

ARMENIA

Monasteries of Haghpat and Sanahin

Brief description

These two Byzantine monasteries in the Tumanian region from the period of prosperity during the Kiurikian dynasty (10th to 13th century) were important centres of learning. Sanahin in particular was renowned for its school of illuminators and calligraphers. The two monastic complexes represent the highest flowering of Armenian religious architecture, whose unique style developed from a blending of elements of Byzantine ecclesiastical architecture and the traditional vernacular architecture of the Caucasian region.

1. Introduction

Year(s) of Inscription 1996, 2000

Agency responsible for site management

- Ministry of Culture and Youth of Armenia
3, Republic Square, Yerevan, Armenia
Phone: +(374 10) 52 93 49
E-mail: dpcv@netsys.am
Website: www.gov.am/en/
- Armenian Apostolic Church
City of Echmiadzin,
Marz of Armavir, Armenia

2. Statement of Significance

Inscription Criteria C (ii), (iv)

Justification provided by the State Party

No justification provided

As provided in ICOMOS evaluation

ICOMOS (1996): That this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv):

The monastery of Haghpat is an outstanding example of the ecclesiastical architecture that developed in Armenia in the 10th to 13th centuries, which is unique by virtue of its blending of elements of both Byzantine church architecture and the traditional vernacular building styles of this region.

ICOMOS (2000): The original nomination to the World Heritage List in 1995 covered the monasteries of Haghpat and Sanahin. However, at that time no decision had been reached on the ownership of the Sanahin Monastery and considerable restoration work remained to be done there. The World Heritage Committee, at its 20th Session in December 1996 accepted the ICOMOS recommendation that Haghpat alone should be inscribed at that time. The Committee invited the State Party, at the suggestion of ICOMOS, "to consider the possible extension of the site to include the Sanahin Monastery when restoration works will be completed and a decision taken regarding the ownership of this site, to also include the Sanahin Bridge (Alaverdi) and the Kayanberd Fortress." When the request for extension was received, it consisted only of a map covering the areas proposed for inscription and the protection zones. No information was supplied about ownership; however, this has now been clarified.

Committee Decision

1996: The Committee decided to inscribe the Monastery of Haghpat on the basis of cultural criteria (ii) and (iv) considering that it is of outstanding universal value and an exceptional example of ecclesiastical architecture that developed in Armenia in the 10th to 13th centuries which is unique by virtue of its blending of elements of both Byzantine church architecture and the traditional vernacular building style of this region.

The State Party was invited to consider the possible extension of the site to include the Sanahin Monastery when restoration works will be completed and a decision taken regarding the ownership of this site, to also include the Sanahin Bridge (Alaverdi) and the Kayanberd Fortress.

2000: The Committee made no statement.

- Statement of significance adequately defines the outstanding universal value of the site
- No change required by State Party

Boundaries and Buffer Zone

- Status of boundaries of the site: adequate
- Buffer zone: adequate
- No change to buffer zone has been proposed by State Party

Status of Authenticity/Integrity

- World Heritage site values have not been maintained. There have not been any significant changes to the authenticity/integrity of the site since inscription

3. Protection

Legislative and Administrative Arrangements

- State Decision n° 616 of 09.07.2001 transmitted the property to the ownership of Armenian Apostolic Church
- Law of Armenia “On the protection and use of the historical and cultural monuments and sites” (1998)
- Provisions of the Civil and Penal Codes, laws “on urbanism”, “on local self-governance” and “on territorial management”
- The protection arrangements are considered by State Party as sufficiently effective

Actions proposed:

- Appointment of the National Coordinator for World Heritage

4. Management

Use of site/property

- Religious use, tourism

Management /Administrative Body

- Steering group has been legally set up within the Armenian Church
- No site manager has been appointed
- Levels of public authority who are primarily involved with the management of the site: national
- The current management system is considered by State Party as sufficiently effective

5. Management Plan

- The initially established management plan is not in force anymore, while the new one has not been prepared
- Responsibility for over-seeing the preparation and implementation of the management plan and monitoring its effectiveness: Armenian Church

6. Financial Resources

Financial situation

- The main funding source is the Armenian Church, which has not provided the State Party Authorities with the information on financial matters
- Funding for the management is considered by State Party as sufficient, while the conservation activities are not financed adequately

7. Staffing Levels

- number of staff: N/A

Rate of access to adequate professional staff across the following disciplines:

- Good: conservation
- Average: management, promotion, interpretation; education; visitor management

8. Sources of Expertise and Training in Conservation and Management Techniques

- Scientific institutions of the Academy of Sciences
- No training opportunities on site management

9. Visitor Management

- N/A

10. Scientific Studies

- N/A

11. Education, Information and Awareness Building

- An adequate number of signs referring to World Heritage site
- World Heritage Convention Emblem used on publications
- Adequate awareness of World Heritage among visitors, local communities and local authorities
- Awareness-raising projects have been implemented within the framework of the European Heritage Days

12. Factors affecting the Property (State of Conservation)

Reactive monitoring reports

- N/A

Conservation interventions

- No conservation/restoration works have been done
- State Party considers the present state of conservation as adequate

Threats and Risks to site

- Environmental pressure; tourism pressure
- No emergency measures taken

13. Monitoring

- No monitoring programme exists
- No measures have been taken or planned to establish effective monitoring exercise
- No key indicators have been identified

14. Conclusions and Recommended Actions

- Main benefits of WH status: N/A
- Weaknesses: lack of overall policies and capacities for the conservation and management, lack of funding, lack of cooperation between stakeholders, absence of management plan and monitoring exercise

Future actions: not provided