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Summary. This study examines the ways how cultural heritage can be reconstructed from the effects of armed conflicts, in Ukraine and beyond (case of Warszawa). It includes a review of important the international law, architectural and cultural frameworks. The Warsaw's experience in reconstruction is analyzed, which bold technological solutions were used in the reconstruction of cultural objects. This study provides a contextual background to assess how to create an efficient Reconstruction Project Management Office.
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Introduction. Cultural heritage is a significant factor in the “Life Space”, connecting link in memory and reproduction of cultural existence. Tangible heritage includes heritage sites, built monuments and objects of archaeological, historical, religious, cultural or aesthetic value. The objects of cultural heritage are also significant and connecting symbolic, architectural and spatial links of urban landscapes. The urban heritage is defined as a historical layering of cultural values that have been produced through the continuity of cultures and the accumulation of traditions [7]. The Russian invasion of Ukraine caused numerous destroy the built environment and cultural heritage objects. The Ukrainian cities suffer from large-scale destruction and damaged heritage sites visualize of an armed conflict. Therefore, urban communities faced new challenges, namely the need to implement numerous reconstruction projects, and not only critical infrastructure, but also cultural heritage sites.

The destruction of infrastructure and the built environment is the most visible impact. Amongst the ruins it is often clear that buildings or monuments that represent particular religious, historical, or ideological traditions have been both indiscriminately and deliberately targeted [4]. UNESCO has already confirmed the destruction or damage of 260 objects of cultural heritage of Ukraine, including buildings of museum-reserve complexes, cultural centres, theatres and libraries [11]. Currently, UNESCO is developing, with its partner organizations, a mechanism for independent coordinated assessment of data in Ukraine, including satellite image analysis, in line with provisions of the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict. The term “cultural property” refers
to immovable cultural property as defined under Article 1 of the 1954 Hague Convention, irrespective of its origin, ownership or status of registration in the national inventory, and facilities and monuments dedicated to culture, including memorials.

The management of the reconstruction of the historical and architectural heritage is one of the most urgent problems in the urban sector of Ukraine. According to International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property, cultural heritage must be recognized as a crucial element of the recovery process immediately following the end of an armed conflict, and not be considered a luxury to await attention later [4]. According to Research for CULT Committee of the European Parliament, there are problems in the management of cultural heritage reconstruction projects in Ukraine. In particular, many actors are involved and competences are not always clearly defined. At the same time, it is not clear to what extent the Ukrainian authorities can coordinate the ongoing efforts. Consequently, coordination (internationally and on-the-ground) is complex. This concerns coordination among international cultural organizations, national actors and the Ukrainian authorities, as well as coordination among the cultural heritage sector and other actors on-the-ground. The lack of formal coordination mechanisms leads to a serious lack of clarity in roles and capacities, as well as transparency and accountability within the heritage sector [5]. In such a situation, it is important to analyze the relevant managerial experience regarding the effective management of the post-war urban reconstruction projects of cultural heritage objects.

Main section. The problem of the reconstruction, revalorisation and protection of Ukrainian monuments exposed to destruction as a result of warfare is multifaceted and multidimensional. Firstly, a technological problem is highlighted: is there and opportunity to rebuild the destroyed object or not. For example, complex discussions between urban planners and the city community are taking place around the symbolic object on Freedom Square in Kharkiv, when a special commission for monitoring the building concluded that it should be demolished, and restorers insist on the possibility of preserving this cultural object. It is noteworthy that the townspeople support the architects-restorers. This situation demonstrates that the reconstruction projects of cultural heritage objects should be carried out at a higher level of interaction with all stakeholders. That is why it is advisable to study such best practices and making balanced decisions.

The Warsaw post-war reconstruction experience is notable. During the WWII, more than 85% of Warsaw's historic center was destroyed by Nazi troops. After the war, a five-year reconstruction campaign resulted in today's meticulous restoration of the Old Town, with its churches, palaces and market-place. It is an outstanding example of a near-total reconstruction of a span of history covering the XIII to the XX century. The reconstruction included the holistic recreation of the urban plan, together with the Old Town Market, townhouses, the circuit of the city walls, the Royal Castle, and important religious buildings. In general, the reconstruction of the entire historical complex of the Old Town according to the volume-spatial scheme of the XVII-XVIII centuries had no precedents in the history of Europe [6]. The post-war reconstruction of Warsaw was recognized as a world heritage site (1980) according to the following criteria: as unique and influential European experience, and
criterion, as an exceptional example of the comprehensive reconstruction.

Management issues must take into account the values and wishes of all stakeholders connected with the area. The principal management tools can be the Management Plan and the integrated spatial planning system, based on an agreed Local Spatial Development Plan. Outlining a buffer zone of significant value in terms of historical monuments protected on the basis of the city's spatial planning documents makes it possible to control the impact of the surroundings on this Cultural Heritage property.

It’s also important that the reconstruction must based on complete documentation without reliance on conjecture. In the case of Warsaw, the medieval city was rebuilt it on the basis of available documentation. The reconstruction projects were followed guiding principle: to use reliable archival documents where available, including of detailed iconographic and documentary historical records from the historic city's late 18th-century appearance. The reconstruction project utilized any extant, undamaged structures built between the 14th and 18th centuries, together with the late-medieval network of streets, squares, and the main market square, as well as the circuit of city walls. Additionally, conservation inventories were compiled before 1939 and after 1944 (the Archive of the Warsaw Reconstruction Office, housing documentation of both the post-war damage and the reconstruction projects, was inscribed in the UNESCO [2].

The Archive of the Warsaw Reconstruction Office (“BOS Archive”), housing documentation of both the post-war damage and the reconstruction projects, was inscribed in the UNESCO Memory of the World Register. “BOS Archive” encompasses a collection of documents depicting the reconstruction of Warsaw and the destruction of the city in the period of World War II (1939-1945), as a result of warfare in 1939, during the Ghetto Uprising in spring 1943, and Warsaw Rising in August-September 1944, as well as the intentional burning and demolition of the city by special forces of the German army in the period of October-December 1944. The “BOS Archive” comprises the following archival collections: Warsaw Reconstruction Office, Directorate for the Reconstruction of Warsaw and Department of Historical Architecture of the Warsaw Reconstruction Office and the Conservator Office for the Capital City of Warsaw. They contain documents produced in the years 1945-1953 and taken over from the occupation period (inventories performed by Polish architects and documents from German offices), as a result of the operation of the Warsaw Reconstruction [8].

Documents accumulated in the archive illustrate the recording of war damage from the years 1939-1945 carried out in May 1945. They provide a specification of the condition of survived buildings, the concept of historic complexes rebuilding, the documentation of designing and investment works relating to monuments restoration. These documents illustrate the works of clearing Warsaw of rubble in 1945, and then the history of the city reconstruction, in particular the recreation of its historical core in the shape developed in a period of 250 years. The Archive includes also documents testifying to the Nazi plans aiming at building a city inhabited exclusively by Germans, and supposed to be erected in place of the demolished district of the Old Town [10].

Indeed, the reconstruction was to be conducted on the grounds of the possibly
most profound historical knowledge and architectural research. The theory, however, mismatched the actual praxis, since a faithful reconstruction was successful only with respect to scarce historic facilities (similarly as in Germany and many other countries). Essentially, the reconstructed buildings were modified in order to cater to contemporary needs. What, however, distinguished the reconstruction process of large historic complexes in Poland, was the large-scale operation, undertaken seemingly with high precision and faithfulness to the past, yet in practice often consciously introducing modernizing and creative elements, which actually replaced the replicating of the past forms even if there existed reliable records testifying to the genuine lost ones [12].

The reconstruction project management scheme remains, on the one hand, traditional, as for any construction project, and to a greater extent oriented to the technical management of project implementation, and on the other hand, to the relevant international requirements. It should be noted that the conceptual principles of cultural heritage architectural rebuilding were outlined during the 20th century. In particular, the principles guiding the preservation and restoration of ancient buildings should be agreed and be laid down on an international basis, with each country being responsible for applying the plan within the framework of its own culture and traditions. The Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments (1931) proposes the idea of a common world heritage, the importance of the setting of monuments, and the principle of the integration of new materials. According to the Venice Charter (1964) for the conservation and restoration of monuments and sites, the conservation and restoration of monuments must have recourse to all the sciences and techniques which can contribute to the study and safeguarding of the architectural heritage. Beginning with the World Heritage Convention (1972), some of the limited explanations in the Venice Charter were revised. The understanding of cultural heritage, which was expressed as historic monuments, was categorized as monuments, groups of buildings and sites. Later on, The Nara Document on Authenticity (1992) carried out the responsibility to clarify the authenticity. It is representing modernist views opposed to reconstruction. The subsequent interpretations have attracted criticism, especially by the followers the idea of a living architectural tradition. As a result, many now believe that visual harmony, aesthetic balance and the essential character of a place are of greater importance than abstract Modernist theories. Because of concern over the damage being to historic settings by the Venice Charter's misapplication, another conference was held in Venice under the auspices of INTBAU (the International Network for Traditional Building, Architecture & Urbanism). Its principal objective was to provide a theoretical framework that would enable new buildings and additions to be in greater harmony with their historic surroundings. The Charleston Charter (2005) is providing preferred guidelines for dealing with historic areas. It states that new construction in historic settings, including alterations and additions to existing buildings, should not arbitrarily impose contrasting materials, scales, or design vocabularies, but clarify and extend the character of the place, seeking always continuity and wholeness in the built environment [6]. According to the terms of Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) principles, the historic centers are considered as living organisms that must focus on such elements as the site's morphology,
geomorphology, and built environment features, historic or contemporary; its open spaces and gardens; its spatial organization, and the cultural value of the built environment [7].

The important event was the international conference in 2018 in Warsaw that was to summarize previous discussions and experiences regarding the recovery and reconstruction of UNESCO World Heritage sites and attempt to develop the most appropriate, universal guidelines for moving forward with properties of exceptional value at the time of destruction. The conference entitled “The challenges of World Heritage recovery. International conference on reconstruction” was noted: “Prior to taking any decision on a proposal for recovery and reconstruction of a heritage place, it is essential to understand the values identified in the heritage property by local communities, including new values resulting from the traumatic events associated with the destruction, together with the corresponding physical attributes and related intangible cultural practices and traditional knowledge” [10].

The management issues take into account that reconstruction of the historic center must be identical with the original and symbolize the will to ensure the survival of urban cultural landscape as a whole. The reconstruction projects must seek to reflect a cultural practice that sustains cultural value. For example, the House of Folk Art (Dom Sztuki Ludowej) was designated as the central object of Warsaw’s Old Town Square. It was from the balcony of this building that the President of the Polish People’s Republic, Boleslav Berut, opened the reconstructed Old Town on July 22, 1953 [9]. In the architectural and spatial context, this building enriches the cultural space of the city. In addition, the House of Folk Art gives an artistic meaning to cultural urban practices, because it is a “treasury of Polish folklore” and at the same time acts as a cultural subject of festive and ritual practices and ethno-festivals of the city.

An important issue of value management is the restoration of the architectural image of the city, in particular, which cultural layer, because the architectural landscape is imagined as a certain palimpsest. Urban heritage is defined as a historical layering of cultural values that were produced through the succession of cultures and the accumulation of traditions. For example, in Warsaw, the central part of the city was restored according to the following historical and architectural logic. High tenement houses from the late nineteenth century were replaced with pastiches of late Baroque or Neo-Classicist architecture, while the edifices that had been remodeled several times were puristically restored to their genuine form, complying with the attempt to achieve a harmonious landscape of an ideal town from the time of Poland’s last King Stanislaus Augustus Poniatowski [8]. The ideas behind the reconstruction of the capital’s monuments carried out, under the socialist regime, included reconstruction in the spirit of the heyday of a monument, respect for relics and the anticipation of space needed for modern art. It is also important that the Historic Centre of Warsaw has fully retained its authenticity as a finished concept of post-war reconstruction.

In reconstruction projects of cultural heritage objects, the project team must work in a single system, with single forms, rules and standards. In the case of Warsaw, the Warsaw Reconstruction Office (Biuro Odbudowy Stolicy, BOS) was established. Office has established with the aim to elaborate an urban concept for Warsaw city.
rebuilding and its implementation, in particular the reconstruction of the Old Town in Warsaw. BOS included 1,500 people and functioned from 1945 to 1951. The institution underwent several reorganizations within a period of 6 years: some departments were separated from it, new units were created or other institutions established (e.g. Directorate for the Reconstruction of Warsaw), closely cooperating for a common cause. It was unique in many ways. It was a “super-institution” that had all kinds of responsibilities, from removing rubble to urban planning and charting the city's development over the following 50 years.

Such a successful experience of the BOS is also important for the creation of the Reconstruction Project Management Office (RPMO) in the conditions of the post-war reconstruction of Ukraine (Figure). According to international standards of project management, the RPMO should be formed taking into account the functional and role specifics of the project activity [3].

![Conceptual diagram of the organization of the RPMO](image-url)
Where traditional techniques prove inadequate, the consolidation of a monument can be achieved by the use of any modern technique for conservation and construction, the efficacy of which has been shown by scientific data and proved by experience. Replacements of missing parts must integrate harmoniously with the whole, but at the same time must be distinguishable from the original so that restoration does not falsify the artistic or historic evidence. Additions cannot be allowed except in so far as they do not detract from the interesting parts of the building, its traditional setting, the balance of its composition and its relation with its surroundings.

However, it should be noted that museums are a challenging building type with diverse programming, from preserving and displaying collections to providing and maintaining visitor facilities, each with its own climatic requirements. The complexities involved in building or renovating a museum, combined with undertaking a sustainable design certification effort, can be daunting for someone unfamiliar with the process. To ensure that preservation concerns are integrated into the design, conservators must both understand the process and be an effective part of it. That is why such construction projects should be carried out at a higher level of sustainability of all organizational, management and production processes.

In such a situation, a technological problem is highlighted: is there and opportunity to rebuild the destroyed object or not, and if so, is it possible to apply green building technologies. Because of this, issues regarding the conceptual rethinking of architectural and spatial solutions, building production processes through the prism of modern requirements for energy saving and environmental friendliness become more acute.

In particular, the issue of restoration of these cultural buildings with the application of the requirements for a “green museum” is relevant. A green museum is a museum that incorporates concepts of sustainability into its operations, programming, and facility. As a general rule, green museums reside in a building featuring sustainable architecture and technology. Museums implementation of sustainable practices in building or altering facilities are carry out such that they are sustainable. This includes using LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) building practices.

The specifics of the production of the construction “product”, its resource intensity, also require more extensive work with the environment of the construction project. The sustainability orientation of the construction project must be represented in the processes, tools, and project actions throughout the entire life cycle. That is why project planning is considered as a significant factor contributing to the successful implementation of projects. It is proposed to evaluate the level of implementation of the planning function in terms of "maturity" of project management, its ability to apply the necessary tools and methods to reduce uncertainty. It is argued that mature planning makes project goals more specific and understandable to the project team. From a sustainability perspective, mature planning is seen as a basis for tracking actual progress.

The PMBOK (Project Management Body of Knowledge) project management standard takes into account the project objectives, directly related to the sustainability of the so-called “project triangle according to PMBOK”: time, cost, scope
and quality. The sustainable development goals can be achieved by “embedding” sustainable development issues at different levels of the hierarchy of project plans, by “simple implementation of the plan” and “monitoring on a monthly/weekly basis” [1].

Further development of the research requires expanding the structure of the corresponding indicators. In particular, it is important to focus on such LEED indicators as integrative process, location and transportation, sustainable sites, water efficiency, energy and atmosphere, material and resources, indoor environmental quality, regional priority credits, innovation [12]. The LEED Scorecard at the “Material and Resources” level includes the following sub-indicators: storage and collection of recyclables, construction and demolition waste management planning, building life-cycle impact reduction, building product disclosure and optimization.

**Conclusions.** The cultural heritage is an integral and essential component of a holistic approach to postwar reconstruction. The problem of the reconstruction, revalorisation and protection of Ukrainian monuments exposed to destruction as a result of warfare and Russia’s invasion of Ukraine was analyzed. The ways how cultural heritage can be reconstructed from the effects of armed conflicts, in Ukraine and beyond (case of Warszawa) examined. It includes a review of important the international law, architacturel and cultural frameworks. The Warsaw's experience in reconstruction is analyzed, which bold technological solutions were used in the reconstruction of cultural objects. The contextual background to assess how to create an efficient the Reconstruction Project Management Office (RPMO) provided. The role of the RPMO for cultural heritage objects in the integration management system of urban reconstruction programs is outlined. Proposed “content inserts” of the basic model of the project office Proposed concept of management office organization for accumulation of organizational and technical capabilities of reconstruction participants and ensuring system management of reconstruction projects of cultural heritage objects.
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