



# MARITIME SPATIAL PLAN OF THE REPUBLIC OF BULGARIA 2021-2035

PROTECTION OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE

Kalin DIMITROV, PhD  
Associate Prof. Velina PANDJAROVA, PhD

# 10

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS..... ii

1. General information: norms, goals and restrictions ..... 1

2. Immovable cultural assets (ICAs) and museum infrastructure in the territorial scope of MSPRB — current state..... 6

    2.1. ICAs in the category of “global significance” ..... 6

    2.2. ICAs in the category of “national significance” ..... 16

    2.3. ICAs in the scope of the MSPRB — summary ..... 45

3. Problems of the cultural heritage within the MSPRB scope ..... 56

4. Museum network within the MSPRB territorial scope..... 62

5. Summarised Conclusions..... 65

SOURCES OF INFORMATION: ..... 67

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| <b>CHA</b>      | Cultural Heritage Act   |
| <b>CM</b>       | Council of Ministers  |
| <b>CRW</b>      | Conservation and restoration work   |
| <b>EU</b>       | European Union  |
| <b>ICA</b>      | Immovable cultural assets   |
| <b>ICOMOS</b>   | International Council on Monuments and Sites  |
| <b>IO</b>       | Institute of Oceanology, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences                                      |
| <b>MC</b>       | Ministry of Culture   |
| <b>MEW</b>      | Ministry of Environment and Water   |
| <b>MoD</b>      | Ministry of Defence   |
| <b>MoI</b>      | Ministry of Interior  |
| <b>MSP</b>      | Maritime Spatial Planning   |
| <b>MSPRB</b>    | Maritime Spatial Plan of the Republic of Bulgaria (2021–2035)                               |
| <b>NIICH</b>    | National Institute of Immovable Cultural Heritage   |
| <b>SECPPICA</b> | Specialised Expert Council for the Protection and Preservation of Immovable Cultural Assets |
| <b>SG</b>       | State Gazette   |
| <b>UAC</b>      | Underwater Archaeology Centre   |
| <b>UN</b>       | The United Nations  |
| <b>UNESCO</b>   | United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation                            |

# PROTECTION OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE

## 1. General information: norms, goals and restrictions

The activities connected with analysis, evaluation and predictions concerning the cultural heritage sites located in the Bulgarian maritime spaces and in the Black Sea coastal area (on land and under water) are an integral part of the Maritime Spatial Plan of the Republic of Bulgaria (MSPRB). The complex nature of the MSPRB presupposes to address all aspects of the Bulgarian national policy on protection and preservation of the cultural heritage, as well as all aspects of international agreements to which Bulgaria is a party. Therefore, this analysis is entirely in line with:

- The national regulatory systems in the field of protection and preservation of the cultural heritage: The Cultural Heritage Act with all its relevant secondary legislation, as well as other laws on issues related to the cultural and natural heritage (Spatial Development Act, Regional Development Act, Protected Areas Act, etc.).
- The national regulatory documents in the field of tourism: The Strategic Plan for the Development of Cultural Tourism in Bulgaria as part of the National Strategy for Sustainable Development of Tourism (2009—2013), the Tourism Act and the other regulatory documents linked to it, etc.
- National legislation connected with regulation of investment activities in the sea: The Maritime Space, Inland Waterways and Ports of the Republic of Bulgaria Act, the Concessions Act, the Black Sea Coast Development Act, etc.
- International documents:
  - Conventions in the field of cultural heritage ratified by Bulgaria: the UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, with the guidelines to it (1972); the Convention of the Council of Europe for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (Granada, 1985) and for the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage of Europe (La Valetta, 1992), and the European Landscape Convention (Florence, 2000)
  - United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (1982)
  - Treaties and agreements with Black Sea states on delimiting the maritime spaces in the Black Sea.
  - UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage (2001)
  - UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003)
  - International documents of ICOMOS: International Charter on the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas; the Charters on the Archaeological Heritage, on Cultural Tourism, on Cultural Routes, on National Architecture.

## VOLUME 10. PROTECTION OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE

- The MSPRB is also in line with the available European experience in developing such plans, especially in the cases when their territorial scope comprises world cultural heritage sites.

With respect to the underwater cultural heritage, this MSPRB has adopted the definition set out in the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage (Article 1a), namely: “*Underwater cultural heritage*” means all traces of human existence having a cultural, historical or archaeological character which have been partially or totally under water, periodically or continuously, for at least 100 years, such as:

- *sites, structures, buildings, artefacts and human remains, together with their archaeological and natural context;*
- *vessels, aircraft, other vehicles or any part thereof, their cargo or other contents, together with their archaeological and natural context, and*
- *objects of prehistoric character”.*

For the Bulgarian waters of the Black Sea this cultural heritage can also be classified more systematically and in more concrete terms as follows:

- Settlements and structures that are at the bottom of the sea today, but have been built or formed when sea levels were lower in the past. Submerged prehistoric settlements from the Late Chalcolithic and Early Bronze Age are the most typical structures of this type. Within the MSPRB scope, such settlements are known and have been partially explored in coastal lakes and in some sea bays.
- Archaeological structures found on the sea bottom, which have come from the sea surface. Remains of sunken ships (shipwrecks) are the most typical examples of such underwater cultural heritage.
- Archaeological structures that have been built on land in the past, but are found on the sea bottom today due to local tectonic and landslide processes. Part of the sunken fortification walls of Nesebar are an example of such structures.
- Archaeological structures that have been built as underwater structures in the past, e.g., the ruins of ancient harbours.
- Individual finds and objects of historical, cultural or archaeological nature, which are found on the seabed.

Together with the cultural heritage that is under water today, it is also necessary to analyse the immovable cultural assets (ICAs) along the coastline which are usually in immediate, semantic and physical connection with the underwater assets.

The understanding about the cultural heritage changes. This makes it necessary to adopt an adequate approach in the work on the Cultural Heritage part of the MSPRB, in compliance with the guidelines for the development of the cultural heritage and its protection as a whole. On a global scale, the tendency of the growing importance of CH as a resource bearing within itself

identity and preserved traditions in culture continues to be topical. Moreover, the cultural heritage is assumed to bear the individual memory that makes it unique. This means that if that cultural heritage is preserved adequately and is in symbiosis with the living environment, it would also improve the standard of said environment and hence the quality of life of the population. That role of the heritage is of particular importance in view of the global world we live in which **changes the notions and the tendencies for its protection**. First and foremost, the social functions of the cultural heritage broaden. It begins to be a factor for sustainable development, especially through the manifestations of cultural tourism and its mechanisms of impact. The CH thus stimulates the living environment, contributing to its development: of the functional systems in it and on its territory. Second, the content of cultural heritage broadens. There are discussions already on integral cultural environment resulting from the interaction between man and territory, with all assets—tangible and intangible—inherited in it. In addition to the immovable cultural heritage assets, beliefs, traditions and customs also belong here. Third, the territorial scope of the cultural heritage is also growing at different levels. New types of heritage appeared recently, in addition to the single cultural asset with its exclusion zone, namely: cultural landscape, cultural route, historical cities and urban historical landscape characterised by their specificities: silhouette predetermined by their volume-spatial structure, structural specificities, as well as by elements of the so-called urban identity. Fourth, the temporal scope of the heritage broadens. Attention is focused on 20<sup>th</sup> century architecture, as well as on the architecture from the period after World War II. This is of interest in particular for the countries from the so-called Eastern Bloc. Specifically for Bulgaria, the architecture from that period has its value characteristics, especially with its Black Sea resort complexes that created a specific silhouette of the Bulgarian coast.

The notions about the heritage and the methods for its protection and preservation changed. The method of the so-called integrated conservation has acquired greater prominence in recent years as it achieves synthesis between heritage and socio-economic development of the respective environment and of its population. Two international documents—the conventions from Granada in 1985 and from La Valetta in 1992—define the integrated conservation as creating conditions for joint activities connected with spatial planning, protection of the heritage and the explorations of scientists-archaeologists.

The following goals emerge on the basis of the arguments presented above and are identified in the part of the present text connected with the cultural heritage:

- sustainable utilisation of the heritage, preserving its authenticity and at the same time the most favourable manifestation of its social functions;
- adequate management of the cultural heritage in the context of the up-to-date notions of integrated conservation;
- protection and preservation of the cultural heritage in its broad scope, in compliance with the requirements and conditions of the MSPRB.

In view of the objectives and territorial scope of this plan and taking into account the tendencies indicated above, the part of the MSPRB connected with the protection of the cultural heritage considers the coastal strip, including the coastal lakes and lagoons having a direct—natural or artificial—link to the sea, the inland sea waters, the territorial sea, the contiguous zone, the continental shelf and the exclusive economic zone of the Republic of Bulgaria. Within this scope, priority will be given to the examination of ICAs having real substance, which are located in the coastal area, under water, as well as the ICAs on the territory of the coastal lakes. ICA sites located on land, but in immediate proximity to the coastal area, which are of high social significance (CHA, Article 50), will also be studied.

The following additional limitations were formulated on that basis:

- **Limitations connected with ICAs in terms of their category, cultural and scientific value, and public significance (according to Article 50 of the CHA):**

The sites in the coastal area which have been identified as ICA are predominantly archaeological sites: single and group — reserves, complexes, etc. Most archaeological sites belong to the category of sites of “national” significance. This presupposes the examination of ICA sites within the two highest categories: ICAs of “global” and “national” significance.

- **Limitations connected with the examined ICAs with respect to their classification (in accordance with Article 45 of the CHA), on the basis of:**

**- the research and cultural field to which they pertain**

The research will focus predominantly on archaeological sites in view of the fact that they are ICAs whose protection and preservation is a concern of the state (as stipulated in Article 2a(1) of the CHA). For this reason, very often the measures for the legal and physical protection of these sites require time and this a lengthy process, which in turn often results in physical compromising of an exposed original archaeological situation. The long duration of the archaeological excavations, of the architectural and historical explorations is also important for the preservation of such sites. Archaeological sites constitute a large part of the ICA sites in the examined territory. They are located along the coastline or in immediate proximity to it, and participate in the formation of the volume-spatial silhouette and in the visual perception of the Bulgarian coast from the sea. Therefore, their inclusion in the MSPRB is imperative. Most archaeological sites with that specific location—immediately along the coastline—have a direct, semantic and physical connection with the ICA archaeological sites that are under water.

In addition to the archaeological sites, the Cultural Heritage part of the MSPRB also deals with ICA sites, in accordance with their social significance, which belong to other scientific and cultural spheres, but only with those with categories of “world” and “national” significance;

**- their belonging to a specific historical period**

In view of the above, the ICA sites to be examined belong above all to the prehistoric, ancient and medieval periods: the archaeological sites are dated precisely within those temporal limits. Sites

from the National Revival period, as well as those from recent and most recent periods, will be part of the MSPRB in accordance with their specificity in volume-spatial terms, with which they are part of the silhouette and landscape of the coastal area.

A broader chronological framework has been accepted with respect to the sites of the underwater cultural heritage under Article 1(a) of the Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage. According to it, underwater cultural heritage means “all traces of human existence having a cultural, historical or archaeological character which have been partially or totally under water ... for at least 100 years ...”. Transposed to the Bulgarian context, this means that the MSPRB scope comprises directly also a number of underwater sites from the Bulgarian National Revival period, as well as from recent and most recent times.

**- their spatial structure and territorial scope**

According to that criterion, ICAs to be examined are:

**group ICAs** — a separate territory or part of the maritime space with a high concentration of archaeological cultural artefacts that have been sought and will be sought on or in the seabed, below the surface or on land. According to Article 48(2), these are the archaeological reserves in the territorial scope of the MSPRB, as well as the other varieties of the group cultural sites: ensemble, complex, historical settlement, historical area and the serial sites.

**single ICAs within the category of “national” significance** — these are predominantly ICAs located entirely under water or immediately on the seacoast, in the contact area between the sea and the land; these sites are qualified as archaeological depending on the scientific or cultural sphere to which they belong;

**- the degree to which they are endangered**

ICAs located in areas of large-scale construction works, in the vicinity of territories exposed to a high risk of floods or ongoing changes resulting from geological, climatic and other natural factors; endangered ICAs exposed to real threat of damage, vandalism, destruction or serious violation of their integrity due to rapid degradation of their original substance, leading to a serious change in the structure, as well as visible loss of their authentic appearance.

**• Limitations connected to the territorial scope of the Cultural Heritage part of the MSPRB, depending on the location of the respective ICAs and on their significance:**

The limitations listed above, as well as the available artefacts, impose a specific scope of the territory analysed in the CH part of the MSPRB. The available archaeological sites found in the Durankulak, Beloslav, Varna, Pomorie, Atanasovsko and Burgas lakes necessitate a greater penetration in depth in the direction of the land compared to the territorial scope required under the MSPRB. This linear development towards the continental part is particularly visible in the area of the Varna and Beloslav lakes. It is necessary both in view of the physical link between the lakes and the Black Sea, and due to the existing culture layers in the area.



The Bulgarian Black Sea coast abounds in sites that can be defined as immovable cultural assets. The first human communities appeared during the Middle Palaeolithic Age. Some Late Palaeolithic materials and the collection of Mesolithic artefacts from the Pobitite Kamani near Varna are associated with the contemporary *Homo sapiens*. The earliest settlements in the Black Sea region are dated to the initial and late phases of the Neolithic Age. Taking into account the latest studies on the changes in the sea level, it may be expected to find numerous prehistoric settlements from the transition between the Mesolithic and Early Neolithic Ages along the ancient coastline from the tenth–eighth millennium BC, currently located along the 30–40 m isobaths. The earliest material architectural traces were found around the Durankulak Lake, and they are dated during the Early Chalcolithic Age (fifth millennium BC). Scholars believe that these were the first structures built of stone in the continental part of Europe. The coast continued to develop during subsequent ages as well. According to the historical belonging of the immovable cultural assets that can be defined on the territory to a certain period, they cover the entire temporal range fixed in the CHA: prehistoric, ancient, medieval, from the National Revival period, recent and most recent past. The situation is similar with the ICAs defined according to the scientific and cultural area to which they pertain. However, it would be correct to note that archaeological sites predominate in that classification, followed by architectural and construction monuments, urbanist sites and the assets of park and landscape art. According to their spatial structure and territorial scope, single ICAs are most numerous, followed by group ICAs, among which archaeological reserves predominate. According to their category, ICAs in the territory and waters under consideration are predominantly of national and local importance, with one site—the ancient city of Nesebar—which is a world heritage site.

It should be noted that the MSPRB scope may prove to comprise cultural assets that would be granted the status of sites of “global significance”. For example, the remnants of shipwrecks in the Black Sea, which are with a degree of preservation that is unknown elsewhere owing to the specific conditions, have a potential to become eligible for inclusion in the world cultural heritage list.

Sunken settlements are another highlight in the cultural heritage connected with the MSPRB. In most cases they are directly linked—physically and semantically—with archaeological sites located in immediate proximity to the coastal strip.

## **2. Immovable cultural assets (ICAs) and museum infrastructure in the territorial scope of MSPRB — current state**

### **2.1. ICAs in the category of “global significance”**

#### **Ancient City of Nesebar — Archaeological, Architectural and Urban Planning Reserve, Nesebar municipality, Burgas District**

The ancient city of Nesebar is one of the few “living” historical cities on the territory of Europe, recognised by UNESCO as world cultural heritage sites. For this reason, its status and assets

presuppose more comprehensive and in-depth research and analysis. Evaluated as cultural wealth, Nesebar's assets are consistently protected with various regulatory documents. The main steps for protecting the peninsula are listed below:

**Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

- The first status of legal protection of sites in Nesebar was stipulated by List No 1 for proclaiming national ancient sites on the grounds of decisions of the Committee on Ancient Sites at the Ministry of People's Education, published in the SG No 69/1927.
- Decree of the Council of Ministers No 243 of 18 July 1956 proclaimed the town of Nesebar as museum, tourist and resort site of national and international significance. The Decree was not published. A new list for protection of cultural heritage sites in Nesebar was published in SG No 41/1964.
- In 1986, the National Institute for Monuments of Culture elaborated a Directive Plan—Concept for Protection and Development of the Cultural and Historical Heritage of the town of Nesebar (authors: Architect E. Bocheva, Architect A. Mladenova and Architect G. Aleksandrov).
- Regulation No 8 of the Committee for Culture and the Committee on Architecture and Public Works on the architectural-historical reserves and tourist sites Sozopol and Nesebar (SG No 9/1981) regulates issues related to the development of general and detailed urban plans, design and implementation of conservation and restoration work, the new construction and specific rules for the protection and the building of the towns. The borders of the Nesebar Reserve were determined to include the entire peninsular part with the “isthmus” linking the old and the new part of the town.
- A dossier on the town was compiled in 1981—1982, and the old town of Nesebar was included in the World Cultural Heritage List at the end of 1983. That happened at the 7<sup>th</sup> Regular Session of the World Heritage Committee of UNESCO in Florence on 5—6 December 1983.
- The present legal status of the cultural heritage sites in Nesebar is determined in compliance with the provisions of the Cultural Heritage Act (published in SG No 19/13.03.2009, last amended in SG No 93/24.11.2009). According to Article 50(1) of the CHA, the *Ancient Nesebar* is a cultural asset of “global significance” included in the World Heritage List. **At this moment, on the territory of the Ancient Nesebar Reserve there are 118 single cultural assets, 20 of which are ICAs of national significance, 50 — of local significance, 34 — for information, 5 — in the category ensemble significance, and 8 — without category.**

**Borders are determined for the reserve as follows:**

- The borders of the *Ancient City of Nesebar* National Archaeological, Architectural and Urban Planning Reserve — a global cultural asset — were determined in Decree of the Council of Ministers No 174 of 3.09.1991 (published in SG No 75/13.03.1991) and updated with Order of the Ministry of Culture No RD9R-14 of 5.06.2015, published in

SG No 51/2015. With that last instrument, the name of the site was changed to *Ancient city of Nesebar* Archaeological Reserve and Historical Settlement, Architectural, Construction and Urban Planning Asset, with the following scope and protection regime:

- The reserve comprises the entire peninsular part with the isthmus, including the restored territories along the northern coast, with the exception of the newly-acquired territories in the southwestern part of the peninsula, with a total area of 27.7 ha.
- The exclusion zone is considered to consist of the newly-acquired harbour territories in the southwestern part of the old town, to the west – part of the new town to the eastern border of quarters 57, 58, 59 and 60 (in the direction of Zornitsa Street to the sea in the north and south), to the east — eastern zoning line of the Nesebar – New Town quarter to the crossing with the coastal strip, to the south — along the coastal strip until it crosses landed estate No 515000.502.518.
- The border of the exclusion zone of ICA — Zone B located in the 2-km water area around the peninsula, is determined. In turn, it is divided into Zone B1 — the 220 m wide water area from the coastal strip of the peninsula, immediately adjacent to the *Ancient city of Nesebar*, and Zone B-2 whose width is from the border of Zone B-1 to the 2-km border of the exclusion zone in the water area.
- Prescriptions and regimes for ICA protection are developed for all mainland zones mentioned above.
- The following restrictions are prescribed for the part of the peninsula's water area: all activities must be coordinated with the Ministry of Culture after obtaining the opinion of the Underwater Archaeology Centre. Similarly, all activities related to dredging and hydrotechnical activities must be preceded by archaeological explorations, and if they are authorised, they need to be carried out under archaeological monitoring. Blasting, dredging, trawling for clams, construction of traps and moles, and disposal of earth masses into the sea are prohibited.
- The access to the underwater sites in Zone B1 — the area with the archaeological artefacts — must comply strictly with Regulation No N-7 of 12 June 2008 on the performance of diving and other underwater activities.

### **Historical Context and Assets**

The strategic location of Nesebar and the favourable natural conditions were a prerequisite for the development of settlements in that place ever since the remotest antiquity. On the one hand, the naturally formed peninsula was convenient for defence purposes: the isthmus linking it to the mainland could easily be crossed. At the same time, however, Nesebar as a trade centre was at the crossing points of sea routes and was linked to the mainland—Thrace and Moesia—by the road along the western Black Sea coast. From a historical perspective, a factor of special importance

for the town's formation was its almost permanent borderline position with respect to the migration of peoples, the cultural contacts and the formation of new states.

The Peninsula of Nesebar (the ancient town of Mesembria) was an ancient Thracian settlement that was conquered by Greek colonists around the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC. The town maintained good trade relations with the *poleis* along the Black Sea, the Aegean Sea and the Mediterranean, and was famous as a rich economic and cultural centre. The founding of the Doric colony Mesembria is dated ca. 510 BC over an almost double territory at least until the 14<sup>th</sup> century (bathymetric and archaeological explorations in the territorial waters of the Nesebar Peninsula have demonstrated that the sea had regained about 400 m from the peninsula since the 6<sup>th</sup> century BC just in eastern direction). The town rapidly developed as a Greek-type *polis* with mixed population of Greeks and Thracians. Owing to its flexible policy vis-à-vis the neighbouring Thracians, Mesembria enjoyed a brilliant upsurge over the several subsequent centuries: at certain moments it was the economically strongest town on the Western Black Sea coast (Pontos Euxeinos). During the age of the Roman Empire (1<sup>st</sup>–3<sup>rd</sup> century) *Mesemvria* (as the town was already called) continued to trade, to mint coins and to develop crafts, remaining an important trade and cultural settlement on the Black Sea coast of Roman Thrace. No major changes were introduced in the urban structure and appearance: the new construction was manifested predominantly in some reinforcements of the defence fortifications and in reconstruction of the harbour.

The spread of Christianity was of special importance for the town's development, as it penetrated in Mesemvria as well in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries. For centuries afterwards the Peninsula was a remarkable centre of Christian culture. After the disintegration of the Roman Empire, Mesemvria fell within the Byzantine Empire. Intensive construction started during the Early Byzantine period and gradually changed the town's image: new fortification walls, public buildings, underground galleries built for the town's water supply system and the town's *thermae*. The Christian basilicas of St. Sophia, the Basilica of the Holy Mother of God Eleusa, the so-called north-eastern basilica built over the foundations of a large ancient temple of Zeus and the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul were built.

The emergence of the Bulgarian state (7<sup>th</sup> century) marked the start of new times for Mesemvria. The street grid began to lose its orthogonal structure, the districts acquired the outlines of irregular polygons, scattered churches appeared as centres of specific urban spaces. The period between the 9<sup>th</sup> and the 12<sup>th</sup> century was the time when new Christian churches were built: St. John the Baptist, St. Demetrios, the Church of the Holy Mother of God (now St. Stephen), St. Clement, and others. Their large number is explained with the fact that they were built as a form of indulgence at the time when the naturally inaccessible peninsula played the role of something like prison where aristocrats who had fallen out of grace were exiled. Nesebar attained its zenith at the time of the Second Bulgarian Kingdom (12<sup>th</sup>–14<sup>th</sup> century) when the town was famous as a bustling centre of trade and crafts, as well as a cultural and spiritual centre. Two monasteries are known to have been built within the fortification walls: the monastery of Christ Acropolites and of the Holy Mother of

God Eleusa. In spite of the considerable changes in the urban structure, the public square did not lose its character, the biggest church in the town — the Basilica of St. Sophia — was erected at the place of the old *agora*. The territory of the acropolis was transformed into a monastery, preserving also the main axes from the harbour and from the land. The importance of *Misivri* as a fortress was preserved between the 15<sup>th</sup> and the 18<sup>th</sup> century, but the town was transformed into a small settlement of fishermen and craftsmen. The town preserved its places of worship and some new smaller ones were built, notably the Church of St. Spas (Ascension Church). Wooden houses began to dominate the town: small in size and laconic in their details. During the Bulgarian National Revival (18<sup>th</sup>—19<sup>th</sup> century) there was an economic animation in *Nesebar*, which created a new image of the town. The two original vital connections in the town — with the land and with the sea — and their point of intersection at the town square preserved their influence in the urban planning scheme. The central part of the peninsula is organised around two main longitudinal streets with east-west direction, which forked at the square. The more important street of the two appears to be the northern one (Mitropolitska Street today) which crosses the square near the Old Metropolitan Bishopric (the St. Sophia Basilica) and ends in a square in the eastern part of the town — one of the rare examples in Bulgaria of open urban space between predominantly residential buildings. After the Liberation in 1878, *Nesebar* remained within Eastern Rumelia. The town diminished its trade, some of the crafts were also in decline. Travellers describe a town with semi-destroyed fortification walls and thirteen churches — during that time the latest Church of the Assumption of the Holy Mother of God was completed and consecrated. The first coastal street of *Nesebar* in the area of the southern harbour took shape. The settling of refugees from Macedonia (in the 1930s) was a new stage in the development of *Nesebar*. In this way, contrary to the strong building traditions, the architecture with single storey houses “sneaked” into the town’s appearance, and entire old neighbourhoods were demolished.

### **Historically Determined Stable Value Characteristics of Nesebar**

The key unique assets of *Nesebar* which have been preserved to this day can be highlighted as a result of the town’s historical development. The traditional trends in the urban structure — the main streets with east-west direction and the north-south streets from the harbour — are a manifestation of the principal urban planning idea of *Nesebar*. Their resilience in time is also dictated by the existing natural factors. Along that backbone, several traditional urban places have also preserved their importance to this day, namely: the southern harbour, the main square, the square near the Old Metropolitan Bishopric and the almost rectangular square in the eastern part of the peninsula. These urban benchmarks are an echo of the superposition of cultural layers in the town, taking into account the benchmarks in ancient Mesembria — the *agora* and the acropolis, and in medieval *Nesebar* — the administrative and metropolitan centre, and the monastery complex.

The traditional visual links with the sea are preserved through the system of small streets transverse to the main ones. On the basis of the historical study and of the analysis of the traces left by it, the tangible and intangible assets of the town of Nesebar can be differentiated in the following groups:

- fortification system and archaeological structures — artefacts of the most ancient Thracian period to the last fortifications of the fortress wall during the Ottoman domination;
- Early Byzantine basilicas, medieval Bulgarian churches, churches from the National Revival period and after the Liberation in 1878, representing Christian church construction forming layers in Nesebar from the 5<sup>th</sup> until the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century;
- structures from the National Revival period— the irregular geometry of the quarters, the two-storey houses with stone masonry of the ground floor and overhanging second floor with wooden planks, and with a courtyard.

Preserved and stable intangible assets with the spirit of Nesebar imprinted on them are also found on the Peninsula, notably: emblematic urban landscapes from Oberbauer's paintings and key territories of traditional means of livelihood (the fishermen's harbour), crafts (the craftsmen's street Tsar Ivan Asen II), customs (place for rituals connected with the water and with the sea on Epiphany and on St. Nicholas' Day).

### **Current State**

The immovable single cultural assets are distributed almost evenly on the territory of the peninsula. Accumulation is observed in the area to the east and northwest of the Old Metropolitan Bishopric, as well as around the roads leading to the town from the isthmus in the west and from the southern harbour. A considerable part of the cultural assets have survived to this day as ruins, elements of the fortification system of the ancient and medieval Nesebar in the waters to the southeast and northwest in a radius of more than 400 m. Most of the archaeological structures are still insufficiently explored and are still not exposed and not socialised in the environment. The archaeological museum in Nesebar has identified territories for planned explorations, and rescue excavations are planned for a part of them in view of planned new construction. Areas with available information on unexposed archaeological structures have also been localised. On the whole, in spite of its rich historical past, the archaeological heritage is strongly neglected in the environment.

The infrastructure servicing cultural tourism in the town is represented by a Centre for Tourist Information, occupying a hall on the ground floor of the Youth Centre, and four museum sites of the *Ancient Nesebar* Museum. Cultural events for the citizens of Nesebar and for its visitors are also organised in the Yana Laskova Culture Club, the Nesebar Conference Centre and at the open-air stage near the southern harbour, which is in poor physical condition and its revitalising is imperative.

Residential buildings predominate on the territory of the peninsula, the public buildings (mostly dating from the second part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century) are concentrated in the central and western area. The town's link with the sea at the easternmost end is hampered by a relatively vast territory occupied by the border police. New territories "regained" from the sea stretch to the southwest — near the harbour and along the entire northern sea coast. Some of these new territories are also

connected with the reinforcing of the coastline (in the 1980s). A part of them are used today as parking lots, big territories in the northern part remain deserted, while those in the southern part, near the harbour, are developed for public services.

The town's irregular street and quarter structure which had developed since the Middle Ages to this day has been preserved. The pavement of the streets on the peninsula is chaotic and diverse: asphalt, concrete, stone pavement, stone slabs and cobblestone. The authentic appearance of the streets in Nesebar from the Middle Ages and the Bulgarian National Revival period — with average-sized stone slabs having a characteristic profile, its lowest part being on the actual street in the middle, with small sidewalks (not more than 1 m wide) — has been preserved to this day in some of the narrower streets. The Nesebar municipality intends to replace the asphalt on the territory of the world heritage site with medium-sized stone slabs, similar to those used for Mitropolitska Street.

Two types of problem areas connected with public catering and trade can be systematised. Uncontrolled public catering places are located close to one another along the southern coast, including in the area of the southern harbour, and more scattered, in groups, along the northern coast as well. That linear development along the coast is not typical of Nesebar whose silhouette, viewed from the sea, was dominated by the fortification wall, and after it gradually crumbled — by the line along which the houses were built, high on the plateau of the peninsula, with courtyards overhanging above the water. Uncontrolled street trade developed (particularly intensively during the tourist season), most tangibly in the central part of the peninsula — along the main streets Mesembria and Mitropolitska and in the small streets crossing and connecting them. Essentially, trade and crafts developed traditionally precisely in that part of the town, but the shops were entirely on the ground floors of the buildings. Value characteristics are violated through loss of visual contact, neglecting the “two-layer” street silhouette with stone ground floors of the buildings and wooden structures above them. The flow of tourists in Nesebar runs basically along the main arteries: Mitropolitska and Mesembria streets. Due to the concentration of services along the coast, the intensity of the tourist flow spreads to the coastal streets as well, this being atypical for Nesebar. In connection with the development of tourism it is possible to identify several functional groups in *Ancient Nesebar*: the restaurants and all forms of public catering are concentrated along the coast, whereas the central part of the Peninsula is overtaken by street trade. The territory in the eastern part remains relatively quiet with its predominantly residential functions.

Cultural tourism in the town is connected with several places under the auspices of the *Ancient Nesebar* Museum. The conservation and restoration work on four of the churches in Nesebar, with their immediately adjacent spaces, included them in the system of sites for guided tours of the town that start at the Archaeological Museum and end at the Christ Pantocrator Church near the town square. The historically differentiated spaces near the Old Metropolitan Bishopric and Mesembria Square, the areas around the Culture Club that took shape in the more recent past, the open-air theatre near the southern harbour, as well as—less frequently—the small part near the western fortification wall, remain the main areas for urban events. However, a number of territories

with potential for events connected with culture and education remain unutilised, notably: the archaeological ensemble immediately behind the western fortification wall, the spaces around the Church of the Holy Mother of God Eleusa, and the territory of the Early Byzantine *thermae*. The fate of the space in the eastern part of the peninsula is of particular importance, it is currently owned by the Border Police Directorate General of the Ministry of Interior. This is the easternmost end of the peninsula, a part of which slid into the sea in the past.

### **Underwater Explorations and Structures**

The Nesebar Peninsula was formed during the Late Karangat transgression, ca. 120 000 to 90 000 years ago. Today the peninsula is an even terrace rising 17 m above sea level and consisting of Miocene sandstones, limestones and clays. That not very stable foundation, as well as the closeness to active geological faults in the area of Cape Emine and in the Black Sea waters to the east and northeast of Nesebar, which provoke frequent and strong earthquakes, resulted in a considerable part of the historical territory of the peninsula being under water today. The general rise in the level of the World Ocean after the end of the Pleistocene, as well as the local sinking of the Bulgarian coast to the south of the Balkan Range played a substantial role in that process.

The fortification system of Nesebar was built with the intention of guaranteeing defence in case of attack from the land, protecting its harbours and securing defence of the slopes of the peninsula. Research on land and under water has identified several construction stages that can be attributed chronologically to the pre-Roman, Late Roman, Early Byzantine and medieval periods. Three defence systems were built then: of the Classical and Hellenistic *polis* (5<sup>th</sup>—1<sup>st</sup> century BC), of Roman cities (1<sup>st</sup>—4<sup>th</sup> century AD) and of the Early Byzantine fortification (5<sup>th</sup>—8<sup>th</sup> century AD). The different stages are differentiated by the type of construction used and by their location.

The underwater finds are interpreted in most cases as constructions that had been initially on land and had subsequently moved to below today's sea level as a result of the environmental factors mentioned earlier, during different periods and under different concrete circumstances.

#### *Underwater Research in the 1960s–1980s*

The underwater research in the area of Nesebar started in 1960 with 15 underwater archaeological expeditions conducted until 1989, the last one being in 1984. These explorations over many years revealed that Mesembria lost about 1/3 of its fortified territory as a result of rise of the relative sea level, sinking of the coast, erosion and abrasion. Consequently, ruins from fortification walls, towers, staircases and artefacts from the pre-Roman and Roman periods, Late Antiquity, Middle Ages and the Bulgarian National Revival period have been found in different sectors of the territorial waters of the peninsula. The structures have been found on the actual coast, where the waves break, at depths of 2—3 and 5—6 m.

Sections of fortification walls following the coastline at a depth of up to 1.5 m have been identified along the entire northern coast of the Nesebar Peninsula.



The northern fortress wall started to the north of the town's western gate. In the east it was found under water, at a distance of about 40 m from the coast. Its transverse links with north-south orientation and fortification constructions have been documented: bastion, gates, staircase and towers, the most remarkable among the latter being the hexagonal tower flanking the harbour gate of the classical *polis*. A wall with north-south orientation has been registered at the western end of the northern wall and has been traced to a distance of 80 m in the northern bay and at a depth of up to 5 m. Two building periods have been identified: from the Classical Age — destructions in pseudo-isodome masonry, and from the Late Antiquity — mixed masonry (*opus mixtum*) over earlier constructions. It is interpreted as part of harbour construction or diateichism, part of the western fortification wall that restricted access by land to the northern shore of the peninsula.

Parts of fortification walls, towers and bastions have also been found to the east and southeast of the Nesebar Peninsula. Those lying at a depth of 4—5 m and at a distance of about 180 m in a straight line from the sea coast (prior to the start of the reinforcing of the coast) are associated by the researchers who found them with the fortifications of the Thracian *bria*, and those at a depth of 4 m and accordingly at a distance of 80 to 130 m from the coast have been associated with the fortification of the Greek *polis*. The structures at a depth of up to 2 m and at a distance of 60 to 80 m from the coast were built during the Late Antiquity.

The results of the underwater exploration of Nesebar, presented above, were included in the documentation submitted when Nesebar applied to be included in the World Cultural Heritage List in 1982. The archaeological structures that are partially or entirely under water are marked on the so-called *Scheme of Historical Monuments*. It should be noted that the coastline of the Nesebar Peninsula is substantially different today after the coast reinforcement structures were built in the second half of the 1980s. During those measures most of the fortification walls that were explored under water until 1984 from the northern and eastern sides of the peninsula were piled over and are under embankments, the beach alley and the northern parking lot today.

#### *Resuming of the Underwater Explorations after 2015*

The underwater archaeological explorations in Nesebar were resumed in 2015 in connection with a conceptual project of the Nesebar municipality for the reconstruction of the northern harbour. Rescue geophysical exploration and archaeological excavations were carried out in the waters of the *Northern Buna* harbour whose periphery includes the northern diateichism documented during earlier explorations. That structure was traced at a distance of 80 m from the shore during the explorations in the 1960s—1980s (prior to the reinforcing measures). When the coastal constructions were built in the 1980s, its initial part was piled up, but most of its outline remained under water.

A linear structure of large stone blocks piled one on top of another was traced in 2017—2019 in the waters of the *Northern Buna*, parallel to the *Argirova Buna*, on its western side. Some of them protrude above the water, which is also visible on photographs from the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. The length of the structure is approximately 40 m and it reaches about 3 m in depth. The blocks are irregular in shape and have different dimensions, some of them exceeding 1—2 m<sup>3</sup>. The stone

structure was probably a breakwater or sea barrier dated to the earliest construction phases in Nesebar.

In 2017, several segments of a fortification wall in *opus mixtum* were found parallel to the structure described, at a distance of about 5 m west of it. The wall is parallel to the breakwater line and its traceable length is about 20 m. Its width is about 3 m and the maximum length of the preserved segment is about 6 m. The underwater archaeological excavations conducted suggesting that the wall fragments should be associated with the western fortification wall of Mesembria.

The regular underwater archaeological explorations in the waters of Nesebar since 2017 to this day are also targeting the eastern end of the peninsula and its southern coast, in addition to the area of the northern harbour. The following differentiated archaeological structures have been registered and documented here, presented from east to west:

- Tower and fortification wall at a depth of 1.5—2.5 m, with NE–SW orientation and length ca. 40 m. It is located at a distance of ca. 180 m S–SW from the eastern cape of the Nesebar Peninsula. The width of the registered wall reaches up to ca. 2.8 m. The wall is on a relatively even bottom with stones that are covered with sand in some places. The face is well expressed from the outside (to the southeast, towards the open sea). The inside can be noticed at the eastern end where it is marked with individual stone slabs. They are lower than the face masonry, in some places by 1 m, and are tilted to the northwest, which is indication of a landslide. The slabs building the wall have different dimensions: 1 x 0.5 m, 0.8 x 0.8 m, etc. Their width is about 30 cm.

- Fortification wall made of quadrae and lying at a depth of 4.5—4.7 m. The distance from the coast (contemporary embankment and built infrastructure) is about 130 m. Its preserved length is about 35 m. Its orientation is southeast–northwest. It is located at the base of a steep slope rising from the level of the wall at a height of 4—5 m to 2 m. Its inner side (to the northeast, towards the coast and the steep slope) is not clearly discernible. The wall is preserved as single-face masonry, basically consisting of one row of blocks, with quadrae from the second row being also preserved in its north-western part. The size of the blocks varies, some of them reach 1 x 0.5 m. The blocks are shaped so that their face produces an even façade to the south. Their upper surface is well smoothed. Some of them are with regular rectangular shape, others are with preserved natural shape of the stone block. Most blocks have their long axis transversely to the wall, but in some cases the axis is oriented longitudinally by placing two parallel blocks next to one another so as to preserve the relative width (thickness) of the row of blocks, which is approximately 1.2 m. The height of the blocks is approximately 0.6 m. Parts of that wall were found in 1984 and they should most probably be associated with the classical *polis*. In 2017—2019 the wall was documented photographically, graphically and photogrammetrically. A 3D model and photomosaic with high resolution was created. In 2019, archaeological drilling was also done at its base, where a grid of massive wooden beams was found.

- Rectangular tower and parts of a wall to the west and east of it at a depth of ca. 3 m. The tower is with dimensions 8 x 8 m, built of massive blocks, with depth about 3 m at the base of the blocks. Some of the quadrae are well-shaped parallelepipeds, while others are with irregular shape. Their

dimensions vary, some of them being 0.5 x 0.65 x 0.40 m, 1.35 x 0.70 x 0.60 m. They are arranged so as to fit with the adjacent blocks and to shape a regular face. Their upper side is well smoothed and together they form an even surface. Most of the blocks have been moved, although they are in their places. One row is preserved, and only one place two rows of stones were found. To the west and to the east of the tower there are fortification walls whose foundation is built of large stone blocks. The western wall is linked with it, whereas the eastern one reaches to about 5 m from it. The total length of the tower and of the two segments of walls exceed 40 m. It is possible that this wall had been linked to the wall of quadrae lying further to the east.

- Early Byzantine or medieval fragments of walls in the bay to the west of the *Northern Buna*. Massive fragments of a fortification wall were found at a depth of ca. 2 m. They were built of stone with mortar and crushed pottery. The wall has been traced along the length of almost the entire bay, at a depth of about 2 m, and is preserved with different segments that become smaller in western direction and are at a bigger distance from one another. The length of the best preserved structure is about 15 m. The fragments of walls are heavily destroyed and no preserved face of the masonry has been identified. The thickness is about 2 m. The stones are with different dimensions (10—40 cm) and they are not hewn. A fragment of a “mortar” wall with imprints of horizontal and vertical wooden beams with rectangular and round cross-section is preserved at a distance of about 2 m south of the wall. The archaeological drilling in 2019 revealed wooden piles below the biggest wall fragment. Their position demonstrates indisputably that the structure has collapsed from the shore.

- Separate fragments of columns and well-hewn quadrae.

The underwater explorations in recent years have found so far four drums of Late Roman columns in the southern waters of Nesebar. Indiscriminately scattered quadrae with dimensions up to 1.5 x 0.8 x 0.6 m were found in the bay, east of the *Southern Buna*. Some of them have swallow’s tails or other grooves for fixing and joining. They probably mark demolished and dispersed sections of the ancient wall.

## 2.2. ICAs in the category of “national significance”

### Archaeological ICA Sites

#### ▪ GROUP ARCHAEOLOGICAL ICAs

The immovable cultural assets classified in this category are of special importance for attaining the MSPRB goals. The six group ICA sites (reserves and complex) — the Big Island in the Durankulak Lake, Yaylata, Kaliakra fortress, the Ancient City of Odessos, the islands Sveti Ivan and Sveti Petar near Sozopol, and the actual Ancient city of Apollonia — are located at the border between the sea and the land. These are also part of the sites with parts that had slid into the sea.

## ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESERVES

### Archaeological Reserve Prehistoric, Ancient and Medieval structures in the Yaylata Locality, Kavarna municipality, Dobrich District

#### **Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation:**

Council of Ministers Order No 1 of 7.02.1989 on declaring the Yaylata locality, Varna District, as an archaeological reserve (SG No 14/1989). A functioning structural Master Plan for the reserve was developed in 2003. The reserve is managed and operated by the Kavarna municipality under State Property Act No 38/18.03.1997.

#### **Borders are determined for the reserve as follows:**

The territory of the archaeological reserve has a total area of 90 ha. It comprises the Big and the Small Yayla and Necropolis II, accordingly with forest lands territories of 31.2 ha, lands of 28.9 ha, and lands of Necropolis II of 29.9 ha. The territory of the reserve overlaps partially with the territory of the Yaylata Protected Natural Site, declared under the Protected Areas Act.

The exclusion zone comprises a 300 m wide strip from the land fund in the north and part of the regulation of the village, as well as the water area of the reserve.

#### **Assets, Historical Context:**

The Yaylata Archaeological Reserve is located 18 km northeast of Kavarna, on the seashore, at a distance of 1.5 km from the village of Kamen Bryag. The Yaylata locality is a vast terrace with dimensions 1.5 km x 200 m, 15 m above the sea and separated from the Dobrudzha Plateau by 30 m tall cliffs.

The more important monuments of culture on the territory of the reserve are:

**Late Hellenistic fortress in the Big Yayla** — encircling a small area, 90 x 30 m. The fortification wall is with double-face masonry of perfectly hewn quadrae with filling of implectum, 2.40 m thick. It has one big gate and one postern (secondary gate). Ruins of staircases are visible. The fortification wall is conserved and exhibited. The interior of the fortress has been partly explored and several residential buildings have been found.

**Stone tombs from necropolis I and II:** the tombs are of four types: with two burial chambers and entirely hewn into the rock, tombs covered with stone slabs, tombs in the shape of a trough, and cave tombs. The tombs with two chambers are richly designed, some of them have decoration in high relief hewn into the rock.

**Sacrificial stones:** round and rectangular sacrificial stones exist. The sacrificial stone near the entrance to the fortress is best displayed. It represents a complex of stone platforms on the very edge of the plateau, with numerous holes and grooves suggesting elaborate wooden structures and ritual.

**Wineries:** a system of troughs and overflows cut into the rock.

**Cave complexes:** it is necessary to mention two of them. The first complex is located close to the fortress, to the west, and consists of widened caves, additionally touched by human hand, hanging over the sea and united in a shared composition and functional scheme with residential functions. The second one is in the western part of the Big Yayla and consists of a rock-hewn church and monastic cells.

The combination of the impressive archaeological ruins and the unique beauty of Nature is a distinctive characteristic of the Yaylata Archaeological Reserve.

### **Current State**

Yaylata became known to research for the first time from the publications of the Škorpil brothers at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In 1980, systematic archaeological explorations started and led to declaring the locality as an archaeological reserve with a decision of the Council of Ministers of 1998. The following elements have been explored so far: the fortification wall of the ancient fortress, with about 1/5 of the southern part of its territory; the necropolis and the sanctuary above the Small Yayla; all rock-hewn dwellings and ancient wineries on the territory of the Big Yayla, along and above the rock wreath to the west of it; the southern and the northern *necropolis* have been partially explored.

The following conservation and restoration works have been performed:

- partial reintegration and sealing of the fortification wall;
- reinforcing and closing of the rock-hewn church with a grid;
- partial exhibiting and piling over some of the rock-hewn tombs in the necropolis above the Small Yayla.

### **Underwater Explorations and Structures**

Underwater archaeological explorations were conducted in the 1980s in the sea to the east and southeast of the Yaylata Reserve. Considerable parts of the steep rocky shore have been found to have fallen into the sea. The finds comprise stone blocks from parts of the fortress wall, fragments of building ceramics, fragments of amphorae and stone anchors. The finds are dated to the Late Hellenistic Age and the Late Antiquity. Small piers probably functioned as early as in the Stone Age in the small bay in front of the fortress and in the bay of the present-day Rusalka Resort.

### **Archaeological Reserve *Ancient and Medieval Fortress Kaliakra, Kavarna* municipality, Dobrich District**

#### **Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation:**

The Ancient and Medieval Fortress Kaliakra and its adjacent territory and waters near Balgarevo village, Kaliakra municipality, Dobrich District were declared an Archaeological Reserve with a total area of 535 ha with Order of the Council of Ministers No 1 of 7.01.2003 (SG No 4/2003).

#### **Borders and regimes for use have been determined for the Reserve, as follows:**

The borders of the Kaliakra ancient and medieval fortress with a total area of 246 ha comprise:

## VOLUME 10. PROTECTION OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE

a) borders of the territory with a total area of 55.6 ha:

- from the north — a straight line connecting a point at a distance of 500 m north of the western end of the first fortification wall with a point at a distance of 300 m north of the eastern end of the first fortification wall, and continuation of that straight line to the sea shore in the east and along the slope in the west;
- from the east, south and west the border passes along the sea shore until it crosses the northern border;

b) borders of the water area with a total area of 190.5 ha:

- from the north — continuation of the northern border to the east and west, perpendicularly to the shore and 500 m out into the sea;
- from the east, south and west — at a distance of 500 m from the coastline, out into the sea until it reaches the points of intersection with the northern border.

The borders of the exclusion zone with a total area of 289 ha comprise:

a) borders of the territory with a total area of 169 ha:

- from the south — the northern border of the monument of culture;
- from the east and northeast — from the northern border of the monument of culture in the north along the seashore to the north-eastern corner of plot No 313, from there to the west along the northern borders of plots with Nos 313 and 201 up to road No 279;
- from the north — from the eastern border along road No 279 to the southwest to the bifurcation of the road between Balgarevo village and Cape Kaliakra, and from there in the direction of Balgarevo village to the northern corner of plot No 317;
- from the west — along the north-western border of plots Nos 317 and 208 to the seashore and from there to the south along the seashore to the northern border of the monument of culture.

b) borders of the water area with a total area of 120 ha:

- from the north — continuation of the northern border to the east and west, perpendicular to the sea shore, 500 m out into the sea;
- from the east and from the west — perpendicular to the sea shore, 500 m out into the sea;
- from the south — the northern border of the water area of the monument of culture.

The regimes for the use of the site cover several of its zones:

- all construction works that are not connected with the exploration, protection and socialisation of the site are prohibited on the territory of the ICA;
- underground construction is allowed only if it is connected with securing installations and is carried out in coordination with and under supervision by an archaeologist;
- construction activities are restricted in the territories of the military unit and the Hydrometric Station of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (BAS), and are allowed only subject to coordination with the BAS;

- pollution of the water, the use of trawls, skin diving and scuba diving are forbidden, and the underwater explorations need to take into consideration the reproductive period of the protected marine species. The regime for nature reserves is applied for the entire water area.

### **Assets, Historical Context**

Ever since the remotest antiquity Cape Kaliakra has been a good place for settlement. The rocky shores with tall vertical cliffs provided a natural protection to that place. Another favourable factor was its closeness to important sea and land routes. In the 5<sup>th</sup> century BC the Thracian tribe *Terizi* founded a fortified settlement in the southern part of the cape, which gave the first name of the settlement. At the end of the 5<sup>th</sup> century BC, the lands of the Terizi were included in the confines of the Odrysian Kingdom. The town continued to exist at the time of the Roman Empire and its provinces in the Balkans. It was noted as the third in importance fortified city in the Scythia Province. During that period, the ancient settlement was part of the chain of fortresses that subsequently formed the Black Sea defence belt of the Byzantine Empire against incursions from the north.

According to written sources and based on the results of the archaeological explorations conducted so far, it appears that the Black Sea cape was not inhabited in the period between the 7<sup>th</sup> and the 10<sup>th</sup> century. Cape Kaliakra received its name during the Middle Ages. The name appeared for the first time in the 13<sup>th</sup> century and was used with the meaning of “good” or “nice” cape for seafarers. From that time on, the name Kaliakra was preserved. Kaliakra’s flourishing from the end of the 13<sup>th</sup> century onward was connected with the fact that it was proclaimed capital of the Despotate of Dobrudzha comprising the north-eastern Bulgarian lands that had broken away from the central rule in Tarnovo. During those years, Kaliakra fortress was referred to as “fortress of the Bulgarian Dobrotitsa” and “capital of the Third Bulgaria”. At that time Kaliakra had an area of about 55 ha, which comprised the *suburbium*, the outer and the inner city. As in the Late Antiquity, their defence from the land came from three successive fortification lines: external, middle and internal. In the 14<sup>th</sup> century, Kaliakra was conquered by the Ottoman Turks. Late medieval written sources mention the existence of a dervish monastery there, as well as one of the two Muslim dual-rite *tekkes* in Dobrudzha, dedicated to the Islamic saint Sarı Saltık. The life of that fortress for two millennia died in the late 17<sup>th</sup>—early 18<sup>th</sup> century. The last major event connected with Kaliakra was the sea battle on 31 July 1791 near its shores, which marked the end of the 1787—1791 Russo-Turkish War.

### **Current State**

Regular archaeological excavations of the ancient and medieval Kaliakra fortress started in the 1960s and continue to this day. The entirely explored sites include the three fortification walls, four medieval churches, a Roman bath, an Early Christian tomb, two medieval *necropolis*, a Turkish bath and mosque, a large number of residential and military buildings, etc. The Kaliakra locality received for the first time the monument of culture status as “Ancient and Medieval Fortification, town of Kavarna, Kaliakra Locality”, published in SG No 77/1959. Order No 356 of the Committee on Forests and Forest Industry (SG No 30/1966) declared the Kaliakra locality as

a historical place including “the area to the south of the northernmost fortification wall with the old fortress, the caves and the beacon building, with a total area of 0.4 ha”. Kaliakra was again declared an “Ancient and Medieval Fortification, town of Kavarna, Kaliakra locality” in SG No 73/1967). In 1983, the borders of the Kaliakra Nature Steppe Reserve and of its buffer zones were stipulated with an order of the Environmental Protection Committee. Buildings and facilities of the former Bulgarian Association for Tourism and Recreation, the Agrarian-Industrial Complex — Kavarna, as well as of the Ministry of Communications, the Meteorological station of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences and the base of the Ministry of Defence were erected on the territory of the fortress.

The first conservation and restoration works took place in 1967, immediately after the fortress was declared a monument of culture. In 1970, a General Programme for Protection and Socialisation of the Archaeological Monument *Ancient and Medieval Fortress Kaliakra* was developed.

Reconstruction of the ancient fortification wall and of the gate with its adjacent towers, conservation of chain buildings, the fortification wall and towers from the Hellenistic period, buildings and facilities close to the meteorological station of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences was undertaken within the citadel.

Restoration was carried out within the outer city of the Roman thermae and the medieval church, the chain buildings, the fortress gate, its adjacent towers and fortification walls.

Conservation and restoration works were carried out within the *suburbium* on certain chain buildings and on the fortification wall, the gate, the posterns and the towers next to it. Tombs from the necropolis are exhibited outside the fortified territory. Conservation and restoration of new monuments of culture exposed as a result of archaeological explorations continued almost without interruption until 1993.

### **Underwater Explorations and Structures**

The first underwater expedition to look for shipwreck remains connected with the battle on 11 August 1791 between the Ottoman and the Russian fleets was carried out in the waters of Cape Kaliakra in 1959. Underwater explorations were conducted in the 1970s and 1980s as well. Isolated amphora finds suggest that the medieval harbour was located on the western side of the cape, below the fortress.

A metal “ingot” was accidentally found in 1972. The claim in the first publication on that object was that it was made of a gold-silver-copper alloy (32 % Au, 18 % Ag, 43 % Cu), that it was an early pre-coin form and that it was evidence of contacts between Thrace and the Mycenaean world during the second millennium BC. New tests of the ingot were made in 2011 and showed that there was no gold and silver in its alloy and that the metal of the find from Kaliakra is the so-called “red brass” — copper-zinc alloy with a high tin content (70.6 % Cu, 18.6 % Zn and 8.2 % Sn). Alloy with such content was characteristic of the 14<sup>th</sup>—15<sup>th</sup> century AD.



**Ancient City of Odessos Archaeological Reserve, city of Varna, Varna municipality, Varna District**

**Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation:**

The territory of the *Ancient City of Odessos* — Varna in the city of Varna was declared an archaeological reserve with Order of the Council of Ministers No 76 of 21.05.1974. The activities within its territorial scope are in strict compliance with the provisions of the CHA, as well as of Instruction No 1 of the Committee for Arts and Culture and the Ministry of Construction and Architecture on protection of the *Odessos–Varna* Archaeological Reserve (SG No 83/1975).

**Borders are determined for the reserve as follows:** The following borders were declared with Instruction No 1 of the Committee for Arts and Culture and the Ministry of Construction and Architecture on protection of the *Ancient City of Odessos* Architectural and Archaeological Reserve, published in SG No 83 of 28.10.1975:

- from the east — the outlines of the seashore
- from the northeast — Koloni street
- from the north — Exarch Yosif Square
- from the northwest — Parchevich and Dragan Tsankov streets
- from the west — Kotel, V. Levski and Tsaribrod streets
- from the south — from the Railway Station Square to the seashore

The same Instruction No 1 regulates the exclusion zone of the reserve as well. It also lays down the rules for the urban planning and construction on the territory of the ICA, in view of the fact that it is within the central urban part of the city of Varna.

Again, the same instruction No 1 (SG No 83/28.10.1975) regulates the ways of conducting historical explorations and archaeological excavations within the reserve.

Since 1975 there is no information of updating of the above-mentioned borders of the reserve and its exclusion zone, or of the stipulated rules for construction.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://agup.varna.bg/index.php/oup/grafichna-chast>

**Assets, Historical Context:**

**Natural and Historical Reserve *Sveti Ivan and Sveti Petar Islands*, Sozopol municipality, Burgas District**

**Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation:**

Order No 36 of 21.11.2001 (SG No 104/2001) for declaring the territory of the Sveti Ivan and Sveti Petar islands with their water areas near Sozopol, Sozopol municipality, Burgas District, as an archaeological reserve.

Borders are determined for the reserve as follows:

The area of the protected territory was updated in 2006 and precision was introduced concerning the regimes for protection in MEW Order No RD-855 of 7.11.2006. The territory of the Sveti Ivan and Sveti Petar islands has a total area of 232 686 m<sup>2</sup>. It has the following boundaries: the territory of the Sveti Ivan and Sveti Petar islands and their waters at a distance of 200 m from the coastline to the north, east and west, and to the south — to the mainland.

The territory of the reserve is divided into two zones:

a) zone A covering the territory of the Sveti Ivan and Sveti Petar islands and their waters at a distance of 200 m from the coastline to the north, east and west, and to the south — to the mainland, without the area of zone B.

b) zone B covering part of the Sveti Ivan island with an area of 80 400 m<sup>2</sup>, belonging to the Naval Base — Burgas.

The borders of the exclusion zone around the borders of the reserve were identified: to the north, east and west — 1 km into the water areas, from the borders of the archaeological reserve under item 2, and to the south the border coincides with the Skamni Peninsula and the Island of Sv. Kirik and Sv. Julitta.

Prescriptions for protection and preservation exist for both zones. Zone A was designated primarily for activities connected with conservation, restoration, adaptation and socialisation of ICAs. All kinds of construction activities unrelated to CRW are forbidden in it, and construction activities needed for socialisation of the site are allowed, provided they are executed using reversible means and materials.

Access to the “Stone Forest” located in the south-eastern sector of the reserve’s territorial waters is allowed only after registration with the Underwater Archaeology Centre in Sozopol. No dredging, trawling, building of piers, blasting and dumping of earth masses are allowed in the water area of the site.

The borders of the seashell farms and traps in the water area of the site are precisely fixed by the Ministry of Culture and the UAC.

The borders of the archaeological reserve and its exclusion zone were not marked on the town’s cadastral map by 2012 and there is no information about changes to date.

### **Assets, Historical Context**

Sveti Ivan island is the biggest of the five islands located along the Black Sea coastal area of Bulgaria, and is also one of the three islands in the Sozopol Bay. It is at a distance of 1 nautical mile from the Old Town of Sozopol. Its area is 28.9 ha, and the area of Sveti Petar Island is 1.2 ha.

The earliest traces of human activity on the Island of Sveti Ivan date back to the 7<sup>th</sup>—4<sup>th</sup> century BC, and they should probably be associated with a sanctuary dedicated to Apollo, God of Healing. A complex of buildings emerged around it and developed in the south-eastern part of the island. An Early Christian basilica dedicated to the Holy Mother of God Kaleosa was erected in that place between the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 5<sup>th</sup> century, and around it the big Christian centre — the Monastery of St. John the Prodromos — developed in subsequent centuries. During that period those were lands of the Bulgarian Kingdom. A second, richly decorated cross-domed church was built in the mid-12<sup>th</sup> century in honour of the monastery's patron saint. It was dedicated to St. John the Baptist. The monastery became an important factor in the eastern part of the Balkan Peninsula. Its literary activities continued well into the first centuries of Ottoman domination. The end of the monastery came in 1623 when it was burned to the ground after an attack by pirates.

### **Current State**

The first archaeological explorations on the island took place in 1985—1994 when the ruins of the first structures dated to the centuries BC were found. The explorations were renewed in 2008 and were paralleled by some conservation and restoration works. In 2010, the archaeological excavations continued and were concentrated predominantly within the monastery, with support under an EU project: *Ancient Sozopol — Monastery of St. John the Baptist — Culture over the Centuries*. Repair works were also carried out under this project, two sheds near the two existing sea harbours. Activities aimed at socialising the space around the ICA were also undertaken: paths were made and a system of information and direction was developed.

On the island there is a plot of land that is property of the Ministry of Defence, which was likewise not reflected in the cadastral map of Sozopol in 2012.

No tourist trips to the island have been organised yet, irrespective of the fact that the access to it is not restricted and it can be reached by boat. The existing sonar beacon on the island is still preserved, maintained and operational.

Sveti Ivan island is a place where many birds flock together. At present about 70 species have been registered. It is also the place of the biggest colony of the silver seagull (*Larus argentatus*) in Bulgaria. According to MEW Order No RD-53 of 26.05.2010, the territory of the Sveti Ivan and Sveti Petar islands is in the Bakarlaka protected area for protection of wild birds and for conservation of the natural habitats of the wild flora and fauna.

### **Underwater Explorations and Structures**

Dozens of stone and iron anchors, stone and lead anchor stocks have been found in the waters of the islands of Sveti Ivan and Sveti Petar. The chronology of the finds follows most generally that

of the historical development of Apollonia Pontica — Sozopol, the earliest finds being dated to the 7<sup>th</sup> century BC, and attest to intensive navigation in the region.

The territorial waters are included in the exclusion zone of the reserve on account of the natural phenomenon known as “stone forest”: fossilised remains of a forest (tree stumps and trunks, as well as branches) of swamp cypress. The phenomenon is at a depth of 12 to 16 m between the Island of Sveti Ivan and Skamni Peninsula (the old town of Sozopol). The stone forest is believed to have been formed when a swamp near the sea coast was flooded with sea water tens of millennia ago, or even earlier.

## **ARCHAEOLOGICAL COMPLEXES**

### **Archaeological Complex *The Big Island*, village of Durankulak, Shabla municipality**

#### **Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

Archaeological Complex *The Big Island*, village of Durankulak, Shabla municipality, Dobrich District, has an ICA status under Article 146 of the CHA.

With a protocol dated 27.07.2015 of a committee designated with an order by the Minister for Culture, a proposal was drafted to confer the status and to determine regimes — territorial scope and prescriptions for the protection and preservation of the ICA *Big Island in the Durankulak Lake*, Shabla municipality, Dobrich District. A proposal is also made with this protocol for a change in the name of the ICA to *Prehistoric, Ancient and Medieval Settlement and Adjacent necropolis — Durankulak*. The proposal is for the site to figure like a group archaeological ICA with a category “national significance”. The borders of the reserve were determined and prescriptions for protection were given in the protocol of 27.07.2015 of the committee. There is a decision of SECPPICA as well.

#### **Assets, Historical Context**

The Durankulak Lake on the western Black Sea coast is a shallow lagoon separated from the sea by a 50—70 m wide sand strip. It was formed about 10 000 years ago as a result of sinking of earth masses and the surging of sea waters into the estuaries of the Vaklinska River and the rivers from the villages Bilo, Smin, Granichar and Durankulak (which are already dry riverbeds today), which flow into the Black Sea. The *Big Island* Archaeological Complex consists of a settlement mound on the Big Island, inhabited during the Chalcolithic, Early Bronze Age, Late Bronze Age, Late Iron Age, Late Antiquity and Early Middle Ages, and an archaeological complex on the western shore of the lake. The culture layer of the mound is 3.50—4.00 m thick. The archaeological excavations on the Big Island at the western end of the lake started in 1975 and have demonstrated that the Big Island in the Durankulak Lake and its western shore were inhabited with interruptions for more than 6 000 years. The explored archaeological sites on the territory of the entire complex are:

*Neolithic settlement* Durankulak–Blatnitsa: three dugouts dated to the second half of the sixth millennium BC.

*Prehistoric necropolis* (from the Late Neolithic to the Early Bronze Age) which functioned without interruption for more than a whole millennium. The discovered 1 204 graves from the Neolithic and Chalcolithic contain rich grave finds: clay vessels, idol sculpture, stone, flint, bone and copper tools, gold articles of adornment, etc.

*Thracian settlement*, 13<sup>th</sup>—12<sup>th</sup> century BC — Late Bronze Age. This is the only entirely explored site in the Balkan Peninsula since the time of the Trojan War. It is dated to the start of the formation of the Thracian-Getic tribal community in the part of the world inhabited then.

*Sanctuary of the Thracian Great Goddess–Mother Cybele* — late 4<sup>th</sup>—1<sup>st</sup> century BC. It was built inside a karst cave on the southern shore of the lake around the beginning of the Hellenistic Age. The excavations yielded a votive tablet of the goddess and other finds from that period, some of the most interesting among them being handles with seals from the islands of Rhodes and Thasos, Kos, Herakleia and other classical Aegean centres.

*Ancient necropolis* on the western shore of the Durankulak Lake: 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC—4<sup>th</sup> century AD. Artefacts of diverse typology, architectural and cultural belonging were found. Among them it is interesting to note the graves–catacombs characteristic of the burial practices of the Scythian–Sarmatian tribal community living to the north, as well as burials from Roman times.

*An Old Bulgarian settlement* from the 9<sup>th</sup>—11<sup>th</sup> century located on the Big Island was studied entirely. More than 240 dwellings have been found, some of which have a plan in the form of a circle (remnants of *yurts*). Conservation and restoration works were conducted on some of them.

*Old Bulgarian necropolis* on the lake’s western shore (second half of the 9<sup>th</sup>—early 11<sup>th</sup> century). The archaeological explorations found and studied 282 graves, and 27 more on the island, around a Christian church in the central part of the settlement and along its southern slope.

*The Big Island mound* in the Durankulak Lake — inhabited permanently during the entire fifth millennium BC, and later. The culture layer of the mound illustrates one of the most developed cultures in the prehistoric world, where the oldest stone architecture on the European continent was also found.

### **Current State**

A plan for preservation of the protected locality Durankulak Lake was adopted in 2003. The actual locality is within the bigger “Protected Area for Biological Diversity — Durankulak Lake”, declared with MEW Order RD-258/16.03.2010.

The archaeological complex Durankulak is located on the so-called Big Island and on the western shore of the lake. The remnants from the original archaeological substance have been explored and exposed using partial emergency measures for conservation and restoration works. In 2004, a project for the socialisation of the archaeological complex was implemented, and in 2014 the Shabla municipality implemented also an EU project connected with the creating of an

environmentally sound and cultural-historical product. The activities under the project were focused on building a wooden path linking the island and the shore along the existing dyke. A small Visitors' Centre was also built. Elements of an information system also exist, but they are not resolved consistently and in the context of the entire complex.

### **Underwater Explorations and Structures**

Two marine archaeological geophysical explorations were carried out in the waters of the Durankulak Lake and in the sea to the east of it. The paleogeographic situation of the region was identified. Explorations in the sea registered a positive shape of the sea bottom with similar parameters to a settlement mound. Underwater archaeological exploration of the place was planned in 2020.

### **Archaeological Complex *Late Antiquity Fortress (Quadriburg), Early Christian Basilica, Early Christian Tomb and Part of an Old-Bulgarian Embankment, village of Shkorpilovtsi, Dolni Chiflik Municipality, Varna District***

#### **Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

A list of the architectural-construction monuments of culture (now ICAs) from the Antiquity and the Middle Ages in the Varna District was published in SG No 16/1968. Three sites are included in that list under Nos 94, 95 and 96: Early Christian basilica, Early Christian tomb and *Tabia* Old-Bulgarian fortification embankment, all of them in the village of Shkorpilovtsi. A list of the archaeological monuments of culture in the Varna District was published in SG No 66/1976. It contains a Late Antiquity fortress (north of the Fandakliyska River). Order No RD9R-51 of 15.12.2015 of the Minister for Culture changed the status of the above-mentioned sites, as follows: Archaeological Complex *Late Antiquity Fortress (Quadriburg), Early Christian Basilica, Early Christian Tomb and Part of an Old-Bulgarian Embankment*, group archaeological ICA with category “national significance”. The ICA borders were determined, as follows:

The regimes for ICA protection were determined with the above-mentioned order and in compliance with Article 79(1), (2) and (3) of the CHA. Total ICA area — 0.6 ha. Three exclusion zones are identified.

**Current State** — change of status.

## **OTHER GROUP ARCHAEOLOGICAL ICAs**

### **Ancient settlement and Late Antiquity fortress located on Cape Sveti Atanas in the town of Byala, Byala municipality, Varna District**

#### **Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

Order No RD9R-0005 of 16.11.2010 of the Minister for Culture conferring a status to an archaeological ICA with category “national significance”. The ICA borders were determined as follows: The regimes for ICA protection (territorial scope and prescriptions for protection) were determined with the above-mentioned order and in compliance with Article 79(1), (2) and (3) of the CHA. Total ICA area — 6.7 ha, area of the exclusion zone — 5.7 ha.

#### **Assets, Historical Context**

The fortress was mentioned for the first time by Škorpil. It is located at about 3 km south of the city. It is assumed to have been part of the large defence system built by the emperors Anastasius and Justinian I. Its area is about 4 ha. Part of military barracks and a basilica were found within the fortified area. The water supply was with a water pipeline.

The underwater archaeological explorations demonstrated the existence of an ancient settlement and necropolis to the west of the fortress.

#### **Current State**

The archaeological explorations started in 2009 because a considerable part of the ICA was within a military site. The terrain was sold to a private owner who undertook pre-construction activities, thus destroying a part of the existing buildings and removing a culture layer about 1 m thick.

**Varna Chalcolithic necropolis near Varna Lake, city of Varna** is an ICA with category “national significance” about which there is no information on prior imposition of definite protection regimes. This is one of the most important archaeological prehistoric sites on the territory of Bulgaria, dated to the late fifth — fourth millennium BC. According to scholars, the finds of gold artefacts are the oldest technologically processed gold in Europe and in the world, attributed to the so-called “Varna Culture” (4400—4100 BC). It was found in 1972, and after the latest archaeological explorations in 1991 the site was neglected.

### **Monastery complex in the Karaach Tekke locality, Varna municipality, Varna District**

#### **Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

Order No RD9R-6 of 17.04.2015 of the Minister for Culture conferring the status of group archaeological ICA with category “national significance”. The ICA borders were determined, as follows: The territorial scope and the prescriptions for ICA protection were also determined with the above-mentioned order and in compliance with Article 79(1), (2) and (3) of the CHA. Total ICA area — 1 ha.

**Assets, Historical Context** — still insufficiently studied.

**Current State:** The site is with changed category. However, in spite of its high category, the site has not been completely explored yet, which leads to lack of CRW activities, as well as lack of socialisation activities.

### **Early Christian Monastery in the Dzhanavara Locality near Varna, Varna District**

#### **Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

A list of the architectural-construction monuments of culture (now ICAs) from the Antiquity and the Middle Ages in the Varna District was published in SG No 16/1968. Number 16 in that list is: Early Christian basilica Dzhanavar Tepe. Order No RD9R-5 of 17.04.2015 of the Minister for Culture changed the status of the site as follows: group archaeological ICA with category “national significance”.

The ICA borders were determined, as follows: The regimes (territorial scope and prescriptions for ICA protection) were also determined with the above-mentioned order and in compliance with Article 79(1), (2) and (3) of the CHA. Territorial scope of the ICA — part of a land plot with identifier 10135.5203.7 in the cadastral map, with a total area of 0.8 ha.

**Current State:** Change of status and need of exploration. There is no data on CRW or on measures for adaptation and socialisation of the site.

**The Aladzha Monastery of the Holy Trinity** near Varna is an ICA with category “national significance” and with defined regimes for protection that need to be updated. The first explorations of the site were made by the Škorpil brothers and even then the potential of the monastery was highly appreciated in terms of its considerable scientific, architectural and tourist value. The site is exhibited and socialised, there are plans to implement a project for CRW and revitalisation of fragments of the complex.

### **Ancient and Medieval City Ulpia Anchialeion Palaeocastro, town of Pomorie, Burgas District**

#### **Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

A list of the monuments of culture (now ICAs) in the Burgas District was published in SG No 35/1965. Number 35 in that list is Ancient and medieval city Ulpia Anchialeion Palaeocastro.

Order No RD-19-334 of 12.04.1990 of the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Construction, Architecture and Infrastructure stipulates the borders and the regimes for ICA protection. According to the Order, the ICA territory is divided into two parts: territory under regulation and



farming lands, with different regimes of protection. The exclusion zone coinciding with the territory of the *necropolis* of the city was also identified.

In connection with the implementation of a project for amending the city's Master Plan, an interdepartmental committee was created with an order by the Minister for Culture to examine and specify the regimes for ICA protection and utilisation. The committee found intensified unregulated construction in Zone B of the ICA on account of the existence of private property on the territory. The two parts of the ICA territory were preserved, but the exclusion zone was revoked. No CRW or measures for the socialisation of the site have been implemented.

**Current State:** Crude construction interventions in recent years which hamper the perception of the ICA

### **Ancient Complex and Medieval Church, city of Burgas, Sarafovo Area**

#### **Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

Within the meaning of Article 146(3) of the CHA, the ICA has the status of a group ICA of “national significance”. The ICA borders were determined, as follows:

A protocol of the interdepartmental committee of 26 July 2012 defines the regimes for protection.

**Current State:** Additional archaeological explorations are needed. Absence of CRW, adaptation and socialisation of the ICA.

### **Late Antiquity and Medieval Fortress Located in the Lands of the Town of Ahtopol, Tsarevo Municipality, Burgas District**

#### **Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

Order No RD9R-52 of 15.12.2015 of the Minister for Culture conferring a status to a group archaeological ICA with category “national significance”.

The ICA borders were determined, as follows:

The regimes (territorial scope and prescriptions for ICA protection) were also determined with the above-mentioned order and in compliance with Article 79(1), (2) and (3) of the CHA. Total ICA area — 12.7 ha, area of the exclusion zone — 8.2 ha. **Assets, Historical Context** — still insufficiently studied.

**Current State** – Change of the status and need of exploration. There is no data on CRW or on measures for adaptation and socialisation of the site. Construction interventions carried out in recent years hamper the perception of the ICA.

▪ **SINGLE ARCHAEOLOGICAL ICAs**

**Ancient Temple of the Goddess Cybele, town of Balchik, Balchik Municipality, Dobrich District**

**Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

Order No RD9R-0006 of 24.11.2010 of the Minister for Culture conferring a status to an archaeological ICA with category “national significance”.

The ICA borders were determined, as follows:

The regimes for ICA protection were determined with the above-mentioned order and in compliance with Article 79(1), (2) and (3) of the CHA.

**Assets, Historical Context**

The temple has the typical plan scheme for ancient Greek temples: rectangular *naos* preceded by a *pronaos*. It was built between 280 and 260 BC. There is a staircase with four steps in front of the southern colonnade of the *pronaos*.

This ICA is the only such temple found in the eastern part of the Balkan Peninsula, and is the best preserved Hellenistic temple in Bulgaria.

**Current State**

The temple with *antae* is with a high degree of preservation and authenticity. It was found in 2007—2008 as a result of rescue archaeological excavations in private properties in connection with construction. It is exhibited *in situ*, but the newly-erected buildings around it hamper its display.

**Episcopal Basilica of Odessos, Khan Krum Street, city of Varna, Varna District**

**Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

Order No RD9R-1 of 13.02.2015 of the Minister for Culture conferring a status to a group archaeological ICA with category “national significance”.

The ICA borders were determined, as follows:

The regimes (territorial scope and prescriptions for ICA protection) were also determined with the above-mentioned order and in compliance with Article 79(1), (2) and (3) of the CHA. Total ICA area — 0.2 ha. It is within the confines of the Odessos–Varna Architectural Reserve, hence no protected area has been determined.

**Current State** — Change of the classification and of the category. Although the ancient building of the Roman *thermae* was subjected to CRW, parts of the site are crumbling down and re-conservation measures are needed. The site is not socialised.

**Late Antiquity Bath (4<sup>th</sup>—6<sup>th</sup> century), city of Varna, Varna District**

**Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

Order No RD9R-2 of 13.02.2015 of the Minister for Culture conferring a status to a group archaeological ICA with category “national significance”.

The ICA borders were determined, as follows:

The regimes for ICA protection were determined with the above-mentioned order and in compliance with Article 79(1), (2) and (3) of the CHA. Total ICA area — 0.5 ha. It is within the confines of the Odessos–Varna Architectural Reserve, hence no protected area has been determined.

**Current State** — Change of the classification and of the category.

**Ancient Building of the Roman Thermae, city of Varna, Varna District**

**Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

Order No RD9R-3 of 13.02.2015 of the Minister for Culture conferring a status to a group archaeological ICA with category “national significance”.

The ICA borders were determined, as follows:

The regimes for ICA protection were determined with the above-mentioned order and in compliance with Article 79(1), (2) and (3) of the CHA. Total ICA area — 1.3 ha. It is within the confines of the Odessos–Varna Architectural Reserve, hence no protected area has been determined.

**Current State** – Change of the classification and of the category.

**Early Byzantine protective dividing stone wall (with fortification to it), town of Obzor,**

**Nesebar municipality, Burgas District**

**Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

*State Gazette* No 25/1998 declared Early Byzantine protective dividing stone wall (with fortification to it), single archaeological ICA with category “national significance”.

It is traced along the town’s north-western periphery — from the northern slope of the Yanko Tepesi hill, and ends at a distance of 300 m east of the Priseltsi village.

**Current State** — there is no data on CRW or on measures for adaptation and socialisation of the site.

**Fortress dated to the Early Byzantine Age and the Bulgarian Middle Ages (Kozyak), town of Obzor, Nesebar municipality, Burgas District**

**Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

*State Gazette* No 25/1998 declared Fortress dated to the Early Byzantine Age and the Bulgarian Middle Ages (Kozyak), single archaeological ICA with category “national significance”.

**It can be traced at a distance of 2.5 km W–NW from the town, near the northern slopes of the Yanko Tepesi hill.**

**Current State** — there is no data on CRW or on measures for adaptation and socialisation of the site. Further explorations are needed.

**Medieval monastery complexes on Cape Emine and in the**

**Kozluka locality near the village of Sveti Vlas, Nesebar municipality, Burgas District**

**Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

Protocol of an interdepartmental committee in pursuance of Order No RD-19-729 of 17.09.1990 of the Deputy Minister for Culture on determining the borders and the regimes for protection of the Medieval Monastery Complexes of St. Nicholas on Cape Emona and in the Kozluka locality near the village of Sveti Vlas.

The St. Nicholas medieval monastery complex is located 1 km east of the village of Emona, close to Cape Emine. It survived until the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The archaeological site is on the territory of a former military polygon, hence no regular archaeological explorations have been carried out. Ruins from different buildings and a water reservoir have been preserved.

The ICA is with a total area of 56.7 ha, 15 ha of which are forests.

The territory of the medieval monastery in the Kozluka locality near the village of Sveti Vlas is rich in archaeological finds from different historical ages. Rescue archaeological excavations were conducted in 1983. ICA territory — 2 ha, exclusion zone — 7.5 ha, offered for the expansion of the Villas Elenite with a decision of the Council of Ministers.

**Current State**

The sites have no status yet. The protocol is from 1990. The village of Emona is mentioned in different sources from ancient times to date. There is information about the existence of an ancient and medieval fortress on Cape Emine. The archaeological excavations continue.

The village of Sveti Vlas has become a tourist settlement with excessive construction.

**Ancient necropolis of Ulpia Anchialo, located in the Krotia locality, in the lands of the town of Pomorie, Burgas District**

**Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

Declared with Letter No 2730 of 12.12.2006 of the National Institute for Monuments of Culture, with preliminary classification as a single archaeological ICA and preliminary category “national significance”.

The regimes for ICA protection are determined with a protocol of a committee appointed with Order No RD-09-963 of 2.11.2006 of the Minister for Culture.

The temporary regimes for ICA protection were changed by Order No RD9D-1 of 17.06.2016 of the Minister for Culture.

**Current State**

Unsystematic exploration over the years. Predominantly rescue archaeological explorations. Many of the *necropolis* described by Škorpil have been destroyed. Inappropriate and unregulated building interventions in recent years.

**Ancient tomb located in the lands of the town of Pomorie, Burgas District**

**Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

A list of the monuments of culture (now ICAs) in the Burgas District was published in SG No 35/1965. Number 36 in that list is “Ancient tomb”. The ICA has the status of a single archaeological ICA with category “national significance”.

The regimes for ICA protection are determined with Order No RD-19-1167 of 4.09.1989 of the Committee of Culture and the Committee for Territorial and Urban Planning of the Council of Ministers (Letter No RD-91-00-20 of 14.09.1989 of the National Institute for Monuments of Culture).

**Current State**

The tomb is one of the sites of the History Museum in the town of Pomorie. The access to it is difficult. Adequate information system is lacking. CRW have been conducted, but the site needs reconsevation and socialisation.

**Aquae Calidae Therma Late Antiquity and medieval fortress, Burgas**

**Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

Protocol of the interdepartmental committee of 2.06.2011 (NIICH Letter No 08-00-1804 of 31.01.2012). The site has the status of a single archaeological ICA with category “national significance” under Article 146(3) of the CHA.

**Current State:** The site is not completely studied yet, CRW and socialisation of the ICA are lacking.

**Medieval fortress Poros on Cape Foros and medieval settlement in the Poda locality,**

**Kraimorie district, city of Burgas**

**Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

Protocol of an interdepartmental committee of 21 and 22 June 1989 in pursuance of Order No RD-19-691 of 29.05.1989 of the Committee for Culture for determining the borders and the regimes for protection of the archaeological sites in the Poda locality and on Cape Foros. The committee found that the medieval tower had not been declared an ICA and that until that moment (1989) no archaeological explorations had been conducted.

The site is located at the place where the Mandrensko Lake flows into the Burgas Bay, in a forest — lands with a special protective function along the Black Sea. At a distance of about 200 m from the tower there is a medieval and late medieval settlement. ICA territory — 1 ha, exclusion zone — 5.4 ha.

In 2009, in connection with a development project and with the declaring of the Poda locality a nature reserve of global ornithological significance, the archaeological explorations of the fortress buildings connected with the medieval fortress Poros located on the Foros Peninsula in the Kraimorie district of Burgas continued. A rectangular tower of the bastion type with length of the walls 9.20 x 9.60 m and preserved height from the foundations — 4.60 m was explored. According to Tsonya Drazheva, the local inhabitants referred to the tower as *burg or pirg*. It guarded the harbour and the access to the interior of the lake and the mainland during the Antiquity and the Middle Ages. The tower is marked on sea maps between the 13<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century because it was very important for navigation in the bay. Its construction is also associated with the activities for reinforcing the borders of the Roman colony Deultum in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century during the reign of Emperor Antoninus Pius.

**Current State**

The acquiring of ICA status for the site is forthcoming. The archaeological excavations continue.

**Neolithic and Chalcolithic prehistoric settlement in the Akladi Cheiri locality in the lands of the village of Chernomorets, Sozopol municipality, Burgas District**

**Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

Letter No 330 of 30.01.2009 of the National Institute for Monuments of Culture proclaimed an ICA with preliminary category “national significance”. The letter also stipulates regimes for the protection and preservation.

**Current State:** The site is not completely studied yet, CRW and socialisation of the ICA are lacking. The category of the site has been changed.

**Archaeological site on Cape Akin (Akra) in the lands of the village of Chernomorets** is an archaeological ICA within the meaning of Article 146(3) of the CHA, still without status and category, and with provisional regimes for protection.

**Dragon’s House Dolmen northwest of the town of Primorsko, Burgas District**

**Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

Order No RD9R-4 of 28.01.2016 of the Minister of Culture on conferring the status of single archaeological ICA with category “national significance.”

The ICA borders were determined, as follows:

The regimes (territorial scope and prescriptions for ICA protection) were also determined with the above-mentioned order and in compliance with Article 79(1), (2) and (3) of the CHA. Territorial scope — part of land plot 58356.67.33.

**Current State:** The site has been archaeologically explored, but CRW and socialisation of the ICA are lacking. The category of the site has been changed.

**Lion’s Head/Valchanovo Kale/Ranuli fortress, northwest of the town of Primorsko, Burgas District**

**Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

Order No RD9R-5 of 28.01.2016 of the Minister for Culture conferring the status of a single archaeological ICA with category “national significance.”

The ICA borders were determined, as follows: The regimes (territorial scope and prescriptions for ICA protection) were also determined with the above-mentioned order and in compliance with Article 79(1), (2) and (3) of the CHA. Territorial scope — part of land plot 58356.67.39.

**Current State:** The site has been archaeologically explored, but CRW and socialisation of the ICA are lacking. The category of the site has been changed.

The **Beliktash rock sanctuary located northwest of the town of Primorsko** is a single ICA with category “national significance” and with defined regimes for protection, and is one of the most popular sites along the Black Sea coast. The site has been explored, partial CRW have been implemented, but it lacks adaptation and appropriate socialisation.

**Ancient settlement on the Kondrus Height, northeast of the town of Primorsko, Burgas District**

**Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

Order No RD9R-9 of 28.01.2016 of the Minister for Culture conferring the status of a single archaeological ICA with category “national significance.”

The ICA borders were determined, as follows: The regimes (territorial scope and prescriptions for ICA protection) were also determined with the above-mentioned order and in compliance with Article 79(1), (2) and (3) of the CHA.

**Current State:** The site has been explored, but CRW and socialisation of the ICA are lacking.

**Ancient and medieval fortress on Cape Maslen Nos, northeast of the town of Primorsko, Burgas District**

**Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

Order No RD9R-10 of 28.01.2016 of the Minister for Culture conferring the status of a single archaeological ICA with category “national significance.” The ICA borders were determined as follows: The regimes for ICA protection (territorial scope and prescriptions for protection) were determined with the above-mentioned order and in compliance with Article 79(1), (2) and (3) of the CHA. **Assets, Historical Context** — insufficiently explored, publications are forthcoming.

**Current State:** The site has been explored, but CRW and socialisation of the ICA are lacking.

**Tumulus at the estuary of the Ropotamo River, northeast of the town of Primorsko, Burgas District**

**Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

Order No RD9R-12 of 28.01.2016 of the Minister for Culture conferring the status of a single archaeological ICA with category “national significance.”

The regimes (territorial scope and prescriptions for ICA protection) were also determined with the above-mentioned order and in compliance with Article 79(1), (2) and (3) of the CHA.

**Current State:** The site has been archaeologically explored, but CRW and socialisation of the ICA are lacking.



**Late Antiquity and medieval settlement located south of the Chenger locality, north of the town of Primorsko, Burgas District**

**Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

Order No RD9R-13 of 28.01.2016 of the Minister for Culture conferring the status of a single archaeological ICA with category “national significance.”

The ICA borders were determined, as follows: The regimes (territorial scope and prescriptions for ICA protection) were also determined with the above-mentioned order and in compliance with Article 79(1), (2) and (3) of the CHA.

**Current State:** The site has been archaeologically explored, but CRW and socialisation of the ICA are lacking.

**Early Byzantine and medieval fortress on Urdoviza Peninsula, town of Kiten, Primorsko municipality, Burgas District**

**Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

Order No RD9R-41 of 2.12.2016 of the Minister for Culture conferring a status to a group archaeological ICA with category “national significance”.

The ICA borders were determined, as follows:

The regimes (territorial scope and prescriptions for ICA protection) were also determined with the above-mentioned order and in compliance with Article 79(1), (2) and (3) of the CHA. Total ICA area — 98.9 ha. The ICA territory coincides from the north, east and south with the borders of the Urdoviza Peninsula. Borders of the water area from the north, east and south — 500 m from the coastline, out into the sea. In view of the fact that the site is on a plot of land owned by the Ministry of Defence, the regimes for ICA protection have been updated and proceedings of a session of SECPICA and an order of the Ministry of Culture are forthcoming. CRW are needed. The site has not been displayed and socialised.

**Assets, Historical Context**

Ideal location. Still insufficiently studied.

**Current State**

There is no free access to the ICA because it is on land formerly owned by the MoD. Today there are private resort facilities there. No restoration and conservation has been applied, only rescue measures. The site has not been displayed and socialised.

**Thracian dynastic home located in the Golata Niva locality, village of Sinemorets, Tsarevo municipality, Burgas District**

**Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

Order No RD9R-37 of 24.08.2015 of the Minister for Culture conferring the status of a single archaeological ICA with category “national significance.”

The ICA borders were determined, as follows: The regimes (territorial scope and prescriptions for ICA protection) were also determined with the above-mentioned order and in compliance with Article 79(1), (2) and (3) of the CHA. The total area of the ICA territory, comprising a plot of land with identifier 66528.34.13 — public state property — is 1 ha.

**Current State:** The site has been archaeologically explored, but CRW and socialisation of the ICA are lacking.

**OTHER ICA SITES**

- **ARCHITECTURAL-HISTORICAL RESERVES**

**Ancient city of Apollonia, town of Sozopol, Burgas District**

**Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation:**

The old part of the town of Sozopol was proclaimed *Ancient Sozopol* Architectural-Historical Reserve with Council of Ministers Decision No 320 of 7.09.1974. According to the Annex to Article 50(3) of the CHA, the *Ancient City of Apollonia*, Sozopol municipality, Burgas District, possesses the status of an archaeological reserve — ICA with category “national significance”.

Order No RD09-3 of 8.01.2014 defines the status of the Fishermen’s School as a single architectural-construction and historical ICA with category “national significance”. The same Order regulates the territorial scope and the regimes for the protection of the ICA. The Fishermen’s School, later Marine School, is located on the Island of Sv. Kirik and Sv. Julitta. The island itself is an ICA (SG No 35/1965) and is within the *Ancient City of Apollonia*.

**Borders are determined for the reserve as follows:** The activities within its territorial scope are in compliance with the requirements set out in the CHA, as well as in Regulation No 8 of the Committee for Culture and the Committee on Architecture and Public Works on the architectural-historical reserves and tourist sites Sozopol and Nesebar (SG No 9/1981).

**Assets, Historical Context:**

The ancient city of Apollonia comprises more than 180 Sozopol houses from the Bulgarian National Revival period, built between the mid-18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> century, some of which have been declared immovable cultural assets. The following buildings are also located within the borders of the reserve: the medieval church of the Monastery of the Holy Apostles, the building of

the art gallery, the Church of the Holy Mother of God, a Christian medieval complex, the museum near the fortress wall, the Sv. Cyril and St. Methodius church.

The architecture of the Sozopol house is specific. It has elements of the houses from the National Revival period from the Strandzha Mountain and the Balkan Range. It is built with stone foundations and brick walls with wooden facing on the outside to protect the building from the salty sea wind. The roof is covered with Turkish roof tiles. Most old Sozopol houses have two or three floors, the first floor being used for farming and artisan needs, as well as for keeping artisans' tools and wine casks.

Restored fragments of the southern fortress wall with a rectangular tower can also be seen today in the Old Sozopol. The ancient city was situated on the rocky peninsula and was surrounded with fortification wall. The walls were built in the 6<sup>th</sup> century and additional construction was done many times over the centuries.

### **Current State**

Being one of the most popular tourist resorts on the Black Sea, Sozopol was not spared the intensive construction, including in the protected areas. Unfortunately, there were also several dubious incidents resulting in the obliteration of physical buildings that are immovable cultural assets. In some places urban planning characteristics that created the appearance and uniqueness of Sozopol, e.g. the so-called *rimni*, have been destroyed, especially in the coastal area. Many of the buildings grew in height to satisfy the investment interests prompted by the development of family hotel business and all accompanying sites: restaurants, cafés, bars, night clubs, souvenir shops, stalls, etc., which vulgarise to a substantial extent the context of the architectural-historical environment. The regulations in the Directive Conceptual Plan drafted in 1984 by the National Institute for Monuments of Culture (now NIICH) were breached a long time ago. This makes it necessary to urgently update the regimes for ICA protection.

All sites of the Bulgarian archaeological heritage on the territory of the reserve have been explored and have been subjected to conservation and restoration works. Unfortunately, these works, as well as the exhibiting of the individual cultural assets, were piecemeal and were not adequate to the contemporary trends in the field of protection of the architectural/archaeological heritage. The successful projects, e.g. the *Concept on the Protection and Sustainable development of the Island of Sveti Kirik and Sv. Julitta*, drafted in 2011, have not been implemented yet.

One positive intention awaiting its materialisation concerns the transformation of the old Naval School on the Island of Sv. Kirik and Sv. Julitta into a museum, integrating in it also the archaeological substance exposed immediately in front of the school building and transforming the territory around it into an area for culture and recreation.

## UNDERWATER EXPLORATIONS AND STRUCTURES

- **ARCHITECTURAL-PARK COMPLEXES**

### **Architectural-Park Complex *The Palace*, town of Balchik, Dobrich District**

#### **Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

Order No RD09-128 of 18.04.2002 of the Minister for culture. The complex is managed by the Ministry of Culture and the Botanical Garden of Sofia University St. Kliment Ohridski under Public State Ownership Act No 604 of 2.02.1998.

Its borders and the prescriptions for its protection are set out in the above Order. There are 15 components with the status of single architectural-construction and artistic ICAs. One among them — the villa of the Romanian Queen Maria — is of the category of “national significance”, five are of category “local significance” and nine — of category “ensemble significance”.

#### **Assets, Historical Context**

The villa of Queen Maria — with its park and auxiliary buildings — was built in the 1924—1936 period by Italian architects. The residential building is positioned on a plot of land forming terraces, with preserved natural characteristics. The summer residence of the Romanian queen is the principal element in the composition of the complex. The architectural and artistic design of the ICA is executed in the manner of national and regional romanticism. The stone-paved alleys, the supporting walls, the staircases, the bridges and the vaults around the buildings of the complex, as well as the ornamental elements of the park environment, additionally intensify that romantic feeling. The park part of the complex was created by the Swiss botanist Jules Jani. In addition to exotic plants like black Dutch tulips, there are also fruit trees characteristic of the region.

The complex had its own autonomous electricity supply and a small beach with a jetty.

#### **Current State**

In the 1960s, the complex was given for use as a resort complex to the Committee for Culture and new buildings were erected in it. Later, in the 1980s, the coastline was reinforced. A panoramic road to the Albena resort was built and an artificial beach strip was created. The intensified construction in the region during the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century resulted in landslides and destruction. This additionally disturbed the beauty of the picturesque landscape. Today the royal palace has been turned into a museum that enjoys interest on the part of Bulgarian and foreign tourists. The park around the palace also evokes special interest.

## **The Complex Euxinograd and its park, city of Varna**

### **Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

Order No RD9R-2 of 27.02.2013 of the Ministry of Culture declared the complex as a group ICA: architectural-construction, historical, artistic, archaeological, park and landscape art, and cultural landscape, with category of “national significance”.

Its borders and the prescriptions for its protection are set out in the above Order. There are six elements with the status of single ICAs: The Euxinograd Park, the Euxinograd Palace, the building of the Automatic Telephone Exchange, the Royal Stables STALL, the Greenhouses and the Late Antiquity and Medieval Castrici Fortress. Of them, the Euxinograd Park, the Euxinograd Palace, the Royal Stables STALL and the Dutch Greenhouse are with category “national significance”, the Automatic Telephone Exchange building and the Late Antiquity and Medieval Castrici Fortress are with category “local significance”, and four of the greenhouses, namely: *High Palms*, *Low Palms*, *French* and *English* are with category “for information”.

The territorial scope of the group ICA *Euxinograd Palace and Its Park*, Soganlak locality, Euxinograd area, Primorski district, city of Varna, coincides with a plot of land with identifier 10135.2567.154 in the cadastral maps and cadastral register of the city of Varna. The total area of the complex is 88.3 ha.

### **Assets, Historical Context**

Euxinograd Palace was built in the period immediately following the Unification of the Principality of Bulgaria with Eastern Rumelia (1885) as a summer residence of the Bulgarian monarchs. It was opened in 1908. The building has two floors, an attic and a trapezoid quadrangular clock tower. The exterior is in 18<sup>th</sup> century French style. The first floor is reserved for reception halls, a music room, dining rooms and work studies, the second floor is for the royal bedrooms, and the guest bedrooms are in the attic. With its functional division and furniture Euxinograd is the only preserved national palace building from which it is possible to judge about state and palace protocol. Although the palace reflects the architectural fashion of the period, it has its own identity and impact. Euxinograd was built during different periods. Initially, the project of the German landscape architect Petzold was implemented in 1884/1886. After Ferdinand became Bulgarian Prince, he invited the French architect André, who redesigned the central part of the park in French style. Vegetation from all continents began to be selected in it. In 1893–1912 new terrains were included in the park to expand it. The Euxinograd harbour was built in 1903 and the rocks on Cape Soganlak were reinforced. The park section of the residence took shape along the coast, and a farming and auxiliary part — in the north and west. In 1921, the park became a subdivision of the Royal Botanical Gardens. After 1935, the compositional building of the park was completed.

After 1944 Euxinograd became a government residence.

A project for conservation and restoration works, coordinated with the Ministry of Culture, was submitted in the second decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, together with the above-mentioned territorial scope and prescriptions for ICA protection.

The Late Antiquity and Medieval Castrici Fortress is located on the seashore. Its total area is about 1.5 ha. It is partially explored. A fortification wall with a length of about 200 m, about 3 m high in some parts, and about 2 m wide is preserved. The different towers are of interest: the five round bastion-towers, the large corner *donjon*-tower, as well as the triangular and rectangular towers that were additionally built at the eastern end. There is a project for the completion of the conservation and restoration works, which has not been implemented.

**Current State** — the site is used predominantly as a resort facility for the government (and not only). Tourist visits are also organised. Although this ICA is relatively well maintained, the combination of these two activities — vacation (for persons from the high public administration and their security guards) and tourism — does not have a favourable effect on the ICA protection.

- **PARK AND GARDEN ART SITES**

**Historical nucleus of the Seaside Garden in Varna, city of Varna**

**Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

The *Historical Nucleus of the Seaside Garden in Varna, city of Varna* was declared an ICA of park and landscape art with category “national significance” (SG No 41/1992).

**Borders are determined for the reserve as follows:**

The regimes for ICA protection are defined in the *State Gazette* issue cited above. The borders of the exclusion zone/contact area of the ICA were reduced with a decision of the Minister for Culture published in SG No 4/1995. The regimes for ICA protection were reduced and updated with Order No RD9R-0025 of 28.12.2011 of the Minister for Culture.

Order No RD9R-11 of 12.02.2018 of the Minister for Culture identifies a single architectural-building ICA within an ICA of park and landscape art, namely: “Black Sea Biological Station with aquarium in Varna, in the historical nucleus of the Seaside Garden in Varna”, identifier 10135.1509.8 in the cadastral map and cadastral register of the city of Varna, with category “national significance”.

**Assets, Historical Context**

The creation of the so-called Seaside Park started in 1862 when parts of a vegetable garden and an orchard were separated in the area between today’s Sea Casino and Observatory — about 2.6 ha. In 1890, the municipal architect Dmitrievich designed the construction of the first sea baths in the sea, with changing rooms and hot water.

The actual planned construction of the garden started between 1895 and 1920. The principal park builder was the Czech national Anton Novak, who designed and implemented the planning of the park. For nearly forty years he was appointed custodian of the park. Around 1906, it was decided to build an aquarium, the place for it was determined, and an Alley of the National Revival heroes was also designed in 1908.

The real flourishing of the park coincided with the so-called third stage of development: the time between 1920 and 1944. The busts of the National Revival heroes were placed then, and in 1921 Varna was proclaimed a resort city. The central sea baths were opened in 1926, the northern and southern baths — in the several subsequent years. The aquarium was opened in 1932 and the casino was built the following year.

### **Current State**

A large part of the vegetation initially planted by Novak is in good condition and preserved. A detailed spatial plan for the ICA was approved in 2002. The intensified construction in the exclusion zone of the ICA during the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century resulted in danger of landslides and destruction.

### **Historical nucleus of the Seaside Garden in Burgas, city of Burgas**

#### **Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

The Historical Nucleus of the Seaside Garden in Burgas was declared an ICA of park and landscape art with category “national significance” (SG No 41/1992).

#### **Borders are determined for the reserve as follows:**

The regimes for ICA protection are defined in the State Gazette issue cited above. The total ICA area is 8.5 ha.

#### **Assets, Historical Context**

The Historical Nucleus of the Seaside Garden was started in the first years after the Liberation of Bulgaria in 1878 at the place of a Turkish hospital. The city’s first zoning plan of 1891 envisaged its enlargement. In 1909, Georgi Duhlev — the first person with a degree in park landscaping — designed and developed the park project and implemented it by 1936. The planning of the park is preserved to a great extent to this day.

The enlargement of the historical nucleus of the part started after 1955, with the newly-added lands from the north, east and southeast forming the exclusion zone for the ICA today.

- **OTHER ICA SITES**

**Pomorie salt pans, town of Pomorie, Burgas District**

**Declaration instrument and regulatory documents on protection and preservation**

Order No RD9D-0003 of 10.03.2011 proclaimed the Pomorie salt pans, Malkoto Ezero locality, as a single ethnographic ICA with preliminary category of “national significance”.

The ICA borders were determined, as follows:

The regimes for ICA protection were determined with the above-mentioned order and in compliance with Article 79(1), (2) and (3) of the CHA.

**Assets, Historical Context**

The history of Pomorie (Anchialo) has been associated for millennia with the production of salt. There is information from different periods about this important economic activity. Salt production was a major sector in the period after the Liberation and is the town’s principal means of livelihood. Initially the Pomorie salt pans were privately owned by individuals, later different cooperatives developed. The salt pans became property of the state after 1944. At the end of the 1960s, most salt pans and their facilities were neglected and piled up with earth.

The Pomorie salt pans ICA presents the technology of salt production: manually, following the millennial practice. Two authentic basins — evaporators — and other authentic facilities and instruments have been preserved.

**Current State:** The Pomorie salt pans still function predominantly as a demonstration site — a branch of the History Museum in the town. Salt production continues to be practised using the authentic method, although the salt quantity obtained is minimal. That salt is commercially available mainly as a souvenir. The specific method of functioning of the Pomorie salt pans and their history are presented in an existing building that has been reconstructed to house the museum collection. The socialisation of the site, as well as the so-called “Salt Museum” are not adequate to the asset’s value and to the contemporary tendencies for exhibiting such sites.

**2.3. ICAs in the scope of the MSPRB — summary**

Most of the sites along the Bulgarian Black Sea coast are single sites. Most frequently they are of local or national significance, but there is still a considerable number among them that are “for information”. The distribution of ICA sites by municipalities along the coastline from north to south is as follows:

1. **Shabla municipality** — a total of 26 ICAs, of which one site is with category national significance, three are with local significance, and the rest are for information;



2. **Kavarna municipality** — a total of 85 ICAs, of which 5 are with category national significance (including two archaeological reserves), 10 are with local significance, the rest are for information;
3. **Balchik municipality** — a total of 120 ICAs, of which 5 are with category national significance, 61 are with local significance, 48 are for information and 6 are without category;
4. **Varna municipality** — a total of 24 ICAs of national significance and no information about the categories “local significance” and “for information”;
5. **Dolni Chiflik municipality** — a total of 4 ICAs of national significance and no information about the categories “local significance” and “for information”;
6. **Avren municipality** — a total of 2 ICAs of national significance and no information about the categories “local significance” and “for information”;
7. **Byala municipality** — a total of 2 ICAs of national significance and no information about the categories “local significance” and “for information”;
8. **Nesebar municipality** — a total of 23 ICAs, of which 1 is with category national significance, 10 are with national significance, 2 are with local significance and 10 are without category. Within the confines of the ICA *Ancient City of Nesebar* there are a total of 118 ICAs, 20 of which are with category national significance, 50 are with local significance, 34 are for information, 5 are with category of ensemble significance and 8 are without category.
9. **Pomorie municipality** — a total of 27 ICAs, of which 2 are with category national significance, 21 are with local significance and 13 are without category;
10. **Burgas municipality** — a total of 329 ICAs, of which 8 are with category national significance, 35 are with local significance, 17 are for information, 60 are ensembles and 209 are without category;
11. **Sozopol municipality** — a total of 65 ICAs, of which 6 are with category national significance, 3 are group ICAs, 29 are with local significance (two of them are group), 5 are for information and 24 are without category;
12. **Primorsko municipality** — a total of 4 ICAs, of which 1 is with category national significance, 2 are with local significance and 1 is without category;
13. **Tsarevo municipality** — a total of 52 ICAs, of which 2 are with category local significance and 50 are without category.

## **Current State**

### **Underwater Explorations and Structures**

The first underwater archaeological explorations were carried out in 1959 (near Kaliakra) and in 1960 (in the waters of Cape Maslen Nos). The explorations continued in the 1970s and 1980s with constantly improving quality of the research. The main research topics were identified (shipping,

sea contacts and trade, sunken settlements, ancient marine facilities, changes in the environment), the first specialists were created.

In 1978, the first specialised research structure was created: Marine Research Base (with seat in the town of Sozopol), a subsidiary of the Cultural Historical Heritage District Directorate, Burgas. The institutional development and transformation continued during subsequent decades.

In 1982, the Marine Research Base was renamed Centre for Marine History and Archaeology (CMHA). Since 1.01.1985, the latter was transferred as a subsidiary of the National Polytechnical Museum in Sofia. In the second half of the 1980s, underwater research and the CMHA activities expanded in scope and transcended the Southern Black Sea region. That found its institutional reflection and with Decree of the Council of Ministers No 122 of 22.12.1992 the CMHA was renamed to Central Base for Underwater Archaeological Research (CBUAR), receiving the status of a legal entity supported out of the budget of the Ministry of Culture. A new change in the status occurred in 1999, when the CMHA was closed down as of 1.01.2000 with Decree of the Council of Ministers No 204 of 11.11.1999. It was replaced by a sole trader company Underwater Archaeology Centre EOOD under the Ministry of Culture. That form of organisation of the work proved to be unsuccessful and the State again resumed its functions in 2002. A new secondary budget authoriser was created with Decree of the Council of Ministers No 128 of 28.06.2002 under the Ministry of Culture – Underwater Archaeology Centre (UAC), a state cultural institute. The UAC was further strengthened with the adoption of the Cultural Heritage Act in 2009 and with its amendments in 2009, 2011 and 2018. Article 21 defines the status of the UAC: state cultural institute with seat in Sozopol, financed out of the budget of the Minister for Culture; Article 22 defines the UAC functions; Article 23 sets the framework of UAC's activities and structure. UAC's increased role in the implementation of the overall cultural policy is seen in Article 64 which entitles UAC's representatives to participate in the SECPPICA. Article 149 can also be viewed in a similar way as, according to it, a UAC representative is a member of the Terrain Council by right.

Irrespective of the way in which the evolution of the UAC is viewed since 1978, it is necessary to stress the fact that Bulgaria was one of the first countries in the world to create a specialised structure for protection of the cultural heritage under water. The interest of the state in that heritage is also demonstrated by the fact that Bulgaria is the first state in Europe and the second in the world to join as early as in 2003 the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage.

As was mentioned earlier, Bulgarian underwater archaeology identified its principal objects of research already at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

1. Remains of shipwrecks;
2. Anchors, amphorae and other single finds allowing to study indirectly the ancient navigation and the cultural contacts;
3. Ancient harbours and harbour facilities;

4. Settlements, structures and facilities that had been originally built on the shore but are now submerged below sea level.

The examination of each of these groups developed further and broadened in recent years with the technological development and with the increased human capacity.

### **1. Remains of shipwrecks within the MSPRB scope**

Coastal zone

Two shipwrecks were explored with archaeological excavations in Bulgaria:

- shipwreck of a wooden sailing boat from the late 18<sup>th</sup>—early 19<sup>th</sup> century in the southern Kiten Bay, town of Kiten, Primorsko municipality, Burgas District;
- shipwreck of a wooden two-mast sail boat from the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century in the Sv. Nichola Bay, town of Chernomorets, Sozopol Municipality, Burgas District.

During the 1960s and 1970s, a series of identical amphorae or roof tiles were taken out in the region of Varna, Cape Sveti Atanas, Ravda, Nesebar and Pomorie, and were interpreted as cargo from ancient shipwrecks. The places of most of these finds cannot be identified accurately, therefore the question whether these are indeed remains of shipwrecks remains open.

Remains from 17<sup>th</sup>—19<sup>th</sup> century wooden sail boats in the coastal area are positively known at the following locations:

the northern beach of Durankulak (17<sup>th</sup> century shipwreck);

Shabla, north of Dobrudzha camping site (17<sup>th</sup>—18<sup>th</sup> century shipwreck/shipwrecks),

area of the village of Krapets (large 19<sup>th</sup> century sail boat).

In the southern Kiten Bay, very close to the excavated 18<sup>th</sup>—19<sup>th</sup> century sail boat, there are well preserved corpuses of at least three other wooden ships from the same period.

### **Deep-water shipwrecks**

Due to the specific conditions in the Black Sea (low salinity, anoxic conditions at a depth above 150 m, weak water exchange, low temperature), remains of wooden ships are extremely well preserved. Therefore, deep-water shipwrecks in the Black Sea, and especially those from the western part of the basin, have the potential to be proclaimed in their entirety as world cultural heritage under the 1972 UNESCO Convention.

Underwater explorations conducted by the Institute of Oceanology of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences registered four shipwrecks to the east and west of Varna at depths between 100 and 140 m. Two shipwrecks are dated to the Roman period (3<sup>rd</sup>—5<sup>th</sup> century), the others are from the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

Two zones were explored in the course of the implementation of the deep-water project MAP Black Sea: southern — from Sozopol to Rezovo and up to 15 nautical miles into the sea, and northern — linear, 2 to 10 km wide along the route of the unbuilt South Stream gas pipeline from

the seacoast north of Varna to the border point of the Exclusive Economic Zone of the Republic of Bulgaria.

The MAP Black Sea explorations registered and documented a total of 55 shipwrecks, which are dated as follows:

- 1 ancient (late 5<sup>th</sup>—early 4<sup>th</sup> century BC),
- 6 from the Roman Age (1<sup>st</sup>—5<sup>th</sup> century),
- 2 medieval (9<sup>th</sup>—10<sup>th</sup> century and 13<sup>th</sup>—14<sup>th</sup> century),
- 20 Ottoman types (17<sup>th</sup>—19<sup>th</sup> century),
- 16 large rowing and sailing boats (18<sup>th</sup> century),
- 7 ships of Western European types from the 18<sup>th</sup>—19<sup>th</sup> century.

The analysis of the MAP Black Sea data shows that there is a similar density of the shipwrecks of about 1 shipwreck per 4 km<sup>2</sup> in the two zones (northern and southern) in spite of the character of research: area grid in the southern zone, and dense coverage along a linear transect in the northern zone. The number and the chronological distribution of the registered shipwrecks correspond quite well with the known information from the historical sources on the maritime economic activity during the respective periods. Therefore, the MAP Black Sea data can be used directly for a general evaluation of the expected number and distribution of shipwrecks within the MSPRB scope.

In addition to these shipwrecks, in Bulgarian waters there are also a number of other remains that have the character of soldiers' graves and which are also under the protection of the Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage.

These are Soviet submarines that sank in the period between November 1941 and December 1942:

III 211 east of Varna,

III 204 south of Varna,

III 210 and JI-24 in the area of Shabla.

Only C-34 of all submarines lost in World War II has not been found so far. It is assumed to lie to the east-southeast of Cape Emine.

A German submarine from the UB-I Project from the time of World War I was found in 2010 east of Varna. This is believed to have been the submarine that served under Bulgarian flag as Submarine No 18 and that was lost in 1919 in an attempt to take it to Istanbul.

In addition to the submarines, in the Bulgarian waters there are also remains of several ships aged more than 50 years:

*Mopang* — merchant vessel, north of Sozopol,

*Rodina* — merchant vessel, southeast of Sozopol;

*Lieutenant Pushchin* — Russian destroyer, in the Varna Bay;

*Sefak* — merchant and passenger ship, southeast of Tsarevo.

## **2. Anchors, amphorae and other single finds allowing to study indirectly the ancient navigation and the cultural contacts;**

Similar finds appear practically along the entire Bulgarian coast.

Many of them have been taken out in the 1970s and 1980s, and the data connected with their finding have been lost.

The uncontrolled taking out of archaeological artefacts continued in the 1990s with the flourishing of the *Rapana* business. Nevertheless, it is known that more finds were discovered and a part of them were added to the exhibits in the museums along the coast in the following water areas:

- Shabla — the region of ancient Caria;
- Kavarna — the region of Cape Chirakman and the ancient colony Bizone;
- Varna — Varna Bay, in the area of the sea port;
- Nesebar — on the northern and the southern side of the peninsula, in the area of the sea port;
- Pomorie — east of the peninsula;
- Sozopol;
- Cape Maslen Nos;
- the entire water area south of Cape Maslen Nos.

## **3. Ancient harbours and harbour facilities;**

Similar facilities have been documented in the following water areas:

The harbour in ancient Caria. It was built in the area of a natural reef east of the overpass and beacon of Shabla. The harbour has not been explored and mapped in detail. Finds of amphorae, stocks and stone anchors are known from its waters.

The sea port of Bizone. It is located in the Kavarna Bay. Underwater explorations have found numerous materials: amphorae and other finds dated to the Hellenistic Age.

Structures and finds were registered during the construction of the modern sea port of Varna. They are interpreted as ruins of the ancient harbour of Odessos. Today these ruins are totally inaccessible for exploration.

Concentration of finds with different dating has been registered in the area of Karantinata on the southern coast of Varna Bay. They most probably mark a small wharf that functioned during the Antiquity and the Middle Ages.

The harbours of Mesembria are located on the southern side of the peninsula. A part of the structures found under water are associated with building of facilities of the ancient ports (see more details in the section on Nesebar).

The ancient harbour of Anchialo was clogged during the Late Roman period and is entirely on land today, within the outlines of today's town of Pomorie.

Two ancient ports are localised in the area of Cape Akra, north of the town of Chernomorets.

The historical harbour of Sozopol is located within the outlines of the modern one, between Skamni Peninsula and the Island of Sv. Kirik and Sv. Julitta. It is marked by many rich finds from all historical periods: from Late Archaic (end of the 7<sup>th</sup> century BC) to the Ottoman period.

A sea port has been registered in the bay opposite the estuary of the Ropotamo River. It also functioned during the Late Archaic period (end of the 7<sup>th</sup> century BC) to the Ottoman period.

A harbour has also been registered in the bay south of Cape Maslen Nos. According to the finds, the harbour functioned after the 5<sup>th</sup> century BC.

Small wharfs have been identified in almost all protected bays south of Cape Maslen Nos.

#### **4. Settlements, structures and facilities that had been originally built on the shore but are now submerged below sea level.**

That category of sites is specific for the Black Sea that had undergone major changes of its coastline in the past 10 000 years due to its closed character. The coastline at the end of the last Ice Age was found to have been along today's 30—40 m isobaths. The sea level along the Bulgarian Black Sea coast was found to have been by about 6—7 m lower in the fifth millennium BC than the present one. This general picture means that in the area between the 30—40 m isobaths and today's coast it is possible to expect settlements and other archaeological prehistoric structures. Most of the known cultural heritage sites belonging to that category are dated to the end of the fifth millennium BC (Late Chalcolithic) or to the fourth—third millennium BC (Early Bronze Age), but due to the dynamics of the change in the sea level, described above, there is every reason to expect earlier materials as well.

##### **Prehistoric settlements and sites north of Cape Emine**

Prehistoric sites and structures have been registered and documented in the following locations:

- The water area east of Durankulak Lake. Geophysical explorations registered a positive topographic shape with the size of a mound.
- Single prehistoric finds have been taken out accidentally in the Durankulak Lake, east of the prehistoric necropolis, which suggests that the necropolis continued under the waters of the lake today as well.
- Two Chalcolithic burials were found under water at a depth of 3—4 m in the water area of Shabla, north of Dobrudzha camping site. They indisputably mark a submerged prehistoric necropolis.

- At least 13 partially destroyed prehistoric settlements dated to the Late Chalcolithic and the Early Bronze Age were found in the waters of the Varna and Beloslav lakes during the construction of canals, ports and other facilities. Explorations conducted by the UAC in recent years have revealed that parts of at least five of these settlements have been preserved:
  - An Early Bronze Age settlement in the waters of the Old Canal and the northern shore of the lake;
  - Morflot settlement. It was registered while wells were built along Devnya Street and its location associates it with the Varna Chalcolithic necropolis. Therefore, the preservation and exploration of that settlement is extremely important.
  - An Early Bronze Age settlement in the waters of the Varna Thermoelectric Power Plant and the village of Ezerovo. The southern part of the settlement opposite the coal quay was destroyed during the construction of the Varna Thermoelectric Power Plant, but the rest of the settlement is preserved.
  - Parts of the Strashimirovo settlement are preserved in the Varna Lake, north and south of Canal 2;
  - Parts of the Baltata and Poveyanovo settlements in the Beloslav Lake outside the Varna-West seaport should also be preserved.

### **Prehistoric settlements under water south of Burgas**

Evidence of prehistoric settlements lying today below sea level in the region of Burgas comes in the form of accidental discoveries of archaeological materials collected in the course of different construction and excavation operations connected with the building of ports or with other major hydrotechnical works. Limited rescue and regular excavations have been conducted only in the harbour of Sozopol, in the bay opposite the estuary of the Ropotamo River, and near Kiten (Urdoviza), and only the excavated area of the latter site (about 900 m<sup>2</sup>) can be assessed as considerable.

#### **1. Atanasovsko Lake**

The first information about prehistoric finds from the area of Burgas, below the sea level, dates back to 1925 when stone tools and ceramic fragments were found at a depth of 0.45—1.0 m while digging canals between the Atanasovsko Lake and the Black Sea (northeast of the city, in the area of the old salt pans). Sometime later, similar materials were found not far from there and at a depth of ca. 2.5 m as well. The prehistoric materials are dated to the Neolithic, Late Chalcolithic and the Bronze Age, and the opinion is that they were from different sites.

#### **2. Burgas port**

Several clay vessels dated to the Early Bronze Age were found in 1958 during digging to increase the depth in connection with the construction of the Fishermen's Port in Burgas. The localisation of the find is most general: "Burgas, from the seabed, close to the ancient settlement near Sladkite Kamani". It is known that many archaeological materials were taken out during dredging of the

Burgas port in 1968. They were found in the southern part of the bay at a depth of 6—12 m and at a distance of about 500 m from the shore. Among the finds from that dredging there is also a disc-like lid dated to the Late Neolithic Age.

### **3. Atiya**

The settlement was discovered in 1968 in the western bay of Cape Atiya, in the course of the construction of the military harbour of the Atiya naval base. Traces of prehistoric settlements that were dated to the Late Chalcolithic and the Early Bronze Age based on the ceramic finds consisting of whole and fragmented vessels were found there, below a surface layer with finds from the Antiquity and the Middle Ages. The prehistoric finds were taken out from a depth of 7—9 m. The preserved vessels from Atiya demonstrate close parallels with the Chalcolithic ceramic finds from Sozopol.

### **4. Sozopol**

In 1927, while building the quays and shaping the basin of the “Old Port” of Sozopol during dredging, about 300 ceramic fragments belonging to different periods, ancient sepulchral monuments and votive reliefs were taken out. Although no archaeologist was present on the spot, information was collected that the materials were found “... while digging on the seabed at a depth of 3—3.5 m, or a total of 5—6 m”.

The first underwater archaeological explorations connected with the prehistoric settlements in the seawaters of Sozopol took place in 1986—1987. The reason for these excavations were the operations to make the port deeper and the building of the “New Fishermen’s Harbour”. These excavations revealed for the first time the existence of a Late Chalcolithic layer in Sozopol as well.

Two campaigns of regular underwater excavations were carried out in 1990 and 1993 with the aim of determining the stratigraphy of the settlements, dating and cultural identification, and clarifying their position in the ancient landscape. The explorations were concentrated in three sectors, provisionally referred to in some publications as “Sozopol 1” (squares H, D and G), “Sozopol 2” (squares A, B, C and E) and “Sozopol 3”.

The vertical and horizontal stratigraphy demonstrates the existence of two prehistoric settlements in the waters of the Sozopol harbour: one from the Late (final) Chalcolithic and another one from the Early Bronze Age. Their territories are in immediate proximity and slightly overlap in sector “Sozopol 2”. It has not been determined whether the EBA layer continued in sector “Sozopol 1” as well, where it was destroyed and removed when the harbour was deepened and cleaned several times in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

The explorations in 1990 and 1993 showed that the Late Chalcolithic settlement was located on a non-flooded (river) terrace, while the EBA settlement was on a terrace that was probably flooded or was wet, hence the EBA buildings were on wooden platforms.



The Late Chalcolithic settlement existed at the very end of the fifth and the beginning of the fourth millennium BC. On the basis of the ceramic finds it can be dated to the end of the Late Chalcolithic Age and the preceding period — to the Early Bronze Age.

The Late Chalcolithic settlement seems to have been destroyed by fire and submerged soon afterwards. The EBA settlement from Sozopol was built on wooden platforms due to the high ground waters. The settlement existed for about 150—200 years.

### **5. Ropotamo**

The first underwater archaeological finds in the sea bay opposite the estuary of the Ropotamo River emerged during dredging using the *Giant* floating crane in 1976, when the harbour was deepened in front of the so-called “Royal Quay” in order to secure the mooring of ships with draught of about 3 m. Finds from the Late Antiquity and Middle Ages came up during the work with *Giant*; part of them are kept today in the museums of Burgas and Varna. The rich collection of Late Roman red-burnished pottery stands out among them.

Several underwater archaeological explorations and excavations were undertaken in 1982—1989. The explorations were resumed in 2017 and continue to this day. A harbour from the historical periods was found in the bay opposite the estuary of the Ropotamo River. It ought to be associated during the Antiquity with the territory of Apollonia Pontica. At a depth of about 4.8 m below sea level an Early Bronze Age settlement dated to the late fourth—early third millennium BC was found. Explorations of Ropotamo revealed that the level of the sea during the existence of the settlement was about 5.8 m lower than the contemporary one.

### **6. Kiten (Urdoviza)**

The EBA settlement is located in the Southern Bay of the town of Kiten, southeast of Cape Urdoviza, and part of it lies under the breakwater of the harbour.

Bronze Age materials were found in the Kiten Bay during underwater archaeological surveys preceding the discovery of the settlement. The settlement was identified in 1986 during the excavations of a merchant ship from the Ottoman period. It was then that parts of the wooden structures of the buildings, EBA ceramic fragments, other artefacts and animal bones were found.

In 1986, drillings were made in four adjacent working squares, but a maximum depth of 2 m into the base was reached only in the point of contact of these squares, over an area of about 25 m<sup>2</sup>. The depth reached is 10 m from the sea surface, and the archaeological materials were found between the 8<sup>th</sup> and the 10<sup>th</sup> metre. A large number of vertically driven wooden posts were found, as well as separate horizontal beams. The upper part of the wooden posts reaches different levels: from the surface of the bottom to 1 m depth in the base. Some of the wooden posts are shaped in their upper part (there are traces of joints), which shows that this was their entire length. Their lower ends reach from 0.2 m to more than 2 m in the base. Their thickness is from 0.1 m to 0.4 m. The horizontal beams are at a depth of about 1 m into the base. A large amount of animal bones

has been found predominantly in the surface layer (0.1—0.4 m). A large amount of ceramic material has been gathered.

The drilling in 1987 is at a distance of about 40—60 m from the first one in west—southwest direction and coincides with the outline of today's quay and breakwater. Its area is ca. 425 m<sup>2</sup>, with only ca. 300 m<sup>2</sup> excavated. A depth of 5—6 m from the sea surface has been attained. The archaeological finds were discovered from the surface of the base to a depth of up to 2 m. 233 wooden posts with diameter from 0.1 to 0.4 m were found. They are both vertical and at different angles. The length of the wooden posts in depth has not been determined. The visible parts are 1, 2 and more metres long. Eleven horizontal beams have been found.

The third drilling in 1988 was to the north of the one from 1987. It covered an area of 125 m<sup>2</sup>, and the explorations were focused predominantly on 100 m<sup>2</sup>. The finds comprise 50 wooden posts, 5 antler axes-hammers, two halves of stone moulds for casting metal axes, a large quantity of ceramic material, both fragments and 20 whole vessels, a stylised female clay figurine, and animal bones.

The settlement was found to have been built on a slightly sloping terrain, the explored layers lying between 5—6 m and 9—10 m below the sea level.

In 1989, the explorations continued in the form of intensive rescue excavations preceding the construction of the quay wall of the yacht harbour. The excavations lasted 8 months and an area of 550 m<sup>2</sup> was exposed, thus bringing the total excavated area in Kiten—Urdoviza to 925 m<sup>2</sup>. Eight drillings were made, some reaching a maximum depth of 2.9 m into the ground, to determine the stratigraphy of the settlement.

Archaeological finds were identified in the first four strata. They are divided into two cultural horizons. The upper horizon, referred to as “Urdoviza 2”, contains materials from the Early Bronze Age, the Antiquity and the Middle Ages, accumulated during the existence of the Kiten Bay and its use as harbour and safe haven for the ships during storms. The lower part of that layer contains materials from the upper levels of the layer of the EBA settlement (the upper part of the wooden posts from the buildings), as well as sea sediments covering the settlements. This culture horizon is in stratigraphic layers 1, 2 and 3.

The analysis of the stratigraphic and taphonomic observations leads to the conclusion that the settlement was located on the land, close to the bed of the Karaagach River and at a distance of several hundred metres from the sea shore, when the ancient sea level was at least 8.5 m lower than the one today. All researchers date the ceramic finds from the site generally to the EBA. The absolute dating of the site was done using dendro-chronological and <sup>14</sup>C analyses in several different laboratories. Eight <sup>14</sup>C samples from Urdoviza were dated in a Berlin laboratory between 4180 and 4040 BC, calibrated between 2850 and 2600 BC (Görsdorf, Bojadziev 1996, 157—158). The dating of the laboratory from Heidelberg is similar: between 4210 and 4150 BC.

Similarly, 85 samples were taken from wooden posts in the settlement and used for creating a 285-year dendro-scale, which is currently one of the oldest in the Balkans for EBA.

According to the datings and the cultural characteristics, the settlement near Kiten was from the beginning of the second EBA phase for the Western Black Sea coast.

### **7. Stomoplo — Primorsko**

In 1922, while cleaning the Kachkata well in the Gerencheto locality in the northern part of the Stomoplo lagoon near the town of Primorsko, Burgas District (then Kyupriya village), the workers came across prehistoric archaeological finds at a depth of 9 m. It is possible to associate these finds with the sea level during the Late Neolithic Age. If this is so, Neolithic materials can be expected along the 10 m isobaths also elsewhere along the Bulgarian coast.

### **3. Problems of the cultural heritage within the MSPRB scope**

Several common problems emerged on the basis of the analysis of the current situation — existing status, declared category, existing regimes for protection, extent of research, CRW and socialisation — for specifically selected ICAs with categories of “global” and “national” significance falling within the territorial scope of the MSPRB. They will be formulated together, summarising the issues stemming from the state of each of the explored sites. However, there are also sites that are characterised with a specificity stemming from the concrete immovable cultural asset. The *Ancient City of Nesebar* is such an example: the only site with category “global significance” within the territorial scope of the MSPRB. For this reason, its problems will be defined separately.

#### **PROBLEMS OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL, ARCHITECTURAL AND URBAN PLANNING RESERVE ANCIENT CITY OF NESEBAR — WORLD CULTURAL HERITAGE SITE**

On the territory of the only site with category “global significance” on the Bulgarian Black Sea coast it is possible to systematise the following more tangible problems of the territory on connection with the protection and preservation of the cultural assets, their place in the contemporary life of the cultural asset, and their role for cultural tourism:

1. Fragmented state of the cultural heritage: ICAs that were once part of entire working systems (e.g., the ancient city or the churches with their liturgically differentiated spaces) are isolated today in their immediately adjacent environment. It should be pointed out that successful projects have been implemented on a part of the church buildings within the global cultural asset, connected with their conservation, restoration and socialisation of their adjacent spaces: the churches of St. John the Baptist, St. Spas, St. Paraskevi, St. John Aliturgetos and St. Stephen. The efforts of the Nesebar municipality and of various NGOs to implement the UNESCO recommendations and to protect the asset continue.
2. Need to conduct reconservation, new CRW and activities aimed at the socialisation of sites and areas of substantial importance for Nesebar’s value characteristics.

3. It is necessary to organise specific events for demonstrating and registering the global cultural heritage, e.g. to install suitable underwater artistic lighting of the registered sections of the submerged fortification walls of Nesebar, which would make them visible to all.

5. Inefficient display of the value characteristics unique for Nesebar

- - the characteristic silhouette that the city possessed,
- - the ancient elements (most of them underground or underwater),
- - the medieval churches, the structures from the Bulgarian National Revival period — all part of the town's living organism. In this way, they remain incomprehensible both to visitors and to the town's inhabitants,
- visual links between the town and the sea,
- the underwater cultural heritage in Nesebar which exists and is accessible even for direct visits (an extremely rare case) is not demonstrated to the public in any way,
- the links of Nesebar as a historical sea town are not shown.

6. Physical degradation of cultural assets, loss of valuable sites as a result of extensive development of tourism and the activities servicing it: street trade, public catering, parking, etc.

7. Existence of different chaotically emerging mass catering establishments and other structures that ignore the town's silhouette, especially in its northern, eastern and southern coastal areas.

8. Neglecting the opportunities offered by the cultural heritage for sustainable development of the *Ancient Nesebar*, e.g. providing incentives to productions that are specific for the place, cultural tourism that is adequate to the value characteristics, and other activities that would highlight the uniqueness of the world cultural asset and would turn it into a preferred destination.

9. Spoiling the landscape of Nesebar with the construction of large and unsuitable buildings and facilities.

- **SUMMARISED PROBLEMS OF THE IMMOVABLE CULTURAL ASSETS LOCATED WITHIN THE MSPRB TERRITORIAL SCOPE**

The general evaluation on the need for different activities of the cultural heritage can be systematised in three main groups that also outline the principal problems of the cultural heritage sites (predominantly ICAs) within the territorial scope of the MSPRB.

### **1. Problems of the immovable cultural assets**

#### **Problems of identification**

- According to Article 56 of the CHA, the identification of immovable cultural assets includes: search, research and preliminary evaluation. In view of the fact that for archaeological sites these activities are within the prerogatives of several institutions, very often the only measure

adopted for these sites is the preliminary evaluation and they do not acquire a status for a long time.

- Activities are needed for the identification of sites which — depending on the scientific and cultural sphere to which they belong — have a potential of being declared as “cultural routes” and “cultural landscapes”.
- Activities are needed for the identification of sites that are representatives of cultural heritage from the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. These are sites, predominantly hotels and resort complexes, which participate actively in the perception of the volume-spatial silhouette of the Bulgarian Black Sea coast.

### **Problems of exploration**

- A large part of the archaeological sites with category “national” significance need additional archaeological and historical explorations. However, the duration of these activities contributes to the degradation of the ICA sites. Architectural explorations are also needed for these sites; such explorations are neglected but they are an essential prerequisite for adequate subsequent CRW.
- There are protected territories —forests, nature parks, terrains owned by the Ministry of Defence and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs — located directly on the coastline or close to it, in which archaeological explorations are not allowed or, if such explorations have been made, CRW and socialisation activities for the site are inadmissible. In view of the strategic position of Bulgaria as an external border of both the EU and NATO, it is necessary to seek compromise solutions, on the analogy with countries like Greece and Italy that provide opportunities to explore and display the archaeological heritage in areas with special regime.

### **Problems of protection and preservation**

- Perception of the cultural heritage, and specifically of ICAs, as an obstacle for future development;
- Difficult or impossible actions for physical protection and preservation of ICAs falling within private farm lands, forest fund, nature parks or territories with a special regime;
- The fragmentary nature of the measures for ICA protection, in legal or physical terms — a problem that is valid for almost all archaeological sites;
- Absence of Protection and Management Plans (PMP) for most of the ICA sites;
- Applying only emergency conservation, which is not a sufficient and sustainable solution for the protection of the respective ICA site. Measures for socialisation of the site are rarely applied during emergency conservation, which leads to its neglecting;
- The attractiveness of seaside territories, especially those with ICAs, for investment interests that are particularly strong along the Black Sea coast.

### **2. Problems of ICA socialisation**

- Lack of interaction between the active cultural, educational and scientific policies at municipal, district and regional level, with the aim of ICA socialisation;

- Slow and difficult communication between the institutions and private individuals — parties to ICA protection;
- Impossible access to most of the ICA sites in the territory;
- Lack of activities connected with urban development of the area around the ICA sites;
- Lack of indication, educational and information elements about and in the ICA sites;
- The possibilities provided by modern information technologies for socialisation of the heritage are not used.

### **3. Problems of the existing infrastructure servicing cultural tourism**

- Lack of information system on ICAs, adequate to 21<sup>st</sup> century needs and requirements;
- Fragmentary information — educational, indicative and historical. Lack of a unified regional policy on informational linking of the ICA sites;
- Lack of museum infrastructure adequate to 21<sup>st</sup> century needs and requirements;
- Lack of polydisciplinary approach to the promoting of the heritage. The lack of links between the ICA sites and the tourist vacation services in the region is particularly sensitive.

### **4. Specific problems of cultural heritage sites under water**

Almost everything presented above in connection with the problems of ICAs is relevant to ICAs under water as well. The following additional problems also exist:

#### **Problems of identification**

A very small part of the MSPRB scope has been explored due to the specificity of the environment and to the need of conducting marine or coastal explorations. Cultural heritage sites under water require special search and identification.

Even the most modern research methods do not guarantee that all underwater cultural heritage sites have been identified in the explored areas. Many of them, even those in a very good physical state of preservation, remain totally hidden in sediments below the bottom.

Systematic exploration and mapping of the entire MSPRB area are extremely expensive and would hardly ever happen. Therefore, it is necessary to apply an approach of “targeted exploration” of areas with future investment interest.

It is necessary to ensure preliminary interaction with the investors through legislative measures.

If preliminary exploration is impossible, it is necessary to apply identification by monitoring of the implementation of the investment intention.

#### **Problems of exploration**

The identified sites of underwater cultural heritage need comprehensive exploration. So far that has been done for very few of the sites. The reasons for this are the lack of financial, human and technological resources.

Even the most modern research methods are not sufficient for exploring the sea cultural heritage. From that point of view, all sites whose exploration is not urgent need to be treated in a conservative manner and to be left to future researchers who would be armed with more technical means and knowledge.

### **Problems of protection and preservation**

Due to the fact that the explored part of the territory covered by the MSPRB is very small, many cultural heritage sites are unknown and it is not possible to apply adequate measures for their protection.

The underwater cultural heritage sites are perceived very often as obstacle for economic activities. Consequently, the underwater cultural heritage is destroyed.

The development of the marine research technologies gives access to a constantly increasing public to numerous sites that were considered to be protected by their inaccessibility just ten years ago. In closest perspective, this increases the danger of plundering and destroying of underwater cultural heritage sites.

There is no global consensus at the level of international treaties and conventions on the need of protecting the underwater cultural heritage. The legislation of a number of countries equates the underwater cultural heritage to salvage of property at sea. This leads to commercial use of the underwater cultural heritage.

### **Problems with ICA socialisation**

The socialisation of underwater cultural heritage, which could be a very strong factor for its protection, is much more difficult than the socialisation of cultural heritage on land. Irrespective of the approach chosen (direct visits, specialised museum collections and exhibitions, use of digital technologies), “bringing” society to the underwater cultural heritage remains a complicated technical task.

The socialisation of the underwater cultural heritage may prove to be destructive for it as a result of treasure hunting, direct impact or destruction of the environment of the underwater cultural heritage.

Several timid attempts were made in Bulgaria to socialise and exhibit the underwater cultural heritage in traditional museum settings.

Successful attempts were also made recently to apply digital technologies through virtual visits to deep-water shipwrecks in a 3D environment.

### **Problems of the existing infrastructure servicing cultural tourism**

The existing infrastructure is entirely inappropriate for the possibilities of presenting underwater cultural heritage.

Underwater cultural heritage is very rarely exhibited in the existing museums, moreover usually only with finds, without highlighting the specificity of that cultural heritage and its different nature.

- **TERRITORIES WITH ICAS AT RISK**

Fast seismic contemporary movements are characteristic of the coastal part of the Dobrudzha Plateau. They are manifested with magnitude IX intensity and seismic coefficient 0.27 in the area of Kaliakra and Shabla. There were several destructive earthquakes in that region. The activity is associated with the fault-block structure of the coastal part of the Moesian platform, with active and now differentiated tectonic movements. According to historical data, there were strong earthquakes in the region during the fifth millennium BC (earthquake traces were registered during the exploration of the Durankulak settlement mound), in 543 AD, 1444, 1858, 1891, 1901, 1902 and 1913.

These occurrences threaten directly the immovable cultural assets located in the coastal area to the north of Kavarna until the border between Bulgaria and Romania.

Moreover, that region is characterised with yet another risk factor: landslides. Landslide steps and collapsed terrain, which are typical phenomena in that part of the Bulgarian Black Sea coast, are characteristic formations of the relief. Limestone sediments and suffusion processes are contributing factors. The linear-block landslide Yaylata, located 1 km south of Kamen Bryag, is assumed to have been probably caused by rock earthquakes. It is 2 000 m long. Its maximum width is in the middle and in the southwestern part — 250 m. Three landslide steps, different in size and area, were formed within its scope.

Karst formations presupposing landslides exist in the highest plateau-like part of the territory in which the exclusion zone of the Yaylata Reserve is located. The smaller layers of the limestone sediments recede under the impact of the physical weathering, the vertical cracks become wider, resulting in collapse of bigger and smaller blocks.

**Factors increasing the risk for the underwater cultural heritage by a change in its environment**

The underwater cultural heritage is threatened by the consequences of the implementation of big infrastructural projects that change the environment. An example in that respect is the change in the levels of the Varna and Beloslav lakes after Canal 1 and Canal 2 were dug to link the lakes with the sea.

Building sea ports and different coastal facilities changes the balance of the sediments in the region, which may prove to be a threat to the actual underwater cultural heritage and to the possibilities for its exploration.

The pollution of the sea with organic and inorganic substances, and the penetration of invasive species, are also factors for the degradation of the environment in which the cultural heritage had been preserved so far.



#### 4. Museum network within the MSPRB territorial scope

##### ▪ NUMBER OF MUSEUMS AND MUSEUM COLLECTIONS ACCORDING TO THEIR LOCATION

The museums existing within the area examined by the cultural heritage part of the MSPRB will be classified in compliance with Article 26(2) of the CHA according to the territorial scope of their activities: national, regional and local museums.

1. **Shabla municipality** — the museum collection at the chitalishte in the town of Shabla;
2. **Kavarna municipality** — Hristo Gradachliev Art Gallery; History Museum — Kavarna;
3. **Balchik municipality** — History Museum of Balchik; Ethnographic Museum, Architectural-Park Complex *The Palace*;
4. **Varna municipality** — Regional History Museum of Varna, the National Museum of Military History (NMMH) — subsidiary *Vladislav Varnenchik* Park-Museum, NMMH — subsidiary Naval Museum, Ethnographic Museum, Museum of the National Revival Period, Museum of Medicine, Museum of Varna's Modern History, the Museum Home of Georgi Velchev, Varna Aquarium;
5. **Dolni Chiflik municipality** — Ethnographic Museum Collection;
6. **Avren municipality** — Ethnographic Museum Collection in the village of Zdravets;
7. **Byala municipality** — Municipal Cultural Institute–Museum in the town of Byala;
8. **Nesebar municipality** — *Ancient Nesebar* Archaeological Museum;
9. **Pomorie municipality** — History Museum with subsidiary Museum of Salt, *Dechko Stoev* City Art Gallery – Pomorie;
10. **Burgas municipality** — *Petko Zadgorski* Art Gallery, *Petya Dubarova* Museum Home, Regional History Museum, Natural History Museum, Ethnographic Museum;
11. **Sozopol municipality** — Museum Centre Municipal Cultural Institute;
12. **Primorsko municipality** — History Museum Primorsko;
13. **Tsarevo municipality** — Municipal History Museum Tsarevo, Museum Collection *Secrets from the Sea Bottom* – Kiten, private museum *History of Anchors* in Ahtopol.

##### Total for the MSPRB territorial scope:

- museums — 24
- art galleries — 3
- museum collections — 4
- private museums — 1

- **CONTEMPORARY TENDENCIES AND CURRENT STATE OF THE MUSEUM NETWORK**

The principal goal of museums is to maintain multilateral links: with unmovable cultural assets of various kinds, with intangible and tangible cultural heritage, with education, science and people. The museum institution currently plays a much bigger role than the role of a mediator between the historical environment and its visitors. Today museums spread knowledge, educate, inform and communicate with the visitors. Today this is done not only with classical artefacts and original exhibits, but also with the help of modern information technologies.

The cited tendencies find expression in a new territorial organisation of museum networks in connection with the settlement cultural assets. It is characterised with integration of groups of museums in comprehensive and complex museum centres, in the search for synergy in the joint action of museums with different specialisations in connection with the historical environment. The inner links and the communication between the different collections are sought, united by the logic of the cultural-historical and artistic processes.

The ways in which the exhibits are presented are constantly reinterpreted, with the ever more active participation of modern multimedia and interactive technologies, with development of educational and information functions, including on the Internet, and with the use of platforms and applications offering a virtual tour around the museums, etc.

New forms of overcoming the narrow institutional specialisation of the museums are sought, the circle of museum friends becomes wider, sponsors are attracted, financing is secured by developing auxiliary activities, etc. The role of museums for managing the activities for protection of the immovable cultural heritage is highlighted.

- **PROBLEMS OF THE MUSEUM INFRASTRUCTURE**

The museum activities along the entire Black Sea coastal area of Bulgaria within the MSPRB territorial scope have a long history connected with the evolution of the archaeological work and with the conservation theory and practice since the beginning of the last century. This contributes to the fact that the cultural-historical resource of that territory has been identified to a great extent. The historical stratification with its authenticity has been preserved and manifested in general.

However, parallel with these achievements, a certain problem situation exists in the current state of the museum network, which is characterised with the following:

- Lack of comprehensive modern concepts on integrated museum complexes based on the inner links between the museum collections. In 80 % of the museum sites (here the museums in Tsarevo and Primorsko create a good impression) the exhibitions or collections are incompatible in terms of displaying with the contemporary requirements of consumers and do not correspond to the value of the exhibited artefact or to the global trends in that field.
- Sites exist that have been identified as ICAs with unique value (e.g. Durankulak, Yaylata, Begliktash) at both regional and global level. They are neglected and no investments are made

in their potential as open-air museums, on the one hand, and on the other — as an opportunity to build interactive museums or interpretation centres that would enrich further and would present the immovable cultural asset in its entirety.

- Neglect and lack of understanding of the “new” interactive museums continue, although they would be appropriate and adequate to the modern requirements, especially in the coastal area.
- The territory is characterised with its relatively scattered structure of the museum network with its existing 14 historical and archaeological museums, and one historical museum collection. On the other hand, there is duplication between the exhibitions in many museums. This encourages fragmented thinking in the development of the different museum sites.
- Most museums lack links between movable and immovable cultural heritage. In this respect the Bulgarian practice is very far from the indicated contemporary trends.
- Most museums lack an attitude to the children’s audience and their exhibitions are not adapted to the perceptions of children.
- Most museums lack accessible environment, especially for the visually impaired.
- There are museums that have no buildings of their own. There is untapped potential for developing the museum network. Parallel with the growing need of new exhibition areas and depositories, certain possibilities for spatial development of the museum network remain unutilised, e.g. disintegrating and/or unused buildings from the recent past.
- The archaeological heritage and individual archaeological immovable cultural assets are compromised under the pressure of investment and commercial interests.
- Orientation of the public in the complex regional and settlement archaeological structure is lacking.
- Lack of adequate forms of management. Lack of ideas for creating mixed state-municipal forms of management, which would rationalise both the utilisation of state facilities for that purpose, and the development of the actual museums. Public-private partnership and entirely private museums are not encouraged. Only one private museum exists on the territory under consideration.
- There is a shortage of strategic and systematic thinking about the development of the museum network in its entirety in the context of the immovable and especially the archaeological cultural heritage on the territory of the Bulgarian Black Sea coast.

## 5. Summarised Conclusions

The brief analysis of the rich cultural heritage along the Bulgarian Black Sea coast and in the adjacent water areas makes it possible to systematise the following more important activities necessary and specific in the field of the protection and preservation of cultural heritage in the MSPRB territorial scope:

- Identification, valorisation and adequate protection at local, national and international levels;
- Integral strategy for protection, exhibiting and sustainable development of immovable cultural assets in their entirety for the purposes of cultural tourism along the Black Sea coast of the Republic of Bulgaria;
- Identification, study and integration of the immovable cultural heritage sites under water with those on land;
- Striving to present the immovable cultural assets along the Black Sea coast as an overall cultural-tourist product, with opportunities for including contemporary creative activities and for integration with useful public cultural functions;
- Perception of the cultural assets as part of the common European heritage and manifestation of the geo-cultural potential of the heritage;
- Ensuring sustainable territorial protection of the existing ICAs by elaborating Protection and Management Plans (Article 78(4) and Article 81(4)(1), (2), (3) of the CHA) of all sites with category “national” significance which are defined as group ICAs depending on their spatial structure and territorial scope;
- Applying measures adequate for the 21<sup>st</sup> century for protecting the immovable cultural assets during their conservation, adaptation and socialisation. Applying the principles of integrated conservation;
- Updating the areas subject to security regime (predominantly areas under the supervision of the Ministry of Defence and the Ministry of Interior) with a view to providing a possibility to explore, adapt and socialise the immovable cultural heritage sites. Searching for and finding compromise options for reconciling the restrictive requirements of protected areas and providing access to heritage, following the example of other European countries whose territory is the EU’s external maritime border;
- Taking into consideration the relatively dynamic nature of archaeological sites, conditioned by the need of future archaeological discoveries, or for comprehensive exploration of the finds;
- Updating of the register of the immovable cultural assets along the entire Black Sea coast. Conducting an audit of the endangered ICA sites;
- Identifying and declaring in accordance with the CHA heritage sites from the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, as well as monumental sites;
- Identifying the cultural landscapes and cultural routes (within the meaning of Article 47(6) and (9) of the CHA) along the Black Sea coast of the Republic of Bulgaria, and their integration in spatial plans and documentation;

## VOLUME 10. PROTECTION OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE

- Elaboration of planning documentation for identified environmentally valuable units and chains of cultural landscape, and their integration with the immovable cultural heritage;
- Integration of the cultural assets along the Black Sea coast of Bulgaria with the resource of historical settlements and important cultural sites in the region of North-eastern and South-eastern Bulgaria, as well as with the seacoast of North-eastern Greece, South-eastern Romania and Turkey;
- Activating the potential of the municipal administrations for drafting investment projects and for participation in suitable programmes for protection of the inherent tangible and intangible heritage in their territories;
- Undertaking steps for registration of underwater cultural heritage sites specific for the Black Sea in the indicative list and in the UNESCO World Heritage List under the 1972 UNESCO Convention;
- Sustainable protection and preservation of the only ICA with category of “global” significance in the MSPRB territorial scope: *Ancient City of Nesebar* and its exclusion zone;
- Implementation of the measures included in the Plan for Protection and Preservation of the ICA *Ancient City of Nesebar*;
- Providing adequate protection measures for all separate sites identified as ICAs, irrespective of their category, and falling within the territory of the ICA *Ancient City of Nesebar* and its exclusion zone;
- Summarising all data and information connected with the immovable cultural assets within the MSPRB spatial scope in one place in a GIS platform.

**SOURCES OF INFORMATION:**

Cultural Heritage Act, published in SG No 44 of 13 May 2020

ICOMOS, International Charter on the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas

ICOMOS, Charter on Cultural Routes

ICOMOS, Cultural Tourism Charter

Information provided by the Ministry of Culture/National Institute of Immovable Cultural Heritage

Convention for the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage of Europe (La Valetta, 1992)

European Landscape Convention (Florence, 2000)

UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003)

UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage (2001)

UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, with the guidelines to it (1972)

Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe, Council of Europe (Granada, 1985)

Ministry of Culture, <http://mc.government.bg/>

National Institute of Immovable Cultural Heritage, <http://ninkn.bg/>