p>	<p>Revise the justification for inscription based on the most appropriate criteria and amend the title to match the revised focus of the nomination;</p>	<p>As explained in response to Pg. No. 44, Column 2, Line 52 to 53; Pg. No. 45, Column 2, Line 26 to 31, State party (India) strongly holds the view that the criteria stands justified and there is no need of revision</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.</p>

<p>Page 51, Column 1, Line 9 to 15</p>	<p>ICOMOS recommends that 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 be deferred in order to allow the State Party, with the advice of ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre, if requested, to:</p>	<p>Given the factual corrections, actions initiated and observations of the State Party (India) requests for reviewing the points considering towards Inscription of the property.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.</p>
---	---	---	--

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

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

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

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Trans-Iranian Railway

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
53- 2-55	<p>Railway equipment, such as bridge-building equipment and iron sleepers, were imported from the United States of America. Delays and technical problems, mainly on the southern line, resulted in the syndicate's contract being cancelled.</p>	<p>As it is mentioned in the nomination dossier, several countries participated in this mega project. More than 70000 workers, engineers and experts coming from Iran and other countries took part in the construction of the Trans-Iranian railway. During the construction of the TIR, although the Iranian government undertook direct supervision but the project was subcontracted to multiple companies from various countries such as Iran, Germany, Greece, Italy, Switzerland, France, Belgium, Britain, former Czechoslovakia, Sweden, U.S. and Denmark.</p> <p>(Section 2/pages19-21,97,145-147)</p> <p>Please correct this text as:</p> <p>Railway different equipment were imported from various countries participating in the construction of TIR. Delays and technical problems, mainly on the southern line, resulted in the syndicate's contract being cancelled.</p>	<p>ICOMOS accepts this editorial change but notes that the information was taken from the nomination dossier p. 166:</p> <p>The first ship carrying a cargo of railway equipment including bridge-building machinery and 20000 meters of iron sleepers bought from USA reached Khor-Musa in 1928.</p>
54- 2-49	<p>Environmental pressures include heat and humidity, soil subsidence and landslides. Natural disasters include floods; potentially vulnerable areas have been recorded by GPS data. Sandstorms create problems for the railway, particularly in the central plateau and southern parts of the country. Seismic faults are found all over the country, raising the possibility of earthquakes.</p>	<p>Technical measures and practical solutions are taken to prevent and reduce the impact of sandstorms on the railway, which are mentioned on pages 261 and 262 of the nomination file.</p> <p>Please change this text as:</p> <p>Sandstorms pose problems for the railway in some small sections of the line close to the desert areas which is under control.</p>	<p>ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.</p>

55- 2-60	<p>In its Interim Report, ICOMOS requested as well the State Party to further develop on the impacts of the development of the railway had on the society itself, as it crosses eight different regions. The State Party answered this question by listing the modernization processes triggered by the entry into operation of the Trans-Iranian Railway: the transition from a condition of demographic dispersion in distant oases to forms of urban centralization, with the creation of new towns, the birth of a new urban lifestyle, the development of new agricultural activities (cotton) and new industrial branches related to oil.</p>	<p>The mentioned report contains more clarification on the impacts of the development of the railway had on the society itself, as it crosses eight different regions. As an introduction, the issue of the impact of the railway was stated equal to the impact of the discovery of oil and its related elements. Several impacts are mentioned but the new industrial branches related to oil do not fall into this category. Also some of impacts are not listed in the text therefore, Please omit the new industrial branches related to oil and correct this text as:</p> <p>the transition from a condition of demographic dispersion in distant oases to forms of urban centralization, with the creation of new towns, the birth of a new urban lifestyle, the development of new agricultural activities (cotton), The fundamental impact on nomadic life that has led to cultural values and pattern of the traditional lifestyle, social structure that led to experienced huge changes, strategically and trading point of view, creating the new economic atmosphere and population density.</p>	<p>ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification and editorial change</p>
56- 2-11	<p>In terms of technical influences for railway techniques, the Trans-Iranian Railway was an adaptation of western technologies already implemented elsewhere, with no technical specificities. In relation to the masonry bridge construction and the Persian influence, this argument is weak as they cannot be considered as the same technical structures: for example, the circular arches were not used during the Persian times. The influence could potentially be explored further in terms of architectural designs, for which detailed analyses and further research work would need to be undertaken.</p>	<p>As there has been evidences of circular arches in Persian architecture since 3000 years ago in Choghazanbil and Haft-Tapeh and continued in historical bridges such as Kashkan, Shadorvan, QaleHatam bridge, Alashtar , Maku and other historical bridges and regards to the clarification which was sent on this Issue Therefore Please considered the architectural designs and not the same technical structures and Please correct this text as:</p> <p>In relation to the masonry bridge construction and the Persian influence, this argument can be considered in terms of architectural designs but not the same technical structures.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>
58- 1-4	<p>To a large degree the nomination dossier equates the conservation of the nominated property with the repair and maintenance activities being undertaken there. The section on conservation focuses on “preventive” repair and</p>	<p>In the nomination file, section 4, page 248, Protection is described at three levels: “Inspection and monitoring”, “preventive” and “unavoidable” repair and maintenance. The first category which contains all stations and their historical elements as well as</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>

	<p>maintenance, and “unavoidable” repair and maintenance. The former includes planned and reactive work to preserve safety and prevent structural problems; the latter includes work to guarantee constant service.</p>	<p>heritage features is omitted in the text.</p> <p>Please correct this text as:</p> <p>The section on conservation focuses on Inspection and monitoring, “preventive” repair and maintenance and “unavoidable” repair and maintenance. The former which contains all stations and its elements and work to preserve heritage features. The latter includes planned and reactive work to preserve safety and prevent structural problems; the last includes work to guarantee constant service.</p>	
58- 2-28	<p>Older Trans-Iranian Railway records and research documents of are kept at the Research Division of the Centre for International Research and Education of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Records, reports and studies of the technical and management aspects of the property are kept by the Railways of the Islamic Republic of Iran.</p>	<p>Please consider that the Research Division of the Centre for International Research and Education of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is one of the TIR historical references. Also, since TIR is registered in the National Heritage List, the historical related documents are kept in the Cultural Heritage Documentation Center located in the Ministry of Cultural Heritage, Tourism and Handicrafts.</p> <p>Please correct this text as:</p> <p>Older Trans-Iranian Railway records and research documents as well as records, reports and studies of the technical and management aspects of the property are kept by the TIR office in Iran Railway Company and the documentation center in the ministry of cultural heritage, tourism and handicrafts. The Research Division of the Centre for International Research and Education of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is one of the references in this regard.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this clarification provides new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.</p> <p>The information was taken from the nomination dossier page 386.</p>
60- 2-44	<p>The structure of the management system puts the Trans-Iranian Railway Office at a relatively low level in the Iranian Railway Company’s organizational chart. Furthermore, the Iranian Cultural Heritage, Handicrafts and Tourism Organization is not positioned at the decision-making level for the nominated property. This raises concerns about achieving the appropriate balance between the operational aspects of the railway and the conservation</p>	<p>The following are noteworthy in this regard:</p> <p>1-The Trans- Iranian Railway Bureau is a subdivision of the most vital Deputy of Infrastructure and Technical Affairs which is considered as the comprehensive historical and technical aspects deputy of the Railway Company of Iran. Because of the great cultural and historical importance attached to the TIR, the bureau has been placed within this deputy and it is not in low level of the company.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>

	<p>of the heritage values of the nominated property.</p>	<p>2-TIR is a National Heritage; it means all decisions and an activity related to TIR is under supervision of The Ministry of cultural heritage, Tourism and Handicrafts and is in the highest level of decision-making for TIR. It even has a veto right over all plans for conservation, management, decisions and master plans.</p> <p>3-The Cultural Heritage is a member of the TIR steering committee, in addition to decision-making, it has the right to full supervision of all aspects of management and protection.</p> <p>Please correct this text as:</p> <p>The structure of the management system puts the Trans-Iranian Railway Office at a vital Deputy of Infrastructure and Technical Affairs in the Iranian Railway Company's organizational chart. Furthermore, the Iranian Ministry of Cultural Heritage, Tourism and Handicrafts as the member of the steering committee has a decision-making level for the nominated property. This raises no concerns about achieving the appropriate balance between the operational aspects of the railway and the conservation of the heritage values of the nominated property.</p>	
<p>60- 2-53</p>	<p>The absence of a dedicated budget allocation for cultural heritage conservation activities is also a concern. An overall conservation management plan should be developed.</p>	<p>All the 1394 km Trans-Iranian Railway is registered in the national heritage list. It is the historical railway and all dedicated budget is for its conservation which contains its function and its historical aspect. Preservation of historical aspects of the railway is included in its budget. The budget mentioned in the nomination file is a combination of safety and maintenance budget that it includes the conservation of TIR cultural heritage. The conservation budget for movable and immovable heritage is included in the Table of page 303.</p> <p>Please correct this text as:</p> <p>The budget allocation for cultural heritage conservation activities is dedicated and conservation management plan is developed based on it.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this clarification provides new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.</p>

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

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

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Mongolia

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Deer Stone Monuments and Related Sites, the Heart of Bronze Age Culture

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
66, 1 st column, 37-40 lines	Also, at this component are examples of the use of the stone fragments from broken deer stones to support and fix other deer stones.	This sentence could be deleted. No evidence of use of stone fragments from broken deer stones was attested at Jargalantyn Am site.	ICOMOS considers that this reflects a difference of opinion.

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

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

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Saudi Arabia

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Cultural Rock Arts in Himā Najrān

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
Numerous	In Paragraphs 25, 47, 116, & 120 the name " al-Kawbab " which is a typo	The Correct name is "Al-Kawkab".	ICOMOS acknowledges this typing error.
P 36, Col 2	ICOMOS considers that it is of utmost importance for the Saudi Commission for Tourism and National Heritage's Najrān Office to keep and to make internally accessible to staff a database of consistent site record files for all sites inventoried within the nominated property and the buffer zone, including site record sheets (panel by panel), past condition reports, past conservation interventions and all photographs taken of the site since it was first recorded.	The State Party (Saudi Arabia) has put in place accessible database of consistent site records. The State Party recognizes the importance of the database of site record files, evident in the following: In page 5 column 2 the MP states "(P4) A region-wide sites database will be established to share all scientific information relating to prehistoric rock art and petroglyphs in the region". In page 61 the MP states "(P4.1) Establish a GIS database for the region to record the sites of rock art, inscriptions and prehistoric monuments as well as finds. (P4.3) Where relevant link the database to national level databases and surveys managed by the SCTH in Riyadh. (P4.4) Use the GIS platform to regularly monitor the condition of the sites using handheld devices. (P4.6) Make the sites database available to established researchers working in the area". In page 61 the MP states "A database will not only enable known sites to be monitored, but with the addition of new sites support more scientific research that can lead to a better understanding of this corpus of prehistoric monuments, rock art and inscriptions." In page 61 the management plan states "(P5.3) Ensure all monitoring data is linked to the GIS database and logged with the SCTH and stored safely". In the MP (V3.3) page 71, and in in page 88 (V3.3) "Najrān Regional Museum to organize regular events and activities focused on cultural heritage sites and their importance to the region". Also, in page 4 column 2 "The rationale for the management of the site is to concentrate interpretation at the new Himā Regional Museum	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered and contain new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.

		<p>and a new Visitor Centre to be located in the old Governorate building to act as a gateway to the sites".</p> <p>Thus, all data obtained from the comprehensive archaeological and rock art surveys (see also Annex 1.A.)</p> <p>by the Heritage Commission (HC) survey teams are filed in the Research Centre and Archeological Excavation Department of the HC at its headquarters in Riyadh; additionally it is also stored in the archive of the newly built regional museum/office in Najran</p> <p>Additionally, the Royal Commission for Al-Ula (RCU) have an established database using Arches software (open source developed by Getty for heritage records) which has been specifically tailored for the Saudi context, and currently being used by the French CNRS to document rock-arts and inscriptions in the site.</p> <p>Moreover, the Heritage Commission takes this consideration seriously and has established a joint program with the King Abdulaziz Foundation for Research and Archives (DARAH) that will be launched in November 2021 to be completed in one year timeframe (see Annex 1.b)</p> <p>Rock arts is a new field of specialization in the Kingdom, the Heritage Commission has ensured access to its available data and knowledge on rock arts to PhD Students from various universities in Saudi Arabia, and intends to work on developing and increasing the knowledge and competencies related to the field, especially after the inclusion of the Rock Art in the Hail Region WHS.</p>	
<p>P 36, Col 2</p>	<p>“ICOMOS considers that a conservation program should be created and implemented, together with the recruitment of specialised staff”.</p> <p>“An overall conservation program is needed, and a professional rock art conservator should be engaged on site”</p>	<p>The State Party (Saudi Arabia) has taken major steps in this regard. The Heritage Commission has initiated a conservation program that includes the recruitment of specialized staff, and the training of local conservation professionals (see also Annexes 4 & 5); these may include students from the King Saud University and University of Hail who are in the process of completing their MSc and PhD in rock art. The following sections illustrate this aspect: In 5.g "Sources of Expertise and Training in Conservation and Management Techniques", the main text states: <i>"Archaeology departments in many universities have trained many undergraduates and graduates now working as researchers and archaeologists in the Saudi Commission of Tourism and National Heritage. In these universities they have received training in all aspects of restoration, conservation and rock art studies"</i>.</p> <p>Concerning trained staff, Najran University Department of Archaeology based in Najran City is in the process of developing research and teaching facilities and capabilities in this field. A Research Center for Rock Art Studies is also being established, through endorsing the field of rock art and conservation as a key focus for the next cycle of the international scholarship program for Saudis, and is committed to the establishment of the first</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections contain new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.</p>

		<p>dedicated research center to rock art in the Kingdom, and the region, with an aim in securing partnerships with international institutions to support and facilitate the founding of the center, currently HC has signed agreements with the French National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS) (see Annex 2).</p> <p>HC is also committed to ensuring specialized Saudi professionals are involved in field research to advance local knowledge and skills. Research staff and students from the Saudi universities, and from the Archaeology Department of Najran University, are participating with the French team from the CNRS and University of Paris to conduct survey of Najran rock arts and to train Saudi specialists in the field of archeological studies. Also, the Museum Studies Program of the Collage of Liberal Arts and Sciences of the University of Kansas under the direction of Prof. Sandra Olsen is conducting research of the area accompanied by university students and researchers.</p> <p>Other factors related to this serial nomination are the planned role of Najrān City as the "Gateway" to the Rock Arts of Hīmā in Najrān Area, the establishment of a new museum, and an archaeology department and a rock art research center at Najrān University.</p>	
<p>P 39, Col 1</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that an operational monitoring program is essential, with a complete set of measurable key indicators that address the state of conservation of the full range of identified attributes that support the proposed Outstanding Universal Value, as well as the identified threats. It must also indicate the periodicity of examination and the identity of the responsible authorities.</p>	<p>The Heritage Commission remains committed to implementing a monitoring protocol and guidelines through a long-term program. This monitoring stream forms part of the conservation plan/ program (see also Annex 4). In 3.3.v "Risk Management" the main text states <i>"The Management Plan submitted with this nomination sets out the general parameters of managing the Property, but it will remain flexible to accommodate any new requirements deriving from the findings of the monitoring program. Various aspects are set out in subsequent sections below, including the pressures arising from development and environmental factors (4. b. i & ii), the projected level of visitation (4. b. iv), the available legislative protection (5. b) and the means of implementing protective measures"</i>.</p> <p>In (4. b) "Factors Affecting the Property" the main text states <i>"These factors need to be addressed in the Management Plan and they are in need of regular review, especially in conjunction with evaluating the results of the monitoring program. Another aspect of physical protection refers to the need of protecting individual sites from adverse effects of significantly increased foot traffic"</i>.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered and contain new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.</p>

		<p>In (6.a) "Key Indicators for Measuring State of Conservation" the main text states <i>"A simple example of organizing the monitoring program given in the following table: Each monitoring station will measure from one to few square millimeters and will be identified photographically in a way that it can easily be found. Monitoring will be by binocular light microscopy and records in the form of microphotographs will be taken by digital field microscope. Special attention will be given to deterioration or changes in mineral accretions, degree of inter-granular porosity and the removal of colloid silica. The retreat of the latter will be precisely quantified"</i>.</p> <p>In 3.1.e "Protection and management requirements" the main text states <i>"The proposed monitoring program, detailed in Section 6, is to record the precise condition of the Outstanding Universal Values, especially in terms of the effects of increased visitation and natural deterioration. The Management Plan submitted with this nomination sets out the general parameters of managing the Property, but it will need to be flexible to accommodate any new requirements deriving from the findings of the monitoring program"</i>.</p> <p>In "Category B: Essential actions (within 1 to 3 years)" The MP states <i>"(P5): A monitoring program as per the WHS nomination and linked to the GIS platform (Policy P4) will be established"</i>.</p> <p>In (P5) A monitoring program as per the WHS nomination and linked to the GIS platform (P4) will be established and implemented <i>"(P5.1) Establish a comprehensive monitoring system of key indicators measuring the state of conservation of the sites, especially of the effects of increased visitation and natural deterioration. (P5.2) Select permanent monitoring stations at both sites in accordance with the WHS nomination document Section 6.a. (P5.3) Ensure all monitoring data is linked to the GIS database and logged with the SCTH and stored safely"</i>.</p>	
--	--	--	--

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

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

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Spain

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Paseo del Prado and Buen Retiro, a landscape of Arts and Sciences

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
Page 148 Map	Revised map showing the boundaries of the nominated property- Oct 2019	February 2020-is the last date and the new map known	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
Page 138 limits	In parts, the proposed boundaries also cut through building complexes, sometimes including streets, and sometimes bisecting public spaces.	In the map included in the additional information at february 2020, the limits have been changed in the ICOMOS sense.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification and notes that in its evaluation it is mentioned: <i>In response to the Interim Report, the State Party has revised the boundaries of the nominated property to address these issues. In relation to these new property delineation, ICOMOS considers that clarifications should be provided as regards the extent to which the buildings and facades of buildings at the edge of the nominated property are included within the revised boundaries.</i>
Page 147 Additional recommendations	Completing the documentation of the historic buildings within the property, such as the headquarters of the Ministerio de Marina	The documentation of all the buildings protected within the property are completed, included the headquarters of the Ministerio de Marina	ICOMOS considers that this correction contains new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.

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


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

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Turkey

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Arslantepe Mound

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
p.148, right column, section: description and history, line 3	“The Arslantepe Mound is a 30m high archaeological tell, located in the fertile Malatya plain, 5 kilometres north of the Malatya city centre and 12 kilometres southwest of the right bank of the Euphrates River”	“The Arslantepe Mound is a 30m high archaeological tell, located in the fertile Malatya plain, 5 kilometres north of the Malatya city centre and 15 kilometres southwest of the right bank of the Euphrates River”	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
p.149, right column, line 1	“Periods between 2950 BCE and 712 BCE”	“Periods between 3000 BCE and 712 BCE”	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.
p.149, right column, section: “Boundaries”, lines 4-8	“In ICOMOS’s view the boundaries of the property are well defined except in the northern, north-western and western directions, where surface surveys suggest archaeological evidence outside the presently-drawn boundaries”	Explanation The boundaries of the property cover all the mound and include the whole settlement. The nature of surface scatters outside the property needs to be verified. Hence MAIAO plans non-invasive georadar and geomagnetic research in the area that have revealed artefacts in previous years, Thus, in the following years, it will be possible to expand the buffer zone in line with the new archaeological indicators obtained as a result of the researches made by the excavation team. Therefore, it is proposed the paragraph to be reconsidered.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
p.150, right column, paragraph 2.	“ICOMOS recommends that the temporary shelter that was approved by the Conservation Council’s decision on the 19 th of December 2019 (see 3 rd paragraph in p.15/44), be submitted for technical review to ICOMOS due to the several technical challenges identifies during the ICOMOS technical evaluation mission.	“ICOMOS recommends that the permanent roofing that was approved by the Conservation Council’s decision on the 19 th of December 2019 (see 3 rd paragraph in p.15), be submitted for technical review to ICOMOS due to the several technical challenges identifies during the ICOMOS technical evaluation mission.	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.

<p>p.150, right column, section: “Factors affecting the property”, paragraph 3,</p>	<p>“In relation to the buffer zone, ICOMOS notes that there are 25 illegally constructed buildings taller than permissible height levels which have been legalized retroactively by means of amnesty issued on 31 December 2018”</p>	<p>“In relation to the buffer zone, ICOMOS notes there are 24 illegally constructed buildings which have been legalized retroactively by means of amnesty issued on 31 December 2018”. Four (4) of them are taller than permissible height levels.</p>	<p>ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification/ considers this correction to be a clarification.</p>
<p>p.153, section “Integrity”,right column, last paragraph.</p>	<p>“ICOMOS notes that the excavation programme anticipated can not be seen as non-invasive. The areas marked where no future digging will be undertaken are those where excavation has already unearthed the lowest levels of significance or where very important findings are situated in later levels, such as the Early Bronze Age Royal Tomb or town wall. No “undisturbed area was included in the zone indicated to remain as they are. With regard to the areas scheduled for future excavation, area C is particular problematic as the archaeological team aims at exploring even lower levels than the present key level of attributes, in particular earlier vestiges than those of the Late Chalcolithic (4/5) palace. ICOMOS recommends revising excavation programme towards a cautious approach and that entirely undisturbed areas are designated as no excavation zone.</p>	<p>Explanation: within the framework of future excavation strategy, undisturbed areas was included in the zone and indicated to remain as they are. As seen on the map below; what was before area C, has been divided into three different areas, C, E and F, exactly to use this sector in three different ways, in order to respect what ICOMOS asked: only in the northern part (what remains of area C), which is the most distant from the exhibited zone, the excavations will be carried out normally; in area E it will be used only non-invasive investigations such as archaeomagnetism and micro-morphological analyses and chemical spot-tests; and in area F, it will be carried out careful excavations only limited to the Late Chalcolithic levels (which are presently already partly brought to light) without going too deeper into the earlier levels.</p>  <p>Therefore, it is proposed the paragraph to be reconsidered.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this correction contains new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.</p>
<p>p.154, right column, section: Attributes, paragraph 2</p>	<p>“ICOMOS notes that, while the latter levels of the nominated property, in particular the Early and Late Bronze Age, as well as the Early and Middle Iron Age levels, including the evidence of Neo-Hittite settlements, are not attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value, this by no means implies that these are not significant in their own right and can therefore be removed as part of future excavation.</p>	<p>Explanation: <u>We are fully aware of the importance of the Neo-Hittite settlement</u> since the site was the capital of a Neo-Hittite Kingdom dominating its region in its history. Remarkable Iron Age buildings with well-known Lion Gate in the site and impressive royal statue in the Ankara Anatolian Civilization Museums are admired.</p> <p>Therefore, it is not a matter of a discussion the removal of the mentioned levels and buildings.</p> <p>In this area, cautious archaeological investigation will be aimed to understand the still poorly known developments of</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this correction provides information which contradicts information provided at earlier stages of the evaluation procedure.</p>

	<p>ICOMOS considers that these levels are highly important at national and regional levels and contribute with significant elements to the understanding of these later civilizations. It is therefore even more essential that the property beneficiaries of the latest available and future investigate technologies which allow for non-intrusive investigation of lower levels of archaeological evidence in multi-layered archaeological sites.</p>	<p>Late Bronze and Iron Age periods (II and I millennia BCE). The levels related to the already exposed town-walls and town-gate systems will be hopefully brought to light preserving the most outstanding architecture testimonies.</p> <p>Therefore, it is proposed the paragraph to be reconsidered.</p>	
<p>p.156, left column, section: Documentation, lines 7-11</p>	<p>“Documentation is stored as a paper copy at Arslantepe site or in the Malatya Museum, which is the office of the site management unit, and as a digital copy in Istanbul” at the Ministry of Culture and Tourism.</p>	<p>“Documentation is stored as a paper copy at Arslantepe excavation house or in the Malatya Museum, which is the office of the site management unit, and as a digital copy in Ankara at the Ministry of Culture and Tourism <u>and at Sapienza University in Rome.</u></p>	<p>ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.</p>
<p>p.156 left column, section: Documentation, paragraph 2, line, 5-9</p>	<p>“ICOMOS recommends undertaking a detailed photographic documentation not just of objects but also of all structures and, where needed, augment these by drawings indicating positions and exact features of elements of specific significance”</p>	<p>Explanation: Photographing documentation of the structures and objects in Arslantepe Mound has been going on for 60 years. In recent years a 3D laser scan and photostan of the adobe structures is being implemented by MAIAO (La Missione Archeologica Italiana in Anatolia Orientale della Sapienza Università di Roma) with the aim of creating a digital repository of the state of preservation and allowing regular and digitally controlled comparisons and updates, with the use of digital sensors. Thus, a monitoring system has been established in which differences and changes are automatically detected. This study was carried out with a research group from MAIAO and 3 universities in Rome.</p> <p>Therefore, it is proposed the deletion of the paragraph.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this correction contains new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.</p>
<p>p.156, right column, section: “management system” lines 17-20.</p>	<p>“In ICOMOS’s view the appointment of a site manager is essential to provide guidance and supervision to the ongoing management process”</p>	<p>Explanation: Site Manager was appointed in <u>11.04.2019</u> by the approval of the Minister of Culture and Tourism. Arslantepe Site Manager Mr. Omer Kalin is still on duty.</p> <p>Therefore, it is proposed the correction of the paragraph.</p>	<p>ICOMOS received contradictory information on this issue throughout the evaluation process</p>

p. 157. Left column, paragraph 2.	Therefore, ICOMOS recommends that a site manager is appointed as soon as possible.	Note: see the explanation regarding the site manager above. Therefore, it is proposed the deletion of the sentence.	ICOMOS received contradictory information on this issue throughout the evaluation process
p.158, right column, paragraph 2, lines 1-3.	“While a local management unit exists in the Malatya Museum, a site manager is yet to be appointed by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism.”	Note: see the explanation regarding the site manager above. Therefore, it is proposed the deletion of the sentence.	ICOMOS received contradictory information on this issue throughout the evaluation process
p.158, right column, paragraph 2, lines 3-6.	“Once the appointment of a site manager has happened, the property will benefit from further local capacity and better definition of management roles and responsibilities”	Note: see the explanation regarding the site manager above. Therefore, it is proposed the deletion of the sentence.	ICOMOS received contradictory information on this issue throughout the evaluation process
p.159. section “recommendation”, lines1-2.	“Strengthen the local management capacity through the appointment of a local site manager”	Note: see the explanation regarding the site manager above. Therefore, it is proposed the deletion of this recommendation.	ICOMOS received contradictory information on this issue throughout the evaluation process
p.159. section Additional recommendation, 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”	Explanation: Photographing documentation of the structures and objects in Arslantepe Mound has been going on for 60 years. In recent years, a 3D laser scan and photostan of the adobe structures is being implemented by MAIAO (La Missione Archeologica Italiana in Anatolia Orientale della Sapienza Università di Roma) with the aim of creating a digital repository of the state of preservation and allowing regular and digitally controlled comparisons and updates, with the use of digital sensors. Thus, a monitoring system has been established in which differences and changes are automatically detected. This study was carried out with a research group from MAIAO and 3 universities in Rome. Therefore, it is proposed the deletion of the paragraph.	ICOMOS considers that this correction contains new information that cannot be taken account of at this stage.

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

(conformément au paragraphe 150 des *Orientations*)

ÉTAT(S) PARTIE(S) : Uruguay

ÉVALUATION DE LA PROPOSITION D'INSCRIPTION DU SITE : L'œuvre de l'ingénieur Eladio Dieste : Église d'Atlántida

ÉVALUATION DE L'ORGANISATION CONSULTATIVE CONCERNÉE : ICOMOS

Page, colonne, ligne de l'évaluation de l'Organisation consultative	Phrase incluant l'erreur factuelle (l'erreur factuelle devrait figurer en gras)	Correction proposée par l'Etat partie	Commentaire (s'il y en a) de l'Organisation consultative et/ou du Centre du patrimoine mondial
2,1,14	Dieste pour la construction de l'église provientd'entrepôts	Dieste pour la construction de l'église provient d'entrepôts	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette erreur de frappe.
2,1,16	imaginé et construit par l'entreprise Dieste/ Monteñez	imaginé et construit par l'entreprise Dieste y Monteñez	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette erreur de frappe.
3,1,2	unesorte de place, où les éléments constructifs seraient	Une sorte de place, où les éléments constructifs seraient	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette erreur de frappe.

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

(conformément au paragraphe 150 des *Orientations*)

ÉTAT(S) PARTIE(S) : Gabon

ÉVALUATION DE LA PROPOSITION D'INSCRIPTION DU SITE : Parc national de l'Ivindo

ÉVALUATION DE L'ORGANISATION CONSULTATIVE CONCERNÉE : IUCN

Page, colonne, ligne de l'évaluation de l'Organisation consultative	Phrase incluant l'erreur factuelle (l'erreur factuelle devrait figurer en gras)	Correction proposée par l'Etat partie	Commentaire (s'il y en a) de l'Organisation consultative et/ou du Centre du patrimoine mondial
P. 106, L. 31	Le bien proposé a été déclaré parc national en 2002 et la législation applicable est entrée en vigueur en 2008 .	Le bien proposé a été classé parc national par le décret 612/PR/MEFEPEPN du 30 août 2002. La loi n°003/2007 relative aux parcs nationaux, qui a été adoptée le 27 août 2007, vise notamment la création du service public chargé de la gestion des parcs nationaux.	Pas une erreur factuelle Clarification
P. 107 ; C. 1 ; L. 1	Cependant, si ces dispositions sont considérées adéquates, elles ne semblent pas empêcher des activités extrêmement préjudiciables comme en témoigne le projet de centrale hydroélectrique envisagé le long des chutes du parc	Ce projet a été évalué et rejeté en 2007 et 2008 par l'Etat Partie. Dès lors, il n'y a eu aucune autre initiative en vue de la poursuite de ce projet. Ce projet d'infrastructure a été clairement et définitivement abandonné. Nous proposons la suppression de cette phrase dans ce rapport d'évaluation technique.	Pas une erreur factuelle En effet, le rapport note l'abandon du projet. Cependant, le projet a été sous considération en 2007 et 2008 en dépit du statut de parc national.
P. 107 ; C. 1 ; L. 39	En conclusion, l'UICN considère que le régime de protection du bien proposé est adéquat, à condition que le barrage hydroélectrique envisagé précédemment à l'intérieur du PNI, ou des projets d'infrastructure semblables, soient clairement et définitivement abandonnés.	En référence à notre commentaire ci-dessus, un projet de ce type n'est pas compatible avec le statut de parc national. La phrase incluant l'erreur factuelle, figurée en gras, ne peut être justifiée par un projet dont l'étude de faisabilité a été entreprise et rejetée il y a 13 ans. Nous proposons de supprimer la fin de la phrase pour lire ceci : « En conclusion, l'UICN considère que le régime de protection du bien proposé est adéquat »	Pas une erreur factuelle Voir commentaire ci-dessus

<p>P. 107 ; C. 1 ; L. 44</p>	<p>L'UICN est en outre d'avis que la protection de la zone tampon du PNI doit être renforcée pour atténuer tout effet bordure possible sur le bien proposé.</p>	<p>Les zones tampons au Gabon sont réglementées par la loi n°003/ 2007 relative aux parcs nationaux et sont respectées.</p> <p>Les permis forestiers sont considérés au Gabon comme un autre mécanisme de préservation de la forêt, de sa biodiversité et de son stock de carbone. L'interprétation que nous pouvons tirer de cette phrase est que l'UICN applique un double standard en insistant que le Gabon modifie sa loi sur les parcs nationaux et annule des permis forestiers pour classer ce site.</p> <p>Les sociétés forestières Precious Woods et Rougier Gabon, toutes les deux certifiées FSC (Forest Stewardship Council), ont investi plusieurs millions d'euros en vue de veiller à ce que les exploitations dans leurs concessions soient durables. Ces concessions sont bien protégées et préservent une biodiversité importante. L'UICN propose d'annuler ces permis, sans évaluer les pertes économiques et sociaux comme les pertes d'emplois.</p> <p>Nous soulignons qu'il existe de nombreux sites naturels dans le monde où ce type d'activité est autorisé dans les zones tampons.</p> <p>Nous demandons le retrait de cette phrase dans le rapport d'évaluation technique.</p>	<p>Pas une erreur factuelle</p> <p>Divergence de vues</p> <p>L'UICN n'applique pas un double standard. L'évaluation de l'UICN se base sur les connaissances actuelles et vise à analyser l'effet protecteur de la zone tampon par rapport à la VUE potentielle du bien proposé et non à d'autres biens ayant une VUE différente. L'existence éventuelle des régimes de protection similaires n'implique pas que le même régime est approprié pour tout autre bien du patrimoine mondial. L'UICN note par ailleurs que parmi les onze permis forestiers il n'y a que deux qui ont été certifiés.</p>
<p>P. 107 ; C. 1 ; L. 47</p>	<p>L'UICN considère que le statut de protection du bien proposé remplit partiellement les obligations énoncées dans les Orientations et que la protection de la zone tampon du bien proposé devrait être renforcée.</p>	<p>Sur la base de nos commentaires développés ci-dessus, nous proposons que les parties de texte en gras soit retiré du rapport d'évaluation technique pour lire ceci :</p> <p>« L'UICN considère que le statut de protection du bien proposé remplit les obligations énoncées dans les Orientations ».</p>	<p>Pas une erreur factuelle</p> <p>Voir commentaire ci-dessus</p>
<p>P. 108 ; C. 1-2 ; L. 55</p>	<p>L'UICN considère que la gestion du bien proposé ne remplit pas entièrement les obligations énoncées dans les Orientations, compte tenu, notamment, de l'absence de plan de gestion à jour et du niveau de financement engagé pour la conservation du bien proposé.</p>	<p>L'évaluateur ne précise pas que le plan de gestion 2016-20 a été prolongé (par décision du ministre de tutelle) jusqu'à la fin 2022 à cause de la pandémie COVID-19 – En conséquence, le plan de gestion existe et il est valable d'un point de vue juridique.</p> <p>L'Etat Partie remercie l'évaluateur et s'engage à suivre ses recommandations sur la consultation, les systèmes d'évaluation dans le plan révisé, celles relatives à assurer la</p>	<p>Pas une erreur factuelle</p> <p>Divergence de vues</p> <p>En effet, le rapport note dans le premier paragraphe du chapitre 4.3 que le plan de gestion a été prolongé. Dans les paragraphes qui suivent l'UICN soulève sa inquiétude quant à la mise en œuvre dudit plan, à sa mise à jour, et quant à son financement.</p>

		<p>préservation de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien proposé</p> <p>Plusieurs de nos financements courent sur une période de 4 - 5 ans, sans être certains de leur renouvellement, et ceci n'est pas unique au Parc National de l'Ivindo.</p> <p>Nous avons signé avec Central African Forest Initiative (CAFI) pour un financement de 150 millions de dollars sur 10 ans, correspondant au paiement des réductions des émissions de carbone pour lequel le Parc National de l'Ivindo et ses zones tampons ont contribué. En cas d'absence de financement sur les dix prochaines années, nous serons en mesure de compléter les financements de ce parc national par ce biais. Nous ne pensons pas que ceci constitue une raison pour justifier le non-classement du bien proposé.</p> <p>Nous proposons donc la reformulation de la phrase comme suit :</p> <p>« L'UICN considère que la gestion du bien proposé remplit les obligations énoncées dans les Orientations »</p>	
<p>P. 109 ; C. 2</p>	<p>Parmi les autres menaces potentielles pour le PNI, il y a le projet de mise en exploitation des gisements de fer de Bélinga, à environ 180 km au nord-est du bien proposé. Premièrement, les sédiments miniers et la pollution causée par les résidus miniers pourraient affecter la rivière Ivindo, jusqu'à ce jour intacte, et sa biodiversité aquatique. Deuxièmement, l'infrastructure de transport, nécessaire au fonctionnement de la mine, pourrait avoir des effets négatifs sur le parc. La construction d'une ligne à haute tension et d'une nouvelle voie de chemin de fer est envisagée à proximité du PNI. Troisièmement, une centrale hydroélectrique devrait être située en aval du bien proposé et pourrait entraver un système de rivières encore libres et affecter la biodiversité aquatique du PNI. À l'origine, la centrale hydroélectrique devait être construite à l'intérieur du PNI, sur les chutes de Kongou, mais le projet a été abandonné en raison de problèmes géologiques. Enfin, ces activités pourraient</p>	<p>L'État Partie considère que cette partie du texte est trop négative. Certes, des menaces existent –contre les éléphants par exemple. Toutefois, nous tenons à souligner que nous avons partagé avec l'UICN le rapport de l'inventaire des éléphants effectués sur toute la superficie du parc par WCS/ Vulcan et ANPN, dans lequel aucune trace de braconniers n'a été détectée.</p> <p>La population des éléphants de forêt au Gabon, estimés à 65,000 en 1990, est plus grande en 2020 (données du recensement 2018-2020, pas encore publiées), lorsqu'ailleurs leurs populations ont chuté de 70 %. Ne serait-il pas mieux de considérer ces efforts de conservation, au lieu de préjuger d'une perte future de nos éléphants?</p> <p>Concernant le projet de barrage, nous l'avons évoqué dans les commentaires ci-dessus : ce dossier vieux de 13 ans n'est plus d'actualité !</p> <p>Pour le cas de Bélinga, les tracés du futur chemin de fer et de la ligne de haute tension seront en moyenne à plus de 15 km au nord de la limite du PN Ivindo.</p>	<p>Pas une erreur factuelle</p> <p>Divergence de vues</p> <p>Dans ses évaluations, l'UICN vise à évaluer les menaces actuelles ainsi que les menaces potentielles en vue d'assurer la protection des biens dans le futur. L'UICN reconnaît dans son rapport l'importance du bien proposé pour les éléphants de forêt En danger critique d'extinction.</p> <p>En vue du déclin des populations ailleurs et des menaces qui l'ont causé, il est primordial à l'avis de l'UICN d'apporter une grande importance aux menaces potentielles. Par ailleurs, l'UICN note l'importance de l'intégrité de la rivière de l'Ivindo pour l'ichtyofaune exceptionnelle du bien proposé. Enfin, l'UICN tiens à noter que la conclusion repose sur les chapitres 4.1-4.5. La conclusion est donc cohérent sur le plan logique.</p>

	<p>avoir d'autres effets boule de neige tels que le morcellement du paysage des forêts et une pression accrue sur les ressources naturelles par une augmentation de l'immigration. Le tourisme et le nombre de visites restent très faibles pour le moment avec moins de 200 personnes qui visitaient le site chaque année, avant la pandémie de COVID-19. Selon l'information complémentaire soumise par l'État partie, le zonage interne du PNI prévoit une zone réservée à l'écotourisme. Elle comprendrait cinq hôtels à l'intérieur du PNI, ce qui suppose un empiètement de l'infrastructure plus important et, en conséquence, l'ouverture de voies d'accès pour le braconnage à l'intérieur du parc.</p> <p>Globalement, l'UICN note avec préoccupation le nombre de menaces qui pourraient affecter la valeur universelle exceptionnelle potentielle du bien proposé mais reconnaît que celui-ci présente à ce jour une intégrité exceptionnelle.</p> <p>En conclusion, l'UICN considère que même si les conditions énoncées dans les Orientations sont satisfaites du point de vue de l'intégrité du bien proposé, les obligations en matière de protection et de gestion ne sont que partiellement remplies.</p>	<p>En raison de nos efforts consentis sur 30 ans pour conserver et gérer durablement nos forêts, avec une augmentation significative de notre population d'éléphants de forêt depuis près de 30 ans, nous ne comprenons pas pourquoi « les obligations en matière de protection et de gestion ne sont que partiellement remplies » sur la base des futures menaces hypothétiques.</p> <p>Ceci nous semble disproportionné – sauf si les instances décideraient à l'avenir de ne plus classer des sites naturels au prétexte de l'intensification d'hypothétiques menaces ?</p> <p>Au vu de ce qui précède, nous sollicitons donc que le texte en gras soit supprimé du rapport d'évaluation technique.</p>	
<p>P. 110 ; C. 1 ; L.</p>	<p>Critère (vii) : Phénomènes naturels remarquables ou beauté naturelle ou importance esthétique exceptionnelle</p> <p>L'UICN considère que le bien proposé ne remplit pas ce critère.</p>	<p>Nous sommes tout à fait conscients que ce critère est assez subjectif et « in the eye of the beholder ».</p> <p>On soumet à votre appréciation deux anecdotes :</p> <p>1) Quand Warner Brothers cherchait une destination pour tourner le film « La Légende de Tarzan », ils ont visité plusieurs destinations forestières. Le Gabon, notamment le Parc National d'Ivindo, a été choisi parmi toutes les destinations possibles ;</p> <p>2) Nous avons amené Geoffrey Kent, fondateur de la société mythique d'écotourisme haut de gamme « Abercrombie & Kent », aux chutes de Koungou. Quand nous le lui avons annoncé, il était peu enthousiaste et n'a dit mot. Après la visite, il nous a confié avoir vu</p>	<p>Pas une erreur factuelle</p> <p>Divergence de vues</p>

		<p>pratiquement toutes les chutes du monde, sauf Angel Falls, et a déclaré que « les chutes de Kongou étaient les plus spectaculaires du monde ».</p> <p>De plus, comme stipulé dans le dossier de nomination, ce ne sont pas seulement les chutes de Koungou, mais l'ensemble de l'Ivindo qui justifie le critère (vii), avec la présence notamment de forêts tropicales, intactes et inhabitées.</p>	
<p>P. 110 ; C. 2' L. 28</p>	<p>2. Renvoie la proposition d'inscription du Parc national de l'Ivindo, Gabon, à l'État partie, en notant du potentiel important de ce bien proposé à satisfaire les critères (ix) et (x), afin de lui permettre, avec l'aide de l'UICN et du Centre du patrimoine mondial, si nécessaire</p>	<p>Suite à l'argumentaire que nous venons de présenter, nous estimons que cette recommandation pourrait être modifiée.</p>	<p>Pas une erreur factuelle</p> <p>Divergence de vues</p> <p>Voir commentaire ci-dessus</p>

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

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

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Bosnia and Herzegovina / Czech Republic / France / Italy / Montenegro / North Macedonia / Poland / **Serbia** / Slovakia / Switzerland

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: 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)]

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY’S EVALUATION: IUCN

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
8, II, 51	In all nominated component parts, Beech is mixed with coniferous trees.	In most of nominated component parts, Beech is mixed with coniferous trees.	Factual error IUCN confirms that there are no autochthonous coniferous forests on Fruška gora Mt. and therefore considers that the correction proposed by the State Party is acceptable.
9, I, 2	The Tara – Rača and Tara – Zvezda component parts are located in Western Serbia along the Tara River , which marks the border to Bosnia and Herzegovina.	The Tara – Rača and Tara – Zvezda component parts are located in Western Serbia, former along the Rača River and the latter along the Drina River , which marks the border to Bosnia and Herzegovina.	Factual error The correction proposed by the State Party is agreed: “The Tara – Rača and Tara – Zvezda component parts are located in Western Serbia, the former along the Rača River and the latter along the Drina River , which marks the border to Bosnia and Herzegovina.
16, II, 63	Concerning the former, the State Party of Serbia confirmed that a water pipeline is planned to pass through the buffer zone of the nominated Kopaonik – Kozje stene (Serbia) component part, including sections directly adjacent to the nominated component part, to feed a new hydropower plant at the entrance of the Kopaonik National Park	Concerning the former, the State Party of Serbia confirmed that a water pipeline of the existing hydropower plant located at the entrance of the Kopaonik National Park passes through the buffer zone of the nominated Kopaonik – Kozje stene (Serbia) component part, including sections directly adjacent to the nominated component part.	Not a factual error New information This may require clarification, as the relevant supplementary information submitted by the State Parties did not note any existing structures. Figure 7 and Figure 8 on pp. 34 do not differentiate between existing structures and planned structures.

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


(conformément au paragraphe 150 des *Orientations*)

ÉTAT(S) PARTIE(S) : Côte d'Ivoire


ÉVALUATION DE LA PROPOSITION D'INSCRIPTION DU SITE : Mosquées de style soudanais du nord ivoirien

ÉVALUATION DE L'ORGANISATION CONSULTATIVE CONCERNÉE : ICOMOS

Page, colonne, ligne de l'évaluation de l'Organisation consultative	Phrase incluant l'erreur factuelle (l'erreur factuelle devrait figurer en gras)	Correction proposée par l'Etat partie	Commentaire (s'il y en a) de l'Organisation consultative et/ou du Centre du patrimoine mondial
Page, 342, colonne 1, ligne 5	Compte tenu des pressions urbaines qui ont déjà un impact sur les mosquées, et qui risquent de s'accroître dans un avenir proche (cinq mosquées sur huit sont dans des zones urbaines), notamment la pression exercée pour accueillir de nouvelles mosquées et leurs installations, les délimitations actuelles ne peuvent pas être considérées comme suffisantes pour maintenir la prépondérance des mosquées à dominer leur environnement, que ce soit actuellement ou à l'avenir. De plus, les abords des mosquées sont des lieux où des activités en lien avec l'importance culturelle des mosquées étaient et sont encore pratiquées de nos jours.	<p>La délimitation effectuée par l'État de Côte d'Ivoire en vue de protéger et de préserver les mosquées de style soudanais du nord ivoirien prend en compte les espaces environnants traditionnellement associés à ces biens culturels. En effet, l'administration ivoirienne a pris en compte tous les attributs liés aux mosquées dans tous les parcelles concernant les lots et les îlots. C'est pourquoi l'État partie a fait le choix de protéger tout les lots ou îlots dans lequel se trouvent les mosquées de styles soudanais dont celles de la série proposée.</p> <p>En outre, sur le plan réglementaire, le décret n°2020-121 du 29 janvier 2020 portant classement des mosquées en série de style soudanais du nord ivoirien sur la Liste du patrimoine culturel national vient renforcer la protection du bien et des éléments qui lui sont associés en ce qu'il ne protège pas uniquement les biens inscrits, mais aussi et surtout le lot et/ou l'îlot. Les deux mosquées (grande et petite) de Kong bénéficient d'une double protection. En effet, outre le décret portant classement des mosquées en série de style soudanais du nord ivoirien sur la Liste du patrimoine culturel national sus-cité, lesdites mosquées jouissent également des mesures de protection contenues dans le décret n°88-413 du 20 avril 1988 portant classement des sites et monuments de la ville historique de Kong. Les monuments historiques de Kong, y compris les mosquées, sont d'ailleurs les premiers à être classés à l'inventaire du patrimoine culturel au niveau national.</p> <p>Ce décret en son article 1^{er} dispose : « Sont classés sur la liste du patrimoine culturel national, les Monuments et Sites historiques de Kong dont les noms suivent :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Tout le secteur aux alentours de la grande mosquée, englobant outre ladite mosquée, l'ancienne case, l'ancien marché, la dâ-ba et la case de Binger ». 2) La petite mosquée. 	L'ICOMOS considère que cette correction reflète des opinions divergentes.

		<p>Vue aérienne de la grande mosquée de Kong dans son environnement</p>  <p>Par conséquent, toute modification dans ces alentours répond à des servitudes comme le stipule la loi no.87-806 du 28 Juillet 1987 portant protection du patrimoine culturel. Cette loi, en son chapitre II : Protection des Sites et Monuments, Section I : Dispositions communes : Article 5 dispose : « La protection du patrimoine culturel immobilier est assurée suivant son intérêt historique, artistique, scientifique ou technologique ainsi qu'en raison de son état de conservation par trois mesures administratives distinctes :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - L'inscription ; - Le classement ; La déclaration de sauvegarde ». 	
<p>Page, 342, colonne 2, ligne 3</p>	<p>Bien que l'ICOMOS salue les efforts de l'État partie, ces ajustements des délimitations ne concernent que de petites zones autour de deux mosquées et n'ont pas répondu de manière satisfaisante aux préoccupations soulevées.</p> <p>La modification des délimitations des zones tampons n'a pas été adaptée pour englober les zones urbaines voisines, telles que les maisons bordant les routes d'accès. Les éléments constitutifs sont donc encore isolés de leur contexte urbain et leur zone tampon n'offre pas de protection contre un développement inapproprié qui risquerait de les enfermer davantage et de réduire la position dominante de ces petites mosquées.</p>	<p>Les limites des sites abritant les mosquées telles que définies par le décret de classement prennent en compte tous les éléments ayant un lien avec les mosquées de style soudanais. Par conséquent, aucun élément constitutif n'est isolé de son contexte urbain. L'exception, c'est les limites des sites de la petite et de la grande mosquée de Kong. Cependant, le décret n°88-413 du 20 avril 1988 portant classement des sites et monuments de la ville historique de Kong, intègre aux sites des mosquées les autres éléments constitutifs tels que l'ancien marché et la dâ-ba du fait que Kong a été un grand Centre religieux et d'échanges commerciaux. Les articles 2 et 3 dudit décret stipulent que: « Les monuments cités à l'article 1er du présent décret ainsi que leurs abords immédiats forment un ensemble dit "zone classée et protégée de Kong" à conserver intact ». Conformément aux dispositions de la loi n°87-806 du 28 juillet 1987 susvisée, notamment en son article 10, « tous travaux publics ou privés de quelque nature que ce soit à l'intérieur de cette zone protégée doivent être soumis à l'autorisation préalable du ministre chargé des Affaires culturelles ».</p> <p>Toutefois, relativement aux observations de l'ICOMOS, un Cahier de prescriptions architecturales définissant les servitudes à observer est en cours d'élaboration. Ce document viendra renforcer les dispositions de la loi n°87-806 du 28 juillet 1987 portant protection du patrimoine culturel et le décret n°2020-121 du 29 janvier 2020 portant classement des mosquées en série de style soudanais du nord ivoirien. Ces textes en leurs articles 5, 9, 10 et 11 disposent :</p> <p>Article 5 (décret n°2020-121 du 29 janvier 2020): « <i>En vue de préserver leur intégrité et leur insertion dans leur environnement naturel et historique, il est défini un périmètre de protection pour chaque mosquée classée. Ce périmètre intègre le lot ou l'îlot sur lequel sont bâties chacune des mosquées et toutes autres constructions y associées.</i>».</p> <p>Article 9 (loi n°87-806 du 28 juillet 1987): « <i>En vue de protéger l'insertion de l'immeuble dans son</i></p>	<p>L'ICOMOS considère que la correction portant sur la relation entre les délimitations des zones tampons et leur contexte urbain reflète une divergence d'opinion.</p> <p>L'ICOMOS considère que les commentaires sur les lois en cours de rédaction contiennent de nouvelles informations qui ne peuvent pas être prises en compte à ce stade.</p>

		<p><i>environnement naturel ou historique, il peut être aménagé un périmètre de sauvegarde dont les éléments et les limites sont arrêtés dans la mesure de protection. ».</i></p> <p>Article 10 (loi n^o.87-806 du 28 juillet 1987): « <i>Tous travaux publics ou privés, de construction, de démolition ou de modification à l'intérieur du périmètre de sauvegarde sont soumis à l'autorisation préalable du ministre chargé des affaires culturelles...Les entrepreneurs sont tenus en outre de se conformer aux prescriptions architecturales et techniques éventuellement arrêtées par l'Administration. Les frais afférents aux prescriptions architecturales et techniques de protection peuvent être, en partie, supportés par l'État. ».</i></p> <p>Article 11 (loi n^o.87-806 du 28 juillet 1987) : « <i>Dans le cas des dispositions législatives et réglementaires applicables en matière d'urbanisme, les plans d'aménagement urbains et ruraux intéressant les zones des périmètres de sauvegarde doivent, sous peine de nullité, respecter les prescriptions visant à la sauvegarde et la mise en valeur de tout immeuble ou ensemble d'immeubles tel que prévu à l'article 2 de la présente loi, ou faire l'objet d'une archéologie de sauvegarde avant exécution des travaux. ».</i></p> <p>Tous ces textes visent à prévenir toute rupture d'échelle des constructions ultérieures.</p> <p>L'Etat se donne les moyens de faire respecter scrupuleusement toutes ses dispositions à travers tous ses démembrements et représentants locaux : Préfet, sous-préfet, Maire, Président conseil régional, Direction régionale en charge de la culture, de la Construction et de l'urbanisme, le Secrétariat exécutif de gestion, forces de l'ordre, etc.</p>	
<p>Page, 342, colonne 2, ligne 5</p>	<p>La conservation des mosquées est ainsi un processus continu qui ne peut être maintenu que si les structures traditionnelles communautaires sont en place, si des maçons traditionnels continuent de faire partie de la communauté, et si le patronage traditionnel prévaut, c'est-à-dire si une personne ou un groupe paye pour l'entretien et le replâtrage périodique des mosquées. Ainsi, même si une mosquée est actuellement en bon état, elle pourrait cesser de l'être dans</p>	<p>Les maçons traditionnels sont membres des Comités Locaux de Base de Gestion et de familles détentrices des mosquées. Leurs capacités ont été renforcées à travers le chantier-école organisé à Kong du 25 novembre au 8 décembre 2018 par l'Office Ivoirien du Patrimoine Culturel (OIPC) en collaboration avec la Direction Nationale du Patrimoine culturel du Mali et des maîtres maçons traditionnels de Djenné et de Tombouctou.(Cf. Rapport atelier) Ce chantier-école répond à un besoin de renforcement des capacités pour une meilleure maîtrise des techniques constructives liées au style soudanais. Ce besoin fait suite à des restaurations hasardeuses constatées sur certains édifices (avec des matériaux modernes par endroits). En tant que plateforme d'échanges, le chantier-école a permis de renforcer les capacités des membres selon les problèmes de conservation observés dans chacune des localités et de transmettre les acquis au sein de leurs communautés respectives lors des travaux d'entretien ponctuels ou périodiques. Depuis lors, des activités d'entretien et de restauration sont entreprises sous la supervision de la Direction régionale en charge de la culture, avec la participation des membres du Comité local de base de gestion et des membres de la communauté. Des activités de renforcement des compétences des maçons traditionnels sont prévues dans le programme d'action triennal 2021-2023 de l'OIPC.</p> <p>Quelques images atelier maçons de Kong</p>	<p>L'ICOMOS considère que la correction réitérée des informations présentées dans le dossier de proposition d'inscription et dans la documentation complémentaire sur le travail entrepris pour renforcer les capacités des maçons locaux et sur les autres activités prévues pour l'avenir.</p> <p>L'ICOMOS a évalué la solidité actuelle de l'ensemble des pratiques et structures de conservation en</p>

	<p>quelques années, si des pratiques traditionnelles ne sont pas maintenues.</p>	 <p>Une stratégie de conservation est mise en place par l'OIPC à travers le Projet d'entretien et de restauration des mosquées de style soudanais. Les maçons traditionnels, à travers les chantiers écoles de ce projet, seront les principaux acteurs. Par ailleurs, en 2019, les maçons traditionnels formés lors du chantier-école de Kong ont été mis à contribution pour les travaux d'entretien des mosquées de Kaouara, de Kong, de Kouto et de Sorobango (Cf. Rapport de restauration).</p> <p>La gestion des mosquées par les familles, les travaux d'entretien assurés par des organisations locales (Comité Local de Base de Gestion) et l'existence de maçons traditionnels sont une garantie pour la préservation de l'intégrité des mosquées. Dans chaque localité, les mosquées sont gérées par des familles (Cissé, Baro, Konaté, Diabi, Samassi...) et les Comités Locaux de Base de Gestion (CLBG). Ce système de gestion a plusieurs niveaux :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - au premier niveau, nous avons la chefferie traditionnelle. Elle est le garant de la cohésion sociale. Elle participe à la mobilisation de la communauté pour les travaux de restauration de la mosquée ; - au deuxième niveau, nous avons les familles propriétaires. Elles ont en charge l'entretien quotidien de la mosquée. Elles assurent la sécurité autour du bien et veillent à l'application des prescriptions religieuses ; - au troisième niveau, nous avons le Comité Local de Base de Gestion. Il donne les orientations globales et stratégiques sur la gestion des biens sur le plan local. Ce Comité met en œuvre les plans d'action que lui soumet l'OIPC par le biais des Directions Régionales de la Culture. Les Comités sont composés des maçons traditionnels, des représentant des familles et des communautés allogènes ; - au quatrième niveau, la communauté musulmane. Elle participe également aux travaux de restauration. <p>Dans le cadre de ses sessions de formation, l'OIPC prévoit aussi des partenariats avec la Direction Nationale du Patrimoine Culturel du Mali (DNPC) et le Centre de Conservation et de Réhabilitation du Patrimoine Architectural Atlasique et Subatlasique (CERKAS) du Maroc pour être appuyé par des maîtres maçons et des spécialistes en architecture de terre.</p> <p>Tout ce système mis en place et existant permet de maintenir les pratiques traditionnelles et les savoir-faire liés à l'architecture des mosquées de style soudanais.</p>	<p>place et la façon dont elles sont suffisamment robustes pour relever les défis auxquels les mosquées sont confrontées pour assurer qu'elles survivent dans le futur.</p>
--	--	--	---

<p>Page, 343, colonne 1, ligne 6</p>	<p>La manière dont de telles pratiques traditionnelles peuvent être relancées et soutenues est l'un des principaux défis auxquels le bien proposé pour inscription est confronté. L'implication des communautés locales dans ce processus est essentielle, mais également celle de maçons spécialisés pour guider les opérations, avec le patronage continu de familles ou de communautés locales. Bien qu'il existe des maçons spécialisés dans la construction en terre, il semble de manière générale qu'ils sont peu nombreux et que les structures du savoir traditionnel sont très fragiles. De même, le système traditionnel, selon lequel les descendants des familles fondatrices, ou des communautés locales, soutenaient les programmes de conservation réguliers et les autres travaux de réparation devenus nécessaires, ne demeure que partiellement en place. Et, comme cela a été observé sur d'autres biens inscrits comme à Djenné, même si des maçons spécialisés subsistent, ils ne peuvent pas travailler à moins d'être parrainés et soutenus par les communautés locales.</p>	<p>Le système traditionnel selon lequel les descendants des familles fondatrices ou des communautés locales soutenaient les programmes de conservation réguliers et les autres travaux de réparation devenus nécessaires, demeure totalement en place parce qu'il est basé sur le droit coutumier et fait obligation aux familles d'assurer pleinement leur rôle. C'est en cela que les familles détentrices de ce droit prennent l'initiative des travaux d'entretien et de conservation en mobilisant toutes les personnes ressources avant ou après la saison des pluies. Ces opérations visent le respect scrupuleux de l'intégrité du bâti et de l'esprit des lieux. Il s'agit notamment de veiller au respect des règles de bonne conduite inhérentes au bien. Ces règles sont entre autres :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - le respect et le suivi des prescriptions religieuses ; - l'entretien quotidien du bien ; - la sécurité à l'intérieur et autour du bien ; - l'implication de la communauté dans la protection du bien ; - l'intégration des mesures de protection dans la mémoire collective ; - la transmission de génération en génération des valeurs liées à la protection du bien. <p>Par ailleurs, l'Etat soutient ce système traditionnel par l'appui financier aux travaux de restauration et d'entretien, la formation des maçons traditionnels. En cas de défaillance du système traditionnel, l'Etat, par l'entremise des organes de gestion (OIPC, Secrétariat Exécutif de gestion) et des textes règlementaires, se donne les moyens de se substituer à lui.</p>	<p>L'ICOMOS considère que la correction réitère des informations présentées dans le dossier de proposition d'inscription et dans la documentation complémentaire qui ont été pleinement prises en compte par l'organisation consultative.</p> <p>L'ICOMOS a évalué dans quelle mesure les pratiques traditionnelles ont survécu et si elles sont suffisantes pour répondre aux besoins actuels.</p> <p>Les systèmes traditionnels sont un élément clé de la justification globale du bien. Ainsi, des mesures sont nécessaires pour soutenir ces systèmes plutôt que de les remplacer.</p>
---	---	---	--

<p>Page, 343, colonne 2, ligne 3</p>	<p>L'ICOMOS considère qu'il est essentiel de designer une autorité qui aura la responsabilité de s'assurer qu'un entretien régulier est exécuté, et ce conformément aux normes appropriées, et de prévoir un soutien financier adéquat, ainsi que des mesures pour soutenir et encourager activement les maçons traditionnels. Alors qu'un système de gestion intégrant différents niveaux d'autorité a été défini, celui-ci n'est pas encore pleinement opérationnel.</p>	<p>Le décret n°2012-552 du 13 Juin 2012 portant création de l'OIPC stipule en son article 21: "<i>il est créé par le présent décret, des Secrétariats exécutifs des sites culturels, en charge au niveau local, de la gestion des sites inscrits sur les listes du patrimoine culturel national et du patrimoine mondial</i>". Les articles 22 et 23 du même décret définissent l'organisation et les missions de cet organe. Il est chargé de promouvoir le patrimoine culturel du ou des sites concernés; de constituer et de gérer une banque de données sur le patrimoine culturel des sites; de le gérer administrativement et techniquement et d'en assurer la promotion; et d'exécuter les activités du programme de gestion du bien. (Cf. Décret OIPC)</p> <p>À cet effet, l'arrêté n°03 du 24 juin 2021 portant organisation et fonctionnement du Secrétariat Exécutif de gestion des mosquées de style soudanais du nord ivoirien crée cet organe et l'arrêté interministériel portant organisation et fonctionnement du « Système de gestion » des Mosquées de style soudanais du nord ivoirien ont été signés (ci-joint les arrêtés).</p> <p>Dans le cadre du Programme de sauvegarde et de valorisation des mosquées de style soudanais du nord ivoirien conçu par l'OIPC et inscrit au Programme d'Investissement Public (PIP) 2017-2021 de l'État de Côte d'Ivoire, plusieurs activités sont prévues cette année (2021), notamment l'entretien et la restauration de six (6) mosquées, la formation de vingt-cinq (25) maçons traditionnels à travers des chantiers-écoles. Dans cette perspective, l'État de Côte d'Ivoire a prévu d'octroyer une dotation budgétaire de 120 000 000 F CFA soit environ 183 206 euros pour les travaux d'entretien et de restauration des mosquées de style soudanais, dont 70 000 000 FCFA soit environ 106 870 euros effectivement mis à disposition au titre de l'année 2021. (ci-joint document PIP).</p> <p>Les deux autres mosquées de la série proposée seront prises en compte en 2022 par la dotation restante qui est de 50 000 000 F CFA.</p>	<p><i>L'ICOMOS considère que la correction relative à l'arrêté sur le fonctionnement du Secrétariat Exécutif de gestion des mosquées est une nouvelle information qui ne peut pas être prise en compte à ce stade.</i></p> <p><i>L'ICOMOS considère également que la correction relative au financement prévu pour 2021 afin de soutenir un Programme de sauvegarde est également une nouvelle information qui ne peut pas être prise en compte à ce stade.</i></p>
<p>Page, 343, colonne 2, ligne 6</p>	<p>Actuellement, compte tenu des très petites zones couvertes par les délimitations et zones tampons proposées, et sans aucune protection proposée pour les zones urbaines qui entourent de tous côtés toutes les mosquées, sauf pour deux d'entre elles, il semblerait que rien ne pourra empêcher le remplacement des bâtiments actuels d'un seul étage par des structures plus hautes, ce qui pourrait bouleverser la</p>	<p>Un plan de préservation et de prescriptions architecturales des mosquées de style soudanais est en cours d'élaboration par l'OIPC en collaboration avec les services techniques concernés (urbanisme, construction, Mairie, cabinet d'architecte) pour être adopté par voie réglementaire. Celui-ci viendra renforcer les mesures existantes, notamment la loi n°87-806 du 28 juillet 1987 portant protection du patrimoine culturel et le décret n°2020-121 du 29 janvier 2020 portant classement des mosquées en série de style soudanais du nord ivoirien.</p> <p>Ce plan définit les prescriptions architecturales et les servitudes dans le périmètre de protection de ces biens en série. En attendant, les dispositions suivantes sont applicables à leur conservation et à leur protection.</p> <p>Il s'agit de l'article 10 de la loi de 1987 sus-citée et de la loi n° 2019-576 du 26 juin 2019 instituant le Code de la Construction et de l'Habitat (Cf. Code) en ses articles 10, 19, 69 et 70 :</p> <p>- la loi de 1987, en son article 10, dispose que : « Tous travaux publics ou privés, de</p>	<p><i>L'ICOMOS considère que la correction relative à un plan de préservation des mosquées est une nouvelle information qui ne peut pas être prise en compte à ce stade.</i></p> <p><i>L'ICOMOS considère que la correction relative à la législation existante réitère la justification présentée dans le dossier de proposition d'inscription qui a été pleinement</i></p>

	<p>manière dont ces petites mosquées devraient être abordées et perçues. Comme le dossier de proposition d'inscription l'indique, ces édifices étaient destinés à dominer les maisons du village environnant. De fait, le dossier de proposition d'inscription indique que les plans de développement et d'urbanisme en place sont considérés comme des menaces. Ils resteront des menaces à moins de pouvoir répondre d'une manière appropriée à la nécessité de protéger les environnements des mosquées.</p>	<p><i>construction, de démolition ou de modification à l'intérieur du périmètre de sauvegarde sont soumis à l'autorisation préalable du ministre chargé des affaires culturelles... Les entrepreneurs sont tenus en outre de se conformer aux prescriptions architecturales et techniques éventuellement arrêtées par l'Administration... » ;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - la loi n° 2019-576 du 26 juin 2019 instituant le Code de la Construction et de l'Habitat a combiné et remplacé les lois relatives aux plans d'urbanisme et au permis de construire. En son article 10, elle dispose que : <i>« les bâtiments sont classés selon les risques à la construction et à l'usage, par décret pris en Conseil des Ministres. Selon la complexité, la classification part de la classe A à la classe L. Selon l'usage du bâtiment, la classification part de la catégorie 1 à la catégorie 14 ».</i> <p>Aux termes de l'Article 10 de la Loi n°2019-576 du 26 juin 2019 instituant Code de la Construction et de l'Habitat, les mosquées de style soudanais du nord ivoirien peuvent être classées d'une part, selon la complexité, dans la classe K relative aux Etablissements à caractère particulier, et d'autre part selon l'usage du bâtiment, la catégorie 6 : culte et loisir, la catégorie 11 : monuments, et la catégorie 13 : établissements spéciaux.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - L'article 19 dispose que : <i>« Le permis de construire n'est accordé que si les constructions projetées respectent les plans d'urbanisme et d'alignement, les règlements d'urbanisme, les servitudes d'hygiène et de salubrité, de sécurité publique, de caractère architectural, de conservation des sites et, d'une manière générale, les prescriptions imposées par la présente loi et les règlements » ;</i> - L'article 69 dispose que : <i>« Toute construction neuve ou modifiée, destinée à être utilisée de façon permanente, quel que soit l'usage final, ne peut être occupée que lorsque le service chargé de l'établissement du permis de construire ou de modifier, a constaté que les dispositions de l'ouvrage réalisé concordent exactement avec les plans et autres pièces approuvées » ;</i> - L'article 70 d'ajouter que : <i>« La conformité des travaux exécutés à celle des travaux autorisés par l'administration compétente, est sanctionnée par la délivrance d'un certificat de conformité au bénéfice du maître d'ouvrage ».</i> <p>Toutefois, des dispositions sont prises par les communautés pour protéger et conserver leurs édifices. Ce sont, entre autres, les espaces aménagés</p>	<p><i>examinée par l'organisation consultative en ce qui concerne les bâtiments urbains dans les environnements des mosquées auxquels cette législation s'applique et leur efficacité.</i></p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>pour la prière dans lesquels aucune construction n'est autorisée.</p> <p>Les mesures étatiques sont complémentaires des mécanismes traditionnels de gestion desdites mosquées pour le respect des plans d'aménagements.</p>	
<p>Page, 344, colonne 1, ligne 4</p>	<p>Un nombre croissant de nouvelles mosquées et de bâtiments pour leurs installations sont en cours de construction près des mosquées proposées pour inscription, certaines empiétant sur leurs environnements. La plupart sont des mosquées salafistes tandis qu'un nombre moins important est associé à l'école malikite. Il sera essentiel de planifier et d'intégrer les nouvelles mosquées dans les plans locaux pour s'assurer qu'elles n'entrent pas en concurrence en termes d'occupation d'espace avec les mosquées existantes.</p>	<p>Sur les sites des huit mosquées de la série proposée, deux ont une mosquée moderne dans la proximité de leur site. Ce sont les sites des mosquées de Kaouara et Kouto. Ces deux mosquées sont des mosquées malékites ; pas salafistes. Certes, de nouvelles mosquées salafistes ont été construites dans certaines localités d'implantation des mosquées de style soudanais, mais leur proportion reste très infime comparativement à celle du courant malékite qui est de loin le plus dominant en Côte d'Ivoire.</p> <p>La construction de nouvelles mosquées à proximité des mosquées de style soudanais est motivée par le fait que celles de style soudanais se sont révélées petites en termes de capacité d'accueil en raison de la croissance démographique qui a induit également une augmentation du nombre des fidèles.</p> <p>La construction de nouvelles mosquées ne doit pas être perçue comme une menace pour celles de style soudanais. Au contraire, le fait de les ériger et de ne pas détruire les mosquées de style soudanais doit être compris comme la manifestation de l'intérêt et de l'attachement des communautés à celles-ci. Autrement, elles auraient pu les démolir purement et simplement et construire les mosquées modernes sur leur site. Du reste, en dépit des mosquées modernes bâties, les usages et les fonctions des mosquées de style soudanais sont restés intacts. Les fidèles continuent d'y prier, et elles sont réputées des lieux d'exaucement rapide des prières et des vœux.</p> <p>Par ailleurs, le Conseil Supérieur des Imams, des Mosquées et des Affaires islamiques en Côte d'Ivoire (COSIM), partie prenante au processus d'inscription, a fait observer que la planification et l'intégration de nouvelles mosquées dans les plans locaux sont du ressort du ministère de la construction et des Mairies des localités concernées ; structures garantes du respect des textes et des normes en matière de construction et d'urbanisme. (Cf. courrier)</p>	<p>L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification mais considère toujours qu'il est essentiel que les nouvelles mosquées soient intégrées dans les plans locaux pour s'assurer qu'elles n'empiètent pas sur l'environnement des mosquées existantes.</p>
<p>Page 344, colonne 2, lignes 2&3</p>	<p>Le dossier de proposition d'inscription reconnaît que la mutation des structures sociales affaiblit l'autorité des anciens sur les jeunes et conduit à l'exode rural, ce qui signifie que la transmission des connaissances et du savoir-faire traditionnels est en passe de disparaître. Tous ces aspects rendent</p>	<p>L'arrêté interministériel portant organisation et fonctionnement du « Système de gestion » des mosquées de style soudanais du nord ivoirien institue de fait une cogestion entre les communautés locales et l'Etat. En effet, l'article 2 dudit arrêté stipule que « Les mosquées de style soudanais du nord ivoirien sont gérées par les organes suivants :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - L'État L'Office Ivoirien du Patrimoine Culturel Le Secrétariat exécutif de gestion des mosquées Les Directions Régionales de la Culture Les Directions régionales du Tourisme Les Directions Régionales de la Construction - Les collectivités territoriales Les Mairies Les Conseils Régionaux Les Préfectures Les Sous-préfectures 	<p>L'ICOMOS considère que cette correction porte en partie sur la mise en œuvre de la cogestion suite à la signature le 24 juin 2021 de l'arrêté interministériel et constitue donc une information nouvelle qui ne peut pas être prise en compte à ce stade.</p>


	<p>les processus de conservation extrêmement vulnérables, et ces évolutions vont probablement s'intensifier au fil du temps. Pour relever ces défis, l'ICOMOS considère que la gestion traditionnelle devra être soutenue par une forme de structure de cogestion entre les communautés locales et les autorités. Dans les informations complémentaires fournies, des objectifs clairs sont fixés pour y parvenir, mais il est nécessaire de donner des détails sur la manière dont un système peut être rendu opérationnel, et d'indiquer quel renforcement des capacités est nécessaire afin de le rendre efficace pour répondre aux besoins de conservation.</p>	<p>- Les Communautés Les Comités Locaux de Base de Gestion Les Chefs de village Les maçons traditionnels Les familles détentrices Les Chefs de communautés.</p> <p>L'organisation et la mise en œuvre du système de gestion des mosquées de style soudanais du nord ivoirien est assurée par un organe local de gestion (secrétariat exécutif de gestion des mosquées), conformément aux dispositions du décret de création de l'OIPC pour la mise en application de la politique générale de conservation, de valorisation, de protection et de promotion du patrimoine culturel. Le système de gestion est évalué tous les deux ans. Les Comités Locaux de Base de Gestion qui se composent des représentants des communautés, de maçons traditionnels et des familles ainsi que de toute personne dont l'expertise est nécessaire à la bonne gestion du bien, donnent au niveau local les orientations globales et stratégiques sur la gestion des biens.</p> <p>Ils mettent en œuvre les plans d'action que leur soumet l'OIPC par le biais des Directions Régionales en charge de la Culture. Ce système de gestion peut également bénéficier de l'appui technique et financier des Collectivités territoriales (Mairies, Conseils Régionaux, etc.), d'autres institutions et partenaires nationaux ou internationaux dans le cadre de coopérations bilatérales et multilatérales.</p> <p>À cet effet, la cogestion est formalisée par deux arrêtés portant respectivement création du Secrétariat de gestion des mosquées de style soudanais et organisation et fonctionnement du système de gestion des mosquées en série du Nord ivoirien.</p> <p>L'arrêté portant organisation et fonctionnement du système de gestion (ci-joint) précise de façon détaillée l'opérationnalité de cet outil de gestion.</p> <p>Les Comités ont été installés par le Préfet ou le Sous-préfet, selon la localité, en présence des Directeurs régionaux en charge de la culture et du Directeur Général de l'OIPC. Ces autorités ont reçu les arrêtés portant création des Comités Locaux de Base de Gestion des Mosquées. Elles président les quatre réunions par an de ces Comités. (Cf. Rapports mission COGES).</p>	<p>Cette correction réitère également des informations portant sur les aspects des systèmes de gestion existants présentées dans le dossier de proposition d'inscription qui ont été pleinement examinées par l'organisation consultative.</p>
<p>Page, 345, colonne 2, ligne 6</p>	<p>Il est difficile de savoir combien de mosquées sont nécessaires pour définir et illustrer ce style soudanais. Les huit proposées pour inscription sont présentées comme les mieux préservées en Côte d'Ivoire, alors que celles situées au-delà des frontières de la Côte d'Ivoire n'ont pas été incluses dans la série. Dans l'ensemble,</p>	<p>Le principe de départ de l'État partie de Côte d'Ivoire a été de proposer une candidature commune avec le Burkina Faso et le Ghana. À cet effet, des correspondances officielles (Cf. courriers) du Ministre ivoirien en charge de la culture ont été adressées à ses homologues des deux pays. Comme réponse à sa correspondance, le Burkina Faso a donné son accord de principe pour participer à l'inscription des mosquées qui est un projet culturel et scientifique sous régional. Le Ghana, lui, n'a pas donné de suite au courrier. Au regard de ce qui précède, l'État de Côte d'Ivoire a décidé de faire acte de candidature, étant entendu que si l'inscription des mosquées de style soudanais est acquise, le Burkina Faso entreprendrait des initiatives nécessaires dans la perspective de l'extension du bien, étant donné que la grande mosquée de Bobo-Dioulasso n'est pas encore inscrite sur la Liste indicative du pays. A cet effet, l'Etat de Côte d'Ivoire est disposé à toute forme de coopération avec</p>	<p>L'ICOMOS accepte cette clarification.</p>

	<p>l'ICOMOS considère que les huit mosquées proposées pour inscription sont suffisantes pour représenter le style soudanais, mais il est nécessaire d'explorer plus avant si des exemples dans les pays voisins pourraient être envisagés comme des extensions.</p>	<p>les pays ayant le style soudanais.</p> <p>Concernant les autres mosquées de style soudanais du nord ivoirien ne faisant pas partie de la série proposée, il faut souligner qu'elles sont classées patrimoine national.</p> <p>À ce titre, l'État de Côte d'Ivoire travaille à améliorer leur état de conservation. Lorsque cet état de conservation sera amélioré, l'extension de la série à ces mosquées sera envisagée. Dans cette optique, les vingt-et-une mosquées de style soudanais du nord ivoirien bénéficient, de la part de l'État de Côte d'Ivoire, d'une dotation budgétaire de 120 000 000 F CFA (environ 183 206 euros) pour les travaux d'entretien et de restauration, dont 70 000 000 F CFA (environ 106 870 euros) effectivement mis à disposition au titre de l'année 2021 dans le cadre du Programme d'Investissement Public (PIP).</p>	
<p>Page, 346, colonne 2, ligne 7</p>	<p>En termes d'intégrité des éléments constitutifs individuels, les délimitations actuelles excluent les zones de rassemblement nécessaires pour l'utilisation de la mosquée, de sorte que tous les attributs de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle proposée n'ont pas été inclus dans les délimitations.</p>	<p>L'État de Côte d'Ivoire précise que la délimitation effectuée en vue de protéger et de préserver les mosquées de style soudanais du nord ivoirien prend en compte les espaces environnants traditionnellement associés à ces biens culturels. En effet, l'administration ivoirienne a pris en compte tous les attributs liés aux mosquées dans tous les parcellaires concernant les lots et les îlots. C'est donc dans cette optique de conservation que l'État partie a fait le choix de protéger tout le lot ou l'îlot dans lequel se trouvent les mosquées de styles soudanais dont celles de la série proposée.</p> <p>En outre, sur le plan réglementaire, le décret n°2020-121 du 29 janvier 2020 portant classement des mosquées en série de style soudanais du nord ivoirien sur la Liste du patrimoine culturel national vient renforcer la protection du bien et des éléments qui lui sont associés en ce sens qu'il ne protège pas uniquement les biens inscrits, mais aussi et surtout le lot ou l'îlot.</p> <p>Article 5 (décret n°2020-121 du 29 janvier 2020): « <i>En vue de préserver leur intégrité et leur insertion dans leur environnement naturel et historique, il est défini un périmètre de protection pour chaque mosquée classée. Ce périmètre intègre le lot ou l'îlot sur lequel sont bâties chacune des mosquées et toutes autres constructions y associées.</i>».</p> <p>De plus, le cas de Kong offre un double avantage, car les monuments historiques qui y sont ont été les premiers à bénéficier d'un décret les classant à l'inventaire du patrimoine culturel national. Il s'agit du décret n°88-413 du 20 avril 1988 portant classement des sites et monuments de la ville historique de Kong.</p> <p>Ce décret en son article 1^{er} dispose : « Sont classés sur la liste du patrimoine culturel national, les Monuments et Sites historiques de Kong dont les noms suivent : Tout le secteur aux alentours de la grande mosquée, englobant outre ladite mosquée, l'ancienne case, l'ancien marché, la <i>dâ-ba</i> et la case de Binger ».</p> <p>Par conséquent, toute modification dans ces alentours répond à des servitudes comme le stipule la loi no.87-806 du 28 Juillet 1987 portant protection du patrimoine culturel. Cette loi, en son chapitre II : Protection des Sites et Monuments, Section I : Dispositions communes : Article 5 déclare : « La</p>	<p>L'ICOMOS considère que cela reflète des opinions divergentes car si les délimitations englobent les éléments construits, elles n'englobent pas les espaces associés autour des mosquées qui peuvent être considérés comme leur « environnement historique » tel que défini dans la loi 87.</p>


		<p>protection du patrimoine culturel immobilier est assurée suivant son intérêt historique, artistique, scientifique ou technologique ainsi qu'en raison de son état de conservation par trois mesures administratives distinctes :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - L'inscription ; - Le classement ; - La déclaration de sauvegarde ». <p>Par ailleurs, la loi n°87 prévoit des dispositions qui prennent en compte la protection du bien et son insertion dans son environnement.</p> <p>Article 9 (loi no.87-806 du 28 juillet 1987): « <i>En vue de protéger l'insertion de l'immeuble dans son environnement naturel ou historique, il peut être aménagé un périmètre de sauvegarde dont les éléments et les limites sont arrêtés dans la mesure de protection.</i> ».</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="651 763 1174 1615"> <thead> <tr> <th>N°</th> <th>Nom de l'élément</th> <th>Région(s)</th> <th>Surface du bien proposé pour inscription (ha)</th> <th>Surface de la zone tampon (ha)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>01</td> <td>Mosquée de Tengréla</td> <td rowspan="2">Région de la Bagoué</td> <td>0,0081 ha</td> <td>0,0583 ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>02</td> <td>Mosquée de Kouto</td> <td>0,0035 ha</td> <td>0,2783 ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>03</td> <td>Mosquée de Sorobango</td> <td>Région du Gontougo</td> <td>0,0100 ha</td> <td>0,1844 ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>04</td> <td>Mosquée de Samatiguila ou missiriba</td> <td>Région du Kabadougou</td> <td>0,0411 ha</td> <td>0,1526 ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>05</td> <td>Mosquée de Nambira ou « Namboura missiri koro »</td> <td>Région du Poro</td> <td>0,0076 ha</td> <td>0,1344 ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>06</td> <td>Grande Mosquée De Kong</td> <td rowspan="3">Région du Tchologo</td> <td>0,0 506 ha</td> <td>1,1102 ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>07</td> <td>Petite Mosquée De Kong</td> <td>0,00397 ha</td> <td>0 ,37694 ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>08</td> <td>Mosquée de Kaouara</td> <td>0,0049 ha</td> <td>0,0342 ha</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Les superficies des zones protégées sont suffisamment grandes et n'excluent pas les zones de rassemblement nécessaires pour l'utilisation de la mosquée, et incluent tous les attributs de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle proposée n'ont dans les délimitations actuelles.</p>	N°	Nom de l'élément	Région(s)	Surface du bien proposé pour inscription (ha)	Surface de la zone tampon (ha)	01	Mosquée de Tengréla	Région de la Bagoué	0,0081 ha	0,0583 ha	02	Mosquée de Kouto	0,0035 ha	0,2783 ha	03	Mosquée de Sorobango	Région du Gontougo	0,0100 ha	0,1844 ha	04	Mosquée de Samatiguila ou missiriba	Région du Kabadougou	0,0411 ha	0,1526 ha	05	Mosquée de Nambira ou « Namboura missiri koro »	Région du Poro	0,0076 ha	0,1344 ha	06	Grande Mosquée De Kong	Région du Tchologo	0,0 506 ha	1,1102 ha	07	Petite Mosquée De Kong	0,00397 ha	0 ,37694 ha	08	Mosquée de Kaouara	0,0049 ha	0,0342 ha	
N°	Nom de l'élément	Région(s)	Surface du bien proposé pour inscription (ha)	Surface de la zone tampon (ha)																																									
01	Mosquée de Tengréla	Région de la Bagoué	0,0081 ha	0,0583 ha																																									
02	Mosquée de Kouto		0,0035 ha	0,2783 ha																																									
03	Mosquée de Sorobango	Région du Gontougo	0,0100 ha	0,1844 ha																																									
04	Mosquée de Samatiguila ou missiriba	Région du Kabadougou	0,0411 ha	0,1526 ha																																									
05	Mosquée de Nambira ou « Namboura missiri koro »	Région du Poro	0,0076 ha	0,1344 ha																																									
06	Grande Mosquée De Kong	Région du Tchologo	0,0 506 ha	1,1102 ha																																									
07	Petite Mosquée De Kong		0,00397 ha	0 ,37694 ha																																									
08	Mosquée de Kaouara		0,0049 ha	0,0342 ha																																									
<p>Page, 346, colonne 2, ligne 8</p>	<p><i>De plus, les sites constitutifs sont tous très vulnérables face à la diminution continue des pratiques traditionnelles d'entretien et de</i></p>	<p>La vulnérabilité des sites constitutifs face à la diminution continue des pratiques traditionnelles d'entretien et de conservation ne saurait être niée. Toutefois, elle doit être relativisée. En effet, l'organisation traditionnelle des communautés leur permettait de faire l'entretien deux fois par an et autant de fois que cela s'avère nécessaire. Ces activités, les communautés les réalisent sans contraintes, vu leur attachement aux mosquées. À l'occasion de ces travaux,</p>	<p>Cette correction reconnaît la vulnérabilité des mosquées.</p> <p>Les informations sur les activités</p>																																										


	<p><i>conservation, et à l'empiètement urbain.</i></p>	<p>et à l'initiative des familles, toute la communauté (enfants, jeunes, vieux, femmes, garçons, chefferie, etc.) est mobilisée.</p> <p>Images de la participation communautaire</p>  <p>Aussi dans l'optique de soutenir et de pérenniser les pratiques traditionnelles d'entretien et de conservation, l'OIPC a élaboré un Programme de sauvegarde et de valorisation des mosquées de style soudanais du nord ivoirien qui est inscrit au Programme d'Investissement Public (PIP) 2017-2021 de l'État de Côte d'Ivoire, plusieurs activités sont prévues cette année (2021), notamment l'entretien et la restauration de six (6) mosquées, la formation de vingt-cinq (25) maçons traditionnels à travers des chantiers-écoles.</p> <p>En ce qui concerne l'empiètement urbain, le décret n°2020-121 du 29 janvier 2020 portant classement des mosquées en série de style soudanais du nord ivoirien sur la Liste du patrimoine culturel national vient renforcer la protection du bien et des éléments qui lui sont associés en ce qu'il ne protège pas uniquement les biens inscrits, mais aussi et surtout le lot ou l'îlot. Par ailleurs, le Plan de préservation et de prescriptions architecturales des mosquées de style soudanais est en cours d'élaboration par l'OIPC, en collaboration avec les services techniques concernés</p>	<p>communales actuelles réitèrent des informations présentées dans le dossier de proposition d'inscription qui ont été pleinement examinées par l'organisation consultative.</p> <p>Les informations portant sur les activités prévues pour 2021 et sur le Plan de préservation et de prescriptions architecturales des mosquées de style soudanais en cours de préparation par l'OIPC sont des informations nouvelles qui ne peuvent pas être prises en compte à ce stade.</p>
--	--	--	---

		(urbanisme, construction, Mairie, cabinet d'architecte). Ledit Plan sera adopté par voie réglementaire, et viendra règlementer toutes constructions dans l'environnement immédiat des mosquées. (avant-projet)	
Page, 347, colonne 1, ligne 3	Ainsi, l'authenticité des matériaux et des techniques de construction reste hautement vulnérable étant donné qu'elle repose sur la poursuite de l'entretien communautaire, la disponibilité de maçons qualifiés et le maintien du parrainage des familles locales, et la manière de parvenir à ce résultat n'a pas été suffisamment clarifiée.	<p>La protection des mosquées au fil des siècles a été assurée par les familles détentrices sur la base du droit coutumier. La gestion des mosquées par les familles, les travaux d'entretien assurés par des organisations locales (Comité Local de Base de Gestion) et l'existence de maçons traditionnels sont une garantie pour la préservation de l'intégrité des mosquées, l'authenticité des matériaux et des techniques de construction. Pour garantir la poursuite de l'entretien par les communautés, une Feuille de route a été définie et remise à chaque Comité local de base de gestion. Cette Feuille de route a été traduite en Arrêté. Le Comité veille à l'entretien régulier des mosquées de style soudanais et à la gestion des visites des mosquées ; saisit le Directeur régional de la Culture et l'organe de gestion pour toutes les actions à mener touchant à l'intégrité et à l'authenticité des mosquées ; rédige des rapports trimestriels sur l'état de conservation et de gestion des mosquées.</p> <p>Aussi, la mise en œuvre des activités d'entretien et de restauration de six (6) mosquées, la formation de vingt-cinq (25) maçons traditionnels à travers des chantiers-écoles du Programme d'Investissement Public (PIP) 2017-2021 de l'État de Côte d'Ivoire, permettra de réduire cette vulnérabilité de l'authenticité des matériaux et de la technique de construction ; et d'augmenter le nombre de maçons qualifiés et disponibles.</p>	<p>L'ICOMOS considère que la correction réitère des informations présentées dans le dossier de proposition d'inscription qui ont été pleinement examinées par l'organisation consultative.</p> <p>L'ICOMOS a évalué s'il y avait suffisamment d'informations pour montrer comment l'implication de la communauté serait maintenue à l'avenir à un niveau adéquat et n'a pas considéré que des ressources suffisantes ont été fournies afin de permettre qu'un système robuste pourrait être mis en place et pourrait répondre aux vulnérabilités actuelles.</p>
Page, 347, colonne 1, ligne 4	En ce qui concerne la manière dont le symbolisme des édifices est appréhendé, les délimitations des éléments constitutifs et de leurs zones tampons ne sont pas appropriées, étant donné qu'elles n'englobent pas suffisamment d'espace autour des mosquées pour leur permettre d'être perçues comme elles sont censées l'être. Sur certains éléments constitutifs, de nouveaux bâtiments ont récemment été érigés dans le	<p>Les délimitations des éléments constitutifs et de leurs zones tampons sont appropriées, étant donné que les lots ou ilots englobent suffisamment d'espace autour des mosquées pour leur permettre d'être bien visibles.</p> <p>Sur un des éléments constitutifs, de nouveaux bâtiments ont récemment été érigés dans le voisinage des mosquées. Il s'agit de trois préaux (édicules) à Kong qui ont été construits (2 sur le site de la Grande mosquée et 1 sur celui de la petite mosquée) pour accueillir les nombreuses personnes les jours de fête et de grands rassemblements, notamment à l'occasion de la Nuit du destin, du Ramadan, de la Tabaski et de la grande prière du vendredi. Cependant, ces édifices ne sont pas si monumentaux au point de constituer un impact visuel négatif et d'empêcher l'appréciation et la délectation du bien par le visiteur.</p>	<p>L'ICOMOS considère que cela reflète des opinions divergentes.</p>

	<p>voisinage des mosquées, notamment des édifices particulièrement grands et proéminents près de la grande mosquée de Kong.</p>	 <p>Pour un besoin de protection, hormis le site de la mosquée de Tengrela, les communautés ont érigé des clôtures basses contenues dans les limites des lots ou ilots tout autour des mosquées. Leur érection répond au besoin de protéger le site contre les intrusions, notamment les animaux en divagation.</p>	
<p>Page, 347, colonne 1, ligne 7</p>	<p>Les huit mosquées qui ont été proposées pour inscription sont manifestement des témoignages importants d'un style de mosquée qui s'est développé dans la région soudanaise principalement après la chute de l'Empire songhaï, et qui reflètent la manière dont le style de Djenné a été fusionné avec des traditions locales et adapté aux conditions climatiques locales. Les huit éléments constitutifs ont le potentiel pour justifier les critères (ii) et (iv) mais les conditions d'intégrité et d'authenticité n'ont pas encore été pleinement remplies, étant donné que les délimitations des éléments constitutifs proposés pour inscription n'englobent pas tous les attributs de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle proposée. De plus, les éléments demeurent vulnérables face aux empiètements urbains.</p>	<p>Les huit éléments constitutifs ont le potentiel pour justifier les critères (ii) et (iv) même si le critère (v) n'a pas été suffisamment justifié selon l'ICOMOS.</p> <p>Par ailleurs, les conditions d'intégrité et d'authenticité sont remplies, étant donné que les délimitations des éléments constitutifs proposés pour inscription englobent tous les attributs de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle proposée.</p> <p>En ce qui concerne les empiètements urbains, le décret n°2020-121 du 29 janvier 2020 portant classement des mosquées en série de style soudanais du nord ivoirien sur la Liste du patrimoine culturel national vient renforcer la protection du bien et des éléments qui lui sont associés en ce qu'il ne protège pas que les biens inscrits, mais aussi le lot ou l'îlot. Par ailleurs, le plan de préservation et de prescriptions architecturales des mosquées de style soudanais en cours d'élaboration par l'OIPC, en collaboration avec les services techniques concernés (urbanisme, construction, Mairie, cabinet d'architecte), et qui sera adopté par voie réglementaire, viendra règlementer toutes les constructions dans l'environnement des mosquées. Ces dispositions paraissent pour l'État partie des mesures suffisantes pour pallier la vulnérabilité des éléments constitutifs due aux empiètements urbains.</p>	<p>L'ICOMOS considère que cela reflète des opinions divergentes</p>

<p>Page, 347, colonne 2, ligne 2</p>	<p>L'ICOMOS considère qu'il est nécessaire de continuer à travailler sur la définition des délimitations et des zones tampons, afin de permettre aux zones proposées pour inscription d'inclure les espaces de rassemblements associés aux mosquées, et aux zones tampons d'englober leur environnement urbain et rural, en vue d'assurer que ce qui reste de la position dominante des mosquées puisse être protégé. Pour traiter ces besoins de conservation urgents, le système de gestion doit être rendu opérationnel et étendu pour qu'il puisse soutenir les processus traditionnels. Cela va prendre du temps et une feuille de route est nécessaire pour exposer les actions requises afin d'atteindre une situation stable.</p>	<p>L'État de Côte d'Ivoire précise que la délimitation effectuée en vue de protéger et de préserver les mosquées de style soudanais du nord ivoirien prend en compte les espaces environnants traditionnellement associés à ces biens culturels (espaces de rassemblement). Les délimitations des éléments constitutifs et leurs zones tampons englobent suffisamment d'espace autour des mosquées pour leur permettre d'être bien visibles.</p> <p>L'arrêté portant organisation et fonctionnement du système de gestion (ci-joint) précise de façon détaillée l'opérationnalité de cet outil de gestion et permettra donc de soutenir les processus traditionnels existants. À cet effet, l'organe de gestion créé, traduira en une feuille de route le plan d'action du système de gestion en déterminant de façon détaillée les actions requises pour parvenir à une situation stable souhaitée et attendue.</p>	<p>L'ICOMOS considère que cela reflète des opinions divergentes portant sur l'adéquation des délimitations proposées.</p> <p>Les informations sur la feuille de route proposée sont des informations nouvelles qui ne peuvent pas être prises en compte à ce stade.</p>
<p>Page, 347, colonne 2, ligne 5</p>	<p>La mission d'évaluation technique a exprimé ses inquiétudes quant aux récentes interventions « désordonnées » sur plusieurs mosquées et identifié la nécessité de prendre des mesures urgentes pour remédier aux travaux faits à Kouto, Kaouara, Sorobango et Samatiguila.</p>	<p>L'État partie précise qu'il y a eu des interventions « désordonnées » sur une mosquée, celle de Samatiguila. Ces interventions ne sont ni du fait du ministère de la culture, ni du Comité local de base de gestion, encore moins des membres de la Communauté. Elles sont du fait du Maire de la ville, qui a posé une action semble-t-il de protection de la mosquée sans aviser les structures compétentes et techniques. Il a fait construire un ouvrage métallique amovible qui recouvre la mosquée de Samatiguila. En termes de mesure urgente à prendre pour y remédier, la ministre en charge de la culture d'alors, par le biais de l'OIPC, a adressé deux courriers (docs ci-joints) en date du 16 septembre 2020 au Maire de la commune de Samatiguila et au Préfet du Département de ladite localité les enjoignant de faire démonter et d'enlever cet ouvrage afin de respecter les servitudes liées au classement du bien.</p> <p>Par ailleurs, l'OIPC a soutenu financièrement les Comités locaux de base de gestion des localités dont les mosquées étaient dans un état de conservation moyen, à savoir Kaouara, Sorobango et Kouto.</p> <p>Pour ce qui est de la mosquée de Kaouara, cet édifice était la seule mosquée de la série dont les façades étaient entièrement recouvertes de ciment. Pour y remédier, l'OIPC a apporté en</p>	<p>L'ICOMOS considère que cela reflète des opinions divergentes portant sur la nécessité de remédier aux travaux récents sur les mosquées de Kouto, Kaouara, Sorobango et Samatiguila.</p>

		<p>2020 un soutien financier d'un million de francs CFA au Comité Local de Base de Gestion. Cet appui a permis de financer les travaux de décapage et de pose d'enduit sur les façades extérieures de la mosquée, avec l'appui des maçons traditionnels venus du Burkina Faso. (Cf. rapport)</p> <p>Un soutien de 600 000 F CFA (environ 916 euros) a été également apporté à chacun des Comités de Sorobango et de Kouto. Sous la supervision des Directeurs régionaux de la culture de ces localités et avec la mobilisation des maçons traditionnels formés au chantier-école de Kong, l'enduit des façades et la restauration des toits-terrasses ont été réalisés. Cependant, il a été donné de constater à Sorobango, qu'un forage été réalisé dans la zone tampon. En effet, pour palier le problème récurrent du manque d'eau à Sorobango, le Conseil Régional du Gontougo, à la demande des populations, envisage de construire un château d'eau. Suite à la recommandation de l'expert de l'ICOMOS, le Conseil régional du Gontougo, initiateur de cet ouvrage, été sensibilisé afin que le château d'eau à construire s'intègre à l'environnement de la mosquée. (Cf.rapport)</p>	
<p>Page, 348, colonne 1, ligne 1</p>	<p>Il semble que les techniques de construction traditionnelles subissent des modifications en raison de l'utilisation de matériaux importés comme le ciment et la chaux, bien que certaines localités expriment le souhait de revenir à des pratiques traditionnelles, notamment à l'utilisation de la terre provenant de termitières. Alors qu'il y a effectivement des maçons spécialisés dans certains établissements, en particulier dans les endroits où l'entretien ordinaire est encore confié à des familles appartenant à une lignée (comme c'est le cas pour la mosquée de Samatiguila), ils ne sont pas disponibles pour tous les éléments constitutifs de la série.</p>	<p>Les techniques de construction traditionnelles subissaient des modifications en raison de l'utilisation de matériaux importés comme le ciment et la chaux, bien que certaines localités expriment le souhait de revenir à des pratiques traditionnelles, notamment à l'utilisation de la terre provenant de termitières. Cette situation était récurrente avant 2015. Grâce aux actions de sensibilisation menées par l'OIPC et les Directions régionales en charge de la culture depuis 2015 et le chantier école de 2018, les comportements et les attitudes ont changé positivement. Les communautés ont compris la nécessité de revenir aux techniques de construction traditionnelles, privilégiant l'utilisation des matériaux originels, puisés dans leur environnement naturel.</p> <p>Photos de décapage mosquées de Kaouara</p> 	<p>L'ICOMOS considère que la correction réitère des informations présentées dans le dossier de proposition d'inscription qui ont été pleinement examinées par l'organisation consultative.</p>

		 <p>Les 17 maçons traditionnels provenant des localités de Kong, Sokoro, Kouto, Samatiguila, Siana, Kani, Tieningboué, Nambira, Bouna, Sorobango, Kaouara, Nafana, Mahandiana, Guanhoué et M'Bengué, formés lors du chantier-école organisé à Kong en 2018 par l'Office Ivoirien du Patrimoine Culturel (OIPC), sont de facto membres des Comités locaux de base de gestion des mosquées et se sont constitués en association. avec pour président Lamine CISSÉ de Bouna. Ils ont été mis à contribution en 2019 et en 2020 dans le cadre des travaux d'entretien et de réhabilitation des mosquées de Kaouara, de Kong, de Kouto et de Sorobango. Ils sont d'ailleurs à la disposition de l'OIPC pour toute intervention sur les mosquées relevant de leurs compétences. (Cf. rapport atelier maçons).</p>	
<p>Page, 348, colonne 1, ligne 4</p>	<p>Les informations complémentaires comprennent, dans une annexe, un plan de conservation chiffré pour six des mosquées. Toutefois, il demeure difficile de comprendre exactement quel est le statut de ce plan et s'il sera élargi pour couvrir les deux autres mosquées restantes.</p>	<p>Dans le Programme d'Investissement Public (PIP) 2017-2021, il est prévu 120 000 000 F CFA (environ 183 206 euros) pour les travaux d'entretien et de restauration, ce qui permettrait d'intervenir sur l'ensemble de la vingtaine de mosquées. Une dotation de 70 000 000 FCFA (environ 106 870 euros) a été accordée pour 2021. Cette dotation concerne prioritairement six mosquées de la série, c'est en cela qu'un plan de conservation chiffré a été élaboré et transmis au ministère du plan et du développement à qui l'OIPC rend compte de tout le processus d'inscription par le truchement de Rapports sur les activités réalisées dans le cadre du processus d'inscription des mosquées. Le gap de 50 000 000 F CFA (environ 76 335 euros) sera accordé en 2022, et prendra en compte les deux mosquées restantes de la série et des autres mosquées.</p> <p>Ce plan de conservation chiffré est approuvé par le ministère du plan et du Développement et de celui de l'économie et des finances. C'est un document qui permet aux deux ministères de suivre la mise en œuvre des activités du PIP concernant le processus d'inscription. Ce plan couvre l'ensemble des charges des activités de restaurations des mosquées. (Cf. TDRs et PIP)</p>	<p>L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification.</p>
<p>Page, 349, colonne 1, ligne 4</p>	<p>Il ressort clairement des informations complémentaires fournies que la protection offerte est limitée à l'intérieur des zones de protection nationale, qui correspondent aux zones proposées pour</p>	<p>Les espaces entourant les mosquées, et qui sont aménagés pour les prières, font partie des éléments/ attributs associés à la mosquée et par conséquent protégés.</p> <p>L'article 10 de la loi de 1987 suscitée, la loi n° 2019-576 du 26 juin 2019 instituant le Code de la Construction et de l'Habitat, en ses articles 19, 69 et l'article 5 du décret n°2020-121 du 29 janvier 2020 de classement des mosquées donnent des précisions sur les zones protégées :</p>	<p>L'ICOMOS considère que cela reflète des opinions divergentes portant sur la protection directe offerte par les zones tampons, par opposition à la</p>

	<p>inscription. Aucune protection directe n'est octroyée aux zones tampons. Il est clairement indiqué que les espaces entourant les mosquées, qui sont aménagés pour des prières, ne sont soumis à aucune interdiction de nouvelle construction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - la loi de 1987, en son article 10, dispose que : « Tous travaux publics ou privés, de construction, de démolition ou de modification à l'intérieur du périmètre de sauvegarde sont soumis à l'autorisation préalable du ministre chargé des affaires culturelles... Les entrepreneurs sont tenus en outre de se conformer aux prescriptions architecturales et techniques éventuellement arrêtées par l'Administration... » ; - la loi n° 2019 en son article 19 dispose que « Le permis de construire n'est accordé que si les constructions projetées respectent les plans d'urbanisme et d'alignement, les règlements d'urbanisme, les servitudes d'hygiène et de salubrité, de sécurité publique, de caractère architectural, de conservation des sites et, d'une manière générale, les prescriptions imposées par la présente loi et les règlements » ; - la loi n° 2019 en son article 69 dispose que : « Toute construction neuve ou modifiée, destinée à être utilisée de façon permanente, quel que soit l'usage final, ne peut être occupée que lorsque le service chargé de l'établissement du permis de construire ou de modifier, a constaté que les dispositions de l'ouvrage réalisé concordent exactement avec les plans et autres pièces approuvées » ; - le décret n°2020 -212 précité en son article 5 dispose que: « En vue de préserver leur intégrité et leur insertion dans leur environnement naturel et historique, il est défini un périmètre de protection pour chaque mosquée classée. Ce périmètre intègre le lot ou l'îlot sur lequel sont bâties chacune des mosquées et toutes autres constructions y associées». 	<p>protection offerte aux mosquées.</p>
<p>Page, 349, colonne 2, ligne 3</p>	<p>Un système de gestion pour huit mosquées de style soudanais du Nord ivoirien, pour la période 2020-2025 a été inclus dans le dossier de proposition d'inscription. En vertu de ce système, les comités locaux seront intégrés dans un système général pour la série proposée pour inscription, lié aux structures régionales et nationales. À l'avenir, tous les travaux de restauration seront réalisés conformément aux dispositions des instruments normatifs existants. Des plans d'action annuels seront</p>	<p>Toutes les structures sont créés et opérationnelles :</p> <p>Le Conseil de Gestion de l'OIPC a été créé par le décret n° 2012-552 du 13 juin 2012 portant création, attributions, organisation et fonctionnement d'un établissement public à caractère administratif dénommé Office Ivoirien du Patrimoine Culturel. Ce Conseil de gestion réunit plusieurs ministères à savoir, les ministères en charge du tourisme, de la construction et de l'urbanisme, du budget, des eaux et forêts, de l'environnement, le l'éducation nationale, de l'enseignement supérieur et de la recherche scientifique, et une ONG qui œuvre en matière de patrimoine culturel. Il fonctionne depuis octobre 2012 et tient régulièrement ses sessions.</p> <p>Quant aux Comités Locaux de Base de Gestion des mosquées de style soudanais du nord ivoirien, ils ont été formalisés par l'arrêté n° 005 MCF/CAB du 20 janvier 2020 portant création, attributions, organisation et fonctionnement des Comités Locaux de Base de Gestion des mosquées de style soudanais du nord ivoirien. Ce texte a été pris pour conférer de la légitimité et officialiser une organisation qui</p>	<p>L'ICOMOS reconnaît la clarification relative au Conseil de gestion, aux Directions Régionales et aux Comités Locaux.</p> <p>Les informations relatives à la création de l'organe de gestion des mosquées par arrêté du 24 juin 2021 sont des informations nouvelles qui ne peuvent pas être</p>

	<p>adoptés par le Conseil de gestion de l'Office ivoirien du patrimoine culturel et mis en œuvre par les Comités locaux de base de gestion. Les Directions Régionales de la culture et de la francophonie seront également impliquées au travers de la coordination d'activités de conservation et de gestion en relation avec les Comités de gestion locaux. Actuellement, il semble que ces structures ne soient pas toutes déjà opérationnelles. Bien qu'un budget annuel soit mentionné pour le Conseil du patrimoine culturel, aucun détail n'est fourni sur la manière dont cela soutiendra le comité local et les travaux locaux.</p> <p>Il est également difficile de comprendre comment tout projet à grande échelle financé par le Fonds islamique de développement, certains étant apparemment en préparation, sera intégré dans le système proposé.</p>	<p>existait déjà. Chaque mosquée a son Comité local de gestion qui assure son entretien de génération en génération. Chaque Comité Local de Base de Gestion est l'organe de décision et d'orientation au niveau local du Programme de gestion des mosquées de style soudanais du nord ivoirien.</p> <p>Pour ce qui est des Directions Régionales de la Culture et de la Francophonie, elles sont organisées par l'arrêté n°57/MCF/CAB/ du 08 juin 2012 fixant le cadre général relatif aux attributions, à l'organisation et au fonctionnement des Directions Régionales de la Culture et de la Francophonie. Elles sont chargées, de façon spécifique, de la préservation et de la valorisation du patrimoine culturel régional, et du renforcement de l'unité nationale par l'organisation d'activités culturelles. Elles travaillent en étroite collaboration avec le Comité Local de Base de Gestion de chaque mosquée.</p> <p>L'organe de gestion des mosquées est créé par l'arrêté n°03 du 24 juin 2021 portant organisation et fonctionnement du Secrétariat Exécutif de gestion des mosquées de style soudanais du nord ivoirien.</p> <p>Quant au projet introduit auprès du Fonds islamique de développement, il s'agit d'un processus de recherche de financements additionnels qui viendra en appui de celui de l'Etat.</p> <p>Les ressources financières pour soutenir le Comité Local de Base de Gestion (en tant qu'organe de décision et d'orientation au niveau local du Programme de gestion des mosquées de style soudanais du nord ivoirien, et les travaux locaux), proviendront du budget général (fonctionnement et investissement) de l'OIPC et de l'organe de gestion, qui lors des conférences budgétaires. L'OIPC présentera et soutiendra son budget annuel comprenant ceux des organes de gestion</p>	<p>prises en compte à ce stade.</p> <p>De même, les informations relatives au projet du Fonds islamique de développement et aux ressources financières qui seront fournies aux comités locaux sont des informations nouvelles qui ne peuvent pas être prises en compte à ce stade.</p>
<p>Page, 349, colonne 2, ligne 5</p>	<p>Une fois pleinement mis en œuvre, le système de gestion peut être considéré comme remplissant les exigences de base d'un plan de gestion. Mais, alors qu'il expose des objectifs généraux et particuliers et des activités à réaliser dans un délai de cinq ans, il n'explique pas comment seront soutenus ces systèmes et méthodes de conservation séculaires, entretenus et pratiqués par les communautés locales, qui ont garanti la conservation des mosquées de génération en</p>	<p>Le système de gestion 2020-2025 est opérationnel depuis 2020 par la réalisation de travaux d'entretien et de réhabilitation des mosquées des mosquées de Kaouara, de Kong, de Kouto et de Sorobango.(Cf. rapport)</p> <p>Cette année 2021, plusieurs activités sont prévues, en l'occurrence la formation de 25 maçons traditionnels à travers des chantiers écoles, l'entretien et la réhabilitation/restauration des mosquées. Ces activités, prévues et prises en compte par le Programme d'Investissement Public 2021, sont chiffrées à 70 000 000 F CFA (environ 106 870 euros) au PIP 2021. Pour atteindre ces objectifs, une Feuille de route a été élaborée par l'OIPC, définissant des actions et des échéances pour chaque activité. Par exemple, la formation des maçons traditionnels, l'entretien et la réhabilitation/restauration des mosquées, sont prévus dans la période allant de mai 2021 à septembre 2021, soit 5 mois (Cf. doc). Les dossiers d'appel d'offre restreint ont été déjà lancés afin que des entreprises puissent mettre les moyens à disposition pour la réalisation des activités prévues.</p>	<p>L'ICOMOS reconnaît la clarification portant sur le fait qu'un système de gestion global est opérationnel depuis 2020.</p> <p>L'information selon laquelle le système de gestion des mosquées de style soudanais n'a été rendu opérationnel que par l'arrêté interministériel de juin 2021 est une information nouvelle qui ne peut pas être prise</p>

	<p>génération. Bien que plus de données sur cet aspect aient été fournies dans les informations complémentaires de février 2021, ce système reste ambitieux, ne précisant pas quand ni comment un système solide de soutien à la gestion traditionnelle sera mis en place. Il est nécessaire de savoir quand le système de gestion sera rendu opérationnel et comment seront traitées les questions à plus long terme comme le renforcement des capacités et la formation des maçons afin d'atteindre un stade où le déclin des pratiques de conservation aura été enrayé</p> <p>À cette fin, il est nécessaire de disposer d'une feuille de route, définissant des actions et des échéances pour arriver à ces résultats.</p>	<p>L'opérationnalité de ce système est actée par l'arrêté interministériel portant organisation et fonctionnement du « Système de gestion » des mosquées de style soudanais du nord ivoirien.</p>	<p>en compte à ce stade.</p> <p>L'évaluation de l'ICOMOS porte sur les spécificités et la façon dont un système robuste pour soutenir la gestion traditionnelle sera mis en place et cela reste encore peu clair, comme déjà indiqué ci-dessus.</p> <p>En ce qui concerne les activités prévues pour 2021, il s'agit d'une nouvelle information qui ne peut pas être prise en compte à ce stade.</p>
<p>Page, 350, colonne 1, ligne 2</p>	<p>Une autre fragilité du système de gestion est son manque de détails sur la manière dont il se rapportera à l'environnement des mosquées et aux plans d'urbanisme – ou si ces derniers seront reformulés compte tenu des préoccupations qui ont été exprimées. La gestion des risques n'a pas non plus été abordée.</p>	<p>Il est prévu cette année (2021) l'élaboration d'un Plan de gestion de risques de catastrophes et une étude d'impact environnemental. L'étude d'impact environnemental est prévue dans les activités du processus d'inscription prises en charge par le PIP. Les résultats de cette étude serviront de base pour élaborer le plan de gestion des risques de catastrophes.</p>	<p>Il s'agit d'une nouvelle information qui ne peut pas être prise en compte à ce stade.</p>
<p>Page, 350, colonne 1, ligne 7</p>	<p>Il est manifeste que des consultations ont eu lieu avec les communautés locales au fur et à mesure de l'évolution de la proposition d'inscription. Des préoccupations subsistent cependant quant à la manière précise dont leurs</p>	<p>Les communautés, selon une organisation qui leur était propre, assuraient l'entretien des mosquées depuis des générations. Cette organisation a été formalisée à travers les Comités Locaux de Base de Gestion. Ils constituent, au niveau local, les entités de décision et d'orientation du système de gestion des mosquées de style soudanais du nord ivoirien. Ils donnent les orientations globales et stratégiques sur la gestion des mosquées, conformément aux directives de l'Office Ivoirien du Patrimoine Culturel (OIPC) et de l'organe de gestion. À ce titre, ils sont notamment chargés de :</p>	<p>L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification.</p>

	<p>contributions seront organisées, soutenues et formellement intégrées aux structures de gestion.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - veiller à l'entretien régulier des mosquées de style soudanais; - gérer les visites des mosquées; - saisir l'OIPC et l'organe de gestion pour toutes les actions à mener touchant l'intégrité et l'authenticité des mosquées; - adresser des rapports trimestriels à l'organe de gestion sur l'état de conservation et de gestion des mosquées, avec copie à la Direction Régionale en charge de la Culture de la région concernée et à l'OIPC; - mettre en œuvre le plan d'action que lui soumet l'organe de gestion. 	
--	---	--	--

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

(conformément au paragraphe 150 des *Orientations*)

ÉTAT(S) PARTIE(S) : France

ÉVALUATION DE LA PROPOSITION D'INSCRIPTION DU SITE : Nice, capitale du tourisme de riviera

ÉVALUATION DE L'ORGANISATION CONSULTATIVE CONCERNÉE : ICOMOS

Page, colonne, ligne de l'évaluation de l'Organisation consultative	Phrase incluant l'erreur factuelle (l'erreur factuelle devrait figurer en gras)	Correction proposée par l'Etat partie	Commentaire (s'il y a) de l'Organisation consultative et/ou du Centre du patrimoine mondial
Page 432, colonne 2, paragraphe 7, lignes 3	« La ville est protégée des vents froids par une succession de massifs montagneux, d'ouest en est : les Pyrénées, le Massif central, les Alpes, et les Apennins de Ligurie. La proximité de la mer contribue également à la douceur de son climat. »	« La rive nord de la Méditerranée occidentale est protégée des vents froids des contrées septentrionales par une succession de massifs montagneux, avec d'ouest en est : les Pyrénées, le Massif Central, les Alpes, et l'Apennin Ligure. » (cf. texte du dossier de candidature p. 26)	L'ICOMOS reconnaît cette clarification.
Page 433, colonne 2, paragraphe 4, lignes 5	« Dans les années 1920 et 1930, Nice commença également à attirer de plus en plus de personnes retraitées , ce qui a renforcé la demande de résidences secondaires liées à la saison estivale. L'aménagement de la Promenade des Anglais date de cette époque. »	« Dans les années 1920 et 1930, avec l'essor de l'automobile et du tourisme estival, la dernière transformation et donc la largeur actuelle de la Promenade des Anglais date de cette époque. » (cf. p.97 et 101 du Cahier descriptif de février 2021).	L'ICOMOS reconnaît ces deux clarifications mais note que la première phrase est issue du dossier de proposition d'inscription, page 284.
Page 434, colonne 1, paragraphe 2, lignes 7	« En conséquence, dans les informations complémentaires envoyées en février 2021, l'État partie a soumis un périmètre révisé pour le bien proposé pour inscription couvrant une superficie de 553 ha et une zone tampon de 4 232 ha. »	« En conséquence, dans les informations complémentaires envoyées en février 2021, l'État partie a soumis un périmètre révisé pour le bien proposé pour inscription couvrant une superficie de 533 ha et une zone tampon de 4 232 ha. » (cf. Addendum du Résumé analytique transmis en février 2021).	L'ICOMOS accepte cette correction en tant qu'erreur factuelle mais note que dans les informations supplémentaires fournies par l'Etat Partie en février 2021, mention est faite des 553 ha sur la carte de la page 125 intitulée "Description sectorielle des attributs du bien".

<p>Page 434, colonne 1, paragraphe 4, lignes 13</p>	<p>« D'après les cartes historiques figurant dans la proposition d'inscription et les informations complémentaires, la zone de la Promenade des Anglais, jusqu'à la période de 1939, semble avoir été limitée à l'ouest par la rivière Magnan et ne pas s'être étendue sur l'espace compris au sein des délimitations du bien proposé pour inscription, qui incluent actuellement la plus grande partie de la baie des Angès. »</p>	<p>« D'après les cartes historiques figurant dans la proposition d'inscription et les informations complémentaires, l'aménagement de la Promenade des Anglais a été planifié par la ville sur la totalité du front de mer depuis 1835 et le tissu bâti s'est rapidement étendu au-delà du vallon de Magnan, sur l'espace compris au sein des délimitations du bien proposé pour inscription, qui inclue actuellement la plus grande partie de la baie des Angès. »</p> <p>(Le plan de 1835 figure en p.98 du Cahier descriptif de février 2021. Il montre que la ville a planifié, dès cette époque, l'aménagement global de cette voie littorale, du Paillon jusqu'au Var.</p> <p>Par ailleurs, dans la proposition d'inscription, figure un plan de 1882 (p.255) ainsi qu'un plan de 1898 (p.263), qui montrent la densité du tissu urbain dès cette époque sur la moitié ouest de la Promenade.)</p>	<p>L'ICOMOS accepte cette correction mais note que le dossier de proposition d'inscription ne comprend pas de cartes historiques concluantes concernant la période en question, où l'on peut voir en détail toute l'étendue de la Promenade des Anglais.</p>
---	--	---	--

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

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

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Germany

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: ShUM Sites of Speyer, Worms and Mainz

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
Page: 363 Column: left Paragraph: 3 Line of the paragraph: 1	Located in the former Imperial cathedral cities of Speyer, Worms and Mainz, in the Upper Rhine Valley, the ShUM Sites of Speyer, Worms and Mainz comprise the Speyer Jewry-Court, with the structures of the synagogue and the women's shul, the archaeological vestiges of the yeshiva, the courtyard and the still intact underground mikveh.	Located in the former cathedral cities of Speyer, Worms and Mainz, in the Upper Rhine Valley, the ShUM Sites of Speyer, Worms and Mainz comprise the Speyer Jewry-Court, with the structures of the synagogue and the women's shul, the archaeological vestiges of the yeshiva, the courtyard and the still intact underground mikveh.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification
Page 364 Column left Paragraph: 3 Line of the paragraph: 14	Exceptionally, in Worms, Imperial intervention prevented the expulsion of the Jewish community and, eventually, a municipal "Jewry- Ordinance" in 1570 ended these attempts, although riots against the community continued.	Exceptionally, in Worms, Imperial intervention prevented the expulsion of the Jewish community and, eventually, a municipal "Jewry- Ordinance" in 1570 ended these attempts, although another severe riot against the community took place in 1615.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
Page 364 Column left Paragraph: 6 Line of the paragraph: 7	The monumental mikveh (e.1128) has been largely preserved in its original state, with its elaborate Romanesque form, refined stone masonry with pietra rasa rendering.	The monumental mikveh (c.1120) has been largely preserved in its original state, with its elaborate Romanesque form, refined stone masonry with pietra rasa rendering.	ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error
Page 365 Column left Paragraph: 1 Line of the paragraph: 6	Its older part contains about 2,500 headstones, 836 of which date back to the Middle Ages and document the development of an Ashkenazic burial culture.	Its older part contains over 2000 headstones, 836 of which date back to the Middle Ages and document the development of an Ashkenazic burial culture.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification
Page 365 Column right Paragraph: 2 Line of the paragraph: 3	The buffer zone includes parts of the former Jewish Quarter, which safeguards visual relationships between the monuments and thus helps the understanding.	The buffer zone includes the former Jewish Quarter, which safeguards visual relationships between the monuments and thus helps the understanding.	ICOMOS accept this as factual error

Page 366 Column left Paragraph: 1 Line of the paragraph: 3	In 1948, a protective wall was built to secure the remains from further loss.	After 1948, a protective wall was built to secure the remains from further loss.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification
Page 336 Column right Paragraph: 5 Line of the paragraph: 3	In Mainz, development has already occurred in a large redevelopment plot along Mombacher Street, with the erection of 6-storey high buildings for Mainz University campus , and will continue with residential and mixed functions in the remaining part of the plot.	In Mainz, development has already occurred in a large redevelopment plot along Mombacher Street, with the erection of 6-storey high buildings , and will continue with residential and mixed functions in the remaining part of the plot.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification
Page 367 Column left Paragraph: 4 Line of the paragraph: 2	The relevant comparative exercise has been developed at the sub- regional level on the basis of the five main facets of the proposed Outstanding Universal Value and key attributes:	The relevant comparative exercise has been developed at the sub- regional level on the basis of the seven main facets of the proposed Outstanding Universal Value and key attributes:	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification
Page 368 Column right Paragraph: 1 Line of the paragraph: 5 and 6	On the other hand, ICOMOS notes that other still surviving Jewish sites reflect the long history of Judeo- Christian encounter and cannot be said to be an exceptional specificity of the nominated property.	On the other hand, ICOMOS notes that other still surviving Jewish sites reflect the long history of Judeo-Christian encounter and cannot be said to be an exceptional specificity of the nominated property.	ICOMOS acknowledges this typing error
Page 370 Column left Paragraph: 3 Line of the paragraph: 12	A multi-year project for developing and testing methods for the conservation of the ancient plaster fragments of the mikveh is being implemented with the involvement of several specialised institutions and the participation of the State Association of Jewish Communities of Rhineland-Palatinate .	A multi-year project for developing and testing methods for the conservation of the ancient plaster fragments of the mikveh is being implemented with the involvement of several specialised institutions and the participation of the Jewish Community Mainz .	ICOMOS accept this as factual error
Page 371 Column left Paragraph: 2 Line of the paragraph: 9	The Highest Monuments Protection Authority is the Ministry for Science, Further Education and Culture .	The Highest Monuments Protection Authority is the Ministry responsible for monuments protection and World Heritage .	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification
Page 371 Column right Paragraph: 6 Line of the paragraph: 3	In its additional information received in November 2020, the State Party explains that the State of Rhineland-Palatinate, the State Association of Jewish Communities of Rhineland-Palatinate , and the cities of Speyer, Worms and Mainz, signed a cooperation agreement in 2012, further updated in 2020, therefore management arrangements are already in place.	In its additional information received in November 2020, the State Party explains that the State of Rhineland-Palatinate, the Jewish Community Mainz, the Jewish Congregation of the Rhenish Palatinate, the State Association of Jewish Communities of Rhineland-Palatinate , and the cities of Speyer, Worms and Mainz, signed a cooperation agreement in 2012, further updated in 2020, therefore management arrangements are already in place.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification

Page 372 Column left Paragraph: 5 Line of the paragraph: 2	The nomination dossier documents the involvement of a variety of administrations and of the State Association of Jewish Communities of Rhineland-Palatinate;	The nomination dossier documents the involvement of a variety of administrations and of the Jewish Community Mainz;	ICOMOS accept this as factual error
--	---	--	-------------------------------------

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

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

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Germany

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: ShUM Sites of Speyer, Worms and Mainz - **FR**

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

NOTE: The following corrections are those made in the French document only. All corrections in the English document apply to both language versions.

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
Page: 378 Column: left Paragraph: 3 Line of the paragraph: 1 and 3	Situés dans les anciennes villes cathédrales impériales de la vallée du Rhin supérieur, Spire, Worms et Mayence, les sites SchUM comprennent à Spire la Cour de justice de la communauté juive , avec les structures de la synagogue et de la shul des femmes, les vestiges archéologiques de la yeshiva, la cour et le mikveh souterrain encore intact.	Situés dans les anciennes villes cathédrales de la vallée du Rhin supérieur, Spire, Worms et Mayence, les sites SchUM comprennent à Spire la cour communautaire de la juiverie , avec les structures de la synagogue et de la shul des femmes, les vestiges archéologiques de la yeshiva, la cour et le mikveh souterrain encore intact.	L'ICOMOS accepte cette correction en tant que problème de traduction.
Page: 378 Column: right Paragraph: 7 Line of the paragraph: 4	Les sites SchUM proposés pour inscription comprennent quatre éléments constitutifs situés dans les villes de Spire, Worms et Mayence, dans la vallée du Rhin supérieur : la Cour de justice de la communauté juive de Spire , le complexe de la synagogue de Worms, l'ancien cimetière juif de Worms et l'ancien cimetière juif de Mayence.	Les sites SchUM proposés pour inscription comprennent quatre éléments constitutifs situés dans les villes de Spire, Worms et Mayence, dans la vallée du Rhin supérieur : la cour communautaire de la juive de Spire , le complexe de la synagogue de Worms, l'ancien cimetière juif de Worms et l'ancien cimetière juif de Mayence.	L'ICOMOS accepte cette correction en tant que problème de traduction. la cour communautaire de la juiverie de Spire
Page: 379 Column: left Paragraph: 6 Line of the paragraph: 1	Cour de justice de la communauté juive de Spire (élément 1)	Cour communautaire de la juiverie de Spire (élément 1)	L'ICOMOS accepte cette correction en tant que problème de traduction.
Page: 379 Column: left Paragraph: 6 Line of the paragraph: 2	Le bien proposé pour inscription comprend la Cour de justice de la communauté juive , avec les vestiges de la synagogue, de sa cour intérieure et de la shul des femmes, ou salle de prière pour les femmes, le mikveh, un	Le bien proposé pour inscription comprend la cour communautaire de la juiverie , avec les vestiges de la synagogue, de sa cour intérieure et de la shul des femmes, ou salle de prière	L'ICOMOS accepte cette correction en tant que problème de traduction.

	bâtiment pour les bains rituels, et le yeshiva, le centre d'enseignement et d'étude.	pour les femmes, le mikveh, un bâtiment pour les bains rituels, et le yeshiva, le centre d'enseignement et d'étude.	
Page: 379 Column: right Paragraph: 1 Line of the paragraph: 1	La zone de l'ancienne Cour de justice de la communauté juive a fait l'objet de recherches en 1965- 68.	La zone de l'ancienne cour communautaire de la juiverie a fait l'objet de recherches en 1965-68.	L'ICOMOS accepte cette correction en tant que problème de traduction.
Page: 379 Column: right Paragraph: 1 Line of the paragraph: 3	En 1999, la ville de Spire a acheté les maisons construites sur la Cour de justice de la communauté juive et dégagé les murs médiévaux.	En 1999, la ville de Spire a acheté les maisons construites sur la cour communautaire de la juiverie et dégagé les murs médiévaux.	L'ICOMOS accepte cette correction en tant que problème de traduction.
Page: 380 Column: left Paragraph: 8 Line of the paragraph: 2	Les délimitations de l'élément 1 proposé pour inscription Cour de justice de la communauté juive de Spire comprend les vestiges des bâtiments rituels et communautaires associés à la communauté médiévale.	Les délimitations de l'élément 1 proposé pour inscription cour communautaire de la juiverie de Spire comprend les vestiges des bâtiments rituels et communautaires associés à la communauté médiévale.	L'ICOMOS accepte cette correction en tant que problème de traduction.
Page: 381 Column: left Paragraph: 2 Line of the paragraph: 3	Les murs dressés subsistants de la synagogue et de la shul des femmes et les vestiges de la yeshiva de la Cour de justice de la communauté juive de Spire ont été restaurés depuis 1999, et la même année une protection en verre a été installée pour empêcher les infiltrations d'eaux de pluie dans le mikveh.	Les murs dressés subsistants de la synagogue et de la shul des femmes et les vestiges de la yeshiva de la cour communautaire de la juiverie de Spire ont été restaurés depuis 1999, et la même année une protection en verre a été installée pour empêcher les infiltrations d'eaux de pluie dans le mikveh.	L'ICOMOS accepte cette correction en tant que problème de traduction.
Page: 387 Column: left Paragraph: 2 Line of the paragraph: 4	Suite à la demande d'informations complémentaires de l'ICOMOS, l'État partie a précisé que les nouveaux plans locaux pour les bâtiments et la construction sont en cours de préparation afin d'y intégrer pleinement la Cour de justice de la communauté juive de Spire et sa zone tampon (PLBC 056A), de couvrir la totalité du complexe de la synagogue de Worms (PLBC O 128) et la zone entourant l'ancien cimetière juif de Worms (PLBC O 127).	Suite à la demande d'informations complémentaires de l'ICOMOS, l'État partie a précisé que les nouveaux plans locaux pour les bâtiments et la construction sont en cours de préparation afin d'y intégrer pleinement la cour communautaire de la juiverie de Spire et sa zone tampon (PLBC 056A), de couvrir la totalité du complexe de la synagogue de Worms (PLBC O 128) et la zone entourant l'ancien cimetière juif de Worms (PLBC O 127).	L'ICOMOS accepte cette correction en tant que problème de traduction.
Page: 387 Column: left Paragraph: 2 Line of the paragraph: 4	Il s'agit d'un bien en série composé de quatre éléments constitutifs, qui sont situés dans les villes cathédrales du Rhin supérieur de Spire, Worms et Mayence : cour de justice de la	Il s'agit d'un bien en série composé de quatre éléments constitutifs, qui sont situés dans les villes cathédrales du Rhin supérieur de Spire, Worms et Mayence : cour communautaire de la juiverie	L'ICOMOS accepte cette correction en tant que problème de traduction.

	communauté juive de Spire, complexe de la synagogue de Worms, ancien cimetière juif de Worms et ancien cimetière juif de Mayence.	de Spire, complexe de la synagogue de Worms, ancien cimetière juif de Worms et ancien cimetière juif de Mayence.	
--	--	--	--

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

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

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Germany / Netherlands

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Frontiers of the Roman Empire – The Lower German Limes

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
Page 379; bullet point 41	Bonn: additional houses will be added to an existing housing complex located within the component boundary, designed to have shallow foundations and no cellars.	[...]have shallow foundations and no new cellars	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
Page 388 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 components located within forests,	Developing a formal inter-agency management agreement between the Municipal Association of the Rhineland (in North Rhine-Westphalia) Service for Archaeological Heritage and the State Forestry Agency that includes an overarching plan and approach for managing all the components located within forests,	ICOMOS accepts this correction as a factual error.

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

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

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Japan

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Jomon Prehistoric Sites in Northern Japan

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
Page 340, Column1, Line 49-50	with buffer zones totaling 984.8 hectares.	Just correction. The number on the nomination dossier was wrong.	ICOMOS considers this correction to be a clarification.
Page 340, Column 2, Line 27-28	and which cannot be covered by protective soil	(delete) Just correction. All the privately owned areas are, as a matter of fact, covered by long-standing sediments which work as protective soil.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification and proposes the following rephrasing: Each of the serial property's archaeological features can thus be categorized in one of five basic states of conservation: still unexcavated and covered with a protective layer of soil; unexcavated, but in a part of the site that is in private hands (six of the component parts have privately owned areas). It is covered by long-standing sediments which work as protective soil.
Page 349, Column 1, Line 6-7	b) Removing existing non-compliant infrastructural elements or mitigating their impact,	Just clarification, as is described in the nomination dossier. These elements did not installed illegally but the regulations and/or standards were amended after their constructions and they have become "non-compliant."	ICOMOS considers this correction to be a clarification.

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

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

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Jordan

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: As-Salt - The Place of Tolerance and Urban Hospitality

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
Page 1, Left, Paragraph 1 (line 6)	between the eastern desert and the west	between the eastern steppe and the west	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
Page 1, Left, Paragraph 1 (line 10)	trade, banking , and farming	trade and farming.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
Page 2, Right, Paragraph 3 (line 18)	opening of the from Damascus to Medina at the turn...	opening of the Hijaz Railroad Line from Damascus to Medina at the turn...	ICOMOS acknowledges this typing error.
Page 6, Right, Paragraph 3 (line 12)	These include the modest surviving ' farm ' houses, a rare but important testimony to the long history of As-Salt.	These include the modest surviving 'peasant' houses, a rare but important testimony to the long history of As-Salt.	ICOMOS considers this correction to be an editorial change which does not modify the meaning of the sentence.
Page 10, Left, Paragraph 6 (line 7)	the eastern desert and the west	the eastern steppe and the west	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.

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

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

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Mexico

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: 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)]

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY’S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
88, 2, 48	The Earliest 16th-Century Monasteries on the Slopes of Popocatepetl is a serial property with 15 component parts located in the states of Morelos, Puebla and Tlaxcala in Mexico, built as part of the evangelisation and colonisation of the northern territories of Mexico.	The Earliest 16th-Century Monasteries on the Slopes of Popocatepetl is a serial property with 15 component parts located in the states of Morelos, Puebla and Tlaxcala in Mexico, built as part of the evangelisation and colonisation of its central territory, that would be replicated to the North and South of Mexico.	<p>ICOMOS notes that the correction provided by the State Party is part of ‘Brief synthesis’ of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the “Earliest 16th-Century Monasteries on the Slopes of Popocatepetl” adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2003.</p> <p>ICOMOS considers that this correction contains new information that could potentially influence the interpretation of the OUV of the property and that the documentation provided by the State Party regarding the proposed extension does not include elements that would support such a correction.</p> <p>Therefore, this correction cannot be taken account of at this stage. ICOMOS considers that such correction could only be evaluated if the State Party were to provide further documentation in this regard in the future.</p>
89, 2, 31	The legal protection of the Earliest 16th-Century Monasteries on the Slopes of Popocatepetl involves three different levels of the government: federal, state and local.	The legal protection of the Earliest 16th-Century Monasteries on the Slopes of Popocatepetl involves three different levels of the government: federal, state and municipal.	ICOMOS notes that the correction provided by the State Party is part of section on ‘Management and protection requirements’ of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the “Earliest 16th-Century Monasteries on the Slopes of

			<p>Popocatepetl” adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2003.</p> <p>ICOMOS considers that this correction could be accepted.</p>
89, 2, 34 and 35	<p>The legal instruments that ensure the protection of the property include the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States; the General Law of Human Settlements and the 1972 Federal Law on Historic, Archaeological and Artistic Monuments and Zones.</p>	<p>The legal instruments that ensure the protection of the property include the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States; the General Law of Human Settlements, Management Land and Urban Development of 2016, the 1972 Federal Law on Historic, Archaeological and Artistic Monuments and Zones and the General Law of National Assets of 2004.</p>	<p>ICOMOS notes that the corrections provided by the State Party is part of section on ‘Management and protection requirements’ of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the “Earliest 16th-Century Monasteries on the Slopes of Popocatepetl” adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2003.</p> <p>ICOMOS considers that both corrections could be accepted.</p>
89, 2, 37	<p>The management of the property is the co-responsibility of heritage authorities at the federal and state level and associated representatives from civil groups.</p>	<p>The management of the property is the co-responsibility of heritage authorities at the federal, state, municipal and associated representatives from civil groups.</p>	<p>ICOMOS notes that the correction provided by the State Party is part of section on ‘Management and protection requirements’ of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the “Earliest 16th-Century Monasteries on the Slopes of Popocatepetl” adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2003.</p> <p>ICOMOS considers that this correction could be accepted.</p>

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

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

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Poland

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Gdańsk Shipyard – the birthplace of “Solidarity” and the symbol of the Fall of the Iron Curtain in Europe

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY’S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
p. 39, “Boundaries”, para 4.	“Without an understanding of what could be the potential attributes [...] ICOMOS considers that it is unclear where the boundaries should be...”	<u>Comment:</u> The Nomination Dossier describes attributes that relate to criterion (iv) and follows with <u>attributes that relate to criterion (vi) on page 26 and 27 of Nomination Dossier</u> . Attributes that relate to criterion (vi) were determined from the dynamics of the Solidarity movement within the Shipyard. This is key to link associations with physical property. The proposed attributes are clearly described, and the boundary of the Nominated Property is drawn to contain these attributes and those additional that relate to criterion (iv).	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
p. 39, “State of conservation”, para 1 and para 3.	“...ICOMOS considers that the state of conservation is uneven...” “The current plans for the redevelopment rather than conservation of this nominated area, and the addition of new developments, will cause significant changes to its character and do not appear to be in line with the aim of preserving the cultural significance of the nominated property.”	<u>Comment:</u> The ICOMOS evaluation cites that the ‘state of conservation is uneven’, an accurate comment which however requires explanation. Gdańsk Shipyard went bankrupt in August 1996, the birthplace of “Solidarity” becoming a victim of the free-market economy it helped to create. Chunks of property were sold to the private sector from 1998 onwards to restructure debt and to ensure profitable shipyard operations, still employing thousands of workers, could continue in the northern sector of the site (Ostrow Island). In the early 2000s, considerable local and national interest emerged with a desire to preserve those parts of the shipyard closely associated with the actions of “Solidarity” (in the southern part of the site, located closest to the city). The European	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.

		<p>Solidarity Centre, a museum and library devoted to the history of the trade union and civil resistance movement, was opened in 2014 to international acclaim (an international design competition was held in 2007). This was followed by building surveys across the historic site, urgent measures to arrest deterioration, and the designation of legal protection. World Heritage nomination – guided by the working group outcomes concerning criterion (vi), in which Poland was an active participant – was then seen by the State Party as an appropriate means to preserve, conserve and protect the site for future generations while at the same time convening the support of the international community for a conservation-led sustainable future for the site.</p> <p>The necessity to adapt historic spaces to new functions is typical for post-industrial heritage. In the case of the Gdańsk Shipyard, it should be emphasized that the entire area of the proposed world heritage site is protected by an entry into the register of monuments. This means that all processes of transformation and adaptation to new functions will have to be approved by the Pomeranian Regional Conservator of Monuments. In this way, it is ensured that the development and adaptation processes take place with respect to the outstanding universal value of the site.</p>	
<p>p. 39, “Factors affecting the property”, para 1.</p>	<p>“...ICOMOS considers that the main factors affecting the nominated property are plans by private initiatives to redevelop the nominated property and its buffer zone, through re-functionalisation and rehabilitation of existing buildings and the insertion of new construction projects into currently open spaces.”</p>	<p><u>Comment:</u> A conservation-led sustainable future for the site has also to be economically viable and align with the ambitions of the community in Gdańsk. The State Party is committed to this vision and, if inscription is successful, also to working with ICOMOS as the relevant Advisory Body to UNESCO under the Convention to achieve a positive outcome for the future of the site. ‘Open spaces’ must be qualified because many open spaces (‘places of meetings and rallies, ‘strikers’ march routes’ – see attributes) are part of the significance of the historic site and will be preserved and presented as such. Only those open spaces which are appropriate for new buildings insertions (e.g., where previous factory buildings have already been demolished) are cited for the potential of new development. And this must be in harmony with the</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>

		<p>historic site and its values and view corridors. In the case of the Gdańsk Shipyard, it should be emphasized that the entire area of the proposed world heritage site is protected by an entry into the register of monuments. This means that all processes of transformation and adaptation to new functions will have to be approved by the Pomeranian Regional Conservator of Monuments. In this way, it is ensured that the development and adaptation processes take place with respect to the outstanding universal value of the site.</p>	
<p>p. 40, "Factors affecting the property" para 5</p>	<p>"...the rationale for delineating the boundaries of the nominated property and of the buffer zone is not fully clear and appears too tightly drawn..."</p>	<p><u>Comment:</u> The Nomination Dossier describes attributes that relate to criterion (iv) and follows with <u>attributes that relate to criterion (vi) on page 26 and 27 of Nomination Dossier</u>. Attributes that relate to criterion (vi) were determined from the dynamics of the Solidarity movement within the Shipyard. This is key to link associations with physical property. The all proposed attributes are clearly described, and the boundary of the Nominated Property is drawn to contain each of attributes and those additional that relate to criterion (iv).</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>
<p>p. 41, "Comparative analysis" para 5.</p>	<p>"...neither the comparative analysis nor the remainder of the nomination has demonstrated how the shipyard layout, architecture, distribution of functions and operation would differ from any other large-scale industrial shipyards and therefore able to reflect, through tangible features, "communist planning". Nor has the comparative analysis or the nomination dossier demonstrated how this type of planning might reflect or contribute through its tangible features the actions or impact of "Solidarity"."</p>	<p><u>Comment:</u> While the 'Shipyard layout, architecture, distribution of functions' differs little from the world's largest shipyards of the late 19th/early 20th centuries, by the time of the post-war socialist era – beginning over half a century later - this antiquated large-scale infrastructure, with much outdated and inefficient production systems, was still able to serve communist-controlled organisation and ideology for decades to come. Why? Its 'operation' was <u>very</u> different. That is the point, and why criterion (iv) was selected in support of (vi). Organisation and processes, reflected in physical property, can legitimately be considered a key attribute: Operations management of the shipyard is a fundamental factor intrinsic in "communist planning". This was dependent on generous subsidies and interest-free loans, a feature of the shipyard under communist rule characterized by a centrally administered shipbuilding industry with limited capital utilisation and tolerant of staggering losses. This was because the shipyard employed tens of thousands of workers and was a</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>

		<p>symbol of Polish industrial pride. Although the labour force was very large (and provided fertile conditions for powerful labour unrest), it was sustained for many years comparatively inexpensively - with full employment, a priority of the regime.</p> <p><u>The shipyard was broadly a vertically integrated state enterprise with no marketing or sales departments, no distribution channels, and completely isolated from competition.</u> The shipyard received a large supply of low-priced steel and was provided with an order book derived from traditional controlled markets in Eastern Bloc countries and the Soviet Union (navies and commercial). All enquiries, customers, contracts, and payments were handled by a state-operated trade company.</p> <p>After 1955 there was a spectacular decline in the European share of the world market for shipbuilding, European hegemony ultimately transferring to Asian yards. By the 1960s (when the British share of the world fleet was down to 16%) British shipyards (which operated in a market economy) were forced to rapidly reduce their production capacity. The 1970s saw oil price increases which triggered an unprecedented crisis in shipping and shipbuilding with many shipyards closing a decade later. The nominated area of Gdańsk Shipyard continued, however, for another quarter of a century, providing surviving testimony to both the dynamics of the “Solidarity” movement and the characteristic attributes of “communist planning” which supported sprawling enterprises with large numbers of employees long after those in the free-market world were simply erased from the face of the earth.</p>	
<p>p. 41, “Comparative analysis”, para 9</p>	<p>“ICOMOS further observes that the “Autumn of Nations”, in several countries of the former Eastern Bloc, was preceded by protests and struggles in previous decades, which may have prepared the ground for the revolutionary wave at the end of the 1980s. It appears difficult to select only the actions of “Solidarity” as the key factor in, or the most important symbol of, what happened throughout Europe. ICOMOS notes as well that powerful associations with</p>	<p><u>Comment:</u> Poland acknowledges this and does not assert primacy, but Gdańsk Shipyard is a place where for the first time after the Second World War the communist regime did not suppress protests by force (like in Germany 1953, Hungary 1956, and Poland 1956, 1968, 1970, and Czechoslovakia 1968) but sat at a negotiation table with its opponents: workers and intellectuals. It is also the first time in the post-war history that these talks ended up with an agreement signed by both sides. This achievement of peacefully taming</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.</p>

	<p>struggles for freedom in the former Eastern Bloc are conveyed at other places, and this has been partly revealed by the comparative analysis, so the nominated property is not unique in this regard; the site of the Berlin Wall and its surviving vestiges is certainly an example, and others exist.</p>	<p>the so-far unrelenting regime caused a serious crack in the Eastern Block. Thus the Gdańsk Shipyard is perceived as a powerful symbol of social and political changes carried out through peaceful negotiations and arrangements that reshaped the face of the earth. The attempt to enter the Gdańsk Shipyard on the World Heritage List is not aimed at appropriating the changes initiated in this place by Poland. On the contrary, it is an expression of faith that Solidarity belongs to the world. This movement was, after all, a synthesis of the tragic uprisings in Central and Eastern Europe. The Solidarity philosophy of fighting without violence was born out of these traumatic experiences and was the result of an exceptional exchange of ideas from many opposition circles.</p>	
<p>p. 42, "Comparative analysis", para 13</p>	<p>"Other locations might be cherished by the people of the countries of the former Eastern Bloc as illustrative of their regained right of self-determination and their role in the fall of the Iron Curtain or the "Unification of Europe"; singling out only "Solidarity" and its actions at the Gdańsk Shipyard appear limitative and may be sensitive..."</p>	<p><u>Comment:</u> See the commentary to the fragment "p. 41, "Comparative analysis", para 9" (page 5).</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.</p>
<p>p.42, "Comparative analysis", para 13.</p>	<p>"...whether the nomination's message may be seen as universal for countries where Communism remains an officially-practiced ideology..."</p>	<p><u>Comment:</u> There is no declaration for or against communism as an adopted ideology. The key idea of the nomination dossier referring to the history of Solidarity, which constituted the outstanding, universal value of this site, was not to fight Communism, but to overcome the authoritarian regime in a peaceful way, and it is not important at what ideology it was based on.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.</p>
<p>p.42, "Comparative analysis", para 13.</p>	<p>"...there may be people from the former Eastern Bloc – still alive – that shared the Communist ideology and have found themselves on the side of the "losers" with the collapse of the system..."</p>	<p><u>Comment:</u> The uniqueness of the events of August 1980 in the Gdańsk Shipyard, to which we refer in the application dossier, was a peaceful strike and establishing dialogue between the social side and representatives of the authoritarian government, and then reaching an agreement to which both sides agreed. What is more, the development of the Solidarity led to the increasing of number of members to the peak of 10 million in September 1981. Such a peaceful and participatory model of making political changes prevented any parties from being identified as "losers".</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>

<p>p. 42, “Criteria under which inscription is proposed”, “Criterion (iv)”, para 3</p>	<p>“In terms of the nominated property reflecting “communist planning”, ICOMOS considers that the nomination dossier does not offer explanations to clarify in what ways the layout, architecture, distribution of functions and organisation of the operation would differ from any other large-scale industrial shipyard.”</p>	<p><u>Comment:</u> See the commentary to the fragment “p. 41, “Comparative analysis” para 5” (page 4).</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>
<p>p. 43, “Criteria under which inscription is proposed”, “Criterion (vi)”, para 2</p>	<p>“...extending the role of “Solidarity” to define it as the principal and direct cause of the fall of the Iron Curtain appears problematic and over-generous.”</p>	<p><u>Comment:</u> The impact of Solidarity on geopolitical changes in Central and Eastern Europe resulting in the fall of the Iron Curtain and the unification of Europe has been widely recognized both by scientists (Shalini Randeria, Timothy Snyder, Timothy Garton Ash, and others) and respected international organizations. <u>UNESCO’s Memory of the World</u> citation states: “Solidarity survived as an underground organization and formed a team of negotiators, who held talks with the government at the so-called round table in 1989. The communist party was forced to make concessions, which led to the first democratic elections in the communist bloc. Subsequently, the elections became an impetus for other countries of the Soviet bloc to fight for freedom and fostered the collapse of the Soviet empire in 1989 (the Czech revolution, and the destruction of the Berlin Wall). The success of the Gdansk strike in 1980 became a turning point and the first stone to be removed from the Berlin Wall... ...a turning point which was of primary importance to the history of the world and which not only changed Poland, Europe and the world at that time but also changed their future fate.” The European Commission awarded Gdańsk Shipyard – as a site – the European Heritage Label. It states ..these sites celebrate and symbolise European ideals, values, history and integration...selected for their symbolic value, the role they have played in European history... These sites bring the European Union and its citizens closer together. It also cites specific buildings and spaces, including the OHS Hall (SALA BHP), Gate No.2, Solidarity Square (Plac Solidarności) and the Monument to the Fallen Shipyard Workers of 1970. This World Heritage nomination asserts that the significance of the Shipyard, as a</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p> <p>ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.</p>

		large-scale socialist industrial facility which charts the emergence and progress of the “Solidarity” freedom movement through to 1989, transcends national boundaries, even European boundaries.	
p. 43, “Criteria under which inscription is proposed”, “Criterion (vi)”, para 5	“...other events might be evoked as representative of the dramatic changes which occurred in the former Eastern Europe. In the collective imagination of the Western European perspective, the fall of the Berlin Wall represents a powerful symbol. However, it is understood that other locations, symbols and places are cherished by the people of other countries of the former Eastern Bloc as illustrative of their own regained right of self-determination and their role in the “Unification of Europe”.	<u>Comment:</u> <u>See the commentary to the fragment</u> “p. 41, “Comparative analysis”, para 9” (page 5).	ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.
p. 43, “Criteria under which inscription is proposed”, “Criterion (vi)”, para 6	“...what might be the universality of the nomination’s message for countries where Communism is still an adopted ideology.”	<u>Comment:</u> See the commentary to the fragment p.42, “Comparative analysis”, para 13.” (page 7).	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
p. 43, “Criteria under which inscription is proposed”, “Criterion (vi)”, para 10	“...neither of the cultural criteria has been demonstrated...”	<u>Comment:</u> The nomination dossier clearly states (pages 26 -27) that the Shipyard facilities: buildings, open spaces and the “communist planning” are associated with, or reflect, the purported global significance of “Solidarity”. The nomination has also shown how the Gdańsk Shipyard can be seen as an outstanding example of a largescale industrial facility based on communist planning, which would illustrate the global impact of “Solidarity”. It was clearly stated that the Gdańsk Shipyard was a largescale industrial plant covers a large area and accommodates a coordinated process of constructing several different ships at the same time, relying on its own manufacturing capabilities and an extensive network of business partners (around 1 000 domestic and foreign companies), the shipyard is the largest producer of ships in the entire Eastern bloc (34 vessels a year) and the fifth largest in Europe. The plant employed more than 17 000 workers and was self-sufficient, with its own bus and train service for collective transport.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
p. 43, “Criteria under which inscription is proposed”, “Criterion (vi)”, para 11	“...it is difficult to evaluate recent events and the scope of their impact on recent history or to define recent “periods of history” in the absence of a sufficient time perspective. Currently, there are	<u>Comment:</u> Questioning of the fact that the Cold War has not ended is a serious contradiction to the state of historical knowledge. The historical record is already set.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.

	differing and varying views on the impact of “Solidarity”’s actions and on whether other events also contributed to the fall of the Iron Curtain or on whether the Cold War and its implications can be considered to have ended.”	The impact of Solidarity on geopolitical changes in Central and Eastern Europe resulting in the fall of the Iron Curtain and the unification of Europe has been widely recognized both by scientists (Shalini Randeria, Timothy Snyder, Timothy Garton Ash, and others) and respected international organizations like UNESCO. In 2003 UNESCO’s inscribed 21 Strike Postulate in the Memory of the World register.	ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.
p. 44, “Integrity and authenticity”, “Integrity” para 2; “Authenticity” para 4	<p>“...direct associations between the impact of “Solidarity” on the noted events and the tangible aspects of the nominated property have not been clearly set out. Therefore, it is difficult to define what would be the potential attributes that could satisfy integrity. As mentioned in previous sections, there is no shared agreement yet on whether the fall of the Iron Curtain could be linked primarily to the Shipyard and thus whether attributes in the nominated property would be sufficient.”</p> <p>“...The role of “Solidarity” in the fall of the Iron Curtain, the end of the Cold War and the “unification of Europe”, cannot be directly and explicitly read and understood at the Shipyard...”</p>	<p><u>Comment:</u> The European Commission awarded Gdańsk Shipyard – as a site – the European Heritage Label which celebrates and symbolises European ideals, values, history and integration...selected for their symbolic value, the role they have played in European history... It also cites specific buildings and spaces, including the OHS Hall (SALA BHP), Gate No.2, Solidarity Square (Plac Solidarności) and the Monument to the Fallen Shipyard Workers of 1970. This World Heritage nomination asserts that the significance of the Shipyard, as a large-scale socialist industrial facility which charts the emergence and progress of the “Solidarity” freedom movement through to 1989, transcends national boundaries, even European boundaries. UNESCO’s Memory of the World citation states: “Solidarity ... led to the first democratic elections in the communist bloc. Subsequently, the elections became an impetus for other countries of the Soviet bloc to fight for freedom and fostered the collapse of the Soviet empire in 1989 (the Czech revolution, and the destruction of the Berlin Wall). The success of the Gdansk strike in 1980 became a turning point and the first stone to be removed from the Berlin Wall... ...a turning point which was of primary importance to the history of the world...” These attributes are demonstrated in the nomination dossier, on 26 – 27 pages.</p>	ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.
p. 44, “Integrity and authenticity”, “Integrity” para 4;	“...the area has lost, to a great extent, its original function – shipbuilding and related activities – and the nominated former industrial complex and its immediate setting awaits being converted into a new urban sector. Existing redevelopment plans will disturb the coherence and the	<p><u>Comment:</u> Loss of function is common to most industrial sites inscribed on the World Heritage List. Conservation-led redevelopment with a future sustainable and economically viable use can sustain World Heritage values. The government of Poland as a</p>	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.

	physical and spatial integrity of the Shipyard as well as its integrity as a site for memorialisation.”	longstanding, responsible and active signatory to the Convention is committed to this outcome. In the case of the Gdańsk Shipyard, it should be emphasized that the entire area of the proposed world heritage site is protected by an entry into the register of monuments. This means that all processes of transformation and adaptation to new functions will have to be approved by the Pomeranian Regional Conservator of Monuments. In this way, it is ensured that the development and adaptation processes take place with respect to the outstanding universal value of the site.	
p. 45, “Integrity and authenticity”, “Authenticity” para 6-7;	“The residual sense of place and character of a large-scale production facility that can still be perceived today at the nominated property, and its associations, are likely to be seriously further eroded by the planned re-functionalisation and urban regeneration of the area. [...] The character of the nominated property as an industrial place will be superseded by the new life and the new functions that are to be injected into this mostly disused area. [...] the current envisaged developments are likely to have a considerable negative impact on the nominated property.”	<u>Comment:</u> See the commentary to the fragment “p. 44, “Integrity and authenticity”, “Integrity” para 4;”.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
p. 45, “Evaluation of the proposed justification for inscription”, para 2	“ICOMOS considers that the comparative analysis has not succeeded in demonstrating how the nominated property is an outstanding example of communist planning that reflects the events it is said to be associated with ...”	<u>Comment:</u> See the commentary to the p. 41, “Comparative analysis” para 5”.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
p. 45, “Evaluation of the proposed justification for inscription”, para 2	“...neither of the cultural criteria has been demonstrated...”	<u>Comment:</u> The nomination dossier clearly states that the Shipyard facilities: buildings, open spaces and the “communist planning” are associated with, or reflect, the purported global significance of “Solidarity”. The nomination has also shown how the Gdańsk Shipyard can be seen as an outstanding example of a largescale industrial facility based on communist planning, which would illustrate the global impact of “Solidarity”. It was clearly stated that the Gdańsk Shipyard was a largescale industrial plant covers a large area and accommodates a coordinated process of constructing several different ships at the same time, relying on its own manufacturing capabilities and an extensive network of business	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered. ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.

		partners (around 1 000 domestic and foreign companies), the shipyard is the largest producer of ships in the entire Eastern bloc (34 vessels a year) and the fifth largest in Europe. The plant employed more than 17 000 workers and was self-sufficient, with its own bus and train service for collective transport.	
p. 45, "Evaluation of the proposed justification for inscription", para 3, 7	<p>"...ICOMOS considers that more time is needed before it is possible to set the events in Gdańsk into a wider global historical framework and to understand how they might contribute to a defined stage in history."</p> <p>"...there is no shared agreement yet on whether the fall of the Iron Curtain, the end of the Cold War and the "unification of Europe" can be linked primarily to the Shipyard..."</p>	<p><u>Comment:</u> See the commentary to: "p. 43, "Criteria under which inscription is proposed", "Criterion (vi)", para 11". the "Solidarity" freedom movement through to 1989, transcends national boundaries, even European boundaries.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p> <p>ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.</p>
p. 45, "Evaluation of the proposed justification for inscription", para 4, 6	<p>"...direct associations between the impact of "Solidarity" on the noted events and the tangible aspects of the nominated property have not been clearly set out. Therefore, it is difficult to define what would be the potential attributes that could satisfy integrity."</p> <p>"...the role of "Solidarity" in the fall of the Iron Curtain, the end of the Cold War and the "unification of Europe" cannot be directly and explicitly read and understood at the Shipyard. Clear links between the influence of "Solidarity" on the course of history at the global level and tangible aspects of the nominated property are not set out and it is therefore difficult to understand how the proposed Outstanding Universal Value is conveyed by which attributes.</p>	<p><u>Comment:</u> The European Commission awarded Gdańsk Shipyard – as a site – the European Heritage Label which celebrates and symbolises European ideals, values, history and integration...selected for their symbolic value, the role they have played in European history... It also cites specific buildings and spaces, including the OHS Hall (SALA BHP), Gate No.2, Solidarity Square (Plac Solidarności) and the Monument to the Fallen Shipyard Workers of 1970. This World Heritage nomination asserts that the significance of the Shipyard, as a large-scale socialist industrial facility which charts the emergence and progress of the "Solidarity" freedom movement through to 1989, transcends national boundaries, even European boundaries. UNESCO's Memory of the World citation states: "Solidarity ... led to the first democratic elections in the communist bloc. Subsequently, the elections became an impetus for other countries of the Soviet bloc to fight for freedom and fostered the collapse of the Soviet empire in 1989 (the Czech revolution, and the destruction of the Berlin Wall). The success of the Gdansk strike in 1980 became a turning point and the first stone to be removed from the Berlin Wall... ...a turning point which was of primary importance to the history of the world..."</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p> <p>ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.</p>

p. 45, “Integrity and authenticity”, “Authenticity” para 8;	“The residual sense of place and character of a large-scale production facility that can still be perceived today at the nominated property is likely to be seriously further eroded by the scale of the planned re-functionalisation and urban regeneration of the area.”	<u>Comment:</u> See the commentary to the fragment “p. 44, “Integrity and authenticity”, “Integrity” para 4.”: place with respect to the outstanding universal value of the site.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
p. 45, “Evaluation of the proposed justification for inscription”, para 5;	“The area has lost, to a great extent, its original function – shipbuilding and related activities – and the nominated former industrial complex and its immediate setting awaits being converted into a new urban sector. Existing redevelopment plans will disturb the coherence and the physical and spatial integrity of the Shipyard as well as its integrity as a site for memorialisation.”	<u>Comment:</u> See the commentary to the fragment “p. 44, “Integrity and authenticity”, “Integrity” para 4.”: place with respect to the outstanding universal value of the site.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
p. 45, “Evaluation of the proposed justification for inscription”, para 9	“...what the universality of the nomination’s message might be for countries where Communism is still an adopted ideology.”	<u>Comment:</u> See the commentary to the fragment p.42, “Comparative analysis”, para 13.” (page 7).	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
p. 46, “Features” para 2	“...the comparative analysis has not demonstrated how the Gdańsk Shipyard would be an outstanding example of communist planning capable of illustrating the fall of the Iron Curtain, the end of the Cold War and the “unification of Europe”...”	<u>Comment:</u> See the commentary to the fragment “p. 41, “Comparative analysis” para 5” (page 4).	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
p. 46, “Features” para 2	“...Neither of the cultural criteria has been demonstrated...”	<u>Comment:</u> See the commentary to the fragment “p. 45, “Evaluation of the proposed justification for inscription”, para 2 (page 13).	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered. ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.
p. 46, “Features” para 4	“The nominated property and buffer zone are also threatened by immense development pressures...”	<u>Comment:</u> Conservation-led redevelopment with a future sustainable and economically viable use can sustain World Heritage values. The government of Poland as a longstanding, responsible and active signatory to the Convention is committed to this outcome. In the case of the Gdańsk Shipyard, it should be emphasized that the entire area of the proposed world heritage site is protected by an entry into the register of monuments. This means that all processes of transformation and adaptation to new functions will have to be approved by the Pomeranian Regional Conservator of Monuments. In this way, it is ensured that the development and adaptation processes take place with	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered. ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.

		respect to the outstanding universal value of the site.	
p. 46, "Features" para 4	"...the rationale for the delimitation of the boundaries of both the nominated property and its buffer zone is not fully clear."	<u>Comment:</u> The Nomination Dossier describes attributes that relate to criterion (iv) and follows with <u>attributes that relate to criterion (vi) on page 26 and 27 of Nomination Dossier</u> . Attributes that relate to criterion (vi) were determined from the dynamics of the Solidarity movement within the Shipyard. This is key to link associations with physical property. The proposed attributes are clearly described, and the boundary of the Nominated Property is drawn to contain these attributes and those additional that relate to criterion (iv).	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
p. 46, "Features" para 5	"...the proposed justification for inscription is fundamentally problematic, as it refers to events that might be seen as divisive at the global level, and to the causes of these events, for which an historical interpretation and appraisal is yet to be made.	<u>Comment:</u> <u>See the commentary to the fragment: "p. 43, "Criteria under which inscription is proposed", "Criterion (vi)", para 11".</u> their symbolic value, the role they have played in European history... These sites bring the European Union and its citizens closer together.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered. ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.
p. 46, "Monitoring", para 3	"...ICOMOS considers that a systematic and purposely designed monitoring system is necessary for the nominated property, particularly to assess periodically its state of conservation and the impacts of proposed developments in the nominated property and in its buffer zone."	<u>Comment:</u> The nominated property as a monument of history or a possible world heritage site is the subject of systemic monitoring actions of the monuments monitoring system introduced by the General Conservator of Monuments. In accordance with the introduced regulation, each world heritage site and monument of history is periodically inspected at least once every two years by the state monument protection services, and they are also subject to ongoing control of conservation procedures and the state of preservation by the Regional Conservators of Monuments.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
p. 48, "Evaluation of the effectiveness of the protection and management of the nominated property", para 2	"...pressure from the private owners and investors remains high..."	<u>Comment:</u> See the commentary to the fragment "p. 46, "Features" para 4 (page 16).	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
p. 48, "Evaluation of the effectiveness of the protection and management of the nominated property", para 4	"...not all owners associated with the property have been informed in a timely fashion about the submission of this nomination dossier and of the draft management plan..."	<u>Comment:</u> All stakeholders were from the beginning involved in the process of preparing the nomination for the entry of the Gdańsk Shipyard in the World Heritage List. Talks and negotiations were conducted in the spirit of "Solidarity" to find a common ground and protect the site	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.

		<p>for future generations with the respect of the value of cultural heritage and sustainable development goals. This group of stakeholders includes owners and administrators of areas and facilities within the boundaries of the proposed entry and buffer zone, users of areas and objects within the boundaries of the proposed entry and buffer zone, non-governmental organisations and citizens' initiatives, scientific institutions and cultural institutions, local government authorities and monument protection authorities. Currently, approx. 70 entities representing different stakeholder circles participate in the process. This is a unique example of involvement of so wide range of stakeholders. A consensus has been reached with almost all real estate owners, and the copies of nine agreements were attached to the nomination dossier. However, there are still two stakeholders, whose investment plans had been identified during preparation of the nomination dossier as threatening to the authenticity and integrity of the site. The State Party is fully aware of this fact and remains in constant negotiation process to reach the consensus on the investment plans which will not threaten the site.</p>	
<p>p. 49, "Evaluation of the effectiveness of the protection and management of the nominated property", para 7</p>	<p>"...the radical transformation of the area from an industrial, productive site into a residential and multi-functional quarter threatens the heritage significance of the nominated property."</p>	<p><u>Comment:</u> See the commentary to the fragment "p. 46, "Features" para 4 (page 16).</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>
<p>p. 49, "Evaluation of the effectiveness of the protection and management of the nominated property", para 9</p>	<p>"...the management plan is in its final draft but has not been adopted yet..."</p>	<p><u>Comment:</u> Only the decision of the Committee to enter the Gdańsk Shipyard on the World List will create the need to adopt a management plan for the World Heritage site. After entering the Gdańsk Shipyard on the List, work on the final version of the Management Plan will be updated and all stakeholders will be invited to sign and implement it..</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>
<p>p. 49 "Conclusion" para 2.</p>	<p>"...the events with which "Solidarity" is associated might be considered divisive at the global level..."</p>	<p><u>Comment:</u> Other potential 'freedom movement' nominations are included on State Party Tentative Lists, e.g., 'Civil Rights Movement Sites' (USA) and 'Human Rights, Liberation Struggle and Reconciliation: Nelson Mandela Legacy Sites' (South Africa). Such candidates for the WH List adopt a similar nomination strategy to</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p> <p>ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.</p>

		<p>Gdańsk. They, too, are testimony to seminal events of 20th-century world history, events which must accord with outstanding universal significance and eligibility under criterion (vi) as indicated in the Operational Guidelines and interpreted as such by the State Parties of Poland, USA, and South Africa (USA only citing criterion (vi) in its Tentative Listing).</p> <p>The test for WH Listing of such associative sites is of course the universal significance of the events and their wider impacts, corresponding physical testimony required under the place based WH Convention, and the ability to protect and manage them. Such events, however, are a well-recorded aspect of our 20th century world history and, although they intrinsically involve a division within society at the time, they need not be considered divisive today after a generation or more has passed.</p>	
<p>p. 49 “Conclusion” para 2.</p>	<p>“...even though this nomination does not focus on a conflict, some of the issues raised by this nomination are similar to those emerging for sites associated with negative or divisive memories of recent conflicts...”</p>	<p><u>Comment:</u> It could be said that there is the potential for negative memories associated with recent conflicts in connection with several World Heritage sites recently inscribed, for example Robben Island (South Africa), Bikini Atoll Nuclear Test Site (Marshall Islands), contested sites in Palestine, industrial heritage sites in Norway, France and Germany or even Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina). World Heritage is at the heart of UNESCO’s Peace Mandate, and UNESCO’s culture webpage states: ‘...the outstanding value of a World Heritage site is first and foremost assessed according to the principles of sustainable development, authenticity, environment, scientific conservation, identity, and the history of peoples. This role distinguishes itself markedly in the determination of sites of memory, and UNESCO must meet the immense challenge of uniting peoples on an unprecedented scale in order to pave a path towards peace ... UNESCO is working so that World Heritage traces a new map for peace.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.</p>
<p>p. 49 “Conclusion” para 3.</p>	<p>“...the comparative analysis has not succeeded in demonstrating how the Shipyard layout, architecture, distribution of functions and operation would differ from any other large-scale industrial shipyards and therefore able to reflect, through tangible</p>	<p><u>Comment:</u> See the commentary to the fragment “p. 41, “Comparative analysis” para 5” (page 4).</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>

	features, “communist planning”. Nor has the comparative analysis demonstrated how the nominated property would be an outstanding example of communist planning that would reflect the events it is said to be associated with...”		
p. 49 “Conclusion” para 4.	“The comparison in the nomination dossier reveals that “Solidarity”, as a peaceful movement for freedom, was not a singularity...”	<u>Comment:</u> Poland, and its dossier submitted, does not claim “Solidarity” as a singular peaceful movement for freedom. To demonstrate uniqueness was not the aim of the comparative analysis. Exceptionality was. Poland openly acknowledges other successive and directly associated freedom movements involved in the same peaceful unification of Europe, and places which are associated with them as physical testimony (Berlin Wall, etc). Gdańsk Shipyard, in comparative analysis, ranks as exceptional physical testimony in this respect.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered. ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.
p. 49 “Conclusion” para 4.	“...the State Party argues that the combination of what are considered to be universally significant 20th century European values – namely solidarity, freedom and democracy – and the features represented by the Shipyard facilities associated with those values, is not represented on the World Heritage List and that there are no other comparable sites throughout the world. ICOMOS considers that in its effort to prove the uniqueness of the nominated site...”	<u>Comment:</u> The methodology followed for comparisons was the perceived universality and significance of the association, the significance of sites, and the nature of the direct or tangible link with physical features. The Comparative Analysis sought to demonstrate exceptionality (of which uniqueness is arguably a part) – of the significant association, of its tangible expression and of exceptional integrity and authenticity – and acceptable state of conservation - when compared to other structures with similar associations (e.g., Berlin Wall). The Comparative Analysis sought to demonstrate that the decade-long peaceful occupation strikes and negotiations at the Shipyard between the “Solidarity” movement and the state representatives to obtain freedom of association, represent events that reflect aspirations of universal significance. These accelerated political change that led to Poland’s freedom, the first in the successive phenomenon of the ‘Autumn of Nations’, contributing to the overwhelmingly peaceful democratic transformation and unification of Europe. The Comparative Analysis highlighted discrete differences with other sites and their associations with freedom movements. It does not claim that the events had a greater and wider impact on the course of history. Neither does it assess the relative value of their impacts - although it does consider	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered. ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.

		<p>the nature of the physical evidence (sites) that survive as testimony (as per the WH Convention).</p> <p>It makes clear that there are different sites, with different values, elsewhere in the world that are clearly recognised by other States Parties for their freedom movement values. Poland does not claim primacy in this respect in any way whatsoever.</p>	
p. 49 "Conclusion" para 4.	"...ambitions of the nomination dossier to memorialise events for which the understanding and interpretations are still evolving, with some of the protagonists of these events still being alive..."	<p><u>Comment:</u> See the commentary to the fragment: "p. 43, "Criteria under which inscription is proposed", "Criterion (vi)", para 11".</p> <p>their symbolic value, the role they have played in European history... These sites bring the European Union and its citizens closer together.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p> <p>ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.</p>
p. 49 "Conclusion" para 4.	"...in ICOMOS's view, it is too early to make a judgment, as the historical periods that might be allocated to the second half of the 20th century have yet to be defined, within which ultimately comparisons will need to be undertaken.	<p><u>Comment:</u> Definition seems to be substantial and not at significant variance (i.e., broadly in academic concordance).</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>
p. 50 "Conclusion" para 5.	The comparisons have also revealed that the struggle of "Solidarity" was preceded and accompanied by other protests in Gdańsk, Poland and other countries of the former Eastern Bloc and that other places convey in a powerful manner the struggle for freedom in Eastern Europe, the site of the Berlin Wall being one key example. Other locations might be cherished by the people of the countries of the former Eastern Bloc as illustrative of their regained right of self-determination and their role in the fall of the Iron "Curtain" or the "Unification of Europe"	<p><u>Comment:</u> Poland acknowledges this and does not assert primacy. The nomination dossier seeks to tangibly link a well-recorded and internationally acknowledged series of events that took place in the shipyard with specific buildings and spaces which still exist, are monument-protected and are readily understandable. It is relatively straightforward to make comparisons with other sites in a meaningful way.</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p>
p. 50 "Conclusion" para 5.	"...singling out only "Solidarity" and its actions at the Gdańsk Shipyard appears limitative and may be sensitive	<p><u>Comment:</u> Poland acknowledges this and does not assert primacy, but .Gdańsk Shipyard is a place where for the first time after the Second World War the communist regime did not suppress protests by force (like in Germany 1953, Hungary 1956, and Poland 1956, 1968, 1970, and Czechoslovakia 1968) but sat at a negotiation table with its opponents: workers and intellectuals. It is also the first time in the post-war history that these talks ended up with an agreement signed by both sides. This achievement of peacefully taming the so-far unrelenting regime caused a serious crack in the Eastern block. Thus the Gdańsk Shipyard is</p>	<p>ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.</p> <p>ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.</p>

		perceived as a powerful symbol of social and political changes carried out through peaceful negotiations and arrangements that reshaped the face of the earth. The attempt to enter the Gdańsk Shipyard on the World Heritage List is not aimed at appropriating the changes initiated in this place by Poland. On the contrary, it is an expression of faith that Solidarity belongs to the world. This movement was, after all, a synthesis of the tragic uprisings in Central and Eastern Europe. The Solidarity philosophy of fighting without violence was born out of these traumatic experiences and was the result of an exceptional exchange of ideas from many opposition circles.	
p. 50 “Conclusion” para 6.	“...these events are still recent history...” “More time is needed before it is possible to set the events at the Shipyard into a wider global historical framework.”	<u>Comment:</u> See the commentary to the fragment: “p. 43, “Criteria under which inscription is proposed”, “Criterion (vi)”, para 11”.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered. ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.
p. 50 “Conclusion” para 8.	“With regard to criterion (vi), ICOMOS considers that the nomination has not demonstrated the direct and tangible association between the nominated property and the impact of “Solidarity” on historic events such as the fall of the Iron Curtain, the end of the Cold War and the “unification of Europe” [...] However, the tangible and direct association between the Gdańsk Shipyard and the above-mentioned historic events has not been clearly set out...”	<u>Comment:</u> The features of the Shipyard evidence tangible and direct links with events that contributed in a substantial and readily identifiable manner to consequent international changes. UNESCO, in its Memory of the World citation available on its website, declares: Solidarity survived as an underground organization and formed a team of negotiators, who held talks with the government at the so-called round table in 1989. The communist party was forced to make concessions, which led to the first democratic elections in the communist bloc. Subsequently, the elections became an impetus for other countries of the Soviet bloc to fight for freedom and fostered the collapse of the Soviet empire in 1989 (the Czech revolution, and the destruction of the Berlin Wall). The success of the Gdansk strike in 1980 became a turning point and the first stone to be removed from the Berlin Wall... ...a turning point which was of primary importance to the history of the world, and which not only changed Poland, Europe and the world at that time but also changed their future fate.”	The UNESCO Memory of the World Programme is different from the World Heritage Convention and follows a different rationale. ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.

p. 50 "Conclusion" para 8.	"...expanding the role of "Solidarity" to define it as the key and direct factor in the fall of the Iron Curtain, the end of the Cold War and the "unification of Europe" appears problematic and is challenged by different appraisals of these complex processes. Varying historical interpretations exist for the period of history to which this nomination relates, besides the one presented in the nomination dossier."	<u>Comment:</u> See the commentary to the fragment: "p. 43, "Criteria under which inscription is proposed", "Criterion (vi)", para 11".	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered. ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.
p. 50 "Conclusion" para 8.	"...Serious arguments point to the internal economic decline of the Soviet Union as a result of technological and systemic weaknesses, and the pressure of the arms race with the United States, as causes of the fall of the Iron Curtain..."	<u>Comment:</u> These are a crucial part of the context – part of the history and development of the nominated site - but unsuitable for the World Heritage Convention. Moreover, Solidarity shows the extraordinary potential and strength of civil society in the declining industrial era in Europe, based on the operation of large industrial plants. Solidarity has clearly shown that apart from countries dominated by ideology, there are societies and individuals as internally independent entities. At the same time, it led to a permanent violation of the monolith of power in the authoritarian regimes of Central and Eastern Europe	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered. ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.
p. 50 "Conclusion" para 8.	"...the Reagan & Bush administrations or General Secretary Gorbachev would play a larger role than the "Solidarity" movement, as executors of a relatively peaceful and orderly transition to post-communism..."	<u>Comment:</u> See the commentary to the fragment "p. 50"Conclusion" para 8."	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered. ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.
p. 50 "Conclusion" para 9	"...The area has lost, to a great extent, its original function – shipbuilding and related activities – and the nominated former industrial complex and its immediate setting awaits being converted into a new urban sector. Existing redevelopment plans will disturb the coherence and the physical and spatial integrity of the Shipyard as well as its integrity as a site for memorialisation."	<u>Comment:</u> See the commentary to the fragment "p. 44, "Integrity and authenticity", "Integrity" para 4;"	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
p. 50 "Conclusion" para 10	ICOMOS considers that the role of "Solidarity" in the fall of the Iron Curtain, the end of the Cold War and the "unification of Europe" cannot be directly and explicitly read and understood at the Shipyard. Clear links between the influence of "Solidarity" on the course of history at the global level and tangible aspects of the nominated property are not set out	<u>Comment:</u> The European Commission awarded Gdańsk Shipyard – as a site – the European Heritage Label which celebrates and symbolises European ideals, values, history and integration... selected for their symbolic value, the role they have played in European history ... It also cites specific buildings and spaces, including the OHS Hall	The European Heritage label is a different programme from the World Heritage Convention and follows a different rationale. ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.

		(SALA BHP), Gate No.2, Solidarity Square (Plac Solidarności) and the Monument to the Fallen Shipyard Workers of 1970. This World Heritage nomination asserts that the significance of the Shipyard, as a large-scale socialist industrial facility which charts the emergence and progress of the “Solidarity” freedom movement through to 1989, transcends national boundaries, even European boundaries.	
p. 50 “Conclusion” para 11	“...there is no shared agreement yet on whether the fall of the Iron Curtain, the end of the Cold War and the “unification of Europe” can be linked primarily to the Shipyard and thus whether the identified attributes in the nominated property would be sufficient or whether they would credibly convey the proposed justification for inscription.”	<u>Comment:</u> See above, and earlier. This is not a case of asserting primacy for the Shipyard in the chain of events or disregarding its important context. It is acknowledged that Poland was at the beginning of the phenomenon of the ‘Autumn of Nations’, its first democratic elections in the communist bloc acting as a model impetus for other countries and contributing to an overwhelmingly peaceful democratic transformation in Europe	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered. ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.
p. 51 “Conclusion” para 12	“The area has lost to a great extent its original function and the former industrial area awaits being converted into an urban sector through a large-scale urban regeneration programme, with plans that threaten the physical and spatial integrity of the Shipyard...”	<u>Comment:</u> <u>See the commentary to the fragment “p. 44, “Integrity and authenticity”, “Integrity” para 4.”</u> place with respect to the outstanding universal value of the site.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
p. 51 “Conclusion” para 13	the immense pressures for massive building developments for the regeneration of the disused former industrial area will inevitably impact adversely the tangible and intangible heritage dimensions of the Shipyard. It will also detract from the ability to understand and appreciate its historic development, layout and associations	<u>Comment:</u> Repetition covered by earlier comment. Conservation-led redevelopment with a future sustainable and economically viable use can sustain World Heritage values. The government of Poland as a longstanding, responsible and active signatory to the Convention is committed to this outcome.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
p. 51 “Conclusion” para 14	“...a management structure or coordination committee among all relevant stakeholders and rights holders and related mechanisms has not yet been set up and it is not clear when this will happen and what institutions and entities will be part of it...”	<u>Comment:</u> <u>See the commentary to the fragment: “p. 48, “Evaluation of the effectiveness of the protection and management of the nominated property”, para 4 (page 17)</u> With strong support of a local community, artists and heritage professionals the legal protection of the Gdańsk Shipyard area has been guaranteed through the entry into the register of historic monuments. Hence, any action in this area requires appropriate consent of the Voivodeship Monument Protection Officer, which is a public administration office responsible for the protection of monuments. This solution guarantees that no activities	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered. ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.

		which could have a negative impact on the site are possible.	
p. 51 "Conclusion" para 18	"...events the nomination wishes to commemorate are still very recent, keeping in mind the dramatic changes and complex processes that these events triggered. Memories are still evolving, and historical interpretations differ as there is no consensus about whether "Solidarity" or other freedom movements and protests in the former Eastern Bloc countries can be seen as the decisive trigger..."	<u>Comment:</u> <u>See the commentary to the fragment:</u> <u>"p. 43,</u> <u>"Criteria under which inscription is proposed",</u> <u>"Criterion (vi)", para 11".</u> European history... These sites bring the European Union and its citizens closer together.	ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.
p. 51 "Conclusion" para 18	"...the need to adopt an agreed Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, which is expected to remain valid indefinitely, with very little room for subsequent modifications."	<u>Comment:</u> The government of Poland's proposed Statement of Outstanding Universal Value is in the Nomination Dossier. This is expected to remain valid indefinitely.	ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.
p. 51 "Conclusion" para 19	"Finally, worldwide, questions also arise about what the universality of the nomination's message might be for countries where communism is still an adopted ideology. [...] this nomination may also be divisive within the former Eastern Bloc, if one considers that there may be people from those countries – still alive - that shared the Communist ideals and ideology and have found themselves on the side of the "losers" with the collapse of the system and subsequent events."	<u>Comment:</u> See the commentary to the fragment p.42, "Comparative analysis", para 13." (page 7).	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered.
p. 52 "Conclusion" para 22	"...the nature of the nomination, related to the memorialisation of and association with "Solidarity" as a liberation movement suggests that other programmes might be more suitable..."	<u>Comment:</u> The rise of freedom and democracy is a key human value of the 20th century; and the second half of the twentieth century was an era of great global freedom movements whose legacy is marked by some iconic sites. Such gaps on the WH List needed time, of course, before some of these sites might appropriately be brought forward to the WH Committee. States Parties to the Convention identified sites, in good faith, that they consider demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value using justification criterion (vi) as guided by Guidance and capacity building for the recognition of associative values using World Heritage criterion (vi) (Draft Report 2017) produced at the request of the World Heritage Centre.	ICOMOS considers that the corrections re-iterate arguments/ justification put forward in the nomination dossier that have been fully considered. ICOMOS considers that this correction contains advocacy for the proposals made in the nomination dossier.

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

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

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): Russian Federation

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: Petroglyphs of Lake Onega and the White Sea

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
P. 402 Column 1 Line 10	The Petroglyphs of Lake Onega and the White Sea nomination refers to 4,500 petroglyphs carved in the rocks during the Neolithic period dated 6-7 thousand years ago, located in the Republic of Karelia in the Russian Federation.	The Petroglyphs of Lake Onega and the White Sea nomination refers to 4,600 petroglyphs carved in the rocks during the Neolithic period dated 6-7 thousand years ago, located in the Republic of Karelia in the Russian Federation.	ICOMOS acknowledges this typing error.
P. 402 Column 1 Line 19	The nominated serial nomination includes the petroglyphs of Lake Onega extending over a territory of 6944.14 hectares in the District of Pudozhsky and those of White Sea, ...	The nominated serial nomination includes the petroglyphs of Lake Onega extending over a territory of 6944.14 hectares in the District of Pudozhsky and those of the White Sea, ...	ICOMOS acknowledge this typing error.
P. 402 Column 1 Line 22	The nomination comprises 33 sites within the two component parts, including a total of 22 archaeological sites at Lake Onega and 11 located at the White Sea.	The nomination comprises 33 sites with 36 rock art panels within the two component parts, including a total of 22 archaeological sites at Lake Onega and 11 located at the White Sea.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
P. 402 Column 2 Line 37	The petroglyphs of Lake Onega and the White Sea represent one of the largest independent centres of Neolithic rock art in Europe, dating to between circa 5,500 BC to 2,000 BC.	The petroglyphs of Lake Onega and the White Sea represent one of the largest independent centres of Neolithic rock art in Europe, dating to between circa 4,500 BC to 3,500 BC.	ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.
P. 402 Column 2 Line 39, 40, 43	The rock art figures at Lake Onega mostly represents birds, animals, half human and half animal figures as well as geometric shapes while the petroglyphs of the White Sea are mostly composed of carvings depicting hunting and sailing scenes including their related equipment as well as animal and human footprints.	The rock art figures at Lake Onega mostly represent birds, symbols, half human and half animal figures, while the petroglyphs of the White Sea are mostly composed of carvings depicting boats, sea and forest hunting scenes including their related equipment as well as animal and human footprints.	ICOMOS acknowledges these clarifications.

P. 402 Column 2 Line 43	The petroglyphs of Lake Onega encompass a total of over 1,200 figures concentrated in 25 groups and spread over 22 sites located on 17 capes and 6 islands .	The petroglyphs of Lake Onega encompass a total of over 1,200 figures concentrated in 25 groups located and spread over 22 sites on 17 capes and 6 islands in the following areas : - Besov Nos (some 200 figures); - Kladovets Nos (about 50 figures); - Peri Nos I-IV, VI-VII (some 470 figures); - Karetsky Nos (some 160 figures); - Korjushkin Nos (22 figures) - Gazhy Nos (13 figures); - Kochkovnavolok Peninsula, A, B, C, D, E groups (over 200 figures); - Cape Cherny (3 figures); - Bol'shoi Golets Island (5 figures); - Mikhailovets Island 9 (1 figure); - Moduzh Island (24 figures); - Korjushkin Island (12 figures); Bol'shoi and Maly Gury Island (40 figures).	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification. The ICOMOS Evaluation contains a summary of the information contained in the nomination dossier.
Page 403 Column 1 Line 2	a total of 45 archaeological sites including settlements and burial grounds .	a total of 45 archaeological sites including settlements and one burial ground .	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
Page 403 Column 1 Lines 7-12	- Zalavruga (about 2000 figures); - Besovy Sledki; - Erpin Pudas (I to IV) (some 200 figures); - No-name islands (I to III) (some 300 figures); - Island Bol'shoj; - Zolotec.	- Zalavruga (about 2600 figures); - Besovy Sledki (about 470 figures); - Erpin Pudas (I to IV) (some 200 figures); - No-name islands (I to III) (some 60 figures); - Island Bol'shoj Malinin (8 figures); - Zolotec I (some 100 figures).	ICOMOS acknowledges these clarifications.
Page 403 Column 1 Line 21	Late Mesolithic settlements have been excavated at Besov Nos and Kladovets Nos.	Late Mesolithic settlements with house pits have been excavated at Besov Nos and Kladovets Nos.	ICOMOS acknowledges these clarifications.
Page 403 Column 1 Line 40-41	Their initial phase dates back to the Neolithic, witnessing the transition from hunter-gathering to food producing by sedentary societies .	Their initial phase dates back to the Middle Neolithic, witnessing the transition of hunting-fishing communities to a more sedentary lifestyle. from hunter-gathering to	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.

		food producing by sedentary societies	
Page 403 Column 1 Lines 43-44	The petroglyphs attest to the beliefs and lifestyle of the hunter-fisher-gatherers over a period of 3,000 years and speak of the high point of these semi-nomadic cultures that used these rock art centres as meeting places.	The petroglyphs attest to the beliefs and lifestyle of the hunter-fisher-gatherers over a period of 600-800 years and speak of the high point of these semi-nomadic cultures that used these rock art centres as meeting places.	ICOMOS acknowledges these factual errors.
Page 403 Column 1 Line 48	The petroglyphs are associated with the Neolithic Pit-Comb Ware culture and Rhomb-Pit Ware culture (broadly speaking 4200 – 2000 BCE; more recent dating hypothesis 4200 – 3000 BCE for the nominated rock carvings).	The petroglyphs are associated with the Neolithic Pit-Comb Ware culture and Rhomb-Pit Ware culture (broadly speaking 4500 – 3000 BCE; more recent dating hypothesis 4200 – 3000 BCE for the nominated rock carvings).	ICOMOS acknowledges this factual error.
Page 403 Column 2 Line 3	Research has revealed that the earlier petroglyphs can be found at Capes Koryushkin Nos, Kladovets Nos and Gazhy Nos and on Capes Peri Nos and Karetsky Nos.	Research has revealed that the earlier petroglyphs can be found at Capes Koryushkin Nos, Kladovets Nos and Gazhy Nos and on the lowest rock surfaces at Capes Peri Nos and Karetsky Nos.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
Page 403 Column 2 Line 30	These carvings are said to be particularly informative about life in the Neolithic for the level and quality of details provided, especially for whale hunting .	These carvings are said to be particularly informative about life in the Neolithic for the level and quality of details provided, especially for whale and elk hunting .	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
Page 403 Column 2 Lines 36-37	Research has noted similarities with the petroglyphs of Lake Onega for the petroglyphs dated from the second period considering the presence of similar images of humans and boats .	The petroglyphs of the White Sea are dated after the petroglyphs of Lake Onega with a first stage located at Besovy Sledki, Erpin Pudas I, II and IV. Research has noted similarities with the petroglyphs of Lake Onega for the petroglyphs dated from the second period considering the presence of similar images of humans, birds and boats .	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
Page 403 Column 2 Line 39	The third stage of evolution is represented by the carvings located at Zolotec I, Erpin Pudas III , a group of small islands in the channel of the river Vyg.	The third stage of evolution is represented by the carvings located at Zolotec I, Erpin Pudas III, Zalavruga (the lowest parts of rock art panels) , a group of small islands in the channel of the river Vyg.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
Page 404 Column 1 Line 1	Ware population of Lake Onega gradually migrated to the White Sea by way of navigation.	Pit-Comb Ware population of Lake Onega gradually migrated to the White Sea by way of navigation.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.

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

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

STATE(S) PARTY(IES): United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

EVALUATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SITE: The Slate Landscape of Northwest Wales

RELEVANT ADVISORY BODY'S EVALUATION: ICOMOS

Page, column, line of the Advisory Body Evaluation	Sentence including the factual error (the factual error should be highlighted in bold)	Proposed correction by the State Party	Comment (if any) by the Advisory Body and/or the World Heritage Centre
Statement of Authenticity Page 443 Column 2 Line 9	However, ICOMOS notes that 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	However, ICOMOS notes that the historical settlements present different yet acceptable levels of authenticity, which need to be closely monitored and controlled by the management system.	ICOMOS acknowledges this clarification.
Brief Synthesis Page 448 Column 1 Line 17	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.	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 which retain multiple examples of their traditional way of life and strong minority language.	ICOMOS agrees with this editorial change.