

National Agency for
Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia

Geoinformation System (GIS) and RS Consulting Center
"GeoGraphic"

**Management Plan for the
World Heritage Sites of Mtskheta**

Tbilisi 2012

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Client | National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia |
| Implementing institution | Geoinformation System (GIS) and RS Consulting Center "GeoGraphic |
| Director | G.Gotsiridze |
| Project Manager | K. Amirejibi |
| Project Authors | K. Amirejibi V.Vardosanidze G. Nikolaishvili G.Kipiani |
| Computer cartography | E.Khokhiashvili T.Janelidze |
| Topographical survey | D. Botkovel |

Contents

List of Figures

1List of Tables

1 Resume

1.1 Vision- Concept of the Management of Territory

1.2 Summary of Basic Recommendations

2 Determination of the Management Area

2.1 Geographical Parameters and Natural- Climatic Characteristics of Mtskheta

2.2 Phases of Development of Mtskheta Local Community

2.3 Role of Mtskheta in Settlement System

2.4 Visual and Physical Areas of Protection of Mtskheta World Heritage Sites and their Analysis

2.5 Boundaries of Management Area

3 Identification and Assessment of the World Heritage Sites

3.1 Retrospective Identification of Mtskheta World Heritage Sites

3.2 Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value of Mtskheta

3.3 Retrospective Identification of Buffer Zones

3.4 Requirements of the World Heritage Convention's Operational Guidelines for the for Implementation of Management Plan

- 4 Description and Assessment of Mtskheta Management Area**
 - 4.1 Social- Economic Context, Environment Protection, Tourism and Town Planning Parameters
 - 4.2 Land Cadastre, Identification of the Forms of Ownership
 - 4.2.1 Cadastre Parcels
 - 4.2.2 Property Management Issues and the Pressures Related to Development
 - 4.3 Stratigraphic Maps of Historical Development of the Territory
 - 4.4 General Assessment of Authenticity and Integrity of Property
 - 4.5 The List of Archive Materials
- 5 Description / Assessment of the Existing Structure of Planning and Management for Mtskheta**
 - 5.1 Identification of Agencies
 - 5.1.1 Management Structure
 - 5.1.2 Great Mtskheta Museum- Reserve
 - 5.1.3 Mtskheta Municipality
 - 5.1.4 Georgian Apostolic Autonomous Orthodox Church
 - 5.2 Common Law Framework, Regulations in Heritage and Related Spheres
 - 5.3 The Existing Communication System and Its Assessment
- 6 Preservation and Conservation of Mtskheta Historical and Cultural Heritage**
 - 6.1 Resources of Cultural Heritage within the Management Area
 - 6.2 Assessment of Historical and Cultural Significance of Environment
 - 6.3 Existing Regulations for Protection and the Limitations for Cultural Heritage
 - 6.4 Current Conservation Programs and Assessment of their Efficiency
 - 6.4.1 History of Legal Protection
 - 6.4.2 Existing Methods of Protection

| | |
|--------|--|
| 7 | Identification and Assessment of Hazards and Risks |
| 7.1 | Anthropogenic Hazards and Risks |
| 7.2 | Natural Disasters and Risks |
| 7.3 | Current programs and plans |
| 8 | SWOT-Analysis for Management Area |
| 9 | UNESCO-UNDP, Analysis of 2003 Master Plan of Mtskheta |
| 9.1 | UNESCO/UNDP, Guidelines of the 2003 Mtskheta Master Plan Document |
| 9.2 | Assessment of Heritage & Tourism Master Plan for Mtskheta |
| 10 | Proposed Model for Management |
| 10.1 | Vision of Management |
| 10.1.1 | General Statements |
| 10.1.2 | Object of Management Plan |
| 10.1.3 | Aim of Management Plan |
| 10.1.4 | Management Plan Concept |
| 10.1.5 | Systemic Model of Management Plan |
| 10.1.6 | List of activities and timetable for the Management Plan |
| 10.1.7 | Monitoring & Control |
| 10.2 | Stakeholders (parties) and Management Structural Model |
| 10.3 | Recommendations on Legislative and Institutional Changes |
| 10.4 | Identification of Needs to Ensure Capacity Building for Potential Participants |
| 10.5 | List and Management Structure of Program Policies |
| 10.6 | Monitoring of Management Plan Implementation and replanning |
| 11 | Basic Action Plan for Transforming the Proposed Management System of Mtskheta World Heritage Sites into Operational Level |
| 12 | Sources |
| 13 | Annexes |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Annex 1.1 | Management guidelines for world cultural heritage sites; |
| Annex 2.1 | list of monuments In Mtskheta municipality |
| Annex 2.2 | list of monuments of national value In Mtskheta municipality (07.11.2006); |
| Annex 2.3 | on the Issues of Origin of Mtskheta |
| Annex 2.4 | Excerpt from the Pubic Register of Georgia, cadastre maps for WH sites of Mtskheta |
| Annex 3.1 | UNESCO-WHC Technical Assessment of Mtskheta historic monuments |
| Annex 4.1 | Constitutional Agreement between the Government of Georgia and Georgian Orthodox Church |
| Annex 4.2 | Decree of the Government of Georgia # 63, 21 February, 2012 on “establishing a Governmental Commission to review the issues provided for by Constitutional Agreement signed between the Government of Georgia and Georgian Orthodox Church”. |
| Annex 4.3 | The list of activities implemented by the Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure of Georgia in Mtskheta municipality during recent years; |
| Annex 4.4 | Pre-project research of General Land Use Plan of Mtskheta |
| Annex 4.5 | The list of basic archive materials; |
| Annex 5.1 | UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (excerpt: protection and management); |
| Annex 6.1 | Review of Historical-archeological Sites of Mtskheta |
| Annex 6.2 | Historical- architectural review of Mtskheta; |
| Annex 6.3 | The rules for determining the general protective zone of Mtskheta cultural heritage; |
| Annex 6.4 | Establishment of protection zones for Mtskheta cultural heritage |
| Annex 6.5 | the results of 2005 general inventory of Mtskheta historical sites. |

List of Figures

- 1.1 Elaboration process of the Management plan for World Heritage Sites
- 2.1 Map of Georgia
- 2.2 Mtskheta-Mtianeti Region
- 2.3 Mtskheta and boundaries of adjacent municipality
- 2.4 Municipality of Mtskheta
- 2.5 Mtskheta boundaries (Public Registry data)
- 2.6 Geological and seismic data of project area
- 2.7.1 Map of Tbilisi National Square
- 2.7.2 Routing tab of Tbilisi National Square
- 2.8 Schematic map of Mtskheta historic monuments (sites)
- 2.9 Mtskheta cultural heritage protection zones (on topographical plan)
- 2.10 Mtskheta cultural heritage protection zones (on orthophotograph)
- 2.11 Site boundaries according to Public Registry data.
- 2.12 Site boundaries according to UNESCO World Heritage Inventory
- 2.13.1 Mtskheta World Heritage Site boundaries. UNESCO 2011.
- 2.13.2 Mtskheta World Heritage Site boundaries. UNESCO 2011.
- 2.14 Areas of site physical protection
- 2.15 Physical and 1 km visual protection areas for sites
- 2.16 Jvari. Visual pool
- 2.17 Svetitskhoveli. Visual pool
- 2.18 Samtavro. Visual pool
- 2.19 Djvari. Field of vision
- 2.20 Svetitskhoveli. Field of vision
- 2.21 Samtavro. Field of vision
- 2.22 Mixed fields of vision of sites

- 2.23 integrated individual protection zones
- 2.24 Coordinates of integrated individual protection zones of sites
- 2.25 Boundaries of Site management area
- 2.26 Coordinates of site management area boundaries – integrated buffer zone
- 3.1 Protection zone of Mtskheta City Museum (1994.)
- 3.2 Protection zone of Mtskheta City Museum (1994.) on orthophotograph
- 3.3 Mtskheta State Architecture Museum-Reserve (1950.)
- 3.4 Map of Mtskheta Monuments Nominated in 1994 (WHC, ICOMOS Center for Documentations)
- 3.5 Svetitskhoveli, Samtavro and Djvari boundaries (1994, ICOMOS Center for Documentations)
- 4.1.1 Socio-economic context, Tourism - Mtskheta
- 4.1.2 Socio-economic context, Tourism - Mtskheta municipality
- 4.1.3 Socio-economic context, Tourism - Mtskheta-Mtianeti Region
- 4.2.1 Mtskheta cadastral map, registered land plots
- 4.2.2 Management area cadastral map, indicating form of ownership
- 4.3.1 Stratigraphic map of historical development in Management area (1-3)
- 4.3.2 Stratigraphic map of historical development in Management area (4-6)
- 4.3.3 Stratigraphic map of historical development in Management area (6-9)
- 4.3.4 Stratigraphic map of historical development in Management area (10)
- 4.4.1 Historical photographs
- 4.4.2 Historical photographs
- 4.4.3 Historical photographs
- 4.4.4 Historical photographs
- 5.1 Current management structure for cultural heritage monuments
- 5.2 Structural model of the management plan implementation
- 6.1.1 Map of cultural heritage sites in precincts of management area

- 6.1.2 Map of archaeological survey
- 6.2 Svetitskhoveli
- 6.3 Djvari
- 6.4 Samtavro
- 6.5 Archaeological excavations
- 6.6 History of Mtskheta legal protection
- 10.1 Monitoring and control of WH sites management plan

List of Tables

- Table 3.1** List of universally recognized monuments in Mtskheta and immediate surroundings
- Table 3.2** Monuments inscribed in the file of nominees and ICOMOS Evaluation Report;
- Table 5.1** Interventions and projects related to Mtskheta historic monuments;
- Table 5.2** Georgian legislation related to the protection of cultural heritage
- Table 6.1** History of legal protection of Mtskheta monuments and sites;
- Table 11.1** Action plan for implementation of the management plan.

1

Resume

Management Plan of Mtskheta World Heritage

office@geographic.ge

1.1 Vision- Concept of the Area

Development of Management Plan is required for maintenance of authenticity and integrity of Mtskheta monuments of the world value, preserved by the population and the history, historical- cultural landscape and Mtskheta, as cultural and religious center of Georgia. The purpose of the Management Plan is to regulate all changes in the area of world cultural heritage management.

During the last decade, as a result of construction boom, the issue of preservation and conservation of cultural heritage monuments moved to the top of agenda. Establishment of buffer zones of monuments and management of new constructions on the territory adjacent to them became necessary.

The agreement between UNESCO and the state on the issue of identification of Mtskheta world heritage monument was achieved in 2011. Due to the lack of control over the constructions occurring in Mtskheta and change of cultural landscape, UNESCO required development and enforcement of Management Plan for the monuments included in the World Heritage List (Svetitskhoveli, Jvari and Samtavro).

The Management Plan was developed on the initiative of the National Agency of Cultural Heritage Preservation. For the purpose of efficient performance of the working process, interdepartmental work group was established, which reviewed the phases and the results of planning process and made decisions.

In the framework of Management Plan the main goals of the Plan, its general concept, implementation strategy, mechanisms of legal and finance provision, forms of administration, methods of control and monitoring of the Plan were elaborated.

One of the basic results of development of the Management Plan is that the area of management of world heritage monuments was identified both for the monuments and historical landscape of Mtskheta.

The main goals and objectives of the Management Plan are:

- Introduction and management of continuous system of conservation and maintenance measures of the world heritage monuments;
- Establishment of management group and ensuring of the relevant administration;
- Creation of uniform database;
- Maintenance of cultural values of the monuments through observance of restriction regimes in buffer zones;
- Preparedness for risks and threats;
- Optimal management and awareness of visitors;
- Rising of the living standards of local community;
- Preparation of specialists of participant parties through education and trainings.

The process of formation of Management Plan of the world cultural heritage monuments is showed on fig. 1.1.

Guidelines of management of the remarkable sites of the world cultural heritage are provided in Annex 1.1.

1.2 Summary of Basic Recommendations

1. For enforcement of the Management Plan, law or legislative changes on protection of the world heritage monuments shall be developed and approved.
2. The law or legislative changes on protection of the world heritage monuments shall be adopted after all stakeholders confirm their preparedness for participation in the Management Plan by signing the relevant memorandum.
3. For validity of the Management Plan it's necessary to exactly define its place and role in the hierarchy of monument preservation documentation. Development of the Management Plan and definition and legal status of buffer zones and submission to the Ministry in the form of initiative is necessary. The provisions of the Management Plan may be presented in the form of new law or introduction of amendments into the existing legislation.
4. This initiative shall define the title, status, regulations and rules of the communication platform, as well as the sources of its funding and the rules and principles of drawing up the budget of the Management Plan.
5. On the initial stage of implementation of the Management Plan it's obligatory to provide education and training of specialists involved in the implementation of the Plan, as well as in the departments which directly performs the activities provided by the Plan, to establish special world heritage preservation subdivisions and/ or allocation of the required staff positions for this purpose.
6. On the next stage of the management Plan these specialists shall draw up detailed program and action schedules according to the relevant sphere and directions.
7. The period of implementation of the Management Plan is 6 years, and the programs according to the directions may be short-, medium- and long-term. The list of the planned activities shall be based on the program goals and

objectives of “General Plan of Mtskheta Heritage and Tourism” implemented in 2003 and those of SWOT analysis provided in this Management Plan.

8. Mandatory part of the Management Plan is introduction of control and monitoring mechanism of its implementation. On the basis of conclusions drawn as a result of these activities, the goals and objectives of the Management Plan shall be identified for the implementation of the further 6- year cycle.

28.09.2012

10

Proposed Model for Management

Management Plan of the World Heritage Site of
Mtskheta

office@geographic.ge

10.1 Vision of Management

10.1.1 General Statements

Pursuant to assumed obligations, the government requires properly elaborated management plan for inscribed World Heritage (WH) sites as a manual;

Key statements of management plan are published in Management Guidelines for World Cultural Heritage (Feilden-Jokilehto guidelines, 2007).

The present management plan is elaborated on the initiative of National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia for inscribed WH sites and their buffer zones;

The management plan presents all important scientific, informational, statistical and other analysis and materials obtained over recent decade in relation with these monuments.

Informational and graphic-analytical data are based on modern geoinformation systems, photogrammetric methods and technologies and are stored in an integrated database, enabling operative management and correction;

An Interagency Working Group has been formed for designing a management plan. The group regularly discussed each stage of planning process, evaluated results and reviewed key issues of designing;

Within the framework of management plan, the main goals of the plan were outlined, as well as its conception and implementation strategy, legal and financial mechanisms, administrative forms and the means for control and monitoring of implementation;

Chronologic frames of the management plan cover 5-year cycle. On completion of the first cycle, the work done needs to be evaluated, new objectives set and the renewed management plan implemented;

10.1.2 Object of Management Plan

Mtskheta World Heritage properties are only the three main architectural monuments – monasteries being part/property of Patriarchate of Georgia.

The following tentative names of the monuments are indicated during the elaboration of management plan:

- **Svetitskhoveli** (Svetitskhoveli Cathedral) (Image 6.2);
- **Jvari** (The Church of the Holy Cross of Saint Nino) (Image 6.3);
- **Samtavro** (Samtavro Peristsvaleba Cathedral) (Image 6.4);

Apart from churches, the three monuments include precinct with various buildings.

In the management plan, through special survey, the individual zones for protection of inscribed monuments provided by the Georgian legislation will be determined, which will consist of physical and visual protection areas. Since the individual zones of protection will significantly intersect, it was considered expedient in the management plan to create integrated individual zone of protection for the three monuments. This zone of protection along with the protection zone of Mtskheta landscape constitutes the area of the management of WH sites.

Based on analysis and study of management area, it was taken into consideration that boundaries of this area spread 2.5-3.0 km from monuments covering the major part of Great Mtskheta cultural landscape that meets the requirements of UNESCO Duideline Document concerning the buffer zones. Territory within the management area is recommended to be **assigned a status of a buffer zone** of WH sites.

10.1.3 Aim of Management Plan

Main goals of elaboration and validation of the management plan are as follows:

- Primary aim of the management plan is to preserve and develop the Outstanding Universal Value of WH sites of Mtskheta;
- Preserve high level of authenticity through permanent and goal-oriented protective efforts;
- Preserve integrity of cultural landscapes and high value of monuments by adhering to restrictions established in buffer zones;

- Ensure maximal raise of cultural value of monuments through measures planned for the monuments and buffer zones using minimal interventions;
- Ensure raise of cultural value of monuments and conflict-free management by forming an interagency management team and coordinated administering;
- Against the background of the protection of cultural heritage, exercising religious function and growth of tourism industry, ensure harmonized coexistence, mutual assistance and development;
- During the implementation of the management plan, improve legal, institutional, financial and educational instruments for the management of WH sites and exercising their functions;
- Create updatable integrated database, information system and communications chain for WH sites and implement new prospective programs and projects;
- Improve forms and methods of work organization and management for WH sites by designing the Management Plan;
- Increase access to WH sites and surroundings, raise cultural value and living standards of local community as a result of planning monument conservation and other efforts;
- Identify all types of risks and hazards, including natural and anthropogenic ones, and elaborate measures and methods for their prevention as a result of study and analysis within the framework of Management Plan;
- Ensure optimal management of visitors and awareness raising through the education/training for specialists of different profiles planned within the framework of Management Plan;

10.1.4 Management Plan Concept

Management Plan for the World Heritage Sites is an instrument, which includes general guidelines for conservation and preservation of WH sites, as well as an interagency document defining priorities, goals and objectives of management.

Effectiveness of the Management Plan greatly depends on its legal status and the implementing institutions. To that end, a right and precise place of Management Plan in the sequence and hierarchy of legal documents needs to be clarified.

Nowadays, monument protection field is provided for by the following documents of Georgian legislation:

- The Constitution of Georgia;
- International conventions, charters and agreements on monument protection;
- Law of Georgia on Cultural Heritage (2007)
- Law of Georgia on the Principles of Spatial Arrangement and Town-Planning (2005)
- Decree on Issuance of construction permits (Government of Georgia, 2009);
- The Rules of Land Use and Building Regulations (2008, general provisions, the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development of Georgia)

Based on this document, the sequence of designing activities and the place of Management Plan is as follows:

- Municipality spatial arrangement plan;
- General plan of land use for settlement;
- Basic historic-cultural plan for settlement;
- Building Regulation plan;
- **Management Plan for the World Heritage Sites;**
- Historic-architectural and archaeological preproject research;

- Conservation plan for historic construction;
- Conservation-rehabilitation projects for WH immovable properties.

Management Plan for the World Heritage Sites has to be included in legislative-normative documents through the law elaborated/adopted for this purpose on “**protection of the World Heritage Sites**” and other relevant laws.

10.1.5 Systemic Model of the Management Plan

Based on international practice, general scheme of the Management Plan has been determined, which provides for a cyclic nature of the works, i.e. upon completion of the first 6-year cycle, the work done are analyzed and evaluated, and a new 6-year cycle is planned to achieve new objectives, etc.

Main stages of this model are to be carried out in following succession:

- Determine management area;
- Information collection and analysis;
- SWOT Analysis;
- Develop vision for the management plan;
- Elaborate management principles and policy;
- Set the goals of management plan;
- Develop a strategy for the achievement of the goals;
- Develop program policies;
- Identify activities and parties;
- Elaboration of the relevant packages of projects by the parties;
- Outline the stages of implementation within accepted projects;
- Revision and renewal of stage performance;
- Planning the new cycle based on the results.

See the Flowchart of management plan on Fig. 1.1.

10.1.6 List of activities and timetable for the Management Plan

According to the goals and objectives of the Management Plan for the World Heritage Sites, the list of activities to be included in program policies has been prepared. These activities are divided over implementation in the short-term, medium and long-term in Mtskheta Heritage & Tourism Master Plan implemented in 2003.

All the activities in this Plan are divided over duration and profiles, such as archaeology, architecture and tourism.

Obligatory and urgent works and objectives revealed through SWOT Analysis are to be added to the activities listed in Heritage & Tourism Master Plan.

10.1.7 Monitoring & Control

Monitoring and control over implementation of Management Plan is one of the important components. During the implementation process, evaluation criteria need to be adopted to ensure objective assessment of quality, timeliness and compliance of performance.

The results have to be reflected in information system and integrated database of the Management Plan in the form of special reports. Following the analysis and interpreting of new data, the next cycle of the Management Plan will be designed.

10.2 Stakeholders (parties) and Structural Model of Management

Implementation of the Management Plan is obligatory to all stakeholders and institutions concerned, among which the three major parties are outlined: **state, Patriarchate and local self-government**. There should be the fourth potential party (if such, it should take active part in management) – it is **local community** represented by its NGO, which has not been in place in Mtskheta so far. In order to demonstrate the preparedness for the implementation of management plan, stakeholders will sign and publish a special

memorandum, indicating topicality of management plan goals and needs for the adoption of special law.

Institutions presented as the state ones may be divided into direct and linked participants. Participants of both types are continuously involved in management; they differ only by the extent of involvement and volume of work to be performed. Direct participants include Patriarchate, National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia, National Tourism Agency, Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development of Georgia, Mtskheta Museum of Archaeology and ICOMOS, as well as Mtskheta-Mtianeti Regional Administration and Mtskheta Municipality. Other institutions can be regarded as linked participants.

In order to ensure coordinated work of participants, a special **communications platform** has been formed, name and a charter of which will be approved by the participants on an equal footing.

Structural model of the Management Plan is provided in Flowchart 10.2.

10.3. Recommendations on Legislative and Institutional Changes

Law of Georgia on Protection of World Heritage Sites needs to be adopted after the all stakeholders confirm their preparedness for the participation in Management Plan by signing a memorandum.

Place and role of the Management Plan in the hierarchy of **documents related to monument protection**, as well as its goals, objectives and methods of implementation need to be stipulated by the law.

The law must stipulate in detail the specific **functions and rights/obligations** of the parties.

The law needs to specify name, status, charter and regulations of the interagency management team (communications platform).

The law needs to provide a definition of a new term “**Buffer zone of WH site**” and the rule for its approval is to be elaborated.

The law need to stipulate **sources of financing** and rules and principles of budgeting for the Management Plan. According to active legislation, the Management Plan budget may be formulated by revenues gained from local economic activity, state budget subsidies, credits, grants and donations.

10.4 Identification of Needs to Ensure Capacity Building for Potential Participants

Within the framework of the Management Plan, it is important to identify needs of the participants to ensure effective work. During the designing process of the Management Plan, the implementing parties send the stakeholders a letter with questions concerning the Management Plan issues and problems. Based on the responses, after discussion on interagency group meeting, basic needs for the implementation of the Management Plan have been underlined:

- **Organizational** needs, and
- **Educational-informational** needs.

Organizational needs relate to a special subunit or staff to be created, which will be in charge of the WH Site protection issues only. It is recommended to form a subunit in the agency, which is directly involved in the implementation of basic objectives of the Management Plan, i.e. Patriarchate, the National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia via its local structural department, and local municipality.

Organizational needs also include elaboration and implementation of program policies, as well as their legal and normative insuring.

Among those participants, which do not establish a special subunit, at least one employee (of the category of manager) is to be trained in WH Site Management Plan issues.

Educational-informational needs include awareness raise in basic conceptual issues about WH Site Management, the role of UNESCO, Convention requirements and basic regulations. It is required also to instruct all stakeholders on Management Plan, which relate to any form of the implementation, and arrange in-depth trainings for persons directly involved in the activities of the Management Plan.

Trainings need to be conducted regularly to prepare as many specialists as possible not only among the parties, but a in a wider range, i.e. monastery vergers, school teachers from Tbilisi, Mtskheta and other towns, professors and teachers of relevant higher educational institutions, representatives of the humanities, law enforcement and military spheres.

Each program policy must have its curricula, to be prepared and taught with the participation of relevant specialists of the parties. Basic **training courses** need to cover the following topics:

- Conservation and maintenance of architectural and archaeological monuments;
- Preventive monitoring;
- Protection of historic environment of monuments (environment protection, ecology, risk preparedness);
- Public relation, awareness raising, accessibility;
- Tourism, cognition, education, programs for kids;
- Socio-economic development, local management, local community, encouraging economic activity, development of transport and engineering infrastructure.

Optimal organization of the training process is of vital importance, for which the World Heritage educational center needs to be established under the Archeological Museum Reserve of Mtskheta or the National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia. In this center, all intellectual and technical resources will be gathered to ensure comprehensive teaching.

At the **first stage**, 5-6 specialists/trainers will be trained in basic profiles in UNESCO by experts of ICOMOS and the National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation.

At the **second stage**, the trained specialist/instructors will provide training course for the groups consisted of the participating stakeholders using the already elaborated curricula. Education process will be of cyclic nature. Upon completion of trainings, instructors will be granted special licenses of trainers, and the attendees – the certificates enabling them to work in their fields.

Education **Financing** needs to be stipulated by the law to be adopted on “Protection of the World Heritage Sites”. In a state budget, specific chapter needs to be dedicated to the financing of the Management Plan and education, as well as training for specialists.

Throughout the education process, specialists/experts will regularly present semiannual accounts to a financing body on education process, and the results of evaluation of the attendees. Financing body will present summary account to the members of interagency management team, to carry out final evaluation and effectiveness of the training and to plan future curricula based on financing.

10.5 List and Management Structure of Program Policies

According to general strategy of the protection of WH Sites, program policies of management plan are determined in accordance with basic goals, objectives, and information obtained during the work. Their redistribution by dates and topicality is also based on 2003 Heritage & Tourism Master Plan and data of SWOT analysis presented in chapter 8 of this Master Plan.

List of program policies includes the following sections:

1. **Conservation and maintenance of WH sites**
 - Architecture, reliefs, wall painting;
 - Archaeology, conservation, exposition, study;
 - Development of site territories, landscape gardening, cleaning

- Scientific study of sites, state analysis;
- designing conservation plan;

2. Buffer Zones

- Environment protection, ecology;
- Risk preparedness;
- Regulation of housing development
- Monitoring over regimes established in protected areas

3. Cognition and Adding Value

- Involvement of local community;
- Public relation;
- Education and popularization;
- Organizing the religious infrastructure

4. Socio-economic development

- Organization of transport infrastructure
- Provision with engineering networks
- Local business involvement

5. Tourism industry

- Development of tourism routes
- Improvement of information system;
- Service industry development;
- Increase and application of tourism potential;

6. Urban planning and spatial arrangement

- Designing spatial arrangement plan for Mtskheta municipality;
- Designing Mtskheta land use general plan;
- Designing building regulation plans
- Designing basic historic-cultural plan
- Elaboration of regulations for Mtskheta historic building.

Timetable for implementation of specific action plan of this program policy will be prepared based on this management plan under the directions of responsible and controlling persons after relevant legal and financial insuring. This preparatory work will be supervised by National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia in close cooperation with other relevant agencies.

10.6 Monitoring of Management Plan Implementation and Replanning

Specialists from National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia will prepare annual accounts on statute of WH site and landscape, current state, planning and action documents, requests for financing and technical assistance, as well as current and potential hazards. These documents then will be reviewed and evaluated on the meeting of management team council. Replanning takes place every 5-6 years. Annual monitoring reports have to be summarized and analyzed to set new goals of the management plan. This method makes easier identification of problems for the improvement of the management plan.

Criteria of monitoring of management plan implementation:

- Are the long-term, medium and short-term objectives clearly defined?
- Are the values, priorities and activities of lesser risk relevantly considered in management plan?
- Was the full inventory of site area carried out and documents prepared?
- Is the relevant documentation related to sites accessible?
- Are there reliably protected copies of the mentioned documents?
- Is there any properly checked fire-prevention plan in place?
- Is there any hazard prevention plan?

- Is any person responsible for disaster response measures considered among the personnel?
- Are the contacts established with relevant institutions and universities for the implementation of research programs?
- Do the current legal and normative documents reflect the need for the management of WH sites?
- Are they effectively applied? If no, why?
- Is the management infrastructure effective and adequate to its objectives?
- Are any contacts established with international organizations engaged in preservation of WH sites?

(Fielden B.M. Jokilehto, J. 2007)

Upon acceptance of the answers on above questions and based on their analysis, a new version of the management plan is determined for the next cycle of action. Structural model of control and monitoring is provided on fig. 10.1.

28.09.2012

11

Basic Action Plan for Transforming the Proposed Management System of Mtskheta World Heritage Sites into Operational Level

Management Plan of the World Heritage Site of
Mtskheta
office@geographic.ge

Table 11.1:

Action plan for implementation of management plan

| Stage | Action | 1-2 years | 3-4 years | 5-6 years | Responsible party | finances |
|---|---|--|-----------|-----------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Coordinate Management plan model | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan Distribution Accept /edit comments Prepare final version and deliver to the parties Signing a Memorandum by the parties on management plan implementation | x x x x | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> agency agency parties | - - - |
| 2. Legislative changes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> prepare definitions and legal basis for Management plan and Buffer Zone and present as a legislative initiative (new law or amendments to old one); approval and validation of Management Plan in compliance with the law; | x x | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry Agency | Budget, credits, donations; |

| Stage | Action | 1-2 years | 3-4 years | 5-6 years | Responsible party | finances |
|--------------------------------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|------------------------------------|
| 3. Program policies | Conservaton and maintenance of monuments (architecture, reliefs, wall painting, archaeology, conservation, exposition, study, site territory development, green space arrangement, cleaning, scientific study of monuments, state analysis); | x | x | x | The parties within the framework of relevant program | Budget, credits grants, donations; |
| | Buffer zones (Environment protection, ecology, Risk preparedness; Regulation of housing development Monitoring over regimes established in protected areas) | x | x | x | The parties within the framework of relevant program | Budget, credits grants, donations; |
| | Cognition and Adding Value (involvement of local community, Public relation, Education and popularization, Organization of religious infrastructure) | x | x | x | The parties within the framework of relevant program | Budget, credits grants, donations; |
| | Socio-economic development (Organization of transport infrastructure, Provision with engineering networks, Local business involvement) | x | x | x | The parties within the framework of relevant program | Budget, credits grants, donations; |

| Stage | Action | 1-2 years | 3-4 years | 5-6 years | Responsible party | finances |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------|-----------|------------------|---|--|
| | Tourism industry (Development of tourism routes, Improvement of information system, development of service industry, growth of tourism potential); | x | x | x | The parties within the framework of relevant program | Budget, credits grants, donations; |
| | Urban planning and spatial arrangement (Designing spatial arrangement plan for Mtskheta municipality, Designing Mtskheta land use general plan, Designing building regulation plans, Designing basic historic-cultural plan, Elaboration of regulations for Mtskheta historic building) | x | x | x | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry of Culture and Monument Protection Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development Mtskheta municipality | Budget, credits grants, donations; |
| 4. Monitoring and Control | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring; Description/ evaluation of the work done; Setting the new goals Draw up a new plan | | | x x x x | Ingeragency management team | Budget of the National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia) |

28.09.2012

12

Sources

Management Plan of the World Heritage Site of
Mtskheta

office@geographic.ge

Jokilehto, J. Fielden B.M.. (1993), The Ministry of Culture, Monuments protection and Sport of Georgia, 2007; 1998 ICCROM Authorized translation of second English edition. Available at <http://ancientgeorgia.files.wordpress.com/2011/09/martva-book.pdf> [Jokilehto, J., and Fielden, B. (1993) Management Guidelines for World Cultural Heritage Sites, Rome ICCROM.]

Mtskheta-Mtianeti Regional Development Strategy, 2012-2017, Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development of Georgia;

Economic development plan for Mtskheta Municipality (2007), working group of Mtskheta Municipality;

(1993) Nomination Dossier of Mtskheta, Georgia: Mtskheta Museum-Reserve, Georgia, Dossier c708, ICOMOS Center for Documentation, Paris

Georgia (2005B) Letter of the Minister of Culture, Monument Protection and Sport to Director of WHC #025/889-17, 17.03.2005, Dossier c708, ICOMO Center for Documentation, Paris.

Georgia (2005C) Decree on awarding a status of Mtskheta Museum-Reserve (nonregistered copy), the Ministry of Culture, Monument Protection and Sport.

Georgia (2006) joint Decree on determining protection zones for Mtskheta Cultural Heritage, #3/471– 1-1/1243, 27.10.2006. The Ministry of Culture, Monument Protection and Sport and the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development;

Georgia (2007a) Law on “Cultural Heritage”, 08.05.2007, #4708, the Parliament of Georgia;

Georgia (2007b) Law on “the Principles of Spatial Arrangement and Town-Planning”, 27.04.2007. #4689, the Parliament of Georgia;

Georgia (2007c) Report on State of Conservation of Mtskheta Historic Monuments, The Ministry of Culture, Monument Protection and Sport;

Georgia (2007d) Law on “Declaring the property right on land plots being in possession (use) of natural persons and LEPLs, #5274-RS, 11.07.2007. the Parliament of Georgia;

Georgia (2008) Decree on “approval of general provisions of regulation of the use and building on settlement territories” #-1-1/1254, 08.07.2008, the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development;

Georgia (2009a) Report on the Conservation State of Mtskheta Historic Monuments, National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia;

Kipiani G., for issue of the Origin of Mtskheta;

Council of Europe. (1985) Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe, 3.X.1985 [internet], Council of Europe. Available from: <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/121.htm> [Accessed 12.11.2008].

Council of Europe. (1995) Recommendation of the Committee of Ministers No. R (95) 9 on Integrated Conservation of Cultural Landscape Areas as Part of Landscape Policies. In: Council of Europe, (2002) European Cultural Heritage, vol. 1, Strasbourg: Council of Europe, p. 289.

Council of Europe. (2000a) The European Landscape Convention, ETS No.176 [internet], Council of Europe. Available from: <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/EN/Treaties/Html/176.htm> [Accessed 12.11.2008].

ICOMOS (1994a) Report of the Evaluation Mission to Georgia on Behalf of ICOMOS, May-June, 1994, Dossier Nc708, Georgie, Reserve de la Ville-Musee de Mtskheta, ICOMOS Documentation Centre: Paris.

ICOMOS (1994b) Evaluation Document for the Historical Church Ensemble of Mtskheta [internet], WHC. Available from: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/708/documents/> [Accessed 09.11.2008].

Mirzikashvili R., (July 2009), "Problems and Perspectives of Management of the Mtskheta World Heritage Site, Georgia", thesis, University College Dublin;

UNESCO (1972a) Convention for Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage [internet], UNESCO. Available from: http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URLID=13055&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html [Accessed 26.03.2008].

UNESCO/UNDP (2003) Heritage and Tourism Master Plan for Mtskheta, Georgia, Final Report, UNESCO.

UNESCO (2005a) Vienna Memorandum, adopted by the International Conference World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture - Managing the Historic Urban Landscape, 12-14 May 2005, Vienna, Austria [internet], UNESCO. Available from: <http://www.koh.hu/vilagorokseg/pdf/whc05-15ga-inf7e.pdf> [Accessed 20.02.2008].

UNESCO, 2011, Chapter II.F, Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention;

WHC (2000) the Letter to the Deputy Secretary General of Georgian National Commission for UNESCO, WHC/74/5481/PSTR 16.10.2000, Dossier N c708, ICOMOS Documentation Centre, Paris. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/708/documents/>

WHC (2005a) Decision of the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee, 29COM 7(b) 64, 10 -17 July 2005, Durban, South Africa, [internet], WHC. Available from: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/888> [Accessed 15.04.2009].

WHC (2006a) Georgia, Historical Monuments of Mtskheta, Periodic Report on the State of Conservation of World Heritage Properties in Europe, Summary of the Section II, [internet], WHC. Available from: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/708/documents/> [Accessed 15.04.2009].

WHC (2007) Decision of the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee, 31COM 7(b), 23 June 02 July 2007, Christchurch, New Zealand, [internet], WHC. Available from: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/statutorydoc/> [Accessed 15.04.2009].

WHC (2008a) Operational Guidelines for Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, (revised), [internet], WHC. Available from: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines/> [Accessed 19.12.2008].

WHC (2009) Georgia's Historical Monuments of Mtskheta Inscribed on Danger List, News Archive 28 June 2009 [Internet], WHC. Available from: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/news/535> [Accessed 01.07.2009].

WHC (2012), 36th session, Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation, 24.06– 06.07.2012;

Annex 6.1

Bibiluri T., Overview of Mtskheta Archaeological Sites

References:

Ghartiskari

1. Apakidze A. et al. Results of 1979 Research-Survey at the Great Mtskheta Territory, Mtskheta. Vol. VI
2. Apakidze A. et al. Great Mtskheta, Results of Archaeological Research-Survey Mtskheta. Vol. IX, 1980
3. Nikolaishvili V., Historic Topography of the Great Mtskheta (based on archaeological data), Iberia-Kolkheti, Collection of 4 antique periods of Georgian Archaeological Surveys, Tbilisi, 2005

Armaziskhevi Complex of Pitiakhshes

1. leonti Mroveli, The lives of Kings. **ქობ ღოს**, I, Tbilisi, 1955
2. Vakhushti Bagrationi, Description of the Kingdom of Georgia, **ქობ ღოს**, IV, Tbilisi, 1973
3. Apakidze A., Gobedjishvili G., Kalandadze A., Lomtadze G., Armaziskhevi Archaeological Excavations. Mtskheta, I, 1955
4. Apakidze A., Cities and City Life in the Ancient Georgia. Tbilisi, 1963
5. Bibiluri, T., Armaziskhevi Burial Grounds of Kartli Pitiakhshes (attempt of new interpretation of Burial rules), Collection, Issues of the History of Cultural, V, Tbilisi, 1998
6. Bibiluri, T., types of Burial Grounds and burying rules in I-IVcenturies Kingdom of Kartli.
7. Melikishvili G., Ancient History of Georgia, Tbilisi, 1955
8. Chilashvili L., for Definition of the name “God” (King Parnavaz – King-God), Commemorative Collection in memory of Alexandre Djavakhishvili, vol, XII - XIII, Tbilisi, 1997

Armaztsikhe

1. Moses Khorenatsi, History of the Armenians, Translated from old Armenian by Abdaladze A., Tbilisi, 1984
2. leonti Mroveli, The lives of Kings, I, Tbilisi, 1955;
3. Vakhushti Bagrationi, Description of the Kingdom of Georgia, IV, Tbilisi, 1973;
4. Strabo's Geography, Moscow, 1994
5. Kakabadze S., City of Armazi – City of Mtskheta, Historic collection,. III, Tb. 1928
6. Apakidze A. Cities and City Life in the Ancient Georgia. Tbilisi, 1963;
7. Apakidze A., Nikolaishvili V., Kipiani G., Archaeological Excavations on Armaztsikhe, MAI III scientific session, Mtskheta, Tbilisi, 1999

8. Kaukhchishvili T., New Greek Inscriptions from Armaztsikhe-Bagineti, Mtskheta, XI, 1996
9. Kutateladze D. Report on Mtskheta Bagineti Excavation. Collection by Takaishvili E., Tbilisi, 1966
10. Ioseliani I., Existed and Existing Cities in Georgia. Tiflis, 1850
11. Bolshunova A., Description of Iberia in Strabo's Geography, VDI, #46, 1947
12. Bolshunova A., about Issue on Armazi, VDI, #2, 1949
13. Melikset-Bekov L., Armazi, Tbilisi.

Former Settlements and Burial Grounds of Samtavro

1. Apakidze A., Mtskheta - Old Capital of Kingdom of Kartli, Tbilisi, 1959
2. Apakidze A., Cities and City Life in the Ancient Georgia. I Tbilisi, 1963
3. Apakidze A., History of Ancient Culture in Georgia, I Tbilisi, 1970
4. Apakidze A. et al. Mtskheta, Results of Archaeological Research-Survey, vol. II, Tbilisi, 1978
5. Baiern F. Study of Ancient Tombs near the City of Mtskheta, II, Tiflis, 1872
6. Bibiluri T., New Type of Tombs in Mtskheta, Academy of Science of Georgia, 'Moambe', vol. 93, #2, Tbilisi, 1970
7. Interesting Complex of Burial Grounds from Mtskheta, Dzeglis Megobari (Friends of Monuments of Culture), #62, Tbilisi, 1983
8. Bibiluri T., Clay Slab Burial Grounds on the Territory of Late Antiquity Period Georgia. Thesis to obtain the scientific candidate degree of historical sciences.
9. Bibiluri T., Moshinski A., Archaeological Artifacts of Georgia in Moscow State Historical Museum, Moscow, 2001
10. Bibiluri T., Novikova E., Earrings from Samtavro Burial Ground of Late Antiquity Period. Tbilisi State University, Issues of the History of Culture and Theory, XIV, Tbilisi, 2003
11. Bibiluri T., Ghlonti N., Archaeological Monuments of Samtavro Burial Ground of II-IV centuries, Series of Great Mtskheta Museum-Reserve "Great Mtskheta and its Country", I, Tbilisi, 2004
12. Ivashchenko M., Samtavro Burial Grounds of I-III centuries. Mtskheta. Results of Archaeological excavations. Vol. III, 1980
13. Ivashchenko M., Samtavro Burial Grounds of IV century and following centuries. Manuscript is kept in Mtskheta Institute of Archaeology.
14. Kalandadze A., Archaeological Monuments of Samtavro of early antiquity period. Mtskheta, vol. IV-VI
15. Lomtadze G., Archaeological excavations in the Capital of Georgia, Tbilisi, 1965
16. Lomtadze G., Bronze pendants in ancient tombs of Samtavro, Tbilisi, 1974

17. Chubinashvili T., Barrow-burial ground of Samtavro #243, Tbilisi, 1950

Annex 6.2

Historic-Architectural Overview

1. Alasania G., Bun-Turks of the Georgian Written Sources (historiography of the issue), Georgian Source Study, IX, Tbilisi, 2000.
2. Apakidze A., Mtskheta - Old Capital of the Kingdom of Kartli, Tbilisi, 1959.
3. Apakidze A., Cities and City Life in the Ancient Georgia. I Tbilisi, 1963.
4. Apakidze A., Sarkine, Description of the History and Cultural Monuments of Georgia. 5, Tbilisi, 1990.
5. Berdzenishvili N., Issues of the History of Georgia, VIII, Tbilisi, 1975.
6. Okhochadze A., 'Old Mtskheta' Localization Issues, Archaeological Monuments of Feudal Georgia, III, Tbilisi, 1978.
7. Gabeskiria Sh., for the issues of family-names of Georgians, origin of Georgia and its old capitals and localization of Kartli. "Valerian Gabashvili 90". Tbilisi, 2003.
8. Gamkrelidze G., Mithridat Evpator and the issues of the History of Kolkheti-Iberia. Matsne, History, Archaeology...series Tbilisi, 1989, #2.
9. Gamkrelidze G., Pirtskhalava M., Kipiani G., Issues of Military History of Ancient Georgia, Tbilisi, 2005.
10. Gotua L., Location of the river 'Pelori', Dzeglis MEgobari, #27-28, Tbilisi, 1971.
11. Information of Dion Kasios about Georgia. Greek text with Georgian translation, published, introduction and comments by Nodar Lomouri. Tbilisi, 1966.
12. Teimuraz Bagrationi, Books Dictionaries. Materials gathered, arranged alphabetically, annexed with foreword and comments by Guram Sharadze, Tbilisi, 1979.
13. Ingorokva P., Old Georgian Chronicle "Moktsevai Kartlisai" and "the List of the Kings of Iberia". Collection. Vol. IV, Tbilisi, 1978.
14. Ioane Bagrationi, Description of Kartl-Kakheti. Text prepared for publication, annexed with analysis and checklists by Tina Enukidze and Guram Bedoshvili, Tbilisi, 1986.
15. Kakabadze S., City of Armaz – City of Mtskheta, collection of Historical Works. Book III, Tiflis, 1928.
16. Lomouri N., Claudio Tolomeo's Geography, Information about Georgia, materials for the history of Georgia and Caucasus. Res. 32, Tbilisi, 1968.
17. Lortkipanidze O., Ancient World and the Kingdom of Kartli (Iberia), Tbilisi, 1968.
18. Lortkipanidze O., Origins of Old Georgian Civilization, Tbilisi, 2002.

19. Margishvili S., War of Iberia with Pompeius (based on Information of Dion Kasios), Mkhedari, #3, Tbilisi, 1991.
20. Mandjgaladze G., Results of Archaeological Surveillance in Svetitskhoveli courtyard and Church of Antioch, 2nd Scientific Session, Summaries of reports, Mtskheta, Tbilisi, 1998.
21. Melikishvili G., issues of the Ancient Population of Georgia, Caucasus and the Near East. Tbilisi, 1965.
22. Melikset-Bekov L., about the Establishment of the City of Mtskheta. "Momavali" magazine, #2, Tbilisi, 1921.
23. Nikolaishvili V., Historic Topography of the Great Mtskheta, Iberia-Kolkheti, research, addendum Collection of Georgian Archaeological Surveys of Antique Periods,. "Otar Lortkipanidze – 75". Tbilisi, 2005.
24. Sardjveladze Z., Dictionary of Old Georgian. Tbilisi, 1995.
25. Cultural Monuments of Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic. Compiled by Barnaveli T., edited by Tsintsadze, foreword by Chubinashvili G. Tbilisi, 1959.
26. Sulkhan-Saba Orbeliani, Selected works, vol. IV₂, Tbilisi, 1966.
27. Kaukhchishvili T., Strabo's Geography (Information about Georgia), Tbilisi, 1957.
28. Kipiani G., 'Antioch' of Mtskheta, Basic construction periods, 3rd Scientific Session, 'Reports', Mtskheta, 23 April 1999. Tbilisi, 1999.
29. Kipiani G., Who was being buried in Uplistsikhe? Collection of Research Works, faculty of the history of art, Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, 2001.
30. Kipiani G., Uplistsikhe. Tbilisi, 2002.
31. Chkheidze T., Essays from Iranian Onomastics, Tbilisi, 1984.
32. Djanashia N., Essays on History and Source Study, Tbilisi, 1986.
33. Djanashia S., about the issues of East-Georgian State Ancient Cultural-Political Centers. Works, II, Tbilisi, 1952.
34. Javakhishvili I., History of Georgian Nation, book 1, Tbilisi, 1951.
35. Atlas of Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic, Tbilisi, _ M. 1964.
36. Kvezereli-Kopadze N., Ancient Bridge of Mtskheta. Tbilisi, 1947.
37. Kozina T., a few issues about consecution of Hellenism. Issues of Universal History of Architecture. #1, M., 1961.
38. Lukovina V., Iran of Ancient and Early Medieval Periods. M. 1987.
39. Manandian, Circular Route of Pompey to Transcaucasus, messenger of Ancient History, #4. M. 1939.
40. Melikishvili G., about History of Ancient Georgia. Tbilisi, 1959.
41. Melikset-Bekov L., about Scythian Problem, about the issues of Saki, Kaspi, Materials for the History of Georgia and Caucasus, part VII, Tbilisi, 1937.

42. Melikset-Bekov L., Armazni., Materials for the History of Georgia and Caucasus, part II. Tbilisi, 1937.
43. Muraviov, Notes about historical geography of Transcaucasus. Plinius about population of Caucasus. messenger of Ancient History, # 1, M., 1988.
44. Mshvenieradze D., Civil Engineering in Ancient Georgia. Tbilisi, 1952.
45. Four-language encyclopedic dictionary of physical geography terms. M. 1980.
46. Adam J-P. L'Architecture Militaire Grecque, Paris, 1982.
47. Brosset M., Histoire de la Georgie. I part. SPB. 1849.
48. Lauter H., Die Architektur des Hellenismus. Darmstadt. 1986.
49. Lawrence, Greek Aims in Fortification Oxford, 1978.
50. Martin R., L'Urbanisme dans la Grece Antique. Paris. 1974.
51. Winter F. E. Greek Fortifications, Toronto, 1971.

2

Determination of the Area of Management

Management Plan of Mtskheta World Heritage

office@geographic.ge

2.1 Geographical Parameters and Natural- Climatic Characteristics of Mtskheta

Mtskheta is located in East Georgia, at the confluence of the rivers Mtkvari and Aragvi, on the banks of these rivers, in the range of 464-560 m above sea level. Distance from Tbilisi by railroad is 21 km. (Fig. 2.1).

The territory of Mtskheta municipality is the part of Mtskheta- Mtianeti region. In addition to Mtskheta, the region includes Akhlagori, Dusheti, Tianeti and Stepantsminda municipalities (Fig. 2.2, 2.3). Total area of Mtskheta municipality makes 71 732,2 ha (Fig. 2.4), and the territory of Mtskheta itself, which is established within the boundaries, adopted by the Public Register of Georgia, makes 4392,3 ha (Fig. 2.5).

The climate in Mtskheta is moderately humid subtropical. Average annual temperature is 10,8°C; in January – 1,1°C, in July - 22°C. The winter is usually cold (absolute minimum of temperature reaches -29°C) and hot summer (absolute maximum of temperature 29°C) As for vertical zoning of temperature, the temperature falls by 0,4°-0,5°C per each 100 m. In particular, if the temperature in the center of Mtskheta is about 30°C, at Mtskheta Jvari it's about +25°, +26°C. Average duration of sunshine in the region makes about 1000 hours; amount of precipitations – 590 mm; maximum precipitations fall in winter; in summer draughts occur. Humidity is moderate and varies in the range of 50-57%.

The direction of winds in Mtskheta depends on relief structure – configuration of gorges and exposition of slopes. So mountain-gorge type winds prevail here. Wind speed in Mtskheta and its adjacent territory is 2,9 m/sec.

The south part of the city represents the north slope of Trialeti Ridge, altitude of which is up to 1000 m. The height decreases to the north and transfers into Mukhrani valley lowland. The slopes of Trialeti Ridge on the territory of Mtskheta in latitudinal direction are crossed by the river Mtkvari, which forms deep and narrow gorge here. Geologically, this part of Trialeti Ridge is represented by middle and upper Eocene sandstones, clay-slates and clays. The structure of geological layers of Mtskheta region is shown on Fig. 2.6.

The varieties of black- chestnut and grey soils prevail on the territory of Mtskheta. From the point of view of vegetation cover, Mtskheta municipality, in general, is characterized

by varieties of secondary origin. Primary forests are in form of stands only in the river gorges. Besides, in Mtskheta lowland we could name the river Armazi gorge, where leading species are hornbeam, oak, maple. Fruit-bearing bushes are represented in the under-growth. On the alluvion of the river Mtkvari plane trees occur. Vegetation cover basically has soil-protecting significance, so great importance is attached to its maintenance. Besides, at many sites of the municipality the forest cover creates beautiful sceneries, which turned into popular places for tourists.

To the east of Mtskheta Tbilisi National Park, having abundant natural conditions, is located. Its territory covers 21586,6 ha. Visitors' administrative, historical- cultural, strict protection and traditional use zones and nine tourist routes are allocated in this park (Fig. 2.7.1, 2.7.2).

Many historical monuments – cathedrals, monasteries, churches, castles, towers and rich cultural layer with protected zones of archeological excavations are located on the territory of Mtskheta municipality (Fig. 2.8). See the list of monuments of Mtskheta municipality in Annex 2.2.

2.2 Phases of Development of Mtskheta Community

The north part of present Mtskheta was developed in X-VIII B.C. This period is classified as pre-city settlements of Mtskheta; in addition to residential building, necropolis of that period is disposed on this territory. Life on this territory wasn't renewed since VIII- VII centuries till II c. A.D.

Polytheistic Spectrum of Mtskheta

Since III c. B.C. Armazi pantheon - Armaztsikhe (Bagineti) according to present nomenclature - was established on the left bank of the river Mtkvari, on the opposite side of the river Aragvi confluence. Deities "Gats" and "Gatsai" ("Ga") – their erection is ascribed to ruler Azo. Deity "Armaz" was erected by King Parnavaz (the first king of Kartli). Female deities – "Ainina" and "Danina" were erected near the gates of Armazi. Armazi pantheon was formed of five deities.

II-I c.c. B.C.

The fifth king of Kartli – Parnajomi – erected the deity Zaden opposite to Armazi, according to historical information, on the mountain, where presently St. Nino Jvari Monastery (beginning of VII c.) stands. The same king established shrine of traditional zoroastrian community – “Moguta” on the right bank of the river Mtkvari. Development of the triangle formed by the rivers Mtkvari and Aragvi starts since I c. B.C. The triangle was concretely defined by three entrances: I – the north entrance; II – the west entrance and III – the east, i.e. Aragvi entrance (fortification entity opposite to the River Aragvis Poni). In the center, where Svetitskhoveli cathedral stands presently, Apollo’s temple existed (Corinth capitals are detected, II c.). Near the west entrance of Mtskheta, Galuti of Mtskhethian Jews and Jewish Temple was established. This is the site which represented the first place of preaching by St. Nino in Mtskheta area.

Samtavro Round Pagan Temple (the nature of the cult is unknown). The Temple was abolished by canonical basilica constructed with efforts of King Mirian – the first Christian king of Kartli.

Christian Structures

In all cases, without exceptions, Christian churches were established in the place of pagan and Jewish temples, but some pre-Christian structures remained, which Christianity didn’t manage to assimilate.

- I. St. Nino Jvari Monastery was established in the place of idol Zadeni.
- II. Svetitskhoveli stands on Apollo Temple. The first non-canonical wooden church, constructed with the efforts of the King Mirian and St. Nino was established on it. At the same place Vakhtang Gorgasali was building a basilica. In the XI c. domed church was constructed there, and in the beginning of the XV c. the survived parts of the previous church were covered with new casing.
- III. Samtavro domed church of Transfiguration was based on the church (basilica) built by the King Mirian, and the latter – on pagan tholos.

- IV. Church “Getsemania” of IV-V c.c. was based on Jewish Temple. The same time at the same time marked the west entrance of Mtskheta.
- V. Church “Antiochia” (IV c.) replaces the idol which was erected near Aragvis Kari and the city gate. In the V c. church “Stephane Tsminda” was built adjacent to it from the south side.

Christianity couldn't develop pagan pantheon Armaztsikhe, as it didn't manage to get cultivated there.

No churches were built in the big zone of zoroastrist religious service – “Mogvta” either. Its becoming the town and then granting of the status of city was conditioned by new territorial division of the Republic. It was seen as the center, where it would be possible to manage the adjacent villages from, i.e. the city where the administrative activities are distributed from.

Contemporary society evaluated the urban and cult values of Mtskheta quite late. Urban values basically imply its natural sanitary environment: two sides of urban triangle are washed by the rivers. Besides, extensive circulation of air occurs.

Cult values imply the landscape, revived by monumental architecture – clearly expressed center of the triangle as a dominant and all the three corners of the city marked with cult structures.

Preservation of the triangle shall be the basic condition for contemporaneity. In this case we preserve the initial idea, expressed in urban cosmogram – the center and the context.

The issues of historical formation of Mtskheta, formation of monuments and urban fabric are comprehensively covered in the paper by Guram Kipiani – Doctor of Architecture and Archeology – “For the issues of Origin of Mtskheta” which is provided in Annex 2.3.

2.3 Role of Mtskheta in Settlement System

None of cities presently existing in Georgia had experienced peripetias like Mtskheta. Once glorious center of urban culture of Iberia, the exemplary center of urban culture

began deterioration since the beginning of the VI c., following the transfer of the functions of the capital to Tbilisi. Degradation of Mtskheta, as the center of urban life, continued till the XX c. During this period it experiences complete fall and turned into ordinary village of Dusheti district. Thus it is mentioned in Ioane Bagrationi's "Description of Kartli and Kakheti" (2nd half of the XVIII c.). Besides, it's stressed that it always maintained the function of religious center of Georgia as its distinguishing feature.

The increase of administrative importance of Mtskheta starts from 1930, when it becomes the center of newly established Mtskheta district, but with the status of "city-type town" and not "city". Mtskheta obtained the status of city only in 1956.

In 1966 the status of "City- Museum" was granted to Mtskheta. In this period radical reconsideration of urban policy doctrine starts in the Soviet Union – the theory of self-sustaining, more or less autonomous cities gives way to more progressive concept of "group system of settlements", in the framework of which the notion of "urban agglomeration" was emancipated. The "Regional Scheme of Renovation of Georgian SSR", developed in late 1970-ies was based on this very theoretical basis.

This "Scheme" recognized that Tbilisi agglomeration was developing in the composition of the cities – Mtskheta, Tbilisi, Rustavi and Gardabani alongside the so-called "Tbilisi cavity", on the verge of several historical- cultural provinces of Georgia. The "Scheme" pointed out three zones of agglomeration:

- Center of agglomeration – Tbilisi;
- Main body of agglomeration – the cities Mtskheta- Tbilisi- Rustavi- Gardabani;
- The area of spreading of agglomeration connections.

It was important that the "Scheme" determined the direction of functional specialization of each city included in Tbilisi agglomeration. In this context and with consideration of the status of the "City- Museum", historical-architectural, tourist- recreation directions were recognized as the peculiarity of development of Mtskheta, which without words, but actually, served to its religious importance as well. It's remarkable that visiting Mtskheta's sacred sites was included in the routes of the "Union" determined for mass tourism as well as in the protocol programs of official governmental delegations.

Together with the revival of the status of Mtskheta, as the “City- Museum”, in parallel it was developing as administrative center – from the point of view of functioning of the relevant district institutions and construction of the corresponding facilities. The “Scheme” stressed the necessity of removal of such functions and facilities from historically formed zone of the city, which was performed partially. More radical opinion was moderately mentioned in the “Scheme” on formation of regional center of Mtiuleti zone in Zhinvali, which would solve the issue of liberation of Mtskheta from non-organic functions.

In 1970 new General Plan of Tbilisi was approved; its project period was defined up to 2000. The basic planning idea of the General Plan was turning of historical axis of development of the City and construction of housing estates around Tbilisi Sea, i.e. it was planned to change linear development of the city into circular scheme. The basic argument of this decision was termination of agglomeration process and stopping of physical merging of Mtskheta, Tbilisi and Rustavi. Although undeveloped territories still exist between these cities, based on mobility and shuttle-type migration of population it could be said for sure that agglomeration of the capital did occur and this process wasn’t stopped.

After obtaining of independence Georgia, basically, maintained administrative- territorial structure of Soviet period. Paragraph 3 of the Article 2 of the Constitution of Georgia rules that “territorial governmental arrangement of Georgia shall be defined by Constitutional law on the basis of the principle of delimitation of authorities after full restoration of jurisdiction on the whole territory of the country.” It shall be mentioned that certain preliminary activities are already being performed in this direction. Primarily, the preparatory stage related to historical phase of formation of metropolitan area of the capital is implied.

If the problems of formation of agglomeration of the capital didn’t go beyond theoretical discussion in Soviet period, presently the issue of formation of Tbilisi metropolis moved to practical plane. Besides the idea of specialized – religious, cultural and tourist center of Mtskheta as metropolitan area of the capital, remains unchanged. Implementation of

mutually beneficial interests of management of the world heritage monuments and town planning of the capital is possible just in these issues.

2.3 Visual and Physical Areas of Preservation of Mtskheta World Heritage Monuments and their Analysis

It is recognized that not only the performed or planned activities related to the monument itself, but optimal formation of protection zones and enforcement of the relevant regimes is crucial for full-value preservation of this or that monument. It's especially important in the case of the monuments existing in urban environment – due to diversity of interests and construction activity in such environment. From this prospect, the situation dramatically aggravated as a result of radical social- economic transformations, which momentarily changed one-subject nature of town planning into multi-subject nature and incomparably complicated urban management – including adequate management of the city development process.

All the above mentioned, at this or that extent, touched Mtskheta historical environment, fundamental milestones of which are the three sites included in UNESCO World Heritage List – Jvari, Svetitskhoveli monasteries and the system of their protection zones.

Preservation of Mtskheta cultural heritage in modern sense began from 1940 by declaring of Armazi area as archeological and architectural reserve. In 1950 “State Architectural Reserve” began functioning in Mtskheta. This phase was followed by extension of the Reserve to Bebris Tsikhe in 1957, and in 1966 the whole city was included in the reserve area. Since 1968 Mtskheta is a City- Museum. After restoration of independence of Georgia (1991) the attention towards Mtskheta cultural heritage site became more extensive, which was facilitated by revival of religious life as well as inclusion of the three remarkable historical- cultural monuments – Mtskheta Jvari, Svetitskhoveli and Samtavro monasteries in UNESCO “World Heritage List” in 1994, with formulation “Mtskheta Historical Monuments”.

Besides, obtaining of this highest monument protection status imposed special obligations on maintenance of the relevant monuments and management of the adjacent territory

(including the protection zones). Expert assessments, performed in this regard revealed that the practice, improper for the status of the world heritage monuments, occurs in regard to the monuments themselves - management of the land near the churches. As a result, in 2009 Mtskheta historical monuments appeared in the “List of Endangered World Heritage” (WHC, 2009). For the purpose of improvement of situation analysis of the existing state was taken as a reference point, primarily, from the point of view of adequacy and efficiency of monument protection zones.

The system of such zones is reflected in Fig. 2.0 – “Protection Zones of Mtskheta City Cultural Heritage”. The scale of the map is 1:20 000, it is accompanied by the legend and the document of approving authority, and the description of boundaries and the coordinates are not specified.

There are some inaccuracies in the “Legend”. Besides, they don’t match the renewed monument protection legislation. “Traditional national dwelling” introduces certain confusion, as this term denotes the type and not the status of the site. Instead of “protection zone of immovable monuments” and “landscape protection zone”, correspondingly, “protection zone of historical development” and “historical landscape protection zone” shall read.

At the first sight it’s formal issue; the form of delimitation of marking of the mentioned zones on topographic map is more substantial. Certain shortcomings occur in this regard as well:

- 1) Jvari monastery is included only in protection zone of natural landscape, based on unclear principle.
- 2) Svetitskhoveli monastery is assigned the monument protection zone but it is broken adjacent to Samtavro monastery, as a result of which the sense of “zone” is infringed. The same shortcomings occur in regard to the contour of development regulation zone, which overlaps the contour of status of other zone at several places. The landscape protection zone is uniform for all the three monuments, but, as already mentioned above, it needs more logical approach and more convincing “attaching” to the relief.

- 3) Samtavro monastery is represented on the verge of two protection zones – archeological zone and monument protection zone. Inter-relation of these two zones and consequently, protection zones are unclear. As for the landscape protection zone, its unclear nature was already mentioned.

And finally, incompatibility of monument protection zones and administrative boundaries of the city occur, which, in these sections, hampers monument protection activities in Mtskheta.

As the purpose of the present analysis is perfection of the system of protection zones of Mtskheta city cultural heritage, consideration of the relevant legislative base shall be taken as the point of reference.

Presently this sphere in Georgia is regulated by the Law of Georgia “On Cultural Heritage” (Georgia, 2007a). Section VIII of the Law is dedicated to the protection zones of cultural heritage and their regimes. The structure of protection zones is provided below in graphical form.

It's obvious that as a rule, the whole arsenal of cultural heritage protection zones isn't applied to all monuments at once, but Mtskheta is just the case when the full arsenal of protection zones is to be applied. Besides, before proposing of correction of monument protection zones we shall review legislative- normative acts of Georgia, individual provisions of which may facilitate complex protection of Mtskheta historical monuments.

The Law of Georgia “On the Bases of Spatial Arrangement and Town planning” (Georgia, 2007b) defines at the very beginning: “spatial- territorial planning – activities, regulating the use of territories of settlements, land use, development and improvement, protection of environment and immovable cultural heritage, spatial- territorial conditions of recreation, transport, engineering and social infrastructure, as well as spatial aspects of economic development and territorial issues of settlement (m.2. g). This general norm is actually repeated in the definition of “General Plan of Land Use”, where, in addition to other objective, it imposes on this town planning document the determination of spatial- territorial terms of protection of immovable cultural heritage (m2.m.). The Law rules that

the plan of regulation of development more accurately defined the parameters of protection and development of cultural heritage and town planning (m2.n.).

As one of its basic goals, the Law specifies determination of basic aspects of spatial arrangement and town-planning “for the purpose of protection and development of cultural heritage and natural resources” (m.4.1.g.). Most important is the norm, the goal of which is “integration of sectoral development programs and sectoral plans into spatial-territorial development policy and plans” (m.4.2.k). It’s clear that monument protection programs and plans are also implied here, as the Law views it as the main principle that “cultural and natural heritage shall be considered as one of the bases of development of the country” (m.6. 1.n).

As it was already mentioned above, the boundaries of protection zones of Mtskheta cultural heritage were approved by the Order N3/471 11-1/1243 dated October 24, 2006 of the Minister of Economic Development of Georgia (i.l.2.9.). According to this document, the following protection zones and sited were allocated on the territory of Mtskheta:

- archeological zone,
- immovable monument protection zone,
- regulation zone,
- landscape protection zone,
- world heritage monument,
- immovable monument,
- site with the sign of monument,
- traditional national dwelling.

These boundaries bear legal force to date and represent significant circumstance of monument protection regulation. For the need of the Management Plan, the mentioned boundaries form the basis, on which the elements of any new regulations shall be built (individual protection zones, boundaries of management area and other possible buffer zones).

On may 8, 2007 the President of Georgia signed new Law of Georgia “On Cultural Heritage” where the list of monument protection zones and sites was more accurately specified. In particular, Section 8 of the Law we can read:

Section VIII

Cultural Heritage Protection Zones and their Regimes

Article 34. The Structure and the Procedure of Establishment of Cultural Heritage Protection Zones:

1. The structure of cultural heritage protection zones consists of individual protecting zone and general protecting zones.

2. Individual protection zone of monument consists of the following areas:

- a) area of physical protection of monument;*
- b) area of visual protection of monument.*

3. General protection zones are:

- a) historical development protection zone;*
- b) development regulation zone;*
- c) historical landscape protection zone;*
- d) archeological protection zone.*

4. Individual protection zone of the monument shall be established automatically, since the moment of granting of the status of monument of the immovable object of cultural heritage. In the case of justified necessity, individual protection zone of the monument or its constituent area may be extended by the Order of the Minister.

The method of determination of individual protection zone of the monument is defined by the Article 36 of the same Law:

Article 36. Determination of Individual Protection Zone of the Monument, its Constituent Areas and Regime:

1. Individual protecting zone of the monument shall be the territory around the immovable monument, which consists of physical and visual protection areas and shall be established for the purpose of physical and visual protection of the monument.

2. Physical protection area of the monument shall be the territory around the monument, where any action may physically damage the monument or its adjacent territory. Physical protection area shall be defined by the following distance – height of the monument multiplied by 2, but not less than with the radius of 50 m.

3. Any activity, which will damage or create the risk of monument's damage or impair its perception or use, shall be prohibited in physical protection area, including:

- a) actions which will cause significant vibration or deformation of land;*
- b) storage of chemical, inflammable or explosive substances;*
- c) erection of objects, which doesn't serve to protection of the monument or improvement of its environment;*
- d) planting of plants or planting in the manner which may damage the monument.*

4. Visual protection area of the monument shall be the territory beyond the area of physical protection, change of which will affect historically formed environment of the monument and/ or full-value perception of the monument. Visual protection area shall be determined as follows:

- a) for monuments – at the radius of 300 m;*
- b) for the monuments of national significance – at the radius of 500 m;*
- c) for the monuments included in the list of the world heritage – at the radius of 1000 m.*

5. If the monument is located on the territory of the city, the relevant distance specified in sub-paragraphs "a" and "b" of p.4 of this Article shall be reduced twice.

6. Actions, which will damage historically formed environment of the monument, interfere with optimal view of the monument, its full-value perception or impair its significance, shall be prohibited in visual protection area.

7. For the purpose of determination of the areas specified in this Article, the height of the monument shall be its highest point, and the distance from the monument to the border of protecting area shall be calculated from external contour of the monument in the direction of the radius, drawn from the center of the monument.

Based on the cited abstract, the need of introduction of an amendment in the Order dated 2006 of the Minister of Economic Development is clearly visible, in particular, the list of protecting zones and the list of objects shall be brought in line with the list, provided in the Law “On Cultural Heritage”.

Individual protection zones and the relevant regimes, which is mandatory based on the requirements of the Law of Georgia “On Cultural Heritage” are not established for Mtskheta world heritage monuments.

Required information was obtained for performance of these activities and certain grapho-analytical procedures were held using modern geo-informational system. In particular, the borders of protecting zones provided in Fig. 2.9 were transformed into vector format and overlain on the latest aerial photo of Mtskheta city (Fig. 2.10).

On the basis of data of the Public Register of Georgia, cadastre maps and abstracts from the Public register were made for Mtskheta world heritage monuments: Jvari, Svetitskhoveli and Samtavro monasteries (Fig. 2.11, Annex 2.4).

The borders of Mtskheta monuments registered by UNESCO for entering into the List of the World Heritage according to the application dated 2011 were identified (Fig. 2.12). Superposition of these borders revealed their partial mismatching.

Physical protection zones of the monuments were drawn up from the borders registered in UNESCO application (Fig. 2.13.1 and 2.13.2) outwards by means of measuring of double height of the monument. The height of cathedral monuments was calculated from ground to the highest point of the monument – top of the dome. The imaginary plane was

overlain to the existing relief by orthogonal projection and the physical protection area of the monument was outlined (Fig. 2.14).

The next stage of activities included establishment of visual protection areas of the monuments. In accordance with the Law of Georgia “On Cultural Heritage” (Georgia, 2007a) visual protection area of the world heritage monuments shall make 1000 m. The circles with this radius were drawn from physical protection zone of the monument outwards (Fig. 2.15) and the obtained picture made it clear that the area of visual perception of the monuments is much larger than the boundaries of 1000 m radius (Fig. 2.16, 2.17, 2.18).

With consideration of these circumstances, the zone of basic visibility was increased up to 2000 m radius and generalization of visibility border was performed towards this radius (Fig. 2.19, 2.20, 2.21).

After optimization of borders (their drawing through ridges and ravines) overlapping of visual basins of all the three monuments became obvious and this it was considered appropriate to unify them in the form of uniform visual protection area (Fig. 2.22).

As a result of consistent implementation of the presented procedures and using geo-informational technologies, the individual protection zone of Mtskheta world heritage was obtained, which consists of physical and visual protection areas (Fig. 2.23). Regimes, characteristic for buffer zone and established by the Law apply to this zone. The borders of the areas are fixed using the system of geodesic co-ordinates (Fig. 2.24).

2.4 The Boundaries of Management Area

Determination of the borders of management of Mtskheta world heritage monuments was based on the following approved principles:

- management area shall include not only the territories of dislocation of the monuments directly, but the spatial- semantic connections among them and with historical landscape;
- Management area can't be smaller or less than any protection zone or area;

- the borders of management area shall cover reasonable area, management of which is possible and shall lead to the desirable outcome;
- management area shall be based on formally justified framework and fixable orthographic elements;
- management are shall be common for all the three world heritage monuments and, desirably, shall not cover territorial enclaves or “islands” torn off from basic territory;
- the borders of management area shall be fixed through the system of geodesic co-ordinates;

On the basis of the above listed principles all protecting zones and areas were marked on uniform base (orthophoto). In the process of determination of management area, leading role was attached to the biggest zones: visual protection area of the monuments and historical landscape protection area. Thought integration of their borders, the borders of management are of Mtskheta world heritage monuments were obtained, which meet all requirements and regulations specified in this art (Fig. 2.24). Formal representation of the borders of management area is fixed on the basis of the system of geodesic co-ordinates (Fig. 2.25, 2.26). Total management area makes 23,8 sq. km.

28.09.2012

3

Identification and Assessment of the World Heritage Monuments

Management Plan of Mtskheta World Heritage

office@geographic.ge

Identification of Mtskheta world heritage monument represented significant problem for years. Formal agreement on this issue between UNESCO and the government was achieved only in 2011. Although, UNESCO still states the need of amendment of the assessment of actual universal value of the territory and the present borders fixed according to it (UNESCO, 2012).

The present section provides retrospective analysis of various official opinions related to the essence of Mtskheta world heritage and amendments introduced in the nomination. The mentioned analysis allows restoration of evolution process of Mtskheta world heritage, which is the necessary prerequisite for perception of its essence and development of the relevant management system.

3.1 Retrospective Identification of Mtskheta World Heritage Monument

The problems related to the identification of Mtskheta world heritage monument rise immediately with the attempt of description of its territorial borders. Its basic constituent elements are described by the Government in the nomination dossier submitted by the state in 1993, as well as the reports of ICOMOS assessment and further monitoring missions and the reports on conservation status submitted by the country to the World Heritage Center. But the list of monuments is different in each document.

Mtskheta was represented in the World Heritage List as the City- Museum- Reserve and not as a group of monuments, which gave rise to number of misunderstandings in regards to the identification of its constituent elements as well the main body and buffer zones.

Table 3.1:

The List of Universally Recognized Monuments Existing in Mtskheta and Immediately Adjacent to it

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| 1 | Svetitskhoveli Cathedral | XI-XIII c.c. |
| 2 | Samtavro Monastery | IV-XI-XVI c.c. |
| 3 | Jvari (Holy Cross) Monastery Complex | VI c. |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| 4 | Armaztsikhe/ Bagineti Archeological Site | III-IV c.c. B.C. |
| 5 | Samtavro Necropolis | Neolithic, Late Bronze Age, Early Iron Age |
| 6 | Antioch Church | V-VII c. |
| 7 | Gethsemane Church | About VI-VII c. |
| 8 | City Gate Archeological Site | V-VI c. |
| 9 | Bebristsikhe Castle | Early Middle Ages |
| 10 | Armaziskhevi Archeological Site (Pitiakhsh residence) | Neolithic, Late Bronze Age, Early Iron Age |

The territory submitted by the state to the World Heritage List covers central part of Mtskheta municipality, including central part of Mtskheta city, as well as neighboring villages existing within the boundaries of “Great Mtskheta”. One of the reasons of such large-scale nomination could be the desire of granting of the status of independent municipality to Mtskheta. Due to this of other reasons, the whole territory of the Museum- Reserve was nominated; furthermore, the boundaries of the Museum Reserve were extended for the purpose of nomination. The borders of the nominated territory were marked on the map, where the “temporary protection zones of City- Museum Mtskheta and its Outskirts”¹ were depicted (Fig. 3.1, 3.2, 3.3).

Identification of borders is also complicated by the circumstance that the map presented in the dossier is a small-scale photocopy, where it’s almost impossible to read the inscriptions (Fig. 3.4). The photocopy presents two maps, having only one title translated into English - “Mtskheta Protection Zones”, which doesn’t correspond to Georgian titles of any of copies - “Protection Borders of Jvari Monastery Impact Zones” and “Temporary Protection Zones of City- Museum Mtskheta and its Outskirts”.

Thus the borders drawn for different purposes were defined in the nomination file as buffer (protecting) zones of the world heritage without any indication to the basic zone of

¹ There is no date of signature on the map and it’s difficult to determine which period it refers to. Presumably it was initially drawn in the period of establishment of administration of the Museum- Reserve for the purpose of outlining the operational district

the world heritage. In 1994 ICOMOS Assessment Mission of mentioned the improper nature of such attitude:

“... the borders exceed the requirements related to the world heritage sites. After examination of the site and negotiations with the Government of Georgia we determined mutually agreed world heritage site and buffer zones.” (ICOMOS, 1994a).

Consequently, on the basis of agreement between ICOMOS Assessment Mission of 1994 and the relevant Georgian authorities three monuments were selected for granting of the status of the world heritage: Svetitskhoveli cathedral, Samtavro monastery and Jvari monastery. ICOMOS recommended to change the title of nomination into “Historical Cathedrals of Mtskheta”. Obviously, monuments like Armaztsikhe archeological site weren’t considered as those having outstanding universal value. Samtavro Necropolis was mentioned only as buffer zone of the monastery and archeological park. The term archeological park appears only on the map attached to ICOMOS report. But this term isn’t mentioned either in national legislation or in earlier maps of the city.

In spite of the agreement, the three maps, which were made during the mission and where the borders of the churches and monasteries of the world heritage were marked, weren’t officially submitted to the World Heritage Committee by the Government (Fig. 3.5). Due to the above mentioned, formal misunderstanding in regard to the constituent elements and borders were protracted. According to the correspondence between the World Heritage Committee and the state (WHC, 2000), in 2000 the World Heritage Committee relied on ICOMOS Assessment Report to explain to the state that only the three cathedrals represent the world heritage sites and the territory, initially submitted for nomination could be regarded as buffer zone.

Another way of retrospective determination of the borders of Mtskheta World Heritage Sites is comparison of the lists of sited included in the nomination file and ICOMOS reports (see Table 3.2). Many monuments are described in the nomination file but it’s not specified whether they are proposed as nomination components or not. As the state didn’t officially submit the version proposed by ICOMOS experts – to include in the list only the

three most significant cathedrals of Mtskheta, only ICOMOS assessment document couldn't ensure exact determination of the world heritage (ICOMOS, 1994 b).

The above mentioned misunderstandings, in their turn, led to long discussions between the country and the World Heritage Center on the title of the site. ICOMOS Assessment Mission proposed to change the initial title "City Museum Reserve" into "Mtskheta Historical Cathedrals". The state agreed to change the title, but, like the case with the borders of the monuments, official request on change of the title wasn't submitted to the World Heritage Center.

Table 3.2:

Monuments included in nomination file and ICOMOS Assessment Report

| | Sites specified in the nomination file | Sites specified in ICOMOS report |
|----|--|---|
| 1 | Historical districts of Great Mtskheta: citadel – Armaztsikhe, Tsitsamuri, Sarkine, Mogvtakari | Historical districts of Great Mtskheta: citadel – Armaztsikhe, Tsitsamuri, Sarkine, |
| 2 | Armaziskhevi: Pitiakhsh's residence complex and bath-house | Armaziskhevi: bath-house and remains of palace |
| 3 | Svetitskhoveli Cathedral | Svetitskhoveli Cathedral |
| 4 | Jvari Monastery complex | Jvari Monastery complex |
| 5 | Samtavro Monastery | Samtavro Monastery |
| 6 | Antioch Church | Antioch Church |
| 7 | Akhalkalakuri Monastery | Akhalkalakuri Monastery |
| 8 | Armazi Monastery | Armazi Monastery |
| 9 | St. George church in Kalaubani | St. George church in Kalaubani |
| 10 | Bebristsikhe | - |
| 11 | Samtavro Necropolis | - |
| 12 | „Dionysus' House" in Dzalisa | - |

Source: Georgia, 1993; ICOMOS, 1994a.

It's important that new version of title was proposed by the country in 2005 – "Mtskheta Historical Monuments" (WHC, 2005). The title was justified by the fact that not only the

churches, but Armaztsikhe- Bagineti archeological site represented Mtskheta world heritage (Georgia, 2005b). The above mentioned contradicted to the visions proposed by ICOMOS Assessment Mission (1994). Nevertheless, the mentioned version was approved by the World Heritage Commission.

Consequently, in most of reports on the status of conservation, presented by the country, four main monuments and one archeological site are specified (Georgia, 2007g).

1. Svetitskhoveli Cathedral,
2. Jvari monastery Complex,
3. Samtavro Monastery'
4. Armazi- Bagineti archeological site

It's interesting, that when the issue again arose in 2010- 2011 in the framework of retrospective inventory program of the world heritage, the World Heritage Committee, as opposed to the report dated 2005 of the Committee, unambiguously supported the version proposed by ICOMOS. In 2011, as a result of repeated exchange of opinions and involvement of leading international experts, in accordance with the request of the World Heritage Center, in the framework of retrospective inventory the country developed and the World Heritage Committee approved retrospective cartographic documentation and the universal value application, which mentions only three cathedrals: Svetitskhoveli, Samtavro and Jvari as the holders of the world heritage status.

Nevertheless, the World Heritage Missions and the World Heritage Commission have repeatedly mentioned that little modification of the borders of the monument is desirable for the purpose of reflection of Mtskheta cultural landscape in the nomination. In this aspect, it becomes possible to include not only Armaztsikhe- Bagineti archeological site, but also Mtskheta urban landscape into the territory of the world heritage monument or its buffer zone. In any case, the mentioned decision has to be assessed in details and approved by all departments, involved in the management in order to avoid the misunderstandings related to limitation of development in the future.

3.2 Retrospective Application on Universal Value of Mtskheta World Heritage

The following document was developed by demand of the World Heritage Center, in the framework of Retrospective Inventory of the World Heritage² in 2011. Following the more accurate specification of the issues related to the components, the document was approved by the 36th Session of the World Heritage Commission in 2012.

The mentioned document sets the goal to present the universal value of Mtskheta world heritage according to the state of 1994 and, consequently, doesn't take into account the agreements, achieved between the state and the World Heritage Center during the next decade.

Great Mtskheta Museum- Reserve (C 708, Georgia)

Retrospective Application on Outstanding Universal Value

a. Brief Overview

Mtskheta historical monuments – Jvari Monastery, Svetitskhoveli Cathedral and Samtavro monastery are located in 20 km north-west from Tbilisi (central and east Georgia) in Mtskheta city, which was the ancient capital of East Georgian Kingdom from III c. B.C. to V c. A.D. It was here that Christianity was announced a state religion in 337. Mtskheta remains the center of Georgian Orthodox Apostolic Church.

Mtskheta historical monuments are located in cultural landscape near the confluence of Aragvi and Mtkvari. The first dwelling survived in the present boundaries of Mtskheta is dated by 3rd and 2nd millennia B.C., when Mtskheta became the capital of Kartli, East Georgian Kingdom. The city had close contacts with Roman Empire, Persian Empire, Syria, Palestine and Byzantium. Their cultural influence was combined with local cultural traditions, which gave special significance to Mtskheta historical monuments. The

² Retrospective Inventory Program of the World Heritage is being implemented by the World Heritage Center since 2004. It sets the goal to complete, retrospectively, the dossiers of all monuments, which were entered into the World Heritage List before 2000 (before the applications on universal value and the standards of cartographic documentation became mandatory) with Applications of Universal Value and the relevant cartographic maps.

favorable natural and strategic conditions of the city and its location on the cross-road of trade routes facilitated its fast development. When the capital was moved to Tbilisi in 5th c. A.D., Mtskheta still maintained the leading role of one of the most important cultural and religious centers.

Since 3rd millennium B.C., archeological monuments and structure of ancient capital of Georgia – Mtskheta preserves the evidences of social, political and economic evolution of the region.

Mtskheta Holy Cross Monastery, Svetitskhoveli Cathedral and Samtavro Monastery are the most significant monuments of Medieval Georgia, which contain the most important archeological materials. The archeological monuments prove high culture of construction, rock processing, pottery, as well as metal molding and processing.

These monuments are directly related to the activities of St. Nino – young Cappadocian missionary woman. In the 4th c. she spread Christianity, which is proven by materials of Georgian, Armenian, Greek and Roman historians. Jvari Monastery, built in the 6th c., is one of the most sacred places in Georgia. Svetitskhoveli complex is located in the center of Mtskheta. The complex includes: cathedral, gate and the palace of Cathalicos Melkisedek of the 11th c., which was build in the place of churches constructed in the 5th century. The cross-shaped Cathedral is embellished with high central dome; significant mural painting survived in the interior. According to legend, St. Nino lived in Samtavro, in the north part of the city. Small domed church of Samtavro Monastery was first built in the 4th century and since then it was altered many times. The main church of the Monastery was constructed in the 11th century. The tom of Iberian King Mirian the Third, who made Christianity the state religion of Georgia, is here.

b. Justification of criteria

| | | |
|----------------------|---|---|
| Nomination of 1994 5 | Operational Guidelines of 1994 (iv) In the example of | Operational Guidelines of 1994 (iii) Bears unique special |
|----------------------|---|---|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | outstanding type structure or architectural ensemble, or the landscape which reflects significant stage(s) of the history of mankind | evidence of lost civilization or cultural tradition |
| Components specified in the decisions | Historical churches | Historical churches |
| Parameters used in the nomination | Historical churches, archeological monuments | Group of churches, archeological monuments, early mosaic and metal ware, inscriptions |

(iii) Bears Unique or Outstanding Evidence of the Lost Civilization or Cultural Tradition

Mtskheta historical monuments evidence high art and great culture of the former Kingdom of Georgia, which played greatest role in Medieval history of the region. Rare evidences of introduction and spreading of Christianity to mountainous regions of the Caucasus are here. Archeological monuments and religious complexes of the ancient capital of Georgia – Mtskheta – reflect social, political and economic evolution of the Kingdom during four millennia the best way. Although each monument makes its contribution to the common value of this cultural heritage, this site is made special by their unified value.

(iv) Is the Sample of Outstanding-type Structure or Architectural Ensemble, which Reflects Significant Stage(s) of the History of Mankind

Mtskheta historical monuments, including Jvari Monastery, Svetitskhoveli Cathedral and Samtavro Monastery, represent clear examples of Medieval ecclesiastic architecture of the Caucasian region and reflect different periods of architecture of such typology from the 4th to the 8th century.

The ruins of earlier structures and remains of antique frescos have also survived near these churches. The most important of them is Svetitskhoveli Cathedral, constructed in the 11th century, which is cross-shaped and is crowned by high dome. Rich relief décor is dated by different periods of its long history.

c. Integrity

Mtskheta historical monuments have maintained the integrity of significant monument of Mtskheta cultural landscape.

d. Authenticity

Mtskheta maintained the function of spiritual and cultural center, which was imposed on it after introduction of Christianity in this region during centuries. The items and ruins discovered as a result of archeological excavations have maintained authenticity. In spite of repeated restoration and renovation, Jvari Monastery, Svetitskhoveli Cathedral and Samtavro Monastery have maintained material and functional authenticity.

e. Management and Protection

On the basis of the relevant legislative acts of Georgia, which were first enacted in the middle of the XX c. (1940; 1957) Mtskheta and its outskirts were granted the status of archeological- architectural reserve. Since 1968 Mtskheta was announced as city-museum. Protection of Mtskheta historical monuments is regulated by the Law on National Cultural Heritage and Spatial Planning.

Long-term objectives are: improvement of site management mechanism and coordination among various stakeholders, which will ensure agreed process of decision-making in regard to land use in buffer zone, as well as prevention of improper interventions in the landscape.

3.3 Retrospective Identification of Buffer Zones

Identification of protection zones of Mtskheta cultural heritage, which were approved for the historical city in 2006, didn't completely solve the issue of identification of basic and buffer zones of the world heritage (Georgia, 2006). This document mechanically uses the three maps attached to ICOMOS Assessment Report, where the world heritage monuments and their buffer zones are marked without their detailed analysis or assessment.

Based on the map, compiled by ICOMOS in 1994 in agreement with the state, the territories of the three cathedrals and Samtavro Valley as buffer zone of the world heritage was marked by the world group on updated cartographic base.

Instead of the term "buffer zone", Georgian legislation uses its Georgian variant – "protection zone", so the territory of Samtavro Valley was marked on the map of protection zones of Mtskheta cultural heritage as archeological protection zone. Due to active concentration of a lot of immovable monuments, the main body of the historical city fell within the boundaries of protection zone of immovable monuments, and the adjacent territories – within the boundaries of regulation of planning and landscape protection zones. The mentioned project practically ensured protection of Mtskheta landscape by regulations of different stringency, which is the purpose of buffer zone. Due to the amendments introduced into the legislation on cultural heritage in 2007, basic regimes acting in different zones were defined, ensuring legal basis required for their implementation in reality.

It shall also be mentioned that the Law of 2007 defined two types of protection zones of cultural heritage – individual and general. While general protection zones apply to groups of monuments, area, historical districts and landscapes, individual protection zones serve to ensuring of the necessary minimum regulations, required for physical and visual protection of its immediate environment.

According to the Law, individual protection zone comes into force automatically upon granting of the status of the monument to the site. Detailed methodology for its determination and the regimes are provided in the Law on Cultural Heritage.

For the monuments of the world cultural heritage the Law defined the biggest radius of individual protection zone, which makes 1 km for visual area. The above mentioned may be extended or changed by the order of the Minister of Monument Protection.

According to the above mentioned legislative regulations since 2007 Mtskheta world heritage monuments and their environment is protected on the level of national legislation by individual, as well as general protection zones. If the mentioned zones overlap each other, more stringent of their regimes shall apply.

In spite of such complex protection, the requirement of the World Heritage Center regarding definition of buffer zone for the world heritage is still valid. The World Heritage Center doesn't consider the existing zoning and regulations sufficient and demands creation of the relevant regulatory framework for the world heritage monuments specifically.

In 2011, according to the instructions of the World Heritage Center, the country has prepared and submitted retrospective maps of the world heritage monuments, where the borders, drawn by ICOMOS in 1994 are fixed by coordinates on the latest aerial photos.

Consequently, Mtskheta world heritage and its buffer zone are considered presently according to these documents, although, as it was mentioned above, the World Heritage Center calls the state (UNESCO, 2012) to modify the mentioned borders for the purpose of integration of Mtskheta cultural landscape.

3.4 The Requirements of the Operational Guidelines of the World Heritage Convention in Regard to Management

Operational Guidelines for Implementation of the World Heritage Convention represents the main document for implementation of the Convention. Along with other details, it also includes guidelines on protection and management of the world heritage monuments (UNESCO, 2011, Section II.F). According to the mentioned document, protection and management of the world heritage monuments shall primarily ensure preservation-improvement of their universal value, integrity and authenticity parameters fixed at the moment of their entering into the World Heritage List and protection against undesirable

development. The state is obliged to ensure long- term legislative, regulatory and institutional framework for fulfillment of this condition, including facilitation of traditional protection forms, if they exist in local community.

The Operational Guidelines include recommendations and instructions in regard to the three main issues:

- a) borders for efficient protection
- b) Buffer zones
- c) management systems

A) Borders for Efficient Protection

The main requirement while determining the borders of the world heritage monument (including criteria 1-6) is that the territory shall include all components and characteristics, which substantially express the outstanding universal value of the monument and that it shall ensure full representation of integrity and authenticity of the monument. The territory shall also include the areas, which have future potential for improve the perception of universal value of the monument.

It is desirable that the territory submitted to the World Heritage Committee coincides with the management or protection zones existing on national level, e.g. national park, reserve, etc., but mostly only part of such protected territories meet the criteria of nomination. Consequently, exactly such part shall be allocated as the world heritage territory.

b) Buffer Zones

The Convention requires determination of buffer, i.e. protection zones, when necessary for the proper protection of the monument. Buffer zone represents the mechanism for additional protection of the monument and shall be determined according to the following criteria:

- the zone shall include the territory, immediately adjacent to the world heritage zone, as well as

- significant views and
- other areas and attributes, which are important for the monument functionally and from the point of view of protection.

Detailed information on the size of buffer zone, borders and the regime acting within it shall be submitted to the World Heritage Center.

Although the buffer zone doesn't represent the part of monument, its modification is subject to agreement with the World Heritage Committee. Usually, establishment of modification of buffer zone is considered in the rank of "minor modification of borders".

c) Management systems and Sustainable Use

Each nominated monument shall be managed by Management Plan or other type of management document. the management document shall defined the method; of protection of outstanding universal value, desirably using participatory method.

The purpose of management is to ensure efficient protection of monument for present and future generations.

Management systems may include traditional practices, existing regional and planning instruments and other formal and informal planning and control mechanisms.

While planning interventions, assessment of their anticipated impact on the world heritage monument is extremely important.

Efficient management system shall include the following elements:

- the participant parties shall fully understand and share the importance of the monument;
- Planning, implementation, monitoring and assessment cycle shall be defines;
- Monitoring mechanism of changes and/ or interventions shall be in place;
- All participants and partners shall be involved;
- Required resources shall be allocated;
- The mechanism of capacity building of the participants shall be ensured so that they were able to take responsibility;

- Functioning of management system shall be understandable for everybody and transparent;

Efficient management means formation of the cycle of short- medium- and long-term actions for protection, conservation and presentation of the monument. This approach includes not only buffer zone of the monument but, often, wider territories.

The recommendation of the Committee is to consider the element of preparation for risk and the need of the relevant training in the process of the world heritage management.

The Convention on the World Heritage supports use of the world heritage monuments if such use is culturally and ecologically sustainable and facilitates improvement of living standards of local community. The state shall ensure that such use and/ or other changes don't have inevitable impact on the monument's outstanding universal value.

Participation of local community and partners in decision-making and management process is seen as one of the required pre-requisite of sustainability of the process.

Please see the document of UNESCO's Technical Assessment in Annex 3.1.

Conclusion

Based on the above stated, the following shall be taken into account in the process of development of Mtskheta world heritage management plan:

Buffer zone of the monument shall include important components of cultural landscape;

Management system shall define the roles and responsibilities of all relevant parties, including local community.

28.09.2012

4

Description and Assessment of Mtskheta Management Area

Management Plan of Mtskheta World Heritage

office@geographic.ge

4.1 Social- Economic Context, Environment Protection, Tourism and Town Planning Parameters

Mtskheta is considered a city of regional importance; Mtskheta- Mtianeti Regional administration is located here. Mtskheta has high historical- cultural potential; it's one of the most important religious centers. According to the number of population, Mtskheta belongs to the category of small cities. Mtskheta is an important transport hub for the west and north-south communication highways. Mtskheta population is mainly occupied in tourism, transport, administration, service and agricultural sphere.

Demography

According to “Plan of Economic Development of Mtskheta” (2007) Mtskheta population was quite stable in the years following the first national census:

| Year | Population |
|-------|---------------|
| 2002 | 7,7 thousand |
| 2003 | 7.6 thousand |
| 2004. | 7,4 thousand |
| 2005 | 7.5 thousand |
| 2006 | 7,7 thousand; |

Presently, as of January 1, 2012, Mtskheta population makes 7,8 thousand. Migration of Mtskheta population is insignificant, but in 2002-2006 migration made 76-72 persons. This figure decreased in 2007:

| Year | Internal migr. | External migr. |
|------|----------------|----------------|
| 2002 | 7 | 14 |
| 2003 | 17 | 19 |
| 2004 | 26 | 26 |
| 2005 | 63 | 38 |
| 2006 | 76 | 72 |
| 2007 | 39 | 46 |

In the framework of development of the above mentioned “Plan”, sociological survey of population was conducted. Mtskheta resident considered tourism development and

creation of employment opportunities as a priority, and rural population made accent on development of infrastructure.

Tourism

Before obtaining of independence Georgia represented tourist Mecca of Soviet Union. The basic tourist flows were attracted by Black Sea coast and Military Road of Georgia, crossing Mtskheta. Mtskheta was included in several the so-called “Union Tourist Routes” which was organized and statistically countable form of tourism. In the second half of 1980-ies Mtskheta tourist attraction was impressive: 200-300 thousand tourist man/days; average 750,000 tourists were served annually; 105 000 foreign tourists visited Mtskheta in 1985. Tourist infrastructure was also developed – network of travels and excursions, hotel, tourist base were waiting for tourists and excursionist. “Mtskheta Historical-Archeological Museum- Reserve”, subordinated to the Main Division of Monument Protection was operating. Total capacity of Mtskheta tourist center was calculated in the range of 600-800 units. Tourist industry was profitable – it made 11% for bureau and 21% for tourist base. The above provided statistics didn’t include unorganized tourism. Obviously, all tourists and excursionists would visit the monuments of the so-called “Union Category” at that time – Mtskheta Jvari, Svetitskhoveli and Samtavro. As compared with them, archeological monuments attracted less interest by that period.

Tourist profile of Mtskheta changed dramatically after obtaining of independence by Georgia, which was followed by civil war, domestic disorders and economic collapse. On the other hand, Georgian Orthodox Church regained the rights in regard to Mtskheta historical and architectural monuments, previously usurped by Soviet government; it was finalized by the concordat (constitutional agreement) concluded with the state of Georgia in 2002 (see Annex 4.1 and 4.2).

In spite of measures taken by the state – including the large-scale town-planning reconstruction-development project – the level of attractiveness of Mtskheta still is not adequate to cultural heritage concentrated here. According to the survey of Georgian tourism sphere by “ACT Research Group” in 2012, in the structure of domestic tourism,

Mtskheta attracts only 3% of tourists, while Adjara – 24%. Mtskheta is more popular among foreign tourists – 18% of tourists, who crossed the state border in Tbilisi International Airport, visited Mtskheta. Besides, remarkably, none of the interviewed foreign tourists used hotel in Mtskheta. It means that Mtskheta hotels meet the characteristics of the status of visitors and not tourists, which is economically unprofitable for the city and its monument preservation complex (Fig. 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3).

Town Planning Parameters

Standard price of non-agricultural land owned by self-government is defined for Mtskheta (Resolution #..... dated February 18, 2011 of Sakrebulo of Mtskheta municipality¹). Based on this sign, the territory of Mtskheta city is divided into 3 zones – central, intermediate and peripheral. Intermediate zone is determined for price setting, indicator of which shall be increased by 10\$ for the central zone and decreased by the same for peripheral zone. As a result, the price of 1 sq.m of non-agricultural land in Mtskheta, based on zones, makes:

- Central zone (from Bebristsikhe to Station Bridge) – 30.0 GEL;
- Intermediate zone (Ghartiskari and Station settlement) – 27.2 GEL;
- Peripheral zone (Narekvavi, Armazi, Mukhatgerdi, Karsani, ZAHES territory, existing in the boundaries of Mtskheta municipality) – 24.5 GEL.

In the Resolution, verbal description of the above mentioned zones of Mtskheta isn't followed by graphical material, which will give rise to uncertainties in the case of specific decision-making.

Besides, the price of 1 m² non-agricultural land along international and internal state roads makes 23.1 GEL.

Non-agricultural land tax in Mtskheta makes 0.288 GEL per 1 m².

It shall be stressed that administrative borders of Mtskheta aren't established (delimited) by present.

¹ The number of the Resolution isn't specified in official documentation

Town-planning situation of Mtskheta significantly depends on the content of the guideline documents. In this regard, the document which is presently in under development – “Development Strategy of Mtskheta- Mtianeti in 2012- 2017”, draft version of which deserves analysis in the context of Preservation of Mtskheta cultural heritage.

It should be mentioned immediately that the “Strategy” pays disproportionately less attention to monument protection problems and tourism in regional network as well as in regard to Mtskheta. E.g. in economic sectoral structure of the region tourism, as such, isn’t considered at all. Separate paragraph is dedicated to “Tourism”, but this part lacks the depth of development and actual, empiric materials.

Significant part of the “Strategy” consists of the “Vision, Goals, Objectives, Priorities, Indicators of the Region Development and Proposals on Regional Development”. Neither monument protection not environment protection spheres appear among the priorities. Cultural heritage is occasionally mentioned in the paragraph “Development of Tourism”: “Resorts and recreational zones shall be improved, as well as historical-architectural monument and other historical- cultural attractions, also their access roads”. The problems of “Mtskheta historical monuments” aren’t even mentioned.

Action Plan for 2012-2015 – “Monitoring Schedule” is attached to the “Strategy”; below, the positions of this Plan are provided, which directly or indirectly touch Mtskheta monument protection problems:

- Rehabilitation of Mtskheta- Shio Mghvimi road (2012-2013);
- Construction of treatment facility of Mtskheta sewerage (2012-2013);
- Development of roads for development of infrastructure in Mtskheta (2012-2013);
- Construction of bridge on Aragvi River in Mtskheta (2012-2013);
- Rehabilitation of public school buildings in the municipality, including Mtskheta city (2012-2013);
- Restoration of Jvari Monastery (2012-2014).

It shall be mentioned that completion of almost all projects is planned by the end of 2013. The present civil plan doesn’t make the impression of a realistic one – neither the client,

nor the source of funding, volume of cost estimate and other important circumstances are provided in it.

Following the above stated, the “Strategy” needs reconsideration and development in the sections of cultural heritage and environment protection, including the formation of indicators. Adequate attitude towards “Mtskheta Historical Monuments” and the list of priority measures to be taken in this regard shall form the part of the “Strategy”.

See the list of activities implemented by the Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure of Georgia in Mtskheta municipality during recent years in Annex 4.3.

See the contents of pre-project research of General Plan of Mtskheta Land Use in Annex 4.4.

4.2 Land Cadastre, Identification of the Forms of Ownership

4.2.1 Cadastre Parcels

The lands located on the territory of Mtskheta are generally divided into agricultural and non-agricultural lands. According to ownership there are state, municipal and privately-owned lands.

State lands include the lands of protected area (Tbilisi National Park), water bodies with riparian forests and water protection zones, transport facility zones, lands occupied by military bases, etc.

In municipal ownership there are public territories within the administrative boundaries of Mtskheta (squares, gardens, alleys, lands of municipal institutions and engineering networks, etc.).

Private ownership implies the lands, owned by natural persons and various non-governmental legal persons.

Identification of the major part of owners of Mtskheta lands is impossible, since they haven't registered their property in the Public Register. As a rule, it refers only to the privately owned lands.

Cadastre parcels registered in the management area are provided on fig. 4.2.1, and the cadastre parcels adjacent to the world heritage monuments (identity of owners of 33 parcels is established) and the forms of their ownership are provided on fig. 4.2.2.

4.2.2 Property Management Issues and the Pressures Related to Development

Mtskheta cultural heritage property, represented by the three churches- cathedrals, includes: Svetitskhoveli, Jvari and Samtavro owned by Georgian Church. The right of ownership of all religious properties, their remains and ruins, is legally recognized on the basis of constitutional agreement concluded between the Church and the Government (see sub-paragraph 4.1).

Architectural area of Armaztsikhe- Bagineti cultural heritage and part of Samtavro necropolis belongs to the state, it is managed by the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development and is assigned, with the right of use, to the National Agency of Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia. In accordance with European Neighborhood Policy and EU recommendations, Georgia was obliged to assign the hand over the property to local government by the end of 2007. But this process is not finished yet due to a lot of technical and political factors, minimizing the involvement of self-governance into the management of Mtskheta archeological site.

The issue of informal private ownership of archeological territories in Mtskheta was the concern for officials of the World Heritage Committee. ICOMOS Assessment Mission met with satisfaction the decision of governmental authorities “to perform expropriation of some private house-building near Samtavro Church and in the boundaries of buffer zone” (ICOMOS, 1994a). But this decision wasn’t implemented. Contrary to the requirements of the World Heritage Committee, official registration of majority of illegally occupied lands in Mtskheta and any region of the country was admitted in 2007 (Georgia, 2007d).

Consequently, official privatization of some sections of buffer zone of Samtavro Necropolis, the so-called Archeological Park and Samtavro Monastery, as well as other significant territories of Mtskheta landscape, was performed.

According to Heritage and Tourism General Plan, Mtskheta is under the risk of urbanization pressure most of all. Pressures related to development affects the country's perimeter most of all. General Plan especially focuses on territories adjacent to Mtskheta M27 highway in direction of Tbilisi. These territories, presumably, would experience the impact of fast urbanization process due to good accessibility and northern location from Tbilisi. Territories, prone to development, are enclosed along M27 highway on the left bank of the river Mtkvari on the opposite side of Mtskheta historical center and in Mtkvari gorge.

Regardless the mentioned assessment, large-scale development projects don't affect Mtskheta. In spite of its favorable location, only several investments are made in the city. The most typical cases of development are individual constructions and restaurants, which are mainly oriented to customers coming from Tbilisi (LOC01GE, LOC02GE 2008, pers. comm. 24.10.2008, R. Mirzikashvili, 07/2009). Locally performed observations also showed that from the point of view of development, the existing situation significantly matches the General Plan. The most popular location for private house-building is Mtkvari gorge and Kodmani hill behind Samtavro Monastery (Fig. 9.1). Restaurants and taverns are basically located near river banks with the view to architectural monuments (ibid; RES01GE 2008, pers. comm. 31.10.2008, R. Mirzikashvili, 07/2009). Recently, land parcels were privatized in immediate outskirts of Mtskheta, but visually no interventions are noticeable.

4.3 Stratigraphic Maps of Historical Development of the Territory

The process of historical formation and development of Mtskheta is studied in details by domestic historiography. The basic stages of this process are as follows:

Mtskheta development stage till IV c. A.D.

- a. Samtavro Valley. Former settlement and Necropolis. Late Bronze – early Iron Age, IX-VII c.c. Development of these territories, obviously, occurs from the north. Cultural

strata of this period stop near “nameless ravine”, dividing present Mtskheta Center from Samtavro Nunnery.

b. Armaztsikhe. Development of this hill, which represents the slope, divided into terraces, coming down from Kartli Mountain to the east, began in the III c. B.C. by Kartli authorities and gradually it formed the “residence of Georgian Kings”; at the same time, it was administrative center of Kartli till the end of the I c. B.C.

c. Zadeni, mountain opposite to Armazi, on the left bank of Aragvi River. It was developed by the King Parnajom (I c. B.C.), but it’s not clear whether it was inhabited or not.

d. 'Mogvta', Zoroastist monastery and settlement established by the King Parnajom, This is archeologically clearly defined zone, with population and their cemeteries (I c. B.C.)

e. Mtskheta was established as the settlement (*mosxorum tractus*), i.e. Meskhs’ settlement, directly indicating activity of Meskhian tribes in Kartli. Decisive significance is attached to the river Aragvi. According to all data (geological, hydro-geological, morphological maps) indicate that the river changed the route in the second half of the II c. B.C. and till the II c. B.C. it was crossing “Mukhrani Valley” diagonally near the village Misaktsieli and flowing into the river Ksani. (In the Register of villages of Kartli and Kakheti in XVIII c. Misaktsieli was referred to as “Misaktsieli of Aragvi”). In the triangle formed by rivers, the city- cosmogram- center and the context – Mtskheta was created.

f. Activities of Vakhtang Gorgasali. Activities of this King (V c.) caused significant changes in Mtskheta. The main thing is that due to the anticipated war with Persia, he somehow modified historical development of Mtskheta. Mtskheta Citadel was created. As a result of this action (historically identified the former settlements, existing in the north to Mtskheta were destroyed (one of the city districts, but Persians failed to take Mtskheta Citadel, but destroyed all Mtskheta outside it.

Development Since 20-ies of the IV c. and Christian Function of Mtskheta

According to historical sources, spreading of Christianity in Georgia began from Mtskheta by Cappadocian missionary Nino. Her way from Cappadocia to Mtskheta is described and studied. The sites of her periodical settlement in Mtskheta are as follows, in sequence: 1. “Bagini Huriata” – Jewish Temple, 2. “Paradise” – Royal Garden, Apollo’s Temple, Svetitskhoveli, 3. Makvlovani, pagan tholos, King Mirian’s basilica.

In the 8th century Mtskheta is viewed as Georgian nation-wide religious center due to the following circumstances. At that time Phasis Metropolis of Lazika Eparchy was abolished. The title of Lazika Metropolis was granted to Trabzon Eparchy in the IX c. West Georgian eparchies Rodopolis, Ziganeion, Kota and Saisi (Tsaishi) joined Mtskheta Catholicate.

In the XI c. Mtskheta was marked with domed cathedral – Svetitskhoveli; Georgian Church unified gradually around it.

The XV c. (first half). Revival of Mtskheta by Alexander I (Great) after devastating invasions of Temur Lengi; but strengthening of the role of Tbilisi gradually weakened Mtskheta and in late Middle Ages it was referred to as a village. Since late Middle Ages begins entering and settling of alien ethnic groups in Mtskheta and adjacent villages.

Its becoming first settlement and then city occurs during Soviet period, when it was selected as administrative center of extreme, east part of Shida Kartli.

Present-day Mtskheta greatly exceeds the borders of historical Mtskheta. Its territory expanded primarily towards the north (New Mtskheta) and partially towards the south-west. In this direction it covered historical “Mogvta”.

According to present situation, extensive development of Mtskheta occurs in the west from historical city, on terraced slope.

Development of Mtskheta in XX- XXI c.c. is described in details in the 2nd chapter of this paper. In the research area, historical development process of Mtskheta could be reflected on stratigraphic map in the following sequence:

| B.C. | Century |
|--|----------------------------|
| 1. Samtavro Valley: former settlement and necropolis | IX-VIII B.C. - II-III A.D. |
| 2. Armaztsikhe- Bagineti | II B.C. – III A.D. |
| 3. Mtskheta – initial unbar structure | II B.C. |
| 4. “Paradise”- royal garden, Apollo’s Temple | II B.C. |
| 5. Zadeni – idol – erected by the 5 th King of Kartli – Parnajomi | I B.C. |
| 6. Old bridge of Mtskheta | I B.C. |
| 7. Mtskheta Kerameikos, settlement of potters | I B.C. – III A.D. |
| A.D. | Century, years |
| 8. “Makvlovani”, antique tholos | II-III |
| 9. Mtskheta vault | III |
| 10. Former settlement of Tsitsamuri, “Sevsamora” | II-III |
| 11. Basilica of King Mirian | IV |
| 12. Early Christian cemetery | IV |
| 13. Stoa, Jewish temple, church “Getsimania” | IV- XVII |
| 14. St. Nino’s Cross | IV |
| 15. St. Nino Jvari (holy Cross) Church | V-VI |
| 16. Mtskheta Citadel | V |
| 17. Mtskheta Aragviskari, Antioch Church, “Stepantsminda Church | V- XV |
| 18. Mukhatgverdi, Zegardi St. Giorgi | VIII |
| 19. Svetitskhoveli | XI -XV |
| 20. Transfiguration domed church, bell tower, Samtavro Nunnery | XI - XV - XIX |
| 21. Beltis (Bebris) Tsikhe | X-XII |
| 22. Barbareti, St. Barbare Church | VI - VIII |
| 23. Village Mtskheta | XIX |
| 24. New view of Mtskheta | XX |
| 25. Railway line and tunnel | XIX - 80-ies |
| 26. Town Mtskheta | XX |

| | |
|---|---------------|
| 27. ZAHES | XX - 30-ies |
| 28. Mtskheta | XX - 40-ies |
| 29. New Mtskheta | XX - 70-ies |
| 30. Rehabilitation of historical center of Mtskheta | XXI - 2008-10 |
| 31. Construction of new center of Mtskheta | XXI - 2010-12 |

See stratigraphic scheme of Mtskheta development on fig. 4.3.1 – 4.3.4.

4.4 General Assessment of Authenticity and Integrity of the Territory

Assessment of authenticity of historical Mtskheta within the scope of research represents significant scientific task, which shall be mandatorily solved for guidance of the further straight processes provided by the Management Plan. In this regard, the following circumstances shall be mentioned:

- a. Archeology of Mtskheta city can be generally assessed as landscape archeology. The landscape on the whole and each of its elements, i.e. geographic environment is the direct participant of each phase of development of Mtskheta, with the exception of XIX-XX c.c.
- b. The population of each stage of development of Mtskheta maintained the existing landscape without changes. It was caused by many reasons: primarily, there were natural protecting bounds (ridge, ravine, gorge). Territory was developed based on selection of these features. And features formed the guarantee of maintenance of micro-landscape.
- c. Ridges (e.g. Kartli Mountain or Tsitsamuri Hill), represent observation zones for quite a long distance, the visibility area of which covered the whole “Great Mtskheta” territory subject to protection.
- d. Preservation of landscape was greatly conditioned by religious doctrine applied on Georgian territory – the cult of the deceased. The point is that death, as the end of life was non-perceptible for pre-Christian world. Death (transformation) represented post-life phase; i.e. death (transformation) meant going out of a person from our eyesight (the birth was perceived not as “appearance” but as coming of person into our eyesight). Thus the

cemetery represented religious area, the area of exercise of the cult of the deceased. Thus the cemetery was the city of the deceased. Each of its elements was inviolable.

e. Temenoses (sacred areas). Complex of cult structures, temples and altars.

Any temple and its environment represented micro-urban world with widely branched network. Settlements, agricultural districts, cult trees, altars, etc. subordinated to temple area (temenos) are implied.

f. Urban fabric, subordinated to the landscape is represented as follows: Mtskheta city – triangular center – cosmogram and dependant satellite towns and settlements – e.g. fortified town Tsitsamuri (Sevsimora) with its agricultural districts and the settlement of Karsniskhevi potters- craftsmen.

The following consideration could be added to general assessment of authenticity and integrity of the territory:

The landscape, which is presently enclosed in the boundaries of management area, is modified in certain parts. Landscape experiences the biggest deformation during the period of construction of ZAHES in late 20-ies of the XX c., in the process of construction of bypass channel, as well as construction of new residential micro-district of Mtskheta in 60-70-ies. Obvious signs of modification of landscape are also noticeable as a result of construction of transport trunk ways: along the railway, along motor highways and in the areas of viaducts and bridges. The signs of landscape modification appear on the territory of former Soviet military base. In general, the authenticity of the landscape could be assessed as quite high.

Assessment of **archeology** in Mtskheta management area is connected with broader range of researched and the circumstance that these activities have permanent nature. The care of the state in regard to archeological excavations became obvious recently; the excavation zones of Samtavro Valley and Armaztsikhe- Bagineti were improved. Based on present assessment, it could be stated that the level of archeological excavations and authenticity of artifacts found there is quite high.

Urban fabric in Mtskheta management area consists of substantially different parts: historical development and modern development. Assessment of authenticity is applicable only for historical part. Urban fabric forms there in modern appearance since the second half of the XIX c. to date. The rates of growth of historical zone are quite low, the density of development increases gradually, Mtkvari riverside and part of the left bank of Aragvi River are developed (series of restaurants) and low development with individual dwelling houses. In general, the authenticity of Mtskheta urban fabric could be assessed as satisfactory. On the whole, the authenticity of the territory, archeology and urban fabric within the boundaries of management area could be assessed as high.

The comparison, provided on the basis of historical photos of Mtskheta regarding the status of the world heritage monuments as per the end of the XIX c. and their present status, gives the idea of their authenticity and integrity (Fig. 4.4.1 - 4.4.4)

4.5 The List of Archive Materials

Archive materials of Mtskheta cultural heritage sites are stores in two places: National Center of Cultural Heritage Preservation of the Ministry of Culture and Monument Protection of Georgia and Mtskheta Archeological Museum- Reserve under its subordination and the National Museum of Georgia. We didn't manage to obtain archive materials from the National Museum of Georgia and Mtskheta Archeological Museum- Reserve.

See the materials stored in the archive of the National Center of Cultural Heritage Preservation of the Ministry of Culture and Monument Protection of Georgia in Annex 4.5.

28.09.2012

5

Description and Assessment of the Existing Structure and Mtskheta Planning and Management

M a n a g e m e n t P l a n o f M t s k h e t a W o r l d H e r i t a g e

office@geographic.ge

5.1 Identification of Departments

5.1.1 Management Structure

Following the latest institutional reform in 2008 the authority of management of Mtskheta cultural heritage was handed over to the newly established National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia, which is supported by the National Committee of Special World Heritage and its structural entity, Great Mtskheta Archeological Museum- Reserve.

The stakeholders of local governance are local governmental authorities and the church. The church is represented by the parish of Svetitskhoveli cathedral, Samtavro Nunnery and administration of Jvari Monastery.

5.1.2 Great Mtskheta Museum- Reserve

Mtskheta Museum- Reserve (at present the official title is Great Mtskheta Archeological Museum- Preserve) is mentioned in the dossier of nomination as the management body of the site. Unclear legal status, as well as lack of funding and technical and human resources led to limitation of efficacy of this institution. The Museum- Reserve was officially registered as public entity, which was subordinated to the Ministry of Culture in 2005. By that time, the right of ownership of Mtskheta cathedrals was officially handed over to the church. Consequently, organizational structure of the Museum- Reserve was limited only by Armaztsikhe- Bagineti and Samtavro archeological area (SMA01GE 2008, pers. comm. 21.08.2008; R. Mirzikashvili, 07/2009; Georgia, 2005g). Management of the Museum- Reserve was limited only by scientific researches, advisory and monitoring activities, renovation of museum collections, organization of exhibitions, etc. This body didn't have any decision-making authority; its basic responsibilities included provision of information to the Ministry of Culture and supervision of construction activities in Mtskheta and its outskirts and archeological expertise (SMA01GE 2008, 21.08.2008; R. Mirzikashvili, 07/2009).

Following the latest institutional changes which took place in November 2008, the Museum- Reserve joined the newly established National Agency for Cultural Heritage

Preservation. The goal of the Agency is development of efficient purposeful strategies for the purpose of improvement of management of the world heritage site.

The activities implemented by the Agency so far include introduction of uniform ticket system for all Museum- Reserves, improvement of their visitor infrastructure, development of information brochures, and research and rehabilitation of individual cultural heritage sites (Georgia, 2009a). In the future, such unification will allow the museums become more efficient in decision of managerial issues.

5.1.3 Mtskheta Municipality

In 2005 the exclusive mandate of local self-governance in the sphere of cultural heritage. Regardless this fact, in January 2007, Integrated Management Council of Mtskheta municipality was convened in Mtskheta Municipality Committee (Mtskheta Municipality Council, 2007). The mandate of the Committee envisaged coordination of activities directed towards the management and sustainable and integrated conservation of cultural heritage located within the boundaries of Mtskheta municipality. The Commission was abolished in 2008.

At present the institution responsible for the issues of cultural heritage doesn't exist within the municipality. The Office of Economic and Infrastructural Development, which is the part of executive body of Mtskheta Municipality, is only indirectly related to cultural heritage (Georgia, 2007a). Within the framework of its mandate, which includes the development project permits in Mtskheta and their supervision, the Office conducts consultations with the Ministry of Culture as well as Patriarchate, if the proposed projects refer to archeological heritage and the landscape of archeological monuments. Approval of development proposals is mandatory on the basis of the law, but the permit of Patriarchate is conditioned by special authority and power of the church. Although all projects related to the monuments shall be submitted to Patriarchate for the purpose of approval, the church doesn't consider it necessary to obtain legal permits from the local government in regard to its own construction projects (LOC02GE 2008, pers. comm. 24.10.2008 R. Mirzikashvili, 07/2009). All the above mentioned negatively affects the status of conservation of Mtskheta monuments.

5.1.4 Georgian Apostolic Autonomous Orthodox Church

Historically Mtskheta was the residence of Cathoalicos- Patriarch of Georgia. At present Mtskheta and Tbilisi forms one administrative entity. Mtskheta- Tbilisi Eparchy is leaded by the Patriarch himself, who, at the same time, is the Archbishop of Mtskheta- Tbilisi Eparchy. Svetitskhoveli Cathedral is the residence of the Patriarch, and the parish church, Samtavro and Jvari are monasteries. Constitutional Agreement concluded between the Government of Georgia and the church is provided in Annexes 4.1 and 4.2.

Table 5.1.

Interventions and projects related to Mtskheta historical monuments

| Period | Projects / interventions | Initiators/ donor organizations |
|-----------|--|---------------------------------|
| 1998 | Conservation of Roman-type Bathhouses in Armaztsikhe | Mtskheta Fund |
| 1999 | Action Plan Related to Mtskheta | UNESCO |
| 2001 | Reconstruction of Six-conch Cathedral in Armaztsikhe | Mtskheta Fund |
| 2001-2004 | Reconstruction of Anton the 2 nd 's Palace in Svetitskhoveli Complex | Church |
| 2001-2004 | Archeological Research, Restoration and Conservation Works in Samtavro Church | The Ministry of Culture |
| 2002-2003 | Removal of Soil Layer from the Yard of Svetitskhoveli Cathedral | Church |
| 2002-2003 | Reconstruction of Anton the 2 nd 's Palace (Svetitskhoveli Complex) | Church |
| 2002-2003 | Engineering- geological Research of Svetitskhoveli Cathedral, Strengthening of Cracks | ? |
| 2003 | Restoration and Strengthening of the Gate of Cathalicos Melkisedec's Palace (Svetitskhoveli Complex) | ? |
| 2003 | General Plan of Mtskheta Heritage and Tourism | UNESCO |

| Period | Projects / interventions | Initiators/ donor organizations |
|-----------|---|---|
| 2003-2005 | Reconstruction of Svetitskhoveli Bell-tower | Church |
| 2001-2002 | Reconstruction of Small Church and Par-church of Jvari | The Ministry of Culture (suspended) |
| 2004 | Fresco Cleaning Activities (Svetitskhoveli Cathedral) | Church(?) |
| 2004 | Construction of Residential House near Jvari Monastery (was suspended in 2005) | Church |
| 2005 | Rock Conservation Workshop of Jvari Monastery | ICCROM/ UNESCO/ The Ministry of Culture |
| 2005 | Project Related to Organization of Roads around Svetitskhoveli Cathedral | The Ministry of Culture |
| 2005-2006 | Change of Flooring in Svetitskhoveli Cathedral and Archeological Researches | Church |
| 2005 | Archeological Research of Interior of Samtavro Church | The Ministry of Culture |
| 2006 | Entering of Historical Monuments in Mtskheta Region into the Inventory | The Ministry of Culture |
| 2006 | Protection Zones of Cultural Heritage Archeological Study of Interior of Samtavro Church | The Ministry of Culture |
| 2007-2008 | Handbook of Jvari Church Conservation | Association Heritage and Unification |
| 2007-2008 | Restoration Project of Small Jvari Church | The Ministry of Culture |
| 2008 | Restoration of Support Wall of Samtavro Monastery Bell tower | The Ministry of Culture |
| 2008 | Development Project of Mtskheta Historical Center | Cultural Heritage Conservation Fund |
| 2008-2009 | Concept of Development of Armaztsikhe- Bagineti Site | The Ministry of Culture |

Source WHC, 2006a; Georgia 2007g, 2009a; Association Heritage and Unification; 2007 and pers. comm. NAT04GE, EXP02GE, EXP03GE, LOC01GE, R. Mirzikashvili, 07/2009.

5.2 General Legal Framework, Regulations on Heritage and Related Spheres

The basic laws, which directly or indirectly affect cultural heritage are provided in Table 5.2.

The abstract from the Convention from UNESCO World Cultural and Natural Heritage Preservation Convention on preservation and management see in Annex 5.1.

Table 5.2:

Georgian National Legislation related to Preservation of Cultural Heritage

(Source: Online database of Georgian “Legislative Bulletin”)

| Scope of regulation | Title of the Law |
|--|---|
| Preservation of Cultural Heritage | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Law on Export and Import of Cultural Values, 2001 (last amendment, 2007) ▪ The Law on Museums, 2001 (last amendment, 2007) ▪ The Law on Culture, 1997 (last amendment, 2007) ▪ The Law of Georgia “On Cultural Heritage”, 2007 |
| Relations between the state and the church | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concordat – Constitutional Agreement Between the State and Georgian Apostolic Autonomous Orthodox Church |
| Fines related to violation of legislation on cultural heritage | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Code of Administrative Law Violations, 1994. (amendment related to cultural heritage, 2007) ▪ Criminal Code, 1999 (amendment related to cultural heritage 2007) |
| Finance policy related to cultural heritage | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tax Code, 2010 ▪ The Law on Local Fees, 1998 (amendment related to cultural heritage 2007) |

| Scope of regulation | Title of the Law |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Law on Permit and License Fees, 1998 (amendment related to cultural heritage 2007) ▪ Budget Code of Georgia, 2010 ▪ The Law on the State Budget of Georgia, 2012 |
| Privatization and organization of land use | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Law on State Property, 2010 ▪ The Law on Recognition of the Right of Ownership of Land Plots Owned (Used) by Natural and Legal Persons of Public Law, 2007 (last amendment, 2008) ▪ The Law on Agricultural Land Ownership, 1996 |
| Issue of licenses and permits | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Law on Licenses and Permits, 2005 (amendment, related to cultural heritage, 2007) |
| The sphere of competence of self-governance bodies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Organic Law on Local Self- Governance, 2005 |

5.3 The Existing Communication System and Its Assessment

Presently the following institutions participate in the management process of Mtskheta world heritage monuments:

- **Patriarchate of Georgia** – official owner of the monuments. Personnel of all the three monasteries conduct continuous supervision of the monument and perform current, small-scale activities in the framework of maintenance of the monuments. All major decisions in regard to the monument are reviewed by Scientific Council of Patriarchate and only in the case of positive decision its realization begins. Scientific Council of Patriarchate cooperated with all stakeholders.
- **National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia**, in accordance to its regulations and together with the administration of Mtskheta Museum- Reserve performs

planning and implementation of activities through study, monitoring, maintenance, restoration- conservation and other programs, projects and plans. Each document of this type is considered by Scientific Council of Patriarchate. The sources of funding of activities, in addition to the state budget, are quite diverse and are defined by Georgian legislation;

- **National Commission of UNESCO Affairs in Georgia** – the main purpose is facilitation and coordination of cooperation between Georgia and UNESCO; in 2011 is established the Project “Improvement of Management of Mtskheta Cultural Heritage Monuments” and coordinated the present Project within these scopes;

- **Mtskheta- Mtianeti Regional Administration and Municipality** participates in maintenance process of the world heritage monuments in fragmented manner, whenever its need arises, and, as a rule, the issues are related to the organization of transport traffic, arrangement of parking areas and the issue of engineering networks, solid waste management, etc.; it communicates with the departments of the Government of Georgia and Patriarchate. In agreement with other departments, reviews and approves urban development documentation of Mtskheta, the boundaries of protecting zones and supervises the implementation of regime established in protecting zones.

The existing communications among the mentioned departments are shown on flow chart 5.1. The existing chart, in our assessment, isn't perfect with consideration of the goals, outlined within the Management Plan of Mtskheta World Heritage Monuments. Presently, number of significant departments and institutions, whose participation would be extremely beneficial for achievement of the goals of the Plan, are outside of the management process. In addition to the already mentioned departments and institutions, whose participation in the implementation of the Plan is mandatory, there are:

- **The Ministry of Culture and Monument Protection of Georgia:** implements state policy in regard to the world heritage monuments, through the relevant agency oversees development of monument management plans and their implementation, maintains contacts among the departments and international contacts, determines and approves normative documentation within its competence;

- **The Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development of Georgia:**

manages the processes of development and implementation of spatial organization, urban development, architectural- planning documentation, determines and approves normative- legislative essays and instructions in this sphere, oversees the current construction and infrastructural projects, participates in decision-making related to monument preservation;

- **The Ministry of Environment Protection of Georgia:** manages implementation of state policy of protected areas, develops and approves documents of environmental norms and rules, implements inter-departmental coordination and international contracts;

- **National Agency for Protected Areas of Georgia:** establishes the boundaries of protected areas, regimes applied there, forms of actions, tourist routes; develops projects, oversees their implementation, monitors the situation;

- **The Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources of Georgia:** implements state policy in the sphere of natural resources, establishment of protecting zones of rivers, forestries, monitoring, exploitation and regeneration of various natural resources, operation of regional power facilities and networks and creation of new facilities and networks;

- **The Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure of Georgia:** takes care of development and implementation of infrastructural projects, establishes the relevant normative and guiding documentation, implements large-scale regional development programs, development and rehabilitation of transport and engineering networks, solid waste management;

- **National Tourism Agency:** implements development of tourist industry, creates new tourist routes, develops tourist service facilities; collects statistical data on tourists; dynamics, trains specialists and manages informational policy;

- **The Ministry of Defense of Georgia:** ensures dislocation of defense facilities in Mtskheta area in the manner that doesn't create any threat to cultural heritage monuments, develops plans for protection of population and cultural heritage in the case of military actions according to international norms;

- **National Agency of Public Register of Georgia:** Collects and, as required, submits exhaustive information on land plots in Mtskheta, concerning their owners, areas, registration, changes and the issues under the competence of other register;
- **National Statistical Service of Georgia:** Studies and submits information on development of demographic, social- economic, cultural and other sectors in Mtskheta municipality and Mtskheta;
- **Mtskheta Archeological Museum-Reserve:** performs diverse research, educational and exposition activities in Mtskheta based on its regulations and under the supervision of National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation;
- **National Museum of Georgia:** implements scientific research, investigation, archive, exposition and educational programs on the basis of Mtskheta cultural heritage and archeological excavations;
- **Regional Administration of Mtskheta- Mtianeti:** implements communication and coordination among governmental and local administration bodies in the issues related to management and maintenance of Mtskheta cultural heritage monuments, participates in development of various projects and their monitoring;
- **Sakrebulo and Gamgeoba of Mtskheta Municipality:** within its competence, participates in development of various programs and projects and performs supervision for the purpose of their implementation, prepares tenders for creation of urban development documentation, reviews and agrees on architectural projects, issues construction permits, performs administrative supervision over them, etc.

NGOs of local community of Mtskheta municipality should be included in the presented list. As a result of our research it was established that by now the NGO of local community doesn't exist in Mtskheta.

Practically all institutions out of the above listed organizations participated in development of the Management Plan; as for the implementation of the Management Plan, the share of participation and responsibility between these institutions will be differentiated and exactly regulated. As for the communication platform for

implementation of contacts among the institutions, we consider it the most appropriate to establish Inter-departmental Coordination Council. The recommended scheme of implementation of the Management Plan among these organizations is shown on flow chart 5.2.

28.10.2012

6

Preservation and Conservation of Mtskheta Historical and Cultural Heritage

Management Plan of Mtskheta World Heritage

office@geographic.ge

6.1 Resources of Cultural Heritage Fallen within the Management Area

Following the establishment the boundaries of management area (see Chapter 2), activities were performed for the purpose of identification of cultural heritage sites within the boundaries of this area. It should be mentioned that Mtskheta is a historical settlement which is studied in details and the sites existing on its territory are described in details in scientific literature and taking the above mentioned into account, we considered it admissible to obtain information from various existing sources. In general, cultural heritage resources in Mtskheta management area may be systematized as follows:

a) Historical Building-up of Mtskheta

Cultural value and the subject of preservation here is the network of streets, morphology of building-up, types of houses, system of houses and yards, scale of buildings, number of storeys, traditional building materials, their colors and texture, elements of planting of greenery and improvement.

b) Cultural Landscape of Mtskheta

Cultural value and the subject of preservation here is the forms of traditional farming of local community, related to agricultural activities: plough-lands, haylands and pastures, orchards and vegetable gardens on homestead lands as well as outside them, grounds related to cattle breeding and poultry farming, arrangement of flood drainage and irrigation systems, construction of roads and bridges, use of forest and shrubs, transportation of building materials from quarries, etc.;

c) Natural Landscape of Mtskheta

Cultural value and the subject of preservation here is natural, virgin landscapes: meadow, bushes, forest, river with its riverbed and riparian forest, orography of relief: mountains, hillocks, ravines, plateaus ridges, natural flood channels and representatives of flora and fauna; special value is born by anthropogenic and natural biocenoses formed during the centuries, which include the unity of atmospheric air,

hydrological network and vegetation cover against the background of minimum human interference.

d) Mtskheta Historical Monuments

The artifacts, discovered as a result of archeological excavations, belong to this category of monuments: former settlement, cemetery, fortification, cult and remains of other types of buildings and architectural structures: fortresses, monastery complexes, separately standing church, dwelling houses, auxiliary facilities, roads and bridges and parts thereof.

The list of the cultural heritage sites fallen within the boundaries of management area Mtskheta world heritage (Fig. 6.1) is provided below:

List of sites fallen within the management area:

1. Beltis Tsikhe (Bebris Tsikhe) – late Middle Ages;
2. Samtavro Valley, burial - IX-VIII A.D. and II-III c.c. A.D.;
3. Former settlement – late Bronze – early Iron Age;
4. Cemetery;
5. Antique Tholos (II-III c.c. A.D.), King Mirian's Basilica (IV c. A.D.), domed cathedral of Transfiguration (XI-XV c.c.), bell tower (late Middle Ages, etc., Samtavro Nunnery (Fig. 6.4));
6. North Entrance of Mtskheta, the result of fortification reform of Vakhtang Gorgasali, V c.;
7. Barbareti, St. Barbara cathedral – early Middle Ages;
8. Fragment of fortification wall – V c.;
9. Stoa, Jewish synagogue (Bagini Huriata), church Getsimania – IV c. and late Middle Ages;
10. Svetitskhoveli (Fig.6.2);
11. Mtskheta Aragvis Kari, church "Antioch" and church "Stephane Tsminda";
12. Ruined city Tsitsamuri, "Sevsamora" of Roman authors;
13. Small valley of Tshitsamuri "Sevsamora" – village tower-shaped house;

14. Burial of early- Christian period;
15. St. Nino Jvari church (Fig. 6.3);
16. Cliff massive – fragment of column of old bridge (“Pompeus’ Bridge) of Mtskheta;
17. Mtskheta vault – III A.D.;
18. Armaztsikhe- Bagineti, residence of Georgian kings, III c. B.C. – III c. A.D.;
- a Kldekari;
- b Burials, stone box vault;
- c Bathhouse #1, III c. A.D.;
- d Bathhouse #2, III c. A.D.;
- e Bathhouse #3, III c. A.D.;
- f Six- conch cathedral - III-IV c.c.;
- g Wine cellar - III-IV c.c.;
- h “Two- cell structure” – cistern of early Byzantine period;
- i “Columned Hall” – I c.;
- k Socle of hall-type church with protruded conch – early Middle Ages;
- l Kldekari;
- m Fortification wall, internal strip, II-I c.c. B.C.;
- n Fortification wall, external strip, II-I c.c. B.C.; tower, II c. B.C.;
- 19 Mukhatgverdi, Zegardi St. Giorgi, VIII c.;
- 20 Mtskheta Keramikios, settlement of potters- craftsmen, late antique period;

See the photos of archeological excavations on fig. 6.5.

See historical- archeological review of Mtskheta in Annex 6.1.

See historical- architectural review of Mtskheta in Annex 6.2.

6.2 Assessment of Historical and Cultural Significance of Environment

Since its establishment (II half of the I c. A.D.), Mtskheta became the center of inter-cultural dialogue, which was conditioned by its geographic location. It is situated on the cross-road and western, as well as eastern artistic and architectural heritages were accumulating in its bosom in equal doses.

Most importantly, development of artistic heritages didn't occur mechanically, at the expense of simple borrowing; complex process of formation of forms occurred. Each artistic form experiences processing, synthesis of various heritages was occurring and as a result, completely new images were born and conformed to local aspirations.

Thus Mtskheta and its environment (according to historical sources – Great Mtskheta”) fully reflects the systems of concords formed during centuries.

It's a concord with alien heritage and at the same time with own vision and own religious and social concepts, i.e. it's the culture and moreover – its substantial special category – city culture, which also implied socium by itself.

Cultural significance of Mtskheta environment consists of several important components:

- **Natural environment**, with complex relief, confluence of rivers, diverse landscapes and their symbolic connections with historical human perception;
- **Cultural landscape**, artificial biocenoses created by a human during centuries, manageable landscape elements, irrigation systems, lowlands and other agricultural grounds;
- **Urban environment**, oldest city-type settlement with the network of streets, fortification structures, system of dwelling houses and yards, specific development of relief, traditional building materials and building technologies, arrangement of roads, bridges and banks, its own scale and morphology;
- Spatial dominants, centers of religious life, central monastery complexes with domed cathedrals, walls and other structures comprising spatial- compositional unity and architectural ensemble, perfectly harmonizing with the environment.

Mtskheta has the complex of unique artistic- aesthetic and historical- cultural values integrated in time and space, which puts it in the line of the best masterpieces created by mankind.

6.3 The Existing Preservation Regulations and the Limitations for Cultural Heritage

The existing legal documentation of cultural heritage preservation regulations and limitations are accumulated in three basic documents. These are: “The Law of Georgia on Fundamentals of Spatial Organization and Town Planning”, “The Rules of Regulation of Use and Building-up of the Territories of Settlements in Georgia”, directly related to it, and the central and the most important “The Law of Georgia on Cultural Heritage”. Below are provided the abstracts from the mentioned documents in the composition which directly relate to the regulations and limitations.

The Law of Georgia on the Fundamentals of Spatial Organization and Town Planning, 2005

Article 35. Ensuring of Preservation of Cultural Heritage and Natural Values on the Territories of Settlements

1. In the process of spatial- territorial planning of settlements, the following protection zones can be established for the purpose of preservation of cultural heritage and natural values:

- a) Strict protection zone;*
- b) Archeological zone;*
- c) Building-up regulation zone;*
- d) Natural landscape protection zone;*
- e) Cultural stratum protection zone.*

2. The following shall be ensured in protection zones:

- a) Preservation of cultural buildings and structures, their conservation, restoration and adaptation;*
- b) Maintenance of architectural- planning fabric in strict protection zone in the lines of historically formed planning; restoration of the lost elements of the network of streets as far as possible;*

- c) *Maintenance of the network of streets and their planning nature in building-up regulations zone;*
- d) *Conservation, restoration and adaptation of damaged, especially important architectural and historical monuments. Conservation, as far as possible, and/ or graphical and photo- fixation of the elements (wall, foundation, etc.) of building and structures survived in archeological or cultural stratum, bearing this sign;*
- e) *Limitation of construction of new buildings and structures in strict protection zone on the basis of legislation, with the exception of the cases when the existing buildings and structures, which don't represent cultural heritage, are being replaced by new buildings and structures, with consideration of the scale of the formed environment;*
- f) *Regulation of volumetric- spatial solutions of new construction in building-up regulation zone in the basis of legislation;*
- g) *Prohibition of construction of structures of engineering and technological purpose, which don't conform to historical appearance of the settlement, with the exception of the cases of inevitable public need;*
- h) *Removal of industrial and communal storage enterprises from strict protection zone and prohibition of construction of new facilities with this function, with the exception of the cases of inevitable public need;*
- i) *Regulation of development of the existing industrial and communal storage enterprises in building-up regulation zone and regulation of construction of new facilities with this function;*
- k) *Prohibition of spatial- territorial planning, agreement on other design documentation, performance of ground and construction works in strict protection zone and building-up regulation zone without positive decision of the Ministry of Culture, Monument Protection and Sports of Georgia or local self-governance (governance) authorities, with the exception of accident elimination activities, during which the methods, endangering immovable monuments (vibration, explosion) are not used.*

3. The following shall also be ensured in natural landscape protection zone:

- a) Preservation and restoration of landscape having historical values;*
- b) Maintenance of natural relief and water reservoirs;*
- c) Cleaning of landscape from dissonant buildings and structures and ruins;*
- d) Protection and regulation of vegetation cover;*
- e) Determination of natural regeneration zones of forest;*
- f) Protection of meadows and other territories from the impact of landslides and flooding;*
- g) Strengthening and greening of ravine slopes.*

4. The borders of protection zones shall be determined on the basis of spatial- territorial planning documentation.

On the Approval of Basic Provisions of Regulation of the Use of the Territories of Settlements and Building-up

Article 13. Protection Zones of Cultural Heritage and Environment

1. Throughout the territory of the country, including the territories of settlements, for the purpose of protection of cultural heritage and environment, allocation of cultural heritage and environment protection zones is possible, which shall be reflected in rights-based zoning documents.

2. Cultural heritage and environment protection zones shall be reflected in General Plan of Land Use as the rights-based zoning document.

3. For the purpose of implementation of rights-based zoning documents, the following types of zones are established:

- a) Cultural Heritage protection zones;*

b) Environment protection zones.

4. Cultural heritage protection zones include the following zones, determined by the Law of Georgia “On Cultural Heritage”:

- a) Individual (physical) protection zone (area) of the monument;*
- b) Visual protection zone (area) of the monument;*
- c) Historical build-up protection zone;*
- d) Historical build-up regulation zone;*
- e) Historical landscape protection zone;*
- f) Archeological protection zone.*

5. Environment protection zones are as follows:

- a) Environment protection zone 1 (EPZ-1):*
 - a.a) Natural monument protection territory;*
 - a.b) Protection of natural monument and its territory is implemented;*
 - a.c) Construction activities shall be performed on natural monument protection territory only for the purpose of its protection and/ or visual perception.*
- b) Environment protection zone 2 (EPZ-2):*
 - b.a) Territory of protected landscape;*
 - b.b) Protection and restoration of the territory of protected landscape is implemented without violation of visual aspect of the protected landscape;*
 - b.g) Construction activities shall be performed on protected landscape territory only for the purpose of its protection, restoration, justified need for local population and creation of the relevant tourist infrastructure, without violation of visual aspect of the protected landscape;*
- c) Environment protection zone 3 (EPZ-3):*

- c.a) Water protecting territory;*
- c.b) Protection and restoration of water protection territories is implemented;*
- c.c) Construction activities shall be performed on water protection territory only for the purpose of its protection and/ or visual perception.*

Abstract from the Law of Georgia „On Cultural Heritage” – Protection Zones

Article 37. Determination of Protection Zone and Regime of Historical Building-up

1. The territory, where great concentration of monuments and historical heritage and other immovable sites, networks of streets preserved in authentic form, building-up, planning structure and morphology is identified, shall be defined as the zone of historical building-up.

2. The purpose of determination of protection zone of historical building-up is preservation of historically formed spatial-architectural environment of monuments, preserved there, traditional forms and appearance of building-up, historical part of city, as historically formed organism (planning structure, morphology, scale of buildings, nature, silhouette, appearance, landscape, etc.), appearance, morphology and scale of building-up of protection and maintenance, landscape environment.

6. Building-up of territories, which historically haven't been built-up is prohibited in historical building-up protection zone.

7. On the territories, where existence of architectural site of high historical- cultural value is identified on the basis of scientific research [conducted] not earlier than 50 years ago, construction shall be admitted only according to the project, developed on the basis of the relevant research, approximated within the project of this site as much as possible.

8. Modification, extension, raising, lowering of levels or other changes of historically formed network of streets in historical building-up protection zone shall be admissible only on the basis of the relevant planning and scientific justification, in maximum approximated manner with historical appearance.

Article 38. Determination of Building-up Regulation Zone and Regime

1. The territory where the fragments of historical building-up, network of streets, planning structure and/ or individual monuments, other immovable sites having cultural value, background building-up is preserved in authentic form, shall be defined as building-up regulation zone. Building-up regulation zone may also be a buffer zone of other zone, protecting cultural heritage.

2. The purpose of determination of building-up regulation zone is ensuring of harmonious blending of historically formed and new building-up.

3. Strengthening and restoration of historically formed spatial dominants on architectural-spatial organization of environment, preservation of architectural and spatial environment, historically formed planning structure of its fragments for the monuments and other sites having cultural value shall be ensured in building-up regulation zone.

4. In Building-up regulation zone, in addition to construction admitted in historical building-up protection zone, construction activities which don't contradict to the requirements of this Article and Article 35, are admissible.

5. For the purpose of promotion of the monuments, harmonious blending of historically formed and new building-up, especially favorable points of perception shall be identified, possibility of viewing of panoramas and individual monuments shall be maintained in building-up regulations zone through regulation of new constructions and removal of improper objects in historically formed environment.

Article 39. Determination of Historical Landscape Protection Zone and Regime

1. Natural, rural or urban territory having historical, cultural, aesthetic values, formation of which, in the course of historical development, is the result of human activities partially or completely, or which is the historically formed natural environment of individual monuments, shall be defined as historical landscape protection zone.

2. The purpose of determination of historical landscape protection zone is maintenance of historically formed environment of immovable objects of cultural heritage and protection zones of cultural heritage, as well as the areas related to legends and folklore, and restoration of its natural appearance.

3. Preservation of natural relief and water reservoirs, liberation of landscape from building- structure and plantings lacking cultural value and introducing dissonance, regulation of vegetation cover, ensuring of natural regeneration of forest and green cover, protection of meadows and other territories from the impacts of landslides and floods is necessary.

4. In historical landscape protection zone only the following are permitted:

a) The following construction activities:

a.a) Research and rehabilitation activities of buildings and structures having cultural or historical value;

a.b) In the case of justified necessity, construction of structures, functionally related to the goals and objectives specified in p.p. 2 and 3 of this Article, temporary structures related to public interests or linear structures conditioned by the state interest, which will not significantly change the appearance of historical relief and landscape, will not impair the perception of cultural heritage protected in the zone or located in visual protection areas;

b) Economic activities, which don't contradict the goals and objectives specified in p.p. 1 and 2 of this Article.

Article 40. Determination of Archeological Protection Zone and Regime

1. The territory, where cultural strata and/ or archeological sites are identified, fixed or explored, shall be defined as archeological protection zone.

2. The purpose of determination of archeological protection zone is ensuring of protection of archeological monuments, cultural strata, identified or explored archeological sites and their adjacent territories.

3. All type of activities, which will cause damage, destruction of cultural heritage protected in the zone, impair its perception or interfere with implementation of full-value scientific research, shall be prohibited in archeological protection zone, including:

- a) ground works, with the exception of ground works related to agricultural and archeological activities;*
- b) throwing of any kind of construction, household, industrial or economic wastes, as well as waste rocks accumulated during archeological excavations.*

4. If it's established that some type of activities, including vehicle traffic, certain agricultural activities or pedestrian traffic will create the risk of damage or destruction to archeological sites or cultural strata in archeological protection zone, the Government, based on proposal of the Ministry, shall be authorized to limit or prohibit such activities. In this case, on the territory of the zone, information board, in the case of limitation or prohibition of vehicle traffic – the relevant sign shall be installed at visible place, where the limitation or prohibition within the boundaries of the zone will be stated.

Article 41. The Procedure of Agreement of Town Planning Documentation and Implementation of construction activities in Cultural Heritage Protection Zone

1. Town planning documentation in cultural heritage protection zones shall be approved by the authority determined by Georgian legislation in agreement with the Ministry, according to the rule under legislation.

2. Construction permit for construction and reconstruction projects in cultural heritage protection zones shall be issued by the authority determined by Georgian legislation in agreement with the Ministry, according to the rule under legislation.

3. The topic of issuing of town planning conditions for implementation of construction and reconstruction projects in cultural heritage protection zones on the territory of Tbilisi city shall be considered by deliberative body comprising of the representatives of Tbilisi City Hall and the Ministry according to the rule under legislation.

Article 42. Planning of Building-up in Historical Building-up Protection and Regulation Zones, Historical- Cultural Reference Plan, Building-up Regulation Plan

- 1. Building Regulation Plan in historical building-up protection and building-up regulation zone shall be issued by the relevant authority determined by Georgian legislation in agreement with the Ministry.*
- 2. The basis of development of Building Regulation Plan in historical building-up protection and building-up regulation zone is Historical- Cultural Reference Plan, principles whereof shall be taken into account in the course of development of spatial-territorial planning documentation.*
- 3. Historical- Cultural Reference Plan is a special complex scientific- research document developed on the basis of multi-disciplinary approach, which includes information analytical material reflecting cultural heritage protection zones and the monuments existing in it, historically formed environment, and includes recommendation on town planning and planning regulation required for their observance.*
- 4. Historical- Cultural Reference Plan consists of informational, analytical and final parts.*
- 5. Informational part of Historical- Cultural Reference Plan is a complex informational database obtained as a result of covering inventory regarding the existing status of the territory and shall consist of the following parts:*
 - a) Indication to the relevant protection zone (zones);*
 - b) Situational plan of the territory;*
 - c) Plan of the boundaries of the territory with indication of coordinates;*
 - d) Topographic plan of the territory;*
 - e) Archive- bibliographic materials;*
 - f) Information provided by registration card of immovable monument on the monuments and other sites of cultural heritage existing on the territory, as well as basic data on all other buildings and structures existing on the territory;*

g) Thematic maps and other graphical materials containing the following information:

g.a) Monument existing on the territory and other objects of cultural heritage;

g.b) Background building-up and disharmonious objects;

g.c) Morphology and planning structure of building-up;

g.d) Functional purpose of buildings or structures;

g.e) Number of storeys of the building or structure;

g.f) Physical status of the building or structure;

g.g) Age of building or structure;

g.h) Architectural- artistic value of building or structure;

g.i) Urban and natural spatial dominants existing on the territory;

g.k) Points of perception of significant panoramas and views;

g.l) Boundaries of historically formed landscape;

g.m) Green massifs, squares, gardens and parks existing on the territory;

g.n) Classification of street network and roads;

g.o) Basic longitudinal and lateral sections of the territory, schematic lay-out of significant streets with indication of basic levels;

h) Materials of photo- fixation of sites having historical- cultural value, urban and natural panoramas.

6. Analytical part of Historical- Cultural Reference Plan shall consist of the following parts:

a) General characterization of historically formed environment:

a.a) Definition of the significance of the territory in general context;

- a.b) Assessment and analysis of significance of historically formed and natural spatial dominants;*
- b) Historical- cultural analysis:*
 - b.a) Analysis of chronological development of streets and building-up;*
 - b.b) Analysis of historically formed types of building-up, their basic characteristics;*
 - b.c) Analysis of traditional building materials and techniques;*
 - b.d) Assessment and analysis of historically formed functions;*
- c) Assessment and analysis of physical status of building-up, assessment and analysis of historical- cultural value of buildings and structures and identification of homogenous districts from historical- cultural point of view;*
- d) Determination of conservation and development areas.*

7. Final Part of shall consist of the following parts:

- a) Basic provisions of cultural heritage preservation and rehabilitation within the boundaries of protection zones and the principles of development;*
- b) Graphical part of Historical- Cultural Reference Plan (synthetic map);*
- c) The list of monuments and other cultural heritage sites existing in protection zones;*
- d) Recommendations on admissible activities in protection zones, recommendations on sites subject to rehabilitation (monuments, other sites of cultural heritage, background building-up, public space, etc.) and their rehabilitation methodology.*

8. In historical building-up protection and building-up regulation zones, the Building-up Regulation Plan, in addition to the parts provided by the Law of Georgia “On the Fundamentals of Spatial Organization and Town Planning”, shall additionally consist of the following parts:

- a) *Requirements related to cultural heritage protection and rehabilitation, in particular, interference in rehabilitation objects (monuments and other sites of cultural heritage, background building-up, public space, etc.);*
 - b) *Requirements related to development of territories and new construction projects;*
 - b.a) *Identification of conservation and development areas (with indication of buildings subject to demolition or preservation);*
 - b.b) *Admissible parameters of new construction projects (scale, height, spatial and planning configuration, rhythm of facades, fenestration);*
 - b.c) *Requirements related to organization of public space.*
9. *If protection zone, for which the Building-up Regulation Plan is being developed, includes heterogeneous districts or areas, the schedule of Building-up Regulation Plan shall be developed individually, for the relevant district, micro-district or area.*

Article 43. Historical- Architectural Research

1. *If Building-up Regulation Plan, approved according to the rule under this Law doesn't exist in cultural heritage protection zones, project documentation of each construction object shall be developed on the basis of pre-project historical- architectural research. The volume, planning structure and architectural appearance of construction object shall be determined on the basis of this research. Only the objects specified in p.3 of this Article shall be the exception.*
2. *Implementation of historical- architectural research shall be ensured by the seeker of the permit. The area of historical- cultural research shall include the construction plot and the surrounding territory in the range of minimum double length/ width of the plot in the relevant direction from the border of the project plot. Documentation of historical- architectural research shall consist of the following graphical and textual parts:*

- a) *The place of the project territory in city structure and characterization of its present status (graphical and textual material);*
 - b) *Topographic plan of the territory subject to research with indication of the borders of the plot, existing monuments of the plot subject to research (scale 1:500 and 1:200)*
 - c) *Historical retrospective review of the territory subject to research, development chronology and stages (graphical, textual and photo- materials);*
 - d) *Photo lay-outs of the building-up existing on the territory subject to research, with indication of project plot and the monuments, existing on the territory (photo materials);*
 - e) *Analysis of building-up existing on the territory subject to research (graphical and textual materials), which shall include:*
 - e.a) *Characterization of structure, morphology and scale of building-up, characterization of building- structures and open spaces, identification of peculiarity of their dislocation in the structure of building-up;*
 - e.b) *Spatial- architectural assessment of the monuments and visual dominants, landscape and building-up, identification of their spatial inter-relation;*
 - e.c) *Description of artistic and decorative elements of building-up, their stylistic and semantic identification.*
3. *Final part of historical- architectural research shall include recommendations on spatial- planning and compositional solution of the construction to be implemented on the project territory, developed on the basis of the implemented research.*
4. *Historical- architectural research is not mandatory for the following objects and construction activities:*
- a) *Small architectural forms, in particular:*

- a.a) structures with the volume up to 50 m³ – pavilions, booths, commercial counters without foundation, sheds, garages, stops of public transport;*
- a.b) Playgrounds and small sport grounds for children, attractions with the area max. 50 m²;*
- a.c) Information and advertisement boards and structures, separately standing or installed on the facades of buildings;*
- a.d) Benches for rest, lighting elements, parts of improvement and engineering equipment for squares, alleys and other small-size green planting zones, signs, waste bins, city clocks, street name and house number signs, fences, gates, shop windows, complexes denoting entrances to settlements, elements of architectural arrangement of memorial boards and statues, drinking water columns, fountains with area max. 25 m².*
- b) Small- scale modification with total area max. 50 m², of the existing buildings: change of roof in the existing dimensions, building-on or addition with volume max. 50 m³, cutting or blocking of a window or door, addition or removal of a balcony.*

Article 44. Suppressing of Activities Causing Damage to Cultural Heritage or Creating Such Risk

In the case of identification of activities, inadmissible according to protection zone regime, causing damage to cultural heritage existing in the zone or beyond the zone, or creating such risk, the Ministry shall apply to the relevant governmental authorities for limitation, suspension or termination of such activities.

Article 45. The Condition of Assignment of the Status of Disharmonious Building-Structure in Protection Zones

1. In protection zones, with the exception of the cases specified in the Law of Georgia “On the Fundamentals of Spatial Organization and Town Planning”, the status of disharmonious building- structure shall be assigned to the building, structure, enterprise, workshop, storehouse, introducing dissonance into historically formed environment, interfering with its perception, causing damage, practically or aesthetically, to cultural heritage; it shall also be assigned to other objects forming goods and transport flows, causing pollution of soil, atmosphere or water reservoirs,

2. In the course of development and approval of town planning documentation, as well as in the case of construction or planning decision-making the authorities defined by Georgian legislation shall be obliged to consider the perspective of removal and correction of disharmonious building or structure.

Article 46. Cultural Heritage Rehabilitation Area

1. In accordance with the Resolution of the Government of Georgia, for the purpose of facilitation and encouragement of rehabilitation of cultural heritage, based on proposal of the Ministry and on the initiative of local self- governance bodies, cultural heritage rehabilitation area can be determined in general protection zone of cultural heritage, the basis of which shall be the Development Program of Rehabilitation Area.

2. The basis of determination of cultural heritage rehabilitation area shall be the following:

- a) High concentration of monuments and other cultural heritage sites;*
- b) Spatial- architectural environment having high historical- cultural value;*
- c) Grave physical status of historical building-up, authentic historical building-up and environment facing the risk of degradation.*

3. The state and local self- governance bodies shall be responsible for the implementation and supervision of Development Program of Rehabilitation Area.

4. *The Development Program of Rehabilitation Area, submitted to the Government of Georgia for approval, shall include:*

- a) Combined assessment of the existing situation in rehabilitation area;*
- b) Assessment of historical and artistic- architectural value of the existing building-up in rehabilitation area;*
- c) Research and assessment of the existing monuments in rehabilitation area;*
- d) Analysis of the existing economic and social situation, development of tourist, economic and social potential in rehabilitation area;*
- e) The terms of rehabilitation of the existing cultural heritage in rehabilitation area;*
- f) The terms of invigoration of the existing urban fabric in rehabilitation area;*
- g) Rehabilitation projects of the existing monuments, other cultural heritage sites and other buildings and structures in rehabilitation area;*
- h) Rehabilitation projects of the existing above-ground and under-ground communication bus networks and engineering communications in rehabilitation area;*
- i) Rehabilitation projects of infrastructure and public space of rehabilitation area;*
- k) Cost estimate of Development Program of Rehabilitation Area;*
- l) The period of implementation of Development Program of Rehabilitation Area;*
- m) The mechanism of public awareness and its involvement in the implementation of Development Program of Rehabilitation Area;*

5. *The sources of funding of Development Program of Rehabilitation Area shall be:*

- a) Funds allocated from the state budget;*
- b) Funds allocated from the budget of local self- governing entity;*
- c) Grants issued by international organizations;*

d) *Donations;*

e) *Infrastructure fee of cultural heritage rehabilitation area;*

f) *Funds, not prohibited by Georgian legislation.*

6. „Infrastructure Fee of Cultural Heritage Rehabilitation Area” shall be determined by the Law, for the period of implementation of Development Program of Rehabilitation Area.

Mtskheta Protection Zones and Limitations

As a result of study and analysis of Mtskheta cultural heritage, the Ministry of Culture and Monument Protection of Georgia approved Mtskheta cultural heritage protection zones in 2006 with the following limitations and regulations.

The rules of establishment of general protection zone of Mtskheta cultural heritage – see Annex 6.3.

Establishment of Mtskheta cultural heritage protection zones – see Annex 6.4.

Explanatory Note

On establishment of Mtskheta cultural heritage protection zones

Mtskheta is one of the oldest cities of Georgia. It is located in north-west from Tbilisi, in the distance of 22 km, in historical Shida Kartli, near the confluence of the rivers Mtkvari and Aragvi. During centuries, Mtskheta represented cultural and religious center of Georgia. Due to the abundant cultural heritage on its territory and outskirts, it always represented the subject of the state care and attention. In 1940 Armazi areas were declared a reserve based on the Resolution of Council of People’s Commissars of Georgian SSR. In 1955 the Museum of Local Lore was established in Mtskheta. In 1957, based on the Resolution of the Council of Ministers of Georgia SSR the territory of Mtskheta between Mtkvari and Aragvi, to Bebristsikhe, was declared archeological reserve. Based on Resolution of the Council of Ministers of Georgian SSR of 1966 Mtskheta city totally

was declared archeological reserve, and according to the Resolution dated November 6, 1968 it was assigned the status of city- museum.

During this period, archeological researches haven't stopped in Mtskheta. In 1974 standing expedition of Mtskheta was established. Based on the Resolution dated September 14, 1977 of the Council of Ministers, Mtskheta Art and Historical-Architectural Museum was established on the basis of Mtskheta Museum of Local Lore. In 1994 Mtskheta city and its outskirts, including Jvari Monastery and the adjacent territories, were entered into the List of World Heritage Monuments. By this most important act, international community recognized outstanding, universal cultural value of Mtskheta.

Consequently, the responsibility of protection and preservation of the monument and its historically formed landscape is immense. In accordance with the Convention "On Preservation of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage", the authenticity of the monument and its environment shall be observed at maximum level in the giver area.

Adequate protection and development of cultural resources of Mtskheta city requires combined approach, including: primary inventory of cultural values, establishment of protection zones, development of protection regimes, etc. The initial stage in the process is establishment and legalization of cultural heritage protection zones.

The submitted project provides for establishment and approval of cultural heritage protection zones provided by the Law of Georgia "On Cultural Heritage Preservation" for ensuring of protection and development of Mtskheta cultural heritage.

In the framework of the project the system of Mtskheta cultural heritage protection zones was developed, including:

- a. Immovable monument protection zone
- b. Building-up regulation zone
- c. Landscape protection zone
- d. Archeological protection zone

Immovable Monument Protection Zone

Immovable monument protection zone, primarily, serves to physical and visual protection of cult monuments enclosed in urban fabric: Svetitskhoveli, Samtavro Monastery, Antioch church and Getsimania architectural- archeological monument. The zone, developed by the project includes the area of visual and contextual relation among the mentioned monuments.

Preliminary research conducted in the framework of the project revealed high historical-cultural value of Mtskheta urban fabric. Although historical building-up is massively preserved on the territory, the number of dwelling houses in Mtskheta historical center bears historical- cultural values. The mentioned buildings were established on the fragment and foundations of dwellings of the beginning of the XX c. and XIX c., by which the network of streets of the XIX c. is preserved. Unique samples of traditional national architecture have survived in the interiors of the number of buildings.

The mentioned circumstance conditioned establishment of uniform protection zone for immovable monuments located in the historical center of Mtskheta. Consequently, immovable monument protection zone covers the area of spreading of monuments and their influence from the ravine located to the west from Getsimania to Monastriskhevi.

The direction of extensive flows of visitors and, consequently, the need of ensuring of the relevant perception of historical Mtskheta shall also be taken into account in the course of determination of the area of immovable monument protection zone

Description of the Border of Immovable Property Protection Zone

The border of immovable monument protection zone starts at the extreme south point of the cape formed at the confluence of Mtkvari and Aragvi. From here, the border follows the road along the edge of old river-bed of Aragvi to the north, to the point of confluence of Monastriskhevi; from this point it follows Monastriskhevi to the extreme north point of Gorky Street where it turns to Gorky Street, follows it towards the south and turns to the left at the very first street. Then the border turns to the right to Gori Street and follows

the east edge of Gori Street building-up to the ravine located in the west from Getsimania, to Mtkvari along the left bank of Mtkvari and joins the starting point of the border.

Building-up Regulation Zone

Building-up regulation zone developed by the given project represents buffer zone, which ensures preservation of harmonious integrity of Mtskheta historical center and its historically formed landscape. The mentioned zone includes territories built-up in the XX c., as well as free territories, for building-up of which maintenance of dominant role of Mtskheta historical monuments, protection of historical context, harmonious integrity of monuments and their environment is required.

Due to characteristic relief and peculiarities of disposition of building-up, the building-up regulation zone is represented in the form of separate districts:

- a) Mtkvari Gorge building-up regulation zone
- b) Aragvi right bank building-up regulation zone
- c) Aragvi left bank building-up regulation zone

Description of Border of Building-up Regulation Zone

a) The border of Mtkvari Gorge building-up regulation zone starts on the left bank of Mtkvari, at the confluence of the ravine existing in the west from Getsimania and Mtkvari. From here the border, in the form of straight imaginary line, goes to the right bank of Mtkvari and follows the edge of building-up located in the south from railway line towards east, includes the existing building-up till the extreme south point, turns towards the north and follows the street to the crossing of Rustaveli Street. Then the border follows Rustaveli Street towards to west and at the end of station platforms turns to the north by 900 degrees. From here the border, in the form of straight imaginary line, crosses Mtkvari and follows the contour of building-up located on the left bank of Mtkvari to the ravine located in the west from Getsimania and goes down the ravine towards the south to the starting point of the border.

b) Aragvi right bank building-up regulation zone includes building-up located on the east slope of Kodmani Mountain, as well as the building-up located between the road following the edge of old river-bed of Aragvi and Agmashenebeli, to Bebristsikhe.

c) Aragvi left bank building-up regulation zone includes the territory of building-up located in the north from Jvari Hill, between the left bank of Aragvi and Tbilisi- Sokhumi highway till plough lands existing in the west from village Tsitsamuri.

Archeological Protection Zones

The most important archeological complexes are located on Mtskheta city territory and its outskirts: Samtavro burial, Bagineti, Mogvtakari, Armaztsikhe and Ghartiskari archeological monuments.

Some of the above mentioned monuments are under the risk of active intervention, as the territories having archeological potential are handed over into private ownership.

The following archeological zones were identified on Mtskheta city territory in the framework of the Project:

Samtavro- Aragviskari Archeological Zone

Samtavro- Aragviskari Archeological Zone includes the west territories of the central square of the city and Agmashenebeli Street. The border of the mentioned zone in the south is Makharadze Street going in the south from the former cinema “Karibche”, in the west – Kodmani plain, in the north – the highest point of the left slope of Baiatkhevi, and in the east – Agmashenebeli street.

Getsimania Archeological Zone

Getsimania Archeological Zone includes the territory adjacent to Getsimania between Gamsakhurdia Street and Gorky Street.

Mtskheta Royal Vault Archeological Zone

Mtskheta Royal Vault Archeological Zone is located on the right bank of Mtkvari, in 300 m from Mtskheta railway station towards the south; it includes the section adjacent to 4, Rustaveli Street.

Archeological Zone of Pitiakhshs' Armaziskhevi Complex

Archeological Zone of Pitiakhshs' Armaziskhevi Complex is located on the right bank of Mtkvari, near the confluence of Armaziskhevi (Kartliskhevi) and Mtkvari. The territory is defined by Armaziskhevi in the east, in the west – in 0,5 km to the east from the right bank of Armaziskhevi; in the north – by the right bank of Mtkvari, in the south – by the right contour of Tbilisi- Dzegvi road.

Armaztsikhe- Bagineti Archeological Zone

Armaztsikhe- Bagineti Archeological Zone – ancient Mtskheta acropolis, is located in the south-east from Mtskheta railway station, in 2 km, on the right bank of Mtkvari, at the end of Kartli Ridge, on the terraced rocky mountain and its north-east slope.

Landscape Protection Zone

Mtskheta historical natural- landscape environment represent the unique context, which basically defines the value of Mtskheta, as harmoniously blended uniform historical complex. The mentioned environment was formed on the basis of inter-relation of natural and architectural dominants. These are Jvari Hill with its crowning monument, Kartli Ridge and Bagineti archeological monuments, unique panorama of Mtkvari and Aragvi confluence with Svetitskhoveli complex, Bebristsikhe, Kodmani Hill, Tsitsamuri, Zedazeni and Saguramo Ridges. Natural components create historically formed background, which is extremely important for adequate perception of these monuments.

It shall be mentioned that the natural environment conditioned specific disposition and appearance of Mtskheta monuments. Architecture is harmoniously blended with natural environment, which conditions the necessity of preservation of the historically formed landscape, as the constituent element of the uniform historical- cultural complex.

The landscape protection zone developed by the project borders, in the east, with the territory of Saguramo Reserve, in the north- east – with the territory of the village Tsitsamuri and Saguramo Reserve, in the south- east – with the territory of Tbilisi National Park (the borders of Tbilisi National Park and Saguramo Reserve are provided as per 1996). The landscape protection zone also includes the section located on the north slope of Jvari Hill of Saguramo Reserve and the lands of Mtskheta Forestry existing in the south and south-east from Jvari Hill. The south border of the landscape protection zone follows Tbilisi- Sokhumi highway, goes down from transport center to ZAHES dam and goes to the right bank of Mtkvari. The west part of the landscape protection zone includes Kartli Ridge, where the border follows the highest points of the Ridge, then crosses Mtkvari and includes Kodmani Hill, Baiatkhevi territories, west and north territories of Bebristsikhe, Aragvi river-bed and the west and south territories of Tsitsamuri including the territory adjacent to Ilia monument.

According to p.2 of the Article 32 of the Law of Georgia “On Preservation of Cultural Heritage”, determination of protection zones shall be ensured by the Ministry of Culture, Monument Protection and Sports and the Ministry of Economic Development on the basis of the Joint Order.

Enforcement of the Order shall not imply expenditures from the state budget.

6.4 The Existing Conservation Programs and Assessment of their Efficiency

6.4.1 History of Legal Protection

Mtskheta is the subject of scientific researched since the 19th century, but it achieved official protection only during the period of Soviet regime. Based on the nomination fine and archive documents of cultural heritage, reconstruction of chronological line of legal protection of Mtskheta monuments is possible. (Fig. 6.6).

Table 6.1:

History of Legal Protection of Mtskheta Monuments and Sites

| | |
|------|--|
| 1940 | Armaztsikhe was declared as Archeological Reserve |
| 1950 | The map of Mtskheta State Architectural Reserve was developed by the Department of Protection of Architectural Monuments on the Council of the Architectural Issues of the Council of Ministers of Georgian SSR, scale 1:15000 (the drawing is made by K. Melitauri) |
| 1955 | Museum of Regional Researches was opened in Mtskheta |
| 1957 | The territory between Aragvi and Mtkvari to Bebristsikhe fortress was declared as Archeological Reserve |
| 1968 | Mtskheta was declared as Archeological Reserve by the Resolution #564, dated 06.11.1968 of the Council of Ministers of Georgian SSR |
| 1973 | General Development Plan of the City- Museum was approved (it implied maintenance of the scale and silhouette of the city) |
| 1974 | Standing expedition of Academician Iv. Javakhishvili Institute of History, Archeology and Ethnography of the Academy of Sciences of Georgia was established in Mtskheta |
| 1977 | By the Resolution #653, dated 14.09.1977 of the Council of Ministers of Georgian SSR on establishment of historical- architectural museum reserve of city Mtskheta of Georgian SSR, Mtskheta Historical- Architectural Museum- Reserve was established on the basis of the Museum of Regional Researches |
| 1984 | The Program, related to architectural and functional organizational structure of Mtskheta historical zone was introduced (G. Shaishmelashvili) |
| 1994 | Mtskheta City- Museum was entered into the World Heritage List |
| 2003 | General Plan of Mtskheta Heritage and Tourism was developed by UNESCO and local experts |
| 2005 | The territory was again named Mtskheta Historical Monument |
| 2006 | Mtskheta city cultural heritage protection zones were approved by the Minister of Culture, Monument Protection and Sports and the Minister of Economic Development |

6.4.2 The Existing Means of Protection

Mtskheta City Cultural Heritage Protection Zones is presently the only legally binding document, which will control development on this territory (Georgia, 2006). This system consists of the following protection zones: (a) immovable monument protection zones; (b) zones of construction norms and rules; (c) historical landscape protection zone; and (d) archeological protection zone (Fig. 2.9). Legislative regulatory rules determining the level

of development of necessary zone and intervention related to each type of conservation of individual or general protection zone are provided in Section VIII of the Law on Cultural Heritage.

In addition to the above mentioned zones, each monument, in the basis of the Law, is protected by individual physical protection territory, which, together with the visual protection zone, shall come into force automatically, immediately upon recording of the monument in the State Monuments Register. The physical protection territory equals to double length of the monument, and the visual protection territory extends to 1000 m for cultural heritage monuments.

See the results of general inventory of Mtskheta historical monuments in Annex 6.5.

28.09.2012

7

Identification and Assessment of Hazards and Risks

Management Plan for World Heritage Site of
Mtskheta

office@geographic.ge

7.1 Anthropogenic Hazards and Risks

Man-made hazards in Mtskheta may be categorized as follows:

- a) Military intervention
- b) Technical disasters
- c) Environmental pollution
- d) Vandalism
- e) Planned wrong and gross intervention
- f) Fires
- g) Terrorism

Military intervention is a potential hazard threatening Mtskheta, as Russian occupational forces are located in 40-50 km distance from the town and in case of attacking Tbilisi, Mtskheta will appear on the way of attacking armed forces. In this case, world heritage monuments of Mtskheta, as well as other cultural sites will be at risk. Georgia participates in the international program Cities Without War, however, it is not a sufficient guarantee. There is a high probability that several strategic places in Mtskheta will become a target of air attack, e.g. Georgian military units, railway station and railroad, overpass, bridges over the rivers Mtkvari and Aragvi, power station ZAHESI and non-operating nuclear reactor. In case these objects are destructed, so will the world heritage sites. It is worth mentioning that Mtskheta (as well as Tbilisi) has sites of defense and evacuation for civil population, including shelters, supply of medicaments and food/water etc. It is evident that removal of military units from Mtskheta to a place of at least 10-15 km distance shall be priority concern for Georgian government.

Non-operating nuclear reactor located near Mtskheta contains technical risk, real hazard of which is unknown, because despite the suspended operations, nuclear reactions might still take place inside it.

Natural gas main is another object posing risk, because safety regulations are not properly met in some cases.

There is no monitoring network for surface waters in Mtskheta, while the nearest station (of ZAHESI) is located so close to Mtskheta administrative borders that its data can be applied for Mtskheta too.

2009 data of this station regarding the situation of Mtkvari River are as follows:

- Biochemical oxygen demand (BOD-5) – less than 2 ml/l, being a very good indicator;
- Average annual concentration of ammonium nitrogen – over 0.8 ml/l, which is caused by absence of waste water treatment plant in Mtskheta.
- Air basin state in Mtskheta is satisfactory, as there are no facilities generating harmful emissions and thanks to low intensity of internal road traffic.

No facts of vandalism regarding Mtskheta monuments of world cultural heritage have been revealed for over many years (scratched names, stealing etc.). Nevertheless, it is desirable to equip the site with cameras to ensure strict video surveillance.

Over recent years, no planned wrong and gross interventions in the ‘corpus’ of monuments damaging authenticity of exteriors and interiors have been undertaken. However, construction of public buildings (Gamgeoba, police department, House of Justice) taking place on the territory between Svetitskhoveli Cathedral and Aragvi river may be considered the facts of such intervention. Rather active and large-dimensioned architecture of these buildings hinder visual perception of Svetitskhoveli Monastery and Cathedral and do not comply with internationally recognized principles of monument protection.

There is a fire fighting unit and local department of the Ministry of Interior Affairs in Mtskheta, which controls all emergency services. As for the threat of terrorist acts, prevention and elimination of them shall be included in the complex of security measures to be within the competence of a special sub-department of the Ministry of Interior Affairs. Information proving the existence of such plan could not be obtained during the research.

7.2 Natural Disasters and Risks

Natural disasters include:

- a) earthquake, volcanic eruption
- b) flooding, flash flood
- c) hurricane, tornado, storm, snow-storm
- d) heavy shower with hail, thunder
- e) avalanche, mudflow, landslide, soil erosion
- f) drought
- g) bogging
- h) grasshopper plague

Among the listed natural disasters, earthquake, flooding and thunder are most dangerous for Mtskheta historic monuments.

Shocks of 3-4 (and higher) magnitude are typical for Mtskheta as well as for Tbilisi – with the frequency of reoccurrence of 4-5 years. Over the history of these monuments, no devastating earthquakes in Mtskheta have been recorded. Seismic stability of these buildings has not been studied so far, which along with reinforcement works is to be included in Mtskheta Management Plan as an obligatory part. As for volcanic eruption, this is not a real hazard for Mtskheta and its surroundings.

It is to be stated, that metal crosses erected on cupola of the three churches apparently serve as lightning rods (without earthing), as no cases of thunderclaps on any church are known historically.

As for the sharp elevation of water in the rivers, this hazard mostly threatens Svetithkhoveli Cathedral. The lower point where the church contacts the earth, is 9.70 meters above average level of water at confluence of the rivers of Mtkvari and Aragvi. Water level in these basins is regulated via Zahesi dam. Since the dam was built - in 1927, there were no events of floods or flash floods, which could damage the monuments. Area of water elevation in Mtkvari and Aragvi is depicted in the illustration A1 to 2003 General Plan of Cultural Heritage and Tourism.

According to maps of natural disasters, Mtskheta territory is categorized as:

- Medium risk zone in terms of landslides;
- Medium risk zone in terms of intensity of damages by mudslides;
- Dangerous in terms of flooding and flash flood reoccurrence - 14%;
- Semiarid zone in terms of drought;
- Safe in terms of avalanche.
- Safe in terms of thunder.

According to the monitoring results conducted by LEPL Regional Agency for Environmental Protection of the Ministry of Environmental Protection, radiation background in Tbilisi and its surroundings including Mtskheta is normal, average annual value of gamma radiation in ambient air accounts 14 microroentgen/hour (2009 data.)

As regards drinking water quality in Mtskheta, by the Presidential decree #245 of 10 April 2008, it should comply with technical regulations of WHO, but not be the worse than the value prior to 2008. Despite the fact that water tariff in Mtskheta includes the fees for wastewater treatment, there is no such facility in the town causing direct flowing of wastewater into the river of Mtkvari.

7.3 Current Programs and Plans

At present, neither national nor international large-scale programs nor activities on restoration/conservation are being implemented for protection of Mtskheta world heritage sites.

Activities undertaken in recent past, as well as the planned and current ones include:

- Study and conservation of the reliefs of Jvari Monastery exterior walls (2009-2012; National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia);
- Fencing of Djvari Monastery territory (2012; National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia);

- Repairing of the Fence of Svetitskhoveli Cathedral and development of courtyard (2006-2012; Patriarchate; National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia);
- Completion and conservation of archaeological excavations at the territory of Samtavro Church (2008-2010; Patriarchate; National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia);
- Covering the excavation site in archaeological zone of Samtavro valley, development of the territory and arranging the access pathways (2009-2010; National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia);
- Rehabilitation and reconstruction of residential houses in the district near Svetitskhoveli Cathedral (2008-2011; Fund for Preservation of the Cultural Heritage of Georgia);
- On the same territory - repair/renovation of road infrastructure (roads, sidewalks and parking), (2010-2012; Development Service of Mtskheta Municipality);
- On the same territory – renovation/rehabilitation of networks (electricity transmission, natural gas, water supply and sewage) (2008-2012; The Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure of Georgia);
- Planning and construction of a new landfill in Mtskheta is underway (2013-2014; The Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure of Georgia);
- Construction of drainage network is provided for by Mtskheta budget, as well as improvement of street lighting and arrangement of green spaces (2012-2014; Mtskheta Municipality, Regional Administration of Mtskheta-Mtianeti);
- On the initiative of Patriarchate of Georgia, pedestrian bridge construction over Aragvi river near the confluence of Mrkvari is planned, which will connect the monasteries of Svetitskhoveli and Djvari. Mtskheta “Dolorosa” (2012-2015; Patriarchate of Georgia, The Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure of Georgia);

- On the same territory, enlargement of pedestrian pathways, development and equipment with necessary facilities for rest and other purposes along the whole length of the way is planned to accept large number of pilgrims during the religious holidays (2012-2015; Patriarchate of Georgia);
- Construction of a new road bridge over Aragvi river perpendicular to the bank of Aragvi from Svetitskhoveli parking is planned (2012 -2015; The Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure of Georgia);
- Construction of new public buildings near Svetitskhoveli is underway: residential quarter, including House of Justice, Museum, administrative building (2009-2014; Government of Georgia, regional administration, The Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure of Georgia);

28.09.2012

8

SWOT-Analysis for Management Area

Management Plan for World Heritage Site of
Mtskheta
office@geographic.ge

Analysis of Strengths and Weaknesses Opportunities and Threats for Mtskheta Monument
Protection Complex

A. Regional development, spatial arrangement, cultural heritage

| Strength | Weaknesses |
|---|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Existence of world heritage site (including Mtskheta Historic Monuments) 2. Higher religious status of Mtskheta - “Chair of theological-administrative center of Georgian autocephalous orthodox church”. 3. Constitutional agreement between the government of Georgia and Georgian Apostolic autocephalous orthodox church (Concordat), which clearly specifies roles and relations of both parties 4. Political will of Georgian Church and central government of Georgia and 5. Direct participation of the church - as highly trusted institution among Georgian population in the fate of Mtskheta Historic Monuments. 6. existence of Mtskheta-Mtianeti Regional Development Council 7. 2012-2017 draft Strategy for Mtskheta-Mtianeti Regional Development is available 8. historic center of landscape architecture and phyto-design 9. large-scale development of personal plots 10. transfer of multi-storey buildings to New Mtskheta 11. ‘photogenic’ cultural landscapes and | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Poor management of sites enlisted in UNESCO World Heritage List (Mtskheta Historic Monuments) and absence of Management Plan 2. Special status of Mtskheta 3. Absence of formalized agreement specified by concordat between the government and church on management/rehabilitation of Mtskheta Cultural Heritage sites and directions for use of religious treasury stored in museums and church depositories 4. Ambivalent attitude to Cultural Heritage. 5. insufficient attention to the spheres of monument protection and tourism in 2012-2017 draft Strategy for Mtskheta-Mtianeti Regional Development 6. casual nature of a draft Strategy Action Plan (in terms of specifying dates for conduction and completion of works, as well as financing) 7. drawbacks in national legislation and its implementation . 8. Unfulfilled requirements of legislation concerning urban planning, monument protection, and environmental protection. 9. lack/unavailable/inaccessible statistics at the level of distinct settlements |

| Strength | Weaknesses |
|--|--|
| <p>monuments</p> <p>12. long and developing ‘frames’ accompanying while traveling by car or train</p> <p>13. there is no permanent archaeological expedition</p> <p>14. transfer of regional center to Zhinvali will provide opportunities for in-depth specialization for Mtskheta</p> <p>15. participation of Mtskheta – as a specialized center in development of metropolitan area of the capital</p> <p>16. large number of summer cottages of Tbilisi citizens</p> <p>17. tradition of summer schools for sculptors</p> <p>18. there is Amphitheatre – specialized public space</p> <p>19. diverse nonmaterial cultural heritage</p> <p>20. state investments in the development of city</p> <p>21. artificial architectural lighting of major monuments</p> <p>22. restoration/development of monastic life</p> <p>23. counseling-expert support from UNESCO and ICOMOS</p> <p>24. tradition of elaboration of spatial arrangement and monument protection documents and practice of rehabilitation</p> <p>25. plenty of archival materials</p> <p>26. presence of the corps of local conservationists</p> <p>27. good awareness of major monuments</p> | <p>(including Mtskheta)</p> <p>10. undetermined administrative borders of Mtskheta, delimitation is based on descriptive system rather than geoinformation system</p> <p>11. gaps in fiscal zoning of Mtskheta territory (general description of zone boundaries)</p> <p>12. there is no general land use plan for Mtskheta</p> <p>13. lack of institutional development of property market</p> <p>14. limited territorial resources for development of Mtskheta</p> <p>15. difficulties with regional and municipal functions and placement of sites</p> <p>16. visually ‘scandalous’ coloristic resolution of New Mtskheta</p> <p>17. traditional handicraft is vanishing</p> <p>18. functional involvement of the rivers of Mtkvari and Aragvi in everyday life of Mtskheta</p> <p>19. there are no holidays related to Mtskheta</p> <p>20. unmanaged archaeological monuments</p> <p>21. absence of individual Charter of Mtskheta museum, incompliance if settlement with legislation</p> <p>22. aggressive intervention in urban structure of the city</p> <p>23. absence of Chief Architect Institute of Mtskheta</p> <p>24. risk factor of nuclear reactor</p> <p>25. risk of being deprived of the status of</p> |

| Strength | Weaknesses |
|---|---|
| <p>among Georgian population traditional interest in their state</p> <p>28. specialized museums are in place</p> <p>29. elaboration of comprehensive management plan for Mtskheta Historic Monuments</p> <p>30. handicraft revival. Clear requirements concerning Mtskheta Historic Monuments in 2012 official report by World Heritage Committee</p> | <p>World Heritage</p> <p>26. ineffective measures for monument protection</p> <p>27. difficulty with inclusion of three World Heritage monuments in one common route</p> <p>28. poor communication between stakeholders of World Heritage site management, inadequate and ineffective management scheme</p> <p>29. threat of military actions</p> <p>30. absence of emergency action plan</p> <p>31. bureaucratic obstacles for Mtskheta Museum initiatives</p> <p>32. undeveloped range of problems in environmental protection in 2012-2017 draft Strategy for Mtskheta-Mtianeti Regional Development</p> |

B. Demography, Local Community, Socio-economic Situation, Education, Culture, Sport

| Strength | Weaknesses |
|---|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. stable population size in Mtskheta 2. low level of migration 3. closeness of Mtskheta to the capital city and close functional links 4. plenty of historic events and literature subjects related to Mtskheta 5. culinary specialization and plenty of public catering objects 6. long history of multi-culture and tolerance 7. fraternized cities – Kuldīga (Latvia) and Periaslavl-Khmel'nitsk (Ukraine). Presence of banks and cash dispensers (ATM) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. high unemployment 2. weak local mass-media 3. backwardness of industry and entrepreneurship 4. Historic split in urban lifestyle 5. scant cultural life 6. degradation of old local sports 7. absence of Mtskheta symbols/emblems 8. weak branding of Mtskheta 9. passive self-government 10. no NGOs engaged in monument protection. Indifference of local community about monument protection issues. |

C. Engineering-Technical Infrastructure

| Strength | Weaknesses |
|---|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. layout of the main thoroughfares (highways and railroads) as bypasses 2. good intercity connection 3. opportunities for development of small aviation 4. high level of gasification 5. regional sewage collector is in place 6. coverage of wireless telephone networks 7. regulated parking near monuments 8. rehabilitated internal and central roads. Growing rate of installing Internet among population | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. regional sewage collector is in poor condition 2. scant/lack of internet cafes 3. low quality service of intercity transport 4. no urban transport 5. no wastewater treatment facilities 6. water supply-sewage system amortized 7. Cut-offs in electricity supply. Landfill regulation issue. |

D. Environmental Protection

| Strength | Weaknesses |
|--|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. favorable natural-climatic conditions 2. closeness to Tbilisi national park . 3. closeness to underground sources of freshwater. Good quality of local fruits and vegetables. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. absence of monitoring over pollution of ambient air, surface waters and soil, in Mtskheta. 2. absence of monitoring over hydrologic parameters of rivers 3. undetermined engineering security zones (relevant lines) on river banks. Removal of inert materials from river beds. |

E. Tourism

| Strength | Weaknesses |
|---|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. vast interest among foreign visitors 2. tourism-informational center is in place. Visitors are provided with information 3. pilgrim tourism. 4. diverse resources of regional tourism 5. closeness to Tbilisi national park 6. there is one official tourism route in Mtskheta 7. Mtskheta tourism center is located near Svetitskhoveli. Personnel speaks foreign languages. 8. there is free internet in tourism center for visitors. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. backwardness of internal tourism. 2. no conference infrastructure 3. backwardness and lack of hotels sector 4. low culture of public sanitation and lack/small number of toilets 5. non- inclusion of Mtskheta monuments in routes of Tbilisi national park 6. small number of family hotels 7. backwardness of training for local guides 8. low quality and scant information materials in Mtskheta Tourism Center 9. kitsch type of souvenirs 10. Tourism Center can only demonstrate copies of souvenirs and not sell |

F. World Heritage Sites

| Strength | Weaknesses |
|---|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. high degree authenticity of monuments 2. high level of recognizability and popularity 3. there are features of unified architectural ensemble . 4. historic development, natural landscape and monuments interweave organically 5. beneficial visibility of monuments from main road 6. international and national programs on monument maintenance are in place. 7. low influence of harmful technologies 8. preparedness of Patriarchate of Georgia (owner) to carry out monument protection activities 9. preparedness of the government to participate in international cooperation in monument protection issues 10. preparedness of regional and local self-governments for cooperation in monument protection issues 11. no facts of vandalism and ‘graffiti’ 12. high potential for growth of religious and tourism attractiveness 13. the three monuments of World Heritage constitute a live socio-cultural organism – Monastery. 14. visit to the major churches of the three monasteries is free of charge 15. idea of the Patriarchate about approximation of Mtskheta to | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. absence of monument conservation plans 2. insufficient knowledge about cultural layers of surrounding territories to monuments 3. absence of projects on development and landscape gardening of the territories surrounding monuments 4. engineering networks on the territory of monuments are in poor state 5. flows of visitors and pilgrims during holidays are unmanaged 6. no permanent monitoring over physical condition of monuments 7. military units are located near the monuments 8. scattered archival materials about monuments 9. humidity regime in internal spaces of monuments is not met 10. no fire safety measures and surveillance cameras 11. no catering zones for visitors 12. existence in the zone of potential military operations, due to which there is a clash of interests concerning monument protection and defense 13. physical insecurity of Mtskheta Jvari and frequent criminal acts 14. systematic violation of dress code by visitors. 15. improper construction works along right bank of Aragvi river. 16. uncertainty concerning the |

| Strength | Weaknesses |
|--|---|
| <p>Jerusalem in terms of functionality /planning .</p> <p>16. construction of Monks' Monastery near Mtskheta Jvari. Presence of a certain pantheon for secular and clerics in Samtavro</p> | <p>ownership of Getsimania Garden territory</p> <p>17. absence of pedestrian bridge over Aragvi river.</p> <p>18. state of public toilets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no water running on Mtekheta JVari and there is no overseer - there is no toilet in Samtavro zone of visitors - operation regime of toilet at Svetitskhoveli is violated <p>19. unacceptable form of functioning of a restaurant near Samtavro Monastery (acoustic regime, vibration during fireworks, etc.)</p> <p>20. doubtful architectural resolution of immediate surroundings of Svetitskhoveli</p> <p>21. difficult and confusing road map to Svetitskhoveli (both, for cars and pedestrians) .</p> <p>22. problems with ventilation and heating of churches.</p> <p>23. need for use of safe candles</p> <p>24. non-completed works for floor replacement and archaeological excavations in Samtavro and Svetitskhoveli.</p> <p>25. small space of parkings at Samtavro</p> <p>26. TV-radio transmitting towers contain real risk for Mtskheta Jvari in case of military operations</p> <p>27. Samtavro Monastery request concerning the allocation of agricultural plot is not satisfied.</p> <p>28. delayed decision-making on the fate of</p> |

| Strength | Weaknesses |
|----------|--------------------------|
| | Jvari east façade relief |

28.09.2012

9

UNESCO-UNDP, Analysis of 2003 Master Plan of Mtskheta

Management Plan of the World Heritage Site of
Mtskheta

office@geographic.ge

9.1 UNESCO/UNDP, Guidelines of the 2003 Mtskheta Master Plan Document

With regard to the *architecture and urban layout* of the site, three strategic interventions are proposed, being 1) legal protection and preservation of natural environment, 2) conservation of the overall image and layout of the town and 3) Tourism control within the existing morphology of the town.

Mountain slopes need to be reforested where disrupted, the large electric poles relocated out of sight from town and typology of vegetation utilized for park development in and around the town. Furthermore, drainage system needs to be developed along the historic borders of Mtskheta.

A control of development within the town needs to focus on height restrictions, respect for the roof typology as well as the fencing. These three elements define the rural character of the town, which need to be preserved.

For tourism control another main parking place within the town, but away from Svetitskhoveli Cathedral, needs to be developed, together with a routing system linking the major monuments and sites with each other.

Regarding *archaeology*, the visual connections between the main monuments and sites need to be respected, and restored (where disrupted) by relocating constructions, that obstruct views. Pedestrian circulation between the monuments needs to be promoted and sites need to be provided with information boards and signage, explaining cultural-historic significance of the property.

For both Djvari Church and Svetitskhoveli Cathedral, an international specialized team of ICOMOS need to develop and execute preservation and conservation measures, since the state of conservation is in an alarming phase. If not dealt with in an adequate manner soon, the authenticity and historic value will be lost beyond recuperation.

The archaeological sites of Armaztsikhe and Samtavro necropolis need proper protection from the elements and a renewed systematic excavation effort, to reveal more of cultural-

historic importance of the town and a region as a whole. A wide area for protection of these sites is proposed.

For *site-management* the following main issues could be developed in detail. Master plans need quick victories in order to be accepted and to be able to generate long-term implementation schemes, and the site of Djvari Church is an excellent starting point where Mtskheta can be ‘sold’ to the visiting public. Here on issues involving visitor safety, conservation of the site, site management and signage, quick victories can be made.

A thorough research project is to be developed to understand historic dimension and phasing of the site. Mtskheta can be considered as a ‘string of pearls’, consisted of a number of monuments and monumental sites each with its own vista and presenting a different time frame and significance. To enhance this concept will improve appreciation of the site as a whole and do justice to its value.

Currently, the two rivers passing by Mtskheta are close to being dead rivers; little activity is taking place, while in essence, rivers can be great assets, providing for a whole range of leisure activities, when properly organized and facilitated (boating, swimming, fishing, river-side relaxation).

With regard to aspects related to *tourism*, a division has to be made between domestic market activities and international ones, in relation to the visitor numbers. Several on-site surveys, as well as with tour operators, have been undertaken during the mission, which need to be further worked out by local researchers. The visitors infrastructure was analyzed and proposals for improvement and extension have been included in the Master Plan.

Mtskheta should become a focal point for cultural activities, like music festivals, art expositions and theatre performances. Currently the site’s main attraction is religious, next to day-trips from Tbilisi for leisure purposes. Once more, a spread of the visitor load and a longer duration of stay are necessary to optimize Mtskheta’s tourism potential.

As for *legal-institutional affairs*, the current problems with the conservation of Svetitskhoveli Cathedral are the most pressing. A dialogue between the Church of Georgia

and the Georgian authorities is absolutely minimal and not sufficient to come to an internationally acceptable execution of restoration and reconstruction activities. The Georgian authorities responsible for conservation are supposed to be coordinating the restoration efforts with the Church, is not the case. As a result, several constructions have been built, which poses questions to the necessity and irreversibility of the interventions. Mtskheta in general, and Svetitskhoveli Cathedral in particular are of incredible importance to the (cultural) history of Georgia. Any digging and construction in the town and its wider surroundings – and most certainly within the cathedral grounds – should be strictly monitored and supervised by archaeologists and conservationists from the Mtskheta Regional Museum the Department on Preservation of Monuments. If no consensus can be reached on proper information-sharing and cooperation in restoration activities between these institutes and the Church of Georgia, and the destructive reconstruction activities continue, the option of putting Mtskheta on the World Heritage list in Danger should be seriously considered.

In a meeting with His Holiness and Beatitude, Catholicos Patriarch of All Georgia, Ilia II, the mission team addressed the subject of cooperation and coordination extensively and in principle an agreement was reached. His Holiness was open to the idea that Svetitskhoveli Cathedral serves three main purposes: a spiritual-religious one strongly related to the future; a social-cultural one, as it is the physical center-point for the community of Mtskheta and taking place at the surface level at present time; and a archaeological-historic one, the subterranean realm related to the past. In order to accommodate these three purposes and to optimize them, information, cooperation and coordination is vital. During the mission an important basis for a better understanding and acceptance of each other's viewpoints and needs was laid, but the Georgia authorities will need to put pressure on the Church for a continuous dialogue, since UNESCO can only support this from the distance.

To facilitate better management and cooperation, a proposal for an *Institution for the Management of the Perimeter IMP* was prepared, which should be a separate project to further develop.

Recommendations for Programs and Projects

The phasing of the Master Plan and its projects will be an essential aspect. The recommendations, therefore, are divided over implementation in the short-term (0-3 years), medium (4-7 years) and long-term (8-15 years).

Legal-Institutional/ short-term (0-3 years)

1. The organization of an international conference ('round table') by the sub-committee of Cultural Heritage of the Parliament of Georgia and the Georgian National Commission for UNESCO, with the participation of experts and specialists of ICOMOS and the UNESCO World Heritage Center for the provision of in-depth information to government officials and general public of the purpose, significance and issues related to the implementation of World Heritage Convention.
2. the application of the State of Georgia New Urban Planning Law for spatial organization, including separate sections regarding the protection of architectural heritage and archaeological sites in accordance with the demands of contemporary international legislation and international declarations.
3. Archaeological monuments and sites (e.g. gates of the ancient city, burial grounds) and the medieval monuments (churches) need to be immediately declared as areas of strict protection. They include: (mentioned also in the attached plans):
 - Archaeological site Bagineti (Armaztsikhe)
 - Archaeological site Samtavro Burian Ground
 - Archaeological site Djvari Monastery
 - Archaeological site Svetitskhoveli Cathedral
 - Archaeological site Antiokia
 - Archaeological site Samtavro Nunnery

- Archaeological site the Gate
- Archaeological site Getsimania
- Archaeological site The Tomb
- Archaeological site Bebristsikhe
- The oldest traditional house of the town

For the detailed recommendations for each of the sites, see the specialized report.

4. The adoption of the Heritage & Tourism Master Plan as a strategic planning document.

Legal-Institutional/ Medium-term (4-7 years)

5. The establishment of a Laboratory for the Conservation for Ceramic, Metal and Stone Artefacts, including a specialized archaeological library, as part of an International Center for Specialized Studies for students and postgraduate researchers (archaeologists, architects, conversationalists, historians, specialists in the observation of flora and fauna) in the region.

Legal-Institutional/ Long-term (8-15 years)

6. The establishment of an institutional instrument, the Institution for the Management of the Perimeter (IMP; tentative name), which is devoted to protective and promotional actions inside the City Museum World Heritage Perimeter able to implement operational activities.

Archaeology/ short-term (0-3 years)

1. For both the archaeological sites of Bagineti (Armaztsikhe) and Samtavro Burial Ground the construction of protective structures and execution of conservation works.
2. For Djvari Monastery restoration and conservation works to consolidate the building and surrounding wall, including repair of damage inflicted by earlier bad restorations.

3. Inside Svetitskhoveli Cathedral conservation work should be carried out on the murals in situ and, on completion of the work, a protective transparent covering should be installed (e.g. a pane of plexi-glass or unbreakable glass with a metal frame) which will prevent visitors from touching the murals.
4. On the grounds of Svetitskhoveli Cathedral all excavation and construction work should be coordinated and supervised by the local archaeological authorities.
5. The oldest traditional house of the town should be declared a representative monument of the town's recent period (19th century) and listed for preservation and a program for repair, restoration and rehabilitation work executed..

Archaeology / Medium-term (4-7 years)

6. For both the archaeological sites of Bagineti (Armaztsikhe) and Samtavro Burial Ground a detailed study and design for visitor access, reception, facilities and explanation need to be undertaken;

Archaeology / Long-term (8-15 years)

7. For both the archaeological sites of Bagineti (Armaztsikhe) and Samtavro Burial Ground a completion of the systematic excavations, design of permanent protection and exhibition space and inclusion of the sites in educational and scientific programs.

Architecture & Urban Planning / **Short-term (0-3 years)**

1. The design of technical guidelines for construction, which will be implemented via the granting of building permission by local authorities (local government technical service and local archaeological service) and include information regarding: structure surface - roofing surface - structure height (storeys) - proportions of openings (closed and open) - requirement for tiled roofs (and not metallic) - preservation of the view of neighboring dwellings - use of which traditional materials - restrictions imposed on colors of paint - requirement to use specific types of wood for fences, etc. This will be a necessary key element in the preservation of the specific character of the town.

2. In the historic city centre the vehicular access from Sanapiro Street should be re-routed only through Arsukize street, Mamulashvili street and Kostava street providing for short-time parking in the small central square for cars and taxis only (not buses). At the same time, a large bus terminal is planned at a short distance from the Cathedral, easily accessible opposite the botanic garden. The position of the parking (that on the drawing has been dimensioned to hold 20 busses and 200 cars) is absolutely strategic for future touristic development.

Architecture & Urban Planning / **Medium-term (4-7 years)**

3. Complete dismantling of the military infrastructure and removal of vast concrete and asphalt structures and other anthropogenic elements. Thereafter, a detailed design should be made for a natural/landscape reservoir, a bio-park of the City-Museum Reserve of Mtskheta, in order to rehabilitate the territory and ensure regeneration of its nature and landscape beneath the Djvari Monastery.
4. Traditional stone paving for side roads in the town.

Architecture & Urban Planning / **Long-term (8-15 years)**

5. As a general principle, a seismic hazard study of the whole town and the wider area must be carried out, which needs a zone-by-zone analysis of the areas around the monuments and establishment of Risk Preparedness schemes.
6. The development of a housing scheme to anticipate and properly guide future growth in specifically earmarked areas of Mskheta.

7. Putting all main supplies underground, such as electricity cables, telephone lines, T.V., water and gas mains.

Site Interpretation & Management / Short-term (0-3 years)

1. Signage program for all monuments and sites within the greater Mtskheta area.
2. Improvements to Cathedral precinct WCs (ventilation, roof lighting and new cubicles).
3. Relocation of car park and office at Javri, to include new WCs, shop and information bureau, as well as safety improvements (fences) at Djvari Church.
4. Development of new coordinated range of guidebooks, as well as a new promotional web site for Mtskheta.
5. Appointment of World Heritage Site Coordinator.
6. Production of World Heritage Site Management Plan.
7. Investigation into continued long-term stability of Svetitskhoveli Cathedral.

Site Interpretation & Management Medium-term (4-7 years)

8. Grants/loans/support program for tourism-related retail, catering and transport small businesses .
9. Set-up of Training programs for site management, catering and other tourism-related employees and administrators.
10. Production of conservation plans for monuments and historic or environmental areas within World Heritage Site.
11. Historical research program
12. Condition survey program
13. Other management information and data gathering

14. Environmental improvements to Cathedral precinct
15. Construction of visitor facilities (WCs, ticket/information office and shop/refreshment area) at all the monuments and sites.
16. Development of visitor orientation centre (including relocation of library, if necessary)
17. Sponsorship of cultural events, including theatre productions and arts events.
18. Construction of safe landing stages for new cross-river small passenger boats.
19. Repair and improvements to Museum building and presentation.

Site Interpretation & Management / Long-term (8-15 years)

1. General road improvements.
2. Environmental improvements around railway station.
3. Re-establish the Mtskheta Arts and Crafts School

Tourism / Short-term (0-3 years)

1. The development of a unified and mutually accepted tourism programme between the church and the state, which must be both economically beneficial to local people while maintaining accepted levels of change to historic monuments.
2. Development of a tourism cultural circuit in the town that includes additional attractions for short-term implementation needed to increase demand and extend visitor time in the town.

Tourism / Medium-term (4-7 years)

3. Development of a fee system for the cultural tour circuit, which can provide financing for site protection and conservation efforts, management posts, and educational and promotional campaigns. The process of developing visitor fees at Mtskheta can be used by the Department of Monuments and for other sites in the country.
4. Creation of a certificate and training programs for local museum guides.

5. Promotion of the re-development of the Mtskheta craft market; with increased tourism to the town it should be relatively easy to bring in local craftsman to reproduce ceramics and jewelry adding an additional aspect to the tour.
6. Training of Department of Monuments personnel in visitor management skills.
7. Develop a Mtskheta promotional campaign and materials.
8. Promote foreign tourism to Mtskheta since foreign tours visiting Mtskheta continue to be a viable market. Active promotion of specialty tours, such as archaeological, historical and cultural tours, could generate additional demand.
9. Increase overnight accommodations in the town and encourage homestays
10. Investigate security issues and include the information in the tourism information materials.

Tourism / Long-term (8 - 15 years)

11. Use foreign markets to promote the Georgian domestic market. Tourism to Georgian cultural events is now underrepresented.
12. Create an organization responsible for research and tourism data collection.

9.2 Assessment of Heritage & Tourism Master Plan for Mtskheta

Mtskheta Heritage & Tourism Master Plan is a comprehensive and updated management tool related to Mtskheta World Heritage site, which despite the high quality has not been implemented for over five years since its elaboration (UNESCO/UNDP, 2003). Master Plan includes detailed strategy in relation to not only World Heritage sites, but also the historic towns and their landscapes. It falls beyond the conservation issues and covers the features of cultural and natural heritage including infrastructure development and social context of conservation.

Master Plan was elaborated through cooperation of international and Georgian experts and includes laconic and comprehensive analyses and guidelines on major topics in

archaeology, urban planning, legal and institutional issues, site interpretation and tourism. Thematic explanation of Master Plan includes various topics, such as site management unit, financing strategy and future land use, location of gates signage and tourism development short-term projects. In terms of a sequence of such management tools, this plan is between the site management plan and the one of conservation and development.

The value of this document is that it presents general approach for understanding and revalorization of Mtskheta World Heritage site. Since ICOMOS recommendation for Mtskheta inclusion in World Heritage List is not sufficient, next to the historic-architectural values of churches and archaeological sites, the authors of the document added explanations of natural surroundings, city perspective and vistas. Natural landscape of Mtskheta, which is created by two rivers and slopes, is “a visual integrity playing important role while evaluating its location and perception of its monuments” (UNESCO/UNDP, 2003:67).

Therefore, Master Plan includes development of a cultural landscape concept and enables acquaintance with Mtskheta in this light. In the Master Plan, Mtskheta as a cultural heritage site is considered at the level of planning the town and country, and the site is addressed from the viewpoint of landscape planning and architectural or archaeological conservation of landscapes. With this respect, there is a link between Soviet period detailed layout of Mtskheta, declaration of grounds around the city as Museum-Reserve and Master Plan guidelines. Master Plan also reflects international opinions on cultural landscapes and increased focus on integrated conservation.

Subject to the above, Master Plan presents two significant action tools to achieve the goals:

- Institute for Management of the Perimeter IMP
- Plan for legal-institutional affairs for the city and surroundings.

IMP is proposed as an alternative to state-private sector partnership, in which the processes are governed jointly by the representatives of local and governmental agencies and private sector stakeholders. IMP is a legal entity under private sector legislation and

civil code. IMP will remain under the control of local government, while private stockholders may possess a part of authorized capital stock.

Map of legal-institutional affairs is a fundamental tool for land surveying, i.e. control of development and conservation efforts in Mtskheta and surroundings. It is based on more precise cartographic data (scale 1:10 000) and determines territories for: a) strict or moderate limitations, b) site development, c) nature conservation sites, d) visual landscape protection sites, e) archaeological sites etc. Some fundamental recommendations of this plan were applied for Mtskheta Cultural Heritage sites (image. 2.9).

Since 2003, when Heritage & Tourism Master Plan was presented, committee of World Cultural Heritage has been continuously reminding and asking the government to adopt and start implementation of a document (WHC, 2005, 2007). Nevertheless, Master Plan failed to be implemented by force of law; neither the government fulfilled any financial liability for this purpose. Though the Master Plan is translated into Georgian, it is known only to a limited number of professionals and its full version is not accessible. Officially, delay in implementation of Master Plan was caused by the law on National Cultural Heritage, which does not provide for a format of management plan in the hierarchy of legal documents.

Experience related to Heritage & Tourism Master Plan shall be taken into consideration while determining new management policies. The experience proved that until the persons to benefit from utilizing Mtskheta resources are not interested in conservation, it is less likely that any consensus will be reached about conservation and development of site. This is especially important in the context of a current tendency of problem resolution. Based on present situation, future strategies need to be focused on raising awareness and education of religious leaders, local businessmen and residents about the conservation and sustainable development issues. Strategy on extension of the authority and development of management initiatives need to be elaborated. In this regard close contacts can be established with NGOs engaged in social issues and municipal development affairs to use share their experience and knowledge.

10

Proposed Model for Management

Management Plan of the World Heritage Site of
Mtskheta

office@geographic.ge

10.1 Vision of Management

10.1.1 General Statements

Pursuant to assumed obligations, the government requires properly elaborated management plan for inscribed World Heritage (WH) sites as a manual;

Key statements of management plan are published in Management Guidelines for World Cultural Heritage (Feilden-Jokilehto guidelines, 2007).

The present management plan is elaborated on the initiative of National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia for inscribed WH sites and their buffer zones;

The management plan presents all important scientific, informational, statistical and other analysis and materials obtained over recent decade in relation with these monuments.

Informational and graphic-analytical data are based on modern geoinformation systems, photogrammetric methods and technologies and are stored in an integrated database, enabling operative management and correction;

An Interagency Working Group has been formed for designing a management plan. The group regularly discussed each stage of planning process, evaluated results and reviewed key issues of designing;

Within the framework of management plan, the main goals of the plan were outlined, as well as its conception and implementation strategy, legal and financial mechanisms, administrative forms and the means for control and monitoring of implementation;

Chronologic frames of the management plan cover 5-year cycle. On completion of the first cycle, the work done needs to be evaluated, new objectives set and the renewed management plan implemented;

10.1.2 Object of Management Plan

Mtskheta World Heritage properties are only the three main architectural monuments – monasteries being part/property of Patriarchate of Georgia.

The following tentative names of the monuments are indicated during the elaboration of management plan:

- **Svetitskhoveli** (Svetitskhoveli Cathedral) (Image 6.2);
- **Jvari** (The Church of the Holy Cross of Saint Nino) (Image 6.3);
- **Samtavro** (Samtavro Peristsvaleba Cathedral) (Image 6.4);

Apart from churches, the three monuments include precinct with various buildings.

In the management plan, through special survey, the individual zones for protection of inscribed monuments provided by the Georgian legislation will be determined, which will consist of physical and visual protection areas. Since the individual zones of protection will significantly intersect, it was considered expedient in the management plan to create integrated individual zone of protection for the three monuments. This zone of protection along with the protection zone of Mtskheta landscape constitutes the area of the management of WH sites.

Based on analysis and study of management area, it was taken into consideration that boundaries of this area spread 2.5-3.0 km from monuments covering the major part of Great Mtskheta cultural landscape that meets the requirements of UNESCO Duideline Document concerning the buffer zones. Territory within the management area is recommended to be **assigned a status of a buffer zone** of WH sites.

10.1.3 Aim of Management Plan

Main goals of elaboration and validation of the management plan are as follows:

- Primary aim of the management plan is to preserve and develop the Outstanding Universal Value of WH sites of Mtskheta;
- Preserve high level of authenticity through permanent and goal-oriented protective efforts;
- Preserve integrity of cultural landscapes and high value of monuments by adhering to restrictions established in buffer zones;

- Ensure maximal raise of cultural value of monuments through measures planned for the monuments and buffer zones using minimal interventions;
- Ensure raise of cultural value of monuments and conflict-free management by forming an interagency management team and coordinated administering;
- Against the background of the protection of cultural heritage, exercising religious function and growth of tourism industry, ensure harmonized coexistence, mutual assistance and development;
- During the implementation of the management plan, improve legal, institutional, financial and educational instruments for the management of WH sites and exercising their functions;
- Create updatable integrated database, information system and communications chain for WH sites and implement new prospective programs and projects;
- Improve forms and methods of work organization and management for WH sites by designing the Management Plan;
- Increase access to WH sites and surroundings, raise cultural value and living standards of local community as a result of planning monument conservation and other efforts;
- Identify all types of risks and hazards, including natural and anthropogenic ones, and elaborate measures and methods for their prevention as a result of study and analysis within the framework of Management Plan;
- Ensure optimal management of visitors and awareness raising through the education/training for specialists of different profiles planned within the framework of Management Plan;

10.1.4 Management Plan Concept

Management Plan for the World Heritage Sites is an instrument, which includes general guidelines for conservation and preservation of WH sites, as well as an interagency document defining priorities, goals and objectives of management.

Effectiveness of the Management Plan greatly depends on its legal status and the implementing institutions. To that end, a right and precise place of Management Plan in the sequence and hierarchy of legal documents needs to be clarified.

Nowadays, monument protection field is provided for by the following documents of Georgian legislation:

- The Constitution of Georgia;
- International conventions, charters and agreements on monument protection;
- Law of Georgia on Cultural Heritage (2007)
- Law of Georgia on the Principles of Spatial Arrangement and Town-Planning (2005)
- Decree on Issuance of construction permits (Government of Georgia, 2009);
- The Rules of Land Use and Building Regulations (2008, general provisions, the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development of Georgia)

Based on this document, the sequence of designing activities and the place of Management Plan is as follows:

- Municipality spatial arrangement plan;
- General plan of land use for settlement;
- Basic historic-cultural plan for settlement;
- Building Regulation plan;
- **Management Plan for the World Heritage Sites;**
- Historic-architectural and archaeological preproject research;

- Conservation plan for historic construction;
- Conservation-rehabilitation projects for WH immovable properties.

Management Plan for the World Heritage Sites has to be included in legislative-normative documents through the law elaborated/adopted for this purpose on “**protection of the World Heritage Sites**” and other relevant laws.

10.1.5 Systemic Model of the Management Plan

Based on international practice, general scheme of the Management Plan has been determined, which provides for a cyclic nature of the works, i.e. upon completion of the first 6-year cycle, the work done are analyzed and evaluated, and a new 6-year cycle is planned to achieve new objectives, etc.

Main stages of this model are to be carried out in following succession:

- Determine management area;
- Information collection and analysis;
- SWOT Analysis;
- Develop vision for the management plan;
- Elaborate management principles and policy;
- Set the goals of management plan;
- Develop a strategy for the achievement of the goals;
- Develop program policies;
- Identify activities and parties;
- Elaboration of the relevant packages of projects by the parties;
- Outline the stages of implementation within accepted projects;
- Revision and renewal of stage performance;
- Planning the new cycle based on the results.

See the Flowchart of management plan on Fig. 1.1.

10.1.6 List of activities and timetable for the Management Plan

According to the goals and objectives of the Management Plan for the World Heritage Sites, the list of activities to be included in program policies has been prepared. These activities are divided over implementation in the short-term, medium and long-term in Mtskheta Heritage & Tourism Master Plan implemented in 2003.

All the activities in this Plan are divided over duration and profiles, such as archaeology, architecture and tourism.

Obligatory and urgent works and objectives revealed through SWOT Analysis are to be added to the activities listed in Heritage & Tourism Master Plan.

10.1.7 Monitoring & Control

Monitoring and control over implementation of Management Plan is one of the important components. During the implementation process, evaluation criteria need to be adopted to ensure objective assessment of quality, timeliness and compliance of performance.

The results have to be reflected in information system and integrated database of the Management Plan in the form of special reports. Following the analysis and interpreting of new data, the next cycle of the Management Plan will be designed.

10.2 Stakeholders (parties) and Structural Model of Management

Implementation of the Management Plan is obligatory to all stakeholders and institutions concerned, among which the three major parties are outlined: **state, Patriarchate and local self-government**. There should be the fourth potential party (if such, it should take active part in management) – it is **local community** represented by its NGO, which has not been in place in Mtskheta so far. In order to demonstrate the preparedness for the implementation of management plan, stakeholders will sign and publish a special

memorandum, indicating topicality of management plan goals and needs for the adoption of special law.

Institutions presented as the state ones may be divided into direct and linked participants. Participants of both types are continuously involved in management; they differ only by the extent of involvement and volume of work to be performed. Direct participants include Patriarchate, National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia, National Tourism Agency, Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development of Georgia, Mtskheta Museum of Archaeology and ICOMOS, as well as Mtskheta-Mtianeti Regional Administration and Mtskheta Municipality. Other institutions can be regarded as linked participants.

In order to ensure coordinated work of participants, a special **communications platform** has been formed, name and a charter of which will be approved by the participants on an equal footing.

Structural model of the Management Plan is provided in Flowchart 10.2.

10.3. Recommendations on Legislative and Institutional Changes

Law of Georgia on Protection of World Heritage Sites needs to be adopted after the all stakeholders confirm their preparedness for the participation in Management Plan by signing a memorandum.

Place and role of the Management Plan in the hierarchy of **documents related to monument protection**, as well as its goals, objectives and methods of implementation need to be stipulated by the law.

The law must stipulate in detail the specific **functions and rights/obligations** of the parties.

The law needs to specify name, status, charter and regulations of the interagency management team (communications platform).

The law needs to provide a definition of a new term “**Buffer zone of WH site**” and the rule for its approval is to be elaborated.

The law need to stipulate **sources of financing** and rules and principles of budgeting for the Management Plan. According to active legislation, the Management Plan budget may be formulated by revenues gained from local economic activity, state budget subsidies, credits, grants and donations.

10.4 Identification of Needs to Ensure Capacity Building for Potential Participants

Within the framework of the Management Plan, it is important to identify needs of the participants to ensure effective work. During the designing process of the Management Plan, the implementing parties send the stakeholders a letter with questions concerning the Management Plan issues and problems. Based on the responses, after discussion on interagency group meeting, basic needs for the implementation of the Management Plan have been underlined:

- **Organizational** needs, and
- **Educational-informational** needs.

Organizational needs relate to a special subunit or staff to be created, which will be in charge of the WH Site protection issues only. It is recommended to form a subunit in the agency, which is directly involved in the implementation of basic objectives of the Management Plan, i.e. Patriarchate, the National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia via its local structural department, and local municipality.

Organizational needs also include elaboration and implementation of program policies, as well as their legal and normative insuring.

Among those participants, which do not establish a special subunit, at least one employee (of the category of manager) is to be trained in WH Site Management Plan issues.

Educational-informational needs include awareness raise in basic conceptual issues about WH Site Management, the role of UNESCO, Convention requirements and basic regulations. It is required also to instruct all stakeholders on Management Plan, which relate to any form of the implementation, and arrange in-depth trainings for persons directly involved in the activities of the Management Plan.

Trainings need to be conducted regularly to prepare as many specialists as possible not only among the parties, but a in a wider range, i.e. monastery vergers, school teachers from Tbilisi, Mtskheta and other towns, professors and teachers of relevant higher educational institutions, representatives of the humanities, law enforcement and military spheres.

Each program policy must have its curricula, to be prepared and taught with the participation of relevant specialists of the parties. Basic **training courses** need to cover the following topics:

- Conservation and maintenance of architectural and archaeological monuments;
- Preventive monitoring;
- Protection of historic environment of monuments (environment protection, ecology, risk preparedness);
- Public relation, awareness raising, accessibility;
- Tourism, cognition, education, programs for kids;
- Socio-economic development, local management, local community, encouraging economic activity, development of transport and engineering infrastructure.

Optimal organization of the training process is of vital importance, for which the World Heritage educational center needs to be established under the Archeological Museum Reserve of Mtskheta or the National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia. In this center, all intellectual and technical resources will be gathered to ensure comprehensive teaching.

At the **first stage**, 5-6 specialists/trainers will be trained in basic profiles in UNESCO by experts of ICOMOS and the National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation.

At the **second stage**, the trained specialist/instructors will provide training course for the groups consisted of the participating stakeholders using the already elaborated curricula. Education process will be of cyclic nature. Upon completion of trainings, instructors will be granted special licenses of trainers, and the attendees – the certificates enabling them to work in their fields.

Education **Financing** needs to be stipulated by the law to be adopted on “Protection of the World Heritage Sites”. In a state budget, specific chapter needs to be dedicated to the financing of the Management Plan and education, as well as training for specialists.

Throughout the education process, specialists/experts will regularly present semiannual accounts to a financing body on education process, and the results of evaluation of the attendees. Financing body will present summary account to the members of interagency management team, to carry out final evaluation and effectiveness of the training and to plan future curricula based on financing.

10.5 List and Management Structure of Program Policies

According to general strategy of the protection of WH Sites, program policies of management plan are determined in accordance with basic goals, objectives, and information obtained during the work. Their redistribution by dates and topicality is also based on 2003 Heritage & Tourism Master Plan and data of SWOT analysis presented in chapter 8 of this Master Plan.

List of program policies includes the following sections:

1. **Conservation and maintenance of WH sites**
 - Architecture, reliefs, wall painting;
 - Archaeology, conservation, exposition, study;
 - Development of site territories, landscape gardening, cleaning

- Scientific study of sites, state analysis;
- designing conservation plan;

2. Buffer Zones

- Environment protection, ecology;
- Risk preparedness;
- Regulation of housing development
- Monitoring over regimes established in protected areas

3. Cognition and Adding Value

- Involvement of local community;
- Public relation;
- Education and popularization;
- Organizing the religious infrastructure

4. Socio-economic development

- Organization of transport infrastructure
- Provision with engineering networks
- Local business involvement

5. Tourism industry

- Development of tourism routes
- Improvement of information system;
- Service industry development;
- Increase and application of tourism potential;

6. Urban planning and spatial arrangement

- Designing spatial arrangement plan for Mtskheta municipality;
- Designing Mtskheta land use general plan;
- Designing building regulation plans
- Designing basic historic-cultural plan
- Elaboration of regulations for Mtskheta historic building.

Timetable for implementation of specific action plan of this program policy will be prepared based on this management plan under the directions of responsible and controlling persons after relevant legal and financial insuring. This preparatory work will be supervised by National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia in close cooperation with other relevant agencies.

10.6 Monitoring of Management Plan Implementation and Replanning

Specialists from National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia will prepare annual accounts on statute of WH site and landscape, current state, planning and action documents, requests for financing and technical assistance, as well as current and potential hazards. These documents then will be reviewed and evaluated on the meeting of management team council. Replanning takes place every 5-6 years. Annual monitoring reports have to be summarized and analyzed to set new goals of the management plan. This method makes easier identification of problems for the improvement of the management plan.

Criteria of monitoring of management plan implementation:

- Are the long-term, medium and short-term objectives clearly defined?
- Are the values, priorities and activities of lesser risk relevantly considered in management plan?
- Was the full inventory of site area carried out and documents prepared?
- Is the relevant documentation related to sites accessible?
- Are there reliably protected copies of the mentioned documents?
- Is there any properly checked fire-prevention plan in place?
- Is there any hazard prevention plan?

- Is any person responsible for disaster response measures considered among the personnel?
- Are the contacts established with relevant institutions and universities for the implementation of research programs?
- Do the current legal and normative documents reflect the need for the management of WH sites?
- Are they effectively applied? If no, why?
- Is the management infrastructure effective and adequate to its objectives?
- Are any contacts established with international organizations engaged in preservation of WH sites?

(Fielden B.M. Jokilehto, J. 2007)

Upon acceptance of the answers on above questions and based on their analysis, a new version of the management plan is determined for the next cycle of action. Structural model of control and monitoring is provided on fig. 10.1.

28.09.2012

11

Basic Action Plan for Transforming the Proposed Management System of Mtskheta World Heritage Sites into Operational Level

Management Plan of the World Heritage Site of
Mtskheta
office@geographic.ge

Table 11.1:

Action plan for implementation of management plan

| Stage | Action | 1-2 years | 3-4 years | 5-6 years | Responsible party | finances |
|---|---|--|-----------|-----------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Coordinate Management plan model | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan Distribution Accept /edit comments Prepare final version and deliver to the parties Signing a Memorandum by the parties on management plan implementation | x x x x | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> agency agency parties | - - - |
| 2. Legislative changes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> prepare definitions and legal basis for Management plan and Buffer Zone and present as a legislative initiative (new law or amendments to old one); approval and validation of Management Plan in compliance with the law; | x x | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry Agency | Budget, credits, donations; |

| Stage | Action | 1-2 years | 3-4 years | 5-6 years | Responsible party | finances |
|--------------------------------|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|------------------------------------|
| 3. Program policies | Conservation and maintenance of monuments (architecture, reliefs, wall painting, archaeology, conservation, exposition, study, site territory development, green space arrangement, cleaning, scientific study of monuments, state analysis); | x | x | x | The parties within the framework of relevant program | Budget, credits grants, donations; |
| | Buffer zones (Environment protection, ecology, Risk preparedness; Regulation of housing development Monitoring over regimes established in protected areas) | x | x | x | The parties within the framework of relevant program | Budget, credits grants, donations; |
| | Cognition and Adding Value (involvement of local community, Public relation, Education and popularization, Organization of religious infrastructure) | x | x | x | The parties within the framework of relevant program | Budget, credits grants, donations; |
| | Socio-economic development (Organization of transport infrastructure, Provision with engineering networks, Local business involvement) | x | x | x | The parties within the framework of relevant program | Budget, credits grants, donations; |

| Stage | Action | 1-2 years | 3-4 years | 5-6 years | Responsible party | finances |
|----------------------------------|---|-----------|-----------|------------------|---|--|
| | Tourism industry (Development of tourism routes, Improvement of information system, development of service industry, growth of tourism potential); | x | x | x | The parties within the framework of relevant program | Budget, credits grants, donations; |
| | Urban planning and spatial arrangement (Designing spatial arrangement plan for Mtskheta municipality, Designing Mtskheta land use general plan, Designing building regulation plans, Designing basic historic-cultural plan, Elaboration of regulations for Mtskheta historic building) | x | x | x | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry of Culture and Monument Protection Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development Mtskheta municipality | Budget, credits grants, donations; |
| 4. Monitoring and Control | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring; Description/ evaluation of the work done; Setting the new goals Draw up a new plan | | | x x x x | Ingeragency management team | Budget of the National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia) |

28.09.2012

12

Sources

Management Plan of the World Heritage Site of
Mtskheta

office@geographic.ge

Jokilehto, J. Fielden B.M.. (1993), The Ministry of Culture, Monuments protection and Sport of Georgia, 2007; 1998 ICCROM Authorized translation of second English edition. Available at <http://ancientgeorgia.files.wordpress.com/2011/09/martva-book.pdf> [Jokilehto, J., and Fielden, B. (1993) Management Guidelines for World Cultural Heritage Sites, Rome ICCROM.]

Mtskheta-Mtianeti Regional Development Strategy, 2012-2017, Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development of Georgia;

Economic development plan for Mtskheta Municipality (2007), working group of Mtskheta Municipality;

(1993) Nomination Dossier of Mtskheta, Georgia: Mtskheta Museum-Reserve, Georgia, Dossier c708, ICOMOS Center for Documentation, Paris

Georgia (2005B) Letter of the Minister of Culture, Monument Protection and Sport to Director of WHC #025/889-17, 17.03.2005, Dossier c708, ICOMO Center for Documentation, Paris.

Georgia (2005C) Decree on awarding a status of Mtskheta Museum-Reserve (nonregistered copy), the Ministry of Culture, Monument Protection and Sport.

Georgia (2006) joint Decree on determining protection zones for Mtskheta Cultural Heritage, #3/471– 1-1/1243, 27.10.2006. The Ministry of Culture, Monument Protection and Sport and the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development;

Georgia (2007a) Law on “Cultural Heritage”, 08.05.2007, #4708, the Parliament of Georgia;

Georgia (2007b) Law on “the Principles of Spatial Arrangement and Town-Planning”, 27.04.2007. #4689, the Parliament of Georgia;

Georgia (2007c) Report on State of Conservation of Mtskheta Historic Monuments, The Ministry of Culture, Monument Protection and Sport;

Georgia (2007d) Law on “Declaring the property right on land plots being in possession (use) of natural persons and LEPLs, #5274-RS, 11.07.2007. the Parliament of Georgia;

Georgia (2008) Decree on “approval of general provisions of regulation of the use and building on settlement territories” #-1-1/1254, 08.07.2008, the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development;

Georgia (2009a) Report on the Conservation State of Mtskheta Historic Monuments, National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia;

Kipiani G., for issue of the Origin of Mtskheta;

Council of Europe. (1985) Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe, 3.X.1985 [internet], Council of Europe. Available from: <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/121.htm> [Accessed 12.11.2008].

Council of Europe. (1995) Recommendation of the Committee of Ministers No. R (95) 9 on Integrated Conservation of Cultural Landscape Areas as Part of Landscape Policies. In: Council of Europe, (2002) European Cultural Heritage, vol. 1, Strasbourg: Council of Europe, p. 289.

Council of Europe. (2000a) The European Landscape Convention, ETS No.176 [internet], Council of Europe. Available from: <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/EN/Treaties/Html/176.htm> [Accessed 12.11.2008].

ICOMOS (1994a) Report of the Evaluation Mission to Georgia on Behalf of ICOMOS, May-June, 1994, Dossier Nc708, Georgie, Reserve de la Ville-Musee de Mtskheta, ICOMOS Documentation Centre: Paris.

ICOMOS (1994b) Evaluation Document for the Historical Church Ensemble of Mtskheta [internet], WHC. Available from: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/708/documents/> [Accessed 09.11.2008].

Mirzikashvili R., (July 2009), "Problems and Perspectives of Management of the Mtskheta World Heritage Site, Georgia", thesis, University College Dublin;

UNESCO (1972a) Convention for Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage [internet], UNESCO. Available from: http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URLID=13055&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html [Accessed 26.03.2008].

UNESCO/UNDP (2003) Heritage and Tourism Master Plan for Mtskheta, Georgia, Final Report, UNESCO.

UNESCO (2005a) Vienna Memorandum, adopted by the International Conference World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture - Managing the Historic Urban Landscape, 12-14 May 2005, Vienna, Austria [internet], UNESCO. Available from: <http://www.koh.hu/vilagorokseg/pdf/whc05-15ga-inf7e.pdf> [Accessed 20.02.2008].

UNESCO, 2011, Chapter II.F, Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention;

WHC (2000) the Letter to the Deputy Secretary General of Georgian National Commission for UNESCO, WHC/74/5481/PSTR 16.10.2000, Dossier N c708, ICOMOS Documentation Centre, Paris. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/708/documents/>

WHC (2005a) Decision of the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee, 29COM 7(b) 64, 10 -17 July 2005, Durban, South Africa, [internet], WHC. Available from: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/888> [Accessed 15.04.2009].

WHC (2006a) Georgia, Historical Monuments of Mtskheta, Periodic Report on the State of Conservation of World Heritage Properties in Europe, Summary of the Section II, [internet], WHC. Available from: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/708/documents/> [Accessed 15.04.2009].

WHC (2007) Decision of the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee, 31COM 7(b), 23 June 02 July 2007, Christchurch, New Zealand, [internet], WHC. Available from: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/statutorydoc/> [Accessed 15.04.2009].

WHC (2008a) Operational Guidelines for Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, (revised), [internet], WHC. Available from: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines/> [Accessed 19.12.2008].

WHC (2009) Georgia's Historical Monuments of Mtskheta Inscribed on Danger List, News Archive 28 June 2009 [Internet], WHC. Available from: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/news/535> [Accessed 01.07.2009].

WHC (2012), 36th session, Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation, 24.06– 06.07.2012;

Annex 6.1

Bibiluri T., Overview of Mtskheta Archaeological Sites

References:

Ghartiskari

1. Apakidze A. et al. Results of 1979 Research-Survey at the Great Mtskheta Territory, Mtskheta. Vol. VI
2. Apakidze A. et al. Great Mtskheta, Results of Archaeological Research-Survey Mtskheta. Vol. IX, 1980
3. Nikolaishvili V., Historic Topography of the Great Mtskheta (based on archaeological data), Iberia-Kolkheti, Collection of 4 antique periods of Georgian Archaeological Surveys, Tbilisi, 2005

Armaziskhevi Complex of Pitiakhshes

1. leonti Mroveli, The lives of Kings. **ქობ ღოს**, I, Tbilisi, 1955
2. Vakhushti Bagrationi, Description of the Kingdom of Georgia, **ქობ ღოს**, IV, Tbilisi, 1973
3. Apakidze A., Gobedjishvili G., Kalandadze A., Lomtadze G., Armaziskhevi Archaeological Excavations. Mtskheta, I, 1955
4. Apakidze A., Cities and City Life in the Ancient Georgia. Tbilisi, 1963
5. Bibiluri, T., Armaziskhevi Burial Grounds of Kartli Pitiakhshes (attempt of new interpretation of Burial rules), Collection, Issues of the History of Cultural, V, Tbilisi, 1998
6. Bibiluri, T., types of Burial Grounds and burying rules in I-IVcenturies Kingdom of Kartli.
7. Melikishvili G., Ancient History of Georgia, Tbilisi, 1955
8. Chilashvili L., for Definition of the name “God” (King Parnavaz – King-God), Commemorative Collection in memory of Alexandre Djavakhishvili, vol, XII - XIII, Tbilisi, 1997

Armaztsikhe

1. Moses Khorenatsi, History of the Armenians, Translated from old Armenian by Abdaladze A., Tbilisi, 1984
2. leonti Mroveli, The lives of Kings, I, Tbilisi, 1955;
3. Vakhushti Bagrationi, Description of the Kingdom of Georgia, IV, Tbilisi, 1973;
4. Strabo's Geography, Moscow, 1994
5. Kakabadze S., City of Armazi – City of Mtskheta, Historic collection,. III, Tb. 1928
6. Apakidze A. Cities and City Life in the Ancient Georgia. Tbilisi, 1963;
7. Apakidze A., Nikolaishvili V., Kipiani G., Archaeological Excavations on Armaztsikhe, MAI III scientific session, Mtskheta, Tbilisi, 1999

8. Kaukhchishvili T., New Greek Inscriptions from Armaztsikhe-Bagineti, Mtskheta, XI, 1996
9. Kutateladze D. Report on Mtskheta Bagineti Excavation. Collection by Takaishvili E., Tbilisi, 1966
10. Ioseliani I., Existed and Existing Cities in Georgia. Tiflis, 1850
11. Bolshunova A., Description of Iberia in Strabo's Geography, VDI, #46, 1947
12. Bolshunova A., about Issue on Armazi, VDI, #2, 1949
13. Melikset-Bekov L., Armazi, Tbilisi.

Former Settlements and Burial Grounds of Samtavro

1. Apakidze A., Mtskheta - Old Capital of Kingdom of Kartli, Tbilisi, 1959
2. Apakidze A., Cities and City Life in the Ancient Georgia. I Tbilisi, 1963
3. Apakidze A., History of Ancient Culture in Georgia, I Tbilisi, 1970
4. Apakidze A. et al. Mtskheta, Results of Archaeological Research-Survey, vol. II, Tbilisi, 1978
5. Baiern F. Study of Ancient Tombs near the City of Mtskheta, II, Tiflis, 1872
6. Bibiluri T., New Type of Tombs in Mtskheta, Academy of Science of Georgia, 'Moambe', vol. 93, #2, Tbilisi, 1970
7. Interesting Complex of Burial Grounds from Mtskheta, Dzeglis Megobari (Friends of Monuments of Culture), #62, Tbilisi, 1983
8. Bibiluri T., Clay Slab Burial Grounds on the Territory of Late Antiquity Period Georgia. Thesis to obtain the scientific candidate degree of historical sciences.
9. Bibiluri T., Moshinski A., Archaeological Artifacts of Georgia in Moscow State Historical Museum, Moscow, 2001
10. Bibiluri T., Novikova E., Earrings from Samtavro Burial Ground of Late Antiquity Period. Tbilisi State University, Issues of the History of Culture and Theory, XIV, Tbilisi, 2003
11. Bibiluri T., Ghlonti N., Archaeological Monuments of Samtavro Burial Ground of II-IV centuries, Series of Great Mtskheta Museum-Reserve "Great Mtskheta and its Country", I, Tbilisi, 2004
12. Ivashchenko M., Samtavro Burial Grounds of I-III centuries. Mtskheta. Results of Archaeological excavations. Vol. III, 1980
13. Ivashchenko M., Samtavro Burial Grounds of IV century and following centuries. Manuscript is kept in Mtskheta Institute of Archaeology.
14. Kalandadze A., Archaeological Monuments of Samtavro of early antiquity period. Mtskheta, vol. IV-VI
15. Lomtadze G., Archaeological excavations in the Capital of Georgia, Tbilisi, 1965
16. Lomtadze G., Bronze poniards in ancient tombs of Samtavro, Tbilisi, 1974

17. Chubinashvili T., Barrow-burial ground of Samtavro #243, Tbilisi, 1950

Annex 6.2

Historic-Architectural Overview

1. Alasania G., Bun-Turks of the Georgian Written Sources (historiography of the issue), Georgian Source Study, IX, Tbilisi, 2000.
2. Apakidze A., Mtskheta - Old Capital of the Kingdom of Kartli, Tbilisi, 1959.
3. Apakidze A., Cities and City Life in the Ancient Georgia. I Tbilisi, 1963.
4. Apakidze A., Sarkine, Description of the History and Cultural Monuments of Georgia. 5, Tbilisi, 1990.
5. Berdzenishvili N., Issues of the History of Georgia, VIII, Tbilisi, 1975.
6. Okhochadze A., 'Old Mtskheta' Localization Issues, Archaeological Monuments of Feudal Georgia, III, Tbilisi, 1978.
7. Gabeskiria Sh., for the issues of family-names of Georgians, origin of Georgia and its old capitals and localization of Kartli. "Valerian Gabashvili 90". Tbilisi, 2003.
8. Gamkrelidze G., Mithridat Evpator and the issues of the History of Kolkheti-Iberia. Matsne, History, Archaeology...series Tbilisi, 1989, #2.
9. Gamkrelidze G., Pirtskhalava M., Kipiani G., Issues of Military History of Ancient Georgia, Tbilisi, 2005.
10. Gotua L., Location of the river 'Pelori', Dzeglis MEgobari, #27-28, Tbilisi, 1971.
11. Information of Dion Kasios about Georgia. Greek text with Georgian translation, published, introduction and comments by Nodar Lomouri. Tbilisi, 1966.
12. Teimuraz Bagrationi, Books Dictionaries. Materials gathered, arranged alphabetically, annexed with foreword and comments by Guram Sharadze, Tbilisi, 1979.
13. Ingorokva P., Old Georgian Chronicle "Moktsevai Kartlisai" and "the List of the Kings of Iberia". Collection. Vol. IV, Tbilisi, 1978.
14. Ioane Bagrationi, Description of Kartl-Kakheti. Text prepared for publication, annexed with analysis and checklists by Tina Enukidze and Guram Bedoshvili, Tbilisi, 1986.
15. Kakabadze S., City of Armaz – City of Mtskheta, collection of Historical Works. Book III, Tiflis, 1928.
16. Lomouri N., Claudio Tolomeo's Geography, Information about Georgia, materials for the history of Georgia and Caucasus. Res. 32, Tbilisi, 1968.
17. Lortkipanidze O., Ancient World and the Kingdom of Kartli (Iberia), Tbilisi, 1968.
18. Lortkipanidze O., Origins of Old Georgian Civilization, Tbilisi, 2002.

19. Margishvili S., War of Iberia with Pompeius (based on Information of Dion Kasios), Mkhedari, #3, Tbilisi, 1991.
20. Mandjgaladze G., Results of Archaeological Surveillance in Svetitskhoveli courtyard and Church of Antioch, 2nd Scientific Session, Summaries of reports, Mtskheta, Tbilisi, 1998.
21. Melikishvili G., issues of the Ancient Population of Georgia, Caucasus and the Near East. Tbilisi, 1965.
22. Melikset-Bekov L., about the Establishment of the City of Mtskheta. "Momavali" magazine, #2, Tbilisi, 1921.
23. Nikolaishvili V., Historic Topography of the Great Mtskheta, Iberia-Kolkheti, research, addendum Collection of Georgian Archaeological Surveys of Antique Periods,. "Otar Lortkipanidze – 75". Tbilisi, 2005.
24. Sardjveladze Z., Dictionary of Old Georgian. Tbilisi, 1995.
25. Cultural Monuments of Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic. Compiled by Barnaveli T., edited by Tsintsadze, foreword by Chubinashvili G. Tbilisi, 1959.
26. Sulkhan-Saba Orbeliani, Selected works, vol. IV₂, Tbilisi, 1966.
27. Kaukhchishvili T., Strabo's Geography (Information about Georgia), Tbilisi, 1957.
28. Kipiani G., 'Antioch' of Mtskheta, Basic construction periods, 3rd Scientific Session, 'Reports', Mtskheta, 23 April 1999. Tbilisi, 1999.
29. Kipiani G., Who was being buried in Uplistsikhe? Collection of Research Works, faculty of the history of art, Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, 2001.
30. Kipiani G., Uplistsikhe. Tbilisi, 2002.
31. Chkheidze T., Essays from Iranian Onomastics, Tbilisi, 1984.
32. Djanashia N., Essays on History and Source Study, Tbilisi, 1986.
33. Djanashia S., about the issues of East-Georgian State Ancient Cultural-Political Centers. Works, II, Tbilisi, 1952.
34. Javakhishvili I., History of Georgian Nation, book 1, Tbilisi, 1951.
35. Atlas of Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic, Tbilisi, _ M. 1964.
36. Kvezereli-Kopadze N., Ancient Bridge of Mtskheta. Tbilisi, 1947.
37. Kozina T., a few issues about consecution of Hellenism. Issues of Universal History of Architecture. #1, M., 1961.
38. Lukovina V., Iran of Ancient and Early Medieval Periods. M. 1987.
39. Manandian, Circular Route of Pompey to Transcaucasus, messenger of Ancient History, #4. M. 1939.
40. Melikishvili G., about History of Ancient Georgia. Tbilisi, 1959.
41. Melikset-Bekov L., about Scythian Problem, about the issues of Saki, Kaspi, Materials for the History of Georgia and Caucasus, part VII, Tbilisi, 1937.

42. Melikset-Bekov L., Armazni., Materials for the History of Georgia and Caucasus, part II. Tbilisi, 1937.
43. Muraviov, Notes about historical geography of Transcaucasus. Plinius about population of Caucasus. messenger of Ancient History, # 1, M., 1988.
44. Mshvenieradze D., Civil Engineering in Ancient Georgia. Tbilisi, 1952.
45. Four-language encyclopedic dictionary of physical geography terms. M. 1980.
46. Adam J-P. L'Architecture Militaire Grecque, Paris, 1982.
47. Brosset M., Histoire de la Georgie. I part. SPB. 1849.
48. Lauter H., Die Architektur des Hellenismus. Darmstadt. 1986.
49. Lawrence, Greek Aims in Fortification Oxford, 1978.
50. Martin R., L'Urbanisme dans la Grece Antique. Paris. 1974.
51. Winter F. E. Greek Fortifications, Toronto, 1971.