

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Historical Centre of the City of Yaroslavl

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- Russian Federation

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

1170

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2005

1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Historical Centre of the City of Yaroslavl	57.653 / 39.876	110	580	690	2005
Total (ha)		110	580	690	

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Historical Centre of the City of Yaroslavl - map of inscribed property	15/07/2005	

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

- Marina Vasilieva
The Department of Culture of Yaroslavskay oblast
Director

Comment

Replace for: Department of Culture of the Yaroslavl Regional Government. Marina Vladimirovna Vasilyeva, Acting Director of the Department, 9/4 Revolutsionnaya str., Yaroslavl 150014, Tel. 8 (4852) 30 52 29 Email: dcul@region.adm.yar.ru Sirotnina Galina Anatolyevna, Head of Historical and Cultural Heritage Section of the Department of Culture, 9/4 Revolutsionnaya str., Yaroslavl 150014, Tel. 8 (4852) 401251 Email: dcul@region.adm.yar.ru

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

Comment

The property has no website of its own and is presented on the official website of the Yaroslavl Regional Government,

page «Department of Culture», section «Cultural heritage protection» - <http://www.yarregion.ru/depts/dcul/tmpPages/reestr.asp>

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

Comment

The European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (ETS No. 66).

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Comment

Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was adopted at the 38th session of the World Heritage Committee in June 2014.

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

(ii)(iv)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

Criterion (ii): The historic town of Yaroslavl with its 17th century churches and its Neo-classical radial urban plan and civic architecture is an outstanding example of the interchange of cultural and architectural influences between Western Europe and Russian Empire. Criterion (iv): Yaroslavl is an outstanding example of the town-planning reform ordered by Empress Catherine The Great in the whole of Russia, implemented between 1763 and 1830.

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
3.1	Buildings and Development							
3.1.1	Housing							
3.1.2	Commercial development							
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure							
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities							
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure							
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure							
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure							
3.3	Services Infrastructures							
3.3.4	Localised utilities							
3.3.5	Major linear utilities							
3.4	Pollution							
3.4.5	Solid waste							
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage							
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses							
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage							
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community							
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation							
3.13	Management and institutional factors							
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	
3.1	Buildings and Development					
3.1.1	Housing	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	decreasing
3.1.2	Commercial development	restricted	one off or rare	insignificant	medium capacity	decreasing
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure					
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	extensive	frequent	significant	medium capacity	static
3.3	Services Infrastructures					
3.3.4	Localised utilities	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
3.3.5	Major linear utilities	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
3.4	Pollution					
3.4.5	Solid waste	restricted	one off or rare	insignificant	high capacity	static
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium 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?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are **adequate** 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?

The buffer zones of the World Heritage property are **adequate** 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)

Les principales législations – en vigueur ou à l'état de projet – concernant le bien se situent à deux niveaux: fédéral et régional.

Législations 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) – loi spéciale principale relative au patrimoine culturel;
- Le Code d'urbanisme (2002, 2004, 2005, 2011), qui fait l'objet d'amendements presque annuels entraînant d'autres amendements de lois s'y rattachant ;
- 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) ;

- 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 ;
- L'Arrêté N° 794 du 5/10/2010 de la Fédération de Russie relatif aux amendements à proposer aux Dispositions dans les zones de protection du patrimoine culturel, qui permet «des écarts des paramètres limites de la construction permise» ;
- L'Arrêté N°954/19.12.2011 du ministère de la Culture approuvant des Dispositions pour un registre d'Etat unifié du patrimoine culturel ;
- Le projet d'amendement à La Loi fédérale sur le patrimoine culturel (monument de l'histoire et de la culture) des peuples de la Fédération de Russie (2002), qui apporte plusieurs suppléments et changements concernant les limites des zones de protection et les régimes, le système de gestion, le registre d'Etat du patrimoine culturel, les activités de conservation, etc.;
- Un projet d'amendement à La Loi fédérale sur le patrimoine culturel (monument de l'histoire et de la culture) des peuples de la Fédération de Russie (2002) concernant le contenu, la préservation et les fonctions admissibles de la „localité historique” (en russe: „istoricheskoe poselenie”).

Législations au niveau régional

- Loi de la région de Yaroslavl N° 25-h de 2008 sur les sites du patrimoine culturel se trouvant sur le territoire de la région de Yaroslavl ;
- Dispositions relatives à la préservation des monuments archéologiques et de la strate culturelle de la ville (N° 582 de 1989) ;
- Arrêté du Gouvernement de la région de Yaroslavl N° 456-P du 22.06.2011 pour approuver un nouveau projet pour les zones de protection des sites du patrimoine culturel à Yaroslavl. Cet arrêté apporte quelques changements aux zones de protection approuvées en 2008 ;
- Loi de l'urbanisme dans la région de Yaroslavl (N° 39-h du 7.11.2011) qui modifie la procédure de délivrance de permis de construire, conformément aux changements intervenus dans le Code d'urbanisme.

Le bien est le seul site du Patrimoine mondial en Russie pour lequel la notion de «Zone tampon» soit appliquée conformément aux exigences des Orientations (dans la Loi fédérale, la notion n'est pas réglementée). Les limites de la zone tampon sont bien motivées. Elles comprennent en toute logique les quartiers situés immédiatement à l'ouest du bien ainsi que «le bassin visuel» fluvial de l'estuaire du Kotorosl dans la Volga et les territoires riverains. Il convient de mentionner spécialement la haute qualité du paysage des zones naturelles riveraines qui présentent une configuration complexe sur les deux rives du Kotorosl. Le bien est organiquement relié aux deux fleuves grâce aux silhouettes urbaines fort expressives qui constituent l'une des caractéristiques de sa VUE.

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 is **inadequate**

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?

An adequate legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of

Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property exists but there are **some deficiencies in implementation**

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

Le cadre institutionnel d'acteurs impliqués dans la gestion du bien correspond à la structure administrative de gestion en Fédération de Russie. Yaroslavl est un centre de la région de Yaroslavl ayant un statut de «sujet de la Fédération». Sur cette base, le réseau institutionnel comprend :

Au niveau central

- Ministère de la Culture – un organe fédéral de préservation ayant les pouvoirs de préserver, d'utiliser, de promouvoir et d'assurer la protection de la part de l'Etat du patrimoine culturel sur le territoire de la Fédération de Russie. Le Ministère a, en outre, des fonctions suivantes : coordonner les projets de zones de protections et leurs règlements ; approuver les délimitations des territoires des monuments de la culture ; coordonner les «obligations de protection» des monuments de portée fédérale ; délivrer des autorisations pour mener des prospections archéologiques ; gérer le registre d'Etat du patrimoine culturel.

- Département régional de la culture (57 personnes d'effectifs) avec son Comité du patrimoine historique et culturel (21 personnes) près de l'administration de la région de Yaroslavl, qui représente l'organe régional de préservation. Il relève du Gouverneur de la région et se trouve sous la direction méthodologique du ministère de la Culture. Le Département applique les pouvoirs de la Fédération de Russie dans le domaine de la préservation, de l'utilisation, de la promotion et de la protection de la part de l'Etat du patrimoine culturel qui est une propriété fédérale et régionale. Le département remplit les fonctions principales suivantes: il exerce un contrôle d'Etat ; il organise et réalise en tant que maître d'oeuvre des activités de conservation de monuments de la culture; il lance des expertises d'Etat historiques et culturelles tout en se prononçant sur leurs conclusions; il participe à la création du registre d'Etat unifié; il conclut «des obligations de protection» avec les propriétaires sur les territoires des monuments; il concerte les projets de monuments et d'ensembles à l'intérieur du bien et de sa zone tampon, ainsi que les plans directeurs d'urbanisme; il donne des permis de construire pour des travaux de conservation des monuments qui ont des problèmes de construction; il organise l'élaboration de projets pour les zones de protection, pour leurs règlements, etc.

Au niveau municipal

- Municipalité de la ville de Yaroslavl et son organe, le Département d'architecture et de développement du territoire de Yaroslavl dont la section Protection des monuments fait partie de la direction Urbanisme. Le département prépare la documentation urbanistique pour le territoire urbain à tous les niveaux; il prépare et réalise le Plan directeur d'urbanisme de la ville; il assure la préservation des monuments de la culture de portée municipale; il délivre des permis de construire sur le territoire de la ville (à l'exception des travaux de conservation des monuments). Le département est sous la tutelle méthodologique du Ministère des régions.
- Le Parlement de la ville de Yaroslavl a pour fonction d'approuver le Plan directeur d'urbanisme de la ville.

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Comment

General City Planning Scheme of Yaroslavl, 2006. The Project of protection zones for cultural heritage objects in Yaroslavl, 2011. Instruction of the Department of Culture of the Yaroslavl Regional Government, 2012, approving the boundaries of the Historical Centre of Yaroslavl. Regulations of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 898-r, 2013, on the authorization of the Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation to exercise state protection of the Historic Centre of Yaroslavl.

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 a range of administrative bodies / levels involved in management but there is **little or no coordination** between them for managing different aspects 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 **not 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?

No annual work / action plan exists

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	Poor
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Poor
Visitors	Not applicable
Researchers	Non-existent
Tourism industry	Fair
Industry	Not applicable

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?

No indigenous peoples are resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone

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 **little or no contact** 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

Currently the management plan of the property does not exist as an integral document. Instead there is an established system of administrative, organizational, legal and financial regulations relating to conservation, usage, promotion and state protection of cultural heritage sites.

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

Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation No 813-r dated 21.05.2012 on classifying historical centre of Yaroslavl as cultural heritage property of federal importance. Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation No 898-r dated 03.06.2013 on additional inscription on the list of properties under state protection of the Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation.

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)	70%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	29%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	0%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	0%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	1%
Other grants	0%

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

Comment

Preparatory assistance for two nominations "Historical Centre of Yaroslavl" and "Rostov Kremlin", 2002, 18,695 USD.

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

There is **no budget** for effective management of the World Heritage property despite an identified need

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

Existing sources of funding are **not secure**

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

There is **some flow** of economic benefits to local communities

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

There are **little or no** equipment or facilities despite an identified need

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

There is **little or no** maintenance of existing equipment and facilities or no equipment and facilities, despite an identified need.

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	100%
Seasonal	0%

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	Poor
Promotion	Poor
Community outreach	Fair
Interpretation	Poor

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

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	High
Promotion	High
Community outreach	Medium
Interpretation	High
Education	Low
Visitor management	Low
Conservation	Medium
Administration	Medium
Risk preparedness	Medium
Tourism	Low
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Medium

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

No capacity development plan or programme is in place; management is implemented by external staff and skills are not transferred

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

There is no plan or program of capacity building.

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 a **small amount** of research, but it is not planned

4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?

Research results **are shared with local partners** but there is no active outreach to national or international 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

A brief report on the state of conservation of the property for 2013 -

<http://www.yarregion.ru/depts/dcul/tmpPages/reestr1.aspx?mr>
=

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?

Not displayed at all

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	Average
Local Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Local landowners	Average
Visitors	Not applicable
Tourism industry	Average
Local businesses and industries	Poor

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

There is **no education and awareness programme**, despite an identified need

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	Not provided but needed
Guided tours	Excellent
Trails / routes	Excellent
Information materials	Poor
Transportation facilities	Adequate
Other	Not needed

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

Within the boundaries of the property there are 2 state, 1 municipal and 2 private museums, as well as their affiliated structures providing museum services.

4.7. Visitor Management

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

Last year	Static
Two years ago	Static
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?

Transportation services
Tourism industry
Visitor surveys
Other

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

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?

There is **some management** of the visitor use of the World Heritage property

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

Although the tourism industry is active in the property, there is **little or no contact** between tourism operators and those responsible for the World Heritage property

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

No fees are collected

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

Admission fees are charged by museums, located within the boundaries of the site, and used for development purposes.

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 to define key indicators, **but this has not been done**

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

World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff	Average
Local / Municipal authorities	Poor
Local communities	Average
Researchers	Poor
NGOs	Average
Industry	Poor
Local indigenous peoples	Not applicable

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

Recommendations of the ICOMOS mission-2012 are implemented in current work and were used for the preparation of the state of conservation report for 2013.

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

It would be advisable to identify indicators of the property's integrity.

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	
3.1	Buildings and Development						
3.1.1	Housing	Integrity of the property under threat: historical proportions between developed and undeveloped areas are changed with the increased construction density in the center	Development of a regulatory legal act, establishing land management in the Yaroslavl historical center area, taking in consideration necessary restrictions and obligations of the territory use	No regular monitoring, authorities take measures only in response to specific actions and violations of the management regime	Permanently	Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation, Yaroslavl Region Government, the Yaroslavl city administration	No comments
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure						
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	The property perception is under threat	Redirecting transit transportation routes out of the city center through additional road expansion and construction around and in the vicinities of the city center	Analysing traffic levels, optimization of the public transport routes	In 2013 - 2015	The Yaroslavl city administration	No comments
3.3	Services Infrastructures						
3.3.4	Localised utilities	Visual perception of property is under threat, disruption of the historical silhouette by new dominant constructions in the city	Developing projects to exclude localised utilities from the city centre	No regular monitoring, occasionally	Permanently	Economic operators - agencies in the city responsible for the utilities use and construction	No comments
3.3.5	Major linear utilities	Visual perception of the property is under threat	Analyzing the present situation and development of the proposals on modernization of major linear utilities	No regular monitoring, occasionally	In 2015	The Yaroslavl city administration	No comments
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage						
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses	As the result of the property promotion a threat to property preservation during big public events	Developing regulations on big public events in the city center	Regular monitoring is organized	Permanently	Yaroslavl region executive authorities, and local self-government bodies	No comments
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community	Representatives of regional and local authorities realize the need to preserve the Outstanding Universal Value while carrying out economic activities	Ensure cooperation of all stakeholders	Monitoring is carried out permanently	Permanently	All stakeholders, city administration	No comments

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

4.2 Protective Measures						
	Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment		
4.2.2	The legal framework is inadequate	Federal law adoption to establish the jurisdiction of the various levels of government in relation to the World Heritage property	2014- 2015	The State Duma of the Russian Federation, the Government of the Russian Federation, Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation	No comments	
4.2.4	Inadequate legal framework	Federal law adoption to establish the concept of a "buffer zone", the status of the buffer zone and the requirements for its use are needed.	2014 -2015	The State Duma of the Russian Federation, the Government of the Russian Federation, Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation	No comments	
4.3 Management System / Management Plan						

4.3.4	Management system / plan is inadequate	Participation in training seminars, learning tools, planning works on preparation of management plan	2014 - 2018	Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation, Yaroslavl Region Government, Natural and Cultural Heritage Institute them. D.S. Likhachev, the Yaroslavl city administration, and other interested parties	No comments
4.4 Financial and Human Resources					
4.4.12	Human resources inadequate for management needs	Definition at the Federal level a property Manager with the appropriate resource provision	2015 - 2016	Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation	No comments
4.6 Education, Information and Awareness Building					
4.6.1	World Heritage emblem not displayed	Development of requirements in order to announce a competition for the project of informing the population about the property with the use of the world heritage emblem	2015	Yaroslavl Region Culture Department	No comments
4.6.3	There is no education and awareness programme	Planning of the workshop with the participation of UNESCO experts	2016 - 2017	Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation, Yaroslavl Region Government	No comments

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 **compromised** by factors described in this report

5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity

The integrity of the World Heritage property has been **compromised** by factors described in this report

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

The World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value has been **impacted** by factors described in this report, but this situation is being **addressed through effective management actions**.

5.3.4 - Current state of the property's other values

Other important cultural and / or natural values are being **partially degraded** but the state of conservation of the World Heritage property has not been significantly impacted

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	Positive
Research and monitoring	Positive
Management effectiveness	No impact
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	No impact
Recognition	Positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	No impact
Funding for the property	No impact
International cooperation	Positive
Political support for conservation	No impact
Legal / Policy framework	Positive
Lobbying	No impact
Institutional coordination	Positive
Security	No impact
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
Others

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

no

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	Fair
State Party Representative	Fair
Advisory Body	Poor

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 concept of Outstanding Universal Value
The property's Outstanding Universal Value
The concept of Integrity and / or Authenticity
The property's Integrity and / or Authenticity
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	Unsatisfactory
Site Managers	Not Applicable
Advisory Bodies	Unsatisfactory

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

• Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Reason for update: Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was adopted at the 38th session of the World Heritage Committee in June 2014.

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