

1) Title: Development of unique Narva-Ivangorod fortresses ensemble as a single cultural and tourist object

2) Country, region: Estonia, North-East Estonia

3) Name of the organization which implemented the project: Narva City Government, Department for City Development and Economy

4) Total size of the project in EUR: 6 871 455, 00

5) Amount of EU funding: 6 184 309 (90%), including Estonian State budget co-financing to the Est-Lat-Rus Programme 1 836 487. (Project partners own financing 687 146 EUR – 10%).

6) Name of the EU fund that supported the project: Estonia-Latvia-Russia cross border cooperation Programme within European Neighborhood and Partnership instrument 2007-2013

7) Name of the Operational Program: Estonia-Russia Programme

8) Short description of the project, aims, targets, project activities: At the Estonian – Russian border there is a unique ensemble of two fortresses of great cultural and historical value. Their historical and cultural potential is not used in full; moreover the fortresses are dilapidated. The overall objective of the project was to increase the competitiveness of the cross-border region through development of the unique Narva-Ivangorod trans-border fortresses ensemble as a single cultural and tourist object. The sub-objectives of the project were:

- Conservation and reconstruction of Narva-Ivangorod fortifications (Narva Victoria bastion and Ivangorod fortress Small Powder Granary)
- Development of necessary tourism infrastructure
- Improvement of quality and accessibility of tourist information
- Expanding cross-border cooperation.

9) Estimated impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services.

Why you think that it is a positive or negative example in the light of the biodiversity proofing paper?

Narva Victoria fortification and the surrounding park are important bat habitats. They are under nature protection due to overwintering of the bats in the walls of fortifications. As the Environmental Impact Assessment brought out that inventory of bats has to be carried out before the building activity starts the project leader organized the inventory works. But after the inventory was carried out the building activities were started as planned and no recommendations from the inventory were taken account. The building works took place during the bats wintering time and many bats were frozen to death or sealed alive into the walls, the important holes in the walls were closed during the reconstruction and lightening of the corridors was foreseen with no exemption to bat habitats.

10) How did project leaders, authorities, NGOs or other stakeholders try to avoid harmful impacts, if the project had any?

How did stakeholders tried to multiply positive impacts, if project had any?

The project team did not take into account the assessments that they had asked from the experts and it ended up with dead bats in the protection area. Only after media published the environmental NGOs concerns about harmful activities the construction works were temporarily stopped. After many meetings the project leader did not make changes into the project plan nor reported the

measures taken. The environmental inspection has started a criminal proceeding but as the final report is not published there is still no clear picture how did the leader try to avoid the impacts.

11) Author of the case study, name of the CEEWEB member, email, phone number: Silvia Lotman&Elin Soomets, Estonian Fund for Nature, silvia@elfond.ee, +3725262013

12) Annex - Attach any relevant materials (web links, photos, references, etc.):

Project portfolio: http://www.estlatrus.eu/uploaded_files/project_files/Portfolio_LSP_6.pdf

The media news about stopping the construction works because of bats:

<http://uudised.err.ee/v/eesti/c253b067-9a90-48fb-a891-a5c8621dace4>

Estonian Fund for Nature position in news related to the construction:

<http://www.postimees.ee/2745560/elf-narva-bastioni-renoveerimistoodel-hukkusid-kaitsealused-nahkhiired>