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Executive Summary

Arslantepe

Arslantepe is a tell of about 4.5 ha in extension, and 30 m high, at the heart of the fertile Malatya plain, some twelve kilometres from the right bank of the Euphrates. The long sequence of the site covers several millennia at least from the 6th millennium cal BC until the final destruction of the neo-Hittite town - Malitiya according to Hittite sources, Melid, Meliddu or Meliteya in neo-Assyrian and Urartu sources - by Sargon II of Assyria in 712 BC. After a short neo-Assyrian occupations, the site was abandoned for a while, to be occupied again in the Late Roman age and subsequently in the Byzantine/Mediaeval time, when the site was used mainly as a cemetery. Arslantepe is the largest mound in the Malatya plain and it has always been the dominant centre in its region in the entire course of its millenarian history.

Its long history, which has been largely brought to light almost 60 years of excavations by the Italian Archaeological Expedition of the Sapienza University of Rome, has been thoroughly analysed and understood thanks to a rigorous extensive and stratigraphic excavation methodology. Arslantepe today very clearly reflects the history of the whole Eastern Anatolia and neighbouring regions in the course of several millennia. It moreover shows in detail the complex processes bringing to the birth of the State and a sophisticated bureaucracy before writing, -offering basic information on the early formation of this new society, which was at the basis of our contemporary world. The site, being located in a real geographic and cultural border, thanks to the intensive and varying external relations that have significantly marked its history, is also a testimony of fundamental events and changes - in various and different civilisations of the Near East. In the earliest phases of its history, in the Chalcolithic period, Arslantepe had close links with the Syro-Mesopotamian world with which it shared many cultural features, structural models, and development trajectories. - In the early centuries of the 3rd millennium, far-reaching changes took place in the site, which halted the development of the Mesopotamian-type centralised system, and differently oriented the Arslantepe’s external relations towards Eastern Anatolia and Transcaucasia. A further radical change occurred in the 2nd millennium when the site interacted with the -Hittite State and civilisation, being strongly influenced by it. Relations with central Anatolia had already been established previously, from the late phases of Late Chalcolithic-but it was with Late Bronze I and, more evidently, Late Bronze II that Arslantepe was included in the cultural and political orbit of the expanding Hittite -Empire, which pushed as far as the banks of the Euphrates. This gave rise to a new political change - heralding in another important stage in the history of Arslantepe, which led to the foundation of the Neo-Hittite kingdom of Melid, of which the site was the capital.

Justification of outstanding universal value of Arslantepe

- Arslantepe is the only known site outside Mesopotamia testifying the origin of state, the beginning of bureaucracy and political entities, and is the only site where this process, documented in detail, can be observed and experimented by visiting its extraordinarily well preserved material remains,

- Arslantepe is the only known place in which today the most ancient palatial complex in the world can be visited (3300 BCE),
• Preservation of the monumental palatial building is unique, with mud-brick walls more than 2 m. high and wall paintings and plastered decorations still preserved in situ,
• The most ancient metal swords known today worldwide have been found in the Arslantepe palace and are visible at the Archaeological Museum of Malatya,
• Thousands of sealings from Arslantepe testify the birth of a complex centralised administrative system for the control and distribution of goods and - show one of the most - varied, original, and breath-taking iconographic repertoires of its time,
• Arslantepe’s long occupation testifies to process of the development of hierarchical societies and political power,
• In historical periods Arslantepe was the capital of a Neo-Hittite reign dominating its region and interacting with the neighboring states, evidence of which are monumental buildings, statues and reliefs -,
• The environment around Arslantepe is still largely uncontaminated making the site a natural as well as historical monument

The archaeological site of Arslantepe and its 4th millennium Palace in particular are a unique visible testimony to the crucial process of State formation and the transformation from egalitarian to hierarchical and politically centralised society. The palace is moreover the first example in the world of this type of architectural and functional organisation of power, which antedates of —six-seven centuries the well-known 3rd millennium palaces of the Near East. It shows that in this region of Eastern Anatolia a new type of secular power started to develop very early, not being mainly based any more on a religious/ceremonial consensus, but already founding its strength on the exploitation of resources and human labour and being exercised through the employment of a sophisticated administrative system and the starting use of force, as a group of metal weapons found in one of the representation halls in the palace testify. Among these, nine swords attest the use of this weapon for the first time in the world - at least a millennium before the already known examples. All these processes and events took place in a group of connected buildings constituting an exceptional homogeneous architectural complex, which is of an Outstanding Universal Value for its extraordinary historical significance (the first example of a “palace” system), its anthropological value as a tangible document of a crucial process of social change, its exceptional state of preservation, and its architectural and artistic value. It certainly transcends the local importance, being the expression of historical processes of common value for the entire international community.

Its permanent protection is therefore of the highest importance for the preservation of a unique monument and document of a crucial stage in the history of humankind.

Managing Authorities

The overall control of the site remains with the Directorate General for Cultural Heritage and Museums of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. The day to day management of the site will be shared by the Archaeological Museum of Malatya, the Arslantepe Research Team and the Municipality of Battalgazi.
The Arslantepe archaeological site is within the territory of the town of Orduzu, part of the Municipality of Battalgazi. It is the part of public property. The site is defined and declared by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism as the first-degree archaeological site.

Management Plan

This management plan is to guide actions at the site of Arslantepe on the long run. The overall objective of the plan is to increase awareness of the local and world community on the role of Arslantepe in the development of proto-historic societies, and to make Anatolian cultural heritage more accessible at all levels of society. Outcome of this first stage of the project will be the creation of an “Arslantepe community” that shall actively participate in its preservation and dissemination. Intent is also to demonstrate the link between local traditions, ethnography and past life in the same region and thus support a sustainable and responsible tourism in the Malatya region. This will be achieved through promoting knowledge, enhancing human resources and developing integrated heritage management.

While doing that, the management plan aims at:

- Integrating archaeology with the natural, social and built environment,
- Identifying sustainable management practices for the site and its environs and
- Proposing practices that are appropriate and relevant to the region

Plan objectives defined to that end are as follows:

Objective 1: The site shall be evaluated and managed in the context of its setting and surrounding landscape.

Objective 2: The research interest of the site shall be enhanced by providing better access to information, training and site presence.

Objective 3: Impacts on exposed and underground archaeological material shall wherever possible be minimised.

Objective 4: Any archaeological finds from the excavation shall be stored and displayed in conditions that are appropriate for their conservation.

Objective 5: Local communities shall be encouraged to become partners in the protection and interpretation of the site and its surroundings.

Objective 6: Visitors to the site shall enjoy a safe, informed and memorable visit including access to good quality interpretation and educational materials.

The management plan is divided and presented under the following issues:

- Environment, Land Use and Planning
- Archaeology and Research
- Protection, Conservation and Security
- Promotion and Presentation
- Socio-Economic Development and Management
The Action Plan identifies responsibilities and time frame for implementing policies. In support of the Action Plan, some projects are proposed. These projects, which are planned to be implemented on site application, information technologies, visitor management, site presentation, visitor centre, educational activities, tourism etc., are defined in following chapters.

This management plan concerns itself with the management of the defined archaeological site, but also makes recommendations concerning the wider setting and context to which the site relates.

**Legal Status of the Management Plan**

According to the legal regulation, a management plan is to be produced by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism in archaeological conservation sites, assessed by the **Advisory Board** composed of members from professional chambers, civil society organisations, relevant university departments and persons with the right to property in the area, and approved by **Supervision and Coordination Board** whose members are representatives from each of the administrations the services of which are needed within the scope of the management plan. The process (preparation, assessment, approval, implementation, monitoring and revision of the management plan) shall be in coordination with a **site manager**, additional to his/her other duties of devising annual work schedules and audit reports. The management structure composed of a site manager, advisory board and supervision and coordination board is appointed by the Ministry.

Therefore, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism has appointed 19th of December, 2018 as the site manager for Arslantepe Management Plan and established the two boards as to consist of the following members:

**Advisory Board**
- Arslantepe Excavation Team
- Dr. Sevgi Dönmez (Inonu University, Department of Archaeology)
- Dr. Hulusi Binbaşoğlu (Malatya Turgut Özal University, Department of Tourism and Hotel Management)
- Dr. Aysun Tuna (Inonu University, Department of Landscape Architecture)
- Malatya Chamber of Merchants and Craftsmen
- Malatya Chamber of Trade and Industry
- Malatya Chamber of Architect
- Orduzu Neighbourhood Administration
- Orduzu Education and Culture Foundation

**Supervision and Coordination Board**
- General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums
- Malatya Metropolitan Municipality
- Battalgazi Municipality
- Malatya Provincial Directorate of National Education
- Malatya Provincial Directorate of Culture and Tourism
- Malatya Provincial Directorate of Agriculture and Forestry
- Malatya Museum Directorate
The plan was assessed by Advisory Board and approved by Supervision and Coordination Board on 8th January, 2019.

Planning Process / Team and Contributors

According to the Articles 7 and 10 of legal regulation on site management, the draft management plan shall be prepared by a team composed of experts and consultants from different professions depending on the characteristics of the area in coordination with the site manager appointed by the competent authority according to these principles. In this case, the plan team shall include experts who would be graduates from architecture, urban and regional planning, art history, archaeology, public administration, business management and economic departments of universities.

The first draft of this management plan has been prepared on behalf of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism (General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums) by Prof. Dr. Marcella Frangipane (La Sapienza University), Prof. Dr Francesca Balossi Restelli (La Sapienza University), Prof. Gian Maria Di Nocera (archaeology, Università della Tuscia di Viterbo) along with other the members of the Italian Archaeological Mission of the Sapienza University of Rome, through “Future is in Tourism” project in 2015 managed by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism (General Directorate of Investments and Enterprises) and supported by Anadolu Efes. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Karagöz (history), Prof. Dr. Bülent Yılmaz (landscape architecture), Associate Prof. Dr. Yusuf Cahit Çukacı (business management), Assistant Prof. Dr. Aysun Tuna Yılmaz (landscape architecture), Assistant Prof. Dr. Hulusi Binbaşoğlu (tourism and hotel management), Assistant Prof. Dr. Metin Kırmıhan (public administration), Assistant Prof. Dr. Fuat ŞANCI (art history), Assistant Prof. Dr. Fazıl Ercan (fine arts) have contributed to the plan with their deep knowledge and experience in their field. Parts of this plan have been elaborated from previously published works done by the MAIAO team members, as indicated in footnote. The first draft was submitted to the Ministry in 2015.

The draft was reviewed, revised and developed by the experts of General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums, namely Evrim ULUSAN (urban and regional planning), Duygu MERT (urban and regional planning) and Üğur IŞIK (archaeology) and legal process for its assessment and approval was initiated thereafter. The work of the General Directorate was facilitated by planning team established within Battalgazi Municipality, composed of Cem KAYA and Bülent KORKMAZ.

Three different questionnaires were prepared by the Ministry experts in this process; one for local community, one for school children at primary and elementary level, one for the national and international visitors. The aim was firstly to understand the relation between the local population and the site and then to develop most appropriate and desirable policies for the site. Each of three questionnaires was filled by 100 participants. The results were inserted into SPSS database and a rough analysis was made, however, the quality of the answers was poor to be taken into consideration to reach a generalized decision. Although it would not be possible to have quantitative figures to reach inductive results, the insights were contributive enough to develop reasonable policies and specific actions.
Moreover, two stakeholder meetings were organized by the Ministry in the review process; a) to deepen the draft SWOT analysis, b) for debating on the draft management policies and developing them so as to ensure their mutual acceptance, c) to define, prioritize and coordinate specific actions in compliance with the agreed policies, and d) to appoint responsible institutions for each action.

The final draft was then delivered to responsible authorities legally to take their formal institutional remarks before approval. This stage was followed by the final review by the Ministry and submission the draft for assessment and approval by the Boards.
SECTION I: UNDERSTANDING THE SITE

1. HISTORY & DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

1.1. Introduction

Arslantepe is a 4.5 hectares and 30 m. high archaeological mound (tell/höyük) dominating the plain and formed by the superimposition of settlements for millennia, from at least the 6th millennium BC to the late Roman period. The mound is surrounded by the Orduzu village, made of dispersed houses among gardens. Some of the houses along the street bringing to the site are still mud-brick buildings and have been recently restored by the Malatya Governorate.

1.2. Geographic Location and Geology

The archaeological site of Arslantepe is located in the Malatya plain, 5 kilometres from the city centre and 15 kilometres from the Euphrates right bank. The Malatya plain, on which the site of Arslantepe rises in an eccentric position in the town of Orduzu, is characterized by rainfall not exceeding 400mm per year and high summer temperatures (average in July of 26°C). Without taking into account the present irrigation practices, these values determine sub-desertic steppe conditions, which only locally give rise to oases due to the emergence of groundwater. According to the meteorological office of Turkey, the annual mean temperature of Malatya is 13.7°C, and the mean annual sum of precipitation equals 386 mm, with pronounced monthly maxima during the winter and spring season (1-41 mm, 2-37 mm, 3-51 mm, 4-58 mm, 5-47 mm, 6-18 mm, 7-2 mm, 8-2 mm, 9-7 mm, 10-38 mm, 11-45 mm, 12-41 mm) in the period 1960-2012.

Arslantepe lies in an extensional fault-bounded basin filled with a sequence of alluvial and lacustrine sediments of Neogene age. The immediate surroundings of the site are characterized by Neogene sequences of clay rich lake sediments alternating with sandy fluvial deposits. Both types of sediments contain carbonates; 700 m to the northeast, the remnant of an andesitic volcano probably of Miocene age forms the eastern flank of the small creek valley of the Orduzu Dere, which passes the tell of Arslantepe at its eastern rim.

According to Marcolongo and Palmieri, Arslantepe is situated favourably within the landscape because of a large hydrogeological catchment, supplying the site reliably with running water. Today, large parts of the area of the Malatya Plain are covered by sediments providing fertile soils for extensive apricot plantations. So far, the genesis and age of the young sediments exposed at the surface (Pleistocene or Holocene) have rarely been studied.

The presence of numerous springs both in the plain and near the mound of Arslantepe favours hygropilous and hydrophilous arboreal vegetation (poplars, willows, elms and ashes). This naturally watered soil allows the intensive cultivation of apricot trees in the plain so that now there are few remnants of natural vegetation.

The south-eastern Turkish province of Malatya is ca. 100 km east of the Anatolian Diagonal, a famous hotspot for biodiversity. This Anatolian province is included in the Irano-Turanian phytogeographical region and is the richest of Turkey in endemic taxa. Among the endemic taxa of the province are species like Hypericum malatyanum Pesyment and Lotus malatayicus Poinert, whose names reveal their geographic origin. Various floristic
studies have been carried out in the Malatya province in the last two decades. In the region of Malatya, steppe vegetation is dominant. However, in some areas Quercus shrubs are common. Among Quercus species are Quercus infectoria Olivier subsp. boissieri (Reuter) O. Schwarz, Quercus cerris L. var. cerris, Quercus brantii Lindl., Quercus libani Olivier, often accompanied by many shrubs of rosaceans, mainly ascribed to species of Crataegus, Rosa, Prunus, Pyrus and Cotoneaster. Gymnosperms are very rare, and represented almost exclusively by some Juniperus species, the most common of which is Juniperus oxycedrus L. subsp. oxycedrus. Many of these species have been used in the 4th and 3rd millennia cal.BC architecture of Arslantepe.

1.3. History

Excavations began in the 1930s, conducted by a French mission headed by L. Delaporte. By investigating the upper part of the mound, Delaporte unearthed the remains of remarkable Iron Age buildings, among which the so-called neo-Assyrian palace (7th century BC) and the well-known Lions’ Gate (9th-8th centuries BC). The gate was flanked on either side by two lions statues carved from stone blocks with high relief bodies and round heads, which probably gave the name to the site (Arslan Tepe, namely, “Lions’ Hill”), and had walls lined with stone slabs decorated with bas-reliefs, whose iconography and style were typical of the neo-Hittite kingdoms art. Inside the gate, there was a great royal statue that had been felled and probably intentionally concealed. The statue and the reliefs can be admired in the Ankara Museum of Ancient Civilizations. The Second World War put an end to the work of the Delaporte expedition and after a short and rather fruitless resumption of excavations in 1949-51 by C. Schaeffer, the French activity in the site came to an end.

In 1961 a new Italian archaeological project began at Arslantepe, originally under P. Meriggi and S. Puglisi and soon after under the latter alone, which is still being operating in the site, and has since become one of the major archaeological projects of Rome’s La Sapienza University. After Puglisi, the excavations were taken over by Alba Palmieri and are now continuing under the direction of Marcella Frangipane. The Italian mission started investigating in the same NE zone where the French had previously worked, identifying a long stratigraphic sequence along the northern edge of the mound. There, a number of building levels dating back to the 1st and 2nd millennia BC - Neo-Hittite (Iron Age), Imperial Hittite (Late Bronze II) and Early Hittite (Late Bronze I) periods have been brought to light above unsubstantial Early Bronze layers with scanty architectural remains and a series of seven building levels with domestic structures from Late Chalcolithic 3-4 (4th millennium BC), built on the virgin soil (Palmieri 1978: 315-330). The sequence in this area ended with the remains of a late Roman occupation.

In the last 35 years the researches have focused on the prehistoric and proto-historic levels of Arslantepe, by operating in the W and SW zones of the mound, where the earliest settlements made up the original nucleus of the tell. There, a long and detailed sequence of Late Chalcolithic, Early Bronze, and Middle Bronze levels, from the end of the fifth to the beginning of the second millennium cal BC, has been investigated over vast areas, supported by more than one hundred C14 dates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Arslantepe period</th>
<th>Absolute Chronology</th>
<th>Other contemporary cultures of the NE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roman and Byzantine</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td>II-III</td>
<td>1100-712</td>
<td>Neo-Hittite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Bronze Age II</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1600-1200</td>
<td>Middle Hittite reign and Empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Bronze Age I</td>
<td>V B</td>
<td>1750-1600</td>
<td>Early Hittite reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Bronze Age</td>
<td>V A</td>
<td>2000-1750</td>
<td>Palaeo-assyrian colonies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Bronze Age III</td>
<td>VI D</td>
<td>2500-2000</td>
<td>Early Dynastic IIIb, Ur III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Bronze Age II</td>
<td>VI C</td>
<td>2750-2500</td>
<td>Early Dynastic II-IIIa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Bronze Age IB</td>
<td>VI B2</td>
<td>3000-2800</td>
<td>Early Dynastic I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Bronze Age IA</td>
<td>VI B1</td>
<td>3100-3000</td>
<td>Jemdet Nasr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Chalcolithic 5</td>
<td>VI A</td>
<td>3400-3100</td>
<td>Late Uruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Chalcolithic 3-4</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>3900-3400</td>
<td>Middle Uruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Chalcolithic 1-2</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>4700-4000</td>
<td>Early Uruk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only recently, in 2008, excavations in the NE zone were resumed to once again investigate, by using modern research methodologies, the important phases in the late history of the site, between the Hittite "expansion" to the region, the subsequent dismemberment of the imperial system, and the crucial transitional periods during which the neo-Hittite kingdom of Malatya was formed. An imposing town-wall and two new beautiful reliefs, now exhibited in the Malatya Museum, have been found belonging to these transitional periods.

1.3.1. The Prehistoric Occupation: The Late Chalcolithic period at Arslantepe

Recent researches in post-Ubaid phases: Arslantepe period VIII

The presence of Halaf and Ubaid sherds found out of context in a recently opened excavation area on the lower western slope of the mound indicates that Arslantepe was certainly occupied as early as the 6th millennium BC. The earliest evidence so far well documented in the excavations, however, dates back to the end of the 5th millennium BC: Arslantepe period VIII / Late Chalcolithic 1-2 (4300-3900 cal BC). This period is documented by three superimposed building levels, which comprise domestic structures full of equipment for cooking food (numerous ovens, some very large in size, inside and outside the dwellings). The pottery recovered in these levels belongs to a local repertoire with connections in the areas of south-eastern Turkey to the west of the Euphrates (Oylum Höyük). This repertoire nevertheless, in general terms, form part of a wider typically post-Ubaid ceramic horizon which links - Eastern Anatolia to the various areas of Upper Mesopotamia in the initial phase of Late Chalcolithic (LC 1-2).

The background to centralisation: the emergence of the élites and the ideological-religious basis of consensus. Arslantepe period VII.

In period VII (Late Chalcolithic 3-4, 3800-3400 cal B.C.), the settlement, which has been investigated over wide areas, seems to have grown to cover the whole surface of the
present mound and is characterised by a clear differentiation between functionally and symbolically diverse areas.

On the north-eastern edge of the site, the excavations conducted in the 1960s and 1970s brought to light common mud brick houses of rather small dimensions consisting of one to three rooms, in one case with a geometric painting on the wall alternating black and white triangles. Once again numerous ovens have been found, mainly outside the dwellings, and burials underneath the floors or close to the houses with simple and poorly differentiated grave goods. Adults were buried in a flexed position lying on one side often with shell and bead ornaments; only in one instance was the body accompanied by a stone stamp seal while in another case the body was resting on two large cooking pots and had a set of two bowls and one beaker at its feet. Small children and infants were buried in pots underneath the floor of the houses, continuing an older and very widespread tradition that was also documented in Arslantepe period VIII.

In the higher part of the western area of the mound-- on the top of the ancient hill, more recent excavations have conversely brought to light imposing large buildings with mud brick walls over 1-1.20 m thick, covered with white plaster and often with paintings on the walls, belonging to several successive levels. The main and earlier construction phase so far excavated in this area consisted of fairly monumental buildings with white-plastered mud brick columns lining the walls. The monumental character of these buildings, their large size and ground plan, their topographic location as a separate district on the top of the mound, their proximity to public ceremonial areas, and the material unearthed there suggest that they were residences for the élites.

Close by these residences, immediately S/SW of them and near the western edge of the mound, the excavations have revealed two large and monumental ceremonial buildings probably two temples. The latest and most preserved one of them (Temple C), was built on a platform made of huge stone slabs and mud layers raising it above the surrounding surface, and had a tripartite floor plan, which was only used in this building at Arslantepe, and, together with multiple recessed niches decorating the short sides of the central room is reminiscent of Mesopotamian architecture. There are, on the other hand, also features of
local, or at all events northern, traditions, such as the wall paintings in the northern niches of the main room and a particular sophisticated construction technique using wooden beams laid horizontally under the stone platform. This combination of foreign and local features already reveals the originality of the Arslantepe development towards an early hierarchical society, within the general framework of a shared Mesopotamian cultural environment.

In the large central room of Temple C, measuring 18 x 7.20 m, containing a low and wide platform in a central position, meals must have been distributed in a ritual context, as evidenced from the presence of hundreds of mass-produced bowls (both flint-scraped and wheel-turned) found scattered on the floor and set aside in the lateral rooms, where they were found piled up and overturned, partly still in situ, and partly probably fallen from an upper storey, as they were ready to be used. In the south-eastern room, there were also numerous clay sealings (cretulae) bearing seal impressions, which were also found in large amount discarded after use in a small room, originally a stair-room, in the second building (Temple D). The presence of cretulae and bowls in large quantities suggests that redistribution practices were performed in this ceremonial environment in connection with an initial process of centralising goods and labour, which was to develop fully at Arslantepe at the end of the fourth millennium.

Although the pottery from period VII reflected the general trend towards mass production, the use of chaff pastes, the lack of decoration and poor firing observed in the whole Late Chalcolithic Upper Mesopotamian environment, the shapes and the repertoire one again reveal a local cultural horizon typical of the Malatya plain, with links, also in this case, with the regions to the west of the Euphrates and the ‘Amuq plain. Potter’s marks appeared, and may be interpreted as signs for recognising the workshops products brought to common areas for drying or firing.
Centralisation at the end of the fourth millennium (The Period VIA, 3400-3100 BC). The first known example of a "Palace" complex.

Economic and political centralisation reached its climax in the next period VI A (Late Chalcolithic 5, 3400-3100 BC). The two temples were abandoned and to the east/south-east of them, an imposing and completely new architectural complex was built along the slope of the mound, made up of agglutinated monumental buildings standing on several terraces and linked by corridors and courtyards, where various different public functions (religious/ceremonial, administrative, storage, reception) were performed.
In the complex, there were two small temples (Temple A and Temple B), which were much smaller than the older Temples C and D and only bipartite. Here, ceremonial activities seem to have been restricted to a limited number of persons, probably the ruling elites.

The religious aspect, though still important, seems to have somehow come down, whereas the public performances took place in a large courtyard where people gathered in front of a huge secular building standing in all its monumental spendour, where a probable throne platform has been recently discovered. This was a sort of Audience Building, where people paid tribute to the authority, staying outside the building in front of the ‘throne’ platform. This building communicated, on the backside, with the residences of high status persons, probably the ruler family.
The Arslantepe architectural complex of Period VIA therefore appears as the earliest example so far known of a ‘public Palace’, preceding by several centuries the famous Near Eastern palaces of the 3rd millennium.

The new power ideology was supported by a complex administrative organisation for the control of goods, mainly staple goods, and particularly food, as evidenced by stores containing dozens of large and medium-sized pots (pithoi and jars), together with a number of spouted bottles and small jars, indicating that different types of food were stored there. In the storeroom complex so far brought to light there is an interesting and pronounced difference in the function of the two main rooms: the larger, northern, room was full of large vessels and was the actual storage place; the smaller, southern, room contained only three pithoi, two large jars and a few cooking pots, but there were hundreds of wheel made mass-produced bowls, probably used for the distribution of meals or food rations, and 130 cretulae.
bearing seal impressions. Dozens of beautiful restored vessels and the best preserved clay sealings are now kept and exhibited in the Malatya Museum.

Some of the cretulae had fallen to the floor from the containers which they had sealed, while others were piled up in a corner of the room, probably temporarily set aside; some more had probably fallen from a collapsed upper storey. In this room, which was perhaps supplied from the northern room, the stored foodstuffs were probably redistributed in the form of meals to the workers employed by the central élites. The movement of goods was now controlled in an administrated and "secular" form, independently of any religious or ceremonial practices which had conversely characterised the earliest archaic forms of redistribution.

Thousands of cretulae were also found discarded in ordered groups in specific dumping places inside the palace, after being temporarily set aside and accounted (Some 2200 still bear the seal impression and the clear imprint of the sealed objects). Over 200 different seals with an extraordinary variety of beautiful designs and styles have been reconstructed from the impressions, through a long and thorough study of this unique assemblage of well-contextualized materials. The in-depth study conducted for many years on these cretulae shows that, at Arslantepe, there existed a highly sophisticated administrative system already at the end of the 4th millennium BC. Hierarchically organised officials sealed and controlled different types of containers and storerooms, and through the accounting of sealing operations and the documentary value assigned to the cretulae,
perfectly managed and temporarily recorded the economic transactions even in the absence of writing.

A significant role was also attributed to the wall paintings, which, in this case, were not only decorations of the walls but figurative motifs and actual scenes painted on the sides of doors and along the main corridor, transmitting ideologically important and highly meaningful messages to everyone entering the palace. The best preserved of these paintings are two almost identical stylised anthropomorphic figures associated with powerfully symbolic elements on both sides of what had originally been the door (subsequently walled in) leading from the access corridor to the internal courtyard of the palace, passing through the central room in the stores. Even more complex and interesting is the depiction of a scene with a sort of car (or plough?) drawn by two oxen and driven by a coachman, which seems to be moving in the direction leading out of the building, painted on the eastern wall of the inner corridor. This image, together with a similar motif (though completely different in style) on a seal impression, stresses the ideological importance of agriculture control by the Arslantepe rulers.

The wall paintings in the Arslantepe Palace have been preserved *in situ* and can be still admired by the public visiting the monumental complex.
The pottery was mostly wheel-made, fine, well-fired and pale in colour, and, once again, though being strongly influenced by the Mesopotamian models of the Uruk culture, retained original and typically local features.

Mass production was restricted to conical wheel-made bowls, which were now mass-produced on the fast wheel. But, other categories of pottery were also wheel-made and appear more standardized and homogeneous than in the previous period. The disappearance of the potter’s marks is also indicative of this change towards a more “industrialized” manufacture. In addition to wares referring to the Syro-Mesopotamian Uruk world, and a more ‘domestic’ hand-made kitchen ware, a type of hand-made red-black ware, which had appeared at the end of period VII, also characterised the Arslantepe period VI A repertoire; its shapes, aesthetic taste and manufacture techniques demonstrate connections with contemporary central Anatolian wares.

The discovery of a group of arsenical copper weapons (nine swords, some decorated with silver inlay, and twelve spearheads) with a quadruple spiral plaque in one of the buildings of the Palace (Building III), together with the finding of an interesting arsenical copper door socket at the corner of a monumental entrance to another building, and various
objects made of sophisticated alloys, including lead and silver, demonstrate a high technological standards attained in metallurgy and, for the first time, the use of the sword.

In this period, Arslantepe probably had a major role as an intermediary centre in the vast network of interregional relations involving the Syro-Mesopotamian communities and those living in the mountain areas of Central-Eastern and North-Eastern Anatolia, while at all times retaining its marked autonomy. The development of a powerful system of centralised political and economic control on a site which never actually became “urban” in a real sense of the term shows that, whereas Arslantepe played an important and active part in the State formation process, in close connection with what was happening in the Mesopotamian world, it also followed its own specific, and different, development pattern, which was less, deep-rooted than those in the highly urbanised environments, and rapidly collapsed.

1.3.2. Early Bronze Age

Crises and new developments at the beginning of the third millennium. Period VIB

A radical crisis overwhelmed the central institutions at the beginning of the third millennium BC leading to the collapse of the Mesopotamian-type centralised system, and changing the course of Arslantepe’s history for ever. Around 3000 BC a devastating fire completely destroyed the palace, putting an end to the early-state organisation of Late Chalcolithic society. Relations with the southern areas and with Syro-Iraqi Jezira were weakened, while close links remained for a short time (during Early Bronze I) with the rest of the Upper and Middle Euphrates Valley; at the same time new relations were established and strengthened with the north-eastern Anatolian and Transcaucasian world.

Two phases have been recognised at Arslantepe in Early Bronze I (3100-2800 cal BC, Period VIB), providing evidence of instability, and probably conflicts, which are clearly shown by a complex sequence of events occurred on the site for one or two centuries following the collapse of the palatial system.

In the first phase of EBI (period VIB1) the areas previously occupied by the public and élite buildings were abandoned, and probably seasonal settlements were built on their ruins by groups of transhumant pastoralists who may have been moving around the plain.
and in the surrounding areas even earlier, joining a vast system of relations with the Eastern Anatolian and Transcaucasian world, with which they shared customs and cultural features. The new groups lived in sub-quadrangular huts with wattle and daub walls coated with mud, separated by wide, open areas, often with rows of post-holes which may have been post fences, perhaps for stabling livestock.

The pottery used by these groups was exclusively hand-made red-black and burnished; it was made using identical firing techniques and according to identical aesthetic standards (black was always used on the most visible surfaces of the pots) to those of Late Chalcolithic red-black ware, but new shapes were adopted reminiscent of the repertoire belonging to the Transcaucasian culture.

In the second phase of Early Bronze I (period VI B2) there was a revival of the mud brick construction traditions and the wheel-made light coloured pottery of Uruk origin. This shows both a continuation of the earlier LC typological features, such as the necked jars with reserved slip decoration, and the appearance of a number of new shapes which produced a general change in the repertoire on the whole, with an increase in the number of small vessel shapes and a decrease of large pots suitable for central storage. A few items of ceramics belonging to the old Late Uruk tradition have also been found in a special building of the VI B1 period, showing that in other areas of the site, or in the plain, the sedentary population may have continued to pursue their traditional way of life and maintained their customs.

At the beginning of Period VIB2, new forms of power seem to have been re-established, perhaps as a result of the introduction of a new political system and a new leadership. On the top of the mound a stout 4 m thick mud brick fortification wall built on stone foundations with internal buttresses surrounded the upper part of the settlement, like a sort of citadel, whose features are yet to be identified.

Further evidence of the co-existence of two different groups and two cultural horizons comes from the discovery of a rich tomb, the so-called Royal Tomb (T1), dated to about 3000-2900 BC, which seems to belong to the very beginning of period VIB2 or the transition from VIB1 to VIB2. This is an imposing stone cist built at the bottom of a large irregular 5 m wide pit, located on the edge of the village, outside the fortification wall. It contained an adult lying in a flexed position on its right side accompanied by a very rich assortment of grave gifts, including vessels, personal ornaments made of cornelian, rock crystal, silver and gold, together with a hoard of metal objects placed behind its back,
comprising weapons, tools, and ornaments made of arsenical copper, copper-silver alloy, silver and gold. On the top of the cist were the bodies of four adolescents, probably sacrificed.

Two of them, a girl and probably a boy, lay on the top of the tombstone, wearing copper pins and a diadem and hair spirals made of copper-silver alloy, similar to the items found among the grave goods buried with the ‘lord’ in the cist, which may indicate kinship or some other kind of close linkage with him. Two other individuals, once again very young and both female, were found outside the area of the cist, with no burial goods, and may have been servants. The cist tomb is still visible and will be part of the visit route.

In the second phase of period VIB2, a village settled along the slope of the mound, outside the great wall, and comprised small mud brick dwellings (with one to three rooms), with the floors covered with many kilos of charred grains (mostly barley, but also wheat and pulses), which had probably fallen from upper floors where the harvest had been stored before the fire destroyed the village. There were courtyards and open areas for activities performed in common, such as slaughtering livestock or working metals (smelting).
The presence of the extraordinary burial, and the large fortification wall on the top of the mound, together with the disappearance of cult areas, cretulae, and mass produced bowls, indicate that a new type of power had been established, focusing more on defence and on the political and military role of the chiefs rather than on their capacity to centralise resources and labour, as had been the case in the fourth millennium.

New developments in Early Bronze II and III. Periods VIC and VID.

Following the fire that also destroyed the period VI B2 settlement, a new and more radical fracture occurred, marked by a temporary abandonment of the site before it slowly re-emerged with wholly new cultural and political features. Between 2750 and 2500 BC (Early Bronze II, Arslantepe period VIC) the site was first re-occupied by nomadic groups which perhaps settled there on a seasonal basis, leaving light structures behind, as in the earlier period VI B1, but this time building a few scattered slightly sunken circular huts paved with mud and tiny pole structures, together with rubbish pits. It was only in a second phase in this period that a large terraced multi-roomed building was erected on the upper part of the tell. It seems to be a sort of cluster of large quadrangular rooms fitted with new types of domestic equipment, such as mortars sunken into the floors, horseshoe-shaped hearths, and articulated ovens with high cooking platforms and basins for ashes. This large isolated building, which also showed evidence of conservation and processing of agricultural products, may have housed an extended family or kinship group. All around this building, nomadic people continued to use the site, perhaps seasonally.

All the pottery was now handmade, and comprised two main classes of production: One black or dark burnished ware, originated from the red-black pottery belonging to the Transcaucasian tradition but this time using new shapes with new typological traits. The second class was a light buff ware, painted with red or brown linear geometric motifs in a very distinctive local style (Gelincik ware).
The shape of the houses, the domestic equipment and pottery all show a radical cultural change in a period characterised by the fragmentation of groups and pronounced provincialism. Arslantepe may have remained as a benchmark site in the narrow territory of the Malatya plain, though no longer dominating it. From that moment onwards the history of the site and of its region was completely separated from the history of the Syro-Mesopotamian areas and of the southernmost region of the Middle Euphrates Valley, rather being an integral part of the Eastern Anatolian world.

During the Early Bronze III (Period VID, 2500-2000 BC), the settlements gradually spread to occupy the slope of the mound with increasingly planning and density, and were provided with roads, channels, courtyards and craft workshops. At the beginning of this period the groups with semi-subterranean round houses still continued to frequent the site mainly settling in free spaces or on the ruins of abandoned houses, but they gradually disappeared as the densely built-up settlement expanded to cover the whole of the mound. The EB III settlements slightly changed across time as the houses and the quarters were continually refurbished and rebuilt, but there were no more massive widespread episodes of destruction. Arslantepe once again became the largest and most important centre in the Malatya plain, even though there is no clear evidence of any new political centralisation. Indeed, the evidence suggests that the organisation was based on small autonomous centres, increasing in number in the plain and on the surrounding hills. This new organisation was perhaps connected with new defence requirements, as showed by the construction of a huge fortification wall, with a stout semi-circular bastion, on the edge of the mound, surrounding the whole of the settlement.

The pottery, which was still handmade, very closely followed the tradition of the previous period, keeping the two main classes, black burnished and painted, and developing a number of typological traits, which became well characterised and full established in this period. A much denser, complex and standardised style of pottery painting emerged, closely related to similar items produced in the Province of Elazig, which may have been the work of specialised craftsmen who distributed their products throughout the whole area. The finding of a metallurgist workshop with numerous moulds confirms that the craftsmanship was highly specialised.

1.3.3. Middle Bronze to the Iron Age (Periods V to III). New developments under the Hittite ‘domination’ and the rise of the Neo-Hittite Kingdom of Melid

Most of the evidence from the Middle Bronze Age (Period VA, 2000-1750 BC) has been found in the south-western area of the mound, exhibiting very close continuity in terms of the architecture and material culture with the Early Bronze III settlements, on which they were directly superimposed. The buildings were seriously damaged because of their closeness to the top of the mound and due to later terracing operations. The architecture was therefore limited to only a few structures preserved in good condition, among which one dwelling comprising a single large square room with an imposing central horse-shoe shaped double hearth and the remains of what was probably a weaving loom, suggested by the discovery of dozens of clay loom weights piled up in the NW corner of this room. The pottery also partially indicates continuity with the previous
period, even though new classes of wheel-made ware now appeared, some of which indicate that contacts had been resumed, albeit sporadically, with the Syro-Mesopotamian world.

The political breakup that is thought to have occurred in the territory of Malatya and Elazig in the second half of the third millennium may have created favourable conditions for the cultural and, later, expansion eastward of the Hittite state during the second millennium BC. The effects of this influence may already have begun to be felt in the Early Kingdom period judging from the fact that, in Late Bronze I (Period VB, 1750-1600 BC), in the Arslantepe defence system made of earthen walls, a town gate was built, flanked by two bipartite quadrangular towers, which was highly reminiscent of similar central Anatolian gates. The entrance to the town now pointed in a N/NE direction, namely towards the Euphrates, unlike what had occurred in pre-protohistoric times; and this new arrangement of the fortification systems was to remain unchanged throughout the imperial Hittite and neo-Hittite periods, although the town became smaller and there was a slight shift of the gates westwards. The gate of the ‘imperial’ period (Late Bronze II, Period IV, 1600-1200 BC) had a different ground plan - ‘tenaille’ type -, but was however still wholly central Anatolian in style. There was also a gallery with a ‘false vault’ belonging to this phase, which has evident parallels with Alisar and Alaca posterns, and may have been a tunnel leading to the water table. The Hittite citadel, which mainly extended in the N/NE area of the mound, was probably destroyed after the collapse of the empire but, between the end of the second and the beginning of the first millennia BC, a new huge town-wall was built, to which a town gate, now destroyed, might have been attached. This gate was probably decorated by stone reliefs, judging from the finding of two of them collapsed on the floor linked to the wall.

This transitional period, during which the local rulers probably took over the government of the town and the region, prepared the foundation of the new autonomous
Neo-Hittite kingdom of Melid/Malatya (Iron Age, Period III), when Arslantepe was once again to flourish as the capital of this kingdom with the construction of new imposing buildings, among which a large pillar hall and the famous “Lions Gate”, entirely decorated by typical stone reliefs. The settlement increasingly took the form of a small citadel, a seat of political and administrative power, while the existence of a lower town is still unknown at the present state of research.

Even though the remains of minor occupations dating back to the late Roman and Byzantine age have been uncovered, it was the destruction of the neo-Hittite town by Sargon II of Assyria in 712 BC that put an end to Arslantepe’s prosperity and centrality.

2. ARSLANTEPE TODAY

2.1. Current Management & Organisation

2.1.1. Legal Status

The mound of Arslantepe itself is scheduled as a first degree archaeological conservation site by the decision of Adana Regional Conservation Council dated 20/01/1989 numbered 191. The boundaries were then enlarged by the decision of Sivas Regional Conservation Council dated 23/12/2010 numbered 2145. The immediate surroundings of the site were also defined as a third degree archaeological site by the decision of Sivas Regional Conservation Council dated 24/01/2018 numbered 4081. Third degree conservation site boundary overlaps with the management plan boundary which was approved by the Ministry decision dated 09/04/2018 numbered 303566.

The legislation states that within first-degree archaeological conservation sites no building or any form of damage to archaeological layers is permitted, the boundaries of the protection zone need to be indicated on a city or town plan, and no excavation is permitted except for the scientific archaeological excavation. No tree plantation or intervention, including agriculture, is permitted, but only limited seasonal production and agricultural harvesting from existing plantation is allowed. Necessary infrastructural applications by legal and private enterprises shall be implemented upon the conservation council’s assessment and approval based on the scientific reports of excavation teams and museum directorate. Interventions for visitor path, open parking area, toilets, ticket sales and guardhouse arrangements can be made upon conservation council’s approval.

Within the third degree conservation boundary, new developments and building activity is allowed providing the balance between conservation and development. While defining development conditions and provisions at these areas, conformity between current and proposed densities, functions and construction materials and techniques is essential. The experts of the concerned museum are required to carry out sounding works before a building permit is issued at these sites. The works may be implemented pursuant to the decree of the concerned cultural heritage conservation board after a report based on the sounding results prepared by the experts, and the opinion of the head of excavation is forwarded to the board by the museum directorate in case a cultural heritage is found there.

Amalgamation and parcelling out may be carried out at both of these archaeological sites without affecting their nature provided that the permission is obtained from the
authorized cultural and natural heritage conservation board. Stone, soil or sand is not allowed to be taken away from these sites; the quarries to extract lime, stone, brick, marble, sand or mine are not allowed; soil, cinder, garbage, industrial waste or alike cannot be dumped to these sites.
Map: Legal Conservation Boundaries at Arslantepe

Red line: 1st degree archaeological conservation site boundary (proposed world heritage boundary)
Green line: 3rd degree archaeological conservation site boundary (management plan boundary and proposed buffer zone boundary)
2.1.2. Ownership and Responsibility

The overall mound is a state property whereas a small portion of private property exists within the first-degree archaeological conservation site, outside of the mound. The Directorate General for Cultural Heritage and Museums of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism and Excavation Team is responsible for taking necessary measures to protect, conserve and present the site.

As the site stays within the administrative boundaries of Battalgazi Municipality, the municipality of Battalgazi has responsibility for planning, access and servicing the area.

The Arslantepe Italian Research Project (MAIAO - Missione Archeologica Italiana in Anatolia Orientale) was established in 1961 under the auspices of the Sapienza University of Rome, with a permit from the Turkish Ministry of Culture. Research has gone on uninterruptedly until then, and has seen three different directors: Prof. Salvatore Maria Puglisi, Prof. Alba Palmieri, and at present Prof. Marcella Frangipane, all of the Sapienza University of Rome, Italy. Annual operating budget for the project is mainly from the Sapienza University of Rome and from the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The site is right within the village of Orduzu and, even though the surrounding environment is still mostly uncontaminated, construction in the last years has started menacing local traditional architecture. Most of the land ownership is private in the buffer zone and the current use is for housing and for apricot or orchard cultivation. As main livelihood of the local community is based on agriculture, and apricot in particular and apricot is the primary tourism and economic value for Malatya, there seems no threat of transformation of agricultural land and thus damage to the landscape silhouette, as this has
been the case for many years until today. Yet, the construction activity in the nearby village needs close inspection for preserving the authenticity of building stock, and maintaining as much as possible the compatibility with the traditional architecture of the area.

2.1.3. Landscape and Setting

The village of Orduzu is a predominantly agricultural highland plain, approximately 900m asl, mostly cultivated with apricot trees. To the East of the mound is the small hill of Gelincik tepe, where an archaeological site of Early Bronze Age II has been identified and excavated in the late sixties by the Italian team. The immediate surroundings of the mound have only a few numbers of houses, except to the south, where the central part of Orduzu expands and where 5 storey cement flat buildings have recently been built. A road passes just by the mound, connecting two sides of Orduzu and linking it to the centre of Battalgazi. The agricultural land surrounding the site is formed by a deep alluvial deposit, the date of which is still unknown, but most probably of historical age. For this reason, archaeological finds outside the mound are extremely difficult to identify, as they might be underlying metres of alluvial deposit. Special attention should thus be given to construction within Orduzu to protect the visual integrity of the mound and the landscape as impact to the site setting will inevitably come from changes in the surrounding landscape. Notwithstanding modern construction, Orduzu, even though very near to the large city of Malatya, still retains today most of its natural environment unaltered, because of the many apricot orchards that characterise it. This environment should clearly be protected.

2.1.4. Socio-Economic Structure at Nearby Settlement

Since 2011 the site of Arslantepe has been officially open to the public thanks to the construction of a roof system for the mud-brick palatial complex of 3300 BCE. This was planned by the Italian Archaeological expedition and financed by the Governorate of Malatya and will be described in chapter 2.3 of the present management plan. The open-air museum is managed by the Archaeological Museum of Malatya, with the support of the Malatya Provincial Directorate of Culture and Tourism.

Until 2014, Orduzu settlement had the village status. Following the legal amendment that year, the administrative status of the settlement has turned out to be a neighbour, thus it has fallen into the jurisdiction area of the Battalgazi Municipality. This political and administrative change is certainly extremely positive for Arslantepe since the Municipality of Battalgazi has since many years demonstrated a strong attention for the site and its history. In year 2005 Marcella Frangipane, the director of excavations, was granted the honorary citizenship of Battalgazi for the years spent working at and for Arslantepe. In 2013, Prof. Frangipane became the fellow citizen of the Battalgazi District (Old Malatya) where Arslantepe is located by the resolution of the Municipal Council. Mayor Selahattin Gürkan awarded the fellow citizenship certificate to her during an event called ‘caravanserai meetings’. In 2013 three other members of the team were likewise awarded the honorary citizenship (Balossi Restelli Francesca, Di Nocera Gian Maria, D’Anna Maria Bianca). Ever since, the Municipality has given a special attention to the needs and problems of the archaeological site, aiding where and when possible. They have also commenced promoting the site through the preparation of leaflets and brochures and through the organisation of public bus tours to the highlights of Battalgazi amongst which, obviously, is Arslantepe.
The increase of local attention and international awareness of the importance of Arslantepe has also been evidenced by some awards given by the various institutions in relation to the research that has been carried out at the site since 1961 and because of findings proving the uniqueness and importance of Arslantepe.

List of awards received by Marcella Frangipane, for her work at Arslantepe:

1994: Title of “Cavaliere Ufficiale del l’Ordine al Merito della Repubblica Italiana” conferred by the President of the Republic of Italy for her scientific activity in Turkey.
2005: Title of “Cavaliere del l’Ordine della Stella della Solidarietà” conferred by the President of the Republic of Italy for her scientific activity at Arslantepe, Turkey.
2005: Awards by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism of Turkey for the methodological and scientific achievements in the archaeological Project of Arslantepe (Malatya).
2005: Honorary Citizenship of Eski Malatya (Turkey).
2011: Honorary PhD conferred by the University of Malatya (Turkey).
2015: Field Discoveries Award for the “Italian Excavations at Arslantepe” from the Shanghai Archaeology Forum, Chinese Academy of Sciences
2015: Vittorio De Sica Prize for Science (Archaeology), Italy.
2017: Rotondi Prize to Art Saviors, Ministry of Culture, Italy

For the results obtained at Arslantepe, she has been elected
2001: Corresponding member of the DAI in Berlin
2013: Foreign Associate Member of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA
2017: Corresponding Member of the Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Italy
2018: Corresponding member of the Archaeological Institute of America

Since 1961 male generations of families of Orduzu have worked for the archaeological investigations at Arslantepe. This has brought economic income to the village, even though seasonal, and many of these people, who were otherwise farmers, benefit now from Turkish Social Security Agency (SGK) thanks to this job. Local Orduzu residents still today compose the workmen of the site, and it is in general the less wealthy that get recruited, as it is only those without a job that seek seasonal occupation, as that of an excavation. This has a great economic and social effect on village dynamics as the more marginalized people receive an income and at the same time become those with the most knowledge on the history and importance of the settlement. Permanent jobs too are covered by Orduzu residents, as those of site and excavation guardians.

While the estimated population within buffer zone is about 1000 people, the overall demographic structure within Orduzu neighbour can be read from the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>0-14</th>
<th>15-29</th>
<th>30-44</th>
<th>45-59</th>
<th>60 and above</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1456</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>6547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>2938</td>
<td>1367</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>7796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3771</td>
<td>4633</td>
<td>2823</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>14343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Today social and economic conditions of local inhabitants are very different from the past. Most male adults leave the village for jobs in the city of Malatya and in other cities of Turkey, and only few of them have continued working at the excavation for decades, becoming very well trained and closely linked to the site. There are however many university students on summer vacation that come to their village and work at the site, getting financial support for their studies and maintaining, together with the memory and affection still alive in their families, the perception of cultural and economic relevance that Arslantepe has for the village of Orduzu and the Malatya province. The inhabitants of the village, thanks to their long-term involvement and closeness to the archaeologists operating at Arslantepe, have undertaken a process of appropriation of knowledge and are indeed today the best guarantee of protection of the site and transmission through generations of its cultural and historical heritage.

Many inhabitants of Orduzu work today in the city of Malatya and return to the village in the evening. Life in the village, thus, even though so near to the city, is mostly that of a slow running rural context.

Even though women too are more autonomous than before, they, together with children and elderly, are those that mostly keep alive the small town of Orduzu. Local craftsmanship is still visible in the streets, with bread making, boiling of wheat to make bulgur, wool cleaning, preparation of dung cakes for fuel, weaving, drying of vegetables, cutting of wood for winter needs, etc. These activities, that have disappeared elsewhere, at Orduzu still make up an important part of the life style and for this reason should be to some extent preserved, as they represent millennia old local traditions, archaeologically attested at the site of Arslantepe too. The promotion of such traditions furthermore would contribute to an economic as well as social development of women that are mostly those involved in these craft activities.

At the moment Orduzu has no touristic facilities and the local markets that sell beverages and food are about 500 metres from the site. The increase in popularity of Arslantepe will undoubtedly bring the development of facilities and thus economic benefits to the village and immediate region.

At the same time, Arslantepe has already inspired various economic and cultural activities in Malatya. Its name has been given to several shops and two of the symbols of Arslantepe - the 3000 BC metal swords found in the palace and the Hittite Tarhunza statue - have been printed on the apricot metal boxes sold by one of the most relevant apricot merchants in Malatya, Hasanbey.

Local artists too have been inspired by Arslantepe’s finds: the main square in Malatya, in front of the Governorate, is decorated with panels inspired to the iconography of the seals found in the Arslantepe palace (Fazıl Ercan is the artist who produced them). Finally, the winner’s statuette at the Malatya International Film Festival is that of Tarhunza, again, the Arslantepe Neo-Hittite king.

Since 2009 the Battalgazi Municipality organises an activity called International Caravanserai Meetings (Uluslararası Kervansaray Buluşmaları) during which conferences on the history of the region are given and the Arslantepe team is always invited to participate. Art laboratories (ceramics, metallurgy, and painting) are also organised and often inspired by the Arslantepe finds.
Recently, fashion shows were organized in the Caravanserai of Battalgazi and in Istanbul with clothes using fabrics designed with the motifs of the 4th millennium seals from Arslantepe.

Local awareness of the importance of the site is thus rather strong and constitutes a good base from which to start a broad and all-inclusive promotion program.

2.1.5. Information Sources and Archaeological Record

Finds

The Arslantepe dig house complex includes a large storehouse made of various storerooms for the finds that are processed during the excavation seasons, drawn, photographed, registered into a database, and carefully stored, divided by category of finds and by periods, in such rooms. At the end of the excavation season the most well preserved, completely restored, and important objects are selected by the government representatives and the excavation director to be handed over to the Malatya Archaeological Museum, together with their data sheets (inventory). A second list of objects is also made with those finds that are considered to be not so important as to be exhibited in the museum, but are worthy of particular consideration for study reasons (studying). These are partly stored in the excavation house storages, partly in the Malatya Museum storehouse. All the other materials brought to light by the excavation are likewise entirely stored at the excavation house. The storerooms are locked and sealed when the excavation season is off and any permission to access them has to come from the Ministry of Culture and Tourism or the Malatya Museum. The finds from the early excavations, before the construction of the Malatya Museum (1969), were sent to Ankara.

Paper, Photo and Digital Archive

The paper archive of the excavation consists of a huge documentation relating to the Italian excavations since 1961 and contains hundreds of excavation notebooks, plans, stratigraphic sections, unit sheets, a very large number of drawings and lists of finds. Together with these is the photographic documentation that includes a wide range of formats (black and white photographs, coloured photographs, slides and videos, digital photographs). Digital photographs are kept in Hard Disks and in CDs. The Italian Archaeological Expedition MAIAO is facing the issues concerning the storage and updating of the format of this huge archive due to the changing nature of the technology used.

Part of the paper documentation has been already digitised and the finds have been recorded in a digital database that is in process of being continuously increased and updated. All this archive is kept in the office of the Arslantepe Excavation Team at the Sapienza University of Rome, but copies are also kept at the Arslantepe excavation house for work during the excavation season.

The photo archive prepared by the Arslantepe Excavation Team is available in print, slide and digital format. They are used for scientific and not commercial purposes. The whole archive of pictures documents the history of excavations, the methodology of field research adopted in the course of time, the various members of the team (academicians, restorers, technicians, students, specialists, etc.) and workers as well as the social life in the excavation house. In order to use these materials in unofficial websites, TV programs,
documentaries, brochures, magazines, books etc. the permission of the Italian Archaeological Mission and the Sapienza University of Rome is needed.

At the end of each excavation season, annual archive reports are prepared. These detailed reports, which also include photos and drawings, are archived by the General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums.

**Publications**

The first results of the French excavations carried out by L. Delaporte have been published in a volume: *Malatya. Arslantepe. La Porte des Lions*, Paris 1940.

Results of the Italian excavations have been regularly published in many scientific international journals, books and book chapters. More than 200 papers have been published by Marcella Frangipane and her team.

The first excavation monographic reports by the Italian team since 1961 have been published in three volumes in the Series *Orientis Antiqui Collection*:

*Malatya* II, by E. Equini Schneider, 1970;

Other thorough presentations of the excavation results have come out in thematic issues of the journal *Origini* (1973, 1983 and 2012).

The most recent publications appeared as monographic volumes have been published in two S and in two Series, *(ARSLANTEPE* and *SPO* respectively), edited by Prof. Marcella Frangipane at Sapienza University of Rome.

**In the Series “ARSLANTEPE”:**

The already published volumes are:
- *Arslantepe V*-2007, *Arslantepe Cretulae* (the integral presentation and analysis of the thousands of cretulae from the 4th millennium Palace, Late Chalcolithic), by M. Frangipane et al.;
- *Arslantepe IX*-2013, *The Late Bronze Age*, by F. Manuelli.

In preparation:
- *Arslantepe IV-1*, *The Late Chalcolithic 5 (Period VIA)*, by M. Frangipane et al.
- *Arslantepe IV-2*, *The ceramic assemblage of Arslantepe Period VI A and its significance in food related practices*, by M.B. D’Anna;
- *Arslantepe VI-1*, Period VIB1, by G. Palumbi et al.

**In the Series SPO (Studi di Preistoria Orientale):**


Annual reports are also published in the Symposium on Excavation and Researches in Turkey. The excavation reports are published by the Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism both in printed version and online.

All these publications narrate the long-term works fulfilled in this site, present the findings and their contexts, the chronological framework of crucial events and processes occurred at Arslantepe in the course of the long time span represented in the site, the results
of intersdisciplinary studies carried out by specialists of various disciplines that show economic practices and climatic and environmental changes across time. They more in general highlight the historical value and importance of Arslantepe (in terms of world archaeology and culture).

**Website**

Two distinct but linked web sites shall be implemented in order to be able to work more effectively on the scientific and research matters concerning the site of Aslantepe (web site managed by the excavation team) and on the informative, touristic and educational aspects of the visit (implemented and managed by the Malatya Archaeology Museum and Provincial Directorate of Culture and Tourism). The two web sites will be accessed through a single homepage and will thus appear to the user as a unitary site, but the autonomy of its two parts shall facilitate updating and correctness of information.

The basic excavation data, information regarding education and publications is already be accessible through [www.arslantepe.com](http://www.arslantepe.com).

- Excavation reports,
- Education,
- Metallurgy,
- Earthenware,
- Unpublished doctoral dissertations,
- Surface analysis,
- Projects and
- Protection and Restoration

The website has Turkish, English and Italian versions. It provides information on how to reach the site is rich in photographic data and provides communication on events related with the site. This part will be conveyed to the informative and touristic section of the website, where a more interactive interface will also be implemented, with the aim of bringing the silent groups who may have opinions about Arslantepe to participate with opinions, discussions and forum groups and thus aid in increasing awareness and participation by creating an “Arslantepe community and network”.

The web site will be regularly updated and is operated in cooperation by the MAIAO (Archaeological team), the Provincial Directorate of Culture and Tourism and Malatya Museum, and the Battalgazi Municipality.

In particular, the MAIAO will be responsible of the scientific and research section of the website, whilst the Provincial Directorate of Culture and Tourism, the Malatya Museum and the Battalgazi Municipality will implement and be responsible of the touristic, educational and social section.

**2.2. Current Condition of Site**

**2.2.1. Current Excavations**

The ongoing programme of excavations is central to the better understanding and its history and significance. The following are ongoing operational issues and targets at the site:
**Research issues:** On the medium-long term the broad research questions that are leading excavations are:

- A further investigation of the origin of State and bureaucracy, through the enlargement and further understanding of the palatial area,
- The process of development of hierarchies, through the investigations of the earlier formative stages and,
- The forms and dynamics of the Hittite period occupation and the investigations of the development of the Melid kingdom, through the analysis of the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age levels

1. **Practical seasonal targets**
   - protection of trenches during the excavation period
   - restoration of archaeological finds,
   - annual monitoring of the state of preservation of the palace mud-brick structures and
   - analysis and cataloguing of archaeological finds, seasonally brought to light and stored.

2. **End of season targets:**
   - secure storage
   - handing over of inventoried objects to the Malatya Archaeological Museum
   - secure closing of the excavation and weather proofing as necessary.

3. **Long Term Considerations:**
   - protection and conservation of outstanding architectural remains and artefacts,
   - on-site conservation of monuments and special findings for display where necessary,
   - on and off site storage and
   - off-site display of finds.

Working space is outdoors and, as the excavation season is in summer, this has not caused great problems until now. A broad plan for new spaces might evaluate the creation of workspace too, especially since computers and digital instruments are now more common work equipment and need to be protected from atmospheric events.

3.1.1. **Protection and Conservation on Site**

**Architectural Remains and Wall Paintings**

Archaeology and conservation at Arslantepe have been two strictly linked matters; in fact, though the investigation and knowledge in a *tell* necessarily imply the removal of levels to thoroughly analyse the entire historical developments, it became immediately clear that some finds at Arslantepe were so monumental, historically and architecturally exceptional that they should not be destroyed, and preservation of such structures was felt as an obligation. A large quota of the available resources for the archaeological research have thus been devoted in the years to the preservation of structures, through the maintenance of mud-brick walls and construction of shelters that kept water - the main cause of destruction of mud architecture - away from the areas to be preserved. When the wall paintings started coming to light, preservation became even more crucial; it took years to uncover the
paintings with figurative motifs over extended surfaces, through a delicate and minute work of mechanical removal of superimposed plaster, cleaning and preserving the cleaned surfaces by restorers. The complexity of this operation was increased by the presence of multiple coats of paint, by the delicacy of the pictorial material used (ochre and charcoal) and by the combined presence of impressed decoration.

Restorers specialized in wall frescos and mud architecture have intervened on the walls, bringing the paintings to light, and carrying out conservative and stabilizing operations, which were mostly precautionary conservation actions. After long observations and discussions between the archaeologists and the restorers, it was decided not to remove the paintings from the walls but to preserve them in situ. This has meant that an accurate protection system and constant monitoring was needed. The “restoration” that has been carried out has essentially been a routine procedure of preventive and programmed conservation; minimal restoration has been made: controlled seepage of powdered soil from the same structure to consolidate small fragments that had fallen off, repair in those places where small insects dig into the walls, light maintenance for the removal of soil that deposits on the surface during the winter. A second specific roofing have been constructed above the painted surfaces, to ensure protection from any possible small drop of water and curtains have been hung to these secondary roofs to protect the paintings from sun and light.
Most important is the annual monitoring, consisting of a direct and meticulous observation of the most critical points and a comparison with the previous conditions by photographically documenting the state of the paintings every year.

In 30 years of intervention we have been able to create a protocol of actions and have observed that finds as fragile and instable as these, once brought to light can be stabilized, preserved and resist to environmental factors if since the very first moment of their discovery they are protected from water and humidity by covering them and leaving the air circulate (the roofing must be open on the sides), and are the object of constant attention and monitoring. The only real danger for the paintings might come from accidents caused by human actions, what makes crucial the regulation of tourist visits, which must always be carried out with the guidance of guardians or museum personal.. Yet, the sequence of images from 1987 to today testifies the excellent state of preservation of the wall painting.

Besides the preservation of wall paintings and decoration the mud brick walls themselves must be protected. The walls of the palatial complex are monumentally preserved to outstanding heights and thickness, with formidable stone basements and the original white plaster still in situ. A channel system has also been brought to light below the floors that allowed water to flow out of the building through the central access corridor, together with monumental thresholds, door hinges, mud plastered benches and basins. All these elements are perfectly preserved, with their original plaster and, thanks to the roof cover that has always been secured above them (even during the excavation), are today in the exact condition they were when found.

The long-term observation has demonstrated that whilst the mud-brick structures that remain exposed to water and snow are fully destroyed, those protected by a roof substantially maintain their conditions. Climatic stability is assured by a carefully planned covering structure made of steel poles and multilayer and wooden panels, which has been conceived in order to resist to the weight of snow, not to cause any perforation in the underlying archaeological levels, while leaving the air circulate, thus maintaining optimal conditions of temperature and humidity. A non-invasive and protection procedure has been therefore implemented, which simply protects the buildings, and does not use any chemical consolidation material, which rather would damage the thick mud-brick walls over time. The walls are entirely original and no reconstruction of the structures has been done.
Cracks due to thermal stress provoked by the strong seasonal excursions may occur and need monitoring, but they can easily be repaired by expert restorers by using the same original mud material. The presence of the multilayer roof panels on the exterior and the wood coating inside has minimised the impact of these alterations as it maintains a relatively constant temperature, whereas the ventilation secured by the open sides of the cover system has eliminated the problem of humidity and consequently the covered walls, the problem of plant and mildew growth.

Finally, insects (mostly wasps) tend to nest within the more chaffy mudbrick; whilst this rarely happens on the plastered parts of the walls which are more compact, and very limitedly thus hamper the wall paintings, monitoring of wasp nests is however important to assure a good preservation of the wall structures.

According to what has been shown above, the monitoring of the palatial buildings should consider the following indicators:
- Changes in the number of cracks on the mud-brick walls
- Possible enlargement of existing fractures
- Changes in the inclination of the walls
- Possible collapse of small pieces of plaster
- Fall of fragments of material (plaster and or mud) in the basal area of the walls
- Appearance of small holes caused by insects
- Possible alterations due to human actions

The first 6 types of minor damages (excluding the possible unpredictable damages by human actions) can be easily controlled and repaired by using the traditional materials (mud and straw) by expert restorers. These are actively present in the Italian archaeological team.

What visitors see today at Arslantepe are the authentic walls of the IV millennium BCE palace, exactly as archaeologists saw them when bringing them to light the first time.

**Security of the site and remains**

Arslantepe is protected by a perimeter wall and fence; at the basis of the mound and within its same perimeter is the excavation dig house and deposits. The dig house has been gradually built in the years, and grown from the single small mud-brick structure existing in 1961 at the beginning of the Italian excavations to comprehend now 4 independent structures, all built with the traditional mud-brick technique. These buildings serve as lodgings and work area for the archaeologists and specialists and as deposits for the archaeological materials.
A large storehouse and three smaller distinct storages are filled with archaeological material and get sealed by the Malatya Archaeological Museum authorities when the work season is closed. Various shelters are also present and modified upon need, where sherds are stacked. The quantity of materials found during the uninterrupted for almost 60 years of excavation are uncountable and these storages are now starting to be non-sufficient. Further storage spaces need to be constructed within a broad and all-inclusive planning of the work and living space, as will be further evidenced below. Another problem of the existing structures is their maintenance; roofs need to be repaired and general maintenance planned.

Lodging is provided at the excavation house for team members, but these too are now insufficient and every year shifts amongst the participants have to be planned in order to be able to host everyone.

The dig house is within the fence protecting the site but has a distinct entrance to that of tourists. Information boards inform about the two distinct entrances, but often tourists mistakenly go knocking at the dig house; it might thus be useful to find a better way of signalling the difference.

Both excavation house and site have a guardian and the area is thus entirely controlled. The site guardian has a small building at the open air museum entrance, where guardians take shifts to cover the site over the 24 hours, whilst the excavation guardian lives at the excavation dig house.

The areas of the mound that are not currently under excavation are covered by vegetation, regularly cleaned by the MAIAO and site guardians, but needing further attention.

The mound has been in the past a source of soil for building materials (mud brick) and there are a series of holes which refer to soil removal by the village inhabitants in the years preceding its regular archaeological excavation. Other disturbances on the surfaces are due to the old excavation trenches made in the 1930s and 40s, when the French expedition was working at the site, and in the early 60s. The northern edge of the mound excavated in the 1960s and 70s nearly down to the level of the surrounding plain has high vertical sections that still stand in a rather good condition even though having suffered from weather erosion during the years. This area has not been included until now in the visitor’s itinerary as it would need to be further investigated and secured. The vertical sections that delimit the area of the 3300 BCE palatial complex are under control and secured by the MAIAO excavation team since these are within the exhibited area. A regular long term security plan, carried out in coordination with the museum authorities, should however include the protection of such sections too, as weather and time will increase security problems related to the high vertical earthen sections.

Soil from the excavations is being dumped along the western edges of the mound that are particularly eroded, and in this way the accumulated soil helps to protect the se edges and the archaeological strata behind them. Only occasionally, in the past, the soil removed in the digging operations has been used to fill in the various holes in the mound.

The Project for a roofing installation over the fourth millennium Palace

**Technical Issues**

As for the technical problems, the initial difficulties stemmed from the fact that this is a vast and monumental area in which the buildings have been preserved up to a height of 2-2.5 meters (which is very uncommon with sites of such antiquity), with much of the original
white plaster still in place, and with extraordinarily interesting figurative paintings that are being beautifully preserved on some of the walls. These paintings, which were unearthed as a result of many years of restoration work, have been consolidated and monitored every year in order to maintain them in situ. A copy of some of them has been conversely made in the Malatya Museum.

These features made it obvious that in this case there was absolutely no question of protecting the walls by covering them with fresh plaster, which is at any rate highly questionable in terms of effectiveness of protection and maintenance of the perception of the original wall. Even the practice of rebuilding new sections of the wall on top of the ancient walls in order to protect them, quite apart from the controversial character of this procedure that was proved to be totally ineffective for the protection of the original walls without further intervention to cover the structures, would have been even less sensible in our case considering the high level of integrity of the conserved walls and the original plasterwork, which could therefore not be plastered over to even out the surface of the walls, while the new added parts could prove to be even dangerous for the preservation of the original walls. The walls of the Arslantepe palace complex, furthermore, are between 1 and 1.20 m thick, making it impossible to envisage any form of chemical consolidation, which would be unable to adequately penetrate throughout the whole thickness, creating more problems they might solve. From when they were first discovered these structures immediately appeared as being unique in terms of their monumentality, state of preservation and their historical value, and we covered them with provisional roofing which we had to remove every year, so long as we were working in the bordering areas or expanding the excavation of the palace complex, and then replace again for the winter. In this way we discovered that the roofing and the protection against the water, while maintaining a circulation of air was the ideal solution for preserving these monuments. And they have indeed been kept in almost perfect condition for more than 30 years, during the long period taken to bring them to light on such a vast surface area and under more than 10m of stratified archaeological levels from the 3rd and 2nd millennia BCE, despite the rudimentary roofing we had built at the end of every excavation season. The problems only arose when there was water seepage or when small holes were made in the metal roofing as a result of removing and then replacing the nails. On the painted parts we provided a double layer of roof protection to obviate these risks. The protection afforded by the roofing was always accompanied by annual check-ups and maintenance work on the masonry where we discovered cracks or erosion. This maintenance work, which is quite easy, and must be performed at all times using traditional materials, that is to say mud mixed with fine chaff, is at any rate essential for the conservation of mud-brick structures, even if they are protected by roofing.

Another problem to be faced was the fact that the Arslantepe palace complex had not only emerged from underneath a long sequence of levels belonging to subsequent periods, but also rested on an equally long sequence of underlying archaeological strata, which we did not want to interfere with. For, even though our team will almost certainly never excavate them, since we have decided to preserve the extraordinary and unique fourth millennium buildings found in that area, the underlying levels had to be protected at all events if someone, one day, might take a different decision.

The third series of technical problems had to do, besides the vastness of the area to be protected, with the numerous terraces and topographic levels on which the buildings stood, with the already mentioned fragility of the structures (all of them built of mud bricks and plastered with mud), and with the harsh winter climate in the Malatya plain where heavy
snowfalls are frequent. This meant that the roofing had to be very solid, though at the same time built without foundations to avoid damaging the underlying levels, it could not rest on the walls which were too fragile and yet had to enable all the rooms to be totally visible, it had to be adjusted to the many differences in altitude and be aesthetically “light” in order not to disturb a proper fruition of the buildings. After conducting various experiments and tests across the years, the MAIAO designed a project of roofing that would be able to take account of all these problems and at the same time, and primarily, respect the spirit and the characteristics of the architectural complex that it was designed to cover.

**The Characteristics of the Roofing at Arslantepe**

The project comprises a very solid metal structure with vertical posts resting on kind of narrow metal bridges passing around the walls and fixed to the ground on both sides of the wall on small reinforced concrete bases, built directly on the spot in order to adhere to the irregular surface of the ground. This made it possible to avoid sinking holes or damaging the underlying archaeological layers. The metal bridges were then linked by horizontal iron beams suspended on the top of the walls, and therefore mostly invisible, which, together with the roofing beams, link all the parts of the structure, making it stable. In this way, and with the help of steel tie-rods, the structure does not rock, even though there are no foundations. The vertical pillars holding up the roof all run along the walls, leaving the rooms free, but they do not rest directly on the walls, rather on the metal bridges which unload the weight onto the ground in two points instead of one; the overall weight of the structure, which is quite imposing in order to meet the need to withstand the weight of the snow, is therefore better distributed. This is particularly important also considering the variable and irregular solidity of the ground below.

The roofing at Arslantepe was conceived of, not as an anonymous single covering of the excavation area, but as the reconstitution of a series of roofs related to the individual buildings, with different heights depending upon the ground height of the terraces. This has made it possible to overcome the problem of the varying altitudes, and also to enable the visitor immediately to see from outside (i.e. from above) the arrangement of the buildings in the monumental complex, while at the same time giving the perception of the volume of every building inside the complex. The roofing is therefore composed of modules, which can be added or removed, making it flexible and susceptible to future extensions that will probably be needed as the excavations continue.
Even though there was no intention to reconstruct anything, the idea was that every building would have its own roof cover, and the mud brick walls would be protected, as occurs in reality with all contemporary mud brick buildings, by the fact that they had their own roof. And so without intending to reconstruct the original roofs in any way whatsoever, the actual roofing has been made of wooden boards, covered on the outside by a multilayer insulating material, and all the metal structures in the roofing are also timber clad; this gives the visitor the perception of the colours, materials and the characteristics of the traditional roofs, which, also in the case of our buildings, must have been supported by wooden beams, as indicated clearly from the findings in the excavation. The great heights of the roofs create the sense of monumentality which the buildings must have had in ancient times and refer to the fact that they must have been very high even though in some instances they probably had two storeys.

The last carefully studied aspect of the project was the lighting of the protected area. The roof is opaque, and this is good because it affords better protection against light and the sun to the plasterwork and above all to the painted parts. But this open-air museum had to be illuminated by a natural light. And so we thought of making provision for light to enter not only from the open sides all around the complex from where the air also enters, but also from those points inside the palace which, according to our reconstruction, would have been open in those days: in other words, the large central courtyard and the middle section of the access corridor. These parts have therefore been covered with special shatterproof glass, allowing the light to enter inside the buildings in the points where we think the daylight must have originally entered. We are thinking of installing light white canvases inside corresponding with these glass points, to suggest the way in which the open areas in traditional buildings are often covered - such as in the large courtyards in the bazaars - and may even have been covered in ancient times. The spirit underlying the design and the construction of the roofing of the huge palace complex at Arslantepe was therefore not merely to generically protect an archaeological area but rather to preserve a homogeneous architectural complex and return it to the public, restoring spaces, volumes, colours and light, and recreating an atmosphere as close as possible to the original.
Below Ground Conditions

Virgin soil has been reached by excavations only on the northern edge of the mound, very near to a spring that was possibly present in prehistoric times too. Archaeological strata are well protected in the delimited area of the mound. The roof system covering the palatial structure has dug no foundations underground (see description below) and thus the earlier archaeological building levels below the palace have been preserved too. This is particularly important as it preserves layers for further generations of researchers. We do indeed suspect that probably other earlier important buildings may lie under the extraordinary Arslantepe Palace.

3.1.2. Restoration and Conservation of Finds

As with the architecture, the Arslantepe team gives primary attention to the restoration of all finds. During every campaign two to four restorers work on the finds. All sherds from the excavation are laid out on long lines of tables and attaches are searched for all items and not uniquely for those pots that are clearly found whole. This is preliminary to any serious study of the materials. All sherds composing a pot are sought in order to recompose the pots as integral as possible and then the best preserved pots are completely restored. The restoration techniques followed are concerned with the ethic and aesthetic rules of correct restoration. Colour pigments are added to the gypsum used for integrations in order to give the pot a harmonious look; the integration is visible but not disturbing.
Metal objects are mechanically cleaned and consolidated. Agents that prevent the flourishing of oxides are then applied. Unbaked clay objects, as sealings (cretulae) are cleaned and consolidated with a highly diluted paraloid.

3.1.3. Presentation on site

**Presentation policy**

It was, on the other hand, the awareness of the archaeologists of MAIAO that in their long investigation at Arslantepe, they had acquired information and knowledge on fundamental historical and anthropological importance, and, on the other hand, the extraordinary state of preservation of the architectural and material testimony of that knowledge, which has made clear the urgency of disseminating and transmitting this knowledge sharing it with a broader public. By displaying the whole palace complex we are able to tell the story of birth of the State and bureaucracy, as well as the complex processes and and dynamics of the emergence of social and economic hierarchies giving rise to a new society that is at the roots of our contemporary world and that allows us to understand many
aspects of it. The challenge we faced was how to enable the public to share this extraordinary experience through direct contact with the very place in which these events and processes occurred, enabling the place to “speak” to them itself. This also meant that we had to prepare the public, at least in part, to know how what they are being told was originally discovered and understood, thus becoming aware of the many uncertainties and obscure points that form an integral part of any archaeological research, and any scientific truth in general. Arslantepe, in our intention, was then to become an opportunity to disseminate the sense and the importance, the researches on our past, as well as the perception of its difficulty, limitations and extraordinary potential, involving the public in the desire to know and understand facts, phenomena and processes of profound relevance to them, following the path that archaeologists had followed. It is therefore necessary not only to enable them to understand the monuments and its architecture, spaces and functions, but also to find out information about the objects and materials that have been found there, recovered and analysed, and are no longer in their place, which are the basis of the archaeological and historical reconstruction. Many of these remains can be viewed at the Malatya Museum, restored and recomposed, while others are no longer visible - and to a certain extent they have never been tangible because their sense and meaning has emerged from the results of archaeological and laboratory analyses conducted on them. A link must therefore be traced between the visit of the site and that of the Archaeological Museum in the town. But knowledge of all these ‘fragments of the past’, of their associations and spatial and functional relations, of the clues they reveal regarding the ancient activities and relations between individuals and groups, must be acquired first in the physical place in which those archaeological materials originally existed, left behind by the people who produced and used them, and were buried for millennia, before they were brought to light again by the archaeologists.

This is an arduous task that would be well tackled with the combined use of traditional explanatory panels, existing now at the site, and interactive systems of communication, that needs to be planned and produced.

The more traditional panel explanations present at the open-air museum have been created in cooperation with Semiotics and communication experts from Palermo University. This cooperation had already been successfully tested at the 2004 Arslantepe exhibition at Trajan’s Markets in Rome.

The process of turning an archaeological site into a museum, making it visitable to the wide public, presents many critical aspects. Some have to do with practical issues, common to any open air museum (the need to protect the finds, to make people visit the site without risks, but also the need to attract people and to give a good answer to their expectations in terms of information’s completeness and depth), some others concern specific issues of the individual expectations and therefore need specific solutions. At Arslantepe such specific aspects had to do with: a) the characteristics of what was to be exposed, i.e. an articulated palatial complex that keep together in a relatively small space a number of areas dedicated to different practices (places of cult, spaces for conservation and redistribution of food, common spaces etc.); b) the presence of a still active excavation, and then, on the one hand, the need to host visitors in an environment where professionals and workers are operating, and on the other hand the chance to integrate in the visiting route, year after year, new finds; c) the nature and quantity of information to be transmitted, in the absence at the site of the most important finds (such as the famous Arslantepe’s swords) that for security reasons are obviously kept in the Malatya museum. The last is a very critical point since the
archaeological mission of University of Rome “La Sapienza” during its almost sixty-year excavation has produced a huge amount of data and very detailed reconstructions of the life at this site. The main goal of the musealization project has been not only to provide complete and reliable information, but also to communicate it in an effective way to different kinds of public specialists, amateurs of archaeology, and simple tourists. In order to structure the communication project, both in theory and in practice, a ‘semiotic’ approach has been followed. From a Semiotic point of view, creating a museum doesn’t have simply to do with displaying finds and spaces trying to reconstruct their original appearance and function, but to make people understand their real historical significance and value. The value of an artefact, as well as that of architecture, is never only a value of the object in itself, but it is mainly the result of its being part of a ‘context’ and reflecting important events and historical facts; the ability to transmit the value of archaeological findings is therefore in the way the information is constructed, the object is shown and its significance suggested, in other words, the way its value is communicated to the public.

In particular, the key concept on which Semioticians have focused is one of “experience”. Making a museum means not only giving information to the visitors but also, and above all, making the knowledge they acquire relevant for them. Only by involving the visitors, both cognitively and emotionally, in the construction of their knowledge the visit to a Museum may become effective. Space, for example, should not be considered as a mere theatre of the events that took place inside it thousands years ago, but an active presence that can still stimulate sensations and feelings. What we need then is to enable space (as well as objects, paintings etc.) to produce meanings again, giving back sense to its articulation. The visiting route in this way becomes a transformative path for the visitor, who not only changes his knowledge of the past, but also, in a deeper perspective, perceives substantial links with it and transforms his or her approach to the present. In order to achieve such a goal, it becomes indispensable to think the information to be given, the media that convey it and the spaces where it is transmitted all together as a single meaningful structure.

Another point that characterises the Arslantepe open air museum project is that we decided to develop, besides the transmission of the complex and wide ranging information, and indeed because of it, a parallel discourse about how discoveries have been done, thematising the process of constructing history. This approach has a double purpose: fascinating and making people think; fascinating because deducting a story from a few elements has the charm of solving a mystery. Making people think because we want to make clear that every reconstruction, despite its accuracy and reliability, is always a hypothesis to be continuously tested. The visitor is not offered an absolute truth, but, exactly as happens to the archaeologist, with a series of clues, which can lead to diverse hypotheses. In this way the visitor is further stimulated to participate himself in this fascinating process of historical reconstruction, as if it were an intriguing detective inquiry.

**Arslantepe Identity**

The first step in constructing Arslantepe’s identity has been the creation of a logo to help distinguishing this site from the others present in Turkey and creating its own brand image. The inspiration for the logo came from one of the seal designs impressed on the cistulae found at Arslantepe: two lions that make visible the meaning of the word Arslan in Turkish.
However, a logo is just the top of the iceberg of a communication project. According to Semiotics, in order to create a stable, effective identity, it is important to define a brand rationale to be followed in all communication products. Such rationale has been identified in the idea of presenting archaeological discoveries not only as windows that open to the past but also as an instrument to read present and future. Understanding how the first form of “salary” appeared how working tasks were for the first time differentiated thus creating social differences and “classes”, how the need for weapons came out, make us think about our contemporary world in a different and more thorough way. According to such considerations, we realized advertising using together with pictures of finds and ancient objects as it is usually done, also images referring to the present day, evocating the topics Arslantepe helps to illuminate. The origin of mass production, the control of labour-force, war, state administration and a sophisticated bureaucracy are the key themes stressed putting together past and present, known and unknown. The ‘origins of power’ was chosen as the “title” of the exhibition that summarizes what has to be expected from the visit.

Information has been given with traditional explanatory panels placed along the visiting route which convey meanings using traditional communication strategies. Written in three languages (English, Turkish and Italian), they are richly illustrated in order to show the finds, including the objects that are kept in Malatya’s museum, as well as the reconstruction of places and activities. The positioning of such panels follows a narrative sequence, which has to gradually “construct” the visitor as a competent observer able to correctly interpret what he or she is observing. Therefore, each panel doesn’t simply come together with the finds to explain them but tries to anticipate information, putting the visitor in the condition to correctly interpret the findings once he or she comes into contact with them. For this purpose, three principal informative areas have been created: one at the beginning of the visit, immediately after the entrance to the site, in order to introduce the broader historical context in which the facts narrated in the palace have to be included; the second before the actual entrance to the palace, in order to tell the story of its birth, general characteristics and historical significance; the third in an internal courtyard which is the heart of the palace’s economic activity. The latter shows the way of functioning of the main and various storage redistribution and administrative activities performed in the public buildings and the procedures of their archaeological reconstruction. A fourth information area will be
implemented in the recently found political core of the Palace, in a large courtyard where people used to gather to be received by the authority in the first known example of “audience” practices performed by political rulers.

As far as the panels used inside the site’s visiting route are concerned, they have been designed in order to ensure a flexible reading experience using the verbal style and visual layout typical of newspapers. The title, centred on the table as a headline, has the purpose to catch attention, while the lead (above or under it) sums up the focus of the story that the panel tells in the text. On the one hand the lead encourages people to read the full text, on the other hand it gives them the indispensable information to understand further panels and to follow the story also without reading the full text. Images, not only give important visual information (i.e. geographical positioning and migrations, etc.), but also show the finds that are now in the Malatya Museum.

Visitor infrastructure

The site is open to the public following official opening hours of Turkish museums (closed on Mondays). The mound has specifically built paths for tourists. Visitors cannot wander around the mound, but must follow these paths and be accompanied at all times. Rigorous pathways have also been designed inside the roofed monumental area so to guide the visit and protect the architectural structures.

Visitors can view excavation work taking place from outside, but cannot step into the work area. Security and scientific reasons are to blame for this. The possibility for the visitors to observe work taking place helps in explaining the aims and methods of archaeological research and is an integral part of the visit to the site.

The perception of the importance and monumentality of the Neo-Hittite period at the site is given to visitors on the way back in time and, further approaching the present proper entrance to the Tell (tepe). Here, they can admire real size stone copies of the Neo-Hittite reliefs and statues found at Arslantepe in the early excavations (now on display in Ankara, at the Anatolian Civilizations Museum), as well as of two reliefs found in recent years and displayed at the Malatya Archaeological museum. All these fantastic works have been made by a local sculptor, who has carved the statues again, exactly reproducing the originals. The Hittite king Tarhunza is there, and the lions and reliefs that decorated the city gates. These
have been made with the same stone used in the past, quarried from the Gelincik tepe that stands less than a kilometre from Arslantepe. Arslantepe thus welcomes its visitors starting with its last period of splendour for which Malatya has long been famous, when it was a Neo-Hittite capital. The traces of this phase, exhibited now in the Ankara museum, have with this operation somehow been returned to their original location.

An experimental 1:1 replica of an Arslantepe Early Bronze Age mud-brick house has also been built in 2010 in this entrance area. The plan, building materials and internal features of the house are those of the original structure, and have been reconstructed on the basis of a thorough architectural and archaeological analysis. The original aim of reconstructing this house was to investigate, and at the same time, exhibit the old mud-brick architecture techniques, and show to local modern inhabitants how their traditional houses have not changed for millennia. This should further help bridge the past with the present as well as being a very effective educational tool for the preservation of traditional cultural heritage.
Even though extremely important and useful within the general exhibition, the position of this house outside the present proper museum area may put that the structure in danger and, for this reason, it was decided not to complete its exhibition by positioning copies of the original objects inside it. Being a mud-brick structure, it obviously also needs maintenance. The lack of a guarded entrance to this area has hitherto prevented fully pursuing the initial aims of this operation. A further planning of the general open-air museum layout should evaluate the possibility of locating the guarded entrance to the Open Air Museum outside this access route, both protecting the valuable copies of the Neo-Hittite statues and allowing to make better use of this house.

The three separate plots to the south of the Arslantepe where Early Bronze I house is situated today owned by the private individuals. Even though this parcel is outside the first-degree archaeological site, the procedural steps for their expropriation were already initiated. The official letters exchanged between the General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums and the Malatya Museum, via the Provincial Directorate of Culture and Tourism, in 2015 and 2016 to start the expropriation procedures. The Malatya Museum submitted the photos, the maps, the information on the current title deeds and the sketches to the General Directorate. Following the assessment and evaluation by both parties, it was decided that an area of 6175 square meters was required.

At the moment at the Open-Air museum entrance visitors find a single toilet that suffers from poor cleaning and maintenance. A few seats and shade is provided in the same entrance area, but no selling booths for drinks or souvenirs are present so far in the vicinity.

**Future Exhibition Planning**

Even if the visit of the Palace leaves a positive impression on visitors, and panels are complete and clear in order to maximise users’ experience, the user himself needs to be disposed to fully get the meanings of what he sees. Structuring an exhibiting route in a correct way means providing, not only a competence knowledge about a past culture, but, before this, the willing to get it.

Willingness is not something that can be given for granted or assumed as a prerequisite of the visitor. A good museum needs to take care also of this aspect, stimulating people curiosity (wanting to know). The ideal visitor, as the perfect reader of a book, doesn’t exist in nature, he or she is always being constructed by the text itself (museum and book are considered texts in a semiotic perspective because both of them produce meanings). In order to acquire such a goal, Arslantepe’s communication should be extended over the limits of the tell, to the streets that lead to it, where indeed some panels have been positioned to stimulate in the visitor those questions to which he will find an answer visiting the site. But more can be made.

**New Technologies**

Innovative technological systems based on the use of palm computers or smart phones could be valuably adopted in the future in the Arslantepe open air museum: A device able to detect the position of the visitor within the tour and to display various contents according to the context being visited. This system would not only make it possible to present a quantity of information much higher than that contained in the printed panels (the number and dimension of which is limited by the physical space and the necessity of not disturbing the visual perception of the monuments), but also to implement different type of media, as, for example, videos. If appropriate funds will be found, specific rooms of the
palace could be accurately digitised in 3D (also thanks to laser scanner technology), rendered and animated, thus allowing not only to view the ancient buildings with a reality and richness in details until now unthinkable, but also to visualise the reconstructed activities that took place in the buildings, avoiding the needs for the visitor to read long texts in the traditional panels during the visit. It will be possible to actually see, for example, the storage rooms and the withdrawal/redistribution of foodstuffs performed there, as well as the sophisticated bureaucratic sealing and recording system with the use of cretulae. Thanks to the video, the complex series of operations that are at the base of the invention of accounting operations as we know them today will become clear and enthralling.

The first of this project is TarihimCebimde (my history in my pocket), which is operated at http://tarihim.battalgazi.bel.tr/. It is funded by the Fırat Development Agency in cooperation with the Battalgazi Municipality. Through this application not only the information on Arslantepe but also those on other historical sites and monuments of Eski Malatya can be listened and watched by the visitors.

TarihimCebimde broadcasts in three languages, Turkish, English and German as well as in sign language.

Malatya’nın Mirası Arslantepe Project, financed by Anadolu Efes, granted the audio guides in four languages, English, Turkish, Italian and German. Currently 10 audio guides are present at the Arslantepe Open Air Museum to be given to the visitors. Use of these audioguides has been monitored in these years and proved highly satisfactory. The audioguide tools however need to be increased in number in the near future.

Actions on the internet and social media too should be planned and carried out. Through the possibility of recalling other subjects or information on the internet, in fact, those who wish shall be able to go into more depth according to their interests and curiosity. Each visitor will be able to build his own personal visit, by deciding which information he wants to obtain, as if he had at his side an expert archaeologist ready to answer to any of his questions. Furthermore, the flexibility of this technology allows a continuous updating of the contents present in the palm computer and internet as new discoveries take place: a function that contributes to the involvement of the visitor with the activity of the archaeologist and stimulates its curiosity. Web navigators furthermore would be able to preview the experience
they will be able to go through once they visit Arslantepe. The use and implementation of social networks, as Facebook, Pinterest, twitter and others should be taken into consideration.

**Current problems linked to the Open-Air museum maintenance and management**

A list of existing problems linked to the open-air museum maintenance and management have been identified and are here listed and divided according to urgency. Most of these need sponsorships, but in some other cases dialogue and cooperation between the involved stakeholders could start solving the issues.

**Immediate needs**

- A new modular roof protection for the site should be added to include the newly excavated part of the palatial complex,
- The Open-Air museum zone should include the access area with the copies of the Neo-Hittite statues and the reconstruction of the Early Bronze Age house,
- More security and guide staff are needed in the Open-Air Museum as they have to accompany visitors along the way as well as control the entrance to the site, thus one guardian at a time is absolutely not enough,
- Cleaning of the site and maintenance of visitors’ paths need to be regularly guaranteed,
- Explicative panel system needs to be renewed according to the new finding,
- The museum area needs a better lighting system on the exterior of the mound and at the entrance. Artificial lights should conversely be avoided along the visiting paths inside the palace, where structures and paintings can be affected and damaged by them (the visiting hours and the lighting features of the roofing system allow visitors to enjoy the daylight),
- A security system should be planned for the protection of the most delicate and unique finds,
- Access to the site with a ticket system, even if symbolic in terms of price, might be considered,
- Another toilet and refreshment facilities would be useful,
- A larger number of audio-guides should be provided to the visitors,
- Brochures and guides for different type of users (adults and children) should be prepared and printed

**Possible Future needs**

- On the long term, parking space might turn out to become a problem and shall then have to be tackled,
- A tourist and cultural centre should be planned in the vicinities of the site,
- Creation of a tangible link between the site of Arslantepe and the Archaeological Museum
- A larger Museum is needed where the exhibition can be updated and improved.

The Ministry of Culture and Tourism prepared a Landscaping Project for Arslantepe which aimed at opening the site for visits in a controlled manner while preserving the site’s values, ensuring the transfer of the precise information about the site, increasing visitor
satisfaction and the site’s carrying capacity as a response to possible increase in visitor number, resolving problems caused by the current use and circulation, and meeting the needs of the site by benefiting modern technological equipment. The aforementioned needs are responded within these design projects which were approved by the decision of Sivas Regional Conservation Council dated 07/12/2017 numbered 4000. The implementation of the project is scheduled by the Ministry.

3.2. Tourism

Although Arslantepe is a site of great cultural and historic importance, its location in eastern Anatolia means it is much less likely to experience the pressures to sites in coastal areas, particularly those in close proximity to popular resorts. Nevertheless, in recent years much has been done to publicise the site, through press and other media and Arslantepe is becoming an increasingly known and recognised site in Turkey. The ever increasing number of public lectures on Arslantepe and its extraordinary discoveries requested from the director of the excavations, Prof. Marcella Frangipane, in different countries, as well as a number of international documentary made on the site and its historical value in recent years (see below) are also increasing the awareness of the importance of Arslantepe in the world. More general strategies of communication and touristic information should be however implemented and improved.

According to the statistics provided by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 25,735 people visited Arslantepe in 2015, 23,404 in 2016 and 51,315 in 2017. On the other hand, visitor numbers for Malatya Archaeology Museum where findings from Arslantepe are exhibited was 17,451 in 2016 and 25,270 in 2017. This means that Malatya Museum attracted nearly half of the numbers of people that visited Arslantepe that year. In order to better convey the site’s values to visitors, a well-prepared presentation scenario that will link the site and the museum is required.

There are just a few tour agents bringing their tours to Malatya. Their itinerary usually comprises of visiting Arslantepe, Malatya Museum and Old Malatya. Here are some statistical data regarding the number of tourists visited Malatya in recent years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Turkish Visitors</th>
<th>Number of Foreign Tourists</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>186,626</td>
<td>5,663</td>
<td>192,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>180,391</td>
<td>3,294</td>
<td>183,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>142,744</td>
<td>3,826</td>
<td>146,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistical data regarding number of check-ins in hotels*

Apart from these numeric figures, we unfortunately do not have information on visitor profiles such as their origin country, ages, gender, travel routes, location of accommodation, level of satisfaction and so on. This analysis would help better formulate province-wide visitor management policies in the future.

**A Destination of Giants**

Arslantepe lies between two other important historical monuments of Turkey, both of which were inscribed into the UNESCO Heritage List more than three decades ago: Mount Nemrut and Great Mosque and Hospital of Divriği.
To the southeast of Arslantepe lies the Nemrut Dağ (Mount Nemrut), which is only about 100 km far from Malatya and takes about 2 hours to reach. It cradles the mausoleum of Antiochus I (69–34 B.C.), who reigned over Commagene, a kingdom founded north of Syria and the Euphrates after the breakup of Alexander’s empire, the giant and unique statues of gods, goddesses, eagles, lions as well as the magnificent epitaphs depicting the scenes belonging the Hellenistic era.

To the north lies the Great Mosque and Hospital of Divriği (a district of Sivas Province). Emir Ahmet Shah in 1228-29 founded a mosque, with its adjoining hospital, at Divriği after this region of Anatolia had been conquered by the Turks at the early 11th century. The mosque has a single prayer room and is crowned by two cupolas. The highly sophisticated technique of vault construction and a creative, exuberant type of decorative sculpture – particularly on the three doorways, in contrast to the unadorned walls of the interior – are the unique features of this masterpiece of Islamic architecture. The distance between Malatya and Divriği is about 190 km. There is a highway connection over Arapgir District of Malatya. It may take about 3 hours to get there from Malatya.

A tour destination covering Divriği-Arslantepe-Mount Nemrut may be an attractive alternative for the tourists travelling as backpackers or travel agents which are capable of taking many tourists.

3.3. Promoting Arslantepe

2.4.1. Arslantepe Lectures

Prof. Dr. Marcella Frangipane, who is the head of the Arslantepe Archaeology Mission since 1990, has been giving main lectures on Arslantepe and related topics in various countries, some of which in the last years have been ‘public lectures’.
These lectures have greatly contributed to particularly inform the universities, academic circles, students and wider public about the discoveries at Arslantepe showing how this site has greatly contributed to the understanding of the rise of an early State system. In these lectures, Prof. Dr. Frangipane elucidated crucial processes of formation of early hierarchical societies and change from the prevailing use of religious / ideological consensus in ceremonial practices conducted by the first leaders to the direct exercise of political power in more secular and already codified forms in a new emerging type of state society.

Besides dozens of conference presentations by M. Frangipane and her team, here are some of the Academic and Public Lectures given by Prof. Dr. M. Frangipane on Arslantepe in recent years:

**Italy:**
- University of Rome La Sapienza (2011 and 2016);
- Universities of Pavia, Florence, Siena, Bologna, Trieste, Venice, Palermo, Perugia, Udine (various years)
  - Florence, Tourism A (2017)
  - Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei (2010 and 2018)

**Turkey:**
- University of Istanbul (2011 and 2013);
- Boğaziçi University-Istanbul (2003);
- Institut Français d’Études Anatoliennes (IFEA)-Istanbul (2011)
- Denizli (2013)
- Ankara, General Directorate of Monuments and Museums (2013)
- Türk Eskiçağ Bilimleri Enstitüsü - Istanbul (2014)
- AKMED Institute-Antalya (2014)
- Koç University, Istanbul (2016)
- Inonu University, Malatya (2015)
- Malatya, Battalgazi Municipality (2014)
- Malatya Metropolitan Municipality (2016)
  - Malatya, Yesilyurt Municipality (2017)
- Australia: University of Sydney (2018)

**France:**
- Auditorium of Louvre-Paris (2001);
- University of Paris I-Sorbonne (2013);
Spain: UniversidadAutonoma de Madrid (2011, 2015, 2018); Universidad de Barcelona (2010)

Germany: University of Heidelberg (2006 and 2013); FreieUniversität Berlin (2011 and 2013); University of Kiel (2009); MonteliusLecture, University of Bochum (2017);

Switzerland: Conference Palace in Lugano;


Georgia: University of Tbilisi, Key-note Lecture (2016)


Mexico: UniversidadNacionalAutonoma de Mexico, Mexico City (2016)
       Colegio de Mexico, Mexico City (2016)

Australia: University of Sydney, McNicoll Lecture (2018)
           University of Adelaide, McNicoll Lecture (2018)
           University of Brisbane, McNicoll Lecture (2018)

2.4.2. Teaching Arslantepe

Battalgazi Municipality’s Culture and Social Affairs Department, in coordination with the Provincial Directorate of Culture and Tourism, organized Arslantepe lectures for the secondary and high school students in Malatya in 2015 just after Arslantepe had been inscribed into the UNESCO World Heritage Tentative List. Within these lectures, a team of said department consisting of director, a consultant and other concerned staff together with the lecturer visited almost all the schools.

Arslantepe conferences for secondary-school students
(Credit: Battalgazi Municipality Press Office)
These were held in cooperation with the Directorate of Culture and Tourism and Directorate of Education. Bülent Korkmaz, the lecturer, who is a tourism researcher, a professional tourist guide and columnist who wrote several articles about the history, culture, tourism of Malatya as well as Arslantepe, informed the students. In addition to these organizations, Korkmaz occasionally made speeches on Arslantepe to the students of the local schools and Inonu University between 2015 and 2018.

2.4.3 Tourist Guides’ Visit to Arslantepe

Gaziantep Regional Association of Professional Tourist Guides (GARO) started to organize the Gourmet Tours for its members in 2015 to train them about the cuisine of Gaziantep, Hatay, Malatya, Kahramanmaraş and Kilis. When the guides came to Malatya in 2015, they visited Arslantepe archaeological site and were informed by Bülent Korkmaz, who is also member of GARO. The guides also visited the other historical sites and monuments nearby Arslantepe, namely Roman walls, Sılahtar (Sword-Bearer of Ottoman Sultan) Mustafa Pasha Caravanserai and Grand Mosque of Eski Malatya (UluCami).

Since then, GARO has been keeping on taking his members every year to train them about the cuisine of Malatya, which becomes an opportunity to visit Arslantepe.

2.4.4. Arslantepe Project: Heritage of Malatya

A project called Malatya’nın Mirası Arslantepe (Arslantepe: Heritage of Malatya) was implemented in cooperation with Ministry of Culture and Tourism, United Nations Development Program and AnadoluEfes. Battalgazi Municipality and Arslantepe Destekleme ve Geliştirme Derneği (Supporting and Developing Arslantepe Association) were the partners of this project which had been implemented from 01 June 2015 to 06 October 2015.

Within this project, activities such as courses, awareness meetings, workshops and visits to Arslantepe and Malatya Archaeology Museum were organized. 220 elementary school teachers, 131 elementary school students, 8 Arslantepe employee, 9 museum staff and 10 Employees of Battalgazi Municipality participated in these activities.

The final meeting of the project was held in Malatya with the participation of the authorities of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Battalgazi Municipality, Directorate of Education, Arslantepe Association, Anadolu Efes as well as representatives of some non-
governmental organizations, mukhtars and local people. Some national bloggers and journalists attended the closing meeting, too.

2.4.5. Local People Visiting Arslantepe

Battalgazi Municipality has been organizing tours to the historical sites and monuments of Old Malatya including Arslantepe for the local people since 2015. In this tour, the visitors see the archaeological site and are informed about the history, importance and cultural value of Arslantepe. These tours are expected to raise awareness of the local people, especially in terms of protection of Arslantepe.

In 2017, the Metropolitan Municipality started weekly tours to Arslantepe taking the local people.

In both tours, the visitors see also the other historical sites in Eski (Old) Malatya such as Grand Mosque, Silahtar Mustafa Pasha Caravanserai and some shrines.

2.4.6. Malatya Film Festival and Tarhunza Statuette

The Malatya International Film Festival is hosted by Malatya Apricot Research, Development and Promotion Foundation under the auspices of Governorship of Malatya. The major sponsors and supporters of this event are Malatya Metropolitan Municipality, Ministry of Culture and Tourism, the Promotion Fund of Turkish Prime Ministry, Battalgazi and Yeşilyurt Municipalities and Inonu University.

The festival, which has been held since 2010, organizes the feature and short films competitions for national and international contestants. In recent years, the winners of these competitions are awarded with a Tarhunza statuette along with the other prizes. It may be suggested that a crystal-made Tarhunza statute has become the symbol of the Malatya International Film Festival.

Thanks to the archaeological excavations, finds, surveys, studies and researches the Arslantepe Archaeology Mission of La Sapienza University has been conducting for 57 years, and particularly recent developments and efforts resulting in Arslantepe’s inclusion into the
UNESCO’s World Heritage Tentative List, the public awareness towards it seems to have considerably risen.

The original statue of Tarhunza, who was the last Melid King in 732 B.C., is still displayed at the Anatolian Civilizations Museum in Ankara while an imitated one greets his visitors at the entrance of the Arslantepe Open Air Museum along with the lion statues and some magnificent reliefs belonging to the Neo-Hittite Period.

During the film festival held usually in November, the festival attendants such as artists, directors, journalists, film makers and jury members from Turkey and other countries visit Arslantepe.

2.4.7. An Arslantepe Documentary: La PassionedellaMemoria

A film producing company named Duna Film International released a series of Arslantepe documentary films respectively in 2007, 2009 and 2016. These films, directed by Isabella Astengo and produced by Loredana de Lama, was broadcast on Rai Culture, RaiStoria, Rai Educational and Rai 3.
The film titled *La Passione della Memoria – Arslantepe (The Passion of Memory – Arslantepe)* narrated the excavation works of the Italian Archaeology Mission that has brought to light the important remains symbolizing the universality of Anatolian cultures.

With the coordination of the Turkish Cultural Office in Rome, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism sponsored the travel, accommodation and guiding services for the filmmaking team.

2.4.8. First Civilizations

American PBS (Public Broadcasting Service) broadcast a landmark television series called *First Civilizations* (produced by Wall to Wall Broadcasting) in 2018. The 4 x 1 hour series explores the story of how our ancestors moved away from a nomadic and egalitarian existence to settle and organise themselves into states. Calling on the latest archaeological, anthropological, environmental and genetic research from experts across the world, the series looked at the development of farming, religion, warfare and trade as the key drivers of change. The series focused on six locations, the accepted ‘seedbeds of civilisation’, namely, China, Peru, Mexico, Near East, Egypt and the Indus Valley.

The PBS team filmed at a number of sites in Anatolia to show a development from the hunter-gatherer to sedentary lifestyle, and ultimately urban civilisation. And definitely, it cited about Arslantepe as it is one of the most important sites defining the seedbeds of our modern civilization.

Interviewing with the head of Arslantepe Archaeology Mission Professor Doctor Marcella Frangipane, the film narrated a rough estimate of the population size of Arslantepe during the late Uruk period before the fire that destroyed the palatial complex and what size the proto-urban site reached before its untimely collapse.
2.4.9. “People Embracing Arslantepe”

To raise awareness of the public regarding Arslantepe, Battalgazi Municipality applied to the Yeni Malatyaspor Soccer Club that are currently playing in the Turkish Super League so that the players take the field before the kick off of a game with a banner which would give a message about Arslantepe. The club and the Turkish Football Federation accepted the proposal of the municipality. The YeniMalatyaspor players hold the banner reading out “People Embraces Arslantepe” before the game they played versus Alanyaspor on 30 July 2015.
2.4.10. 1st International Arslantepe Archaeology Symposium

The 1st International Arslantepe Archaeology Symposium were held by the Malatya İnönü University and Roma Sapienza University between 4th October and 6th October 2018 at the İnönü University. This symposium was supported and financed by Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Malatya Governorate, Malatya Metropolitan Municipality, Battalgazi Municipality and Italian Cultural Institute.

The academicians who participated in the symposium submitted their papers elaborating the archaeology and history of Arslantepe and Malatya and the finds obtained thanks to the excavations conducted at Arslantepe. The local authorities, Rector of İnönü University, some academic members and managing staff of both universities, the members of Arslantepe Archaeology Mission, the diplomatic mission of Italian Embassy and the students followed the papers.

The Organization Committee stated that the final declarations of the papers would be forwarded to the stakeholders. The second symposium is planned to be held in Rome, Italy, in 2019.

2.4.11. Malatya and Apricot

It may be suggested that Malatya Apricot (Prunus armeniaca) is a symbol of this province. It is closely associated with the economy, culture, demography and social life of the local people as Malatya produce 50% of fresh apricots in Turkey while this rate reaches at 85-90% of the dried apricots most of which is exported to other countries with a revenue of 300 to 350 million USD.

Firm-textured fruits with uniform yellow colour and size that possess rich aroma and sugar content. It can easily be distinguished from other apricots through unique aroma and flavour.

A geographical indication sign was awarded to a variety of Malatya apricot named Hacıhaliloğlu in 2017 bearing a testimony to its uniqueness. This variety, as well as the other varieties such as Kabbaşı, Soğancı, Hasanbey, Çöloğlu, Çataloğlu and Şekerpare are not grown only in Malatya Province but a geographical area covering other districts nearby, namely, Elbistan of Kahramanmaraş, Gölbaşı of Adıyaman, Baskil of Elazığ and Gürün of Sivas.

Apricot harvest mainly demands manual work. When it is picked up from the millions of apricot trees covering the huge areas dotted around the districts between mid June and early August (harvest season varies according to the altitudes) the local labour force may not meet the demand of farmers. Therefore, about 50-thousand seasonal workers come to Malatya to pick up the apricots, which would be dried and processed for the market, during the harvest season.

The apricots of Malatya are particularly famous in Turkey. The domestic visitors coming to Malatya feel obliged to visiting Şire Pazarı, a market where mainly dried apricots are sold along with other dried foodstuff most of which are produced in the province such as apricot almonds, walnuts, nuts, raisins, dried mulberries, blackberries, pistachio nuts etc. to, to shop for themselves or buy some for their friends or relatives as present. The tour itineraries organized by the travel agencies almost include visiting Şire Pazarı after Eski Malatya, Malatya Archaeology Museum and Arslantepe is visited.
Malatya apricot is used as a symbol in squares erected in various parts of the city. In July, when the apricot is harvested, a festival (*Malatya Apricot Festival*) dedicated to it is organized to celebrate the crop.

Today, the biggest source of income of Orduzu where Arslantepe is located is apricot production, too.
SECTION II: ASSESSING THE SITE

1. STAKEHOLDERS

Decision Makers

Decision making bodies concerned with the present management plan have been identified at national, regional and local level, as listed:

National Level
Ministry of Culture and Tourism, General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums
Ministry of Urbanism and Environment, General Directorate of Spatial Planning
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry

Regional Level
Sivas Regional Council for Conservation of Cultural Properties
Sivas Surveying and Monuments Directorate
Malatya Archaeological Museum
Fırat Development Agency

Provincial Level
Malatya Governorate
   (Provincial Directorate of Culture and Tourism)
   (Provincial Directorate of National Education)
   (Provincial Directorate of Environment and Urbanization)
   (Provincial Directorate of Agriculture and Forestry)
Malatya Metropolitan Municipality
Malatya Public Training Centre

Local Level
Battalgazi Municipality
Battalgazi Governorate
Orduzu Neighbourhood Administration (Mukhtar)

Research Group and People Working on the Site

The archaeological research team at Arslantepe is managed by the MAIAO (Missione Archeologica Italiana in Anatolia Orientale) of the Sapienza University of Rome, with a regular excavation permit issued by the Turkish Cabinet of Ministers since 1961. The multidisciplinary team of researchers has a multinational composition with people from the following institutions:
Sapienza University of Rome, Italy
La Tuscia University, Viterbo, Italy
CNR (National Centre for Research), Rome, Italy
CNRS (National Centre for Research), Paris and Nice, France
ICR (Central Institute for Restoration), Rome, Italy
During work season workmen are hired from the village of Orduzu in numbers that may vary between 40 and 60. These are mostly men, but it is in the aims of the present plan to help increase female participation.

Inonu University, the departments of archaeology and landscape architecture in particular and Malatya Turgut Ozal University, the department of tourism and hotel management in particular are the two local partners for research at Arslantepe.

**Non Governmental Organizations**

The relevant local non governmental organizations are:
- Malatya Chamber of Architects
- Chamber of Merchants and Craftsmen
- Chamber of Trade and Industry
- Orduzu Training and Culture Foundation

The following organigram demonstrates the legal hierarchy and relation between different scales of key administrations with the decision making power in the process of conservation, use and management of the site.
2. VALUE ASSESSMENT AND STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

2.1. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

The site was the protagonist in the primary process of formation of the first centralised societies, as an emblematic case to illustrate not only the history of this site and the events that took place there, but also the general processes that these events revealed, and which have changed the history of humanity; founding processes of great interest to all those who wish to acquire an understanding of their own past and to catch its links with the present. The beginning of the economic and political control exerted over the population by emerging elites, the development of a sophisticated administrative system and the birth of bureaucracy, the origin of control over the labour force, the rise of stratified societies, the emergence of the need to use organised force - perhaps the origins of war as we conceive of it today -, are all epoch-making phenomena which changed the face of human societies. And the public buildings complex of the end of fourth millennium at Arslantepe, thanks to the abundance of materials found in situ on the floors, which have been now thoroughly studied by archaeologists and specialists, can recount exhaustively these processes and phenomena.

The Arslantepe 4th millennium “palace” complex is an outstanding example of a new type of monumental public architecture for two main reasons: 1) it is the earliest example of a public palace, substantially antedating the well-known 3rd millennium examples of the Syro-Mesopotamian areas and revealing a precocious development of new forms of secular power based on economic and administrative control; 2) This architectural complex of buildings, excavated over about 3000 square metres, is very large and in an extraordinary state of preservation, with walls more than 2-2,50 metres high, original white plasters and wall paintings, unique in their subject and style. The monument has been moreover protected with an innovative roofing system and is the object of continuous monitoring and conservation procedures by the team of restorers of the Italian Expedition. This conditions make the Arslantepe 4th millennium palace the only place in the world where the public can
still enter such a kind of monument and learn the history of one of the basic stages in human
developments in the only well preserved place where it occurred for the first time.

2.2. Values of Arslantepe

Definition of values of Arslantepe is so crucial prior to determination of management
policies that they will guide the decision makers to find the most proper way of use of the
site without endangering these values.

Historic and Archaeological: The Arslantepe 4th millennium levels show fundamental
changes in human relations in the period of State formation, which involved Eastern
Anatolian and Mesopotamian societies in the course of the entire 4th millennium BC. This
interchange of cultural traditions and social values resulted in the emergence of new social
and political systems based on hierarchies and social differences, economic privileges and
new power relations which led to new developments in monumental architecture,
administrative technology and iconography of power in artistic representation. Arslantepe
exhibit the most largely excavated public complex of this period and the best preserved
element of such a development in the entire Mesopotamia and its northern “periphery”.

Arslantepe is an exceptional testimony to the first emergence of State society in the
Near East, original though related with the great 4th millennium Uruk civilization. The
extensive and systematic excavations of the palace complex, full of material in situ, and the
thorough researches conducted on them have allowed to reconstruct the characteristics of
this civilization, the life of these first elites and their activities with incomparable details,
enlightening the emergence of a centralised government controlling the economy of the
population and exercising a central political authority. The finding of an exceptional group
of metal weapons, among which the earliest swords so far known in the world, which were
probably hanging on a wall in one of the building of the palace (and are now exhibited in the
Malatya Museum), also points to the beginning of forms of organized combat as the
prerogative of an elite, who probably flaunted it as an instrument of their new political
power.

The importance of these results and the related value of the property have been
established by a long lasting research activity carried out in the site by professional well-
known archaeologists and interdisciplinary team and is documented by a large number of
scientific publications in international reviews and books. The present director of the
evacuations, Prof. Marcella Frangipane, thanks to the scientific discoveries at Arslantepe and
the related studies and publications, has been elected as a Foreign Member of the National
Academy of Sciences of the United States, Corresponding Member of the Deutsches
Archäologisches Institut in Berlin, Corresponding member of the Italian National Academy
of Sciences “Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei” and of the Archaeological Institute of
America.

All the anthropological and historical achievements obtained at Arslanetpe, which are
also explained to the public in the Arslantepe Open Air Museum, write a new page in the
history of the Near Eastern proto-state civilizations and, more generally, highlight the early
developments in of a new type of social and political order that is at the root of our
contemporary societies.
**Authenticity:** All the monuments exhibited in the Open Air Museum of Arslantepe are totally original and no reconstruction has been made. The site is officially recognised as a 1st degree archaeological site in Turkey, and as such, it is protected by the Turkish law, and is, since a long time, property of the Turkish State. The mud-brick walls, the plaster covering them and the wall paintings, as well as all other architectural features, are totally authentic, except for few minor repair intervention made by the restorers using the same traditional material to guarantee the preservation and maintenance of the monument.

**Integrity:** Original monuments, wall paintings, stone reliefs, and archaeological materials of ancient population daily life have been brought to light in the course of many years, in a unique state of conservation and integrity; they have been regularly protected and preserved, and they are still visible at the site and the nearby Museum of Malatya. The team of the Sapienza University of Rome carries out yearly monitoring processes for the conservation of the mud-brick architecture and wall paintings, and collaborates with the local authorities of the Malatya Province and the Ministry of Culture of Turkey for the protection of the site as the excavations go on. The site and the monumental palatial complex of the 4th millennium BC, thanks to a long and careful excavation activity on large surfaces and across many levels representing millennia of ancient history, can ensure the complete representation of the crucial processes of the birth of State and hierarchical society, which can be learned by moving through the original places where they have occurred, due to the exceptional state of preservation of the Arslantepe 4th millennium mud-brick architecture.

**Rarity:** Arslantepe is presently a unique site for representing the history of the earliest formation of politically centralised societies, the origin of sophisticated bureaucracy with a hierarchy of officials, in other words the State, by showing a very well preserved complex of public and monumental buildings constituting the first example of a public Palace, unique for many centuries, which has no comparison, as for its features and state of preservation. There are a few 4th millennium sites in Mesopotamia with monumental public architecture of the same period and representing the same processes. These are however almost completely destroyed or deteriorated, due to the construction of dams such as Habuba Kabira and Jebel Aruda in Syria, or to abandonment and, more recently, war struggles and conflicts, such as the well-known large cities of Uruk-Warka in Iraq, Susa in Iran, or Tell Brak in Syria. Furthermore, the latter two sites have only been very partially brought to light as far as the 4th millennium levels are concerned, and in no case there was so well preserved architecture on such a vast extension as in Arslantepe. Arslantepe is moreover the only ‘Early State’ centre showing the birth of this crucial phenomenon in Anatolia and the regions north of Mesopotamia.

**Landscape:** The beautiful natural and cultural landscape around the site is still fairly preserved. A wide, well watered and intensively cultivated plain extends from the mountains of the Taurus range to the right bank of the Euphrates. Numerous springs are scattered in the plain close to the hilly flanks and poplar trees flank small rivers and canals. The Arslantepe mound stands out from the green plain, at a certain distance from the river, showing its round well defined silhouette from a long distance. The village of Orduzu is scattered around the site with rather sparse houses with gardens. Only a small part of this village (to the south of the mound) is more densely occupied and constitute the public centre of the community with the mosque, the municipality, some grocery stores and small
supermarkets, the ‘cafe’ where people use to gather in the evening. Only in this part of the village, some new higher building have been recently constructed. This building boost developed in the last decade and constitutes a potential of danger for the integrity of this traditional village and the beautiful landscapes surrounding it. The recent inclusion of part of this area (the part closer to the site) in the buffer 3rd degree zone is now a good step forward in the policies for protecting this exceptionally still preserved landscape and the environment.

The Malatya region is surrounded by mountains made up of limestone and volcanic rocks, which have been widely used in the past as building materials for stone foundations and as material for manufacturing tools and art pieces.

Education and Research: The historical information obtained from the site the extraordinary large amount of in situ discovered materials, and conservation work done on these materials and on the delicate and monumentale mud-brick architecture serve to the development of disciplines of archaeology, history, architecture, and conservation/restoration. Moreover, thanks to the aforementioned values the site bears, it may attract the attention of students and researchers from the disciplines of public administration, economics and urban planning, too. The discovery of such an early form of administration and bureaucracy in the 4th millennium BC thanks to the long-lasting and very fruitful work conducted on the thousands of cretulae (seal impressions) from the Arslantepe public buildings, for instance, has recently attracted the interest of a group of professors and researchers of the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences of the Malatya İnönü University, who want to study the relationship of the modern accountability systems with their very early origin. Recent isotopic researches conducted on Arslantepe archeobotanical and bone materials have highlighted interesting phenomena of climatic changes and changes in dietary customs occurred millennia ago that have attracted the interest of biologists, nutritionists and climatologists. This can turn the site into a multi-disciplinary research area which can lead to production of more publications in return and thus an increase in our knowledge and understanding about the history of ancient population behaviours and the relations between human societies and their environment. The education value lies at the integrity and authenticity of the site itself where visitors of different ages, occupations and levels of education can experience the reality of one of the most important stages in human history to a high degree of accuracy by witnessing its spatial configuration and historical traces in situ.
3. SWOT (STRENGTH, WEAKNESS, OPPORTUNITY, THREAT) ANALYSIS

The following SWOT analysis is generated through a participatory process where all relevant stakeholders had the opportunity to assess the site’s current situation from individual and institutional perspectives. They, however, went into disagreement on some of the issues. The Ministry team enabled them for debating on the issue in such situations, in order to find the most proper way to formulate the sentences and only facilitated the discussions. These meetings were also very rewarding for that they enabled exchanges of information among the stakeholders as the participants were informed by the relevant administrations about the projects ongoing at the site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research / Inventory / Knowledge Management</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Historical and architectural uniqueness of the site</td>
<td>- The absence of a local archive of scientific publications</td>
<td>Excavation team’s project proposal for a research centre</td>
<td>- Potential risk of damage to wall paintings by visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Academic recognition of the field</td>
<td>- Not updating the excavation website regularly</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Potential disturbance of the landscape silhouette around the area with new constructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Long-term scientific and systematic excavations</td>
<td>- Physical inadequacy of two of the storages housing artefacts for scientific study</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Vulnerability of mud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Scientific publications which are mostly in digital media</td>
<td>- The institutionalization of Inonu University Department of Archaeology has not been completed yet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Existence of two universities in Malatya providing education in related departments</td>
<td>- Lack of an archaeological policy at the local level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The presence of depots under the control of the excavation team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The presence of a website under the auspices of the excavation team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Existence of an ongoing project about floristic research and biodiversity analysis on the site and its surrounding (the existence of the project that considers archaeology and natural environment together)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Continuous studies about the current and potential risk analysis for the site and its surrounding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The disaster and security measures taken in the Malatya Museum building (fire, earthquake, theft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection and Conservation</td>
<td>- Legal protection of the mound and its buffer</td>
<td>- Nonexistence of an urban conservation plan for the area</td>
<td>- Opportunity to increase cooperation for protection and monitoring through World Heritage Listing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Effective close protection and monitoring measures that have been taken due to long-term scientific excavation activities,</td>
<td>- Absence of disaster management and emergency action plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- High level of authenticity and integrity of the site</td>
<td>- Inadequacy in the number of security officers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The mound’s being away from construction</td>
<td>- Lack of camera system and lighting in the mound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| and development pressures                                                                 | - Absence of wire netting in the north/northwest of the mound  
| - High level of protection of the landscape silhouette around the site due to agricultural activity  
| - The mound’s being protected by a fence and the controlled entries and exits  
| - Provision of security staff for 24-hour  
| - Existence of a project approved by the regional council for the construction of the additional roof covering on the north of palace structure | - Site’s having potential of being identity value for the city  
| brick structures against environmental effects                                                                 | - Non-existence of a tourism management plan regarding to possible increase in the tourist number following the site’s registration to the World Heritage List.  
| - Damage to the traditional authentic around the mound due to the shock caused by high tonnage vehicles |
| Presentation                                                                                     | - A basic level and good quality presentation infrastructure in the field  
| - Transportation facilities provided by Battalgazi Municipality for local people in order to visit the site  
| - Studies by Museum Directorate in relation to Arslantepe identity and designation a logo in this process  
| - Existence of a landscaping project prepared by the Ministry and approved by Conservation Council addressing to the needs of camera, lighting, visitor centre, toilets, selling units and visit routes in the site  
| - Existence of a project study on new Malatya Archaeology Museum | - Non-existence of a visitor welcoming centre.  
| - Non-existence of a paid entrance system to the site  
| - Non-existence of the facilities for catering, insufficient hygiene and quality of toilets  
| - Insufficient number, quality and content of informative brochures  
| - Insufficient parking space at the entrance of the site  
| - Non-existence of presentation link between the site and Malatya Museum  
| - Inability of exhibition of many Arslantepe findings placed in the storage of Malatya Museum due to insufficient physical capacity of the Museum  
| - Non-existence of an official web site to be used for promotional purposes | - Non-existence of a visitor welcoming centre.  
| - Non-existence of a paid entrance system to the site  
| - Non-existence of the facilities for catering, insufficient hygiene and quality of toilets  
| - Insufficient number, quality and content of informative brochures  
| - Insufficient parking space at the entrance of the site  
| - Non-existence of presentation link between the site and Malatya Museum  
| - Inability of exhibition of many Arslantepe findings placed in the storage of Malatya Museum due to insufficient physical capacity of the Museum  
| - Non-existence of an official web site to be used for promotional purposes |
| **Tourism** | - Presence of visitor destinations near the site attracting huge amount of tourists (such as Nemrut, Divriği)  
- Presence of an airport in the city  
- Easy transportation via highway to the site  
- Local administrations’ interest in tourism investments and projects  
- Strong potential of the site in terms of touristic attraction  
- Sufficient amount of accommodation capacity of the hotels within the city.  
- Presence of tourism master plan of the city prepared by Malatya Metropolitan Municipality  
- Being a stop on the routes of travel agencies for limited time  
- Technically insufficient infrastructure and low quality tourism service in Battalgazi and Orduzu  
- Not sufficiently known at national and international level  
- Non-inclusion of the site as a destination point in the Ministry’s 2023 Tourism Strategy  
- Increased opportunity on the recognition of the site as well as tourist number due to nomination of the site on WHL  
- Evaluation of the site together with nearby destinations such as GAP region, Nemrut, Harput, Hazar Lake, Divriği, Ulu Mosque, Cappadocia  
- High local capacity towards sustainable tourism (young population, agricultural activity, education opportunity)  
- Increased interest in cultural tourism rather than mass tourism  | - Insufficiency of routing signboards within the city | - Underdeveloped awareness on sustainable tourism in local level. |
| **Built environment** | - No population growth which would demand for sprawl in the built environment  
- Nonexistence of conservation development plan.  
- Gradual divergence of the development of the structure around the mound from traditional architecture.  | | |
| **Socio-economic development** | - Mainly agriculture based economy in Orduzu and Battalgazi  
- Assured employment of local people in excavations.  
- Diversified economic activity in city level (agriculture, trade, industry)  
- Existence of strong companies and holdings (4 out of 100 top ranking)  
- Only seasonal and short-term employment for the excavations.  
- Changes in the demographic structure of the local population due to increasing migration, gradual secession of local population from the area.  
- High capacity in local level in terms of sustainable development (young population, agricultural activity, education opportunities)  | - Underdeveloped awareness on sustainable development in local level.  | |
| **Education and Awareness Raising** | - Organization of promotional tours and informative activities by Battalgazi Municipality  
- Organization of activities such as festivals,  
- Inadequate basic knowledge of local people’s about the site (uniqueness, history, architectural features, excavation activities etc.)  
- Existence of two universities in Malatya providing education in related academic departments  
- Organization of educational tours to | | |
meetings, conferences and symposiums related to the area and its surroundings
- Local people's embracement and recognition of Arslantepe as a part of their culture
- Participation of local people in ongoing archaeological studies at the site

- Lack of transfer of experience gained from archaeological excavations carried out at the site to local experts
- Lack of experience and capacity of the Inonu University Archaeology Department

Arslantepe in primary schools based in the province

| Local Participation and Governance | - Local administrations' interest to and embracement of Arslantepe
- Sponsor support for some of the activities that have been carried out at Arslantepe | -Non-participation of the local people in the decision making process as well as organization of activities about Arslantepe | - Local people's interest to the site is mostly economic gain oriented |
SECTION III: PLANNING THE SITE

1. VISION STATEMENT

A World Heritage which highlights the archaeological, ecological, historical, architectural, and research values as the identity, is used as an open air museum being enriched with the thematic exhibitions, is integrated with a museum ensuring the multidisciplinary research and education activities, has a complete planning and project infrastructure aiming a holistic preservation and conservation and where tourism is promoted as a sector supporting the local agricultural production and economy in a sustainable way.

2. MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES

The primary objectives of the management policies are to:
- Integrate archaeology with the natural, social and built environment,
- Identify sustainable management practices for the site and its environs and
- Propose practices that are appropriate and relevant to the region

The basic principles to be adopted are:
- Sustainability,
- Accessibility.

The overall management objectives for the site are as follows:
- Objective 1: The site should be evaluated and managed in the context of its setting and surrounding landscape.
- Objective 2: The research interest of the site should be enhanced by providing better access to information, training and site presence.
- Objective 3: Impacts on exposed and underground archaeological material should wherever possible be minimised.
- Objective 4: Any archaeological find from the excavation should be stored and displayed in conditions that are appropriate for their conservation.
- Objective 5: Local communities should be encouraged to become partners in the protection and interpretation of the site and its surroundings.
- Objective 6: Visitors to the site should enjoy a safe, informed and memorable visit including access to good quality interpretation and educational materials.

3. MANAGEMENT POLICIES

Land Use and Planning
LP.1 Protecting the natural setting and silhouette of the surrounding
LP.2 Planning the site comprehensively

Archaeology and Research
AR.1 Continuation of excavations in its current setting and profile
AR.2 Improving the on-site working conditions of excavation team
AR.3 Dissemination of information regarding Arslantepe excavations and research to a broader public
AR.4 Strengthening the condition of the site as a multidisciplinary scientific research field

Protection, Conservation and Security
PC.1 Increasing the security measures across the site
PC.2 Increasing the protective measures for archaeological remains
PC.3 Constant and systematic monitoring of the site and remains

Promotion and Presentation
PP.1 Increasing the quality of on-site visiting infrastructure
PP.2 Benefiting from new technologies for off-site presentation
PP.3 Increasing the level of recognition of Arslantepe by a broader public
PP.4 Increasing the accessibility to the site

Socio-Economic Development and Management
SDE.1 Increasing the quality of economic infrastructure at nearby settlements for tourism activities
SDE.2 Ensuring economic benefit from activities at Arslantepe to local community
SDE.3 Integration of Arslantepe identity to local life at Malatya province
SDE.4 Increasing coordination and cooperation capacity among stakeholders

As can be seen from the time-frame given by action plan below, priority in the management policies is given to protection, conservation and planning, followed by research, presentation and socio-economic integration of local community.

Conservation and Excavation Policy
Excavation and conservation projects will be proposed and evaluated every 5 years as well as presented in detail annually. The aim of the EXCAVATION PROJECT is to thoroughly understand the roots of the important phenomena of State origin occurred and already highlighted at the site, as well as its following developments, changes and historical events that have taken place at Arslantepe over the millennia. The second specific objective is to investigate (1) the crucial changes occurred at the site during the Hittite Empire expansion and the impact of the related events on the political developments manifested at the site in the Late Bronze Age, and (2) the consequences and reaction to the Hittite State collapse in the eastern periphery and the transition to the foundation of the autonomous kingdom of Melid. The goal is also to increase the knowledge of the less known periods of occupation at the site: Early, Middle, and the earlier part of the Late Chalcolithic sequence (and possibly Neolithic), to be investigated in the western / south-western areas of the mound; Late Bronze and Iron Age that will be explored in the north, north-eastern, and eastern areas of the tell. Possible investigations at the base of the mound are also targeted in the future in order to enquire into the possible presence of a lower town or villages annexed to the main centre. The CONSERVATION activities will be devoted to: (1) The preservation and maintenance of the 4th millennium outstanding monumental architecture, mainly the Palace complex. Careful conservation practices will be dedicated to new buildings in this complex that may be brought to light in the future, together with the monitoring and maintainance of the already excavated sectors of the Palace, now protected and exhibited. New older
outstanding buildings which may be brought to light in the future will also be carefully evaluated according to their possible uniqueness or special character; (2) Architectural conservation and restoration of possible monumental structures that may come out in the Hittite and Neo-Hittite levels in the future. At present the only well preserved monumental structure belonging to these periods that deserves conservation and maintenance practices is a sector of a huge town-wall at the northern edge of the site made of mud-brick with stone foundations, burnt and preserved for a considerable height; (3) Continuing the restoration and consolidation of all objects and any kind of archaeological materials brought to light during the excavation seasons, to be issued to the Malatya museum or kept in the storage structures of the excavation house.

**Presentation Policy**

One of the sensitivities in management policies has been raised on visitor management. Taking into consideration the fragility of the mud-brick structures in the site and relatively small size of the tell in terms of visiting area, although no damage is foreseen to be witnessed for the near future, presentation and promotion policies are deliberated in an integrated manner in order for better management of possible increase in visitor numbers in the long run. While aiming at attracting more visitors through different policies, the attention is also paid to the capacity and character of the site. Therefore, providing presentation opportunities for off-site visitors, improving protective measures and managing circulation within the site are defined as main targets to be achieved through visitor management policies. Given the need that visitors are always accompanied on the visit to the Palace and the site, an increase in the number of guardians and tourist guides at the Arslantepe open-air museum is a priority. A second very important target is an integrated visit between the Malatya Museum and the site to prolong the visit duration and expand visiting area.

Primary target is, however, to complete upgrading the on-site presentation infrastructure until expected increase in visitor numbers is realized in order to get the site prepared for more visitors by increasing its carrying capacity and not threatening its unique values.

As one of the values to be protected, developed and conveyed to future is education and research value the site bears, presentation policies should primarily target an informed and instructive experience for visitors at different ages, occupations and level of education. It is also aimed that research facilities and necessary on-site infrastructure to that end as well as availability of resources to off-site researchers are to be provided.

4. **ACTION PLAN**

The time frame for implementation is as follows:

- **Urgent (within 1 year)**
- **Short term (2-3 years)**
- **Medium term (3-5 years)**
- **Long term (up to 10 years)**
# Table: Action Plan of Arslantepe Management Plan

## LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible Partner</th>
<th>Supporting Partner</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Time-Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LP.1</td>
<td>LP.1.1 Making present state analysis of natural environment</td>
<td>Inonu University Department of Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>Battalgazi Municipality</td>
<td>TÜBİTAK</td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP.1</td>
<td>LP.1.2 Distribution of the results of present state analysis for natural environment to related authorities</td>
<td>Inonu University Department of Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>Battalgazi Municipality</td>
<td>TÜBİTAK</td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP.1</td>
<td>LP.1.3 Identification of buildings, structures and street elements that affect the landscape silhouette negatively (building height, façade typologies, material, electricity and telephone lines etc)</td>
<td>Battalgazi Municipality</td>
<td>Sivas RCC, Malatya Chamber of Architects, Inonu University Department of Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>Battalgazi Municipality</td>
<td>Urgent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP.2</td>
<td>LP.2.1 Reviewing the upper-scale plan provisions and strategies and making necessary revisions on them in compatible with this management plan</td>
<td>Malatya MM, Battalgazi Municipality</td>
<td>Inonu University Department of Landscape Architecture, Malatya Chamber of Architects</td>
<td>Malatya MM, Battalgazi Municipality</td>
<td>Urgent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP.2</td>
<td>LP.2.2 Finalization and approval of 1/5000 and 1/1000 scaled conservation development plans</td>
<td>Battalgazi Municipality</td>
<td>Malatya Metropolitan Municipality, Regional Conservation Council, Malatya Chamber of Architects</td>
<td>Battalgazi Municipality</td>
<td>Urgent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ARCHAEOLOGY AND RESEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible Partner</th>
<th>Supporting Partner</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Time-Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR.1</td>
<td>To be prepared and submitted to the KÜVAM by the excavation team</td>
<td>- Excavation Team - Hacettepe University of Ankara</td>
<td>- KÜVAM - İnönü University - Malatya Museum Directorate - Istituto Sapienza University of Rome, Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>Sapienza University of Rome, Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR.2</td>
<td>Improving on-site working conditions of the excavation team</td>
<td>Rehabilitation of two depot buildings of the excavation team</td>
<td>Excavation Team</td>
<td>Malatya Museum Directorate</td>
<td>Excavation Team, Malatya Museum Directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR.3</td>
<td>Dissemination of information regarding Arslantepe</td>
<td>Enriching the database of official website of the excavation team and updating it regularly</td>
<td>Excavation Team</td>
<td>KÜVAM, Inonu University, Malatya Turgut Ozal University,</td>
<td>Excavation Team, Malatya Museum Directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Responsible Partner</td>
<td>Supporting Partner</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>Time-Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PC.1</strong> Increasing the security measures across the site</td>
<td><strong>PC.1.1.</strong> Increasing the number of security staff</td>
<td>DÖSİMM</td>
<td>Excavation Team</td>
<td>DÖSİMM</td>
<td>Urgent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PC.1.2</strong> Placing the appropriate fire-extinguisher material (C12 dry chemical powder) against fire risk at the identified locations</td>
<td>Malatya MM Department of Fire Brigade, Malatya Museum Directorate</td>
<td>Battalgazi Municipality</td>
<td>Malatya MM Department of Fire Brigade, Museum Directorate</td>
<td>Urgent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PC.1.3</strong> Placing infrared cameras at appropriate places within the site</td>
<td>Sivas Surveying and Monuments Directorate</td>
<td>Malatya Museum Directorate, Excavation Team</td>
<td>Malatya Governorate, DAP</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PC.1.4</strong> Increasing the number of lighting pole on</td>
<td>Malatya MM</td>
<td>Battalgazi Municipality</td>
<td>Malatya MM</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROTECTION, CONSERVATION AND SECURITY**

- **AR.3.2** Compilation of all written materials and publications, and archiving them within Malatya Museum
  - Battalgazi Municipality, Malatya MM

- **AR.3.3** Translation of important publications in foreign languages to Turkish
  - Battalgazi Municipality, Inonu University, Excavation Team,
  - Provincial Directorate of CT

- **AR.4** Turning the site into a multidisciplinary scientific research field
  - **AR.4.1** Opening up a specialized scientific library in the new Malatya Museum
    - KÜVAM
    - Excavation Team, Inonu University, Malatya Turgut Ozal University

  - **AR.4.2** Establishing Arslantepe Archive within the new Malatya Museum
    - KÜVAM
    - Excavation Team, Inonu University, Malatya Turgut Ozal University

  - **AR.4.3** Foundation of a Research and Implementation Center within the body of Inonu University
    - Inonu University
    - Malatya Turgut Ozal University

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible Partner</th>
<th>Supporting Partner</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Time-Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PC.2</strong> Increasing the protective measures for archaeological remains</td>
<td>PC.2.1 Construction of new roof in the north of Palace in compliance with already approved project</td>
<td>Sivas Surveying and Monuments Directorate</td>
<td>Malatya Museum Directorate, Excavation Team</td>
<td>Malatya Governorate, DAP</td>
<td>Urgent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC.2.2 Elimination of dried plants</td>
<td>Malatya Museum Directorate, Battalgazi Municipality</td>
<td>Excavation Team</td>
<td>Malatya Museum Directorate, Battalgazi Municipality</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PC.3</strong> Constant and systematic monitoring of the site and remains</td>
<td>PC.3.1 Adoption of key monitoring indicators</td>
<td>KÜVAM, Excavation Team, Malatya Museum Directorate</td>
<td>Battalgazi Municipality</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Urgent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC.3.2 Adoption of a monitoring mechanism among Museum Directorate and Excavation Team</td>
<td>KÜVAM, Excavation Team, Malatya Museum Directorate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Urgent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROMOTION AND PRESENTATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible Partner</th>
<th>Supporting Partner</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Time-Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PP.1</td>
<td>Increasing the quality of on-site visiting infrastructure</td>
<td>PP.1.1 Determining the carrying capacity of the site and deciding on the highest number of visitors per group accordingly</td>
<td>Excavation Team</td>
<td>Malatya Museum Directorate</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PP.1.2 Adopting a routing and presentation scenario including the relation between the site and Malatya Museum</td>
<td>Malatya Museum Directorate, Excavation Team</td>
<td>KÜVAM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Urgent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PP.1.3 Arranging a parking area at appropriate size near the site for cars and buses</td>
<td>Battalgazi Municipality</td>
<td>Malatya MM</td>
<td>Battalgazi Municipality</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PP.1.4 Making a model showing the mound in full together with its layout</td>
<td>Sivas Surveying and Monuments Directorate</td>
<td>Malatya Museum Directorate, Excavation Team</td>
<td>Malatya Governorate, DAP</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PP.1.6 Increasing the number of audio guides</td>
<td>Malatya Museum Directorate</td>
<td>KÜVAM, Excavation Team</td>
<td>Malatya Museum Directorate</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PP.1.7 Constructing a visitor center</td>
<td>Sivas Surveying and Monuments Directorate</td>
<td>KÜVAM, Malatya Museum Directorate, Excavation Team</td>
<td>Malatya Governorate, DAP</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PP.1.8 Completion of new Malatya Museum design</td>
<td>KÜVAM</td>
<td>Malatya Museum</td>
<td>KÜVAM</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Responsible Bodies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PP.1.9</strong> Construction of new Malatya Museum building</td>
<td>KÜVAM Malatya Museum Directorate</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PP.1.10</strong> Updating and diversifying informative and promotional materials</td>
<td>Battalgazi Municipality, Provincial Directorate of CT, Excavation Team, Malatya Museum Directorate</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PP.1.11</strong> Expropriation of private land where Early Bronze Age Replica House is situated</td>
<td>KÜVAM Malatya Museum Directorate</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PP.2</strong> Benefiting from new technologies for off-site presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PP.2.1</strong> Opening up formal social media accounts to be managed by Malatya Museum Directorate</td>
<td>Malatya Museum Directorate, Battalgazi Municipality</td>
<td>Urgent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PP.2.2</strong> Setting up a virtual museum of Arslantepe</td>
<td>KÜVAM Malatya Museum Directorate, Excavation Team</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PP.2.3</strong> Production of a short promotional film to be disseminated to Turkish Tourism Offices abroad and to be broadcasted internationally</td>
<td>Battalgazi Municipality, KÜVAM, Malatya Museum Directorate, Provincial Directorate of CT</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PP.2.4</strong> Opening up a website for promotional purposes to be directed from Excavation Team’s website</td>
<td>Provincial Directorate of CT, Battalgazi Municipality, Malatya Museum Directorate</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PP.3</strong> Increasing the level of recognition of Arslantepe by a broader public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PP.3.1</strong> Linking the nearby touristic destinations with Arslantepe</td>
<td>Provincial Directorate of CT, TÜRSAB Regional Executive Council, YİGM</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PP.3.2</strong> Inscription of Arslantepe on the UNESCO World Heritage List</td>
<td>KÜVAM, Excavation Team, Battalgazi Municipality, MoFA, UNESCO TR</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PP.3.3</strong> Organizing international symposiums periodically</td>
<td>Inonu University, Malatya Turgut Özal University, Battalgazi Municipality, Malatya MM, Provincial Directorate of CT, Excavation Team</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PP.3.4</strong> Production of a documentary film to be disseminated to national/international research</td>
<td>Malatya Governorate, Inonu University Faculty, Battalgazi Municipality, Excavation Team, Malatya Governorate</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Responsible Partner</td>
<td>Supporting Partner</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>Time-Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SDE.1</strong> Increasing the quality of economic infrastructure at nearby settlements for tourism activities</td>
<td>SDE.1.1 Providing training courses on various topics for tourism establishments</td>
<td>Malatya Turgut Ozal University</td>
<td>Inonu University</td>
<td>Malatya Chamber of Trade and Industry</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDE.1.2 Allocating appropriate places for sale of agricultural products of locals</td>
<td>Battalgazi Municipality</td>
<td>Orduzu Neighbourhood Administration, Orduzu Culture Foundation</td>
<td>Battalgazi Municipality</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SDE.2</strong> Ensuring economic benefit from activities at Arslantepe to local community</td>
<td>SDE.2.1 Establishing Arslantepe Tourism Cooperative to operate the sales places within the settlement area</td>
<td>Orduzu Neighbourhood Administration</td>
<td>Battalgazi Municipality, Malatya Governorate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDE.2.2 Organizing vocational courses on handicraft production</td>
<td>Public Education Center</td>
<td>Battalgazi Municipality</td>
<td>Public Education Center</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SDE.3</strong> Integration of Arslantepe identity to local life at Malatya province</td>
<td>SDE.3.1 Foundation of Arslantepe Student Clubs within elementary and intermediary schools and universities and ensuring their participation in organization of Arslantepe-themed activities</td>
<td>Provincial Directorate of Education, Inonu University, Malatya Turgut Ozal University</td>
<td>Battalgazi Municipality, Malatya Museum Directorate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDE.3.2 Application of an educational program for elementary schools based on games (playing cards, matching cards, puzzles, painting books, models etc)</td>
<td>Provincial Directorate of Education</td>
<td>Excavation Team, Malatya Museum Directorate</td>
<td>Provincial Directorate of CT</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDE.3.3 Re-organizing of the painting competition on Arslantepe targeting elementary schools with an award of painting education abroad</td>
<td>Provincial Directorate of Education, Battalgazi Municipality</td>
<td>Private schools across the province</td>
<td>Provincial Directorate of Education, Battalgazi Municipality</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDE.3.4 Organizing a photograph training and</td>
<td>MAFSAD</td>
<td>Battalgazi Municipality, Firat Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDE.3.5 Organizing Arslantepe Culture Festival</td>
<td>Malatya Governorate</td>
<td>Malatya MM, Provincial Directorate of CT, Inonu University, Malatya Turgut Ozal University</td>
<td>Malatya Governorate</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing coordination and cooperation capacity of stakeholders</td>
<td><strong>SDE.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>SDE.4.1.</strong> Appointing focal points for Arslantepe in each partner institution and establishing a network among them</td>
<td>Site Manager</td>
<td>All relevant partners</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SDE.4.2.</strong> Organizing briefing meetings at 6 months intervals with participation of all focal points and reporting the decisions</td>
<td>Site Manager</td>
<td>All relevant partners</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING STRATEGY

5.1. Overall Structure

Site Manager is the main responsible for monitoring of implementation of the plan and ensuring coordination among stakeholders in implementation. Monitoring indicators and Project Assessment Table below will be used by the site manager for measuring of performance and operability of the plan. Implementation is to be commenced via projects following approval of the management plan by Coordination and Audit Board.

According to the Article 13 of related legal legislation, public institutions and organisations, municipalities and real and legal persons shall be obliged to follow the management plan approved by the coordination and audit board. Competent authorities shall prioritise the services covered by the plan and be obliged to allocate funds from their budget to this end.

The flowchart below shows feedback mechanism in implementation and authority shares among partners as defined in legislation:

![Flowchart for management plan monitoring and revision process](image)

5.2. Monitoring Indicators

Performances of the projects are evaluated annually. Reports prepared in line with the indicators and Project Assessment Table to be filled for each project separately are examined by the Coordination and Audit Board, which then approves the work program and budget of the next year and revised management plan. The vision, aims and policies of the plan are to be evaluated in the last implementation year of 2024 through participatory processes and its findings are to be submitted to Advisory Board and the Coordination and Audit Board for evaluation.

Project Assessment Table to be taken as basis for evaluation of projects in monitoring is shown below:
Monitoring indicators, on the other hand, are the most important tools for reviewing whether an action plan is realistic and operable or not. Monitoring indicators for Arslantepe Management Plan have also been defined for assessing its implementation and measuring its performance.

It would be possible to measure through these indicators how much of the actions are realized and to what extent the goals are achieved. By this monitoring to be held each year, rational and practicable action plan corresponding to national legal and institutional framework will be reached. Years in the table refer to the assessment year of the plan.
Table: Project Assessment Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No and Name of the Project</th>
<th>…………………………………………………………………………………</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Institution(s)</td>
<td>…………………………………………………………………………………</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Institution(s)</td>
<td>…………………………………………………………………………………</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>…………………………………………………………………………………</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ Commenced in due of time and ongoing as foreseen

☐ Explain the reason if not commenced in due of time

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

☐ Completed in due of time

☐ Explain the reason if not completed in due of time

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

☐ If a revision is needed in the project for the next year:

☐ Project is not necessary or applicable, shall be removed.

☐ Content of the Project shall be revised.

☐ Responsible institution shall be revised.

☐ Resource institution shall be revised.

☐ Term of the project shall be revised.

☐ Other:

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

... / ... / ...

Signature
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Monitoring Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND USE AND PLANNING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LP.1.1 Making present state analysis of natural environment</strong></td>
<td>Acreage of the studied area</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget spent on the analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of experts taking part in the analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**LP.1.2 Distribution of the results of present state analysis for</td>
<td>Number of pages of the result report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural environment to related authorities</td>
<td>Number of the delivered institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**LP.1.3 Identification of buildings, structures and street elements</td>
<td>Number of elements identified as negatively affecting the landscape silhouette</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that affect the landscape silhouette negatively (building height,</td>
<td>Number of days spent on the site analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>façade typologies, material, electricity and telephone lines etc)</td>
<td>Number of days spent on the site analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**LP.2.1 Reviewing the upper-scale plan provisions and strategies</td>
<td>Number of plans reviewed</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and making necessary revisions on them in compatible with this</td>
<td>Number of plan provisions that needs to be revised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**LP.2.2 Preparation of 1/5000 and 1/1000 scaled conservation</td>
<td>Date of approval of the plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARCHAEOLOGY AND RESEARCH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**AR.2.1 Rehabilitation of two depot buildings of the excavation</td>
<td>Budget spent on rehabilitation</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**AR.3.1 Enriching the database of official website of the excavation</td>
<td>Number of publications uploaded to the website</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>team and updating it regularly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**AR.3.2 Compilation of all written materials and publications, and</td>
<td>Number of publications compiled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>archiving them within Malatya Museum until research and training</td>
<td>Number of visual materials compiled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>center will come into function</td>
<td>Number of institutions from which publications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AR.3.3 Translation of important publications in foreign languages to Turkish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of pages of publications that need translation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pages already translated</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget spent on translation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AR.4.1 Opening up a specialized scientific library in the new Malatya Museum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of publications stored in the library</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of the allocated space for library</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AR.4.2 Establishing Arslantepe Archive within the new Malatya Museum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of publications stored in the archive</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of visual material stored in the archive</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AA.4.3 Foundation of a Research and Implementation Center within the body of Inonu University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of foundation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of staff employed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget allocated for its activities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROTECTION, CONSERVATION AND SECURITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC.1.1. Increasing the number of security staff</td>
<td>Number of staff employed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC.1.2 Placing the appropriate fire-extinguisher material (C12 dry chemical powder) against fire risk at the identified locations</td>
<td>Number of places where the equipment placed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity/volume of the material placed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC.1.3 Placing infrared cameras at appropriate places within the site</td>
<td>Number of cameras placed</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration of total record</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC.1.4 Increasing the number of lighting poles on the two main road accessing the site</td>
<td>Number of placed additional lightening poles</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of lighting poles on the accessing roads</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC.2.1 Construction of new roof in the north of Palace in compliance with already approved project</td>
<td>Budget allocated for construction of new roof</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size of the constructed roof</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of end of the construction</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC.2.2 Elimination of dried plants</td>
<td>Number of working days spent for elimination of dried plants</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of staff charged of elimination of dried plants</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acreage of the land eliminated from dried plants</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC.3.1 Adoption of key monitoring indicators</td>
<td>Number of indicators adopted</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of institutions to which indicators are</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Monitoring Year</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC.3.2 Adoption of a monitoring mechanism among Museum Directorate and Excavation Team</td>
<td>Date of adoption of monitoring mechanism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMOTION AND PRESENTATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PP.1.1</strong> Determining the carrying capacity of the site and deciding on the highest number of visitors per group accordingly</td>
<td>Allowed highest number of visitors at any time</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allowed highest number of visitors allowed per group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average duration of site visit per group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PP.1.2</strong> Adopting a routing and presentation scenario including the relation between the site and Malatya Museum</td>
<td>Estimated duration of integrated visits of Malatya Museum and the site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PP.1.3</strong> Arranging a parking area at appropriate size near the site for cars and buses</td>
<td>Acrage of the lot arranged for parking area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum capacity of parking area for cars and buses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PP.1.4</strong> Making a model showing the mound in full together with its layout</td>
<td>Size of the model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of delivery of the model</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PP.1.6</strong> Increasing the number of audio guides</td>
<td>Number of additional audio-guides supplied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of audio-guides supplied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PP.1.7</strong> Constructing a visitor center</td>
<td>Budget allocated for the construction of the visitor center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size of the constructed visitor center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of end of the construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PP.1.8</strong> Completion of new Malatya Museum building design project</td>
<td>Date of submission of the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of approval of the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PP.1.9</strong> Construction of new Malatya Museum building</td>
<td>Budget allocated to the construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of tendering announcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of launch of the construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of completion of construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PP.1.10</strong> Updating and diversifying informative and promotional materials</td>
<td>Number of promotional material in each languages</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of promotional material published</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of promotional material distributed</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP.1.11 Expropriation of private land where Early Bronze Age Replica House is situated</td>
<td>Number of places where promotional materials distributed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP.2.1 Opening up formal social media accounts to be managed by Malatya Museum Directorate</td>
<td>Budget allocated for expropriation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount spent on expropriation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acreage of the land expropriated</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP.2.2 Setting up a virtual museum of Arslantepe</td>
<td>Budget allocated for designing virtual museum</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of function of virtual museum</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of visitors to virtual museum</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP.2.3 Production of a short promotional film to be disseminated to Turkish Tourism Offices abroad and to be broadcasted internationally</td>
<td>Budget allocated for production of promotional film</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration of the promotional film</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Tourism Offices to which promotional films are delivered</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP.2.4 Opening up a website for promotional purposes to be directed from Excavation Team’s website</td>
<td>Budget allocated for designing promotional website</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of staff charged of the design</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of function of promotional website</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of visits to the promotional websites</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP.3.1 Linking the nearby touristic destinations with Arslantepe</td>
<td>Number of tour itineraries that link Arslantepe with nearby destination</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP.3.2 Inscription of Arslantepe on the UNESCO World Heritage List</td>
<td>Date of inscription</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP.3.3 Organizing international symposiums periodically</td>
<td>Number of international symposiums organized</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of institutions organizing international symposiums</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of participants to each international symposium</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP.3.4 Production of a documentary film to be disseminated to national/international research centers, universities and schools</td>
<td>Budget allocated for production of documentary film</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration of the documentary film</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of research centers, universities and schools to which documentary films are delivered</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP.4.1 Placing more signage and routing panels at the roadways</td>
<td>Number of additional signage and routing panels</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from airport and bus station placed at the roadways from airport and bus station

Number of total signage and routing panels placed at the roadways from airport and bus station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Year</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PP.4.2 Providing free shuttles from nearby settlements for locals</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of shuttles</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of total passengers</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Monitoring Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SDE.1.1 Providing training courses on various topics for tourism establishments</strong></td>
<td>The themes of training</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total hours of training</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of participants in each training</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of institutions organizing trainings</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of institution / firms sending staff to the training</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SDE.1.2 Allocating appropriate places for sale of agricultural products of locals</strong></td>
<td>Size of allocated spaces for sales of local products</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of people selling local products</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of kiosk for sale of products</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of different kinds of products</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SDE.2.1 Establishing Arslantepe Tourism Cooperative to operate the sales places within the settlement area</strong></td>
<td>Number of meetings for debating the issue</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of establishment of the cooperative</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of cooperative members</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SDE.2.2 Organizing vocational courses on handicraft production</strong></td>
<td>The themes of courses</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total hours of training</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of participants in each course</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of institutions organizing courses</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SDE.3.1 Foundation of Arslantepe Student Clubs within elementary and intermediary schools and universities and ensuring their participation in organization of Arslantepe-themed activities</strong></td>
<td>Number of schools which founded Arslantepe Student Clubs</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of universities which founded Arslantepe Student Clubs</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of member students in each club</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDE.3.2. Application of an educational program for elementary schools based on games (playing cards, matching cards, puzzles, painting books, models etc)</td>
<td>Number of activities organized by each club</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of games designed</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of schools to which the games are delivered</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of schools which actively organized the program</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of students participated in the program</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDE.3.3 Re-organizing of the painting competition on Arslantepe targeting elementary schools with an award of painting education abroad</td>
<td>Number of students participated in the competition</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDE.3.4 Organizing a photograph training and competition on Arslantepe targeting local community</td>
<td>Total hours of training</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of participants to the training</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of participants to the competition</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDE.3.5 Organizing Arslantepe Culture Festival</td>
<td>Duration of the festival</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget allocated for the festival</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget spent on the organization of festival</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of activities organized during the festivals</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of participants to each activity during the festival</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDE.4.1. Appointing focal points for Arslantepe in each partner institution and establishing a network among them</td>
<td>Number of partner institutions who appointed focal point</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of focal points</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDE.4.2. Organizing briefing meetings at 6 months intervals with participation of all focal points and reporting the decisions</td>
<td>Number of organized briefing meetings</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of participants to each meeting</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of decisions taken</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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