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Veliky Novgorod
Putting a Stop to Losses, Managing the Present and the Future of the Cultural Heritage of Russia

The bitter news of the fire that destroyed the wooden tent-roofed Church of the Assumption in Kondopoga, the Republic of Karelia has shocked all of us. It was a symbol of the spiritual and material power of the Russian people, a cultural monument of federal significance, an object of worship for thousands of people. Its beauty and sophistication, its unique image celebrated by poets and artists were fascinating. Numerous monographs both in Russia and abroad have been dedicated to it, for centuries it was passing down the generations the inimitable charm of the Russian North. This loss is irreversible, architectural monuments may not be cloned.

It is imperative to put a stop to losing the masterpieces of the wooden architecture in which Russia used to be so rich. The VII Parliamentary Forum in June 2018 in Suzdal dedicated to this most fragile part of our cultural heritage has raised the issue of the necessity to ensure the safety of the cultural heritage object's that are located far from populated places, in the hard to access areas which was historically predetermined.

Russia possesses a unique experience in protecting the objects of the national significance. Vandalizing priceless cultural masterpieces is a kind of terrorism which our country prevails. In our opinion, the state should adopt a comprehensive inter-agency program for protection of the cultural heritage of the Russian North, Siberia and Far East. It should also prepare the serial nomination of the unique wooden churches of Russia to the UNESCO World Heritage List which would allow preserving this outstanding heritage not only for our country but for the entire mankind.

Faithfully yours, President of NC ICOMOS, Russia,
People's Architect of the Russian Federation
Academician
A. P. Kudryavtsev
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World Heritage in Danger and Heritage Alert

Riin Alatalu, Member of ICOMOS, Estonia

The aim of different listings like World Heritage List, European Heritage Label, national registers of monuments, as well as different awards like Europa Nostra Prize, national and local awards to monuments, professionals and dedicated people, is to promote heritage, to demonstrate the best practices and serve as example for the evaluation of heritage on all levels.

World Heritage List and Europa Nostra have also instruments – World Heritage in Danger and 7 Most Endangered Programme (http://www.europanostra.org/our-work/campaigns/7-most-endangered/) to highlight the heritage sites that are threatened by human activities or nature disasters. Similar instrument is Heritage Alert used by ICOMOS. There are also several local traditions, for example in Estonia our Heritage Society has a Medal of Disservice (Karuteene) since 1997.

The aim of these instruments is the same - give international attention to sites with significant problems and thus help to mobilize partners to seek solutions, assistance and even financial help.

The reactions to and steps taken in case of such a listing may be very different. World Heritage listing has national importance on political level as it represents states commitment to safeguard heritage. Thus danger listing is often misunderstood as accusation in misdeeds or notification of failure. Often states advocate in World Heritage Committee to avoid danger listing without thoroughly understanding the opportunities and aims of it.

ICOMOS and Europa Nostra activities are usually taken less seriously in political decision making as they are NGO and expert level decisions. However, both instruments have significant advantages and important role in safeguarding the heritage. Europa Nostra helps to advocate the sites on public level and raise awareness. ICOMOS Heritage Alerts initiate broad and international discussions on expert level and attention on state level, but enable more flexible and open discussions and professional recommendations. ICOMOS Heritage at Risk Reports document different cases and provide comparison material.

The aim of the presentation is to give a small overview of recent danger listings on different levels, concentrating mainly on 20\textsuperscript{th} century heritage and to discuss the outcomes and challenges of such activities.

THE LIFE BEYOND TOURISM MOVEMENT. World Heritage as a Peace Builder

Paolo Del Bianco, Life Beyond Tourism Movement, Italy

The exponential growth of the travelers worldwide and the ever-growing attraction of multiculturalities by the World Heritage Sites was unpredictable 50 years ago; therefore, the Foundation considers as important a new way of interpreting the UNESCO Convention 1972 and of thinking and acting for the protection and enhancement of the World Heritage; all of this, in the light of the development of the mobility and of the ever-growing appeal raised by the World Heritage to a large community over the last 50 years. From this new reading, it should sort out the contribution to the dialogue by the Sites and the World Cultural Heritage as a whole, by becoming also excellent training centers for meetings between cultures to peace and therefore for the "protection" and the "enhancement" of the World Heritage itself, as well as for raise thoughts
and actions for the protection of the Planet Earth. Thus, the dissemination of this orientation worldwide, with an economic leverage that leads to a new commercial offer with another ethics, for the growth of the international community in peaceful coexistence becomes an aim.

The philosophy of the Life Beyond Tourism Movement begins to be applied worldwide, as a real cultural and commercial evolution.

The Movement today is powered by the network of the Romualdo Del Bianco Foundation, a network of private individuals and institutions, in 5211 cities, in 111 countries on 5 continents.

The Movement is the promoter of the brand-new specific Quality Certification for Dialogue between Cultures (DTC-LBT: 2018), designed according to the international standards and whose members communicate their involvement to actively favor the dialogue between cultures. In this context are the Life Beyond Tourism training courses for trainers -in Florence and in e-learning format. Starting from 2019 the Life Beyond Tourism will be a part of a specific university curricula for young architects, conservators and landscape planners in the Polytechnics of Madrid, Lublin, Vilnius and La Sapienza University of Rome, in the framework of the Erasmus+ project Sustainable Urban Rehabilitation in Europe.

The economic leverage ensures a widespread diffusion on a worldwide scale, activated by a strong commercial interest that in this case makes its effects virtuous.

This new commercial offer was shared among others by ICOMOS, first in the Quebec General Assembly in 2008, then in Florence in 2014; the UNESCO World Heritage Committee also shared it on July 2, 2018 in Manama, Bahrain. Besides, 151 universities and institutions from 37 countries in 4 continents (included this prestigious National Committee ICOMOS Russia Federation) signed a suitable Memorandum of Understanding with the Foundation.

This result has been achieved with the contribution of all the International Experts of the Foundation who, year after year, have built with their international bricks the Life Beyond Tourism construction, adapted to the Florentine context.

Russia with its tangible and intangible heritage and its capacity to manage multiculturalism on its territory can represent a great school for dialogue with the Certification of Quality for Dialogue DTC-LBT 2018, by demonstrating that the heritage is a “builder of peace”; also for that matter, the contribution of its National Committee ICOMOS will be fundamental.

The Foundation wishes that a working group would be set up to submit this theme to the World Heritage Committee through the International Council on Monuments and Sites. We believe that Azerbaijan and Bahrain also share this orientation, considering that the relevant Ministries of Culture signed the Life Beyond Tourism Memorandum of Understanding.

Monuments of the World Cultural Heritage – Challenges and Perspectives

Kirsti Kovanen, ICOMOS, Finland

At its creation in 1972, the World Heritage convention was based on the states’ commitments to both, homeland and international actions. The States Parties were called to record their heritage, propose sites for recognition with this status, to secure their conservation with up-to-date standards, and to raise awareness on the values of natural and cultural heritage. The original idea of getting together around heritage and creating an international community around it, still exists, behind the diverse forms of cooperation that the World Heritage processes and its system offers.
The many tools that the system nowadays includes are in wide use of all cultures and conservation trade, even in many heritage sites outside the system. Whether the comprehension for heritage has started to resemble the type of heritage that the Operational Guidelines depict, would be interesting to explore. The size of the World Heritage list has grown to 1092 cultural, natural or mixed properties, a far bigger number than envisaged in 1972. However, the commitment to the funds and to the maintenance of the list or the properties themselves is not self-evident.

It is clear that since the beginning of the convention, also an enormous growth of expertise can be seen in the field of conservation and partly explained by the growth of the application of the convention. Over time, the ideas of heritage have changed with ever deepening and detailing trends and new heritage approaches. The context of World Heritage has widened: education, social life, communities, science, indigenous engagement, sustainable urban development, sustainability in actions, and the methodologies of the recent years, like cultural systems and eco-systems, are now on the tables where World Heritage is deal with. The Advisory Bodies to the convention work on finding linkages between Nature and Culture, on Sustainable development, on Post-trauma situations, on Reconstruction and on Rights based approaches. The many examples of good practices in World Heritage properties show the flagship nature of the convention, for ex. when offering models for engagement and participation.

The growth has also created problems that are not solved. Changed views on heritage have caused in the list itself from time to time imbalances so sorely felt for ex. when new properties are discussed. The main threats to the World Heritage have long been and still remain urbanization, poverty, natural catastrophes, pollution, mass tourism, and carelessness, which are faced annually when monitoring the state of conservation of the properties.

For us as heritage specialists, most challenging may be in our time the application and understanding of the value of dialogue – how to come together around heritage and to talk to each other, to work together and to understand each other – it still is as valid as a principle as it has been since the early days of the convention. The wide stream of practices and ideas produced in the World Heritage system as a whole has the capacity to contribute to improving life and living conditions not only within the system and its properties, but in societies and on the globe more generally.

On the Experience of Nominations ‘Silk Roads’ and ‘Rock Art Sites in Central Asia’

N. Turekulova, Member of ICOMOS, Kazakhstan

Transnational serial objects’ nominations to the UNESCO World Heritage List from our experience are a unique instrument for international collaboration. They present more opportunities for many valuable heritage objects which have little chance of being listed as individual objects. Also, when nominating transnational objects the countries in which territories such objects are located jointly develop common approaches to the heritage’s most efficient preservation and management as well as undertake to constantly improve them (International expert meeting on World Heritage and Serial properties and nominations. Ittingen, Switzerland, 2010).

For the first time the concept of transnational serial nominations ‘Silk Roads’ and ‘Rock Art in Central Asia’ have been articulated and prioritized by the Central Asia countries in 2005 at the UNESCO Regional Seminar in Almaty which followed up the Periodic Report concerning the implementation of the World Heritage Convention. These ideas were also in line with the
ICOMOS analysis ‘The World Heritage List: Filling the Gaps — an Action Plan for the Future’ conducted in 2004 within the Global Strategy for a more credible, representative and balanced World Heritage List. The ICOMOS study showed that cultural routes and rock art monuments are ones of the least presented in the World Heritage List. Cultural heritage of the Central Asia countries is hardly present in the List. However, all the Central Asia republics already were having tentative lists containing sites that might be smoothly fitted into these two transnational series. In the early 2000s at the most prominent of these sites a series of regional projects has been realized with the UNESCO support aimed at their conservation and preparation for nomination which gave a new impetus to developing national heritage preservation systems.

The Silk Road that is mostly associated with silk trade begins in Xi’an and therefore it is only natural that the first application for a tentative list for the national serial nomination was initiated in 1994 by China. However, in the course of multiple consultations coordinated by the World Heritage Center and ICOMOS it has been agreed that this object should expand beyond one country. The 2006 Regional Meeting in Turpan has laid a foundation for joint preparation of the initial part of the transnational serial nomination by the Central Asia countries and China. While preparing the nomination many issues concerning developing a common concept for the nomination, methods of selecting sites, coordination and management of the extremely complex serial site have been addressed for the first time ever. In 2014 the Silk Road’s site and its first part — the Chang’an-Tianshan Corridor stretching over China, Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan — has been successfully included in the UNESCO World Heritage List. This opened the gates to other concerned countries keen to make additions to this unique transnational serial site that has no equal in the world.

Next in line is preparation of yet another site — equally significant for the Central Asia countries — the Rock Art Sites in Central Asia. The process that actively started in 2008 and was suspended in 2015 has been resumed in June 2018 during the Regional Meeting of Experts in Almaty where a new action plan has been developed with consideration to the experience of preparation of the Silk Roads nomination.

Panel 1. Historical Cities of Russia in the World Heritage System. Challenges in Preservation and Development

Preservation of Cultural Heritage: Economic and Social Aspects

Bogush, I.N., Member of ICOMOS, Saint Petersburg
Romanovskaya N.V., Member of ICOMOS, Saint Petersburg

In order to balance interests of communities and developers there is such a mechanism as urban general plans and rules for land use and development. However, no matter how good a general plan development planners have come up with, it would not work if a private interest is held above the public one. Unfortunately, today cases of imbalance between private and public interests are very common. We can see that very clearly in Saint Petersburg.

Private interests are promoted by a small group of businessmen who — despite any urban development restrictions — violate the majority’s interests. But the community’s (public) interests are not equal to a sum of private interests. The purpose of urban development regulations is precisely to put limitations upon realization of private interests. As long as these limitations remain mere ink on paper, they would not work. To reverse the situation it would take not only introducing
amendments to the General Plan but also changing overall attitude towards cases of disregard for the law in urban development sphere.

In order to find balance between history preservation and urban development interests we have to seek not the balance of interests but the balance of powers. One of the powers is represented by the city community and the experts in cultural heritage preservation who are ready to defend the city fabric. It is this power that is surging now in the city at its multiple ‘disputable points’, in particular in a controversy surrounding a residential building construction in one of Saint Petersburg’s historical areas where it would clash with the Chesme Palace with Side Wings, an 18th-century architectural site.

In this case the group of city people supported by experts is defending not just a cultural heritage but the very soul of the city (genius loci). People are opposing not a developer but the authorities’ indifference. It is understood that new construction is inevitable and developers have to generate profit from their businesses, however not from building up unique public areas.

The civic society today is a small group of people who defend community values. Civil protests against construction of the Gazprom’s tower in the center of Saint Petersburg in the two-thousands have led to the ban on high-rise buildings in the city’s historical part. Before that the value of the city’s skyline was not in the focus. The conflict of values gives momentum to the civic society formation.

It takes a strategy to resolve an urban development conflict. Today it means appealing to the global public opinion, building up resources through global transparency and publicity, involving UNESCO and ICOMOS. It seems that today the citizens have a chance to be heard only if the authorities’ reputation is at stake.

**Pulkovo in the Cultural Landscape of Saint Petersburg as a World Heritage**

Gorbatenko S. B., Member of ICOMOS, Saint Petersburg

Since the early 1990s the issue of protecting cultural landscapes of the Big Saint Petersburg has become very vital. This concept has become a foundation for Saint Petersburg as a World Heritage and the authorities of the city and the region should give it due attention. However as of today both the territorial entities of the Russian Federation — Saint Petersburg and the Leningrad Region ignore UNESCO’s mandates and keep engulfing the landscapes of Saint Petersburg and its suburbs through new development like Saturn consuming his children. Examples of this can be found in the city center and in many components of its suburbs alike: the Peterhof Road and the Neva bank ensembles, the Taitsy estate, the Izhora Clint, the Duderhof and the Koltushi heights.

In July 2018 we have completed the Heritage Impact Assessment for the World Heritage in regards of the designed and started construction of residential complexes Planetograd, On Tsarskoe Selo Hills and Yugtown on the Izhora plateau territory that is literally surrounded by and abundant in components and elements of this World Heritage Site. For example the Planetograd complex in fact borders with the Pulkovo Observatory on the South. This area is limited by the Izhora Clint, the Peterburgskoe, Kiyevskoe and Volknonskoe roads run through it. The Green Glory Belt — the memorial of the 1941–1944 battles — runs right across its central part.
We have analyzed sources and data bases, international and national protection status, have conducted historical researches and developed a key historical and cultural plan, have established the degree of the cultural landscape’s preservation in terms of its integrity and authenticity. During field works we have studied and established the key visual accessibility points, axes and lines for the new structures (on- and above-ground). The key role belonged to the results of the landscape and visual analysis based on a basic 3D model of Saint Petersburg developed at the Research and Development Center for the Saint Petersburg General Plan.

The assessment has been conducted in accordance with the ICOMOS official Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage Properties, with the focus on the criteria of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). Since the adopted Declaration on OUV mostly refers to the center of Saint Petersburg (in our opinion it has to be reviewed), according to the Articles 4–7 of the 2011 ICOMOS Guidance we have established 11 OUV criteria and have assessed the new structures’ impact upon them. Based on value of a heritage’s assets (resources) and on gravity of impact we have assessed the overall impact. The consequences of the impact upon the World Heritage Object by construction of the above mentioned structures have been assessed as NEGATIVE.

On Applying UNESCO General Principles for Preservation of Cultural Heritage to the Historic Center of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments World Heritage Object

Zvereva, L.V., Member of ICOMOS, Saint Petersburg

In the Russian Federation decisions and instructions to follow the Convention concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972) as well as mandates of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee concerning the listed World Heritage Objects in the Russian Federation are made on the highest level, by the President of Russia. On the regional level however, these decisions are not complied with in regards to the Historic Center of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments World Heritage Object (Decision by the 14th Session of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee, December 7–12, 1990, object No. 540-001 Historic Center of Saint Petersburg).

In the historic center of Saint Petersburg there is a very small area of high historical, architectural and cultural value between the Nevsky Prospect, the Fontanka river embankment, the Italianskaya and Karavannaya streets, with seven monument buildings.

The Committee for State Control, Usage and Protection of Historic and Cultural Heritage of Saint Petersburg (KGIOP SPb) has approved historical and cultural assessment of documentation for adaptation for current usage in regards of two Cultural Heritage Objects (CHO) in this area: the I. Forsh Residential Building, late 1780s — early 1790s, a monument of regional significance where in the Y.F. Abaza’s music salon the first performance of the opera by Piotr I. Tchaikovsky ‘Eugene Onegin’ took place in 1878 (23, the Fontanka river embankment); the D.P. Naryshkin/S.L. Shuvalova Palace, a federal significance monument (21, the Fontanka river embankment).

In order to allow construction of a 7-floor hotel with underground levels on the site of the I. Forsh Residential Building, in 2016 the KGIOP SPb has made the decision dissolving its own prior decision dated 2015 for the CHO protection. Upon investor’s commission an assessment has been conducted which resulted in unacceptable (in my opinion) reduction of the protected object as it was previously defined. Adaptation of the D.P. Naryshkin/S.L. Shuvalova Palace would lead to demolition of its western wing.
I consider this approval by KGIOP SPb of adaptation of the two heritage objects in this area to violate the Federal Law, the Constitution of the Russian Federation and the general principles for preservation of cultural heritage as defined in one of the most important legal acts — the UNESCO Recommendation concerning the Preservation of Cultural Property Endangered by Public or Private works dated November 19, 1968.

Adaptation of the two cultural heritage objects in question based on unacceptable reduction of the protection object and the side wing’s demolition not only endangers these objects but also poses risks to three other adjacent cultural heritage objects within the 30 m zone of high risk. The building at 25, the Fontanka river embankment where in 1814–1825 lived Decembrists N.M. and A.M. Muraviov and in 1814–1826 — artist O.A. Kiprensky, a federal significance monument as well as two newly identified Cultural Heritage Objects: the Naryshkina mansion (20, Karavannaya Str.) and the A.F. Lvov mansion (22, Karavannaya Str.) are at risk of damage.

Therefore the KGIOP SPb Deputy Chairman A.V. Milhailov’s view that the above mentioned monuments are not part of the Historic Center of Saint Petersburg and Related Group of Monuments object listed on the UNESCO List of the World Natural and Cultural Heritage is highly arguable (KGIOP’s letter No. 01-32-57/18-0-1 dtd 16.05.2018). According to A.V. Mikhailov’s logic the historic center as a certain amorphous definition can exist without preservation of the cultural heritage object being its part.

I believe that harming and putting at risk the monument in the historic center of Saint Petersburg would cause irreparable damage to the Historic Center of Saint Petersburg and Related Group of Monuments World Cultural Heritage Object No. 540-001.

International Experience in World Heritage Preservation in France (Nancy, the Grand Est Region)

Kozlova, Y.A., Member of ICOMOS, Moscow

As part of this Symposium it is proposed to consider France’s experience in World Heritage protection as exemplified by the city of Nancy. In the city — the capital of the Meurthe-et-Moselle Department in the North-East of France, there are three components of a World Heritage Object: Place Stanislas, Place de la Carrière and Place d’Alliance. All of them form an integral urban ensemble under UNESCO protection. In addition to majestic architectural complex with the Triumphal Arch designed by architect Emmanuel Héré de Corny in 1752–1756, statues of kings and fountains this ensemble is distinctive by a unique programme for urban tissue and public buildings (both administrative, judicial, religious and the fine arts). These attributes make the Nancy ensemble a unique example of urban development in the Age of Enlightenment which made it viable for being included in the UNESCO World Heritage List in 1983 based on criteria (i) and (iv).

With the purpose of best preservation of this heritage, numerous protection instruments have been developed in France on various levels. It is proposed to consider statutory requirements to each party in restoration, new construction, beautification, creation of temporary installations, etc., as well as the role of the state on each level. Today the work continues on expanding the protected area of the city center and developing a plan for preservation and valorization that would also cover the buffer zone surrounding the UNESCO Heritage Sites. This example is suggested as a guideline for developing legal instruments and preceding studies by architectural bureaus involving regional departments of the French Ministry for Culture.

The case of Nancy proves that the existing UNESCO urban ensemble effects not only the protection of these World Heritage Sites but the life of the city as a whole.
Methods of Preservation of Historical Urban Tissue as Exemplified by the Town of Sestroretsk

Matveyev B.M., Member of ICOMOS, Saint Petersburg

On the Sestroretsk territory beside the manmade lake of Sestroretsky Razliv and the Dubki park there are buildings of the famous arms factory and the dachas that used to be very popular in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century and that these days have become historic areas: Alexandrovskaya, Tarkhovka, Dyuny, Razliv. The latter is a fragment of an urban settlement formed after the disastrous fire in 1868.

The Sestroretsky Razliv and the Sestroretskiye Dubki are parts of the Historic Center of Saint Petersburg and Related Group of Monuments World Heritage Site. For other historic territories the areas subject to regulation of development and business activities and/or areas of protected natural landscape are defined. Such areas’ regimens are not sufficient to preserve historical wooden structures the number of which gets lower each year.

Almost all the wooden buildings that in 2001 have been included in the List of the Newly Identified Cultural Heritage Objects — including those that in 2014–2017 have been given the status of Cultural Heritage Objects of regional significance based on the state assessment — by now have become utterly dilapidated. It would be impossible to preserve them using traditional restoration methods. Widely used methods of reconstruction and adaptation for current usage do not comply with the ICOMOS Principles for the Conservation of Wooden Built Heritage, 2017.

‘Remakes’ that get built in place of the gone historical buildings do not meet the basic authenticity criteria. At most, reconstruction results in more or less exact replicas of outer appearance through modern structures and new interiors. Such objects lose their status of architectural monuments and are to be excluded from the register. Therefore, an owner gets an opportunity for further transformation. However, in the context of urban tissue protecting such objects is of significant value. To avoid irretrievable loss of dominant urban elements and with the purpose of sustainable development of historical urban tissue on the condition that cultural heritage preservation is highly ensured, such ‘remakes’ should remain under the government control for which they have to be given a special legal status.

The most acceptable would be a legal term ‘significant objects of historical urban tissue’. Along with the listed Cultural Heritage Objects and newly identified cultural heritage objects they should be subject to protection of a territory of a historical settlement or site.

As an example we give two objects located in Sestroretsk. In the Andreeva street there is an authentic early 20\textsuperscript{th} century building — the Belvedere (Wooden) which replica is also located at the town entrance. The first object is a Cultural Heritage Object of regional value while the second one is a ‘significant object’ perceived as one of the town’s symbols and signifying the town’s historic role as one of Saint Petersburg’s ‘dacha’ suburbs in the past. Another example of a ‘significant object of historical urban tissue’ is the A.K. Gerbikh Dacha in Alexandrovskoye. The wooden building with stucco finish has been replaced with the stone one which retained the original structure’s aesthetic distinctiveness.

Preservation of the Industrial Heritage in the South Urals Company Towns

Olenkov, V.D., Member of ICOMOS, Chelyabinsk

The cultural heritage in the Chelyabinsk Region reflect the Region’s unique history and culture. On the other hand they are an integral part of the global and Russian culture. The National
State Register of Cultural Heritage Objects of the Russian Federation lists 780 objects located in the Chelyabinsk Region, of which 21 are Cultural Heritage Objects of federal significance.

The South Urals industrial heritage should be recognized as unique since it is related to founding mines, metal works, handicrafts dealing with metals and stones.

Towns emerged during the industrial revolution in 18–19th centuries as settlements surrounding plants. This was the way that the Kasli cast-iron plant (1747), the Miass copper foundry (1773), the Nizhny Sim iron works (1771) which settlement later became the town of Minyar. The history of emergence and development of such company towns as Zlatoust, Ust-Katav, Katav-Ivanovsk, Kusa, Kyshtym etc. is similar.

Since 1990 there used to be a list of historic cities. Thirteen cities of the Chelyabinsk Region were on the list: Chelyabinsk, Verkhneuralsk, Zlatoust, Kasli, Kyshtym, Magnitogorsk, Miass, Minyar, Troitsk, Verkhny Ufaley, Katav-Ivanovsk, Sim and Nyazepetrovsk. Most of them (10 out of 13) once used to be company towns. Out of 426 Russian historic cities on the List only 40 began as company towns and 10 of them were in the Chelyabinsk Region.

In 2010 the Ministry for Culture of the Russian Federation has issued an order that redefine the list of historic settlements. Instead of 426 only 41 historic settlements remained.

The South Urals company towns are a special kind of towns and urban culture; they represent a phenomena of the Russian and regional cultural heritage. Today these towns are going through tough times, however they still have a potential for development.

The Historic Center of Yaroslavl World Heritage Object: Strategy and Ways to Preserve the Outstanding Universal Value

Ostrovskaya, O.I., Member of ICOMOS, Yaroslavl

This presentation’s goal is to try to analyze developing efficient ways to comply with the Convention concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage based on the experience in maintaining the Historic Center of Yaroslavl World Heritage Object (hereinafter referred to as ‘Object’) in accordance with the effective law, as well as to identify major issues in the Object’s preservation and usage.

Study methods: 1) analysis of the Object’s condition as of the time of its inclusion in the World Heritage List; 2) monitoring reports on the Object’s condition and response; 3) monitoring effective laws; 4) assessment of the Object’s current condition.

The Object’s special features in terms of the effective Russian law. Improving the Object’s protection systems. Establishing the Object’s outstanding universal value. Identifying issues in the Object’s preservation. Analyzing requirements to activities within the territory of the cultural heritage object of federal value (site) Historic Center of Yaroslavl and ensuring the Object’s preservation. Insufficiency of requirements to preservation of attributes of authentic urban tissue. The issue concerning preservation of the environment-forming buildings and beautification elements, integrity of architectural and urban tissue. Lack of any instrument to comply with the international regulations concerning World Heritage. Analyzing new construction’s impact on the Object’s outstanding universal value. Methods of assessment of new development projects which may have a negative impact on the Object’s visual integrity and authenticity. Implementing the ‘historic settlement’ status and the statutory procedures to assess major construction projects’ compliance with the protection objects in a historic settlement.
Conclusions: 1. It is imperative to develop legal instruments for protecting the historic urban tissue within the Object’s territory and its buffer zone. 2. It is necessary to develop methods of architectural and urban tissue preservation. 3. It is necessary to control new buildings and structures design quality, scale, materials and scope when such structures are to be located within the Object’s boundaries and its buffer zone. 4. It is necessary to establish the Object’s managing body to implement sustainable actions towards the Object’s efficient management.

The Issues in Preservation of the Duderhof Heights
Rubanik, A.V., Member of ICOMOS, Saint Petersburg

The Duderhof Heights are located near the boundaries of the Component No. 540-031 Duderhof Heights of the Historic Center of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments UNESCO World Heritage Site and include the Orekhovaya, the Voronya and Kirchhof hills. The Kirchhof hill is located in the Leningrad Region while the Voronya and Orekhovaya hills at 1.5 km distance from the Kirchhof hill are under the Saint Petersburg jurisdiction. The Saint Petersburg Government has taken measures ensuring preservation of the part of the Duderhof Heights under the city’s jurisdiction: the Voronya and Orekhovaya hills have a status of protected natural territory, within this area there is the Nagorny Park, a Cultural Heritage Object of Regional Significance. In spite of all this the historic landscapes get swarmed with cottages while the monuments located in the city part of the Duderhof Heights (the building of the former St. George Sisters of Mercy Hospital, the A.P. Verlander Mineral Water Factory, the Duderhof railway station and the wooden homes for disabled) are in urgent need of restoration. The building of the former Bakery House (early 19th century) on the Orekhovaya hill at mere 30 m distance from the city boundary is deteriorating and is not protected on the regional level as a cultural heritage object.

The Kirchhof hill located in the Leningrad Region is not protected either as it should be under the national law. Moreover, despite its international protection status that the Kirchhof hill has been given in 1990 as an element of the World Heritage Object No. 540, the construction of the Tuutari Park ski resort began in 1998, the hill’s terrain has been modified, the church’s foundation and a part of historical cemetery ended up beneath a ski slope. At present it is possible that three more sports centers and four cottage communities get built on the rest of the hill (construction works on one of these — the Russkoye Oruzhiye Sports Shooting Complex — was commenced without prior historical and cultural assessment). Up to 2017 the municipal and regional authorities had no information about the Kirchhof hill’s being a part of the UNESCO protected object.

Since 2016 the Ministry for Culture of the Russian Federation has been developing documentation for attributing the Kirchhof hill as a Cultural Heritage Object of Federal Significance and a Site. At the same time the Leningrad Region Governor has approved the documentation on the plot planning for one of the sports center projects; the municipal authority has developed the Regulation on Land Usage and Development which allow construction of cottage communities on the Kirchhof hill. The World Heritage Committee is still unaware of the planned construction. This situation is obviously in direct contradiction with the key provisions of the Convention Concerning the Protection of World Heritage and the Guidelines for its implementation.

Urban Planning Restoration as One of the Key Methods in Preservation of World Heritage in the Context of Its Development

Safonov, V.I., Member of ICOMOS, Yaroslavl
The modern times paradigm, especially since 2004 when the Urban Planning Code of the Russian Federation has been adopted, can be characterized by degeneration of urban planning and architectural activities over the last decades, growing criminality in decision making in the field of construction on historic sites, merging of authorities with developers and lobbying developers’ interests.

The role of urban planning architects responsible for harmonious urban development is virtually limited to accommodating any developers’ desires. In most cases an architect has become a mere draftsman educated in technical standards. This is the environment in which many a deformation of architectural and urban tissue of historic settlements manifests themselves (the Yaroslavl case).

One of the most important methods of urban planning aimed at preservation and development of historic settlements is urban planning restoration. The principles of the urban planning restoration have been worked out in response to the public demand in Europe for recreation of architectural appearance of the historic cities destroyed during the World War II which was vital for nations self-identification and for preservation of their cultural codes.

The term ‘urban-planning restoration’ is not mentioned in the basic documents regulating urban planning in our country. However, I believe its introduction into legal, scientific and practical vocabulary would be very timely. This idea is quite vague in the protecting laws (73-FZ) in the Art. 47 ‘Recreation of a Lost Cultural Heritage Object’, while a great number of lost objects which were not granted this status in due time (churches and cathedrals destroyed in the USSR in 1930s) and which characterize architectural appearance of historic settlements as a result of this situation have no legal foundation to be recreated.

The proposed term unlike ‘recreation of a cultural heritage object’ has its specifics, a wider territorial coverage and can be a primary tool for the urban planning activity in historical settlements while renovation and reconstruction; this is extremely important for our country that suffered the greatest loss of historical and cultural heritage over the past century.

Factors Contributing to Degeneration of Valuable Historical Urban Tissue as Exemplified by the Petrogradsky District of Saint Petersburg

Semykina, L.V., Member of ICOMOS, Saint Petersburg

The Petrogradsky Administrative District’s area located on six islands of the Neva delta makes a significant portion of one of the components of the Historic Center of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monument World Heritage Object. Entire area of the District is within the zone of protected cultural heritage objects according to the regional law. However, declared protected status does not ensure conservation of the historic environment’s valuable features.

Realization of major infrastructure projects (the Western High-Speed Diameter, cable-stayed bridges and elevated roads), cutting down monuments’ areas (the Petrovsky Park, the Primorsky Victory Park), high-rise construction along the banks of the delta, replacing historical urban tissue with modern buildings (based on groundless declaring old buildings’s state irreparable or even forged dating of their construction) results in irreversible degeneration of the historic tissue.

Flows of the effective legal instruments for cultural heritage protection should also be considered factors contributing to such negative consequences.

On the federal level:
- lacking requirement of impact assessment according to the Cl. 172 of the Guideline for implementation of the 1972 Convention;
- lacking requirement to establish separate protected zones for each cultural heritage object within integrated protected zones etc..

On the regional level:
- unwarranted land boundary survey disregarding historical boundaries of land plots;
- lacking limitations of land plot areas within protected zones which results in emerging capital structures incongruent to the existing environment;
- lacking clear definitions in the legal instruments or obscure wording which give an opportunity to arbitrarily manipulate the existing limitations;
- construction and reconstruction without area planning projects which are subject to public discussions;
- lacking tools for obtaining information of pending transformations prior to their beginning;
- consistent downsizing of the objects of historical value that are essential for the urban tissue and that have been earlier established by the law, etc.

The Issue of Preservation of the Diominsky Garden, a 20th-century Garden Art Object

Starozhorskaya, L.V., Member of ICOMOS, Saint Petersburg
Lavrentiev, N.V., Member of ICOMOS, Saint Petersburg

The Diominsky Garden located at the Melnichnaya street at the Obukhovskoy Oborony Prospect is a part of the Neva Riva and Its Banks component No. 540-029 of the Historic Center of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments UNESCO World Heritage Object.

The garden has been laid out in 1933 on the plot that earlier belonged to the Russian-American Metal Company’s plant. On one side it faces the former Diominskaya street (now the Professor Kachalov street) which was named after A.P. Diomin, founder of the former glass factory.

So far we don’t know who the garden’s original designer was; the garden’s layout can be seen quite clearly on the 1942 aerial photography. In 1947 a new design for the garden’s beautification has been developed at the Workshop No. 13 of the Lenproyekt Institute and the original layout has been slightly modified.

Unfortunately, even though the garden is historical and compactly fits in the architectural tissue of the area it has never been identified as a city landmark of historical significance within protected zones or as a protected object within a historic settlement. This made it possible to start taking out a part of the garden’s area from the General Plan’s recreational zone in 2008 and then in 2010 to allow construction of office buildings on more than half the area of the garden.

These circumstances urged the local community supported by the historic preservation activists to take legal action since to all their petitions against construction in the garden the Saint Petersburg Government answered that the territory in question is no longer considered a garden. After one year of hearings the court took the community side and recognized construction in the garden illegal.

In addition, the developer failed to conduct an impact assessment which is required by the cl. 172 of the Guideline to implementation of the 1972 Convention. None of this, however, stopped Smolny from extending the garden lease agreement for another three years although the developer could not avail itself of this additional time to realize its project.

At present, the city community supported by MPs of various levels have raised the issues of formally returning the cut-off plot to the Diominsky Garden and of a necessity of beautification of the entire garden’s area as of the 1947 design as well as of registering the garden as a city landmark of historical value in the urban planning documentation.

The Pulkovo Observatory’s Research Activities as an Integral Attribute of Outstanding Universal Value

Chernyshev, V.A., Member of ICOMOS, Saint Petersburg
The Central Astronomical Observatory of the Russian Academy of Sciences at Pulkovo is the component No. 540-008 of the Historic Center of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments World Heritage Object. Being a research institution it is one of the most valuable cultural heritage sites in the Russian Federation. It represents a combination of properties of an architectural ensemble and a research institution.

The Pulkovo Observatory is one of the oldest active astronomical observatories in the world (opened in 1839). This is its major attribute of outstanding universal value as a component of the World Heritage Object and this makes it so important for the contemporary science.

1. The Pulkovo Observatory is the first specialized research institution in Russia. Over 179 years of its existence (except the war and post-war periods) it produced consistently high scientific achievements. Never in its history had the Observatory had any periods of degeneration of its scientific level even down to a medium one.

2. The Observatory’s scientific activities’ attributes always included diversity of research directions, rigorous selection of research methods, initiating role in developing research directions for new observatories and prototypes of unique instruments (RATAN, BTA, BTA pavilion, the Linnik interferometer, the smaller interferometer, geodesic comparator of the small basis, horizontal transit instrument etc.).

3. Over the Observatory’s entire history a great deal of the Russian astronomers used to work there — about half of them at the foundation time and about 10% at the present time.

4. The Pulkovo scientific school always had observation, theory and design components; their ratio differed with the times but all of them were always present. Observation, prototyping, training new specialists were the usual kinds of activities for the Observatory without which its scientific process may lose its authenticity.

5. At the present observations at the Pulkovo Observatory — despite anthropogenic depressing factors — retain their scientific value. It is possible because of the Pulkovo hill’s excellent natural features, of the sparse anthropogenic environment in the protected park zone, of the expertly selected specialization in astrometry. When the Observatory was constructed in 1839 the relevant European expertise has been taken into consideration.

6. The anthropogenic factors are gradually increasing while still are within physical control; negative trend towards their increase is not predetermined a priori. For example the city air since mid-20th century has become much more clean and transparent because of new technologies in power engineering and car industry.

7. The Observatory’s observations contribute to formation of intangible heritage of the global astronomy through consistent accumulating scientific data. The very process of continuous observations from the same point is a component of universal cultural value.

8. The Observatory’s observations are evolving due to scientific and technical progress; however, a certain core of classical instruments, in particular the Grand Refractor remains unchanged. One of the most precious attributes of the Grand Refractor is exceptional stability of its parameters proven by the long history of observations.

9. Since observations are a key element of the Pulkovo Observatory’s scientific authenticity the conditions of observations are equally an attribute of authenticity. Certain parameters are set as rigid, such as terrain altitude, but most of them have been formed as a result of the historic process in which the Observatory used to have a determining influence on the surrounding landscape. The air quality required for observations was determined by the law over the entire history of the Observatory through establishing protected zones (one mile, 5 km, 3 km) and it ensured that dark sky became an integral protected parameter of the landscape. Should large residential blocks get constructed in the Protected park zone around the Pulkovo Observatory light
pollution would increase manifold which would endanger observations and even cause their termination.

10. In applied geodesic works the zero-point time series are of extreme importance. Inability to continue the zero-point time series would result in the old high-class catalogues becoming non-referential in relation to the entire sequence of all similar catalogues from the past years; it would be impossible to compare certain points with established coordinates in the long perspective.

The Urban Planning Strategies for Preventing Degeneration of Historic Urban Tissue: Draft Restoration and Adaptation Design for the Apraksin Dvor and Mariinsky Market (Former Shchukin Dvor) Cultural Heritage Object

Yaveyn, N.I., Member of ICOMOS, Saint Petersburg

The Apraksin Dvor and Mariinsky Market (Former Shchukin Dvor) Cultural Heritage Object of federal significance has 58 historical buildings and spans the area of about 12 ha. This is the largest of the 19th-century markets which clustered along the Sadovaya street. By 1917 the Apraksin Dvor was one of the largest markets in Europe. In the 1990s the Apraksin Dvor’s buildings have been privatized, some of them have been reconstructed to their owners’ taste, gaps have been filled with kiosks with neither plan nor design.

This way the Apraksin Dvor has become the cheapest consumer goods market; low prices based on low rent rates for dilapidated spaces. Virtually the market became a slum and a place for hawkers in the very heart of the city. Over the last decade the city authorities have made several attempts at revitalizing the Apraksin Dvor by means of one major investor but all those attempts were useless. It became clear that the ‘grand project’ model does not fit the Apraksin Dvor’s motley ownership pattern: solving this riddle would take methodical dealing with property owners.

The draft restoration and adaptation design for the Apraksin Dvor developed by the ‘Studia 44’ (headed by N.I. Yaveyn) in 2017 introduces the oldest Saint Petersburg shopping and warehousing area as a fully-featured residential block: residential space would be balanced by working spaces (co-working spaces, workshops, service shops), retail spaces (retail park, food market, art salons, boutiques, restaurants and cafes) and cultural infrastructure (experimental stage of the Big Drama Theatre, Museum of Saint Petersburg Merchants).

The project could be considered a restoration master plan or guidance manual for investors: proposed functional zoning and transport infrastructure for the area are complemented with detailed information on each of the 58 historical buildings. For each building there is a certificate of condition in which all modifications of its appearance are listed, protection objects and restoration regimens are indicated, ideas for restoration and adaptation are proposed.

The area’s transport infrastructure supposes a system of underground passages which would separate pedestrians and vehicles on different levels, thus substantially improving quality of living standards.

Panel 2. Cultural Landscapes as World Heritage Objects

The Strategy for Forming a Tentative List of Nominated World Heritage Objects as Exemplified by the Russian Country Estate Ensembles

Alekhina, E.A., Member of ICOMOS, Saint Petersburg
Russian country estates over their entire history (mid-18th — early 20th centuries) and until today remained most potent keepers of the Russian culture. Each region of Russia has its own famous nobility estates of which many are included in the National State Register of the Cultural Heritage Objects (History and Culture Monuments) of the peoples of the Russian Federation as monuments of federal and regional significance. There are also newly identified cultural heritage objects. Although certain efforts are made towards cataloguing estate complexes, there are plenty of organizations and charity foundations dealing with this issue (the Society for Study of Russian Country Estates as one of the examples) and there is understanding of their value, the situation differs in various regions and the estates protection is implemented on local levels and mainly depends on degree of preservation. Often, if buildings have not survived, protection of estate park or natural landscape complex would be simply lifted.

For more systematic and centralized studies as well as in order to develop methods of preservation of Russian country estates as a phenomenon of the Russian culture the authors propose to draw up a single list of Russian country estates, mark them on one single map for further nominating them to the World Heritage List. It would help develop a uniform system of recording and studying and generating individual concepts for estates usage and preservation.

This work has to be done in the regions and consolidated by the ICOMOS Research Committee for Russian Country Estates Studies (Russian Estates) that we also propose to establish. The preparatory stage of works would include studying other organizations’ and specialized societies’ positive experience and involving them in this work.

One of the positive examples is D. Fedorova-Zemlyanskaya’s signature project ‘Nobility Estates. Podmoskovnye.ru’. It covers 17 regions of Russia as well as Crimea — there is a map with all the estates studied by the project author presented on the website. In many of the estates their buildings (main house and service structures) and parks with water bodies have survived, therefore they can be nominated to the World Heritage List. However, there are estates that are less studied and that have suffered great loss (for example, main house is missing but historic landscape has survived) but that are of great significance for their respective regions, Russia and the global culture as a whole.

Studying country estates in the Leningrad Region (hereinafter referred as LR) requires a centralized approach. In our region such studies were conducted by L. Myslina, N. Murashova et al. In 1990–2010s they have published several books in the ‘Nobility Estates of the Saint Petersburg Province’ series which covered the Lomonosovsky District, the South Ladoga area, the Kirovsky and Volkhovsky Districts. As of today there is no single map for all of the LR estates.

On the five cases of LR estates studied by the authors in the Lomonosovsky and Kingiseppsky Districts that are in danger of extinction as historical cultural landscapes it is possible to identify categories of their usage and single out aspects of their preservation.

Preserved planning framework with some elements of partly conserved landscape (graveyard, estate garden, etc.) in the Valgovitsy estate (mid to late 19th century) served as a base for a village with its particular pattern and type of layout. It has to be noted that the villagers value the surviving elements of the estate and the memory of those who used to live in it which contributes to historic and spiritual authenticity of this place.

In the case of the Medushi estate (mid 18th to 19th century) we can be sure that the estate park with surviving old trees, terrain, elements of layout and a water maze over 200 years of its existence has become an integral landscape ensemble. The historic landscape has become a base for a natural biogeocenose as an integral system of plants, soil, water, terrain and animals and this ecosystem has become stable within time and space, undergone natural conservation of a kind.

The Romanovka estate (1840s–late 19th century) is located in the center of the town of Kingisepp which determined its further development as a town’s entertainment park. Natural macro-landscape on a peninsula formed by a bend of the Luga — a water-abundant river with
scenic panoramas of its banks — served as a framework for the manmade spacious cultural landscape. The Romanovka estate has become a planning core for the nature and culture complex and, being its part has preserved certain elements of historical ensemble such as parkways, scenic paths, copes and groups of valuable old trees, hilly terrain and architectural structures.

The Pustomerzha estate (1st third of the 19th – early 20th centuries) like many Russian estates was laid out near a natural stream where a manmade water system in a shape of a dyke bridge over the river and a series of scenic ponds were created. The estate’s strategic location at a crossroads has not only determined its dominant position among surrounding villages but also gave it a potential for development in the conditions of present-day city planning: in 1960s a school has been built on the estate’s main house foundation. Since mid-20th century the Pustomerzha estate has been functioning as an education and museum complex on which territory historical landscape and architectural elements have survived: planning framework with rows of old trees, groups and copses of century-old oak trees and linden trees, water structures as well as service structures.

The Alexandrovskaya Gorka estate (19th century) located far from the city, of all the estates that we have studied, is using its potential in the conditions of modern city planning the least. However, it has preserved the elements of historical landscape typical for Russian estates: landscape layout with some elements of a regular park, century-old trees, water bodies with related structures, terrain, architectural structures such as service buildings are in semi-deteriorated state. This estate also has memorial significance. There is indirect evidence that poet Alexander Pushkin used to visit the estate. This makes it viable for being included in a series of estate complexes (for example links to the Suyda estate). Certain spots in the estate territory have been identified for adaptation for culture and education centre under the condition of conservation of the estate’s landscape and historical and cultural value.

Based on the conducted studies we can come to conclusion that Russian country estates as historical landscape ensembles have significant potential for sustainable development in the present conditions of city planning. At the same time Russian estates that retained their historical authenticity are of great significance for the global culture and are viable for nomination to the World Heritage List.

Cultural Landscape of Pereyaslavl–Zalessky: the 1157 Transfiguration Cathedral with Adjacent Ramparts and Archaeological Heritage Objects — Prospects for Studying and Conservation

Andreeva A.Y., Member of ICOMOS, Yaroslavl

Areas around the Pleshcheyevo Lake including the ancient town of Pereyaslavl-Zalessky represent an incredibly intact territory in terms of its local identity and intangible culture, a territory that we tentatively defined as cultural landscape.

These days the Pereyaslavl-Zalessky area is under major study aimed at establishing its boundaries, describing and drafting its nomination dossier as a World Heritage Site (WHS) ‘Cultural Landscape of Pereyaslavl-Zalessky: the 1157 Transfiguration Cathedral with Adjacent Ramparts and Archaeological Heritage Objects’. This territory is the best preserved example of a medieval city in the North-Eastern Rus with defense systems, sacral spaces of ecclesiastic architecture and cultural landscape of adjacent areas which have direct effect upon the urban tissue development. The nominated object has the following elements: the 1157 Transfiguration Cathedral, the City Ramparts from the 12th century, the lost town of Kleshchin mentioned in ancient chronicles.

The developed comprehensive set of documentation on the Object including, first of all, a Management Plan as well as relevant maps would contribute to maximum preservation of the integral special environment of the cultural landscape having its roots in intangible yet fundamental objects in which the Pleshcheyevo Lake area is so abundant — archaeological heritage objects.
Building the integrated information base containing items and tools of the WHS Management Plan and cartographic records in the geographic information system format would allow ensuring the object’s maximum preservation and raising its monitoring efficiency. We believe that developing such system should be the next step after completing comprehensive studies and making up nomination dossier.

Such a database may have various access levels; it may happen that there would be an access level for tourists visiting the Object as it would help its promotion and, with due visitor flow management, would contribute to additional monitoring of the cultural landscape territory.

In order to preserve the historical and cultural landscape in 1978 the Project for Protected Territories of Historical and Cultural Monuments in Pereyaslavl-Zalessky has been developed and it is still in effect. Some provisions of the Project have been revised and updated in the nomination dossier under development.

**Cultural Landscape at the Oka and the Volga Confluence as a Unique Phenomenon**

Vinogradova, T.P., Member of ICOMOS, Nizhniy Novgorod

Ivanov, A.V., Member of ICOMOS, Nizhniy Novgorod

At the confluence of the rivers Oka and Volga one of the largest Russian cities — Nizhniy Novgorod — is situated. First of all the confluence area is unique for its geological history. Over hundreds of millions of years since the Paleozoic Era over the East European platform that then was a sea bottom the sedimentary stratum was building up and by the end of the Mesozoic Era it was over 1000 m deep. During the Cenozoic Era the Eastern part of the Russian Plate was lowering which led to formation of the present Caspian basin. Three million years ago the slow processes of sediment accumulating gave way to the dynamic era of landscape transformation by the largest rivers of the East-European Platform — Oka and Volga, each of which is over 1000 km long from their headstream to the point of confluence. Under the Coriolis force the Volga was shifting to the South and the Oka to the East, washing away the latest 100 m strong layer of sediments down to the Permian period. This resulted in the only European view where the immense floodplain valley on the left bank is opposed by the 100 m high right bank of the Oka and Volga. In clear weather from the Verkhnevolzhskaya embankment one can see the 35 km wide Volga plains and the largest in mid-latitudes oak grove near Gorodets as well as the Southern corner of the largest natural zone on the planet — taiga. The Verkhnevolzhskaya embankment is perceived as a European terrace above Asia. At the same time, when viewed from the Strelka and the Volga stream the Dyatlov Gory with a necklace of the Kremlin walls look like the majestically elevated celestial throne above the endless East European Plain.

In terms of formation mechanisms and aesthetic perfection, the Oka and Volga confluence is a unique geological creation symbolizing the triumph of dynamic transformation forces of nature over slow processes of disintegration and decline. Foundation of a big and dynamic city at this place has deep symbolism. The city’s heart is the Nizhgorodsky Kremlin, an element of the Volga slope’s architectural ensemble. The Alexandrovsky garden and the Volga slope together make one of the most scenic sights in the world. The Oka side of the ensemble includes the historical Rozhdestvenskaya street with well-preserved environment and a gem of the Stroganovskaya church. Between the Nizhgorodsky Kremlin and the Rozhdestvenskaya street the Square of People Unity is located — it witnessed the Minin and Pozharsky’s militia setting out to liberate Russia. The unique cultural landscape at the Oka and Volga confluence deserves to be included in the World Heritage List.

**The South Coast of Crimea as a Potential World Heritage Object. Protection Issues**

Vitenberg, E.V., Saint Petersburg
The South Coast of Crimea (SCC) has no peers neither in Russia nor anywhere in the world. In terms of climate, natural beauty, combination of mountains and sea it can be compared with the best sites of the Mediterranean coast (the Cote d’Azur in France and the Amalfi Riviera in Italy, both UNESCO Sites). What makes it unique is the fact it is manmade and its size (about 701 km long). The entire SCC landscape rising from the sea to the mountain bottoms is manmade. The SCC from the very beginning was Russia’s government project. Property owners were encouraged to invest huge amounts in parks and estates which resulted in the unique phenomenon in terms of its scope.

The South Coast of Crimea as a World Heritage Territory project is implemented by the D.S. Likhachov Foundation in collaboration with the State Hermitage and other organizations. The project’s objective is to describe SCC in detail and to conceptualize it as a comprehensive object, to analyze its authenticity and integrity as well as to assess threats to the heritage’s integrity. The result will be an objective assessment of the SCC cultural complex as a potential UNESCO World Heritage site.

While working on the concept of the SCC cultural and natural heritage and its universal value the South Coast of Crimea as a World Heritage Territory project’s experts have come up with two ideas: the idea of a ‘serial object’ (several palace and park ensembles) and the idea to consider this territory a ‘Garden Coast’. In this ‘park’ there are many mile-long ‘parkways’ (The Royal Path), walkways along the entire coast that existed here until recent times, the Nikitsky Botanic Garden as a center of this ‘park’. Palaces and gardens, estates, spa complexes and dachas — all of them are architectural elements of this manmade park.

At the same time it has to be noted that although certain architectural ensembles of the Royal Coast are in the state that complies with their state protection status, their environs used to and still are being aggressively developed. This practice has to be opposed through the state and the Crimea government developing a special cultural policy towards the SCC historical and cultural heritage. The announced project is to contribute to it.

One of the takeaways by the project working group is that the issue of the SCC nominating to the UNESCO World Heritage List is worth raising.

Experience of the System Approach to Preservation of Spiritual, Cultural and Natural Heritage of the Golgotha-Crucifixion Priory on the Anzer Island (the Solovetsky Archipelago)

Yevgenyeva, L.V., Member of ICOMOS, Solovetsky village, the Arkhangelsk Region

This presentation is an attempt at a retrospective assessment and analysis of approaches to preservation of spiritual, cultural and natural heritage. The Anzer Island, one of the Solovetsky Archipelago, is inhabited by monks and oblates. The island’s territory is a single and integral space within the World Heritage Site on the UNESCO World Heritage List.

Keeping up traditions and memory is the essence of the Russian Orthodoxy. The monastic order has been reestablished in the early 21st century. Its priority was to preserve the ancient rites of life at the Priory on the Golgotha, however gradually the repair and restoration works started to unfold at the cultural heritage sites.

Since 2000 the designs have been developed and the repair and restoration works completed on more than 10 cultural heritage sites. Whenever possible, historical monastery landscapes also get recreated. Pilgrimage and tourism to the island have resumed as soon as the monastic life has been revived.
This case shows that the comprehensive approach to cultural heritage preservation, development and management is correct, it smoothly fits in the UNESCO World Heritage Object Management Plan. No tangible object void of spiritual scope can become a significant cultural phenomenon which once again proves inseparable unity of spiritual and cultural heritage (once upon a time these concepts were identical).

It can be stated that only through historical treatment of monastic heritage on a systematic basis it is possible to preserve all the wonderful heritage of the Solovetsky Monastery as a whole and its Priories in particular. It is obvious that the status of a Religious and Historic Site of federal significance — development of which has already began — is most befitting the diversity of monastic settlements and sites, tangible and intangible components of the Solovetsky Monastery ensemble as a part of the archipelago. Such a status has been approved not only by the Russian Orthodox Church, the Russian expert community and the Russian Government but also by international experts.

Range of Issues Concerning Cultural Landscape in World Heritage Management Plans
Kolbovsky, E.Y., Moscow

Cultural landscapes (CL) are integral components of each heritage object, be it a fragment of an urban tissue of historical value or a traditional countryside. However, from the perspective of the effective Russian law landscape represents just environment for architectural and cultural sites, a background or ‘backdrop’ of a kind for the principal site or a group of sites. Nevertheless, the issues of landscape protection and maintenance inevitably present themselves as heritage site management plans are being developed when it ‘suddenly’ turns out that a cultural landscape is not something to be taken for granted and requiring mere conservation but a complex and ever changing entity possessing a wide range of features.

We define cultural landscape as a system formed as a result of interaction of an ethnos with nature and including elements of object-spatial tissue of various nature — local (sacred centers and structures), linear (roads and boundaries) and areal (various farm fields, parks, lakes etc.) as well as parameters of their interaction (patterns), traditional utilization, maintenance and improvement techniques and finally features of intangible heritage that ‘animate’ a landscape (local tales, myths and folk art). With all this in mind preservation and maintaining a cultural landscape calls for developing special sections within WHS management plans that should include the following: 1) finding patterns in tourists and visitors queries in a process of WHS perception and modelling CL visual structures that relate to such queries; 2) modelling visual functions for particular CL components for building CL’s comprehensive visual appearance and integral aesthetic features; 3) assessment and parameterization of CL’s target state based on historical reconstruction in order to preserve authentic attributes and meet modern functions and requirements; 4) developing territory management plan that is based on a landscape target state and that provides for recreation (reconstruction), preservation and maintaining a cultural landscape.

Such sections have been developed for a series of WHS and nominees including the Island of Kizhi cultural landscape and the Kenozero National Park.

Wooden Architecture: Preventing Losses, Managing the Present and the Future
Kudryavtsev, A. P., Member of ICOMOS, Moscow

Wood, the ancient and the most environmentally friendly construction material, gave rise to a unique phenomenon: the ancient Russian architecture. Ensembles of the North European part of Russia — monasteries, chapels, skeets of the North and Siberia, urban wooden buildings — are a striking phenomenon both in the global architecture and in urban development. The state of preservation of historical wooden architecture in general gives serious reasons for concern: the major part of irreparable losses fall under this category. So far the most efficient method of their
conservation is to move them over to the protected areas of the open-air museums of wooden architecture; however, even this cannot save the wooden masterpieces.

Fifteen years ago the church from the Spas-Vezha has burned down after 50 years of having been safely positioned in the Ipatyevsky Monastery in Kostroma, a place that was supposed to guarantee the masterpiece's safety. People from all over the world used to come to admire the gigantic logs of which the church was built.

Establishing open-air museums does not guarantee the absolute preservation for WHS and unfortunately may lead to losing the essential criteria of the UNESCO Outstanding Universal Value such as integrity and authenticity. The case of the relocation of the 17th century Candlemas-St. Michael's Church's, a landmark of the lost village of Krasnaya Lyaga, is an evidence of this trend: the Church's existence can be ensured only through its inaccessibility; however, only experts in property conservation can tell how to ensure its safety. We meet such experts every day but unfortunately not at the WHS sites. It is imperative that an interdepartmental conference on this subject be organized under the auspices of the Federation Council. This subject has been raised again at the VII Parliamentary Forum Historical and Cultural Heritage of Russia that took place on June 28, 2018 in Suzdal and was dedicated to development of restoration, conservation of the wooden architecture monuments and volunteers engagement in this process.

'We are concerned about such gems as the wooden architectural heritage that does not exist anywhere else in the world; we should not let them get lost, we should preserve them for the future generations', said V. I. Matvienko in her address.

On the 10th of August the Assumption Church in Kondopoga, a monument of federal significance and an iconic example of the Russian North, has burned down. The Council of NC ICOMOS, Russia has approached the Prime Minister of the Russian Federation D.A. Medvedev with a proposal to take urgent measures to ensure the safety of the monuments of the wooden architecture in the Russian North, Siberia and the Far East.

Issues and Perspectives Concerning Nominating Russian Cultural Landscapes to the World Heritage List

Kuleshova, M. E. Member of ICOMOS, Moscow

Cultural landscapes constitute a significant part of the World Heritage. Such countries as France, Germany, Italy, Great Britain, China are the leaders in terms of numbers of cultural landscapes on the World Heritage List. Unfortunately, Russia is not one of them. Greece, Spain, Mexico, India and the Czech Republic also demonstrate the proactive approach to heritage landscapes. The only Russian-Lithuanian object – the Curonian Spit is officially recognized as a cultural landscape through Lithuania's initiative. Chersonesos Taurica received recognition as a cultural landscape through Ukraine's efforts. Some of the Russian world heritage sites are considered cultural landscapes, based on conceptual approaches by the experts who study them and by the monitoring missions that assess their state: among them are the Solovky and Saint Petersburg with environs. Russia's tentative list contains the Kenozero National Park as a cultural landscape. Of course, this does not reflect the country's wealth of cultural landscapes. As to the policy regarding Russia's representation on the World Heritage List, it is limited to nominating
Kremlins, monasteries and capital cities as architectural ensembles. The positive trend of the recent years is in the closer attention to the archaeological complexes and paleo-cultural landscapes. In our opinion, the solution to the issue of Russia's more prominent presence on the global arena is in the comprehensive implementation of the cultural landscape concept which allows considering both various cultural layers of different times (or the types of historically formed cultural practices) and Russia's geographically predetermined extremely high ethnic and cultural diversity. A number of objects recognized as natural heritage also has cultural value and in fact, they are mixed natural-cultural heritage phenomena. These include the Baikal Lake, The UbsuNur, The Golden Mountains of the Altai; and the 'Bashkir Ural' and Pazyryk on the tentative list. The most appropriate management subjects and forms of protection for cultural and landscape heritage are the museum-reserves and national parks. The vast majority of the Russian cultural world heritage sites are museum-reserves. There are also other institutional forms of protection for landscape heritage, which in right combination give the best possible effect. Legal protection of the world heritage sites in Russia calls for major amendments to the legislation.

Panoramas of Historic Cities in the Volga River Cultural Landscape as Heritage Objects

Ryzhova, T.S., Member, ICOMOS, Nizhniy Novgorod

Two events of which the Nizhniy Novgorod community is concerned are to the great extent a reason for this address. The first one is the fate of the Strelka (spit), a place of confluence of the Volga, the major Russian river and the Oka river. The second one is preparing for celebration of the 800th anniversary of Nizhniy Novgorod’s foundation and the related to it substantiation for nomination of the Nizhgorodsky Kremlin Cultural Heritage Object of Federal Significance for the UNESCO World Heritage List. After many discussions experts have decided to nominate the Nizhgorodsky Kremlin in the Cultural Landscape category. The historical part of Nizhniy Novgorod—along the Oka up to the Annunciation Monastery and along the Volga up to the Pechersky Monastery—is supposed to be included in the Object’s boundaries while the Nizhgorodsky Kremlin ‘majestically elevated’ upon the Dyatlovy Hills’ slopes is to become an architectural and landscape essence in the scenic river panorama.

Rivers used to be major transport routes in all civilizations of the world and the Volga’s role in Russia’s populating and urban formation is hard to overestimate. Historic panoramas of the cities along the Volga were always unique and followed national traditions, reflected each city’s functional features and governing ideologies of their respective times: the City Law, the City Foundation Statute and other regulations. The Volga’s cultural landscape as a result of nature’s and men’s joint efforts is in full compliance with the methods developed by UNESCO for the World Cultural and Natural Heritage.

River panoramas in the context of information and axiological approach most clearly demonstrate richness of natural and cultural layers in heritage objects, they visually prove their information value, century-long evolution, integrity and authenticity. This is why it is imperative to refer to river panoramas of historic cities within the Volga’s cultural landscape as Heritage Objects. It has to be noted that in this case the instruments of the state protection also cover river bank terrains as well as settlement’s ravine and valley topography, small and big rivers’ beds, natural and manmade vegetation and distant visual links which are to bind a city with its architectural ensembles as a whole in its natural environs. However, it would be much more realistic to solve the issues of their protection if at least the oldest ones had a ‘historic settlement’ status.

The Decree of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic dated July 31, 1970 has approved The List of Cities and other Settlements in the RSFSR Having
Architectural Monuments, Urban Ensembles and Complexes Representing National Cultural Monuments, Preserved Natural Ensembles and Ancient Cultural Layer of Archaeological and Cultural Value. There were 115 cities and other types of settlements on the List. The List has been expanded by further Government decrees: up to 426 cities, 54 settlements and 56 villages in 1990 and up to 478 cities and other types of settlements in 2001. But the joint order by the Ministry for Culture and the Ministry for Regional Development of the Russian Federation No. 418 and 339 dated 29.07.2010 ‘On Approval of the List of Historic Settlements’ the List has been reduced to 41 historic cities, excluded were even such oldest cities of the Volga region, significant in the history of Russia as Tver, Balakhna, Gorodets, Nizhniy Novgorod, Saratov and many others.

Cutting the number of historic settlements makes the issue of protection status for river panoramas in cultural landscapes ever more serious. Regardless of the definition in the law the officially approved number of historic settlements in Russia is little above forty which is very far from reality. It is imperative to get back to the issue of status, number and legal form of historic settlements and it has to be resolved on the legislative level as soon as possible. Since developing a new list might take decades anything that still has any value among panoramas of historic settlements in the Volga region and in the rest of the country might be lost forever.

Challenges in Preservation of Historical and Cultural Landscapes of Transnational Significance on the Example of Ivangoord and Narva

Stieglitz, M. S., Member of ICOMOS, Saint Petersburg

One of the most important directions of ICOMOS activities is joining efforts on the international level in order to preserve the integrity of cross-border historical and cultural landscapes. One of such examples is the Narva river which forms a natural border between the Russian Federation and Estonia. At a distance of 1.5–2 km from the Ivangoord and Narva fortresses upstream, there is the Krenholm island. It divides the river into two branches. In the past, there used to be the famous Narva waterfalls there which were a magnificent sight and were a great opportunity to harness the energy of falling water. Development of cotton industry in the Narva province was encouraged by the government incentives to those ‘who would set up big factories or plants at the Narva waterfall’ (when in 1956 the Narva hydro-power station was built, a water supply canal has been constructed which drained the river bed dry; the waterfalls can only be seen when the water is discharged). In 1836 Baron Ludwig Stieglitz, a banker and philanthropist founded a wool-mill of the Society of the Narva factory which later has been reconstructed and expanded by his son Alexander. In 1851, not far from it, on a man-made island with many a canal, A. Stieglitz founded his flax-spinning mill. The whole area was named Parusinka. The wool-mill structures — adapted for residential purposes in 1950s — have preserved their historical appearance. The flax-spinning mill that retained its industrial profile is partly out of business. Factories along the village, the park and the remains of the estate, the Holy Trinity church and the hydraulic structures have formed a unique natural and man-made landscape, a cultural heritage object of the Russian Federation of regional significance. In 1857 the entrepreneur Ludwig Knoop has established the Manufacture Partnership on the left bank of the river; its buildings have been recorded in the Estonian Register of Cultural Monuments. These factories are in better condition than the Russian ones, but they also need a better functionality.

Compositional ties between the Narva and the Krenholm manufacturies which cannot be considered in isolation from the water system has determined the Narva-Ivangoord landscape's transnational significance. We believe that preservation of these valuable properties of the two countries as well as their use as tourism destinations or for other cultural purposes are very important and call for a unified approach to studying and preservation of the Narva river basin.
Panel 3. World Heritage Sites' Boundaries: Methods of Delimitation, Legislative Gaps

Delimitation of the Great Patriotic War Sites (the Heroes of Stalingrad Battle Memorial Complex on the Mamayev Kurgan, a Nominee to the World Heritage List)

Antyufeev, A. V., Member of ICOMOS, Volgograd
Ptichnikova, G. A., Member of ICOMOS, Volgograd

The problem of preservation and use of the war history monuments in our country is of special significance. For several years the authors have been researching the objects related to the Stalingrad Battle in the Volgograd Region. This work resulted in formulating a series of provisions for delimitation of the boundaries of the war history sites as exemplified by the Heroes of Stalingrad Battle Memorial Complex on the Mamayev Kurgan, a nominee to the World Heritage List.

The Sites associated with the events of the 1941–1945 war history have their pronounced features which distinguish them from those objects that were formed based on architectural and urban tissue heritage such as those related to a region's, a city's or the country's civil history or even to the history of the civil war, based on the existing approach to their identification. The paper formulates recommendations for the composition and content of the work and research necessary to establish the territory of the Sites associated with the events of the Great Patriotic War. A stage of identification and evaluation of tactical terrain features, which are understood as a complex of natural elements (terrain, hydrography, vegetation etc.) and the manmade ones (roads, settlements, buildings, technical structures etc.) which have had an impact on the course of the battles.

The authors have developed recommendations for identification of the components that allow to determine the site's area, for assessment of the elements forming the site's historical memorial environment (geographic location, spatial layout of the landscape, memorial objects, which are the material evidence of military battles in the territory, preserved planning elements of settlements, architectural style, construction materials and technologies used on the extant buildings and structures that witnessed the war events; intangible (mental) features such as people's emotions and associations) as well as for evaluation of the objects attributed to other periods of history in the war history site's area, including clashing objects.

World Heritage Object's Protected and Buffer Zones: Identical or Related Concepts?

Dushkina, N. O., Member of ICOMOS, Moscow

Currently, a number of provisions of the Law No. 73-FZ 'On Cultural Heritage Objects' do not comply with the procedures of implementation of international commitments under the Convention concerning the World Heritage and the principles of the Guidelines for its implementation. To date, in our country de jure there is no terminology of international law, such as 'world heritage area', 'buffer zone', 'management plan', 'impact on outstanding universal value (OUV) assessment'. The law does not define either the authorities’ powers in complying with international commitments or procedures for assessment of impact of new development on OUV, etc. There is no clear understanding of the correlation between a world heritage's buffer zone and protected zones on the national level which poses certain difficulties for preparing nominations,
comprehensive assessment of OUV and their subsequent monitoring. What is a buffer zone and how it works often is not clear at all; with the existing trend towards reducing protected zones or ignoring them, unique monuments of global significance remain unprotected.

However, the Operational Guidelines (§§ 103–107, 2017) give quite a detailed definition: “A buffer zone is an area surrounding the nominated property which has complementary legal and/or customary restrictions placed on its use and development to give an added layer of protection to the property. This should include the immediate setting of the nominated property, important views and other areas or attributes that are functionally important as a support to the property and its protection. The area constituting the buffer zone should be determined in each case through appropriate mechanisms. Details on the size, characteristics and authorized uses of a buffer zone, as well as a map indicating the precise boundaries of the property and its buffer zone, should be provided in the nomination”. As we can see, the buffer zone is a multidimensional concept that is broad enough to, in theory, be able to protect a OUV object even from any remote impact. It is clear that by its nature a world heritage 'buffer' is directly linked to the national protected zones and presumes their existence; however, does it mean that they completely overlap?

In 2016–2017, after many a criticism within the country and from the international institutions in charge of World Heritage, certain attempts have been made to amend the Law No. 73-FZ 'On Cultural Heritage Objects', as well as to develop a special 'National standard of the Russian Federation' (GOST) for world heritage. The draft document gives a brief definition of buffer zones as “areas outside world heritage site surrounding its boundaries, that contribute to conservation and management as well as maintaining authenticity and integrity of a world heritage site's outstanding universal value.” Following the Operational Guidelines it is pointed out that buffer zones are not part of a nominated object, however, any modifications in their territory have to be approved by international institutions. The developed draft amendments to the Law No. 73-FZ has it that a buffer zone is 'a combination' of a protected zone, a regulated development zone and a protected natural landscape zone (or the first two if the latter is not there). Which means that national protected zones are completely identical to 'international' buffer zones. Is it really so?

The experience of ICOMOS expert reviews of world heritage buffer zones boundaries in various countries conducted in 2002–2018 showed that often these zones’ boundaries are broader than the national protection zones. In some cases, deliberate lowering of a buffer zone status and cutting down its area have led to significant revision of boundaries towards extension which was a condition for admission to the World Heritage List. The paper will give concrete examples and graphic materials showing the inadequacy of the promoted 'equality' approach.


Zavyalova, N. I., Member of ICOMOS, Moscow

In this presentation, I would like to raise the issues of concern to me and my colleagues, and to identify the gaps in these methodological issues that are not yet filled.

In accordance with the ‘Procedure of Including a Settlement in the Historical Settlements List of Federal Significance, Determining an Object of Protection and its Boundaries’ for a historical settlement the following has to be developed: history and culture reference plan, draft boundaries, object of protection, regimens and regulations. A historic settlement should have the
following statutory and legal documents: the Russian Government resolutions, orders of the Russian Ministry for Culture. There is only one paragraph in the Law No. 73-FZ that refers to 'sites'.

A historic settlement status is instrumental in attracting investments and obtaining subsidies, which is more vital for small settlements than for big cities that already have enough investment programs. A historic settlement status does not substitute procedures of protection zones drafting. The regulation concerning an object of protection in a historic settlement requires that not only WHS but also environmental tissue be subject to protection, which is very important.

On Landmarks (Sites). 'Sites' means the records that are submitted to the institutions in charge of monuments protection. Alterations to an already approved Protected Zones Draft (PZD) is allowed only if a new PZD is being developed. It is not required in case of a 'site'. For a 'site' limited parameters for development projects can be changed through public hearings. Development control zones and protected natural landscape zones (for the purpose of PZD) are restricted zones for which the rules are clearly articulated by the Law. When a cultural heritage object territory is treated as a 'site', zoning is different from the above-mentioned zones since it is a design developer who decides which regimens and regulations are applicable. What kind of a design document would be a result of this? Separated WHS areas, zoning of developed areas and open landscapes, regimens and regulations. But is it possible for a 40-thousand-hectares area (for example) to have the WHS regimen? We believe that the 'site' status could be given to cultural (historical) landscapes and certain local developed areas, not necessarily having outstanding monuments.

“Buffer zones are clearly marked areas surrounding a world heritage site, located along its boundaries; they further protection, conservation and management, as well as maintaining the authenticity and integrity of the outstanding universal value of the property”. There are several documents that refer to determining areas of buffer zones. They are determined by a state party to the Convention and are mandatory for listing a WHS in the UNESCO lists. Buffer zones are considered efficient if their protection concept is already incorporated in the law that regulates the area containing the object. Accordingly, it is desirable that states parties to the Convention were to undertake certain steps towards adopting the 'buffer zone' concept in their legal systems if that has not been done yet. It would be proper to include entire protected areas within their boundaries of outer PZD (sites, historical settlement) into UNESCO buffer zones; however, it would take a Management plan for such entire areas which so far is applicable only to Reserves.

Analysis of Existing Legislative and Methodological Gaps as Exemplified by Drafting the Buffer Zone Boundaries for the Ferapontov Monastery Ensemble World Heritage Site

Kulikov, S. B., Member of ICOMOS, Moscow
Zamzhitsky, O.V., Central Scientific Restoration Design Workshops (CSRDW), Moscow
Dronova, A. A., Member of ICOMOS, Moscow

This paper will present the results of a draft proposal for a buffer zone boundaries of the Ferapontov Monastery that has been included in the UNESCO World Heritage List in 2000 (cultural criteria: i, iv). Taking into consideration that the World Heritage Site (WHS) is also a National Cultural Heritage Object it is covered by the comprehensive protection measures that not
only comply with the Russian law but also with the UNESCO practices. The Ferapontov Monastery ensemble has effective and approved protected zones; however, according to the current international WHS requirements it is mandatory to work out the buffer zone boundaries which should correlate with the Russian legislation and function as a protective zone for the WHS. The Ferapontov Monastery's buffer zone since its inclusion in the WHS List has never been matched with the Russian legislation and, therefore it is still not effective to the full extent. Uncontrolled construction of private houses and fences still continues in the historical villages' territories which blocks access to the river bank and the views of the Ferapontov Monastery. There is a series of environmental issues that are still not resolved (in particular, cattle burials located in close vicinity to the Monument), historical buildings deteriorate and disappear. However, we should note a fairly high degree of integrity of the historical environment that was evolving over many centuries and this process is still on.

The presentation raises an issue of methods and potential proposals for drafting the buffer zone and correlation of this zone's boundaries with the territory protected by the Russian law. The draft proposal has WHS with the monument's zone and the buffer zone determined based on the nomination dossier and encompassed by international law. The buffer zone on the draft has been developed in compliance with UNESCO recommendations, in particular with the purpose of protection, development, integrity, authenticity and sustainability of landscapes surrounding the WHS territory and having OUV attributes, etc. The presentation also uses materials used for developing protected zones for the Ferapontov Monastery (by CSRDW), drafting boundaries for the Kirillo-Belozersky Monastery Museum-Reserve Site, field studies conducted by the Sector for Historic and Urban Planning Studies, the Science Department of the CSRDW (March–August, 2015).

Using Modern Information Technologies for Determining Areas of Impact on Protected Objects of a Historic Settlement's Skyline and Buffer Zone Boundaries

Lamkina, S.A., Member of ICOMOS, Saint Petersburg

1. 3D Model of Saint Petersburg. Brief history of development. New opportunities.

The model and its analytical tools have been created using materials, methods and techniques that have been developed by organizations under the Committee for City Planning and Architecture (KGA) since 1960. Officially the basic 3D digital model of Saint Petersburg terrain has been completed in 2009 and since then this digital resource has been incorporated in the KGA's geo-information system. The model's current facilities meet the requirement, whenever needed, to address current issues in the protection of Saint Petersburg's historic skyline and to make up building height control maps as a part of the Rules of Land Use and Development.

2. Specification of the tasks for the Basic 3-D Digital Model information resource for the purpose of determining buffer zone boundaries.
An opportunity of visibility zones projection for elements of the historical landmarks' system which can be used to determine:
- historical landmarks' visibility pools;
- open urban spaces perception of which should be protected;
- visual directions subject to protection;
- protected visual cross-sections for historical planning directions;
- surviving elements of the historical skyline when viewed from open city spaces and outside;

An opportunity to visualize historical panoramas and its use for:
- identification of the protected skyline on the basic historical panoramas;
- identification of clashing objects on the basic historical panoramas;
- identification of the lost parts of the historical skyline on the basic historical panoramas;
- identification of aperture angle for protected panoramas.

An opportunity to build surface of limited construction height that can be used to identify:
- impact limits for historical skyline's protected objects including the depth of impact;
- height regulations within the historical settlement's boundaries and beyond, when construction may have an impact on the historical skyline.

3. Limits of the impact of historical skyline's protected objects as a basis for buffer zone boundaries development.

The Need to Expand the Buffer Zone of the Trinity Lavra of St. Sergius World Heritage Site and to Preserve its Historical Environment

Sosedov, E.V., Member of ICOMOS, Krasnogorsk, the Moscow Region
Trubetskaya, I.A., Member of ICOMOS, Moscow

The Trinity Lavra of St. Sergius is a UNESCO World Heritage Site since 1993, the only one in the Moscow Region.

The Lavra is the core of the town that originally used to be a suburban settlement around the monastery. Because of the significance of this Monastery that was founded by Sergius of Radonezh in the 14th century and in the 18th century was granted the status of a Lavra, traditionally all roads in the town led to the Monastery. In 1919 the Posad was granted the town status and in 1970 — historical settlement status.

Preservation of the historical tissue surrounding the Trinity Lavra of St. Sergius WHS is ensured by its protection zones and by the town's status as a historical settlement. However, there are two problems: 1. the PZD regimens while posing limits on parameters of new construction have no ban on historical buildings' demolition; 2. protected object and historical settlement's boundaries are not fixed. The result is that the Lavra's authentic environs get replaced with new buildings of aggressive design. Historical buildings fall into the list of irreparably damaged and subject to demolition regardless of their value as authentic witnesses of the town's history.

The WHS boundaries determined under the international rules do not match the ensemble's boundaries fixed by the national law. The former one’s narrower by about a quarter. The buffer zone's boundaries are very narrow — it protects the WHS only on the western and southern sides. A major part of the established buffer zone matches the area of the Lavra as a Cultural Heritage Object, i.e. according to the Russian law it falls under the same limitations as the WHS itself. The remaining areas fall within the boundaries of the Lavra's protected zone.
Whereby to the East and North there are panoramas, vistas, blocks of historical buildings that by their nature should be a protective buffer zone, an essential security belt. And vice versa, from these places there are traditional sights of the Lavra — from and above one- and two-storey wooden and stone buildings, shops and offices, from river valley and ravines. The latter fact is important as the town's terrain is hilly and scenic.

The town's new General Plan does not take into account the regimens of the Lavra's protected zones and allows construction in the river valleys; it does not contain a protection object for the historical settlement. Additional regulation through the instruments of the Lavra as a WHS is an urgent necessity.

### Panel 4. World Heritage Monuments in Russia. Research, diagnostics, restoration, presentation

**Potential Industrial World Heritage Objects in Russia.**

Aytuganova, N.L., Member of ICOMOS, Kazan

Industrial heritage objects are rapidly drifting from the category of the least represented types of cultural heritage to the category of the wider represented ones: as of early 2017, 82 industrial heritage objects had the World Heritage status which makes up 9.8% of all cultural objects on the World Heritage List.

Russia is one of the state parties to the 1972 Convention, but its industrial heritage is not represented in the World Heritage List. Despite a rich industrial history and the processes of deindustrialization that have led to formation of a pool of cultural heritage objects that may be attributed to the groups of proto-industrial and industrial heritage or overlap the groups of the 20th century's heritage such as scientific and technological heritage, industrial heritage objects are not represented in the Russia's tentative list either. At the same time, the potential outstanding universal value (OUV) of a number of Russian industrial heritage objects has been noted by the International ICOMOS, TICCIH in the case studies (1996, 1999, 2007) and in the Global Industrial Heritage List (1994).

The presentation gives a comprehensive assessment of industrial heritage in the Russian discourse and in the heritage practices, as well as identifies major trends in the Russian system of nominating World Heritage Objects under centralized and decentralized models. The results of this research are complemented by two cases concerning Russian industrial heritage objects potentially having OUV recognized by ICOMOS: The railroad bridge over the Yenisey river in Krasnoyarsk (lost in 2007) and the Demidov Plant-Museum in Nizhny Tagil.

**Comprehensive Engineering Monitoring of World Heritage Sites in Russia**
Almazova, N. M., Member of ICOMOS, Moscow

The Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage adopted by UNESCO in 1972 contains one of the fundamental requirements of permanent monitoring of highly valuable sites included in the World Heritage List in order to ensure their conservation, integrity and authenticity.

Each State Party to the Convention is required to prepare reports on the monitoring results in two basic formats: annual reporting (State of Conservation) and periodic reporting (once in six years).

One of the vital components of the monitoring of a world heritage site’s status of conservation is the structural scrutiny through comprehensive engineering control. There are over 30 types of instrumental monitoring of cultural heritage in the world. The following monitoring types are among the most commonly used and efficient:

- geodetic (settlements, scheduled benchmarks shifting);
- deformation control (width and depth of cracks and other defects, stresses in braced elements, structures inclination);
- geological (landslides, karst-suffusion processes);
- inclinometry (scheduled shifting into ground’s depth including heights of construction pit barriers);
- extensometry (layer wise settlements of ground masses);
- hydrogeological (groundwater level, temperature, chemical and radiation pollution);
- environmental (chemical and radiation contamination of interior spaces, ground masses and construction materials);
- temperature and humidity monitoring (temperature and humidity of structures and indoor air), performed either at intervals or online (with any frequency up to 24 hours a day).

However, only the comprehensive approach, i.e. the use of all these types of monitoring of a world heritage site can produce the most complete and accurate information about the monument’ condition.

The above-listed types of monitoring are performed in the Russian Federation according to the following standards: SP22.13330.2011, GOST R 56198-2014, 55567-2013 GOST R, GOST R 56063-2014. It has to be admitted that the existing in the Russian Federation statutory framework needs to be substantially revised and expanded.
Good examples of applied comprehensive engineering monitoring display the Our-Lady of Smolensk Novodevichy Convent and the Ascension Church in Kolomenskoye.

The results of the comprehensive engineering monitoring ensure permanent control of the most valuable objects and enable making competent decisions on their preservation, integrity and authenticity.

ICOMOS Reconstruction Global Case Study Project: Post-Traumatic Reconstruction of World Heritage

Busina, L. M., Member of ICOMOS, Moscow

Despite the human progress in all spheres of development and the universal opportunities for peaceful coexistence, war conflicts continue disturbing the international community. In addition to physical destruction, war conflicts in the first place undermine national self-identification of the nations that associate themselves with particular cultural heritage. On the other hand, cultural heritage is constantly exposed to destructive natural elements: earthquakes, fires, tsunamis, rising water level. At present 54 out of 1073 world heritage sites are on the List of the World Heritage in Danger.

At the 40th Session of the World Heritage Committee (Istanbul, Turkey, 2016), the international community has articulated a request to develop a guidance document for cultural heritage reconstruction after anthropogenic and natural disasters (Decision 40 COM 7 by the 40th Session). The document — *ICOMOS Guidance on Post Trauma Recovery and Reconstruction for World Heritage Cultural Properties* — has been developed based on the results of the 2016 International Seminar on Reconstruction in Paris. The document is displayed on ICOMOS official website in English, French, Arabic, Spanish and Russian languages; feedback and comments from numerous national committees ICOMOS and UNESCO representatives have been incorporated in it.

The objective of the ICOMOS Reconstruction Global Case Study Project is developing a tool for reconstruction cases which would encourage exchanging skills and positive experience in reconstruction. To this end, national committees ICOMOS will have to submit their cases of world heritage and national heritage properties reconstruction according to the Matrix for the Compilation of Case Studies (*ICOMOS Global Case Study Project on Reconstruction: Matrix for the Compilation of Case Studies*). This document is under development and is intended to provide the international expert community with practical solutions of the issues concerning the restoration of cultural heritage in post-traumatic period.

Worth noting is the feasibility of building an electronic database on the ICOMOS web platform, where the expert community would have access the much needed examples and make comparative analysis, thus systematizing the positive experience in the world heritage preservation.

The Issue of Enhancing Promotion of the Outstanding Universal Value of the Kazan Kremlin as a UNESCO World Heritage Site
The Kazan Kremlin has been inscribed in the UNESCO World Heritage List at the UNESCO World Heritage Committee's 24th Session in Cairns, Australia in 2000 (based on criteria ii, iii, iv). The Museum-Reserve has been established in the Kremlin territory for the purpose of the management of the UNESCO World Heritage. Over the past period, a tremendous amount of archaeological research has been performed, which provided the scientific proof that Kazan has been founded at the turn of 10-11th centuries; in 2005 Kazan and entire Russia have celebrated the city's Millennium. Significant restoration projects have been performed on the Suyumbike Tower, the Annunciation Cathedral, the President of the Republic of Tatarstan Residence, the Kremlin walls and towers, the Kul-Sharif Mosque and other cultural heritage properties. Over ten museums have been established, including the first in Russia Hermitage Center under the agreement with Saint Petersburg. The Museum-Reserve's impressive work is reflected in numerous events of various nature, annual reports and on its website. In 2017 over 2.8 million tourists and sightseers have visited the Kazan Kremlin.

In 2017-2018 as soon as the 18-19th centuries Public Offices building has been vacated by the Republic's ministries and departments, an opportunity to begin the building's restoration and to turn the South-East part of the Kazan Kremlin into a museum, cultural and exposition space has presented itself. The group of scholars including this presentation's author A. G. Sitdikov, R.R. Hayrutdinov, F. M. Zabirova, I. L. Izmaylova et al has developed the Concept of the Museumification of the South-East Part of the Kremlin.

It involves an integrated approach to the preservation and use of the South-Eastern part of the Kremlin, including the Public Offices building, public area, curtain-walls 12-13, the Consistory, the South-Eastern and the Spasskaya towers, which area is over 12 thousand sq. m, and inclusion into this space of the North-Western part of the Kazan Kremlin with the Residence of the President of the Republic of Tatarstan, the Suyumbike Tower and the Kazan khans mausoleums — the most ancient part of the Kremlin, an evidence of continuity of state power and of this area's transformation into a major museum, cultural and educational center.

The goal was to establish a Presidential Center within the Museum of the History of the Tatar People Statehood and the Republic of Tatarstan — an integrated cultural, educational and museum space with the common concept of conservation, study and promotion of the complex that represents the history of the Tatarstan and the Tatar people statehood, reflects traditions of the state culture of the region and is unique in the world.

The following tasks have been solved:

1. Creation of a new innovative platform that gives opportunities, on the principle of integration, to conserve and turn into a museum the Kazan Kremlin as a UNESCO World Heritage Site and to integrate it into the present-day life under the state cultural policy of Tatarstan and the Russian Federation.

2. Setting up the centralized depository of sources, study, publication and promotion of the Museum collection reflecting the history of the Republic of Tatarstan and the Tatar people statehood.

3. Promotion of the Kazan Kremlin as a tourist brand and product, enhancing its image as an open and educating museum and cultural center. Expanding museum, cultural, educational and public areas.
4. Organization of cultural, educational, competency-based and adaptation programs.

5. Creation of a new area for the urban life, an activity zone attractive to any social strata, accessible for family entertainment, friends' meetings, business negotiations, cultural, educational and other communication programs for visitors of all ages; workshops on political leadership, public events celebrating the key events in the history of the Republic of Tatarstan and other remarkable events.

All this should result in the increased 10 times exposition and universal exhibition spaces. Following the implementation of this project, it would be important to organize innovative training that should give a profound insight into the history of Tatarstan statehood in the context of the present-day information environment and instill national pride for our country.

Given the fact that the Kazan Kremlin is a UNESCO World Cultural and Natural Heritage, the basic concept of the museum and cultural project is in the presenting and enhancing the Outstanding Universal Value of the Kazan Kremlin that has been recognized at the UNESCO World Heritage Committee Session (2017, Krakow, Poland), raising awareness of it through the museum, cultural and other means in accordance with the UNESCO values and criteria.

**Involvement or Exclusion. The Issue of Local Communities Integration in the Processes of Heritage Development and Preservation**

Gaynutdinova, A. R., Member of ICOMOS, Moscow

Active involvement of local communities in a territory development, world heritage protection and conservation is undoubtedly an indispensable factor which contributes to the success of such development and its sustainability.

This paper presents the results of the analysis of a wide range of initiatives to engage local communities in the processes of cultural heritage conservation, development and management concerning the monuments of the national and local significance inscribed in the World Heritage List that were launched in Russia in the past few decades. During the study, we have analyzed the information related to the factors that furthered such initiatives, to the territories on which they were launched and the process of their development.

The paper reveals that the major part of such initiatives to engage local communities in the process of interaction with the heritage was originated as a spontaneous activity on the part of the people who live in several types of territories. All the described manifestations of local communities' activities concerning the heritage reflect various aspects of the study's subject and lead to different results.

The study has found that one of the factors affecting the process of such initiatives arising and evolvement is the clear trend towards excluding the public from the sphere of active protection and development of the heritage. At the same time, many years of international experience show that, in particular, it is impossible to reach the stage of an area's sustainable development, especially when there is a heritage site, without the local communities involvement.

The paper presents a brief overview of the government institutions' activities and private initiatives to involve local communities in the development of local cultural heritage, both tangible and intangible. The paper also focuses on the outstanding role of non-government organizations and private charitable foundations in this sphere. The overview of over twenty years of experience in involving the local community in the process of conservation and restoration of the Historic and Cultural Ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands World Heritage Site, which began even before its
inscription in the UNESCO World Heritage List, is given as a bright example of the successful practice.

Assessment of Universal Value of Historical and Cultural Heritage Properties for Their Inclusion in the UNESCO World Cultural and Natural Heritage List Through Qualitative Assessment Method Based on the Properties' Value Parameters

Zelenova, S.V., Member of ICOMOS, Nizhniy Novgorod

A special qualitative system called the Methods of Assessment of Universal Value of Historical and Cultural Heritage which enables classification of properties according to their value parameters and identification of the most valuable of them for the global cultural environment, is proposed as a universal approach to historical and cultural heritage’s value assessment. Calculations may be based on a heritage's rating according to the criteria of scoring its significance for the main scientific domains: history, architecture and urban planning, cultural studies. The proposed method allows lowering the degree of subjectivity while assessing properties and identifying their value through qualitative approach.

Historical and architectural heritage falls into a specific area of expertise of interdisciplinary nature that reflects the current ideology, political and economic situation. Comparative analysis of the state and scientific concepts for assessing the value of historical and architectural heritage allows obtaining information on specific approaches to the heritage in a particular period of history, identifying respective innovative processes and general trends.

The vagueness of approaches to assessing the value of historical and cultural heritage, differing interpretation of its significance lead to the fact that often a heritage's true significance remains unappreciated, assessment is subjective and reflects the values of a particular time and place. This is why for the purpose of assessing the value of historical and cultural heritage it is necessary to develop a unified classification system based on the generalized historical expertise and take into account the current situation and various internationally accepted approaches to establishing the value of the heritage.

In order to build a scientific tool for assessing historical and cultural heritage based on its value it is proposed:

- to identify historical trends in formation and evolvement of the system of criteria for assessment of historical and cultural heritage;
- to analyze the history of the formation of conceptual construct and definitions for historical and architectural heritage in the official documents and scientific researches;
- to identify theoretic prerequisites and logic in the formation of classification systems for historical and architectural heritage in official documents and scientific researches;
- to analyze and to systematize criteria of the assessment of historical and cultural heritage in various historical periods;
- to identify basic rules in the formation of the value specifics for historical and cultural heritage in various historical periods;
- to develop the terms of reference for the system of value assessment for a historical and cultural heritage that would enable establishing an object's individual value as well as identifying its universal value in the global cultural context.

The comprehensive approach allows identifying a qualitative criterion for assessing a study object that is based on such categories as theory and history of architecture, urban planning,
restoration, philosophy, cultural studies, monuments studies and legislation in the global cultural context and that includes the comparative analysis of theoretic researches of concepts and statutory regulations; structural analysis and systematization of the research data; analysis of historical structure that allows identifying changes in attitude to heritage sites over a certain period as well as the experimental principle in building terms of reference while structuring historical and architectural heritage.

The Methods of Assessment of Universal Value of Historical and Cultural Heritage will give an opportunity to determine the value of historical and cultural heritage through calculations and identification of the most significant objects in the global cultural context for the purpose to inscribe them in the UNESCO World Natural and Cultural Heritage List.

Automated System for Monitoring the State of the Assumption Cathedral and for Recording the Results of its Study: Architecture, Frescos and Microclimate

Imamutdinova, A. M., Member of ICOMOS, Kazan
Shaykhtudinova, E. F., Kazan
Kasimov, A. V., Kazan
Kugurakova, V. V., Kazan
Sitdikov, A. G., Member of ICOMOS, Kazan

The monitoring of the conservation status of cultural heritage objects (CHO), taking into account that their deterioration with the time is inevitable, is one of the priorities in the modern world. There is a need for regular monitoring and collating data concerning CHO. Comprehensive interdisciplinary study of the 16th century Assumption Cathedral (the Sviyazhsk Island) is an important condition for its being treated as a site according to international requirements for the preservation of cultural and natural heritage.

Today, the progress in various fields of science gives us an opportunity to use a huge set of tools for studying CHO; however, their interaction and integration are hindered by large gaps between certain domains of expertise. The solution to this problem is in developing an integrated automated information environment for studying CHO with their 3–D visual models. Having analyzed the existing automated systems for monitoring of the preservation status and studying CHO it became clear that all of these systems are limited to one particular narrow domain of expertise which makes it difficult to see the complete picture of the status an object’s expiration and to develop a program for its further study as well as an action plan for its conservation. The solution to this problem is in developing an automated system of monitoring of a current status of CHO that would take into account the changes of its status in the past, current anthropogenic impact and analytic forecast of the status changes in the future.

The developed automated system includes a software core, a 3-D model of an object with its exterior and interior surfaces. As of today, the following functions are in effect: databases on the results of historical and cultural as well as engineering and architectural studies of the Assumption Cathedral; depository for storing results of interdisciplinary studies of the Cathedral where all the information is kept in the high quality digital format with the references to graphic materials in the tabular format; digital catalog of the monitoring of the frescos status and restoration including the pool of frescos maps by subjects and extended functional features; monitoring of the current temperature and humidity conditions; the 3–D model with indication of
the Cathedral's parts and paintings' subjects in the 2-D and 3-D formats. The system is in the process of improving; the method of the in-situ monitoring of the frescos based on the digital scaled batch scanning is under development.

Innovative Approach in Information Technologies for Diagnostics of Materials Damage on the World Heritage Properties

Knyazeva, V. P., Member of ICOMOS, Moscow
Kaver, N.S., Member of ICOMOS, Moscow
Koroliova, T. V., Member of ICOMOS, Moscow

In the process of conservation of architectural monuments and world heritage properties, a special focus should be on the issues concerning the identification of construction materials damages and the causes of damaging processes. This would allow, based on the preliminary studies, choosing proper restoration materials. Today the databases built as reference resources for typical damages are available for expert assessment of construction materials integrity and prompt identification of damages. The structure of this reference resource issued by ICOMOS is represented as the Illustrated Glossary on Stone Deterioration Patterns. It contains photographs of typical damages, accumulated information such as types of material surface deterioration under the environmental effects: alga colonization, destruction etc. Using this reference material one can promptly identify the type and major causes of damages.

While examining visually a monument, having identified a material damage and using the Glossary's data, one can substantially cut expenses on additional studies for developing restoration designs; however, this information is not sufficient for the purpose of sustainable restoration and scientific substantiation of the choice of proper restoration materials for rehabilitation, corrosion protection and extending material's and monument's life-span. Today we need information on a restored material's chemical composition and its structural features such as metastable phase, types of chemical and biological contamination. Through detection of changes in chemical composition of material's microstructure, one can identify a threat of damage and choose proper materials for slowing down or preventing destructive processes, preventing their further development and reaching the macro--stage when structures display visual cracks and other dangerous defects.

The Architectural Materials Studies Chair of the Moscow Architectural Institute has developed the method of environmental and material engineering assessment of damage to a monument material on the level of microstructural changes for most kinds of typical material damages. Many years of environmental-material studies have shown that the predominant types of damages of monuments materials are biochemical and salt corrosion of structural materials, pollution of finishing materials surface with dust and material’s degradation products.

It is well known that the problem of monument material's damage such as contamination of building's veneer and finish is the result of integrated effects of mechanical, physical, chemical and biological factors which are aggravated by changes in chemical composition of the original material and destructive processes on the microstructural level. Materials get contaminated by corrosion products and become nonhomogenous and metastable, unstable; this is why traditional technologies and composite materials that are often used in restoration practice prove inefficient.
Experimental physical and chemical data pool has been accumulated through scanning microscopy and systematized, the Reference Resource Model has been presented — the Atlas of typical microstructures and chemical compositions for major types of monuments' original materials damages.

The paper presents the information format of the data unit from the *Microstructures and Composition Identification Guide* for places of typical damage and deterioration on the example of the 'white stone', the typical historical material of the Moscow monuments.

The compiled database for these types of damages in the atlas format containing microstructural and biochemical analysis of the material samples from the damaged places allows predicting how the process of structural material's destruction will evolve and significantly cut expenses on engineering inspections of cultural heritage properties in accordance with the Code of Restoration Practice (M., 2011) and the GOST R 55653-2013 and GOST R 55567-2013.

The inclusion of information about micro-damages in the reference resource can be considered an innovation for this type of information technologies. Having examined composition and microstructure of original materials within the complex system of materials and environment interaction one can choose the most efficient restoration technologies for cultural heritage.

**Challenges and Prospects in UNESCO Sites Preservation as Exemplified by the St.George Church on the Marketplace (1356, 1750–1754) and the Dmitry Solunsky Church (14th Century) in Veliky Novgorod**

Kovalenko, O. N., Member of ICOMOS, Veliky Novgorod

After the devastating Great Patriotic War of 1941–1945 the Soviet Government has made a decision to give priority to the restoration of 15 Russian cities with Novgorod among them. In order to restore architectural monuments, a restoration workshop has been established. Eventually, the workshop representing the Novgorodian restoration tradition has become one of the best in the country and has laid a foundation for scientific restoration. Thanks to the hard work of the workshop specialists (their disciples and tradition keepers now work at the Novgorod Directorate for Scientific Restoration, the workshop's successor), today we are happy to enjoy magnificent civil and religious architectural monuments. Thirty seven heritage objects of Veliky Novgorod are on the UNESCO World Heritage List since 1992.

Restoration of architectural monuments calls for reflective and serious approach, it is a long process. In case of recurrent restoration, it becomes extremely important to have available the documentation executed during the previous restoration as well as the scientific restoration report made at its completion. More than 70 years of the workshop's archives have accumulated a tremendous amount of scientific materials which have to be analyzed and integrated in one single resource. Systematization and compilation of detailed information for each monument on the UNESCO World Heritage List spares a researcher the need to study numerous sources, thus cutting the time required for preparatory work.

The feasibility of systematization of research results and the prospects of using such a resource for the case of the Veliky Novgorod sites included in the World Heritage List are currently under consideration. The sites are: the St.George Church on the Marketplace (1356, 1750–1754) and the Dmitry Solunsky Church in Veliky Novgorod. The former is the property of the Novgorod State Integrated Museum–Reserve, the latter is the property of the Novgorod Diocese. Despite the obvious difference in the monuments' functions, requirements to their
conservation should be the same for which purpose it is necessary to develop a common system for these properties management. The proposed line of actions may become a first stage of developing a systematic scientific approach to efficient management of world heritage sites.

**Issues in Restoration of Historical and Cultural Monuments in Saint Petersburg**

Krechmer, A. V., Member of ICOMOS, Saint Petersburg

The Council of the Saint Petersburg Branch of the National Committee ICOMOS, Russia (hereinafter referred to as ICOMOS, SPb), has repeatedly raised the issues of restoration of cultural heritage objects of federal significance: the garden art objects in Peterhof, the Ioannovsky Bridge, the Teatralny and Malo-Konyushenny Bridges (the 'triple bridge'), the A. F. Kelkh and A. A. Polovtsov mansions, the fences of the Anichkov Palace and the Church of Resurrection of Our Savior (the Mikhailovsky Garden) etc.

The working group has identified the major violations of methods and scientific procedures. Due to a large number of discovered flaws the Council found unsatisfactory the result of the above mentioned works. These works are not only egregious examples of the so-called modern 'restoration' but also an indicator of the poor condition of the entire restoration sector (the death of scientific restoration) and protection of cultural and historical monuments in general. Let us have a closer look at the Marlinsky Rampart's restoration in the Lower Park of Peterhof, facades and interiors of the A. A. Polovtsov mansion and the Northern part of the fence of the Church of Resurrection of Our Savior — three sections and five posts near the sacristy and the Chapel of the Iberian Icon of Our Lady.

ICOMOS SPb always engages third-party experts: thus, we invited Mr. G.P. Vyunov — the Member of the Union of Restorers of Russia, artist-restorer of metal items — to the Council Session on January 30, 2018. In 1996–2006 he was in charge and took an active part in the restoration of 28 sections of the fence of the Church of Resurrection of Our Savior and the gates with lanterns.

The inspection of the fence of the Church of Resurrection of Our Savior immediately after its restoration has been completed, has discovered the following defects and technology violations:

1. Three sections of the fence have been 'rested' upon the granite plinth during installation. It is an indication of improper assembly and the sections flawed installation. According to the design by architect A. A. Parland the lacelike wrought-iron fence should look as if 'hovering' in the air, merely touching the plinth but not be ‘sitting’ on it.

2. The historical structure of the sections fastening to the posts has been completely ignored and replaced with welding ('open' welding has also been applied to other elements of the fence). The bolt system made at the K. I. Vinkler's factory makes it easy to dismantle and reinstall the fence's elements.

3. The recreated wrought elements of the sections significantly differ from the original ones in terms of size and detailing. Some wrought elements (flower petals) have been mixed up and therefore misplaced during installation.

4. Sloven metal treatment — certain units and elements of the fence have been poorly fitted. The fence’s paint color does not match the original one (graphite and soot) that has been identified during the previous restoration by the Stek, OOO in the late 1990s. The fence sections have been painted poorly: multiple laps and drips are visible.
5. The bricks of the posts' facing have been sandblasted which almost destroyed their glossy surface. It led to the bricks changing their original color: it became pale and dull. The spiral pattern of the brickwork is no longer visible. Having undergone such treatment the now rough surface of the posts would get easily soiled and wet.

Discovery of so many flaws leaves no other choice but to recognize the result of the restoration of the Northern part of the fence of the Church of Resurrection of Our Savior unsatisfactory. Conservation works on the Southern part of the Church's fence, followed by further scientific restoration have to be conducted as soon as possible.

We suggest that the experts from the Directorate for the North-Western Federal District, the Ministry for Culture of the Russian Federation, the KGIOP and the Union of Restorers of Saint Petersburg meet at the restoration sites in order to compare the completed works with the respective iconography and approved design documentation and estimates as well as to prevent the violations identified in the Council's decisions in the future.

Training Programs for the Preservation of Wooden Architecture at the Kizhi Museum Reserve

Kuznetsova K.V., the Republic of Karelia

The Training Center for the Preservation of Wooden Architecture Monuments (TC) has been established at the Kizhi Museum–Reserve in 2014 following the recommendations of ICOMOS experts and with the support by the Ministry for Culture of the Russian Federation. The TC activity's purpose is to train professionals in the field of conservation of historical wooden structures.

Prerequisites for the TC foundation:

1) The unique experience of the restoration of the Church of Transfiguration, a component of the Kizhsky Pogost WHS. Exceptional skills of restorers have been recognized by the Russian and international experts.

2) The Museum has developed the comprehensive system for the wooden architecture maintenance

3) Many years of the Carpentry Center at the Museum that is engaged in the restoration of wooden architecture and the revival of the carpentry lore.

The Museum's TC is working in close collaboration with the State University of Petrozavodsk where the UNESCO Chair for Study and Preservation of Wooden Architecture has been established under the tripartite agreement between UNESCO, the State University of Petrozavodsk and the Kizhi Museum. The UNESCO Chair has developed two programs of additional professional training: Conservation and Restoration of Wooden Architecture Heritage for 72 and 144 academic hours (2/4 ECTS). At the end of the TC courses those of the students who have passed the final test receive certificates of advanced training issued by the UNESCO Chair and participation certificates in Russian and English.

The courses are taught by the specialists of the Kizhi Museum–Reserve whose highest level of professional skill is recognized by the Russian and international experts. The modular training course has been developed for various groups of students from professionals who get an
opportunity to expand and refine their skills through learning the nuances of restoration at the Kizhi Museum to those who just set about learning the carpentry basics.

The length of a course for each individual group depends on the students' initial scope of skills and available time.

The course consists of theory and practice classes under the guidance of experienced craftsmen at the base of the specially equipped workshops at the Restoration complex on the Kizhi Island. Practical classes are held at the Museum's main exposition, at the carpentry exhibition and center as well as at the monuments along the Kizhi Necklace route. Special equipment, carpenter tools, interactive models demonstrating restoration and carpentry techniques as well as training videos and materials are used for practical classes.

The main training modules are:

- Wooden architecture of the Russian North;
- Wood as construction material;
- Studying, conservation and restoration of cultural heritage objects;
- Main phases in developing restoration design;
- Traditional carpentry;
- Guidelines for Restoration of Wooden Architecture Heritage

To date over 100 people have completed training on various levels: groups of students from specialized educational institutions, specialists from restoration companies, volunteers, foreign restorers specializing in wooden heritage. The first international ICCROM courses have become a milestone event in 2017; the course has been attended by 18 experts in conservation of wooden architecture from 16 countries. The three weeks ICCROM courses have been taught by Russian and foreign teachers. The major part of the lectures and practical classes was taught by the specialists of the Kizhi Museum–Reserve. The courses' students had an opportunity to gain a unique experience from the Russian restorers and share their own skills and expertise in the preservation of wooden structures. All the students and teachers as well as ICCROM representatives have commended the high level of teaching and organization of the courses.

The next international ICCROM course is planned for the year 2019.

Thirty Years Since Ratification by the USSR of the Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage, 1972

Lavrentiev, N.V., Member of ICOMOS, Saint Petersburg

In 2018 we mark 30 years since the ratification of the Convention Concerning World Cultural and Natural Heritage by the USSR. The Convention has been adopted at the 17th Session of the General Conference of UNESCO on November 16, 1972 in Paris and in 1975 it has become effective.

The Convention has been ratified by the Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR dated 09.03.1988 No. 8595-XI ‘Ratification of the Convention Concerning World Cultural and Natural Heritage’. The Convention has become effective for the USSR on January 12, 1989. The Convention has been officially published in the Russian language in the Collection
of the International Treaties to which the USSR is a Party (issue No. 44, 1999, p. 496). The Russian Federation is a State Party to the Convention as the successor of the USSR.

In accordance with the Part 4 of the Article 15 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation the Convention is a part of our legal system, the Convention's provisions have primacy over the Russian federal laws.

According to the Article 8 of the Convention, for the purpose of its implementation, UNESCO has founded the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (World Heritage Committee). The World Heritage Committee meets once a year at the Sessions that make decisions to amend the World Heritage List and other vital decisions concerning the World Heritage properties.

In 1977 the World Heritage Committee has adopted the Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention which subsequently were repeatedly revised and amended by the Committee's decisions. The Guidelines elaborate upon the Convention's provisions and the compliance with them is a main tool for the Convention's implementation. Since the Committee's decisions adopted within the Convention's framework are international statutory instruments which do not require additional ratification, the Guidelines are a part of the Russian system of law and must be strictly observed and implemented in respect of the world heritage properties.

As under the P. 172 of the Guidelines for the Convention Implementation, the World Heritage Committee invites the State Parties to the Convention to inform the Committee, through the Secretariat, of their intention to undertake or to authorize in an area protected under the Convention major restorations or new constructions which may affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Notice should be given as soon as possible (for instance, before drafting basic documents for specific projects) and before making any decisions that would be difficult to reverse, so that the Committee may assist in seeking appropriate solutions to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is fully preserved.

However clear and obvious these international legal provision are the P. 172 of the Guidelines for the Convention Implementation aimed at the protection of the Russian world heritage properties is virtually not complied with. The case of the World Heritage Site No. 540 Historical Center of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments is a proof that this requirement of the Guidelines has never been adhered to after the Site has been included in the World Heritage List in 1990.

Failure to adhere to the P. 172 of the Guidelines for the Convention Implementation today is one of the burning issues concerning Russia's international commitments concerning the world heritage preservation.

The Issues of Correlation of the Laws on the Protection of Cultural and Natural Heritage: International and Russian Experience

Lebedev, A. I., Member of ICOMOS, Ufa

In our opinion, there are three main features of the current Russian laws concerning the conservation of natural and cultural heritage:

1. The concept of protection in our country is regarded as a ban of any forms of commercial and non-commercial use of the protected properties. We believe that here is the deep difference between the Russian and the international approaches to protection of culture and
nature. The Russian tradition is in protecting from people. The international tradition is in protecting for people. This difference is the reason for the fact that in our country a decision on a property protection depends only on ‘objective’ criteria such as a rare taxonomic category, a building's attribution to a certain architectural tradition, memorial sites of the 'here used to live/visit...' kind. 'Subjective' arguments are never accepted. This is why some properties or phenomena that are liked by people but are not unique from the point of view of the 'science’ or classification are not included in the protected pool.

There is neither a legal concept nor a protection status for such layman’s notions as beautiful landscape or village, delicious food, tourist road or path, unique wine/cheese/meat/kumys. The internationally accepted concept of genius loci is not reflected in the practical protection of cultural and natural heritage.

2. The second fundamental feature is a limited number of the formats of properties and phenomena protection. The UNESCO Program for World Heritage has a completely different approach to the formation of protected territories and properties: sites are selected based on their features but not on the protection format. The UNESCO Program defines a series of criteria for cultural, natural and mixed heritage. A decision on assigning the World Heritage status is made if a property/territory meets one or more criteria. This approach makes it possible to have a great number of combinations of the criteria for assigning the protected status.

3. The Russian law has limited instruments for economic support to the protection activity. Neither local communities nor investors have any effective tools for investing in the protection of nature and/or monuments with the purpose of gaining profits from tourism, traditional handicrafts and organic farming.

Unlocking the World Heritage Potential for Sustainable Development and Improving Living Standards for Local Communities. The Role of Integrated Conservation

Partina, O.V., the Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow

The concept of integrated conservation which implies adaptation of the heritage to the present-day conditions, its contributing to a region's sustainable development and improving living standards, has been accepted by the expert community since the second half of the 20th century. Although this approach has been formally incorporated in the UNESCO basic statutory documents on the World Heritage protection, today as a matter of actual practice we observe that the concept of sustainable economic, environmental and social development of cultural heritage in the interests of local communities is opposed to the purpose of conservation of the outstanding universal value of such heritage.

For a long time, the very concept of cultural heritage was never used in the discussions on sustainable development. The issue of heritage preservation on the UN level has been raised for the first time during the preparation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development that has been adopted by the UN in September 2015. Also in 2015 UNESCO has adopted the Policy for the Integration of a Sustainable Development Perspective into the Processes of the World Heritage Convention. However, the methods of applying the principles of sustainable development to the processes of world heritage management remain unclear. The next logical step towards extending the approaches based on the sustainable development concept to world heritage management would be shaping up a roadmap, concrete measures and tools for the application of these
approaches. In particular, these tools could be integrated in the Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

The roadmap for incorporating the principles of sustainable development into the world heritage management process has to be based on the mechanism of engagement of a wide range of the parties concerned in the process of decision making and implementation on all stages of the management process. Its structure should cover the main spheres of sustainable development such as economic, environmental and social as well as peacekeeping. In order to monitor the efficiency of performance, it is proposed to incorporate a set of sustainability indicators for world heritage management. Such a set could be developed based on the internationally recognized Global Reporting Initiative for sustainable development (GRI). The set of sustainability indicators could include among others: number of consultations with the local community representatives, number and results of assessments of a sites' environmental and social impact related to the assessment of maximum levels of visits to the sites etc.

World Heritage Trough the Lens of Trauma Studies: Prospects for Development

Samover, N.V., Member of ICOMOS, Moscow

One of the new and rapidly developing directions in the today's global social and humanities studies are the trauma studies — the interdisciplinary studies of historical, social, psychological, philosophic, legal and cultural aspects of collective historical trauma and of its determining impact on historical memory and identity of certain social groups and entire nations.

The 20th century was abundant in traumatic events, with the memory of the two world wars, ethnic genocides, nuclear bombing, apartheid and certain totalitarian regimes' crimes against their own nations.

The concept of a collective historical trauma supposes that an event and a memory of it are congruent. Therefore, the trauma studies field would inevitably overlap the heritage science field. In the today's world, reflection on the objects related to a historical trauma, in the cultural heritage paradigm starting with its memorialization on a national level and up to inscribing a traumatic heritage object in the World Heritage List, is an integral part of fostering historical consciousness both in particular nations and in the entire humankind as a global community, that should be built on the basis of recognizing common humanistic values.

Today, we witness a trend towards universal growth of interest to traumatic heritage and, as a reflection of this process, a significant growth of the number of such objects on the World Heritage List and on the Tentative List. As of today, these are the Nazi concentration camp Auschwitz (Poland), the site of nuclear tests at the Bikini Atoll (the Marshall Islands), Australia Convict Sites (18th-19th centuries), places of memory and sorrow for the victims of the I World War in various countries and other sites.

The sites of this kind represented in the World Heritage system are diverse in terms of their subjects and their chronology spans over the period from the early modern period to the recent past; however, most of them refer to the 20th century. This is due to the fact that the value paradigm which is intrinsic for the modern civilization was formed as a reaction to the traumatic events of the twentieth century and their subsequent comprehension.

Today the study of traumatic aspects of historical memory on the global scale is an effective instrument for preserving fundamental values and a guarantee against recurrence of such
events in the future. This suggests that inscription of new sites of traumatic heritage is a sustainable trend and one of the most important directions for further development of the World Heritage system.

The Roman Vorontsov Dacha on the Peterhof Road

Starkova, L. A., Member of ICOMOS, Saint Petersburg

The building of the R.I. Vorontsov dacha at 186a, the Stachek Prospect is located in the area of the Peterhof Road Component No. 540-034 of the Historic Center of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments UNESCO World Heritage Site.

The Peterhof Road has been constructed in 1710 as a road connecting Saint Petersburg with the suburban Imperial residences. Along the entire road that follows the South coast of the Gulf of Finland there used to be private estates. One of such estates was the Roman Vorontsov dacha. This dacha's history is similar to the rest of them. The Peterhof Road cut through a long and narrow (110 fathoms) lot that lay from the Gulf shore to the Ligovsky Canal. The dacha's building is situated on the Littorina Ledge.

So far the author of the building's design and the garden's layout with its water system has not been identified. From mid-18th century till 1917 the dacha had several owners. The latest owners by the time of the revolution were the Bogomolov merchant family. With the advent of the Soviets all dachas have been nationalized. In 1918 the clergy and officers sentenced to death were kept in the building's cellar, including one of the Bogomolov sons and several grandsons — officers. By the late 1920s the estate used to belong to the Nov children's colony. Later the building housed various Soviet institutions.

During the Great Patriotic War, the area adjacent to the Peterhof Road near the Roman Vorontsov estate was a section of the frontline. That is why most of the estate's structures were destroyed. But the water system and some landscapes of the estate have survived. In the late 1980s, there were plans to construct a large residential complex on the Stachek Prospect, so the Roman Vorontsov house that at that time has not been yet attributed was supposed to be demolished. However, the KGIOP specialists have surveyed the area of the supposed construction and found that the small house was constructed in the mid-18th century and used to be the Roman Vorontsov estate's main house.

From the estate's plan that has been retrieved from the RGADA (Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts) it has become clear that the building that for some time was housing a store and then a construction department, in the 18th century has been built for Roman Vorontsov. The estate's layout is clearly visible on the 1913 plan and on the 1942 aerial photography. The KGIOP specialists succeeded in insisting on revising the development plans for this territory. A survey and subsequent restoration have been performed. The main house and the park with the water system have been taken under protection as a monument of regional significance.

In 1990s, a religious community has squatted the building; later they obtained required registration and turned the building into a church. They have attached a belfry and spire to the building. Currently, the building is occupied by the Church of Vera, Nadezhda, Lyubov and their mother Sofia, a metochion of the Pokrovo-Tverenichesky Convent at the Ladoga Lake.

In March 2013 the Toponymic Commission proposed to name the area represented by the remains of the landscape parks of the Vorontsov dacha and the adjacent Sheremetev and Bruce dachas — located between the Kronshtadskaya Square, the Dachny Prospect, the Veteranov Prospect and the Lyoni Golikova Street in the Kirovsky District of Saint Petersburg — the Vorontsovsky Garden. So it was done by the Decree of the Saint Petersburg Government dated 01.03.2013 No. 130. Its number in the Saint Petersburg Register of Green Spaces of Public Use: 5097. The Garden's area is 15.51 hectares.
Tourism on UNESCO Sites: Issues and Prospects
Timofeyeva, L. S., Member of ICOMOS, Kazan
Akhmetova, A. R., Member of ICOMOS, Kazan

There are 28 objects in Russia that are inscribed in the UNESCO World Heritage List. Among them there are several religious objects which are managed on both religions and secular principles. These are the ensembles of the Novodevichy Convent, the Ferapontov Monastery, the Trinity Lavra of St. Sergius and the Solovetsky Monastery. Two similar sites are in Tatarstan — the Assumption Cathedral and the Monastery on the Svyazhsk Island and the Bolgar Historical and Archaeological Complex. The latter object is the northernmost Muslim enclave in the world and an outstanding example of the Medieval Islamic culture.

In the recent years, the Bolgar has become one of the major tourism destinations of Tatarstan through the Tatarstan authorities' policy and the efforts of the 'Revival' foundation. The increase in tourism was largely due to the Bolgar's positioning as a place of adoption of Islam by the inhabitants of the Volga Bulgaria in the year 922. Today the Bolgar remains a place of religious worship and pilgrimage for the Turkic Muslims of Eurasia.

However, such positioning of the Bolgar complex in its sole capacity lowers its historical and cultural value and increases the risks of losing authenticity. The UNESCO experts and the scientific community of Tatarstan have repeatedly expressed their concern about this even during the period of the object's nomination to the World Heritage List. They rightly pointed to the uniqueness of the historical and archaeological complex within the Bolgar Museum-Reserve, a significant part of which is still insufficiently studied by experts. The object retains the great potential for further research, which is difficult due to the construction of several remakes and the development of new infrastructure.

At the time of the Bolgar Complex’s inscription in the UNESCO World Heritage List, one of the fundamental criteria was the interaction of several successive cultural traditions and mutual exchange of different civilizations — Turkic, Finno-Ugric, Slavic and other. Expanding the topics of tours and excursions, presenting the monuments from perspectives of various cultures that are present in the region's cultural landscape would bring new categories of tourists to the town of Bolgar.

The Physical Culture House in Sverdlovsk. Presentation and Interpretation of a Potential World Heritage Property
Tokmeniniva, L. I., Member of ICOMOS, Yekaterinburg

The unique monument has been studied and nominated by the NC ICOMOS, Russia for the World Heritage List, included in the promising objects list by the Working Group for World Heritage of the Ministry for Culture of Russia, approved by the Scientific Methods Council (the Soviet Architecture Section) of the Ministry for Culture of Russia, approved by the NC ICOMOS, Russia, the upstream process in its regards has been supported by the I Interregional Conference of NC ICOMOS, Russia, the monument has been unanimously recommended for the World Heritage by the Scientific Methods Council of the Department of CHO Protection of the Sverdlovsk region.

The House of Physical Culture is located in Yekaterinburg (former Sverdlovsk till 1991) at 12, Yeremina street and is a cultural object of federal significance. In the State Register it is listed as the 'Sports Complex Dynamo: aquatic sports station; stadium’, 1929, architect V. D. Sokolov' (the Decree of the Council of Ministers of the RSFSR No. 624, 1974).
The Sports Complex Dynamo in the city historical center on the Eastern shore of the city pond has been constructed in 1934; in 1929 the complex’s design has been executed. The complex consisted of: the sports club *House of Physical Culture*, the significantly rebuilt stadium with stands and the wooden buildings of the aquatic sports station with four swimming pools and diving towers that were lost in the mid-twentieth century, the boathouse and the spectator stands on the shore.

The aquatic sports station used to be a multipurpose platform with four swimming pools, two of which, having diving towers and springboards, served for competitions while the other two for children's bathing; on the nearby shore were the spectator seats.

Wooden structures of the aquatic station have become dilapidated and have been demolished in the early 1940s. The stadium's stands were made of wood in 1946-1948, in 1963-1966 have been replaced with the ones made of reinforced concrete, there were a cinema and a swimming pool inside them.

With the documentation issue put aside, we dare to suppose that the object meets two (iv) and (vi) criteria of Outstanding Universal Value.

The House of Physical Culture is undoubtedly an outstanding example of a widespread type of buildings — a sports club — illustrating an important stage in the history of mankind, including the socio-economic experiment coupled with seeking a unique architectural image in the forms that were new for its time, and of course associated with the events, ideas and the public significance of sports that have outstanding universal significance for the world history.

*The House of Physical Culture* (1929-1934, architect V. D. Sokolov) is a unique building of a sports club in terms of its design in the style of symbolic constructivism to which there are no peers both in Russia and abroad. It shows reproduction of a ship shape in the building's architectural design and reflects the search for ways of expressing a horizontal line of vision in the world practice of architectural avant-garde and the influence of the German expressionism.

The House of Physical Culture is a valuable component of the urban tissue. Perfectly fit in the urban landscape on the spit in the city pond it symbolizes the dynamic development of the Soviet society according to the official state ideology. The House of Physical Culture located in the South-Western part of the sports complex is the architectural focal point in the panorama of the Eastern part of the city pond with the surrounding 18-19th centuries architectural monuments. In front of the main facade of the building in the shape of a ship, there is a fan-shaped granite ramp leading to the water which enhances their unity. The distinctive spatial composition reminding of a ship is rich in plastic details which originally were all in white color.

The sports club House of Physical Culture Dynamo is a well-preserved structure with minor alterations and losses which do not affect the architectural image as a whole. The building is being used to its original purpose by the Sports Society Dynamo.

**The Issue of the Domes of the Cathedral of the Intercession of the Holy Theotokos on the Moat**

Troskina, N.D., Member of ICOMOS, Moscow

The Cathedral of the Intercession of the Holy Theotokos on the Moat on the Red Square in Moscow is a World Heritage Site and one of the masterpieces of the global architecture. The studies of the Cathedral are of great historical and cultural significance. One of them is the monograph by A. L. Batalov *The Cathedral of the Intercession on the Moat*, which has become an important stage in studying the interaction of European and Russian architecture. The monograph has clearly
identified the features of the monument's style which combines Gothic and Renaissance forms. However, the shape of the Cathedral's intricate domes and the time of their creation have not been addressed in the monograph. These issues remain a subject for discussion. Many researchers, referring to the miniatures in the Illuminated Compiled Chronicle, believed that the intricately shaped domes were there from the very beginning. However, according to the Piskariyovsky chronicler, 'the tops of the Trinity (church) and the (Cathedral of) Intercession on the Moat of different shape' were made 'during the rule of the pious Tsar and Grand Prince Fedor Ivanovich of all Russia'. It is corroborated by the texts of the tile chronicler dated 1683 which were amended in the late 18th century. Many researchers of the history of the monument's construction used to associate appearing of the domes with the Cathedral’s post-fire repairs. However, such an unusual shape that has no peers both in Russian and global architecture can hardly be explained by the scheduled repairs. In our opinion, there are more reasons to associate the domes' erection with the events when 'Lord revealed His Pleaser Basil the Fool and from his tomb came great wonders and many ailments were healed'. It is known that in 1588 Tzar Feodor Ioannovich has commanded 'to make a reliquary of silver and gold and adorned with gems and pearls over his tomb... and to build over his tomb a stone church and to establish celebrations on the second day of August'. The glorification of the new Moscow Wonderworker preceded the celebrations on the occasion of the establishment of the Patriarchate in Russia in January 1589 and was apparently a part of the vast program for the presentation of this most important event in the country's history. We can assume that the program also included consecration of the new tombs of grand princesses and tsarinas, the Cathedral at the Ascension Convent in the Kremlin built in 1588.

Research into the origins of the unusually shaped domes of the Cathedral of the Intercession has revealed their direct and close analogs in the 15-16th centuries European graphic materials. They became available in Russia due to the introduction of printing, engravings and model making. In particular, we know of the existence of a wooden model of the Church of Holy of Holies which Boris Godunov wanted to build in the Moscow Kremlin.

The intricate domes have burned in the 1595 fire when 'the entire Kitay-Gorod burned down: not only courts but also everything in the stone churches and cellars have burned down'; that is why they are not present on the Kremlingrad drawing. Apparently the burned down domes have been restored during Boris Godunov's rule. Immediately after the Trouble Times, in 1610s., they were described by Piotr Petrey who noted that the Cathedral 'is faced with bright shiny stones"; they were shown on the first plans of Moscow.

The analysis of the iconographic materials with images of the Cathedral of the Intercession shows that the shape of its domes remained unchanged over one century despite numerous fires. The shapes have been replicated during the Cathedral's largest renovation in 1670-1680 when the domes were made 'after the example'. As the field observations and archival documents show, the 1680s metal structures have been preserved in the subsequent numerous repairs in 18-20th centuries. Only two domes have been modified: in 1680, the central dome that has been replaced with the smooth-surfaced one and the Southern one that has been modified in 1940s.

At the present, the domes of the Cathedral of the Intercession are a rare example of the synthesis of the early modern times European ideas in the science and arts which were welcomed and materialized in the 16th century Moscow, following the construction of the churches in Kolomenskoye, the Cathedral of the Intercession on the Moat etc.

Economic Potential of World Heritage Properties
The issues of conservation of heritage belong not only to the domain of culture. They represent a space of a great potential for socio-economic development of our country. Cultural heritage objects are the points of attraction for many people. First of all, these are tourists who often come to our country to see the gems of the Russian architecture, paintings and sculptures. Therefore, the architectural masterpieces, museums, historical areas should be considered as the basis for building and supporting the tourist infrastructure. From the other countries’ practical experience we know that cultural heritage is able to turn into a permanent source of revenues for a settlement, a city or a region.

During his address to the Federal Assembly in March of this year, Russian President Vladimir Putin proposed to create a regional cultural, educational and museum complexes which, according to the President 'have to become real centers of cultural life.' It is obvious that the key elements around which such complexes are to be created are the cultural heritage objects. That is why today there is a growing number of professionals who suggest that the monuments' preservation, studying and restoration were considered as a separate sector of the economy that creates the conditions for sustainable socio-economic development.

Attitude to the cultural heritage is one of the factors for gaining respect to the country in the world. Seventeen cultural heritage objects in Russia have been inscribed in the UNESCO World Heritage List. Such monuments as the Moscow Kremlin, the Solovki, the Kazan Kremlin, the Trinity Lavra of St. Sergius, the Bolgar, the historical center of Saint Petersburg every year attract attention of millions of people from all over the world, they are the 'points of growth' for the formation of cultural space and comfortable urban environment. Yet another significant role of the cultural heritage objects is in enhancing Russia's international authority as a global power with a rich cultural tradition.

For the successful implementation of this task we need a systematic analysis of the issues related to the preservation of the World Heritage Sites in Russia, we have to use international experience, improve legal instruments for the protection of cultural heritage and methods. One of the burning issues is the expert community's efficient resistance to the processes related to degeneration of historical urban tissue. The leading role in the discussion on these issues and in seeking solutions are the meetings of the National Committee ICOMOS.

Advanced Technologies in Emergency Response on the World Cultural Heritage Properties. Experience in Assessing Their Efficiency

Fisser, S.V., Member of ICOMOS
Knyazeva, V. P., Member of ICOMOS, Moscow

In the 21st century, to meet the challenges of 'sustainable restoration' and to preserve scientific potential of the World Heritage Sites the field work requires innovative technologies and materials which would be able to restore an original material destroyed by corrosion and to ensure its effective long-term protection from water and pollution for the entire life of a monument.

The environmental studies recognize monuments and the world cultural heritage as an information resource and a component of our planet. This is why while restoration it is especially important that the heritage's value potential were not corrupted, in particular, if there is a corrosion destruction of structural materials being a key feature of Russian wooden and stone architecture. Such materials should not be contaminated with the materials used in restoration.
The Department of Architectural Materials Study, the Moscow Architectural Institute has, within the F2 priority direction "Evaluation of material's evolution and developing materials compatible with cultural heritage" for the purpose of scientific substantiation of the efficiency of new technologies and materials, performed the comparative analysis of the efficiency of the widely used waterproofing compounds of various action principles: 1) plugging capillary passages, blocked moisture transmission; 2) narrowing capillary passages, complicated moisture transmission; 3) rendering capillary walls hydrophobic, blocked moisture penetration; 4) rendering capillary walls hydrophobic + narrowing capillary passages, filling pores with silica gel; blocking moisture penetration and narrowing capillary passages, filling pores with hydracrylic gel.

Field studies of the efficiency of the waterproofing materials have shown that the effect was insufficient. In some cases there was no effect at all. One of the causes of the defects of the restored waterproofing and of the negative results of waterproofing is the waterproofing material's transfer into the construction materials polluted with salts under the capillary pressure. When choosing materials the conditions of chemical reactions, types of pollution and degree of destruction of construction materials have not been taken into account.

Long-term (over 20 years) monitoring of the World Cultural Heritage in Moscow has shown that the so-called acrylic gels are the most environmentally friendly waterproofing materials, they have been successfully used in Europe for over 30 years. In the 90s, they came to our markets and were used successfully for waterproofing structures in basement spaces on the sites of national significance. However, their use was limited by their high cost. By today the Russian chemists have developed an analog of this product with improved properties, adapted to become compatible with the traditional Russian construction materials. In developing the acrylic gels the molecular and nuclear precision technology was used. There is a real opportunity for phasing out costly imported materials with the Russian environmentally efficient product HydrAcryl.

The results of the research into the efficiency of waterproofing, salt-proofing and biocidal preservative compounds of various compositions have been studied and presented in the paper; mistakes in determining whether their use in restoration practice is feasible, have been identified and analyzed.

Panel 5. Archaeological Studies of World Heritage Sites in Russia

Interpretation of Archaeological Heritage Sites (the Archaeology Parks case)
Antyufeyeva, O.A., the Urbanistics and Theory of Architecture Chair, the Volgograd State Technical University, Volgograd

Today the need to develop new formats of presentation and exposition of the archaeological heritage is quite obvious. The requirement to 'liven up' archaeological sites predetermined the development of new approaches to the structure of their display and interpretation. Interpretation is understood as a complex multifaceted process of construing and presentation of cultural heritage sites, which includes educational activity, a process of communication with a monument in the form of experiences, immersion or interaction, which actuates various links between the meanings inherent in the cultural heritage and its perception by the audience. In other words, the interpretation of heritage can be described as the translation of information from scientific language into a language that is understandable to a wider audience and that is presented in an
interesting and engaging format associated with modern life. The new methods of interpretation of archaeological heritage are the formats of presentation that are based on perception through active interaction with the use of entertainment technologies ('living history', 'deep tourism', experimental archaeology).

Admitting the unconditional advantages of this phenomenon, it is also necessary to consider possible negative consequences of interpretation in the process of translating scientific language into ideas understandable to a wide audience. The fact that the stories and themes related to cultural heritage provide excellent material for entertainment due to their being obviously different from the daily life cannot be used as an excuse for their loose interpretation.

Such formats of exposition and presentation of monuments as archaeological parks may be considered as a successful format of interpretation of archaeological heritage. A new format of an archaeological park as a modern and active public space shows that the archaeological heritage can be vibrant and included in the modern life.

The author has developed a concept of an extended spatial system of exposition for displaying the archaeological heritage of the Great Silk Road in the South of Russia. It is proposed to use spectacular formats of exposition such as 'living history' (historical reconstruction of events, role-playing games) on the following subjects: Survival Path (living in extreme conditions); Warrior's Path (nomadic peoples' martial arts training); Khan's Path (studying khans' and rich merchants' life styles); Women's World, 'Nomad Children' etc.

**Conservation and Studying the Archaeological Heritage of Veliky Novgorod at the Present Stage**

Gaidukov, P. G., Member of ICOMOS, Moscow

Oleynikov, O.M., Institute of Archaeology, RAS, Moscow

Sedov, V. V., Member of ICOMOS, Moscow

The 10-17th centuries cultural layer of Veliky Novgorod that covers the 350 hectares area within the Okolny town's ramparts has been put under the government protection in 1974. The decision of the XVI Session of the UNESCO Committee in December 1992 has inscribed it in the UNESCO World Heritage List as a separate item within the multicomponent object 'Historic Monuments of Novgorod and Environs'.

Informative potential of the Novgorod's cultural layer is a most valuable historical resource of global significance which has no peers in other medieval cities of Russia. Over 85 years of archaeological study in Novgorod have covered an area of about 50,000 sq.m while the depth of the cultural layer was ranging from 1 to 8 m. Entire block of a medieval city with streets and mansions has been discovered on the Novgorod excavation sites. A rich collection of over 200,000 individual artifacts including 1107 birch bark letters has been compiled (16.07.2018).

In the recent years the archaeological study of the Novgorod cultural layer was performed through systematic excavations funded by the state budget (the Troitsky excavation site, the Novgorod ancient city, architectural and archaeological surveys in Novgorod and its environs) as well as in the format of emergency archaeological works which are funded by various construction companies and individuals.

Among the organizations performing archaeological studies in Novgorod are the Institute of Archaeology, RAS, the Novgorod State Museum-Reserve and the State Universities of Moscow, Saint Petersburg and Novgorod.
In 2005–2017 the Institute of Archaeology, RAS has performed extensive studies of the Novgorod city area as well as excavations and surveys of the extinct and extant monuments of the medieval Novgorodian architecture. The works have been performed on more than 100 objects which total area amounted to over 15,000 sq.m. In addition to the urban area, regular excavations have been performed in the monasteries in Novgorod environs: the Annunciation on Myachin, the St. Panteleimon, St. George, St. Andrew Sitetsky Monasteries.

The excavations yielded new materials important for understanding the dynamics of Novgorod’s evolution in various periods of history as well as for studying its monumental structures, internal and external trade link, material and spiritual culture.

Tourism Development at the Shulgan–Tash Cave Museum–Reserve

Gainullin, D. A., Member of ICOMOS, Ufa

The Shulgan-Tash is one of the largest karst caves in the South Urals, over 2.9 km long with three tiers. It was academically discovered in 18th century. It is not only a unique natural monument but also a historical and cultural object. The cave is the only one in the Russian Federation and throughout Eastern Europe which has well-preserved Paleolithic art reliably attributed to the Pleistocene Age.

In 2012 the Shulgan-Tash cave has been inscribed in the UNESCO Tentative World Heritage List while its unique historical and cultural value has been appreciated in the first years following the discovery of the Paleolithic art in 1959.

The Directorate for the State Protection of the Cultural Heritage Objects of the Republic of Bashkortostan along with other parties concerned is compiling the nomination dossier of the Rock Art of the Shulgan-Tash Cave object. Construction of a multi-purpose archaeological and natural complex Shulgan-Tash Cave should become an anchor project in its history; it will be a large-scale exposition complex of European level, with an easy access for its visitors. It will channel the main stream of visitors to the museum, thus significantly reducing anthropogenic impact on the cave's microclimate and the status of preservation of the original paintings in the cave. It will also create conditions for preservation of the cave's unique archaeological complex and the surrounding cultural and natural landscapes in their original state.

One of the priority objectives of the Shulgan-Tash Museum-Reserve is to establish research institutes; it would open up a prospect for creating the unique All-Russia Center of Restoration and Conservation of Rock Art and a permanent archaeological expedition to the sites of Paleolithic age. The Museum will have a children's interactive center for studying prehistoric civilizations which will give the young generation an opportunity to develop scientific approach to the human civilization.

The Shulgan-Tash Museum-Reserve will be included in international catalogs of sites and prehistoric monuments which would raise interest to the unique monument among the public and academic community. International tourists will become interested in visiting the Republic of Bashkortostan as a unique birthplace of the primitive art.

The Issues in Nominating the Petroglyphs of the Onega Lake and the White Sea object to the UNESCO Tentative List
Devlet, E. G., Member of ICOMOS, Moscow
Lobanova, N.V., the Karelian Science Center, RAS, Petrozavodsk
Alipova, Y. B., Directorate for Protection of Cultural Heritage of the Republic of Karelia, Petrozavodsk
Amelina, T. P., Directorate for Protection of Cultural Heritage of the Republic of Karelia, Petrozavodsk

Intensified efforts towards nominating archaeological monuments and sites of Russia to the UNESCO List poses a challenge that is not limited to the issues of research, preservation and arranging access to cultural heritage. Considerable difficulties are represented by the concept of outstanding universal value and identifying criteria for successful nomination of the objects which should in an advantageous format focus on the powerful potential of historical memory, aesthetic value and cultural identity which all the outstanding object being nominated to the UNESCO List possess.

Therefore, learning from the international experience and the Russian studies of the rock art becomes very useful and effective. The UNESCO List has forty four sites with rock art on different continents which are distinctive for outstanding iconography of petroglyphs and paintings. However, understanding of the phenomenon of rock art would never be complete without Russian sites that display new aspects of images on rocks as an ancient communication means. There are three Russian nominations to the UNESCO Tentative List while in the main List there are still no Russian rock art objects.

The nominated object Petroglyphs of the Onega Lake and the White Sea is a serial one and includes images on rocks at the Onega Lake (25 groups) and at the White Sea (11 groups). They are located in the exceptionally impressive natural environments and in the extant cultural context, however, at the significant distance from each other (330 km). The total number of petroglyphs is at least 4,500. They are distinctive for variety of images and subjects, abundance of scenes and mult figured compositions, skillful performance, artistic expression of narratives and good state of preservation and represent a rare example of Neolithic rock art without any earlier or later strata. Assessment of outstanding universal value of a serial object for the purpose of its inscribing in the UNESCO List is based on the three cultural criteria: (i), (iii), (iv).

The expert discussion at the Ancient Rock Art in the Context of World Cultural Heritage International Research to Practice Conference that took place on June 26 to 30, 2018 helped highlighting the most controversial issues in nominating such special objects as Karelia petroglyphs to the UNESCO List.

The Case Study of the Annunciation Church at Gorodishche, a UNESCO Protected Property

Sedov, V. V., Member of ICOMOS, Moscow
Vdovichenko, M.V., Institute of Archaeology, RAS, Moscow

The Annunciation Church at Gorodishche is a double-level monument. The first stone church at Gorodishche, the Novgorodian princes’ residence has been built in 1103 upon the Prince Mstislav Vladimirovich's order. In 1342-1343, the second stone church, partially extant, was built on the same place. It has undergone several reconstructions and additions and in 1941-1944 was reduced to rubble. The 12th century church was partially discovered by archaeologist M.K. Karger
but later the excavation sites got buried under the soil and the research’s materials have never been published.

In 2000 and 2012, extensive archaeological surveys have been performed at the church and have yielded new materials concerning the church's conservation status. Recently a program of conservation of the 14th century church's ruins has been drafted (architect V. A. Popov) which supposed uncovering and conservation of the entire 1103 church.

The works have been performed in 2016–2017 by the Novgorod Architecture and Archaeology Group of the Institute of Archaeology, RAS. The entire 1103 church's site has been uncovered, its walls, pillars and foundations have been studied. Numerous fragments of frescos have been discovered including historical and trivial graffiti as well as fragments with face images which allow studying the style of paintings.

Archaeological Survey at the Lyudin Konets of the Medieval Novgorod (the Troitsky Excavation Site)

Singh, V. K., the Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow
Stepanov, A. M., the Novgorod Museum–Reserve, Veliky Novgorod

Systematic archaeological researches at the Troitsky excavation site, the main object of the Novgorod archaeological expedition have continued for 45 years. Their total covered area is more than 8,000 sq.m.

Started with a small excavation in 1973, gradually the researched area extended along the medieval Chernitsina street including the junction of the Pereboynaya street which used to be the main road in the Lyudin Konets and the Chernitsina street. To the North of the Chernitsina street a small part of the parallel Yarysheva street has been studied. Later, in the Southern part of the excavation site an unnamed alley has been discovered, it ran parallel to the Redyatina street to the South of the site. In the studied area of the Lyudin Konets 19 medieval mansions have been discovered, some of them have been thoroughly studies. The first settlements in this part of the Lyudin Konets have been attributed to 930s AD, the late medieval strata are attributed to the early 15th century.

The materials of the studies of the Lyudin Konets allowed solving the most burning issues in the Novgorodian history related to the city's foundation, its early history (tax collection, judicial proceedings etc.). Currently the works are performed at the Troitsky XV and XVI.

The archaeological studies at the Troitsky excavation site are an inexhaustible well of information on various aspects of lives and customs of the medieval Novgorodians and these studies are still far from end.

Over the last 25 years excavations were funded largely by the Russian Foundation for Humanities (since 2017 by the Russian Fund for Federal Property).

Despite all the logistics problems that extend the timeframes of works in the new areas, the cultural layer still has to be studied in larger areas which proved feasible in the 1950s at the Nerevsky excavations, unlike surveys on the future construction sites limited by parameters of the developed lots.
The Latest Archaeological Studies in Staraya Russa
Toropova, E. V., the Novgorod State University, Veliky Novgorod

Staraya Russia is situated at the 60 km distance to the South of Novgorod. These days, it is a small district center in the Novgorod Region but in the Middle Ages it was the largest and the closed 'suburb' of Novgorod's. The written sources up to early 16th century refer to it as just Russa. By the late 1530s the adjective 'Staraya' (old) was added to the name but the present day form of 'Staraya Russa' has been permanently accepted only in the 18th century. For the first time the town was mentioned in the First Novgorod Chronicles in 1167-1168 in the context of a conflict between Novgorodians and Prince Svetoslav Rostislavovich who, having been banished from Novgorod was trying to regain the Novgorod Principality through military force and the aid of his family. The earliest written record is contained in the birch bark letter No. 526 attributed to the second third of the 11th century.

Today the only reliable method of studying the Russa's history is the comprehensive analysis of archaeological materials. The results of many years of archaeological excavations in Staraya Russa give a vivid picture of the town’s life starting from the early stages of its formation at the turn of 10-11th centuries up to the present days. Like the Novgorod's, the Staraya Russa's cultural layer is beneficial for organic matters' preservation which manifold increases its informative value. The layers' maximum depth is 6 m. Among organic discoveries there is a large number of wooden items, fragments of leather footwear, textiles as well as 49 birch bark letters attributed to 11th to 15th centuries (16.07.2018). Information on all individual discoveries is recorded in the electronic database stored in the server cluster at the Novgorod University with remote access for researchers (URL: http://www.novsu.ru/archeology).

Despite the almost complete equivalence to the material culture of Novgorod as a capital city the provincial Russa had its specifics that in the first place are related to the main source of economic wealth of the medieval Russa's citizens — salt-making craft. Staraya Russa's cultural layer as a single holistic object studied since 1966. The materials obtained in the course of the research and emergency excavations in the recent years have greatly expanded our understanding of this town’s emergence at the turn of 10-11th centuries, of the special features of its economic, administrative and cultural development and external trade links.

The Issues in Protection of Cultural Layer as a Component of Historical Landscapes of Russian Cities as Exemplified by Yaroslavl
Frolov, I. V., Member of ICOMOS, Yaroslavl

According to one of the definitions a landscape is the visible surface of a land area resulting from the joint effects by the Nature and Man. Landscape is affected by both geologically defined basis, soil formations and the technogenic (in the geological engineering terminology) load. The cultural (technogenic) overlay is understood as a historically developed system of cultural layers and related geological and soil deposits. The Russian law has established the 100 years limit for attributing objects to the archaeology domain. Thus, cultural layer is one of the bases for a cultural landscape formation and its integral part.
The cultural layer of Yaroslavl as a UNESCO World Heritage Site is not an exception. Formally the Yaroslavl cultural layer is divided into two individual archaeological sites of federal significance — the Spit as the Place of Yaroslavl Emergence and the Cultural Layer of Yaroslavl, 11-17th Centuries. The cultural layer survey is mandatory for economic activity, planning and construction within the boundaries of the Historical Center of the City of Yaroslavl Site, a cultural heritage object of federal significance.

Despite the tight restrictions imposed by the effective law, the cultural layer destruction and, therefore, damaging the CHO's cultural landscape in the course of such operations as installation of new communication lines and repairing the old ones, construction etc. within the boundaries of the Historical Center of the City of Yaroslavl World Heritage Site are still an often occurrence. One of the forms of justification for the CHO's cultural layer's destruction is the appealing to the fact that only the archaeological strata down to 12th century constitute archaeological heritage and, therefore, the 18th – early 20th centuries' deposits are not of archaeological value and construction works in such areas are not forbidden. Based on this argument permissions for works without the mandatory participation of archaeologists are often given which, in our opinion is intolerable. It is also often forgotten that the Russian law has established the hundred years limit for attribution of technogenic overlay to cultural layer which presumes mandatory archaeological surveys. This situation is paradoxical from the legal point of view and disastrous in the context of cultural heritage preservation. The lack of solution to this issue may entail significant loss of cultural layer and subsequently the irreversible corruption/destruction of the HCO’s cultural landscape.

As one of the tools for protection of cultural layer and preservation of cultural landscapes we see the development of a digital map of the cultural layer's preservation status through the GIS technologies.

Challenges in Organizing Tourism in the Bolgar Archaeological Complex World Heritage Site

Faskhutdinov, A. N., Member of ICOMOS, Kazan

The first description of a Bolgar settlement can be found in the 1627 'Big Book of Drawings'. Emperor Peter I was the first high-rank visitor of the Bolgar settlement; he stayed there in June 1712 during the Persian campaign. He has viewed the ruins and left his autograph on the Great Minaret wall. Following this visit he has issued the Decree for repairing architectural monuments of the ancient town. In June 1767, Catherine II has visited Bolgar and noted the site's miserable state. During the 18-19th centuries, many famous political figures, travelers and scholars visited Bolgar. Its ancient ruins are depicted in the paintings by A. Savrasov and I. Shishkin. Nevertheless, the ancient town always remained a religious pilgrimage destination for the Tatar people. In the 1860s, an idea to organize a museum-reserve has come up. The first tours of the ancient town have been organized by the Archaeological and Ethnographic Society of the Imperial University of Kazan. But the lack of the government support to conservation and protection of the ancient monuments lead to the loss of many of them.

In 1919 the local teacher V. M. Korolev became the State Custodian of the Bolgar settlement. It was him who over many decades conducted tours for the site's visitors. In 1969 the
Bolgar Museum-Reserve has been established. By that time the settlement and its architectural monuments had been granted the All-Russia Cultural Object status. Over the years up to 2010 the Museum-Reserve has received over 2 million visitors. A surge in the number of visits occurred with the beginning of implementation of the *Cultural Heritage of the Svyazhsk Island Town and the Ancient Bolgar* comprehensive project which resulted in extensive archaeological surveys, restoration works and creation of new museums, communication lines and tourist infrastructure. In 2014 The Bolgar Archaeological Complex has become the 1006th World Heritage Site. Naturally, the number of tourists visiting Bolgar has grown significantly: over the seven years since the project's inception their number reached 2,019 thousand. This is an impressive growth. It entailed both anthropogenic and engineering load on the cultural heritage. Quite often public events involving dozens of thousands people are organized there. All this causes a threat to the heritage's archaeological and architectural conservation status. The Great Bolgar has become a famous brand of Tatarstan and is gradually gaining popularity throughout Russia. However, there is still a long way to go to gain international recognition. But the question arises: will we be able to preserve it in its present state?

**Current Russian Legislation in the Sphere of Conservation of Archaeological Heritage**

Engovatova, A. V., Member of ICOMOS, Moscow

In the recent years we witnessed a growing number of archaeological studies. This is supported by the data on the number of the issued permits for archaeological excavations and surveys (so called open sheets). This trend started in 2004 following the adoption of the Federal law No. 73-FZ *Cultural Heritage Objects (Monuments of History and Culture) of the Peoples of the Russian Federation*, when the number of emergency archaeological surveys prior to construction projects has significantly grown throughout the country.

The archaeological surveys' practice in the conditions established by the new law has made evident certain flaws in the law which complicate field archaeological works. During the following years the law drafting continued with the purpose of amending the effective law, adopting new laws and secondary implementing instruments regulating the issues of conservation and studying archaeological heritage.

The first of the positive changes were a long discussion (since 2003) and the preparation for ratification of the European Convention Concerning the Archaeological Heritage. In June 2011, as soon as the Convention has been ratified, the systematic process began with the intent of bringing the Russian legislation into conformity with the Convention's provisions aimed at comprehensive conservation of archaeological heritage, prevention of illegal trafficking in archaeological artifacts and collections.

In 2013-2014, the benchmark federal laws regulating the issues concerning the conservation of archaeological heritage have been adopted, such as No. 245-FZ dated 23.07.2013 Amendments to the *Certain Legislative Acts of the Russian Federation for Prevention of Illegal Activities in the Archeology Field* and № 315-FZ dated 22.10.2014 Amendments to the Federal Law *Cultural Heritage Objects (Monuments of History and Culture) of the Peoples of the Russian Federation* and *Certain Legislative Acts of the Russian Federation*. To a certain extent, they have solved many issues, which in the last decade have been a matter of deep concern for academic archaeologists, participants of the parliamentary events devoted to the preservation of archaeological heritage.

One of the important achievements has become the introduction of significant changes to the section related to the state historical and cultural assessment of land lots, forest areas and water objects or their parts subject to the impact by excavation, construction, reclamation, maintenance, forestry-related and other types of works. Such assessment can be performed exclusively in the format of archaeological survey and with the permits for archaeological excavations and surveys.
(so called open sheets). If there is an archaeological object on a land lot, any further operations are permitted on the condition of implementation of the mandatory provisions for cultural heritage safety in the operation plans, or the plans for ensuring safety of such cultural heritage, or the plans for emergency field archaeological operations including assessment of intended operations' impact on cultural heritage, approved by a respective institution in charge of cultural heritage protection. The above provisions are also subject to historical and cultural assessment. This system ensures preservation of not only already discovered archaeological objects but also the new ones identified in the course of a land lot's assessment.

At the end of June 2018 the State Duma has held the hearings on amending the effective law with the purpose of 'simplification' of historical and cultural assessment procedure. Practical implementation of the proposed amendments which suppose the federal institutions' responsibility for determining boundaries of the said areas causes archaeologists deep concern.

It should be noted that a significant part of the Russian Federation has never been examined in terms of archaeology, especially Siberia with its vast areas where only a few archaeological heritage objects have been recorded in the respective state registers. Determining boundaries of the territories which may have objects with cultural heritage criteria may take years of systematic archaeological studies including archaeological and planimetric surveys which call for involving a great number of certified experts in archaeology and for significant financial costs. However, the proposed amendments have no reference to any source of financing. Boundaries of the areas which according to the proposed amendments will be subject to the Ministry for Culture approval will have to be determined with utmost accuracy eliminating any probability for a heritage being located beyond such boundaries since, in such a case they may get lost as a result of business operations.

Panel 6. Challenges in Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Heritage

Historical Center of Bolkhov: Presentation Experience

Koveshnikova, N.A., Member of ICOMOS, Orel

Bolkhov's officially recognized year of foundation is 1556; however, Tatishchev used to attribute the first mention of Bolkhov to 1196 with the reference to the ancient manuscripts. Undoubtedly, archaeological excavations would be able to shed light on the town's ancient history but they have never been performed on this site.

Today Bolkhov is a small town far from railroads that preserved the evidences of its ancient and unique beauty. It was only fair that in 2002 it was included in the list of historical cities of Russia having significant cultural value. Bolkhov's low-rise public and residential buildings within the historic boundaries of attributed to 18th to early 20th century represent a vivid example of the provincial civil architecture, developed in the 18th century on the regular planning principle. The central blocks retain their historical planning framework and integrity with the terrain; they display various vistas and focal points at the significant urban nodes. The number of clashing structures is insignificant. Thus, Bolkhov's historical center possesses a high degree of authenticity and conservation of architectural and spatial tissue as well as historical planning structure, scenic landscapes and distinctive urban fabric.
About 60 objects have been granted protection as historical and architectural monuments of federal, regional and municipal significance. Protected zones have been identified for all the monuments. The central conservation area where the most valuable architectural structures are located is under the rigid control of any restoration and beautification operations as well as of the buildings conservation status. Any development that may prove alien to the integral ensemble is forbidden. The control is exercised by the Department for the State Protection of the Cultural Heritage of the Orel Region.

The places of religious worship constitute the main architectural and historical value. The earliest one is the Trinity Cathedral of the Optin Monastery (construction started in 1668). The most striking heritage of the pre-Peter period in the Orel Region is the Trinity Church in Bolkhov (1708). It is remarkable primarily for its decor, the ‘wonderful patterns’, which glorified the Russian architecture of the 17th — early 18th centuries. Experts put the Trinity Church on a par with the outstanding late 17th century buildings in Moscow, Ryazan and Yaroslavl.

Convergence of Sciences in the Urban Reconstruction of Historical Cities

Malaya, E. V., Member of ICOMOS, Moscow

The convergence of the sciences is gaining increasingly decisive importance for the modern society development. The key element in the system of academic knowledge that is accumulating achievements of science and technology, inventions and creativity, is Architecture – the art and science for creating space for human life. The struggle of the classical principles of architectural design with the most promising directions of engineering and 3D modeling is expressed in the unity of opposites. Architecture and urbanism constitute a link between various science domains.

The convergence of academic knowledge is in demand with architects and urban planners for creating comfortable habitation environment, integrating development and nature, environment protection along the industrial development, preservation of cultural values along the emergence of new technologies.

Academic researches and discoveries contribute to creation of new architectural objects, new approaches to urban planning. Advanced achievements of the science contribute to spatial formation and compositional modeling based on the experimental facilities of the research and academic institutions.

Material production is becoming ever more science-driven. The throughout integration of automated management systems and production facilities, space exploration, biotechnologies are but a few most striking manifestations of science and technologies integration in the modern world.

These days the urban tissue of the historical cities of Russia calls for major repairs, reconstruction of engineering systems and beautification of urban spaces, development of transport infrastructure and walking areas, planting more vegetation in the urban environment. In order to preserve and, in many cases, to boost the role of historic cities in the development of economy, culture and scientific potential the leading role should be given to the renovation of industrial and abandoned areas in historical cities. The leading experts in the respective and related fields contribute to developing methods of urban reconstruction and resuscitation of urban areas.
Within the academic program and for the purpose of furthering universities' research activity, developing experimental projects a team of architects from the Moscow Architectural Institute, teaching engineers and students from the Beuth University of Applied Sciences, Berlin, dendrologists and experts from the Russian State Agrarian University — Moscow K.A. Timiryazev Agricultural Academy, the Harbin Institute of Technology and other institutes has been formed to work in this field. Round tables and meetings have already been held, development of experimental projects in Rybinsk and other cities of the Yaroslavl Region has begun.

**Urban Planning Strategies for Prevention of Degeneration of Historic Urban Tissue.**

Malaya, E. V., Member of ICOMOS, Moscow

A professional approach to the preservation of historical heritage restores the harmony and sustainable development of the urban tissue. Under the pressure of concrete embankments, new thoroughfares, incessant clearings of green areas for purposes of new construction, historical centers are facing slow but inevitable death. Only architects, urban planners and city authorities are able to put an end to this process through the efforts towards conservation of the valuable historical urban tissue on the edge of the 'hectic life' of smoggy cities.

The cities and their streets and squares now are referred to as 'living environment'; the beauty of city streets, parks and buildings — 'comfortable living conditions', the city image and its composition features — 'identity'. Any city's main employers — factories and production facilities — constitute a special value.

In many cities in the central Russia some industrial architecture monuments are still alive, in some cases we can even see a trend towards conservation and restoration of the buildings that were constructed and functioned in the late 19th – early 20th centuries. There are many examples of the attitude of care for industrial buildings in Moscow (centers near Metro station Kurskaya), Warsaw, Berlin and other cities where the industrial heritage are given a chance for a new start through reconstruction and reinvention as cultural or shopping centers.

This presentation proposes to revive old porcelain, faience, ceramic and household factories and discusses the issues related to this process that is of great significance for the city. It would help in cultural revival and social invigoration, rekindling the economy and creating favorable living environment.

**Conservation of the Staraya Sarepta Ensemble in Volgograd**

Serebryanaya, V. V., Member of ICOMOS, Volgograd

The German colony of Sarepta was founded by Catherine II in the Astrakhan province at the 28 miles distance to the South of Tsaritsyn, on the river Sarpa as one of the fortified outposts in the South of Russia and a religious mission in the Kalmyk environment. On September 14, 1765 the envoys of the Fraternal Union of Hernhut arrived here. Sarepta's urban tissue has been formed over a century. In 18th and 19th centuries it became an economic, religions, academic and cultural center in the Lower Volga region. Sarepta is a unique natural, historical and cultural phenomenon while its buildings are gradually deteriorating. Its area was shrinking as 'the Magic Skin'. In 1970–1990s the development plans for this area did not take into account the need to preserve the most valuable architectural and urban heritage in the region. Despite the fact that in
1989 the Old Sarepta Historical, Ethnographic and Architectural Museum-Reserve has been established in the area and architects N. and Y. Esau have developed protected zones, many buildings and the graveyard have been demolished and replaced with the five- and nine-storey buildings. The one- and two-storey historical buildings in the protected zone of Sarepta center (the Svobody sq.) became squeezed between high-rise and compactly set buildings.

The ensemble's area is 7.1 hectares. There are 28 buildings of which 23 are the 18th–19th century federal heritage monuments. The area has been divided into four protected zones:

1. The Svobody sq.
2. The Glitsch mustard oil mill (a monument of regional significance). Various industrial facilities built in 1950-1980s located in this protected zone are clashing with its vista; however, they are still not demolished.
3. The area of 0.75 hectares with the Bauer mill and the former office building.
4. The landscape within the boundaries of the Saprinsky Island, the Sarpinsky backwater and the Volga-Don Canal.

Sarepta has been a cultural heritage object of federal significance for 39 years. There are existing protected zones. However, in 1992 the Urban Planning Council has approved only one of them, the Svobody square. In 1993 the Spetsproektrestavratsiya Institute has drafted restoration plans for six buildings and working drawings for two buildings. However, the restoration progress is very slow due to financial problems. Meanwhile, the architectural heritage is deteriorating. The urgent measures have to be taken towards their preservation. Since the Old Sarepta ensemble meets all the criteria as a Site it is proposed to recommend assigning this status to this object. The new status would integrate the entire territory of the German Hernhuters’ colony, would extend the opportunity not only for the preservation of individual objects but for the whole of the historical architectural tissue.

The Issue of Protection of Small and Medium-Size Country Estates

Polyantseva, E. V., Member of ICOMOS, Moscow

The 18th – early 20th centuries small and medium-size country estates fall into the category of the most vulnerable and rapidly disappearing segments of our cultural heritage.

It should be noted that as a rule, only the most prominent and famous of them become objects of academic context, while the most extensive stratum of medium and small estates are not able to attract due attention, especially if such estates are not associated with celebrity owners or architects, and their current status is miserable. While this is the very type of monuments in terms of their great number, the 18-19th centuries farming, cultural and aesthetic systems, that contributed to the formation of the historical landscape phenomenon around big cities of Russia. The main elements of the latter such as terrain, water-bodies, road network, settlements and architectural focal points to the great extent have influenced locations and compositions of country estates and, vice versa, where influenced by the practice of estate architecture. High density of country estates in certain regions of the central Russia suggests that their design fitted into a single artistic system. To illustrate the scope of estate construction it would be sufficient to
mention that only in the Moscow Province by mid-19th century there were over 5,500 estates, most of which fell into the category of small and medium-sized.

The aesthetics of an estate at that time used to presume redesigning the entire available area. All the design elements were integrated in a single ensemble and arranged in a particular hierarchy. An estate of that time can be considered as an independent artistic system with its own logic, established features of composition, links between the ensemble's elements as well as between the ensemble and its natural environs. The well-developed network of estate structures used to build that special environment which today we call the world of Russian estate with its pillars, mezzanines, little bridges and shady parkways. Today many of those structures and small architectural forms vanish without a trace and take with them the elements of once integral creation.

Some Aspects of the Current Restoration of the Vyborg Castle

Tsoy, V. O., Member of ICOMOS, Vyborg

The Vyborg Castle, founded in 1293 during the Sweden's Third Crusade, over more than 700 years of its history has been reconstructed many times. Following a series of devastating fires in the 19th century (especially the one in 1856) the Castle has lost its inner layout and interiors. In 1891–1894 the Castle has been reconstructed by the Vyborg Department for Military Fortress Engineering; its present look is the result of that reconstruction. In the 20th century's wars the Castle has avoided any serious damage; today the complex of structures on an island is a monument of federal significance. In the mid-1960s began the Castle's museumification, at the same time some of the buildings such as the Governor's House have undergone restoration.

Today the Ministry for Culture of the Russian Federation has recognized the need to restore all the 23 architectural monuments located on the Castle Island. In 2015 the developing of designs and estimates has begun, and in 2017 the repair and restoration operations have commenced. The most difficult aspect is the lack of comprehensive approach to restoration: the project has no single customer; as a result there is no clear approach to restoration in the context of the monument's future use; the issue of the funding sequence remains pending. The Vyborg Museum-Reserve located at the Castle which founder is the Committee for Culture of the Leningrad Region, is acting as coordinator between sundry customers under the Ministry for Culture, trying to correlate its own plans for museum development with the developed and performed restoration projects for various objects as well as with contradicting provisions of the law (in the spheres of environment protection, archaeology, state construction monitoring and assessment, fire prevention).

It has to be noted that the scope of researches is far from sufficient, it goes for geological and archaeological surveys without which it is impossible to make a proper design. Tenders for the studying of a small part of the island's cultural layer were issued only in 2018 and within such a short time several significant discoveries have been made which should affect the already developed and approved restoration designs for certain architectural monuments on the Castle Island.

Practical Aspects of Implementation of Urban Planning Legislation as Exemplified by the Town of Yelets as a Historical Settlement of Federal Significance in the Lipetsk Region
Cherepannikova, L. A., Member of ICOMOS, Lipetsk

The town of Yelets in the Lipetsk Region was mentioned for the first time in 1146 in the Nikon Chronicle. The town's population in 2017 was 105,018. In the territory of Yelets there are 167 cultural heritage objects under the state protection, 168 newly identified cultural heritage objects, one cultural heritage of regional significance — the *Historical Part of the City of Yelets Site* and the historical settlement of federal significance — the *City of Yelets in the Lipetsk Region*. In 1978 the plan of the protected zones and the zones of regulated construction have been developed for the town. In 2015 the municipal administration has commissioned an action plan for determining the boundaries and the object of protection for a historical settlement. In February 2017 the Ministry for Culture of the Russian Federation has approved the boundaries of the territory, the object of protection (1207 objects) and the requirements to the urban planning regulations for the territory within the historical settlement.

According to the law the municipal administration has to incorporate the boundaries of the territories with special conditions of use into the documentation of territorial planning (the General Plan and the Land Use and Development Rules (PZZ)) and to develop respective regulations. Requirements to protect the objects of protection are not effective unless the amended General Plan and PZZ are adopted. The municipal administration is not interested in prompt amending of the documentation for territorial planning since it may entail additional commitments such as monitoring of the state of objects under protection, financing the measures towards its protection. Being the owner of the municipal property constituting the object of protection within the historic settlement (former merchant mansions that during the Soviet era served for 'communal' residential purpose) the municipal administration leaves them unprotected and easy prey for looting and destruction. The law on protection of cultural heritage at present does not specify which authority should exercise control over the municipal administration's actions in regards of the protected object of the historical settlement.

If there is a substantial number of monuments in the historical settlement's territory, many of the properties fall within a protected zone for cultural heritage. The effect of the protected zones gets revoked only when the protected zones for a cultural heritage object are approved. It turns out that with the approved regulations concerning height, size, color and requirements to construction materials any construction within the protected zones in the historical settlement's territory is impossible under the law in effect. It is unacceptable both for the municipal administrations of historical cities and for their citizens. Such an approach to heritage protection provokes violations of the urban planning and development law on the part of administration and developers and unauthorized construction on the part of the citizens. We have to revert to the issue related to the monuments' protected zones in the historic settlements' territories for which the requirements to regulations and the allowed types of land use have already been approved and to find a solution to this problem.

The local authorities exclude the apartment buildings within the cultural heritage sites from municipal programs of capital repairs. Such buildings are in a much deteriorated state while the contributions to the capital repair fund are insufficient for the managing companies' preparing documentation for restoration of the apartment buildings as required by the law on cultural heritage protection. This problem should be addressed on the federal level. It is necessary to develop a long-term program for historical settlements with provisions for financing preservation operations on cultural heritage objects represented by apartment buildings.
Land survey works in the historical settlement territory are not allowed unless archaeological survey has been performed which entails the increased construction costs. The same is true for installation of water supply and sewage. We have to admit that the historical blocks are first of all the territories where initially no engineering lines were laid; even now in the historical center there are plenty of buildings without basic amenities. Today the burden of financing archaeological surveys is on the owners of apartments in apartment buildings or the owners of single-standing houses. Archaeological surveys are necessary to study the history of the country; however, for this purpose there should be special archaeological departments under the local administrations of historical settlements. It is necessary to make provisions for additional expenditures in the historical settlements budgets.

**Restoration of the Railway Station in Veliky Novgorod**

Yavein, O. I., the Moscow Institute of Architecture, Studio 44 Architectural Bureau, Moscow

The Railway Station in Veliky Novgorod has been designed and constructed in 1945–1953 by Prof. I.G.Yavein, a prominent theorist and expert in railway construction practice, the author of the first in Russia monograph about railway stations, Doctor of Architecture Science. The building's concept was a trope of the ancient Novgorod, a combination of Novgorodian belfries, the White Gates, monastery walls bearing reliefs of a boat and of the Warrior Saint Alexander Nevsky. The theme of ecclesiastic architecture was to symbolize the beginning of the revival of the ancient Novgorodian culture, its continuity and fortitude. The author architect in the 1920s was deeply influenced by constructivism and the Novgorod station has become a unique example of the symbiosis of the Neo-Russian style and the Russian avant-garde.

In 1992, the Station has suffered from a fire; its left (Southern) part was badly damaged. In 2001 the provisions for funding the restoration have been made, the restoration assignment reflected the attitude to the Station as an architectural heritage. The 2000–2001 restoration design plan has been developed by Igor Yavein’s sons O.I. and N.I. Yavein in collaboration with architect and restorer N.G. Razina. The project was based on the private archive of I.G. Yavein's. The archive, in addition to drawings and photographs, has preserved quite an extensive collection of working drawings and templates which have been used during the Station's construction. In each individual case, the archival materials were compared with the photographs and measurements from different years and with the survived fragments of the interior decoration. In case of a discrepancy between an archival documents and a material object, a decisions was made for each individual element.

Often, when restoring a building from relatively recent times one is tempted by an illusion of having a complete understanding of its architecture. Meanwhile, the difference between today's mentality and the way of thinking of that time is enormous; we are as fare from it as from the classical architecture. Hence a series of failures in restoring constructivist buildings when double glazing would be substituted with the single one, window sashes and floors with the seemingly identical, etc. the I.G. Yavein's design was based on the inner proximity of simple white asymmetrical compositions of the ancient Novgorod with the unconstrained treating of the space and shape in the 1920s Russian avant-garde architecture. However, this station is an example of the 1950s architectural tradition. It is a complex mixture to be deciphered to perceive the author's concept. In my view, the experience of interaction with such an object should be of interest to the restoration theory and practice.