

Distribution limited

WHC-93/CONF.002/7  
Paris, 25 October 1993  
Original: English

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION  
CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE  
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

World Heritage Committee  
Seventeenth session

Cartagena, Colombia  
6-11 December 1993

**Item 10 of the Provisional Agenda: Nominations of cultural and Natural Properties to the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger**

At its seventeenth session the Bureau examined the nominations of twelve natural properties, thirty cultural properties and one mixed property, recommended that two natural properties and fifteen cultural properties be inscribed on the World Heritage List. The Bureau did not recommend the inscription of four natural properties on the World Heritage List. Furthermore, the Bureau referred three natural and twelve cultural nominations and one mixed nomination back to the States Parties concerned for further information to be submitted to the Committee at its seventeenth session. In addition, the Bureau deferred two natural and three cultural nominations and approved the extension of one natural property.

At its seventeenth session, the Bureau did not examine three cultural nominations, the Inca Temple of Huaytara (Peru), Coro and its Dunes (Venezuela) and the Town of Sintra and its Serra (Portugal), as the properties in question did not appear on the tentative lists of the States Parties concerned. The Bureau invited these States Parties to submit to the World Heritage Centre, before 1 October 1993, revised tentative lists so the Bureau may examine the nominations during its meeting in December 1993 and formulate its recommendations to the World Heritage Committee at its seventeenth session. In this respect, the Bureau recommended to the Committee to decide that the World Heritage Centre should no longer accept nominations for properties which do not appear on the tentative list submitted by the State Party concerned.

## I THE TENTATIVE LISTS

At its 17th session the Bureau recommended to the Committee to decide that the World Heritage Centre should no longer accept nominations for [cultural] properties which are not included in the tentative list submitted by the State Party concerned. This recommendation was based on the following considerations:

- In article 11.1. of the World Heritage Convention States Parties to the World Heritage Convention are invited to submit "...to the World Heritage Committee an inventory of property forming part of the cultural and natural heritage, situated in its territory and suitable for inclusion in the [World Heritage] list ... This inventory, which shall not be considered exhaustive, shall include documentation about the location of the property in question and its significance."
- The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention elaborates on this matter in paragraphs 7 and 8 by stating that the tentative list should include properties which the State Party intends to nominate during the following five to ten years and providing a standard format which provides for information on the name and location of the property, a brief description and a justification of the "outstanding universal value" of the property.
- Paragraph 7 of the Operational Guidelines remind the States Parties also of the "... Committee's earlier decision not to consider cultural nominations unless such a list of cultural properties has been submitted."
- Tentative lists are considered to be indispensable for planning of the work of the Committee and the World Heritage partners, for comparative analysis of nominations and for facilitating the undertaking of the global and thematic studies.

After the 17th session of the Bureau, the Secretariat has proceeded with an analysis of the tentative lists that have been submitted by States Parties over the years. The results of this analysis are as follows:

- Of the 136 States Parties, only 60 (44 %) have presented, in one form or the other, tentative lists. Almost 50 % of these tentative lists include cultural properties only. The States Parties which have not submitted a tentative list are listed in Table C.
- Of the 60 tentative lists on file, 31 (i.e. 23 % of the total number of States Parties) provide the information as requested in article 11 of the World Heritage Convention and/or paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Operational Guidelines. The States Parties concerned are listed in Table A.

- The States Parties which have submitted tentative lists that do not meet the requirements as stipulated in the Convention are listed in Table B. It should be noted however that to date these lists have been considered as tentative lists and that nominations of cultural properties included in these lists have been processed accordingly.

In order to improve this situation and to establish meaningful and useful tentative lists, the Secretariat requests the Committee to consider the following proposal:

- During the next two year period the highest priority will be given to the establishment and/or revision of tentative lists in accordance with the stipulations in the Operational Guidelines par. 7 and 8. Active collaboration with the States Parties will be sought and preparatory assistance will be provided when necessary and requested by the State Party concerned.
- During this period, i.e. until 1 October 1995, nominations of cultural properties that are included in any of the tentative lists will be accepted and processed according to the Operational Guidelines.
- As of 1 October 1995 only nominations of cultural properties that are included in tentative lists which meet all requirements as stipulated in the operational Guidelines, will be accepted.
- From 1994 onwards, the tentative lists that meet the requirements as stipulated in the Operational Guidelines will be published and presented as an information document to the Committee at its annual meetings.

**TABLE A: STATES PARTIES WHICH HAVE SUBMITTED TENTATIVE LISTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH ART. 11 OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION AND/OR THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION**

STATES PARTIES	DATE OF THE LAST REVISION	CULT./NAT. SITES
BANGLADESH**	29-09-93	C
BRAZIL	---12-87	C / N
BULGARIA	18-10-84	C / N
CAMBODIA	---10-92	C
CANADA	---07-80	C / N
COLOMBIE	30-12-84	C
CZECH REPUBLIC	30-06-93	C
DENMARK	01-10-93	C
EL SALVADOR	21-09-93	C
FINLANDE	23-08-90	C
GERMANY	19-08-93	C
HUNGARY	---07-93	C / N
JAPAN	---10-92	C
LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC	12-03-93	C
LUXEMBOURG	01-10-93	C
MOZAMBIQUE	-----90	C / N
NORWAY	19-12-84	C / N
OMAN	04-07-88	C
PARAGUAY	06-10-93	C / N
PHILIPPINES	11-08-93	C / N
POLAND	29-09-93	C
ROMANIA	19-09-90	C
RUSSIAN FEDERATION	18-10-93	C / N
SLOVAK REPUBLIC	30-09-93	C
SPAIN**	09-09-93	C
SWEDEN	---06-89	C
THAILAND	---03-89	C
TURKEY	---06-84	C / N
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	---11-85	C / N
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	30-04-82	C / N
UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA	24-01-84	C / N

\*\* ONLY CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

**TABLE B: STATES PARTIES WHICH HAVE SUBMITTED TENTATIVE LISTS  
WITHOUT PROVINDING COMPLETE INFORMATION AS REQUIRED**

STATES PARTIES	DATE OF THE LAST REVISION	CULT./NAT. SITES
ALGERIA	09-04-85	C / N
AUSTRALIA	19-09-91	N
BOLIVIA	10-03-87	C / N
CHINA (PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF)	---12-86	C / N
CUBA	19-05-88	C / N
CYPRUS	---12-84	C
FRANCE	13-12-88	C
GREECE	---10-85	C
GUYANA	02-08-85	C
INDIA	16-04-86	N
IRAQ	NOT DATED	C
ITALY	---10-84	C
JAMAICA	05-08-80	C / N
JORDAN	---02-84	C
LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA	09-01-84	C
MADAGASCAR	10-12-85	C / N
MALDIVES	22-09-87	C
MALI	14-12-87	C
MOROCCO	17-10-85	C
MEXIQUE	10-07-86	C / N
NIGERIA	22-07-88	C / N
PAKISTAN	02-08-93	C
PERU	13-12-84	C / N
PORTUGAL	12-02-85	C
SPAIN	24-01-89	C
SRI LANKA	---08-87	C
SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC	NOT DATED	C
TUNISIA	18-12-84	C / N
UKRAINE	---05-89	C / N
VENEZUELA	22-09-93	C / N

**TABLE C: STATES PARTIES WHICH HAVE NOT SUBMITTED TENTATIVE LISTS**

AFGHANISTAN  
ALBANIA (REP. OF)  
ANGOLA (PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF)  
ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA  
ARGENTINA  
AUSTRIA  
BAHRAIN (STATE OF)  
BELARUS  
BELIZE  
BENIN  
BURKINA FASO  
BURUNDI  
CAMEROON  
CAPE VERDE  
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC  
CHILE  
CONGO  
COSTA RICA  
COTE D'IVOIRE  
CROATIA (REP. OF)  
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC  
EGYPT  
ECUADOR  
ETHIOPIA  
FIJI  
GABON  
GAMBIA  
GEORGIA  
GHANA  
GUATEMALA  
GUINEA  
HAITI  
HONDURAS  
HOLY SEE  
INDONESIE  
IRAN (ISLAMIC REP. OF)  
IRELAND  
KENYA (REPUBLIC OF)  
LEBANON  
MALAYSIA  
MALAWI  
MALTA  
MAURITANIA  
MONACO  
MONGOLIA  
NEPAL  
NETHERLANDS  
NICARAGUA  
NIGER  
NEW ZEALAND  
PANAMA  
QATAR

REP. OF ARMENIA  
REP. OF BOSNIA HERZEGOVINE  
REP. OF LITHUANIA  
REP. OF KOREA  
REP. OF SAN MARINO  
SAINT CHRISTOPHE AND NEVIS  
SAINT LUCIA  
SAUDI ARABIA  
SENEGAL  
SEYCHELLES  
SLOVENIA  
SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM  
SOLOMON ISLANDS  
SUDAN  
SWITZERLAND  
TADJIKISTAN  
UGANDA  
URUGUAY  
UZBEKISTAN  
YEMEN REPUBLIC\*  
YUGOSLAVIA\*\*  
ZAIRE  
ZAMBIA  
ZIMBABWE

\* The former Arab Republic of Yemen submitted a tentative list in September 1989.

\*\* Former Yugoslavia submitted a tentative list in December 1985.

## II. NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

### A. Properties recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List

Name of Property	Identification No.	State Party having submitted the nomination in accordance with the Convention	Criteria
Yakushima	662	Japan	(ii) (iii)

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the site containing warm temperate evergreen forests of Yakushima. Furthermore, it encouraged the Japanese Government to prepare a management plan taking into consideration the high level of visitation and to establish a coordinating system for the management of the area. As some of the values still remain adjacent to the site, the Bureau also noted that some extensions to the site would also be encouraged.

The Japanese authorities in their response of 1 October 1993 to the Bureau's recommendations, have stated, in particular, that a coordinating committee has been established.

Tubbataha Reef Marine Park	653	Philippines	(ii) (ii) (iv)
----------------------------	-----	-------------	----------------

The Bureau recommended the inscription of Tubbataha Reef Marine Park as one of the outstanding coral reefs in the region. The Bureau showed concern that conservation management support under a "Debt-swap" arrangement was coming to an end and strongly recommended that the Government provides funds for the management of the site. Eventual extension of the site to include the Bastera and Jessie Beazly Reefs should also be considered by the Philippine Government.

The Philippine authorities in their response to the Bureau's recommendations via their letter of 17 September 1993, point out, the assurance that funding will be available to manage the site. Furthermore, that action will be taken to expand the area of the Tubbataha Reef Marine Park. This will, however, take some time.





### C. Extension of World Heritage properties

<p><b>Central Eastern Australian Rain- forests of Australia (renomination the of the Australian East Coast Temperate and Sub-Tropical Rainforest Parks)</b></p>	<p><b>368bis</b></p>	<p><b>Australia</b></p>	<p><b>(i) (ii) (iv)</b></p>
---	----------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------

The Bureau noted the error made in the 1986 nomination which resulted in the site being accepted under criterion (iii), whereas the correct criterion was (iv). The Bureau recommended the acceptance of the extension to the site. However, it recommends that the Australian authorities review the inclusion of Iluka in the light of the inscription of Fraser Island on the World Heritage List, and to make the site less complex. The Bureau requested the Australian authorities to suggest a more explicit name of the site and to provide by 1 October 1993 details of the new management committee and define a final boundary limitation and other areas that could be added.

Australian Authorities have replied to the Bureau's request. The Minister for the Environment by letter of 21 October 1993 has advised us of the complexity of the processes involved, they have been unable to conclude negotiations in time to provide supplementary documentation for the World Heritage Committee in December 1993. The Australian Authorities anticipate that the revised nomination will be ready for consideration by the Bureau in 1994.

### D. Properties for which nominations were referred back to the national authorities for further information

<p><b>Shirakami-Sanchi</b></p>	<p><b>663</b></p>	<p><b>Japan</b></p>	<p><b>(ii)</b></p>
--------------------------------	-------------------	---------------------	--------------------

This beech forest of some 10,000 ha is buffered by a 7,000 ha virgin forest and the Bureau recommended that the buffer should be incorporated within the nomination. The Bureau further recommended that the Japanese Government should upgrade the legal status and complete the management plan improving the administrative structure of the site. If action on these points is well advanced by 1 October 1993, it would recommend inscription of the site under criterion (ii) at the seventeenth session of the Committee.

The Japanese authorities in their response of 30 September 1993 to the Bureau's recommendations, have stated, that they will take the measures necessary to incorporate the buffer zone in the World Heritage site and they have provided a new map illustrating the revised boundaries. In addition, an advisory committee has



Jiddat-al-  
Harasis and  
its adjoining  
areas

654

Oman

### III NOMINATION OF MIXED PROPERTY TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

#### A. Mixed property for which the nomination was referred back to the State Party for further information

Reserva del Vizcaino	554bis	Mexico	C (i) (iii)
			N (ii) (iii) (iv)

The Bureau, recognizing the exceptional universal value of the Laguna Ojo de Liebre and Laguna de San Ignacio (criterion (iv)), recommended that the site be inscribed on the World Heritage List and the management recommendation in IUCN's technical evaluation be transmitted to the Mexican authorities. This site is a sanctuary for grey whales and other important species. The Bureau further recognized the Sierra de San Francisco area as meeting cultural criteria (i) and (iii) for its outstanding rock art and to be inscribed as a cultural site. It is further recommended that a revised nomination be submitted: (a) for the natural components and (b) for the cultural component. It is further recommended that a new name be identified for each of these nominations.

The Mexican authorities informed the Centre on 8 October 1993 that they agree with the recommendation of the Bureau and that they propose the following names:

- cultural nomination: Pinturas rupestres de la Sierra de San Francisco, B.C.S.
- natural nomination: Refugio de Ballenas en las Lagunas de El Vizcaino

The World Heritage Centre requested ICOMOS and IUCN to look into this matter and to report to the Bureau at its next session in Cartagena whether the conditions for separate nominations, including revised boundaries for the whale sanctuary and inscriptions are being met.

In October 1993 the Advisory Committee on Biosphere Reserves accepted the natural property of El Vizcaino as a UNESCO Biosphere Reserve.



international expertise should be sought to ensure that the best methods are employed for this work.

The Irish authorities informed the World Heritage Centre on 31 August 1993 that they have no objections to the name proposed by the Bureau being used by UNESCO. They reserve their position, however, as to the title to be used within Ireland. As to the recommendation on possible conservation works, the Irish authorities accept this recommendation.

**Residence of Himeji-jo**      661              **Japan**              (i) (iii) (iv)

**Buddhist ensemble of Horyo-ji**              660              **Japan**              (i) (ii) (iv) (vi)

**Historic Monuments of Zacatecas**              676              **Mexico**              (ii) (iv)

The Bureau recommended to inscribe the site of 'Historic Monuments of Zacatecas' under criteria ii) and iv).

The Mexican authorities commented by letter of 7 October 1993 on the name of the property used by the Bureau and recalled that the nomination was presented under the title 'Historical Centre of Zacatecas' or 'Historical Town of Zacatecas' and that the criteria proposed were the criteria i), ii) and iv). The authorities request the Committee to reconsider the name of the site as well as the criteria to be applied.

The World Heritage Centre transmitted these comments to ICOMOS for review and requested ICOMOS to report to the Committee on the name and the proposed criteria for inscription.

**Sergiev Posad, architectural ensemble of the Lavra of the Trinity Saint Sergius**      657              **Russian Federation**              (ii) (iv)

The Bureau recommended inscription of this property on the world Heritage List, but requested the competent Russian authorities to urgently put in place a new law for the protection of the site in order that its future conservation may be assured.

The recommendation of the Bureau was transmitted to the Russian Permanent Delegation on 11 August 1993. To date, no response has been received to this communication.

**Banská Stiaavnica**              618rev              **Slovak Republic**              (iv) (v)

**Archaeological ensemble of Merida - Spain**                      664                      Spain                      (iii) (iv)

**Royal Monastery of Guadalupe of Caceres**                      665                      Spain                      (iv) (vi)

**The Route of Santiago de Compostela**                      669                      Spain                      (ii) (iv) (vi)

The Bureau recommended the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List, but requested the competent Spanish authorities to envisage the possibility of combining under this nomination also the two sites already on the World Heritage List (Burgos Cathedral (no. 316) and the old Town of Santiago de Compostela (no 347)).

This observation was transmitted to the Spanish Permanent Delegation on 29 July 1993. To date no response has been received to this communication.

**Birka-Hovgarden**                      555                      Sweden                      (iii) (iv)

**Engelsberg Ironworks**                      556rev                      Sweden                      (iv)

**Boukhara**                      602rev                      Uzbekistan                      (ii) (iv) (vi)

The Bureau recommended the inscription on the World Heritage List but drew the attention to the fact that the site should be regularly monitored in order to ensure its proper conservation.

**B. Properties for which nominations were referred back to nominating States for further information/documentation**

**Red Fort, Delhi**                      231                      India                      (iii)

Taking into account the ICOMOS evaluation, the Bureau requested the competent Indian authorities to complete the nomination file with precise information on the buffer zone surrounding the proposed property defined by national legislation, as well as to provide detailed explanations on the management plan for Red Fort. This complementary information should be provided before 1 October to allow ICOMOS to carry out an evaluation which will be submitted to the Bureau at its next session in December 1993.

The Indian authorities provided additional information which was received at the Centre on 14 October 1993. This information was transmitted to ICOMOS for review with the request to report to the Bureau at its next session in Cartagena.

**Humayun's Tomb, Delhi**      **232**      **India**      **(ii) (iii) (iv)**

Taking into account the ICOMOS evaluation, the Bureau requested the competent Indian authorities to complete the nomination file with precise information on the buffer zones around the proposed property defined by national legislation, as well as detailed explanations on the management plan for the Humayun Tomb and its associated monuments. This complementary information should be provided before 1 October to allow ICOMOS to carry out an evaluation which will be submitted to the Bureau at its next session in December 1993.

The Indian authorities provided additional information which was received at the Centre on 14 October 1993. This information was transmitted to ICOMOS for review with the request to report to the Bureau at its next session in Cartagena.

**Qutb Minar and  
associated  
monuments, Delhi**      **233**      **India**      **(iii) (iv)**

Taking into account the ICOMOS evaluation, the Bureau requested the competent Indian authorities to complete the nomination file with precise information on the buffer zones surrounding the proposed property defined by national legislation, as well as provide a detailed explanation of the management plan for the monumental ensemble and archaeological ruins. This complementary information should be provided before 1 October to allow ICOMOS to carry out an evaluation which will be submitted to the Bureau at its next session in December 1993.

Additional information was provided by the Indian authorities which was received at the Centre on 14 October 1993. This information was transmitted to ICOMOS for review with the request to report to the Bureau at its next session in Cartagena.

**Jesuit Missions**      **648**      **Paraguay**      **(iv)**

Taking into account the ICOMOS evaluation, the Bureau requested the competent Paraguayan authorities to complete the nomination file with precise information on the buffer zones around the proposed properties defined by national legislation, especially for the Santísima Trinidad of Paraná property. This complementary information should be provided before 1 October to allow ICOMOS to carry out an evaluation which will be submitted to the Bureau at its next session in December 1993.

Extensive additional information and documentation was presented by the authorities of Paraguay on 1 October 1993. This material was transmitted to ICOMOS for review with the request to report to the Bureau at next session in Cartagena.

**Inca Temple of  
Huaytará**

647

Peru

The Bureau at its 17th session decided not to examine this nomination in view of the fact that this cultural property was not included in the tentative list for Peru. The Bureau decided that if a revised tentative list would be presented before 1 October 1993, this nomination could be considered at its next session in Cartagena.

The Peruvian authorities informed the Centre on 30 August 1993 of their decision to withdraw this nomination.

**Baroque Churches**

677

Philippines

(iv)

Taking into account the ICOMOS evaluation, the Bureau requested the competent Philippine authorities to complete the nomination file with precise information regarding the buffer zones around the proposed monuments defined by national legislation. This complementary information should be provided before 1 October to allow ICOMOS to carry out an evaluation which will be presented to the Bureau as its next session in December 1993.

The authorities of the Philippines provided additional information which was received at the Centre on 2 September 1993. This information was transmitted to ICOMOS for review with the request to report to the Bureau at its next session in Cartagena.

**Sintra**

656

Portugal

The Bureau at its 17th session decided not to examine this nomination in view of the fact that this cultural property was not included in the tentative list for Portugal. The Bureau decided that if a revised tentative list would be presented before 1 October 1993, this nomination could be considered at its next session in Cartagena.

On 7 September 1993, the Portuguese authorities informed the Centre of the decision to withdraw the present nomination and that a new nomination will be presented in the future.

**Biertan**

596

Romania

**Monastery of  
Horezu**

597

Romania

**Churches of  
Moldavia**

598

Romania

The Observer for Romania informed the Bureau of the interest of the national authorities in heritage conservation and expressed the wish that the nominations for inscription proposed by his country be re-examined. The Bureau recommended that the three



nomination deferred during the June 1991 Bureau session be examined at the next session in December 1993 on the condition that the competent authorities provide assurances that there exists in Romania a real legal protection for monuments and cultural properties.

This decision of the Bureau was transmitted to the Permanent Delegation of Romania on 12 August 1993. To date no response has been received. ICOMOS might be in the position to report on this matter on the basis of the results of a mission to Romania that was scheduled for late October 1993.

**Vlkolínec**                      **522rev**                      **Slovak Republic**                      **(iv) (v)**

The Bureau recommended that ICOMOS complete the on-going study on Central European villages which is being carried out in consultation with specialists from all countries concerned. In the light of the results of this study, which should be presented at its next session in December 1993, the Bureau will take a decision regarding the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List.

**Spissky Hrad**                      **620rev**                      **Slovak Republic**                      **(iv)**

The Bureau requested the competent Slovak authorities to provide detailed information on the management plan of the property. This complementary information should be received before 1 October to permit ICOMOS to carry out an evaluation which will be submitted to the next session of the Bureau in December 1993.

Additional information on the management plan was provided by the authorities on 27 September 1993. This information was transmitted to ICOMOS for review with the request to report to the Bureau at its next session in Cartagena.

**Coro and its Dunes**    **658**                      **Venezuela**

The Bureau at its 17th session decided not to examine this nomination in view of the fact that Venezuela had not submitted a tentative list. The Bureau decided that if a tentative list would be presented before 1 October 1993, this nomination could be considered at its next session in Cartagena.

The authorities of Venezuela submitted a tentative list for their country on 23 September 1993. A revised nomination, following the recommendations of the original ICOMOS evaluation, was presented on 12 October 1993. This information was transmitted to ICOMOS for review with the request to report to the Bureau at its next session in Cartagena.



order to prevent the construction of high buildings along and close to the coastline and to limit the use of billboards and neon signs in and around the old town.

On 2 September 1993, the Croatian authorities presented a proposal for the extension of the site so as to include the immediate environment of the city as well as the Island of Lokrum. This proposal was transmitted to ICOMOS for evaluation with the request to report to the Bureau at its next session in Cartagena.

**D. Properties for which nominations were referred back to State Party or deferred in earlier years and for which additional information has been received**

**Tongariro National  
Park**

**421rev New Zealand**

This site was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1990 on the basis of natural heritage criteria. The nomination of this site for inscription under cultural criteria also, was deferred by the Committee at its 16th session with the instruction to the Centre to contact the New Zealand authorities and request further supportive material on cultural aspects of this site in order to study the possibility to inscribe the site under cultural heritage criteria as well.

The authorities of New Zealand presented on 27 July 1993 a revised nomination for this site. The nomination was transmitted to ICOMOS for review with the request to undertake a new evaluation of the nomination and to report to the Bureau at its next session in Cartagena.

**Bamberg**

**624**

**Germany**

The nomination of Bamberg was deferred by the Bureau at its 16th session in order to permit the competent German authorities to reconsider the boundaries of the site and of the buffer zone so as not to include recent constructions in the World Heritage Site.

On 26 May 1993, The German authorities presented additional information on the site as well as new proposals for the boundaries of the site and the buffer zone. This material was transmitted to ICOMOS for review with the request to report to the Bureau at its next session in Cartagena.

**E. Properties for which nominations were deferred**

At its 17th session the Bureau decided to defer the following nominations:

<b>Lumbini and associated sites</b>	<b>666</b>	<b>Nepal</b>
<b>Karlstejn Castle</b>	<b>619</b>	<b>Czech Republic</b>
<b>Skogskyrkogarden</b>	<b>558</b>	<b>Sweden</b>