

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Ensemble of the Ferapontov Monastery

Comment

Ensemble of the Ferrapontov (with double "r") Monastery is the correct name for the property - see WHC-2000/CONF.204/21, 34 COM 7B.97, 35 COM 7B.106, 37 COM 7 B.103 etc. Corrections should be made in the World Heritage List and elsewhere in whc.unesco.org.

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- Russian Federation

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

982

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2000

1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Ensemble of the Ferapontov Monastery	59.95 / 38.567	2.1	20	22.1	2000
Total (ha)		2.1	20	22.1	

1.4 - Map(s)

Comment

Maps have been submitted to WHC in 2000. During WHC-ICOMOS mission to Ferapontov in 2010 experts had valid WHC maps with them.

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Grigory E. Ordzhonikidze
Commission of the Russian Federation for UNESCO
Executive Secretary

Comment

replace for: Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation
Vladimir Tsvetnov Director of the Department for Control, Supervision and Licensing Malyi Gnezdnikovskiy per,7/6, str.1,2 125993 Moscow Tel: +7 495 625 07 08 e-mail: tsvetnov@mkrf.ru, depkontr@mkrf.ru

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Michail Sharomasov
Kirillo-Belozerskiy Historical Cultural and Art Museum-Reserve
Director

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

Comment

kirmuseum.ru

1.8 - Other designations / Conventions under which the property is protected (if applicable)

Comment

Historical and cultural monument of federal importance, protected by state (Federal Law of 25.06.2002 No. 73-FZ "On Cultural Heritage Properties (Monuments of History and Culture) of Peoples of Russian Federation") Outstanding valuable cultural heritage site of peoples of Russian Federation (according to Executive Order of President of Russia of 06.11.1993 No. 1847 "On Inscription of Properties on National List of Outstanding Valuable Cultural Heritage Sites of Peoples of Russian Federation")

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Comment

Statement of Outstanding Universal Value has been submitted to WHC for approval in 2014.

2.2 - The criteria (2005 revised version) under which the property was inscribed

(i)(iv)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

Criterion (i):The wall paintings of Dionisy in the Cathedral of the Nativity of the Virgin at Ferrapontov Monastery are the highest expression of Russian mural art in the 15th-16th centuries. Criterion (iv):The complex of Ferrapontov Monastery is the purest and most complete example of an Orthodox monastic community from the 15th-17th centuries, a crucial period in the cultural and spiritual development of Russia.

2.4 - If needed, please provide details of why the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be revised

2.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

3. Factors Affecting the Property

3.14. Other factor(s)

3.14.1 - Other factor(s)

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact				Origin
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure					
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure					
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure					
3.5	Biological resource use/modification					
3.5.1	Fishing/collecting aquatic resources					
3.5.3	Land conversion					
3.5.4	Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals					
3.5.5	Crop production					
3.5.7	Subsistence wild plant collection					
3.5.8	Commercial hunting					
3.5.9	Subsistence hunting					
3.5.10	Forestry /wood production					
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric					
3.7.1	Wind					
3.7.2	Relative humidity					
3.7.3	Temperature					
3.7.8	Micro-organisms					
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses					
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage					
3.8.3	Indigenous hunting, gathering and collecting					
3.8.4	Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system					
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community					
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation					
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events					
3.10.1	Storms					
3.10.6	Temperature change					
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events					
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)					
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species					
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species					
3.13	Management and institutional factors					
3.13.1	Low impact research / monitoring activities					
3.13.2	High impact research / monitoring activities					
3.13.3	Management activities					
Legend	Current	Potential	Negative	Positive	Inside	Outside

3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure				
3.2.1	localised	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	medium capacity	static

		Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	localised	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric					
3.7.1	Wind	widespread	frequent	minor	high capacity	static
3.7.2	Relative humidity	widespread	frequent	minor	high capacity	static
3.7.3	Temperature	widespread	frequent	minor	high capacity	static
3.7.8	Micro-organisms	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	high capacity	static
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events					
3.10.1	Storms	extensive	one off or rare	significant	high capacity	static
3.10.6	Temperature change	widespread	on-going	minor	high capacity	static
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species					
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	high capacity	static

3.17. Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to factors affecting the property

3.17.1 - Comments

4. Protection, Management and Monitoring of the Property

4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is a buffer zone

4.1.2 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

Inadequacies in the boundaries make it difficult to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.1.3 - Are the buffer zone(s) of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

Inadequacies in the buffer zones of the World Heritage property make it difficult to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.1.4 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property known?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are known by both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

4.1.5 - Are the buffer zones of the World Heritage property known?

The buffer zones of the World Heritage property **are known** by both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

4.1.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to boundaries and buffer zones of the World Heritage property

4.2. Protective Measures

4.2.1 - Protective designation (legal, regulatory, contractual, planning, institutional and / or traditional)

Four methods of legislative protection apply to the Ensemble of Ferrapontov Monastery: protection as an Historical and Cultural Monument of federal significance under the provisions of the 1978 Law; protection of a series of zones in the surrounding area (monument protection zone, controlled building zone, and protected landscape) established under a 1986 directive; protection as a Specially Important Cultural Monument, as the buildings complex of the Kirillo- Belozerskii Museum-Reserve, in accordance with a 1997 Presidential Decree ; and protection of the surrounding area as part of the Rouskii Sever National Park (166.6ha) under the 1991 Law.

Lois et ordonnances au niveau fédéral:

- *La Loi fédérale sur le patrimoine culturel (monument de l'histoire et de la culture) des peuples de la Fédération de*

Russie (2002, la dernière version est de 2010). La loi se substitue à l'ancienne Loi de 1978, sans changer en principe la protection juridique du bien en tant qu' *Ensemble*, avec la catégorie d' *importance fédérale*. La nouvelle loi propose une nouvelle alternative du statut juridique du bien. Elle définit trois types de patrimoine culturel: les monuments, les ensembles et les sites (en russe, littéralement: «lieux remarquables»).

- *La loi qui transmet aux organisations religieuses les biens à vocation religieuse qui étaient une propriété de l'Etat ou de la municipalité* (novembre 2010). Au gré de cette loi les biens sont transmis de manière désintéressée et illimitée aux organisations religieuses. La loi vise également les biens qui sont patrimoine culturel, et dans ce cas, les organisations religieuses prennent l'obligation de suivre les mesures de leur préservation, «y compris les exigences quant à la procédure et aux délais des travaux de restauration, de réparation et autres» (art. 5, point 1). La Loi prévoit que la jouissance, l'utilisation et la disposition du patrimoine culturel soient «conformes aux exigences de la Législation de la Fédération de Russie dans le domaine de la conservation, de l'utilisation, de la promotion et de la protection d'Etat des ouvrages du patrimoine culturel» (art. 10, point 2).

- *Le Code d'urbanisme* (2002), qui règle les questions de l'activité urbanistique dans la Fédération de Russie.

- *La Loi de modification du Code d'urbanisme et de certains actes législatifs de la Fédération russe* (2006). Les modifications sont essentielles, puisqu'elles suppriment les fonctions de concertation que remplissaient les organes de protection pour ce qui est de la documentation d'urbanisme et des projets d'architecture, et elles ont un impact direct sur l'efficacité du système de gestion.

- *L'Arrêté N° 315 du 26/04/2008 de la Fédération de Russie* relatif aux *Dispositions dans les zones de protection du patrimoine culturel* déterminant la procédure de réglementation des zones de protection et leur approbation par l'organe fédéral central.

- *Amendement à la Loi fédérale sur le patrimoine culturel* (N° 163864 –5/2010).

Lois et ordonnances au niveau régional:

Le bien étant, selon la législation fédérale, géré au niveau fédéral, il ne fait pas l'objet de législations au niveau régional. Seule la zone tampon du bien est contrôlée et gérée à ce niveau sur la base du document suivant:

- *Une ordonnance du Gouvernement de la Région de Vologda* (N° 583 du 14 mai 2007) *relative aux limites des zones protégées et au régime d'utilisation du sol à l'intérieur des zones protégées de l'ensemble du monastère de Ferapontov*.

Sur la base des législations ci-dessus, la protection juridique du bien se fait à trois niveaux:

- Au niveau du bien en tant qu'«ensemble» ayant la catégorie d'«importance fédérale» (selon la Loi fédérale de 2002);

- Au niveau du territoire immédiat autour du bien, grâce au système des zones protégées (Ordonnance de la Région de Vologda de 2007);

- Au niveau du territoire protégé du Parc national «Ruski sever» (aux termes d'une loi de 1991).

Comment

Federal law of 25.06.2002 N° 73-FZ "On Cultural Heritage Properties (Monuments of History and Culture) of the Peoples of the Russian Federation"; Regulations on the Protection Zones of Cultural Heritage Sites (Monuments of History and Culture) of the Nations of the Russian Federation (enacted by Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation, 2008); Law on Transfer to Religious Organisations of Assets Having a Religious Intended Purpose and Representing State or Municipal Property (2010).

4.2.2 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

The legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property provides **an adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection

4.2.3 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

The legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property is **inadequate**

4.2.4 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

The legal framework for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone is **inadequate** to ensure the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the property

4.2.5 - Can the legislative framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) be enforced?

There is **acceptable** capacity / resources to enforce legislation and / or regulation in the World Heritage property but some deficiencies remain

4.2.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to protective measures

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

The nominated property is in public ownership, as established by a 1992 Presidential Decree which restricts the restitution of church property and forbids the privatization of cultural monuments of federal importance. The management plans currently in force ensure protection at three levels. The Rouskii Sever National Park Plan defines the functional zones, the boundaries of the protection zones, and the respective regulations. The plans relating to the land surrounding the monument delineate the three protection zones. The Ferrapontov Urban Plan defines the character of the environment in the immediate vicinity of the property. Management is exercised at the three administrative levels in operation in Russia - federal, regional, and departmental. At the federal level the Ministry of Culture is responsible for overseeing, methodological control, and coordination. Three specialized institutes of the Ministry are responsible for the conservation of the Dionisy murals, architectural conservation, and management of the protection zones respectively. At the regional level, the Vologda Administration provides financial resources for the conservation of the ensemble, control of the works, technical supervision, and the issuing of building permits. At the departmental level the main institution, the Historic-Architectural and Artistic Museum-Reserve of Kirillo-Beozerskii is the contracting authority in respect of the federal and regional funding and is responsible for planning technical control, etc. Its subsidiary, the Ferrapontov Monastery Museum, shares these functions, monitors the condition and

conservation of the ensemble, organizes scientific, cultural, and educational events and exhibitions, builds up its own funds, etc. The conservation of the ensemble is financed from four possible sources: federal (Ministry of Finance), regional (Vologda Administration), local (the Museum's own budget), and extra-budgetary (sponsorship).

Monitoring is carried out at different levels - by the Special Curator of the Museum, the specialized institutes of the Ministry of Culture, and by the federal coordinating architect. Rapid communication between the various parties involved is effected according to a programmed system.

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Comment

Work on the following documents is underway: Statutory Management Plan for property Strategic plans Permits Annual work plan 'Code of practice' Traditional arrangements recognised by traditional inhabitants

4.3.3 - How well do the various levels of administration (i.e. national / federal; regional / provincial / state; local / municipal etc.) coordinate in the management of the World Heritage Property ?

There is **excellent coordination** between all bodies / levels involved in the management of the property

4.3.4 - Is the management system / plan adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value ?

The management system/plan is only **partially adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?

The management system is **only partially** being implemented

4.3.6 - Is there an annual work / action plan and is it being implemented?

An annual work / action plan exists and **many activities** are being implemented

4.3.7 - Please rate the cooperation / relationship with World Heritage property managers / coordinators / staff of the following

Local communities / residents	Fair
Local / Municipal authorities	Good
Indigenous peoples	Fair
Landowners	Fair
Visitors	Good
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Good
Industry	Fair

4.3.8 - If present, do local communities resident in or near the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?

Local communities have **some input** into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management

4.3.9 - If present, do indigenous peoples resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer

zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?

Indigenous peoples have **some input** into discussions relating to management but no direct role

4.3.10 - Is there cooperation with industry (i.e. forestry, mining, agriculture, etc.) regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone?

There is contact but only **some cooperation** with industry regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone

4.3.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training

4.3.12 - Please report any significant changes in the legal status and / or contractual / traditional protective measures and management arrangements for the World Heritage property since inscription or the last Periodic report

4.4. Financial and Human Resources

4.4.1 - Costs related to conservation, based on the average of last five years (relative percentage of the funding sources)

Multilateral funding (GEF, World Bank, etc)	0%
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Governmental (National / Federal)	95%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	0%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	0%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	5%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	0%
Other grants	0%

4.4.2 - International Assistance received from the World Heritage Fund (USD)

Comment

There was no application for international assistance from World Heritage Fund.

4.4.3 - Is the current budget sufficient to manage the World Heritage property effectively?

The available budget is **acceptable** but could be further improved to fully meet the management needs

4.4.4 - Are the existing sources of funding secure and likely to remain so?

The existing sources of funding **are secure** in the medium-term and planning is underway to secure funding in the long-term

4.4.5 - Does the World Heritage property provide economic benefits to local communities (e.g. income, employment)?

There is a **major flow** of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the World Heritage property

4.4.6 - Are available resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure sufficient to meet management needs?

There are **some** equipment and facilities but overall these are **inadequate**

4.4.7 - Are resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure adequately maintained?

There is **basic** maintenance of equipment and facilities

4.4.8 - Comments, conclusion, and / or recommendations related to finance and infrastructure

4.4.9 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Full-time	100%
Part-time	0%

4.4.10 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Permanent	95%
Seasonal	5%

4.4.11 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Paid	100%
Volunteer	0%

4.4.12 - Are available human resources adequate to manage the World Heritage property?

Human resources are **inadequate** for management needs

4.4.13 - Considering the management needs of the World Heritage property, please rate the availability of professionals in the following disciplines

Research and monitoring	Fair
Promotion	Fair
Community outreach	Fair
Interpretation	Fair
Education	Fair
Visitor management	Fair
Conservation	Fair
Administration	Fair
Risk preparedness	Fair
Tourism	Good
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Good

4.4.14 - Please rate the availability of training opportunities for the management of the World Heritage property in the following disciplines

Research and monitoring	Medium
Promotion	Medium
Community outreach	Medium
Interpretation	Medium

Education	Medium
Visitor management	Medium
Conservation	Medium
Administration	Medium
Risk preparedness	Medium
Tourism	Medium
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Medium

4.4.15 - Do the management and conservation programmes at the World Heritage property help develop local expertise?

A capacity development plan or programme is in place and **partially implemented**; some technical skills are being transferred to those managing the property locally **but most of the technical work is carried out by external staff**

4.4.16 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training

4.5. Scientific Studies and Research Projects

4.5.1 - Is there adequate knowledge (scientific or traditional) about the values of the World Heritage property to support planning, management and decision-making to ensure that Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?

Knowledge about the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient** for most key areas **but there are gaps**

4.5.2 - Is there a planned programme of research at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?

There is **considerable** research but it is **not directed** towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?

Research results are **shared with local participants and some national agencies**

4.5.4 - Please provide details (i.e. authors, title, and web link) of papers published about the World Heritage property since the last Periodic Report

Publications in magazines "Mir Muzeya" 2013, Nos. 4,5,6,9,13; "Blagovestnik" 2013, Nos. 3, 4. Catalogues to exhibitions. "Odnadtsatye Kirillovskiy chtenia", Kirillov, 2013. Web links to articles:
<http://www.kirmuseum.ru/news/detail.php?ID=149495>,
<http://www.kirmuseum.ru/news/detail.php?ID=151798>,
<http://www.kirmuseum.ru/issue/article.php?ID=167446>, and many others.

4.5.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to scientific studies and research projects

4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building

4.6.1 - At how many locations is the World Heritage emblem displayed at the property?

In one location, but **not easily visible** to visitors

4.6.2 - Please rate the awareness and understanding of the existence and justification for inscription of the World Heritage property amongst the following groups

Local communities / residents	Average
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Excellent
Local Indigenous peoples	Average
Local landowners	Average
Visitors	Excellent
Tourism industry	Excellent
Local businesses and industries	Average

4.6.3 - Is there a planned education and awareness programme linked to the values and management of the World Heritage property?

There is a **limited and ad hoc** education and awareness programme

4.6.4 - What role, if any, has designation as a World Heritage property played with respect to education, information and awareness building activities?

World Heritage status has influenced education, information and awareness building activities, **but it could be improved**

4.6.5 - How well is the information on Outstanding Universal Value of the property presented and interpreted?

The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is adequately presented and interpreted **but improvements could be made**

4.6.6 - Please rate the adequacy for education, information and awareness building of the following visitor facilities and services at the World Heritage property

Visitor centre	Not provided but needed
Site museum	Excellent
Information booths	Poor
Guided tours	Excellent
Trails / routes	Poor
Information materials	Adequate
Transportation facilities	Adequate
Other	Not needed

4.6.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to education, information and awareness building

4.7. Visitor Management

4.7.1 - Please provide the trend in annual visitation for the last five years

Last year	Minor Increase
-----------	----------------

Two years ago	Minor Increase
Three years ago	Minor Increase
Four years ago	Minor Increase
Five years ago	Minor Increase

4.7.2 - What information sources are used to collect trend data on visitor statistics?

Entry tickets and registries
Tourism industry
Visitor surveys

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

Comment

Visitor management plan Targets for museum Timeframes for visiting "Museum of Dionisy"s frescoes"

4.7.4 - Is there an appropriate visitor use management plan (e.g. specific plan) for the World Heritage property which ensures that its Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?

Visitor use of the World Heritage property is managed but **improvements could be made**

4.7.5 - Does the tourism industry contribute to improving visitor experiences and maintaining the values of the World Heritage property?

There is contact between those responsible for the World Heritage property and the tourism industry but this is largely **confined to administrative or regulatory matters**

4.7.6 - If fees (i.e. entry charges, permits) are collected, do they contribute to the management of the World Heritage property?

The fee is collected, and makes **some contribution** to the management of the World Heritage property

4.7.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to visitor use of the World Heritage property

4.8. Monitoring

4.8.1 - Is there a monitoring programme at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?

There is considerable monitoring but it is **not directed towards management needs** and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

4.8.2 - Are key indicators for measuring the state of conservation used to monitor how the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is maintained?

Information on the values of the World Heritage property is sufficient and key indicators have been defined but **monitoring the status of indicators could be improved**

4.8.3 - Please rate the level of involvement in monitoring of the following groups

World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff	Excellent
Local / Municipal authorities	Excellent
Local communities	Poor
Researchers	Average

NGOs	Poor
Industry	Poor
Local indigenous peoples	Average

4.8.4 - Has the State Party implemented relevant recommendations arising from the World Heritage Committee?

Implementation is **underway**

4.8.5 - Please provide comments relevant to the implementation of recommendations from the World Heritage Committee

4.8.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to monitoring

4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs

4.9.1 - Please select the top 6 managements needs for the property (if more than 6 are listed below)

Please refer to question 5.2

5. Summary and Conclusions

5.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

5.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property

	World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment	
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure						
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	Criterion (iv):The complex of Ferrapontov Monastery is the purest and most complete example of an Orthodox monastic community from the 15th-17th centuries, a crucial period in the cultural and spiritual development of Russia.	Setting up road signs which forbid passage	Forbidding passage	Till 01.01.2016	Museum	Vibration from traffic along western boundary site affects state of conservation of property
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric						
3.7.1	Wind	Criterion (iv):The complex of Ferrapontov Monastery is the purest and most complete example of an Orthodox monastic community from the 15th-17th centuries, a crucial period in the cultural and spiritual development of Russia.	Preventive measures	Preventive measures programme	Every year	Museum	Sometimes roof damages happen
3.7.2	Relative humidity	Criterion (i): highest expression of Russian mural art in 15th-16th centuries Criterion (iv): purest and most complete example of Orthodox monastic community from 15th-17th centuries, crucial period in cultural and spiritual development of Russia	Preventive measures and control over temperature and humidity	Monitoring programme and preventive measures	Daily	Museum	Relative humidity varies from 30-40% in spring to 95-100% in summer. Daily temperature fluctuations within 10-20% affect front walls. Timely control over regime in cathedral is carried out.
3.7.3	Temperature	Criterion (i): highest expression of Russian mural art in 15th-16th centuries Criterion (iv): purest and most complete example of Orthodox monastic community from 15th-17th centuries, crucial period in cultural and spiritual development of Russia	Preventive measures and control over temperature and humidity	Monitoring programme and preventive measures	Daily	Museum	Outside temperature span from -35°C in winter to +35°C in summer affects front walls. Timely control over regime in cathedral is carried out.
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events						
3.10.1	Storms	Criterion (iv): purest and most complete example of Orthodox monastic community from 15th-17th centuries, crucial period in cultural and spiritual development of Russia	Preventive measures	Preventive measures programme	Every year	Museum	Sometimes roof damages happen
3.10.6	Temperature change	Criterion (i): highest expression of Russian mural art in 15th-16th centuries Criterion (iv): purest and most complete example of Orthodox monastic community from 15th-17th centuries, crucial period in cultural and spiritual development of Russia	Preventive measures and control over temperature and humidity	Monitoring programme and preventive measures	Daily	Museum	Temperature span up to 20°C within one day affects front walls. Timely control over regime in cathedral is carried out.

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

4.1 Boundaries and Buffer Zones					
		Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
4.1.2	Inadequacies in the boundaries	Projecting increased territory and getting approval of new boundaries	Before 01.01.2015	Ministry of Culture of Russia	Territory within stone walls shall be increased for better preservation of the OUV of property. Monastery territory was much bigger in earlier centuries which is proved by archaeological excavations.
4.1.3	Inadequacies in the buffer zones	Projecting increased buffer zones.	Before 01.01.2015	Ministry of Culture of Russia	Current territory shall be increased for better preservation of the OUV of property.
4.2 Protective Measures					
4.2.3	The legal framework in the buffer zone is inadequate	Projecting increased buffer zones and regulations within them. Submitting project of buffer zones to WHC.	Before 01.01.2015	Ministry of Culture of Russia	Legal framework does not provide adequate control over illegal activities.
4.2.4	Inadequate legal framework	Discussing legal problems at professional conferences and workshops.	Depending on meeting dates.	Ministry of Culture of Russia	There is no federal legislation directly regulating WH properties. Obsolete prices for restoration works, Inadequate normative documentation for restoration works
4.4 Financial and Human Resources					
4.4.6	Inadequate equipment and facilities	Developing project of tourist facilities and services and submission to WHC for approval.	2014-2015	Museum	There are neither tourist facilities nor public toilet. That discourages visitors.
4.6 Education, Information and Awareness Building					
4.6.3	There is a limited education and awareness programme	Continuation of research and education programmes.	Permanently	Museum	There are no long-term research programme.

5.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.3.1 - Current state of Authenticity

The authenticity of the World Heritage property has been **preserved**

5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity

The integrity of the World Heritage property is **intact**

5.3.3 - Current state of the World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value

The World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value has been **maintained**.

5.3.4 - Current state of the property's other values

Other important cultural and / or natural values and the state of conservation of the World Heritage property are **predominantly intact**

5.4. Additional comments on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.4.1 - Comments

6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise

6.1 - Please rate the impacts of World Heritage status of the property in relation to the following areas

Conservation	Very positive
Research and monitoring	Very positive
Management effectiveness	Very positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Positive
Recognition	Very positive
Education	Very positive
Infrastructure development	Positive
Funding for the property	Very positive
International cooperation	Very positive
Political support for conservation	Very positive
Legal / Policy framework	Very positive
Lobbying	Very positive
Institutional coordination	Very positive
Security	Very positive
Other (please specify)	Not applicable

6.2 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to World Heritage status

6.3 - Entities involved in the preparation of this Section of the Periodic Report

Governmental institution responsible for the property
Site Manager/Coordinator/World Heritage property staff
Advisory bodies

6.4 - Was the Periodic Reporting questionnaire easy to use and clearly understandable?

yes

6.5 - Please provide suggestions for improvement of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire

6.6 - Please rate the level of support for completing the Periodic Report questionnaire from the following entities

UNESCO	Good
State Party Representative	Very good
Advisory Body	Good

6.7 - How accessible was the information required to complete the Periodic Report?

Most of the required information was accessible

6.8 - The Periodic Reporting process has improved the understanding of the following

The World Heritage Convention
Managing the property to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value
Monitoring and reporting
Management effectiveness

6.9 - Please rate the follow-up to conclusions and recommendations from previous Periodic Reporting exercise by the following entities

UNESCO	Satisfactory
State Party	Excellent
Site Managers	Excellent
Advisory Bodies	Excellent

6.10 - Summary of actions that will require formal consideration by the World Heritage Committee

- Name of World Heritage Property**
Reason for update: Ensemble of the Ferrapontov (with double "r") Monastery is the correct name for the property - see WHC-2000/CONF.204/21, 34 COM 7B.97, 35 COM 7B.106, 37 COM 7 B.103 etc. Corrections should be made in the World Heritage List and elsewhere in whc.unesco.org.
- Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance**
Reason for update: Statement of Outstanding Universal Value has been submitted to WHC for approval in 2014.
- Map(s)**
Reason for update: Maps have been submitted to WHC in 2000. During WHC-ICOMOS mission to Ferapontov in 2010 experts had valid WHC maps with them.

6.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to the Assessment of the Periodic Reporting exercise