

**REPORT OF A JOINT UNESCO WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE / ICOMOS
REACTIVE MONITORING MISSION
TO THE
CULTURAL AND HISTORIC ENSEMBLE OF THE SOLOVETSKY ISLANDS
(RUSSIAN FEDERATION) (Ref: 632)**



Jean-Balthasar de la Traverse, View of Solovetsky, 1780 (free of known copyright restrictions)

22 – 28 April 2018

ICOMOS
international council on monuments and sites


United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization


World
Heritage
Convention

Contents:

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.1 *Main Conclusions*
- 1.2 *Recommendations – Summary*

2. BACKGROUND TO THE MISSION

- 2.1 *Inscription history and SOUV*
- 2.2 *Terms of Reference*
- 2.3 *Mission team*
- 2.4 *Mission programme*
- 2.5 *World Heritage Committee Decisions, recommendations of previous mission, meetings with State Party - summary*

3. NATIONAL, REGIONAL AND LOCAL POLICY FOR CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT

- 3.1 **Existing structures**
 - a) *Legal framework*
 - b) *Urban planning*
 - c) *Management*
 - d) *Governance*

4. IDENTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT OF ISSUES

- 4.1 **General issues**
 - a) *OUV and its attributes*
 - b) *Sacred lake (Svytoe ozero)*
 - c) *Forested landscape*
 - d) *Monastic meadows*
 - e) *Monastic water management systems*
 - f) *Roads and trackways*
 - g) *Settlement*
 - h) *Local Building typologies*
 - i) *Craftsmanship*
 - j) *Protection*
 - k) *Development projects*
 - l) *Tourism*
- 4.2 **Conservation**
 - a) *Conservation of the main Monastic Buildings*
 - b) *Conservation of monastic water management system*
 - c) *Conservation of monastic and Soviet era service buildings*
 - d) *Conservation of industrial heritage*
 - e) *Conservation of Soviet era domestic buildings*
 - f) *Conservation of vernacular buildings*
 - g) *Conservation of Gulag buildings*

4.3 Reconstruction/demolition

- a) Proposed reconstruction of the cemetery Church of St Onufrievskaya.*
- b) Possible demolition of Gulag period hospital building*

4.4 New Development

- a) Museum Project*
- b) Airport improvements*
- c) New Hospital*
- d) New Nursery School*
- e) Quay development*
- f) New Jetty*
- g) New housing*

4.5 Environmental issues

- a) Sewage connections and disposal*
- b) Waste disposal; plastic waste*
- c) Energy*

5. PROPOSED MASTER PLAN

6. NEW FOUNDATION FOR THE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOLOVETSKY ARCHIPELAGO

7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Main Conclusions

7.2 Recommendations - Summary

ANNEXES:

1. Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:
2. Decision 41 COM 7B.49
3. Terms of Reference of the mission
4. Mission programme

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The four members of the mission warmly thank the authorities of the Russian Federation for their efficiency in organizing the mission, their availability to respond to requests and for their extremely warm welcome. The mission members especially wish to thank Mr *Sergey G. Obryvalin*, Deputy Minister of Culture of the Russian Federation, Father *Profiryi*, Archimandrite of the Solovky monastery and Director of the State Solovky Museum and Reserve and *Ludmila Evguenieva*, Advisor to the Director of the State Solovky Museum and Reserve for their personal dedication to the success of the mission objectives.

The mission members' warm thanks extend to all institutional representatives, professionals and team members who participated in formal working sessions, visits to the site components as well as informal exchanges that contributed in various ways to the success of the mission.

For the Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation, *Vladimir Tsvetnov*, Head of the Department of Cultural Heritage Protection, *Anastasia Bolshakova*, Senior specialist in the Department of Minister of Culture, *Kirill Rynza*, Senior Advisor to the National Commission of the Russian Federation for UNESCO, *Pavel Tsarkov*, Assistant to the Deputy Minister of Culture; and *Marine Jyutcheva*, architect, Bureau Rozhdestvenka, adviser to the Department of Cultural Heritage Protection, *Natalia Dushkina*, Vice President, ICOMOS Russia.

For the Solovky monastery and the State Solovky Museum: Noon *Nikova*, whose extensive knowledge of the monastery history guided the mission members' visits of the site, *Marina Vassilivna Ossipenko* and *Larissa Petroska*, from the museum team, *Igumene Yalogi*, in charge of the Anzer island and *Aramonche Yakov*, in charge of the Savatiski monastery, *Galina Medveno*, from a restoration company;

The Government of the Arkhangelsk Region and its representatives, whose contributions and inputs to the working sessions were instrumental to implement the terms of reference of the mission.

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1.1 Main Conclusions

The mission visited the Solovetsky Islands at a crucial time. The archipelago has recently been designated as Heritage Religious Zone, changes have just been made to the overall governance of the islands through the creation of the Foundation for the Conservation and Development of the Solovetsky Archipelago, and a new Master Plan is to be developed to chart the way forward for the World Heritage property.

Just before the mission in early April 2018, the decision was taken to establish the State Foundation for the Conservation and Development of the Solovetsky Archipelago which will become the coordinating body for all stakeholders. This Foundation was initiated by the Patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church, Kirill, and supported by President Putin. This Foundation should promote an integrated approach for conservation and development of the property and encourage the provision of targeted resources.

These changes, when combined, provide an exceptional opportunity to set out a holistic and integrated approach for the conservation and restoration of the buildings and landscapes that make up this property and for new development that optimises the cultural and natural attributes that convey its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), and particularly its strong religious associations. Such an approach should also offer ways for conservation and development to benefit not only the monastic community, but also the local community and visitors.

In spite of its apparently robust monumental buildings, the property is in many ways exceedingly fragile. Insensitive restoration or development could quickly compromise its strong sense of place that arises from a unique combination of a highly prosperous monastic buildings, remote landscapes, sophisticated water management systems and vernacular buildings that taken together are a microcosm of the history of Northern Russia – as suggested in the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. Development that might be ‘absorbed’ in a larger property could have a highly adverse impact on the small scale of the Solovetsky landscape. Many of the elements are now in a vulnerable state and care will be needed to revive them sensitively; in some places insensitive restoration needs to be halted.

If the Master Plan is to support the OUV of the property, it will be crucial for it to be firmly based on well-defined attributes of OUV. These are both complex and intertwined and relate not only to tangible aspects but also to associations. This report sets out recommendations for how those attributes might be defined and considered. It will be essential that the Tender for gathering data for the Master Plan includes these aspects.

As the Master Plan will in effect set out a new ‘vision’ for the property and how it moves forward, this provides an opportunity to reflect on where development might be appropriate and how it might be delivered to strengthen the strong character of the islands. The Plan should provide the essential context for development and avoid a piecemeal project by project approach. There is also a need to define the overall building typology for the island in order to define how new sympathetic development might be conceived, designed and located.

The mission was extremely concerned by some of the most recent conservation work on monastic buildings, both on the interior of the main complex and on the fortifications, as this is having a highly

adverse impact on the authenticity of the structures, through the introduction of inappropriate materials and techniques. There is a need to halt this work immediately and to re-consider how conservation work should be planned, defined and managed and how on-going maintenance is carried out. There appear to have been structural failings in the way projects have been defined and managed, with few people on the islands being involved in their management.

The proposals for re-designing the half built museum are progressing well; and the mission supports the latest revised plans subject to changes as outlined in this report. For the wider museum project that encompass the Diesel Generating station, the Gulag Barrack and possibly the Soviet era storage barn, the mission considered that further reflection and changes to the overall scope of the wider museum project are necessary.

Over the past two decades, much restoration work has been undertaken to revive the monastery and its sketes and in effect to reverse the destruction wrought by the Gulag. Beyond the monastic buildings, decision on what should and should not be kept from this period also needs more reflection in terms of how the island is to reflect its overall history. The mission considered that a visual approach was too simplistic a way to decide what should be demolished and what rebuilt, and that consideration must be given to the associations these buildings have and how a coherent and logical approach might be taken.

Over the past few years, the number of tourists has risen considerably as has the infrastructure put in place to transport and receive them, as has the number of religious pilgrims. The expectations of these two groups are quite different as are the responses to their needs. The mission understands that the new designation of the archipelago combined with the new Foundation could bring about a change in focus towards pilgrimage and cultural tourism. There is an interest in re-defining the nodal position of Solovetsky Monastery in the wider historic pilgrimage routes across Russia and further afield.

This changed approach could be highly beneficial provided it is based on a clear definition of carrying capacity and that there are means in place to limit visitation. As a small and fragile place, the property needs visitors who respect its religious associations and contribute towards its conservation.

In conclusion, the mission considers that the current situation offer immense potential to allow sustainable development of the property in a way that respects its OUV. Given the very short timeframe envisaged for the development of the Master Plan and its associated Action Plan that will set the direction of the islands for the next decade, the mission considers that it would be valuable if a system for collaboration and dialogue between the State Party and the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies could be set up to guide the development of these plans.

1.2 Recommendations - Summary

1.2.1 New Foundation for the Conservation and Development of the Solovetsky Archipelago

The mission welcomes the establishment of the new Foundation for the Conservation and Development of the Solovetsky Archipelago, and its role in the restoration and development of the World Heritage property. It considers that ways of setting up a mechanism to allow dialogue and cooperation with the State Party on future developments should be explored as soon as possible.

1.2.2 The Master Plan

The mission also welcomes the proposed development of a Master Plan which it sees as an exceptional opportunity to create a way forward for the property that integrates all systems on the island and allows development that supports and sustains OUV.

It considers that it is essential that the Master Plan is underpinned by clearly defined attributes of OUV and that the tender for the collection of data upon which the plan is to be based should be extended to address recommendations above relating to attributes of OUV. It is recommended that this crucial plan should be developed in a way that allows dialogue with the Advisory Bodies during its production.

1.2.3 Key issues to be addressed by the Master Plan:

a) *Attributes of OUV*

There is a need to define more clearly the attributes of OUV and their inter-relationship, particularly with regard to the sacred and secular landscapes, isolated and accessible areas, the functions of the monastic community, monastic building traditions, the different phases of the settlement and how the islands reflect all phases of long history, as a basis for developing the new Master Plan. The following provide recommendations for some of the key attributes of OUV.

b) *Sacred Lake*

The boundary of the Sacred Lake, as a key attribute of OUV needs to be defined to encompass both the lake itself and a surrounding area where new development is permitted, views are maintained, and pollution is tightly controlled.

c) *Forests*

Given the high cultural importance of the forest, as an attribute of OUV, and particularly its sacred associations, it is recommended that the natural, sacred, utilitarian aspects of the forests are more clearly defined, determining which parts have open access, which are closed, which have limited and controlled access and use, and how silence can be largely maintained and lights limited.

d) *Monastic meadows*

The scope and extent of the monastic meadows, what drainage they rely upon and what plants they host need to be clearly defined as an attribute of OUV,

e) *Monastic water management systems*

A detailed survey mapping needs to be undertaken of the overall network of water drainage systems on the main island, their historical associations and their current condition. A conservation strategy should then be developed for the monastic water management system to set out how work will be defined, phased and carried out for this key attribute of OUV

f) *Roads*

Improvements to the important network of monastic tracks and roads, that is a key attribute of OUV, need to reflect a restrained approach to facilitating religious and cultural visitors; the network should be surveyed to inform decisions on which tracks and roads need improvement and which can be kept for 'slow' transport or for pedestrians only.

g) ***Settlement***

There is a need to clearly define the scope and history of the settlement and how this is reflected in its building and planning. A detailed survey should be undertaken of the overall settlement and all of its buildings and this should be combined with documentary evidence to elucidate which buildings relate to which periods of development and precisely how the settlement has evolved. The settlement is a key attribute of OUV.

h) ***Building typologies***

An analysis should be undertaken of building types, use of building materials and local building techniques that give the islands their specific characteristics, in order to inform protection and conservation and to define appropriate scale and materials for new structures, such as the proposed quay and residential blocks;

i) ***Craft skills***

As the monastery was known as a centre of craftsmanship, these aspects need to be clearly defined as a basis for understanding what structures are needed to sustain such skills.

j) ***Protecting building ensembles***

Protection needs to be extended beyond certain individual buildings to the ensemble of buildings and their spatial patterns in the settlement, as the historical development and morphology of the settlement is a key component of the wider cultural landscape.

k) ***Development zones***

In relation to development and the need for adequate services in and near the settlement, there is a need for a detailed zones and areas where development could take place with respect to what should be protected, conserved and sustained.

l) ***Tourism strategy***

In order for the Solovetsky Islands to be perceived and managed as a sacred place, where visitors need time to relate to the cultural lands, a tourism strategy that has considered the overall way that pilgrims and tourists are encouraged to visit the island and how their visits are managed, should be developed. This strategy should include measures to define the carrying capacity of the islands and to implement such limits.

m) ***Building ensembles***

There is a need to document, protect and conserve the highly important ensemble of timber service buildings, the Soviet era and later architect domestic buildings, and the important collection of vernacular buildings all of which contribute to OUV.

n) ***Gulag buildings***

The Master Plan needs to clearly set out a logical and coherent approach to the protection or otherwise of Gulag buildings, which are part of the history of the property.

o) ***Proposed quay building***

The mission has concerns about the scale of the proposed quay building in relation to the function it is expected to fulfil and also its building typology. Consideration should be given to using local log building traditions, in a manner that respects vernacular practice but creates a 21st century building to meet modern needs. The current proposals should be reconsidered as

part of the Master Plan and in the context of a wider conservation plan for this whole section of the coast.

p) Proposed jetty

The need for a jetty and its siting need to be explored further as part of the Master Plan.

q) Sewage scheme

The mission supported the overall rationale and location for the sewage scheme but considered that more details were needed on screening proposals. It also considered that careful consideration needed to be given to how the proposed new sewage connection network was linked to the overall development plan for the settlement in order to ensure that the presence of sewage connections does not lead to a presumption that development would be allowed. Careful consideration also needs to be given to any intersection of the new drains with the monastic water system to ensure they do not damage historic infrastructure.

1.2.4 Conservation

The mission considers that the current restoration projects should be halted until there has been a review of how conservation work is undertaken and delivered.

The Master Plan should be used to reinforce the need for connections between conservation studies of the monastic buildings, restoration work, and on-going maintenance in order to try to optimise resources and avoid the need for regular major interventions.

The supervision of major restoration and conservation projects should be undertaken by a conservation architect.

Priority should be given to conserving original fabric wherever possible and to analysis of original materials to ensure that materials and techniques selected for restoration and renewal work (especially for mortars, plasters, bricks and wood) are compatible from a physical-chemical as well as a visual viewpoint.

Restoration, maintenance and rebuilding programmes all need to be more firmly supported by the results of surveys and research into the buildings and their constructive history and by knowledge of recently completed works. Ways need to be found to make accessible the research and evidence that is available.

On-going regular maintenance needs to be instigated through the building up of a team of craftspeople supported by adequate resources.

Because of the presence of paintings below the last white painted finish within the church of Holy Trinity Skete in Anzer Island, it is important for a restorer to take samples and undertake analysis, in order to make the right choices for conservation work on the architectural surfaces.

1.2.5 Reconstruction

If there is a proposal to reconstruct the Church of St Onufrievskaya, a detailed case should be presented on how the original building contributed to the overall monastic settlement, how it is proposed the reconstruction would be undertaken, and how the church would be used if reconstructed.

1.2.6 Demolition

If the property is to be seen to reflect adequately all periods of history, then not all Gulag interventions should be reversed; the mission did not consider that a case had been made for the demolition of the Hospital building and concludes that the building should not be demolished.

1.2.7 Museum project

The mission supported the latest plans for the reconstruction of the partly built museum subject to further reflection on the facing material. Further work is needed on identifying the overall scope of the wider museum project (encompassing the diesel power station, Gulag barracks and possibly the Soviet era barn) and its aims and purposes. The proposals for the Soviet Era barn are unacceptable in terms of the degree of intervention and alternative uses should be pursued. Revised proposals for the overall museum project should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by ICOMOS.

1.2.8 Airport

Modest improvements to the current airport could be supported given the lack of acceptable alternative locations and given the importance of reliable air transport to the local and monastic communities, provided that such improvements do not lead to an increase in the number, frequency or size of regular service planes and that larger planes, such as the Dash8 Q400, are not used for regular services.

However, further work is needed on the design and materials of the passenger reception building, further reflection is desirable on whether an observation tower is necessary or could be replaced by a 'remote' tower, and the mast for lights should be modified to take a corona that could be lowered when not in use. Revised plans need to be provided to the World Heritage Centre for review by ICOMOS.

2. BACKGROUND TO THE MISSION

2.1 Inscription history and SOUV

The World Heritage property of the Cultural and Historic Ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands (Russian Federation) was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1992, under criteria (iv) during the 16th Session of the Committee.

The retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was adopted at the last session of the World Heritage Committee, the 41st session (Krakow, July 2018) (Annex 1).

2.2 World Heritage Committee Decisions, recommendations of the previous missions and Terms of Reference of the mission

In the last ten years, threats to property have been identified, including:

- the lack of adequate legal measures for the protection of the property and of adequate governance which would include national, local and religious authorities;
- the lack of appropriate standards for restoration and conservation and the bad condition of the monastic water management system;
- the construction of an airport building and inappropriate location of a planned Museum Complex;
- the lack of adequate development control processes.

These threats have resulted in almost yearly World Heritage Committee Decisions adopted between its 35th (2011) and its 41st (2017) sessions, and requests for progress reports from the State Party in order for the Committee to review, through close monitoring, if these threats would represent a potential danger to the property, in accordance with Paragraph 179 of the *Operational Guidelines*. However, the State Party has taken major steps to address these threats and respond to the World Heritage Committee Decisions, including regarding the legal framework, the finalization of the Statement of OUV, fully reflecting the complexity of the property, and the submission of draft documents such as the Management Plan. Conservation reports of the State Party to the Committee have accounted for the progress of the State Party. However, the level and rhythm of development projects submitted in the framework of Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines* as well as the need to fine-tune the various management and development tools and their overall articulation (Development Strategy and Master Plan, legal protection and regulatory framework, Protection Zoning Plan, Integrated Management Plan, Conservation Master Plan, Tourism management Strategy, risk preparedness strategy, environmental and socio-cultural risk management strategy) remain key factors of potential threats to the OUV of the property.

Consequently, at its 41st session, by its Decision 41 COM 7B. 49 (see Annex 2), the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission, in consultation with IUCN, to assess the overall issues concerning the Solovetsky archipelago, review the state of conservation of the property as well as the progress achieved in implementing all recommendations, and submit its report and recommendations at the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee in 2019. Accordingly, the Terms of Reference of the mission were defined as to:

- consider the revised plans for the museum building and the full scope of the development that is being proposed over the next decade;
- advise on whether and how this might be satisfactorily accommodated within the main island;

- assess whether the current management structures are effective enough to ensure the new development does not erode the special characteristics of the main island and impact adversely on OUV and, if not, how these might be strengthened;
- review the draft documents concerning the development of the Master Plan of the Solovetsky settlements and the Management plan of the World Heritage property;
- assess the condition of the monastic irrigation system, with its lakes and canals, and review the implementation of all relevant preventive conservation measures;
- review the state of development of a Conservation Plan for the overall property, including relevant budget provision for mid- and long-term conservation and maintenance measures;
- review the progress made in preparing of Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs) for all planned development proposals;
- evaluate the new revised plans for the Museum Complex and evaluate the implementation by the State Party of the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee and the Advisory Bodies on the Museum Complex Project;

The complete Terms of Reference for this Mission are included in Annex 3.

2.3 Mission programme

The mission was planned for April 2018. Sufficient time to visit all components of the property was foreseen in the mission programme (Annex 4). However, due to weather conditions and despite the efforts of and means deployed by the organizers, it was not possible for the team to visit all six components of the property. The mission did not visit the Big and Small Mucksalma islands nor the Big and Small Zayatski Islands. Also, the programme did not include meetings with local communities and NGOs.

2.4 Mission team

The mission was composed of: Isabelle Anatole-Gabriel, Chief Europe and North America Unit, World Heritage Centre; Francesco Bandarin, advisor to the Director-General of UNESCO; Susan Denyer, World Heritage Adviser, ICOMOS; and Donatella Fiorani, ICOMOS expert.

2.5 World Heritage Committee Decisions, meetings with State Party and report to the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee

Among the developments initiated within the property that had a negative impact on the OUV of the property, a new Museum complex had started to be built. Consequently, the World Heritage Committee at its 40th session (40 COM 7B.56) urged “the State Party to immediately halt its construction, remove the parts already constructed, and consider a more appropriate design and location for the Museum”. Since then, the State Party has halted the construction and has entered into a close consultation process with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies ICOMOS and ICCROM for the revision of the design of the new Museum Complex. The State Party, WH Centre and ICOMOS/ICCROM have met several times to discuss the revised plans. The Decision of the Committee at its 41st session (41 COM 7B.49) took stock of the process initiated and noted :

“that new revised plans have been submitted for the Museum Complex, recognize(d) the efforts taken by the State Party to implement the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee and the Advisory Bodies on the Museum Complex project, and requeste(d) the State Party to report progress to the World Heritage Centre by 1 December 2017, for review by the Advisory Bodies.”

The Committee decided further:

“to request the State Party to invite a World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission to the property, in consultation with IUCN, in the light of the considerable challenges facing the property, which should assess the overall issues concerning the Solovetsky archipelago, consider the revised plans for the museum building and the full scope of the development that is being proposed over the next decade, to advise on whether and how this might be satisfactorily accommodated within the main island, and whether the current management structures are effective enough to ensure new development does not erode the special characteristics of the main island and impact adversely on OUV, and, if not, how these might be strengthened”

and to:

“ submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 December 2018, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 43rd session in 2019”.

Following the personal commitment of the Minister of Culture of the Russian Federation, Mr Medinsky, a third working meeting was held on 20 October 2017 at UNESCO headquarters. Deputy Minister of Culture, Sergey G. Obryvalin, participated in the meeting with the Assistant Director-General for Culture, Francesco Bandarin, and representatives of ICOMOS International and of the World Heritage Centre. The meeting objective was to review the general concept of the revised design of the new Museum Complex that would allow the State Party to develop the technical documentation, on the basis of the Technical Reviews made by ICOMOS. Taking into consideration the need for the State Party to start with the construction works of the revised project during summer 2018, an outcome of the meeting was to decide to report on the State of Conservation of the property to the Committee at its 42nd session in 2018. Consequently, the State Party provided by 1 February 2018 a detailed state of conservation report on the progress made in the implementation of the Committee’s Decision 41 COM 7B.49, as well as on the final construction project of the Museum Complex, including the detailed project of rehabilitation of the existing historical buildings which are part of the Museum Complex.

3. NATIONAL, REGIONAL AND LOCAL POLICY FOR CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT

3.1 Existing structures

a) Legal framework

At present, the World Heritage property is managed under the following documents at the level of the Russian Federation:

- Resolution of the Council of Ministers of the RSFSR No.1327 dd. August 30, 1960 “On Further Improvement of Cultural Monuments Protection in the RSFSR”. Under this normative legal act, the objects forming an integral part of the Solovetsky Monastery Architectural Ensemble are recognized as Cultural Heritage Sites. A subsequent Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 1662-r dd. September 27, 2011 changed the name of the site to “The Ensemble of the Solovetsky Monastery and separate structures of the Solovetsky Archipelago Islands, the XVI century – first half of the XX century” (Arkhangelsk region, Primorsky district). By this document all cultural heritage sites included in the Architectural Ensemble of the Solovetsky Monastery from 1960 were revised, and their dating and names were made more specific;
- Article 44 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation adopted by national vote on December 12, 1993;
- Federal Law No. 73-FZ dd. June 25, 2002 “On Cultural Heritage Sites (historical and cultural monuments) of the Peoples of the Russian Federation” – the fundamental law of the Russian Federation for preservation, use, promotion and state protection of all cultural heritage sites in Russia;
- Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 759-r dd. June 1, 2009, through which all the state protection powers in relation to the World Heritage property are exercised by the Ministry of Culture of Russia. This document grants the state protection powers to the Federal Authority of Cultural Heritage Sites Protection that ensures the most effective protection in the Russian Federation;
- Order of the Ministry of Culture of Russia No. 1467 dd. November 27, 2012 on registration of the Solovetsky Monastery Ensemble and separate structures of the Solovetsky Archipelago Islands in the Unified State Register of Cultural Heritage Sites (historical and cultural monuments) of the Peoples of the Russian Federation.

b) Urban planning

- Order of the Ministry of Culture of Russia No. 2333 dd. December 24, 2013 “On approval of the protection zones boundaries of the Cultural Heritage Sites of federal significance forming part of the Cultural Heritage Site of federal significance “The Ensemble of the Solovetsky Monastery and separate structures of the Solovetsky Archipelago Islands, the XVI century – first half of the XX century” added to the World Heritage List (Solovetsky settlement, Primorsky district, Arkhangelsk region), as well as requirements to lands use policies and urban planning regulations within the boundaries of these zones”;
- Order of the Ministry of Culture of Russia No. 946 dd. June 3, 2014 “On approval of the part of the Cultural Heritage Site of federal significance “The Ensemble of the Solovetsky Monastery and separate structures of the Solovetsky Archipelago Islands, the 16th century – first half of the 20th century” added to the World Heritage List (Arkhangelsk region, Primorsky district, Bolshoy Solovetsky island, Bolshaya Mucksalma island, Anzer island and Bolshoy

Zayatsky island), as well as requirements for lands use policies and urban planning regulations within the boundaries of these zones”.

In addition, a number of fundamental documents have been adopted at the level of the subject of the Russian Federation – Arkhangelsk region:

- State Program of Arkhangelsk region “Development of the Solovetsky Archipelago Infrastructure (2014-2019)” approved by the Resolution of the Government of Arkhangelsk region No. 314-pp dd. July 16, 2013.

c) Management

- Concept of preserving the Cultural Heritage of the Solovetsky Archipelago developed by the federal state unitary enterprise “Central Scientific-Restoration and Design Workshops” in 2013-2014 (on request of the Ministry of Culture of Russia) and approved by the resolution of the Board of the Russian Ministry of Culture on June 25, 2014 (Minutes No. 14). This includes status analysis and main issues in regard to the preservation of cultural heritage sites situated in the territory of the Solovetsky Archipelago and proposals on the order, terms and procedures of restoration activities.
- Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 1939-r dd. October 1, 2014 “On approval of the set of organizational measures on the Solovetsky Archipelago preservation and development”. These measures will be implemented by responsible federal executive authorities within the limits of the federal funds.

While noting that management tools and structure were in place, the 2013 Reactive Monitoring mission underlined the need for a more efficient management system and recommended to develop a Management Plan along with a Conservation Plan and an Action Plan. The first draft of the management plan of the property was prepared in 2014 and shared with the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre and, further to Decision 40 COM 7B.56 by the World Heritage Committee, a revised version was submitted to the World Heritage Centre in January 2018 for review by the Advisory Bodies and the Centre. The Management Plan was sent for review by the Advisory Body ICOMOS; however, during the mission, the team was presented with a comprehensive overview of the document by the Deputy Director of the Department of Cultural Heritage Protection. He underlined the fact that, as per Committee recommendations, the document:

- 1) has taken on board all recommendations from the previous missions (2013 Reactive Monitoring mission and 2015 Advisory mission);
- 2) does include sections on OUV of the property and its attributes,
- 3) is focused on the main three factors aiming at sustaining the OUV and its attributes (i) preservation, ii) limitation of development and iii) management);
- 4) aims at harmonizing and strengthening the legal status of the various objects and components of the World Heritage property, giving a special attention to religious and historical significance;
- 5) is the result of an inclusive working group created in 2016, headed by the Deputy Minister of Culture and since January 2018 by the Minister of Culture. The working group includes the Federal Ministry, the representatives of the Arkhangelsky region, representatives of the museum and monastery, and representatives of professional organizations and of civil society.

The mission was also made aware that the structures proposed by the new Foundation would have a significant impact on the management structure of the property. The proposed Master Plan will similarly

have an impact on the overall framework for management. It was therefore accepted that the current draft of the Management Plan would need to be amended after the Master Plan had been completed.

The mission suggests that a working session dedicated to the Management Plan should be organised in collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS following the completion of the Master Plan.

In addition, a number of fundamental documents have been adopted at the level of the subject of the Russian Federation – Arkhangelsk region:

- Development Strategy of the Solovetsky Archipelago as a unique site of historical, cultural and natural heritage approved by the Resolution of the Government of Arkhangelsk Region No. 310-rp dd. July 16, 2013. Requirements of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee for the preservation of the World Heritage Site “Historical and Cultural Ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands” were taken into account by making corresponding supplements to the above-mentioned strategy, which were approved by the Decree of the Government of Arkhangelsk Region No. 190-rp dd. July 21, 2015.

d) Governance

State institutions, the Russian Orthodox Church and the public of Russia work together to preserve and restore the Solovetsky Monastery Architectural Ensemble as a whole.

Proper coordination of all actions of the branches of government and the Russian Orthodox Church for the purpose of preservation and up-to-date development of the Archipelago as an integral site of historical, cultural, natural and spiritual heritage is achieved through the application of the programme-target method. Targeted programmes (federal, regional, municipal), in accordance with the competence and established sphere of jurisdiction, allow the development and reconciliation of the priorities of the federal, regional and local levels as well as relations between the state and the church; the accumulation and best use of resources to address the problems of the Solovetsky Archipelago development; and the evaluation of the effectiveness of the programme measures through use of indicators and indices.

The choice of the programme-target method as a basic approach to carry out the actions aimed at providing state support to the Government of the Arkhangelsk region to solve the issues of sustainable social and economic development of the Solovetsky Archipelago was recommended by the President of the Russian Federation to the Government of the Russian Federation in the Instruction No. Pr-1625 dd. June 25, 2012.

The Government of the Russian Federation through the Ministry of Culture of Russia provides long-term federal financing of the restoration works to the World Heritage property within the framework of the Federal Target Programme “Culture of Russia (2012-2018)” (approved by the Resolution of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 186 dd. March 3, 2012) in accordance with the annual list of sites proposed by the Russian Orthodox Church for financing after its approval by the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia. Restoration activities on the Solovetsky Islands are arranged and carried out in accordance with the Concept of preserving the Cultural Heritage of the Solovetsky Archipelago and the Action Plan up to 2018.

All the works being undertaken are aimed at scientific restoration with the recovery of the Cultural Heritage Sites’ historical functions.

4. IDENTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT OF ISSUES

4.1 General issues

The proposed new Master Plan is a timely opportunity to devise a sustainable way forward for the property. To be effective, the Plan needs to be based on a detailed analysis of the property and its OUV, on historical, archival and archaeological surveys and research, and an analysis of social, economic and environmental parameters. All of these should inform an identification of the key issues facing the property, for which policies and actions are needed.

Below are the mission's observation and recommendations on the key issues that the Master Plan needs to address.

a) OUV and its attributes

The OUV of World Heritage properties recognises intangible associations that the property is seen to reflect in an outstanding way. These intangible aspects are not separate from the tangible aspects but inter-related.

In the case of Solovetsky islands, the property was inscribed for the way the islands' landscape 'admirably illustrates the faith, tenacity and courage of late medieval religious communities' as well as for the tangible remains of its monasteries and other related buildings.

The SOUV, adopted by the Committee in 2017, sets out clearly the key tangible attributes of the property. Its religious, residential, domestic, defence and technical constructions, comprise the monumental monastic complex, the village of the 16th to the early 20th centuries, cells and hermitages of 16th to the early 20th centuries, as well as insular hydraulic and irrigation systems. There are also sacred sites, dozens of archaeological remains, constructions of the Solovetsky Special Prison Camp, and, surrounding all of these, the 'natural and cultural landscapes throughout the archipelago'.

The SOUV also stresses the significance of the inter-relationship between these attributes that combine to form 'a rare cultural and natural synthesis' and a 'complex [that] is unique in its integrity and safeguarding of its harmoniously blended with the surrounding natural and cultural landscapes'. It also stresses the way 'Solovetsky complex represents all periods of the history of the archipelago and the Russian North in general'.

What became clear to the mission was the complexity of these attributes but also of their inter-relationships. It considers that there is a need for the SOUV to be complemented by a detailed description of the attributes, how they are inter-related, and how they contribute to OUV. The following offers a few examples of this complexity.

If the property is to represent 'all periods of the history of the archipelago and the Russian North in general', then precisely how the property has evolved and what conveys its history needs to be clearly understood. The village that flourished from the 16th century has been subject to many changes, as detailed below, but at its core there are still the fragile remains of traditional structures that are characteristic of the fishing settlements of the White Sea Coast and which are crucial to an understanding of the overall evolution of the island.

The islands that make up the property are now considered to be among the most sacred of Russian Orthodox places, a revival of the sacred status accorded to them in the 15th and 16th centuries when they became a symbol for the Russian Orthodox Church, equivalent to the way that Mount Athos came

to symbolise Greek Orthodoxy. It is not just the main Monastery and sketes and hermitages that are seen as sacred but also the overall landscape, associated with the Holy Land of the Church, including natural aspects such as Golgotha Mountain on Anzer Island, and the Svyatoe (Holy) lake. There is a need to clarify the precise extent of the landscape considered sacred in relation to the supportive secular landscape.

There has been a long-standing contrast, and at time tensions, between the strength and success of the monastery and the isolation and seclusion of the forested landscape that attracted monks. This contrast appears to be fundamental to the form and purpose of the sacred landscape, and needs to be set out as an attribute to be sustained.

The heart of the property is the main monastery as a ‘unique architectural complex’ of buildings ‘characterized by their monumentality, individuality and integrity of all components resulting from the centuries-old tradition of building’. All these aspects need to be much more clearly defined, and particularly the building traditions, with distinct contrasts between those of the monumental buildings and of its supporting structures – as set out in more details below.

The monastic community is the main ‘engine’ of the property; its scope should be more clearly defined in relation not just to its main buildings but also in relation to the skills needed to sustain its main functions and how and where these are and should be accommodated. The keeping of cattle has been a long-standing tradition and associated with this are not only large structures for cattle housing but also pastures on Bolshaya Mucksalma Island and important hay meadows around the sketes. Traditional craftspeople included blacksmith, carpenters, builders, etc. and various large wooden buildings near the monasteries associated with these professions still survive. The buildings needed to support the full range of monastic activities to be sustained to allow an understanding of how this remote community organised its needs.

These are just a few examples of the way the key attributes need to be more fully described and understood for the way they convey OUV, in order to inform how they might be protected/conserved/managed or sustained, as appropriate, as part of the new Master Plan.

Recommendation:

There is a need to define more clearly the attributes of OUV and their inter-relationship, particularly with regards to the sacred and secular landscapes, isolated and accessible areas, the functions of the monastic community, monastic building traditions, water management system,, ancient paths, the different phases of the settlement and how the islands reflect all phases of long history, as a basis for developing the new Master Plan.

b) Sacred lake (Svytoe ozero)

The lake immediately adjacent to the isthmus on which the main monastery is sited was enlarged in the 16th century to provide fresh drinking water, as part of an elaborate water management system on the island. Its name reflects its life-sustaining properties. It is a crucial part of the immediate surroundings of the monastery and of views to and from the monastery.

There is an urgent need to define and protect its perimeter – not just the water body but the land surrounding it that needs to be carefully managed to ensure it is perceived as a sacred lake and maintains its purity – and the views across it to and from the Monastery. Along its north eastern edge, there has been some development including a large house (now partly-ruined), a guest house, and a partly-built

new house right next to the inflow of the lake (see photo). These structures are all highly visible from across the lake and apparently not connected to any centralised sewage system.



Fig. 1: *New house by Sacred Lake*

Much greater control is needed of the periphery of the Lake, its water quality and views across it to and from the main Monastery.

Recommendation:

The boundary of the Sacred Lake, as a key attribute of OUV needs to be defined to encompass both the lake itself and a surrounding area where new development is permitted, views are maintained, and pollution is tightly controlled.

c) Forested landscape

The forest landscape, covering some 95% of the islands, is currently protected for its natural qualities encompassing important tundra forests, rich flora and rare bird species. The aim has been to regenerate those parts of the forest that were felled during Soviet times.

As part of the overall landscape of the island, the forest also has a strong cultural value as a key attribute of OUV and a major element of the sacred landscape that exemplifies the remote and inhospitable area chosen by monks, and associations with miracles and saints.

The forests are not wholly natural wilderness, as the activities of the monastic community over time, particularly as a result of the drainage of swamps as part of the development of hydraulic systems, and through clearance of land to facilitate the keeping of cattle, have had an impact. Some 75% of the forest is still native species of pine and spruce, while elsewhere birch and alder flourish.

The monks have long protected the forest resource, using logs washed ashore as fuel. Wood for fuel is now brought to the islands from the Onega region and no (or only few) trees are now felled for construction purposes. Although sand used to be extracted for roads and the airport, such material is now brought from the mainland. Mushrooms, berries and other produce are gathered by pilgrims and

tourists as well as by the monastic community. The forest landscape is now seen to also have a high touristic value and forest roads are open to visitors.

There is a clear need to consider whether and how these different aspects – natural, sacred, utilitarian and touristic - can be sustained. It is understood that there are tensions between the local community and visitors over the gathering of forest produce. Visitors can also be associated with noise. Defining which parts of the forest have open access, which have limited access and which are closed, and where how silence should be largely maintained and lights limited, is a priority.

Recommendation:

Given the high cultural importance of the forest as a key attribute of OUV, and its sacred associations, it is recommended that the natural, sacred, and utilitarian aspects of the forests are more clearly defined, determining which parts have open access, which are closed, which have limited and controlled access and use, and where silence should be largely maintained and lights limited.

d) Monastic meadows

The meadow around the sketes on Bolshoy Solovetsky and Anzer islands (and those on Bolshaya Mucksalma Island but not visited) were carved out of the forests by monks to provide hay for cattle and, as a result, became hosts to many introduced species of wild flowers. The maintenance of these meadows is important as part of the history of the development of the island. Their continued management is dependent on a functioning water management system.

Recommendation:

The scope and extent of the monastic meadows, which contribute to OUV, the drainage they rely upon and the plants they host all need to be defined.

e) Monastic water management systems

The extensive water management system created in the 15th-16th centuries connected 52 of the many hundreds of lakes on the main island, enlarged the Sacred Lake to create a source of drinking water, and piped water into the main monastery.

The increased flow of water to the lakes had a beneficial impact on the amount and diversity of fish. In the early twentieth century, a new canal system was built for navigation (1907–1918). The shipping canals, with their walls reinforced with boulders, connected 10 lakes in all and allowed water travel from the central to the northern part of the island. At the same time, a boulder dam connected the main island to Mucksalma Island. Currently, the overall system includes 16 dams and four locks.

As has been observed in previous mission reports, this system needs urgent conservation, particularly the interface of channels with roads and tracks, and the underground channels within the monastery.

The mission understood that no detailed survey had been prepared of the overall system, upon which a conservation strategy could set out a phased approach to the necessary work. The mission considered that such a survey, linking channels with historical data, and a condition report were urgently needed as a basis for programming work.

Recommendation:

A detailed survey needs to be undertaken to map the overall network of water drainage systems on the main island, a key attribute of OUV, and its historical associations and condition.

f) Roads and trackways

Some 75km of unsurfaced roads, tracks and paths on Bolshoy Solovetsky Island link the main Monastery with sketes, hermitages, sacred sites, fishing areas, the Botanical garden and Bolshaya Mucksalma Island. Conservation of this extensive network is essential in order to strengthen the links between the various elements of the overall religious complex.

It is understood that the early roads built by the monks were faced in stone blocks. The main arteries were ‘improved’ in the early 19th century. Now the roads around Solovetsky village and elsewhere are not in good condition. The increase in tourism in the past decade has probably contributed to the worsening condition of the roads.

It is understood that the Municipality of Arkhangelsk has considered a programme of road improvement including removing through roads from the village.

The issue of road improvement is crucially linked to how the islands are to be developed. There is clearly a basic need for communication by the monastic community. Over and above that the need for road traffic will depend on whether the island is developed for pilgrims, cultural tourism or leisure tourism or for a mixture of these, whether the numbers of visitors are limited, and how they travel.

As set out below, the mission considers that the property is at a critical juncture in terms of which way development will proceed. If as recommended it becomes a sacred and cultural destination where visitors are limited in numbers and requested to visit at a slow pace to respect the peace and quiet of this remote and special place, there will be less need for quick access across and between the islands.

The road programme needs to be drawn up to reflect this restrained approach. Road improvements should only be made to essential roads. On tracks, non-motorised horses and carts could be considered. A survey of the overall network of roads should identify which roads should be improved and which kept for mainly ‘slow’ transport and which for pedestrian only.

The mission also considers that the road surfaces should as far as possible be of natural materials, such as stone, rather than tarmac/concrete (see photo of a small section of stone road constructed in the 1980s).



Fig. 2: Stone road

The mission was encouraged to be advised that the Master Plan would not be a tool to urbanise the island.

Recommendation:

Improvements to the important network of monastic tracks and roads that are key attributes of OUV need to reflect a restrained approach to facilitating religious and cultural visitors; the network should be surveyed to inform decisions on which need improvement and which can be kept for ‘slow’ transport or for pedestrians only.

g) Settlement:

The development of the settlement to the north and later the south of the monastery was inextricably linked to the development of the monastery. The monks who lived within the walls of the monastery were supported by others residing outside the walls. As well as houses, service buildings for supporting agricultural and other processes were developed especially during the prosperous period of the 19th century when a large hotel for visitors was constructed. The main cemetery for the monastery was adjacent to the settlement.

During the Gulag period, further buildings were constructed, including the hospital (built over part of the cemetery) and warehouses, while the church of St Onufrievskaya was demolished. Following the closure of the camp, the settlement was extended with ensembles of two-storey residential buildings in the south and a large timber barn, and in the post-Soviet Era a further complex of houses designed by architect Nikita Yavein was built between 1989 and 1995. The settlement became a municipality in 2005 and its boundaries were slightly reduced in 2017.

The SOUV sets out clearly the capacity of the property to represent ‘all periods of the history of the archipelago and the Russian North in general’. Such a historical representation should not be limited to the main monastery buildings but should also include the buildings that supported the monastery and buildings that reflect more recent history. The timber service and vernacular buildings and the handsome Soviet apartment blocks are all important elements of the overall sequence of development. If the vernacular buildings were to disappear over the next, say, ten years, as a result of neglect, the whole character of the settlement would be changed and much of value lost.

Overall the planning structures that evolved between the 16th and 19th centuries are still in place. Many of the timber vernacular buildings in the settlements though are in a highly fragile and vulnerable condition.

While a plan currently exists that shows buildings protected as Monuments of Heritage as well as buildings and others considered to be inharmonious and where demolition would be supported, this plan is inadequate to guide the choices that need to be made. It is not based on any full analysis of the settlement as a whole, and its scope is limited to formal buildings, thus excluding consideration of the ensemble of vernacular buildings that are crucial to its character.

A wider assessment of all the buildings is urgently needed that could inform an understanding of how the settlement reflects different periods of history. It is not acceptable for buildings to be demolished because they are in an ‘emergency state’ of repair and therefore look unsightly, as such demolitions could wipe out valuable parts of the historical record.

There is a need for more detailed survey and documentation of the overall settlement and all its buildings in relation to its historical development. As the settlement is not large, documenting every building should not be too onerous a task. Such an exercise could clearly elucidate which buildings relate to which periods of development and precisely how settlement developed.

Recommendation:

There is a need to clearly define the scope and history of the settlement and how this is reflected in its buildings and planning. A detailed survey should be undertaken of the overall settlement and all of its buildings and combined with documentary evidence to elucidate which buildings relate to which periods of development and precisely how the settlement has evolved. The settlement is a key attribute of OUV.

h) Local building typologies

As well as the need for an overall survey of the settlement, there is also a need to define more clearly local building typologies, and how the use of local materials and building techniques have shaped both the formal and informal architecture of all the islands.

The distinctive use of large boulders as foundations for the buildings of the main monastery and particularly their use in its surrounding fortified walls and towers are well promoted. These are used for the sauna on Anzer Island and stores on Bolshoy Zayatsky Island (not visited). In the main monastery buildings, the dominant material is burnt brick, painted or plastered.

There is also an important corpus of timber structures, some large, such as the monastic service buildings and later Soviet Era buildings on Bolshoy Solovetsky island, the houses and harbour buildings on Anzer island, structures on Bolshaya Mucksalma island and St Andrew's church, Bolshoy Zayatsky Island (the latter two not seen from the ground), as well as the small vernacular buildings in the settlement. Some of these might not be outstanding or distinctive as individual structures in the wider north Russian context, but they need to be appraised for the valuable contribution they make towards an understanding of craftsmanship in this specific locality.

The architecture of the Solovetsky Islands is a mixture of monumental buildings, of stone and brick, and more utilitarian buildings, of timber or brick and timber, but one supports the other. Both are needed to reflect the history of the islands.

Such an analysis of topologies could also help inform an approach for conservation. It could also help define a way forward for the design of new structures and when it is appropriate or not appropriate to adopt a monumental approach. (See below for further discussion on this in relation to the new museum and the proposed quay building.)

The main monastic buildings should remain as the dominant monumental structures. New building for houses or for services should reflect the timber, or timber and brick, architecture of utilitarian buildings.

Recommendation:

There is a need for a detailed analysis of building types, use of building materials and local building techniques that give the islands their specific characteristics; in order to inform protection and conservation and to define appropriate scale and materials for new structures such as the quay and residential blocks;

i) *Craftsmanship*

The monastery has been at times a centre of craftsmanship in relation to masonry, carpentry, cabinet making, the production of icons and boat building, to name a few areas. One of the constraints now facing the monastic community is the lack of craftspeople and experienced conservators who are resident on the islands. This has led to major renovation and restoration projects being undertaken by companies from outside the area using building and craftspeople who may not be familiar with the local practices or local sensitivities and without a resident conservator to guide them. Some of the resultant work is a cause of conservable concern – see Conservation section below.

The lack of resident craftspeople is also problematic in relation to on-going maintenance. The mission understands that this is a comparatively recent problem. A small group of two well-detailed traditional timber houses and adjacent storage buildings shown to the mission were constructed in the early 2000s as a Scientific-Research and Design-Production centre known as "Palata", by the then-head architect-restorer, Vladimir Soshin. These buildings are no longer in use for that purpose and there is apparently no longer a head architect-restorer on the islands.



Fig. 3: *New log-built chapel*

The one exception to this decline in expertise is a monk who has been trained at ICCROM and who was the master builder in charge of the new, small but very well designed and detailed log-construction chapel and sauna next to a lake. This small complex effectively revives the local log building tradition. (see photo of chapel)

Recommendation

The monastery was known as a centre of craftsmanship and these aspects need to be clearly defined as basis for understanding what structures are needed to sustain such skills.

1) *Protection*

The mission understood that currently only certain individual buildings have protection (as marked on the existing Master Plan). This in effect means that the majority of buildings in the settlement are not protected.

This is unsatisfactory given the fact that it is the ensemble of all structures that has value, not just the monumental monastic and other structures but the vernacular buildings as well. The property is an

outstanding example of a cultural landscape where incremental development has shaped the face of the islands. In this development, the minor aspects as well as the major ones may hold important evidence, may offer important associations, and certainly contribute to the overall harmony of the landscape and its ability to reflect its history.

There is an urgent need to protect the form and detail of the settlement as an overall ‘conservation area’, or through some such similar mechanism, where the traditional vernacular houses, the monastic service buildings, the Gulag era constructions, and the Soviet era housing blocks and barns, are protected as an ensemble that clearly reflects the history of the islands.

Recommendation

Protection needs to be extended beyond certain individual buildings to the ensemble of different building types and associated structures and their spatial patterns, as the historical development and morphology of the settlement is a key component of the wider cultural landscape.

j) Development projects

Currently major projects appear to be organised on a one-by-one basis without being clearly integrated into an overall context for the development of the property. Over the past two years, a number of projects have been submitted to the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for review, such as for the museum, ferry terminal, hospital, and housing block, and although these have been submitted with Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs), they have mostly lacked a clear rationale to support the proposed development and it has been unclear how much more development is being planned and where.

Given the comparatively small scale of the islands, the very limited number of vernacular buildings, and the highly sensitive landscape and its sacred associations, there is an urgent need for an agreed understanding of the needs of the monastic community, the local community and tourists and how some or all of these can be met without compromising the very essence of the islands or threatening the property’s OUV.

The mission fully supports the need for adequate service buildings to be provided for the local community but considers that these needs should be considered within a more detailed plan of how and where development should take place, which roads will be improved, and which buildings will be conserved. In turn, this plan should be based upon an analysis of the significance of the settlement as a whole as well as of all its component parts.

Recommendation

In relation to development and the need for adequate services in and near the settlement, there is a need for an agreed understanding of the specific needs of the monastic community, the local community, pilgrims and tourists and a detailed plan of how and where development should take place in relation to what should be protected, what conserved and what sustained.

k) Tourism

The tourism season is short – from May to September. During the same period, many pilgrims visit the islands and school children take part in workshops at two of the sketes. The pilgrims stay within the main monastery or in two hostels operated by the Monastery. Tourists are accommodated in a hotel or in guest houses, while school children stay in dormitories at the sketes.

Currently, approximately 30,000 visitors arrive at the islands each year. The balance between leisure tourism and pilgrims was not made known to the mission.

The increase in visitation over the past 15 years has been facilitated by the local community who have invested in boat transport. They benefit from the visits and would like to further increase numbers.

There is also a clear wish to increase religious tourism and studies are currently being undertaken to identify historic pilgrimage routes to and from Solovki, which is seen as a nodal point in such routes across Russia and which connect to key Christian sites in further afield. Proposed improvements to the airport (see below) could also improve access to the islands.

The issue of the overall carrying capacity of the islands is crucial given the fragility of the place. Currently, most visitors only arrive during three summer months. Much of the accommodation is not suitable for winter visitation while transport around the island is very limited when snow is lying.

As with many other issues, the property is at a turning point in terms of whether visitor numbers should be increased, and if so by how many, what type of visitors should be the main focus for the islands, and whether efforts should be made to increase winter visiting. All of these aspects will impact on transport to the islands, transport around the islands and the type of accommodation that is provided.

In the mission's view, a rapid increase in tourism could destroy the sacred nature of the cultural landscape, as could increasing transportation to a point where the islands become an easy place to reach.

Solovki is a special place where visitors should make time to interact with the buildings, the landscape and the ceremonies that intertwine the two. It should be a place that encourages contemplation of the interaction between culture and nature, a 'slow' destination where visitors are privileged to be guests of the monastic community. The mission would therefore welcome a change of focus to religious and cultural tourism. The mission was encouraged to learn that in the short-term, no permissions will be given for further hotels.

It would be beneficial to develop a tourism strategy to address the points outlined above as part of the wider Master Plan. Such a strategy could then guide the promotion of the islands, the development of visitor transport to the islands, accommodation, travel around the islands, the management of visitor numbers and how the islands are interpreted.

Recommendation

In order for Solovki to be perceived and managed as a sacred place, where visitors take time to relate to the cultural landscape, a tourism strategy should be developed that considers the overall way that pilgrims and tourists are encouraged to visit the island, how their visits are managed and how interpretation is organised.

4.2 Conservation

a) Conservation of the main Monastic Buildings

The Advisory mission visited the Solovetsky monastic fortress several times. Restorations are being undertaken in many buildings of the complex, such as the Cathedral of the Transfiguration-of-the-Saviour, Cathedral of the Trinity, of Zosimus and of Sabbat, used for the liturgy. Other restorations

have involved the Belltower and some monastic rooms used for monks' everyday life (Assumption tower, ancient buildings of Icons and the Tailor, Father superior buildings) and for guests (kitchens, common refectories and halls). The report of the ICOMOS Advisory mission of 22-28 July 2015 has already referred to these works.

Other conservation works noted were on the walls of the fortress, particularly on the Nikolskaya (St Nicholas) tower (Fig. 4a), at NW, the South wall of the Transfiguration church (Fig. 4b-c), the basement of the gallery-passageway to the complex of Nikolskaya (Fig. 4d). The Skete of St Sabbatus (Skit Sabratieva) was also visited, and the two monasteries in Anzer Island: the Holy Trinity Skete (Fig. 5a-b), and the Golgotha Crucifixion Skete (Fig. 5c).



Fig. 4a: *The St Nicholas tower and the western border of the Solovetsky Monastery Complex*



Fig. 4b: *The Transfiguration church within the Solovetsky Monastery*



Fig. 4c: *The interior of Transfiguration church*



Fig. 4d: *The basement of the gallery-passageway within Solovetsky Monastery Complex*



Fig. 5a: *The Holy Trinity skate in Anzel Island*



Fig. 5b: *The interior of the cathedral in Holy Trinity skate in Anzel Island*



Fig. 5c: The Golgotha Crucifixion Skete in Anzel Island

Referring to the pictures in the already-cited mission report of 2015, it was noted that the works on Holy Trinity Skete have not progressed: the painting of part of the monastery wall has been completed and the scaffolding taken down, but the other parts of the buildings are still not completed and the interiors and the cathedral have still to be restored. The restoration and re-building of Golgotha Crucifixion Skete is completed; a religious community live permanently there and use small wooden houses and chapels around the main building.

The mission was extremely concerned at the techniques and materials being used in some of the areas under restoration. In the refectory of the main monastery, the stonework of the massive pillar supporting the vaulted ceiling has been refaced with some sort of mortar to smooth out ‘imperfections’ with the result that the original stone is mostly hidden. This work might be reversible but what is not is the unfortunate, and it would appear unnecessary, replacement of the original massive granite steps leading up to the main church with new mechanically sawn blocks. Elsewhere, repairs to brick walls were being undertaken by re-facing spalled bricks with proprietary mortar rather than by carefully inserting new bricks. On the large boulders at the base of a staircase, lichen was being rubbed off with a wire brush drill. There was no evidence of lime mortar or lime wash being used on stone walls. Some of the joinery work, such as on the bell tower, had been undertaken in a very unsatisfactory fashion with balustrades constructed in poor wood and fixed with small insecure brackets. Parts of a new roof show wooden members connected with iron, rather than traditional wooden joints being constructed that allow the right structural collaboration between the parts. The rationale for some of the work was also unclear in terms of how the decision to restore to a certain period had been reached or why, for instance, the wooden floor had been laid in the refectory on top of concrete.

An area of great concern was the work on the exterior walls of the main fortifications. These consist of large boulders between which the mortar is ‘galleted’, that is, interspersed with fragments of bricks. In areas where the mortar has been replaced, there appeared to have been no attempt to replicate the original patterns with the brick fragment scattered in a random fashion. On one tower and on a large section of the adjoining wall, all the orange lichen, which is such a distinctive and notable feature of the towers (and much painted by artists), has been mechanically removed.



Fig. 6a: *Stone tower with lichen.*



Fig. 6b: *Tower after cleaning and repointing*

The mission acknowledges that these restoration projects were necessary but considers that most could have been undertaken more sympathetically through restoring more original fabric and through the use of compatible materials, both of which could have produced more long-lasting results. This is true also for the improvement projects in service areas and dormitories, at the main Monastery and elsewhere, where restoration was not the aim but appropriate materials would have offered more sustainable outcomes.

There is a need to halt current restoration work immediately and to re-consider how conservation work should be planned, defined and managed and how on-going maintenance is carried out. There appear to have been structural failings in the way major projects have been defined and managed, with few people on the islands being involved in their management and a lack of use by contractors of relevant historic and scientific evidence. Above all, major projects need to be under the supervision of a conservation architect.

Given the huge scale of the monastic buildings, there is a need for a continuous process of maintenance that can be delivered by the stable presence of a team of specialised craftspeople supported by a permanent fund reserved for this endeavour.

There is a particular need to control water infiltration from roofs and at ground level for buildings already restored through regular maintenance in order to avoid the need for major restoration in the future.

Restoration, maintenance and rebuilding programmes all need to be more firmly supported by the results of surveys and research into the buildings and their constructive history and by knowledge of recently completed works. The mission understands that much work has been undertaken on the monastic buildings by eminent restorers and architects and ways need to be found to make this evidence available.

Overall the mission considered that the development of the Master Plan should be used to reinforce the need for connections between conservation studies of the monastic buildings, restoration work, and on-going maintenance in order to optimise resources and avoid the need for regular major interventions.

Recommendations

The current restoration projects should be halted until there has been a review of how conservation work is undertaken and delivered.

The Master Plan should be used to reinforce the need for connections between conservation studies of the monastic buildings, restoration work, and on-going maintenance in order to try to optimise resources and avoid the need for regular major interventions.

The supervision of major restoration and conservation projects should be undertaken by a conservation architect.

Priority should be given to conserving original fabric wherever possible and to analysis of original materials to ensure that materials and techniques selected for restoration and renewal work (especially for mortars, plasters, bricks and wood), are compatible from a physical-chemical as well as a visual viewpoint.

Restoration, maintenance and rebuilding programmes all need to be more firmly supported by the results of surveys and research into the buildings and their constructive history and by knowledge of recently completed works. Ways need to be found to make accessible the research and evidence that is available.

On-going regular maintenance needs to be instated through the building up of a team of craftspeople supported by adequate resources.

Because of the presence of paintings below the last white painted finish within the church of Holy Trinity Skete, it is important for a restorer to take samples and undertake analysis, in order to make the right choices for conservation work on the architectural surfaces.

b) Conservation of monastic water management system

The lakes and the associate water courses are the lifeblood of the main island as well as being a technical system of great cultural significance. The lakes could also be part of a sustainable energy system (see below). An overall conservation strategy is needed as a matter of urgency as well as a maintenance programme that defines the resources needed to sustain the channels once they have been restored/conserved.

It is clear that the conservation of these channels is a long-term project and their conservation will have to be phased over many years. A conservation strategy would allow an understanding of how the work will be defined, phased and carried out.

Fishing on the lakes is confined to local people. It should be clarified who is in charge of managing the overall water system, who is responsible for water quality and how the ecology of the lakes and their fish stocks are monitored or managed.

Recommendation

A conservation strategy should be developed (or included in the Master Plan) for the monastic water management system to set out how work will be defined, phased and carried out.

c) Conservation of monastic and Soviet era service buildings

The various islands house an important ensemble of mainly timber service buildings. There are several one-storey barns, partly built into the ground, and a complex of large timber barns to the north of the Sacred Lake, part of a large complex shown clearly on a late 19th century map. These include highly important examples of a ‘bank barn’ type of construction with ramps at the gable end leading to the upper floor. Presumably cattle used to be housed on the ground floor, and grain and hay above. One of the barns has been converted into a hostel with apparently its roof pitch altered and the ramp removed. It is essential that the remaining barns of this complex are preserved to reflect the agricultural practices of the island. They comprise a quite possibly unique, large scale ensemble and need documenting and protecting as such.



Fig. 7: Monastic Barns

One of the most prominent buildings is the very long partly-subterranean building constructed in the 1930s for the storage of vegetables. This is a magnificent structure and should also be documented and protected.

Other service buildings include the large structure for drying sails on the sea side of Prosperity Bay, the boat barn, now a museum, the blacksmith's building and a carpenters' workshop. All these are an essential part of the history of the island and should be documented, conserved and protected before they become too fragile.

Less obvious are the many small sheds around the island, some dilapidated. These are essential storage places for flat-dwellers and very characteristic of rural settlements. They should not be seen as untidy or in-essential.

Recommendation

There is a need to document, protect and conserve the highly important ensemble of timber service buildings.

d) Conservation of industrial heritage

The property includes some of the first technological buildings in Russia. The hydro-electric power station, the radio station and the diesel power station still survive. This ensemble of structures are of value as a whole and all need to be fully surveyed and documented.

The hydro-electric power station, built on the outflow of the Sacred Lake, provided electricity for the main monastic complex. It was constructed in 1909-12 and still has its machinery, produced by Siemens & Halske. The building needs extensive restoration. Power generation ceased when the diesel power station was constructed in 1938-9. (Fig. 8a).



Fig. 8a: *The hydro-electric power station on Solovetsky Island*



Fig. 8b: *The diesel power station on Solovetsky Island*

The Diesel Power Station (Fig. 8b) is one of the first built in Russia. The mission only viewed its exterior. A synthetic drawing provided by architects working on the museum project foresees the use of the whole building for displays with the introduction of some contemporary elements, and without any reference to the existence of the original machinery. In the case these still exist, the project should consider their maintenance and harmonisation with the new insertions. The excavation of the ground all around the building is necessary due to the presence of diesel oil pollution of the ground; the results of the excavations should be evaluated.

Recommendation

The Master Plan needs to consider the documentation, survey, conservation and enhancement of the ensemble of industrial buildings

e) Conservation of Soviet era and later domestic buildings

The groups of apartment buildings constructed in the Soviet era extend from the village to the south of the monastery. There are several different styles with similar blocks grouped together. Many of these are handsome buildings of mainly timber construction and painted in earthen colours (see photos). A few later blocks are built of rendered bricks.



Fig. 9a: *Red Soviet era blocks*



Fig. 9b: *Yellow Soviet era blocks*

Between the cemetery and the Gulag Barracks is a good architect-designed smaller scale residential settlement, constructed between 1989 and 1995 (see photo).



Fig. 10: *Post-Soviet era houses by architect Nikita Yavein, constructed between 1989 and 1995.*

Recommendation

The conservation of the Soviet era and later architect-designed domestic buildings need to be clearly identified in the Master Plan.

f) Conservation of timber vernacular houses

The high significance of the timber vernacular buildings is set out above, as well as the need for their protection.

These buildings encompass some early examples of small houses, part of the few remaining intact examples of small settlements around the White Sea, one or two larger perhaps 19th century linear houses, and a few small houses added during the Gulag period.

It is crucial that these vernacular buildings are sensitively restored as an essential reflection of the development of the island. The corpus of these dwellings is in an extremely fragile condition. Their

conservation presents an urgent challenge. In order to maintain their authenticity, the buildings to be need restored/conserved rather than re-built.

Careful attention also needs to be given to how these structures are used, once restored. If they were all converted to new uses, and particularly tourist uses, this could compromise their ability to reflect their role in the development of the islands. If they are to remain as houses, they will need to be modernised and extended extremely sensitively.

Recommendation

The Master Plan needs to address how the important collection of vernacular buildings, which contribute towards OUV, are documented, protected, conserved and used.

g) Conservation of Gulag buildings

The remaining Gulag buildings consist of barracks, a hospital, the diesel power station and a few small vernacular houses.

The barracks consists of a semi-formal arrangement of remaining timber barracks arranged in a U-shape. Recently, one of the end buildings was set up as a museum (not currently open). There are tentative proposals to widen the scope of Gulag interpretation in relation to individual histories. To provide the necessary space, all the remaining Gulag buildings (some now used for residential use) are planned to be converted for the storage of archives, research etc.

On the north side of the Gulag buildings, one or two have been replaced by two Soviet era brick buildings. Mention was made during the mission that these might be demolished and a copy of the earlier Gulag building constructed in their place.

The timber hospital was constructed in 1938-9 to a design by Gulag architects. There is a debate on whether or not it should be demolished to allow the full scope of the cemetery to be revealed.

The diesel power station is listed on the current Plan as being an inharmonious structure, which implies it could be demolished. Notwithstanding this designation, the mission learned that its value as an industrial structure has now been recognised and initial designs have been prepared for its incorporation into the proposed museum complex.

Decisions on whether to restore the integrity of the Gulag buildings need to be taken within a wider framework of the relative importance of the different buildings in relation to the history of the islands. The monastic community that has persisted for six centuries, apart from a break in the 20th century, has had a major impact on the islands and is the major reason the property justified OUV. But, as has been pointed out above, the SOUV also refers to the way the islands reflect all periods of history as a context for the monastic structures and associations.

If the Gulag period (and the Soviet era) are to be respected and reflected in the built remains, then care needs to be taken to ensure that the overall outcome of what is restored, what is demolished, and what is reconstructed is both logical and coherent. Decision should not be primarily taken on visual grounds alone in terms of whether or not a building is 'inharmonious'. The meaning of the buildings and what they reflect of the history of the islands must also be considered.

Recommendation

The Master Plan needs to clearly set out a logical and coherent approach to the protection or otherwise of Gulag buildings, which are part of the history of the property.

4.3 Reconstruction/demolition

a) Proposed reconstruction of the cemetery Church of St Onufrievskaya

During the Gulag period, a small church outside the main Monastery walls and adjacent to the ancient cemetery was demolished not long after it had been memorably used for a major gathering of inmates for an Easter service in 1926.

The church was originally constructed in the mid-19th century and full architectural drawings survive. Ground penetrating radar has been used to scan below ground remains of the basement areas. It was indicated to the mission that there is a desire to re-build the church for use by residents of the settlement and to re-instate the contribution it makes to views from Monastery windows.

Much of the devastation caused by the use of the islands as a Gulag has been reversed within the main monastery buildings to revive their use by the monastic community. If this small church outside the walls could be seen to be an adjunct to the main monastery, its re-building could be seen as part of that revival process. Its reconstruction would need to be based on detailed evidence of the demolished church but should nevertheless have the character of reconstruction or copy. It would also be essential that the new work allowed for careful integration of the new structure with the surrounding monks' cemetery.

Recommendation

If there is a proposal to reconstruct the Church of St Onufrievskaya, a detailed case should be presented on how the original building contributed to the overall monastic settlement, how it is proposed the reconstruction would be undertaken, and how the church would be used if reconstructed.

b) Possible demolition of Gulag hospital building

On the east of the cemetery, a timber hospital was constructed during the Gulag period (1938-9) on top of part of the cemetery. It is a well-detailed, classical style building with pediments and porticos, visible from across the Sacred Lake to the east and masking views of a post-Soviet housing estate to the west.



Fig. 11: *Gulag-era hospital building*

The mission was told of an on-going debate as to whether the hospital should be demolished to reveal underlying graves (if they still survive and this is unknown) or whether it should remain for other uses once a new hospital has been constructed.

While the devastation caused by the Gulag has and can be partly reversed or erased in terms of the Monastic buildings, it is impossible to wipe out all traces of the Gulag on the islands, and also undesirable in terms of erasing memories of individual people who suffered – and this view is supported by the proposals to extend the Gulag Museum.

If some of the Gulag buildings are to be reconstructed near the museum, it could appear contradictory to remove the hospital.

The mission considers that if the property is to be seen to reflect adequately all periods of history, then not all Gulag interventions should be reversed. Hospitals were an established part of the Gulag system. This particular example is complete, it is a reflection of the work of Gulag architects, it was well constructed, and its size makes it a useful space. It would appear logical to retain it, together with the barracks buildings, for use as part of storage for archival records connected to individuals who were interned in the Gulag and perhaps also for information on those buried in the earlier monks' cemetery. It is understood that some of the burial stones from the cemetery were used as foundations for this building and the possibility of recovering these should be explored.

Currently painted blue, it is prominent when viewed from across the Sacred Lake. If blue was not its original colour, changing it to something darker and more muted could help to minimise its impact on these long views.

Recommendation

If the property is to be seen to reflect adequately all periods of history, then not all Gulag interventions should be reversed, and the mission did not consider that a good case had been made for the demolition of the Hospital building and concludes that the building should not be demolished.

4.4 New Development

a) Museum Project

The mission was presented with the latest plans for the reconstruction of the partly-built museum. A further storey will be removed, the building covered with a grass roof, and the entrance and exit areas faced with local Karelian granite. The museum will be approached by a path off the road leading to the Gulag barracks. The current road between the museum and the lake will be closed and all vehicular access will be from a loop road to the west and south.

Visitors will have access to the perimeter of the roof, but there will be no structures such as formal seating, parasols, etc. that could be seen from across the lake.

Although granite facing was suggested for the entrance and exit area, rather than concrete, and this granite is local to Karelia, such slabs of stone are not local to the island. Since the idea of stone was initially suggested, the development of the Master Plan and the mission have offered the opportunity for reflection on the existing building types and how they define the islands, and what might be appropriate for future developments.

If large slabs of stone are used, this could give the museum a monumentality that is not quite in line with its status in relation to the Monastery. An alternative that would respond to the flexibility of openings proposed would be painted brick, widely used in the island, and this could more readily symbolise the service function of the building.

The mission supports the latest revised plans subject to more reflection being given to the facing material of the entrance and exit areas.

The reconstructed building is seen as the focal point for a much wider museum interpretation project that will encompass other buildings in the vicinity.

During the mission it was suggested that displays and exhibitions for visitors in the new building could be extended to space in the diesel power station building, which is currently empty and devoid of machinery. The building was not visited by the mission.

Further proposals were suggested for exceeding the Gulag museum onto adjacent barracks buildings (see text above on the Gulag buildings), and for using the Soviet storage buildings either for more exhibition space or as a library for both local communities and visitors.

The mission considered that the overall scope of the museum project needs more work in order that its aims and purposes are more clearly defined. What is the scope of communication envisaged, how it will be transmitted, and how much space is needed for storage, archives and library, are questions that need answering before it becomes clear what sort of buildings are needed. Currently, the buildings appear to be driving the project.

In terms of the interventions proposed for the Soviet storage building, the mission considered that these were far too drastic for this important structure. Given its siting at the interface between the settlement and the monastery, the mission fully supports a use that involves both communities, but considers that such a use should not comprise the structure. One possibility could be some sort of market that might be an asset both to the local community and to visitors, and perhaps also to the monastery if it extends its range of dairy and other products.

Recommendation

The mission supports the latest plans for the reconstruction of the partly built museum, subject to further reflection on the facing material. Further work is needed on defining the overall scope of the wider museum project (encompassing the diesel power station, Gulag barracks and possibly the Soviet era barn) and its aims and purposes. It considers that the current proposals for the Soviet era barn are unacceptable in terms of the degree of intervention and alternative uses should be pursued. Revised plans should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by ICOMOS.

b) Airport improvements

The current airport consists of a single runway paved with perforated cast-iron panels, and a small blue painted wooden passenger terminal and integral observation tower. It is just to the east of the Monastery and settlement. Currently, there are a maximum of two flights a day by small 12-seater planes.

The airport infrastructure is considered inadequate and needs updating to ensure a reliable link with the mainland that will support the needs of the monastic and local communities.



Fig. 12: *Aerial view of runway in relation to monastery*

The paving of the current runway is porous and is also beginning to lift in parts. To achieve an acceptable standard, the runway will need to accept Dash8 Q400 planes and have a surface that allows for the collection, drainage and treatment of liquid to prevent ice formation on planes. The present observation tower does not meet current safety standards and the passenger reception building is insecure and too close to the runway and a small chapel. There is no storage place for planes and inadequate lighting.

The mission was presented with the results of project to explore other airport locations. The aim was to address technical issues necessary to sustain the existing air links and not to increase the number of flights or the number of passengers transported.

Nine locations were initially set out in December 2018, including the existing location. The one on Mucksalma Island was the first to be abandoned because of difficult transport links. Of the remaining eight possible locations, two in the south of the island are in an area included in IUCN's Red List for birds and were considered unacceptable for nature conservation reasons, and four in the centre of the island were considered to be too close to monastic structures and these were also discounted. The remaining one possible alternative location was at an angle to the existing runway, and this was considered unacceptable for its possible impact on a lake; it was also suggested that it brought little benefit in relation to the existing runway location. Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) had been carried out on all options, but not HIAs.

What is currently proposed is the improvement to the existing runway, the development of a new terminal and observation tower at the end of the runway rather than in the centre, the development of an uncovered storage area for four planes, and a car park. The access to the airport will be changed so that it is approached along a road through the forest and lights will be installed.

The mission considered that it was essential that improvements to the airport do not lead to an increase in the number, frequency or size of planes. The Dash8 Q400 plane mentioned appears much larger than the planes that currently land at the airport as they can accommodate up to 79 passengers. Reassurance is needed that such large planes will not be used for regular services.

In terms of the location of the proposed new passenger building, this was considered acceptable as it will be screened by the forest. The design of the building, and its scale were both considered unacceptable. The size of the building must be the minimum necessary to meet the essential needs of passengers who will not be waiting for long periods at the airport. The monumental design with stone facing is also not appropriate. This is a service building and needs to be simple, functional and easy to maintain. As with the proposed quay building, the airport reception building must send the appropriate signals as an introduction to the rest of the islands. It should not have large windows, or be over lit. Subject to satisfying the necessary fire requirements, treated timber should be used where possible for cladding. Further consideration needs to be given to the scale and materials of this proposed building as well as the appropriateness and quality of its design.

The mission was told of the need for an observation tower. Following further reflection on this issue, it would like to understand whether consideration has been given to the possibility of a 'remote tower' as is now used in some low-activity airports in, for example, Sweden, Germany, and Norway, where the physical tower is replaced by remotely controlled video cameras and other means of communications, whose output is relayed to controllers at ground level either at the airport or elsewhere.

The provision of adequate lighting is necessary for take-off and landing on dark days, of which there are around 196 days each year. The height of the masts needed to carry the lights was said to be 16 metres. The lights would be positioned at the southern end of the runway near the proposed location of the passenger reception building. Although the forest would screen the building, the trees would not be tall enough to screen the corona of lights on top of the mast and these would be visible from the Monastery across the Sacred Lake, which is not considered to be satisfactory.

The mission was told that the masts could be designed so that the corona of lights could be lowered when not in use. This would leave only the slender mast visible for most of the year, although the lights would be visible when planes take off and land on dull days – for around half the year. The mission considered that this modification would be essential to protect a crucial view from the Monastery across the Sacred Lake.

Recommendation

The mission considered that modest improvements to the current airport could be supported given the lack of acceptable alternative locations and given the importance of reliable air transport to the local and monastic community, provided that such improvements do not lead to an increase in the number, frequency or size of regular service planes and that larger planes, such as the Dash8 Q400, are not be used for regular services.

Further work is needed on the design and materials of the passenger reception building, further reflection is desirable on whether an observation tower is necessary or could be replaced by a 'remote' tower, and the mast for the lights should be modified to allow the corona to be lowered when not in use. Revised plans need to be provided to the World Heritage Centre for review by ICOMOS.

c) New Hospital

The proposal for a new hospital building to the south-east of the village has been the subject of an ICOMOS Technical Review. The mission confirmed that the site was satisfactory and the design adequate. One aspect that needed further thought is the colour of sheeting for the roof. The mission considered that this needed to be considered in relation to the colour of roofing throughout the islands.

Analysis is needed of what colours were used, and where and when. It might also be helpful to differentiate the colour of roofing for monastery buildings from that for more modest service buildings.

To the eyes of the mission, a bright blue colour seems to stand out far too much and more muted colours would appear preferable.

d) New nursery school

The mission was made aware of proposals for a new nursery school. The site is near two existing yellow painted masonry school buildings which are a pleasing part of the settlement. The mission noted that, although there had been plans to replace these buildings with a new structure, the idea now is to make more effective use of the existing buildings. This change of approach is to be welcomed.

The plans for the nursery school should be considered as part of the Master Plan in relation to the overall needs for the settlement, and an overall approach on building typologies.

e) Quay development

The mission was presented with revised proposals for a new quay building. The purpose of this building is to provide a space for welcoming pilgrims and visitors to the main island.

The plans are for a masonry building with glazed, arched openings set within a paved area surrounded by a low masonry wall. Careful thought has been given to the siting of the building to ensure that it did not occlude other warehouse buildings behind.

The mission has concerns about the scale of the building in relation to the function it is expected to fulfil and also its building typology.

As has already been set out above, the development of the Master Plan is allowing a much-needed reflection on what types of buildings are required on the islands and the most suitable materials for their construction. The mission considered that further reflection was needed on the use this building would have, and what image it should project, as well as its impact on the local landscape.

This reception building will be the first thing that visitors see when they arrive on the island by boat. It should set the scene for what follows. What also has to be considered is its impact on the stretch of coast where it is to be sited. The large arched windows of the current proposals would have an unacceptable impact in terms of light spill on dull days and could present maintenance problems. Why are such large windows needed?

In the mission's view, this building should reflect local building technologies. This does not mean it should be a copy of anything that has existed before, but rather such technologies could be used to deliver the space and form that is required for a visitor reception building. The painting dated 1780 on the title page of this mission report, highlights one possible configuration: a tall square log construction building next to the water and behind a long, lower, rectangular structure. Such a combination of forms could avoid large windows facing the sea, while the use of log construction could provide the opportunity to show how craftsmanship has been revived as a high quality exemplar of local building traditions. The new structure should not aim to copy earlier buildings but rather use traditional forms and practices to produce a 21st century building that meets present day needs.



Fig. 13: *Detail from Jean-Balthasar de la Traverse, View of Solovetsky, 1780*

The development of the quay should also be considered as part of a wider conservation plan for this whole section of the coast and particularly the section between the quay and the monastery along which visitors will walk, in order to avoid piecemeal development that could erode its character.

Recommendation

The mission has concerns about the scale of the proposed quay building in relation to the function it is expected to fulfil and also its building typology.

These proposals should be reconsidered as part of the Master Plan and in the context of a wider conservation plan for this whole section of the coast.

f) New jetty

The mission was presented with plans for a new T-shaped jetty between the landing quay and the Monastery. These also involved a storage area for boats and a square masonry building next to the entrance gate the function of which was unclear.

The proposed jetty had a dual purpose: first to offer berths during the Yacht Regatta and secondly to offer boat storage for members of the local community, whose boats are presently stored informally along the shore to the south of the Monastery. It was not clear whether the jetty's proposed use extended to facilities for visiting yachts throughout the year. There did not appear to have been any consultation with the local community over these new arrangements nor was there clarity on whether charges would be levied for storage facilities.

The rationale for the jetty being in the position suggested was also not clear. The site would be prominent from the bay side of the Monastery, which the mission considered to be unsatisfactory, and the proposed building would not be a beneficial addition to this part of the landscape.

The mission considered that the justification for this jetty and its siting need to be explored further as part of the Master Plan. Consideration would need to be given to whether the Regatta jetties could be temporary floating structures. Where local boats are stored would need more discussion with the local community within the wider context of tourism development proposals.

Recommendation

The need for a jetty and its siting need to be explored further as part of the Master Plan.

g) New housing

The mission was presented with possible designs for a new model housing block of four units. The mission explained that it did not consider that it was possible for a standard design to be accepted which could be built on any plot.

As set out above, the current housing from the Soviet era and later has been well designed, has variety and is well sited. The island deserves new housing that is similarly carefully designed and sited to complement the existing ensembles.

4.5 Environmental issues

a) Sewage connections and disposal

The mission was presented with details of a proposed new sewage disposal facility. This will be linked to an extension of the sewage network which currently only serves part of the main settlement. Treated water from the new system will be re-used.

Three locations had been considered and one next to the existing site was preferred. This is located to the south west of the village near the coast and some 750 metres from the Monastery. Archaeological surveys of the site have been undertaken as well as a visual analysis.

The mission supported the overall rationale and location for the project but considered that more details were needed to support the schematic ideas on screening as presented in the plans. The details of this scheme need to be considered as part of the Master Plan.

Careful consideration should be given to how the proposed new sewage connection network is linked to the overall development plan for the settlement, in order to ensure that the presence of sewage connections does not lead to a presumption that development would be allowed. This is particularly a concern for areas along the north-eastern edge of the Sacred Lake where further development should be prevented, but the current plans propose sewage connections.

Recommendation

The mission supported the overall rationale and location for the sewage scheme but considered that more details were needed on screening proposals. It also considered that careful consideration needed to be given to how the proposed new sewage connection network was linked to the overall development plan for the settlement in order to ensure that the presence of sewage connections does not lead to a presumption that development would be allowed.

b) Waste disposal; plastic waste

The mission was presented with details of a proposed new biological waste disposal centre. This will be located within a forest area to the south-east of the village near an existing road. Domestic and other rubbish would be collected, sorted at the centre and then transported to the mainland.

This project, too, will be further considered as part of the Master Plan.

In tandem with the development of new facilities for disposal of rubbish, efforts should be made to limit the amount of rubbish generated. The possibility of the Solovetsky Islands becoming a one-use plastic-free zone was suggested. This could be part of an ecological (as well as a spiritual) approach to the natural environment that pilgrims and visitors agree to when they visit the islands.

c) Energy

The need for energy on the island is increasing and at the same time concern over ecological safety is increasing. As diesel is now seen as a main cause of pollution on the islands, the reliance on diesel

power is to be phased out and a diesel facility will be maintained only as a reserve source of energy. An underground cable will be laid to bring electricity from the mainland. This is seen as a temporary measure (as it will increase the cost of energy) while the possibilities of alternative renewal measures are explored.

Wind turbines have been previously discounted by earlier missions in view of their adverse landscape impact. The mission learnt that heat sources pumps were now being considered that involve a network of submerged pipes on the bottom of a selectin of lakes.

The use of heat pumps that draw embedded heat energy from within the extensive network of lakes should be explored as a matter of priority as part of an overall sustainable development approach for the islands.

5. PROPOSED MASTER PLAN

The Master Plan aims to set out a ‘vision’ for the conservation and development of the islands over the next ten years. As no such designation exists in legislation, it will in effect be a National Religious Landmark Plan.

The development of this Plan was welcomed by the mission as an exceptional opportunity at this time to create a way forward that integrates all systems on the island and allows development that supports and sustains the OUV of the property.

The aim is to complete the Plan by the end of 2019. A tender is being launched in July 2018 for a project to compile the basic data upon which the Plan will be based. The mission was shown a copy of the draft brief. This is very light on cultural matters and needs to be strengthened particularly in relation to defining the attributes that convey OUV. Section 3.1 above sets out recommendations relevant to how this brief might be strengthened and sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 set out issues that should be considered by the Plan.

Once completed, this Plan will supersede all existing master plans. Its development will also promote the need for a revision of the Management Plan which has been effectively developed over the past few years. The Master Plan should be developed in a way that allows some dialogue with the Advisory Bodies during its production.

Recommendation

The mission welcomes the proposed development of a Master Plan which it sees as an exceptional opportunity to create a way forward that integrates all systems on the island and allows development that supports and sustains the OUV of the property.

It considers that it is essential that this plan is underpinned by clearly defined attributes of OUV and that the tender for the collection of data upon which the plan is to be based should be extended to address the recommendations above relating to attributes of OUV.

The mission recommends that this crucial plan should if possible be developed in a way that allows dialogue with the Advisory Bodies during its production.

6. NEW FOUNDATION FOR THE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOLOVETSKY ARCHIPELAGO

During a meeting held on Saturday 28 April, one mission member met with Mikhail Fradkov, Director of the Russian Institute for Strategic Studies and the Head of the Foundation for the Conservation and Development of the Solovetsky Archipelago, and his team to officially inform the mission of the creation of the Foundation.

The fund has been created by decision of the President of the Russian Federation and the objectives of this new mechanism are to ensure the restoration and development of the Solovetsky Archipelago as a whole, including the World Heritage property. The Prime Minister and the Patriarch of Moscow and Russia manage the Fund. Its Board includes representatives of the different Ministries concerned, inter alia the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Environment as well as the Advisor to the Director of the State Solovki Museum and Reserve, Mrs Ludmila Evguenieva.

The new mechanism is therefore dedicated to addressing major conservation issues, ensuring adequate planning of the renovation and development of the Archipelago as well as monitoring the socio-economic impacts for the local population. In its mission, the Fund will ensure that regular visits are paid to the property to monitor the works and projects.

The Head of the Fund underlined the need for an ad hoc mechanism which will coordinate the respective roles and contributions of the national stakeholders in responding to the World Heritage Committee decisions and recommendations while ensuring the timely implementation of planned projects. He underlined what was seen as a discrepancy between the cycle of the World Heritage Committee sessions and the national budget cycle – as well as the limited period during which works can be conducted in the Archipelago. He considered that this situation called for a specific and reinforced process of dialogue and collaboration between the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

The mission recommends exploring as soon as possible with the State Party the conditions for setting up a mechanism for dialogue and cooperation that could respond to the priorities of the State Party and the needs of the property.

The proposed Master Plan together with a phased Action Plan, should provide the essential context and rationale for development projects that are taken forward and how they support OUV. As set out above, dialogue and cooperation during the development of this Master Plan would be extremely beneficial.

Recommendation

The mission welcomes the establishment of the new Foundation for the Conservation and Development of the Solovetsky Archipelago, and its role in the restoration and development of the World Heritage property. It considers that ways of setting up a mechanism to allow dialogue and cooperation with the State Party on future developments should be explored as soon as possible.

7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Conclusions

The mission visited the Solovetsky Islands at a crucial time. The archipelago has recently been designated as Heritage Religious Zone, changes have just been made to the overall governance of the islands through the creation of the Foundation for the Conservation and Development of the Solovetsky Archipelago, and a new Master Plan is to be developed to chart the way forward for the World Heritage property.

Just before the mission in early April 2018, the decision was taken to establish the State Foundation for the Conservation and Development of the Solovetsky Archipelago which will become the coordinating body for all stakeholders. This Foundation was initiated by the Patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church, Kirill, and supported by President Putin. This Foundation should promote an integrated approach for conservation and development of the property and encourage the provision of targeted resources.

These changes, when combined, provide an exceptional opportunity to set out a holistic and integrated approach for the conservation and restoration of the buildings and landscapes that make up this property and for new development that optimises the cultural and natural attributes that convey its OUV, and particularly its strong religious associations. Such an approach should also offer ways for conservation and development to benefit not only the monastic community, but also the local community and visitors.

In spite of its apparently robust monumental buildings, the property is in many ways exceedingly fragile. Insensitive restoration or development could quickly compromise its strong sense of place that arises from a unique combination of a highly prosperous monastic buildings, remote landscapes, sophisticated water management systems and vernacular buildings that taken together are a microcosm of the history of Northern Russia – as suggested in the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. Development that might be ‘absorbed’ in a larger property could have a highly adverse impact on the small scale of the Solovetsky landscape. Many of the elements are now in a vulnerable state and care will be needed to revive them sensitively; in some places insensitive restoration needs to be halted.

If the Master Plan is to support the OUV of the property, it will be crucial for it to be firmly based on well-defined attributes of OUV. These are both complex and intertwined and relate not only tangible aspects but also to associations. This report sets out recommendations for how those attributes might be defined and considered. It will be essential that the Tender for gathering data for the Master Plan includes these aspects.

As the Master Plan will in effect set out a new ‘vision’ for the property and how it moves forward, this provides an opportunity to reflect on where development might be appropriate and how it might be delivered to strengthen the strong character of the islands. There is also a need to define the overall building typology for the island in order to define how new sympathetic development might be conceived, designed and located.

The mission was extremely concerned by some of the most recent conservation work on monastic buildings, both on the interior of the main complex and on the fortifications, as this is having a highly adverse impact on the authenticity of the structures, through the introduction of inappropriate materials and techniques. There is a need to halt this work immediately and to re-consider how conservation work should be planned, defined and managed and how on-going maintenance is carried out. There appear

to have been structural failings in the way projects have been defined and managed, with few people on the islands being involved in their management.

The proposals for re-designing the half built museum are progressing well; and the mission supports the latest revised plans, subject to changes as outlined in this report. For the wider museum project that encompasses the Diesel Generating station, the Gulag Barrack and possibly the Soviet era storage barn, the mission considered that further reflection and changes to the overall scope of the wider museum project are necessary.

Over the past two decades, much restoration work has been undertaken to revive the monastery and its sketes and in effect to reverse the destruction wrought by the Gulag. Beyond the monastic buildings, decision on what should and should not be kept from this period also needs more reflection in terms of how the island is to reflect its overall history. The mission considered that a visual approach was too simplistic a way to decide what should be demolished and what rebuilt, and that consideration must be given to the associations these buildings have and how a coherent and logical approach might be taken. Over the past few years, the number of tourists has risen considerably as has the infrastructure put in place to transport and receive them, as has the number of religious pilgrims. The expectations of these two groups are quite different as are the responses to their needs. The mission understands that the new designation of the archipelago combined with the new Foundation could bring about a change in focus towards pilgrimage and cultural tourism. There is an interest in re-defining the nodal position of Solovetsky Monastery in the wider historic pilgrimage routes across Russia and further afield.

This changed approach could be highly beneficial provided it is based on a clear definition of carrying capacity and that there are means in place to limit visitation. As small and fragile place, the property needs visitors who respect its religious associations and contribute towards its conservation.

In conclusion, the mission considers that the current situation offers immense potential to allow sustainable development of the property in a way that respects its OUV. Given the very short timeframe envisaged for the development of the Master Plan and its associated Action Plan that will set the direction of the islands for the next decade, the mission considers that it would be valuable if a system for collaboration and dialogue between the State Party and the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies could be set up to guide the development of these plans.

7.2 Recommendations - Summary

7.2.1. New Foundation for the Conservation and Development of the Solovetsky Archipelago

The mission welcomes the establishment of the new Foundation for the Conservation and Development of the Solovetsky Archipelago, and its role in the restoration and development of the World Heritage property. It considers that ways of setting up a mechanism to allow dialogue and cooperation with the State Party on future developments should be explored as soon as possible.

7.2.2 The Master Plan

The mission also welcomes the proposed development of a Master Plan which it sees as an exceptional opportunity to create a way forward for the property that integrates all systems on the island and allows development that supports and sustains OUV.

It considers that it is essential that the Master Plan is underpinned by clearly defined attributes of OUV and that the tender for the collection of data upon which the plan is to be based should be extended to address recommendations above relating to attributes of OUV. It is recommended that this crucial plan should be developed in a way that allows dialogue with the Advisory Bodies during its production.

7.2.3 Key issues to be addressed by the Master Plan:

a) *Attributes of OUV*

There is a need to define more clearly the attributes of OUV and their inter-relationship, particularly with regard to the sacred and secular landscapes, isolated and accessible areas, the functions of the monastic community, monastic building traditions, the different phases of the settlement and how the islands reflect all phases of long history, as a basis for developing the new Master Plan. The following provide recommendations for some of the key attributes of OUV.

b) *Sacred Lake*

The boundary of the Sacred Lake, as a key attribute of OUV needs to be defined to encompass both the lake itself and a surrounding area where new development is permitted, views are maintained, and pollution is tightly controlled.

c) *Forests*

Given the high cultural importance of the forest, as an attribute of OUV, and particularly its sacred associations, it is recommended that the natural, sacred, utilitarian aspects of the forests are more clearly defined, determining which parts have open access, which are closed, which have limited and controlled access and use, and how silence can be largely maintained and lights limited.

d) *Monastic meadows*

The scope and extent of the monastic meadows, what drainage they rely upon and what plants they host need to be clearly defined as an attribute of OUV.

e) *Monastic water management systems*

A detailed survey mapping needs to be undertaken of the overall network of water drainage systems on the main island, their historical associations and their current condition. A conservation strategy should then be developed for the monastic water management system to set out how work will be defined, phased and carried out for this key attribute of OUV.

f) *Roads*

Improvements to the important network of monastic tracks and roads that is a key attribute of OUV needs to reflect a restrained approach to facilitating religious and cultural visitors; the network should be surveyed to inform decisions on which need improvement and which can be kept for 'slow' transport or for pedestrians only.

g) *Settlement*

There is a need to clearly define the scope and history of the settlement and how this is reflected in its building and planning. A detailed survey should be undertaken of the overall settlement and all of its buildings and this should be combined with documentary evidence to elucidate which buildings relate to which periods of development and precisely how the settlement has evolved. The settlement is a key attribute of OUV.

h) *Building typologies*

An analysis should be undertaken of building types, use of building materials and local building techniques that give the islands their specific characteristics, in order to inform protection and conservation and to define appropriate scale and materials for new structures, such as the proposed quay and residential blocks.

i) *Craft skills*

As the monastery was known as a centre of craftsmanship, these aspects need to be clearly defined as basis for understanding what structures are needed to sustain such skills.

j) *Protecting building ensembles*

Protection needs to be extended beyond certain individual buildings to the ensemble of buildings and their spatial patterns in the settlement, as the historical development and morphology of the settlement is a key component of the wider cultural landscape.

k) *Development zones*

In relation to development and the need for adequate services in and near the settlement, there is a need for a detailed zones and areas where development could take place with respect to what should be protected, conserved and sustained.

l) *Tourism strategy*

In order for the Solovetsky Islands to be perceived and managed as a sacred place, where visitors need time to relate to the cultural lands, a tourism strategy that considers the overall way that pilgrims and tourists are encouraged to visit the island and how their visits are managed, should be developed. This strategy should include measures to define the carrying capacity of the islands and to implement such limits.

m) *Building ensembles*

There is a need to document, protect and conserve the highly important ensemble of timber service buildings, the Soviet era and later architect domestic buildings, and the important collection of vernacular buildings, all of which contribute to OUV.

n) *Gulag buildings*

The Master Plan needs to clearly set out a logical and coherent approach to the protection or otherwise of Gulag buildings, which are part of the history of the property.

o) *Proposed quay building*

The mission has concerns about the scale of the proposed quay building in relation to the function it is expected to fulfil and also its building typology. Consideration should be given to using local log building traditions, in a manner that respects vernacular practice but creates a 21st century building to meet modern needs. The current proposals should be reconsidered as part of the Master Plan and in the context of a wider conservation plan for this whole section of the coast.

p) *Proposed jetty*

The need for a jetty and its siting need to be explored further as part of the Master Plan.

q) Sewage scheme

The mission supported the overall rationale and location for the sewage scheme but considered that more details were needed on screening proposals. It also considered that careful consideration needed to be given to how the proposed new sewage connection network was linked to the overall development plan for the settlement in order to ensure that the presence of sewage connections does not lead to a presumption that development would be allowed. Careful consideration also needs to be given to any intersection of the new drains with the monastic water system to ensure they do not damage historic infrastructure.

7.2.4 Conservation

The mission considers that the current restoration projects should be halted until there has been a review of how conservation work is undertaken and delivered.

The Master Plan should be used to reinforce the need for connections between conservation studies of the monastic buildings, restoration work, and on-going maintenance in order to try to optimise resources and avoid the need for regular major interventions.

The supervision of major restoration and conservation projects should be undertaken by a conservation architect.

Priority should be given to conserving original fabric wherever possible and to analysis of original materials to ensure that materials and techniques selected for restoration and renewal work (especially for mortars, plasters, bricks and wood) are compatible from a physical-chemical as well as a visual viewpoint.

Restoration, maintenance and rebuilding programmes all need to be more firmly supported by the results of surveys and research into the buildings and their constructive history and by knowledge of recently completed works. Ways need to be found to make accessible the research and evidence that is available.

On-going regular maintenance needs to be instigated through the building up of a team of craftspeople supported by adequate resources.

Because of the presence of paintings below the last white painted finish within the church of Holy Trinity Skete in Anzer Island, it is important for a restorer to take samples and undertake analysis, in order to make the right choices for conservation work on the architectural surfaces.

7.2.5 Reconstruction

If there is a proposal to reconstruct the Church of St Onufrievskaya, a detailed case should be presented on how the original building contributed to the overall monastic settlement, how it is proposed the reconstruction would be undertaken, and how the church would be used if reconstructed.

7.2.6 Demolition

If the property is to be seen to reflect adequately all periods of history, then not all Gulag interventions should be reversed; the mission did not consider that a case had been made for the demolition of the Hospital building and concludes that the building should not be demolished.

7.2.7 Museum project

The mission supported the latest plans for the reconstruction of the partly built museum subject to further reflection on the facing material. Further work is needed on identifying the overall scope of the wider museum project (encompassing the diesel power station, Gulag barracks and possibly the Soviet era barn) and its aims and purposes. The proposals for the Soviet era barn are unacceptable in terms of the degree of intervention and alternative uses should be pursued. Revised proposals for the overall museum project should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by ICOMOS

7.2.8 Airport

Modest improvements to the current airport could be supported given the lack of acceptable alternative locations and given the importance of reliable air transport to the local and monastic communities, provided that such improvements do not lead to an increase in the number, frequency or size of regular service planes and that larger planes, such as the Dash8 Q400, are not used for regular services.

However, further work is needed on the design and materials of the passenger reception building, further reflection is desirable on whether an observation tower is necessary or could be replaced by a 'remote' tower, and the mast for lights should be modified to take a corona that could be lowered when not in use. Revised plans need to be provided to the World Heritage Centre for review by ICOMOS.

ANNEXES:

1. Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:
2. Committee Decision 41 COM 7 B.49
3. Terms of Reference of the mission
4. Mission programme

Annex 1

Cultural and Historic Ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands

Brief Synthesis

The Cultural and Historic Ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands comprises six islands of the Solovetsky Archipelago situated in the western part of the White Sea, 290 km from Arkhangelsk, the centre of Arkhangelsky region.

Founded in the 1430s, the Solovetsky complex is an outstanding example of the tenacity, courage and diligence of monks of the Russian Orthodox Church in the inhospitable environment of Northern Europe. The complex is unique in its integrity and safeguarding of its religious, residential, domestic, defence and waterside constructions, its road network and irrigation systems of the Middle Ages harmoniously blended with the surrounding natural and cultural landscapes as well as archeological sites that reflect the ancient and medieval culture of the islands for six thousand years. The Solovetsky complex represents all periods of the history of the archipelago and the Russian North in general.

The Cultural and Historic Ensemble of the Solovetsky Archipelago comprises a monastery-fortress of 15th to the early 20th centuries, a former monastic village of 16th to the early 20th centuries, cells and hermitages of 16th to the early 20th centuries, insular hydraulic and irrigation systems, sacred sites and dozens of settlements of 6 to the first millennia BC, groups of memorial constructions of the Solovetsky Special Prison Camp of 1923-1939 and the surrounding natural and cultural landscapes throughout the archipelago.

The heart of the historic and cultural complex of the archipelago is the architectural ensemble of the Solovetsky Monastery, which is a holistic unique architectural complex. Its constructions are characterized by their monumentality, individuality and integrity of all components resulting from the centuries-old tradition of building.

The Solovetsky historic and cultural complex is the only large set of monuments in northern latitudes, built from local boulders in combination with rare brick and forge iron produced on Solovki. The peculiar linear design of the facade and high density of buildings on small areas contribute to the integrity and architectural expression of the ensemble. The fortress is the only Russian fortification complex built with the use of large boulders, which adds greatly to its individuality.

The vast variety and uniqueness of the Solovetsky monuments together with the northern wilderness create a rare cultural and natural synthesis. Archeological studies over the last 20 years have identified some interesting new materials that expand the cultural context of the property.

The Solovki is often recognized by the public as one of the first and best known Soviet special purpose camps of the GULAG. The islands have been used as a place of exile since the 17th century.

Criterion (iv): The Solovetsky complex is an outstanding example of a monastic settlement in the inhospitable environment of northern Europe, which admirably illustrates the faith, tenacity and courage of late medieval religious communities. The subsequent history of the monastery is graphically illustrated by the wealth of remains of all types that have survived.

Integrity

All the identified attributes are within the property boundaries, which include the whole territory of the archipelago.

A number of the site's elements (buildings and structures) have been rehabilitated in the process of restoration and other works for the conservation of the cultural heritage, works which have revealed its values as a whole. However, these large-scale works, under certain conditions, can have a negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the site, and so can active development of the archipelago area, especially in the vicinity of the protected historical and cultural monuments.

The site is exposed to the severe subpolar climate. The specific ground conditions together with the abundance of water (lakes and swamps) and high humidity create difficult conditions for the site's preservation, which is why programs for current monitoring of buildings and constructions have been developed. Special engineering maintenance of the structures as well as mandatory archaeological research are provided by restoration projects.

Authenticity

The elements of the site fully represent the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The level of authenticity of the preserved buildings is high. Archaeological research is a mandatory step in implementation of preservation activities on cultural heritage sites.

Restoration and research activities carried out on the archipelago have had a positive effect on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Sacred service has been brought back to the cathedrals and this fact has contributed to better perception of the heritage site by visitors.

The possession of most of the buildings is delivered to the Solovetsky Saviour Transfiguration Monastery, and they are used according to their original purpose. Some buildings are used by the Solovetsky historical, architectural and natural museum-reserve.

Protection and management requirements

At present, the World Heritage Site is managed under the following documents at the level of the Russian Federation:

- Article 44 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation adopted by national vote on December 12, 1993;
- Federal Law No. 73-FZ dd. June 25, 2002 "On Cultural Heritage Sites (historical and cultural monuments) of the Peoples of the Russian Federation" – the fundamental law of the Russian Federation for preservation, use, promotion and state protection of all cultural heritage sites in Russia;
- Resolution of the Council of Ministers of the RSFSR No.1327 dd. August 30, 1960 "On Further Improvement of Cultural Monuments Protection in the RSFSR". Under this normative legal act, the objects forming an integral part of the Solovetsky Monastery Architectural Ensemble are recognized as Cultural Heritage Sites;
- Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 1662-r dd. September 27, 2011 changed the name of the site to "The Ensemble of the Solovetsky Monastery and separate structures of the Solovetsky Archipelago Islands, the XVI century – first half of the XX century" (Arkhangelsk region, Primorsky district). By this document all cultural heritage sites included in the Architectural Ensemble of the Solovetsky Monastery from 1960 were revised, their dating and names were made more specific;

- Order of the Ministry of Culture of Russia No. 1467 dd. November 27, 2012 on registration of the Solovetsky Monastery Ensemble and separate structures of the Solovetsky Archipelago Islands in the Unified State Register of Cultural Heritage Sites (historical and cultural monuments) of the Peoples of the Russian Federation;

- Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 759-r dd. June 1, 2009, through which all the state protection powers in relation to the World Heritage property are exercised by the Ministry of Culture of Russia. This document grants the state protection powers to the Federal Authority of Cultural Heritage Sites Protection that ensures the most effective protection in the Russian Federation;

- Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 1939-r dd. October 1, 2014 "On approval of the set of organizational measures on the Solovetsky Archipelago preservation and development". These measures will be implemented by responsible federal executive authorities within the limits of the federal funds; - Order of the Ministry of Culture of Russia No. 2333 dd. December 24, 2013 "On approval of the protection zones boundaries of the Cultural Heritage Sites of federal significance forming part of the Cultural Heritage Site of federal significance "The Ensemble of the Solovetsky Monastery and separate structures of the Solovetsky Archipelago Islands, the XVI century – first half of the XX century" added to the World Heritage List (Solovetsky settlement, Primorsky district, Arkhangelsk region), as well as requirements to lands use policies and urban planning regulations within the boundaries of these zones";

- Order of the Ministry of Culture of Russia No. 946 dd. June 3, 2014 "On approval of the protection zones boundaries of the Cultural Heritage Sites of federal significance forming a part of the Cultural Heritage Site of federal significance "The Ensemble of the Solovetsky Monastery and separate structures of the Solovetsky Archipelago Islands, the 16th century – first half of the 20th century" added to the World Heritage List (Arkhangelsk region, Primorsky district, Bolshoy Solovetsky island, Bolshaya Muksalma island, Anzer island and Bolshoy Zayatsky island), as well as requirements for lands use policies and urban planning regulations within the boundaries of these zones";

- Concept of preserving the Cultural Heritage of the Solovetsky Archipelago developed by the federal state unitary enterprise "Central Scientific-Restoration and Design Workshops" in 2013-2014 (on request of the Ministry of Culture of Russia) and approved by the resolution of the Board of the Russian Ministry of Culture on June 25, 2014 (Minutes No. 14). This includes status analysis and main issues in regard to the preservation of cultural heritage sites situated in the territory of the Solovetsky Archipelago and proposals on the order, terms and procedures of restoration activities.

In addition, a number of fundamental documents have been adopted at the level of the subject of the Russian Federation – Arkhangelsk region:

- State Program of Arkhangelsk region "Development of the Solovetsky Archipelago Infrastructure (2014-2019)" approved by the Resolution of the Government of Arkhangelsk region No. 314-pp dd. July 16, 2013;

- Development Strategy of the Solovetsky Archipelago as a unique site of historical, cultural and natural heritage approved by the Resolution of the Government of Arkhangelsk Region No. 310-rp dd. July 16, 2013. Requirements of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee for the preservation of the World Heritage Site "Historical and Cultural Ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands" were taken into account by making corresponding supplements to the above-mentioned strategy, which were approved by the Decree of the Government of Arkhangelsk Region No. 190-rp dd. July 21, 2015.

State institutions, the Russian Orthodox Church and the public of Russia work together to preserve and restore the Solovetsky Monastery Architectural Ensemble as a whole.

Proper coordination of all actions of the branches of government and the Russian Orthodox Church for the purpose of preservation and up-to-date development of the Archipelago as an integral site of the historical, cultural, natural and spiritual heritage is achieved through the application of the program-target method. Targeted programs (federal, regional, municipal) in accordance with the competence and established sphere of jurisdiction allow the development and reconciliation of the priorities of the federal, regional and local levels as well as relations between the state and the church; the accumulation and best use of resources to address the problems of the Solovetsky Archipelago development; and the evaluation of the effectiveness of the program measures through use of indicators and indices.

The choice of the program-target method as a basic approach to carry out the actions aimed at providing state support to the Government of the Arkhangelsk region to solve the issues of sustainable social and economic development of the Solovetsky Archipelago was recommended by the President of the Russian Federation to the Government of the Russian Federation in the Instruction No. Pr-1625 dd. June 25, 2012.

The Government of the Russian Federation through the Ministry of Culture of Russia provides long-term federal financing of the restoration works to the World Heritage property within the framework of the Federal Target Program "Culture of Russia (2012-2018)" (approved by the Resolution of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 186 dd. March 3, 2012) in accordance with the annual list of sites proposed by the Russian Orthodox Church for financing after its approval by the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia. Restoration activities on the Solovetsky Islands are arranged and carried out in accordance with the Concept of preserving the Cultural Heritage of the Solovetsky Archipelago and the Action Plan up to 2018.

All the works being undertaken are aimed at scientific restoration with the recovery of the Cultural Heritage Sites' historical functions.

Annex 2

Decision : 41 COM 7B.49

Cultural and Historic Ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands (Russian Federation) (C 632)

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC/17/41.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **40 COM 7B.56**, adopted at its 40th session (Istanbul/UNESCO, 2016),
3. Acknowledges the progress made by the State Party to address the decisions of the Committee, notably the issuing of a Decree establishing a working group in charge to progress with classification of Solovetsky archipelago and adjoining territories as Cultural Heritage objects of federal significance, namely as a religious and historical site;
4. Notes the progress with the development of the Master Plan of the Solovetsky settlement and the Management plan, and requests the State Party to pursue this work and submit these draft documents to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies;
5. Notes with great concern the negative condition of the monastic irrigation system, with its lakes and canals, and also requests the State Party, as a matter of urgency, to develop a Conservation Plan for the overall property, to adequately plan and implement conservation measures, as well as to define and implement, immediately, all relevant preventive conservation measures regarding the monastic irrigation system, as well as to secure all relevant funds for mid- and long-term conservation and maintenance measures;
6. Welcomes the assurance of the State Party that Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs) will be undertaken for all projects;
7. Notes with concern that the Solovetsky main island is currently facing many development projects related to the need to upgrade housing, education and health facilities, and tourism facilities, on the island, and also notes with concern that proposals for large building complexes are being considered in advance of the Master Plan, the Management Plan and the Conservation Plan being completed, approved and implemented; and without a formally approved Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV);
8. Noting that new revised plans have been submitted for the Museum Complex, recognizes the efforts taken by the State Party to implement the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee and the Advisory Bodies on the Museum Complex project, and requests the State Party to report progress to the World Heritage Centre by **1 December 2017**, for review by the Advisory Bodies;
9. Further requests the State Party not to resume work on this project until all revised proposals and possible alternative location have been fully reviewed by the Advisory Bodies and examined by the World Heritage Committee;
10. Requests furthermore the State Party to invite a World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission to the property, in consultation with IUCN, in the light of the considerable challenges facing the property, which should assess the overall issues concerning the Solovetsky archipelago, consider the revised plans for the museum building and the full scope of the development that is being proposed over the next decade, to advise on whether and how this might be satisfactorily accommodated within the main island, and whether the current management structures are effective enough to ensure new development does not erode the special characteristics of the main island and impact adversely on OUV, and, if not, how these might be strengthened;
11. Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2018**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 43rd session in 2019.

Annex 3

TERMS OF REFERENCE

for the joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission to the Cultural and Historic Ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands Russian Federation

22-28 April 2018

At its 41th session (Decision 41 COM 7B.49, Krakow, 2017) the Committee requested the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property to assess, in consultation with IUCN, the overall issues concerning the Solovetsky archipelago.

In line with this decision, the main objective of the reactive monitoring mission is to review progress achieved in implementing all recommendations, assess all issues that have been raised and also to review the overall state of conservation of the property.

The mission should :

- Consider the revised plans for the museum building;
-
- Understand the full scope of the development that is being considered for the islands over the next decade, in relation to the provision of upgraded housing, education, health and tourism facilities and other needs of the Monastic community, local residents and tourists;
-
- Advise on whether and how this development might be satisfactorily accommodated within the main island, and on how it relates to the emerging Conservation Plan and Master Plan;
-
- Assess whether the current management structures are effective enough in drawing together the different stakeholders in an inter-disciplinary way, and in ensuring that development does not erode the special characteristics of the main island and impact adversely on OUV, and, if not, how these structures might be strengthened.

In particular, the mission should review and assess the following:

- 1) The draft documents concerning the development of the Master Plan of the Solovetsky settlement and the Management plan of the World Heritage property,
- 2) The condition of the monastic irrigation system, with its lakes and canals, and review the implementation of all relevant preventive conservation measures,
- 3) The state of development of a Conservation Plan for the overall property, including relevant budget provision for mid- and long-term conservation and maintenance measures,
- 4) Progress made in preparing of Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs) for all planned development proposals,
- 5) New revised plans for the Museum Complex

Overall the mission should evaluate the implementation by the State Party of the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee and of the Advisory Bodies on the Museum Complex project,

And prepare a joint mission report for review by the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee and submit the joint report to the World Heritage Centre in electronic form (according to the standard format).

**Programme of UNESCO/ICOMOS/IUCN mission
to the World Heritage Property
“Cultural and Historic Ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands”
April 22-28, 2018
The Russian Federation, Arkhangelsk region, Solovetsky
archipelago**

Time*	Event
Day 1 – April 22	
	Flight of the mission experts to Moscow
Evening	Flight of the mission experts from Moscow to Solovetsky Islands, charter flight
Evening	Accommodation in the hotel “Ostrovito Morushko” («Островито Морюшко»)
Day 2 – April 23	
	Meeting with the representatives of the Solovetsky Monastery and Museum
	The coordination meeting. General report on the mission and its objectives, adjustment of the program (if necessary). Distribution of information materials
	Lunch
	Presentation of the Management Plan of the World Heritage Property (which is currently under further development)
	Observation of the monastery ensemble: a sightseeing tour with a visit to the evening church service (or to a special prayer at the relics)
	Free time
Day 3 – April 24	
	Breakfast
	Observation of the settlement Solovetskoye. Acquaintance with previously done and planned restoration works
	Continued observation of the monastery ensemble with a visit to the dairy farm, carpentry workshop, Herman's hotel, Cookery, etc.
	Lunch
	Observation of the Solovetsky museum-reserve
	Discussion of the issue of construction of the new museum building
	Discussion of the issue of correcting the Master Plan of the Solovetsky settlement
	Working meetings with representatives of the municipality and other stakeholders
	Free time

Day 4 – April 25	
	Breakfast
	A visit to Bolshoy Zayatsky, Maly Zayatsky and Anzer Islands (depending on the weather conditions**)
	Observation of the historic monastic settlements of the islands, examination of the objects on the islands
	Lunch
	Return to Bolshoy Solovetsky Island

	Free time
Day 5 – April 26	
	Breakfast
	A visit to Bolshaya Muksalma and Malaya Muksalma Islands (depending on the weather conditions**)
	Observation of the historic monastic settlements of the islands, examination of the objects on the islands
	Lunch
	Return to Bolshoy Solovetsky Island

	Free time
Day 6 – April 27	
	Breakfast
	Additional discussion of issues that arose during the mission. Provision of the additional materials (if necessary). Answers to the questions
Day	Flight of the mission experts to Moscow, charter flight
Evening	Accommodation in the hotel “Radisson Royal Hotel Moscow”
Day 7 – April 28	
	Departure of the mission experts

* The Russian side is leaving the exact time of all events within the mission to the discretion of ICOMOS experts in accordance with their wishes.

** Visit to the other islands will be carried out according to the weather as soon as it permits, in connection with which the programme may be changed in situ, during the mission.