

Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article

**Kültürel Miras Alan Yönetimi ve Yönetim Planı: İshak Paşa Sarayı
Örneği***Cultural Heritage Site Management and Management Plan: The Case of İshak
Pasha Palace*Şehnaz ERASLAN¹DOI : [10.63556/ankad.v10i2.372](https://doi.org/10.63556/ankad.v10i2.372)

Geliş/Received: 05/11/2025

Kabul/Accepted: 09/04/2026

Öz

Doğu Anadolu'nun önde gelen anıt yapılarından biri olan İshak Paşa Sarayı, Osmanlı, Selçuklu, İran, Barok ve Rokoko mimari geleneklerinin yerel etkilerle zenginleşmiş dikkat çekici bir sentezini temsil etmektedir. Tarihi İpek Yolu üzerinde, Ağrı'nın Doğubayazıt ilçesinde stratejik bir konumda yer alan saray kompleksi, bîderun (dış avlu) ve enderûn (iç avlu) etrafında düzenlenmiş üç ana bölümden oluşmaktadır. Yapı; cami, türbe, selamlık (kabul salonu), divan (meclis salonu), harem, nöbetçi odaları, zindan, mutfak, çeşme ve hamam gibi çeşitli işlevsel birimleri bünyesinde barındırmaktadır.

Saray, Osmanlı-Rus savaşları sırasında ağır hasar görmüştür. 20. yüzyılda Eski Beyazıt yerleşiminin günümüzde "istasyon bölgesi" olarak bilinen alana taşınmasının ardından saray terk edilmiş, taşlarının bir kısmı spolia (ikinci kullanım malzemesi) olarak değerlendirilmiştir. 20. yüzyılın başlarında başlayan restorasyon çalışmaları, ilk belgeleme girişimlerinden günümüzde devam eden kapsamlı koruma programlarına kadar uzanan bir süreç izlemiştir. 2000 yılında saray, "Üstün Evrensel Değeri" tanınarak UNESCO Dünya Mirası Geçici Listesi'ne alınmıştır.

Tarihi ve mimari önemine karşın İshak Paşa Sarayı halen resmi bir alan yönetim planına sahip değildir. Bu durum, hem yapının fiziksel bütünlüğünü hem de çevresindeki arkeolojik ve peyzaj unsurlarını risk altında bırakmaktadır. Bu çalışma, UNESCO sistemi çerçevesinde alan yönetiminin kuramsal temellerini incelemekte; sarayın tarihsel gelişimi ile restorasyon sürecini değerlendirmekte ve bütüncül bir yönetim planının yokluğundan kaynaklanan sorunları analiz etmektedir. Belirlenen temel sorunlar arasında yapısal, çevresel etkiler, ziyaretçi yönetimi, taşıma kapasitesi, sürdürülebilir turizm, risk ve afet hazırlığı, eğitim ve yorumlama stratejileri ile sınırlı yerel toplum katılımı yer almaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İshak Paşa Sarayı, Miras, Alan Yönetimi, Yönetim Planı

Abstract

The İshak Pasha Palace, a prominent monument in Eastern Anatolia, represents a unique synthesis of Ottoman, Seljuk, Iranian, Baroque, and Rococo architectural traditions, enriched by local influences. Strategically located along the historical Silk Road in Doğubayazıt (Ağrı), the complex is organized into three main sections centered around a bîderun (outer courtyard) and an enderûn (inner courtyard). It comprises diverse functional units, including a mosque, tomb, selamlık (public reception hall), divan (council hall), harem, guard rooms, dungeon, kitchen, and hammam.

The palace sustained significant damage during the Ottoman-Russian wars. Following the relocation of the Old Bayezid settlement to the present-day site, known as the station area, in the twentieth century, the palace was abandoned, and its stones were repurposed as spolia. Restoration efforts, initiated in the twentieth century, have progressed from initial documentation to ongoing comprehensive conservation projects. In 2000, the palace was inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage Tentative List, recognizing its outstanding universal value.

¹**Sorumlu Yazar/Corresponding Author**, Assoc. Prof. Dr., Ağrı İbrahim Çeçen University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Department of History. e-mail: seraslan@agri.edu.tr

Önerilen Atıf/Suggestion Citation

Eraslan, Ş., (2026). Kültürel Miras Alan Yönetimi ve Yönetim Planı: İshak Paşa Sarayı Örneği, *Anadolu Kültürel Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 10(2), 1134-1150.

Despite its significance, Ishak Pasha Palace currently lacks a formal site management plan, leaving both its physical fabric and surrounding archaeological and landscape elements at risk. This study examines the theoretical framework of site management under the UNESCO system, reviews the palace's historical development and restoration efforts, and analyzes challenges stemming from the absence of a management plan. Key issues identified include structural vulnerability, environmental pressures, visitor management, carrying capacity, sustainable tourism, emergency preparedness, education and awareness programs, and limited local community engagement.

Key Words: *Ishak Pasha Palace, Heritage, Cultural Site Management, Management Plan*

1. INTRODUCTION

The Ishak Pasha Palace represents one of the earliest and most distinctive examples of Ottoman palace architecture in the eastern regions of the empire. The palace is strategically located along the historic Silk Road in Ağrı Province's Doğubayazıt district, Eastern Anatolia. Its architecture uniquely blends Ottoman, Seljuk, Baroque, Rococo, Iranian, and local styles. Following Ottoman palace tradition, the complex is organized around two main courtyards: the outer courtyard (bîderûn) and the inner courtyard (enderûn) (Akok, 1961: 32; Bingöl, 1998: 69) (Fig.1). The construction date of the palace is recorded on the inscription above the crown gate of the harem section as AH 1199 / 1784 CE. The same inscription indicates that the building was commissioned by Ishak Pasha (Akok, 1961: 30; Ünsel, 1965: 4; Arseven, 1970:138; Gündoğdu, 1991:13; Yurttaş, 2004:261; Bingöl, 2008:31; Çetin, 2017:718). However, the overall condition of the palace, along with the stylistic diversity of its portals and stone decorations, suggests that construction extended over a prolonged period. Research suggests that construction began under Çolak Abdi Pasha, who was the sanjakbey of Bayezid during Murad IV's reign. The project continued through the terms of Abdülfettah Efendi (d. 1711) and Mahmut Pasha (d. 1767), and was finally completed by Ishak Pasha II (Gündoğdu, 1986:13).

Covering approximately 7,600 square meters, the palace comprises a mosque, tomb, selamlık (public reception hall), divanhane (council hall), harem, guard rooms, dungeon, kitchen, fountain and hamam (Akok, 1961:32-34). These multifunctional components illustrate the integration of administrative, religious, social, and private life, reflecting Ottoman urban planning principles and a regional reinterpretation of the hierarchical layout of Topkapı Palace, adapted to local conditions (Gündoğdu, 1985:39). Architectural elements such as the crown gate, muqarnas, mihrab, and the mosque's double-walled stone dome demonstrate a clear continuity from the Seljuk to the Ottoman period, reflecting the transmission, adaptation, and reinterpretation of Seljuk architectural traditions within the evolving Ottoman aesthetic (Çetin & Yeni, 2017:721).

The decorative program of the palace integrates Baroque and Rococo elements, which emerged in Ottoman architecture during the eighteenth-century Westernization period. It features curving branches, acanthus leaves, palmettes, grape clusters, and stylized floral motifs alongside Seljuk-derived motifs, including the tree of life, lion figures, and geometric patterns. The floral reliefs and figurative decorations adorning the crown gate of the harem represent the most characteristic examples of this stylistic synthesis (Bulat, 2014: 173). Iranian influences are evident in the bulbous dome form in mosque, while local stoneworking traditions further enhance the palace's architectural uniqueness (Bingöl, 1998).

Inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage Tentative List in 2000, the palace has nevertheless endured extensive damage during the Ottoman-Russian wars (1828–1829, 1854–1856, 1877–1878, 1914–1918) and subsequent abandonment following Bayezid's relocation in 1938. Removal of building materials for spolia caused additional deterioration (Zühtü, 1934). Systematic studies began in 1956 with a survey led by Mahmut Akok, followed by restorations in 1960–1961 (Akok, 1961). While later interventions, including large-scale restoration projects in the 1990s, revealed original architectural elements, modern interventions—such as the 2009 roof extension—have been criticized for incompatibility with the palace's original design (Gündoğdu, 1996; Belli, 2011; Yıldırım, 2011).

2. METHODOLOGY

This study evaluates the applicability of site management and management plan concepts in the conservation and sustainable management of the Ishak Pasha Palace through a qualitative, case study-based research design. The methodology combines field-based observations, archival research, and a

comprehensive review of the cultural heritage management literature to ensure a multi-dimensional analysis.

Field visits were conducted at Ishak Pasha Palace between May–September 2025, enabling direct observation of the palace’s physical condition, environmental context, visitor patterns, and existing management practices. The data collection process involved systematic on-site observations, photographic documentation, and note-taking focused on structural conditions, conservation issues, visitor circulation, and environmental impacts. These observations were evaluated in relation to conservation priorities and management deficiencies.

In addition, archival research was carried out through the examination of previous restoration reports, official documentation, and secondary sources to contextualize the historical development of interventions at the site. A comprehensive literature review further supported the study by situating the case within broader theoretical and practical discussions on heritage management, particularly within the UNESCO framework.

The analytical framework is structured in three interrelated sections. The first examines the theoretical foundations of site management and management plans within the UNESCO system, with particular reference to their role in ensuring long-term conservation, integrity, and sustainability in line with international standards. The second section evaluates the historical development and restoration processes of Ishak Pasha Palace, assessing the effectiveness, continuity, and limitations of past interventions. The third section identifies key challenges resulting from the absence of a formally implemented management plan, including structural vulnerability, environmental pressures, visitor management and carrying capacity, sustainable tourism, risk preparedness, education programs, and the level of local community engagement.

The analysis adopts a qualitative and interpretive approach, integrating empirical observations with theoretical insights. However, the study is limited by the absence of systematic quantitative data, particularly in relation to visitor statistics and long-term monitoring records.

Future research may benefit from the incorporation of quantitative methods, such as visitor surveys, carrying capacity analysis, and long-term environmental monitoring, to support more data-driven management strategies. In addition, comparative studies with similar heritage sites that have implemented formal management plans would further contribute to the development of context-specific and sustainable management models.

2.1. Ethics Committee Approval

All stages of this study—including the development of the conceptual framework, the implementation of data collection instruments, the collection of data, and the analysis and interpretation of findings—were conducted in full compliance with established ethical principles. In the event of any ethical violations, the Editorial Board of ANKAD bears no responsibility; all responsibility rests solely with the authors. The author hereby declares that this study has not been submitted to any other academic publication venue for evaluation apart from ANKAD. Furthermore, all procedures carried out in this research comply with the principles set forth in the *Directive on Scientific Research and Publication Ethics of Higher Education Institutions*. None of the actions defined under the second section of the Directive, titled “Actions Contrary to Scientific Research and Publication Ethics,” have been committed. As the study is based on archival research involving the examination of previous restoration reports, official documents, and secondary sources, it does not require ethics committee approval.



Fig.1. General view of Ishak Pasha Palace in 2025

3. THE ROLE OF CULTURAL SITE MANAGEMENT AND MANAGEMENT PLANS WITHIN THE UNESCO FRAMEWORK

Cultural heritage represents a multidimensional construct encompassing tangible and intangible values of historical, artistic, social, and scientific significance. Rooted in the complex interaction between human societies and their natural and built environments, it reflects the cumulative expressions of identity, memory, and creativity across time. Under the guidance of UNESCO and ICOMOS, the understanding of cultural heritage has evolved from a monument-centered perspective to a holistic and integrative framework. This expanded paradigm recognizes not only monumental and architectural heritage but also vernacular structures, cultural landscapes that embody the interrelationship between humanity and nature, and historic urban landscapes linking the physical fabric of cities with the intangible traditions of their communities (Hoşkara, Lombardi, & Doğaner, 2021:1965).

The conservation of cultural heritage and its transmission to future generations is not a process limited to restoration interventions; it also requires a multidimensional and systematic approach. In this context, the 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage was opened for signature by UNESCO to ensure the international safeguarding of cultural and natural heritage sites of exceptional significance. Alongside the Convention, the World Heritage List was established to facilitate the protection of these sites (UNESCO, 1972). Over time, however, the rapid expansion of the List has highlighted the need for a more systematic and holistic approach to the effective conservation and sustainable management of heritage properties (Badia, 2011:41).

Within the framework of the World Heritage System, the concept of management planning has existed since 1977, but it notably developed after the 1990s. A major turning point came with the Burra Charter (1999) and the Budapest Declaration (2002). The Burra Charter highlights the importance of site management in heritage conservation (UNESCO, 1999), while the Budapest Declaration urges State Parties to balance protection, sustainability, and development (UNESCO, 2002). In this context, site management emerges as a fundamental strategy that ensures coordination among public authorities, civil society organizations, and local communities, facilitating the sustainable preservation and transmission of historical, cultural, and natural heritage sites to future generations. Building upon these evolving international frameworks, heritage management practices have gradually shifted from a preservation-oriented approach to an integrated model that aligns cultural sustainability with socio-economic development. Contemporary heritage management thus emphasizes not only preservation but also the development of administrative and financial frameworks that ensure the long-term continuity and societal value of cultural heritage (Göktürk, 2023:581).

Since 2005, UNESCO has required State Parties to include a management plan in the nomination dossiers for properties proposed for the World Heritage List (UNESCO, 2005). This requirement has brought the concept of site management to the forefront of the international cultural heritage conservation agenda. The rationale for adopting a holistic site management approach under UNESCO is rooted in the 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. Article 4 of the Convention explicitly obliges States Parties to take all necessary measures to identify, protect, and transmit their cultural heritage to future generations (UNESCO, 1972: Art. 4). In this

context, site management has emerged as a fundamental tool, not only ensuring the protection of heritage but also facilitating its sustainable planning and administration.

As a result of these developments, the preparation of management plans for archaeological sites and protected areas in Turkey was granted a legal basis with the amendments to the Law on the Protection of Cultural and Natural Heritage (Law No. 2863) in 2004.

Consequently, management plans became applicable not only to sites proposed for the World Heritage List but also to all designated heritage sites. In 2005, in accordance with Annex -2 article of the Law, the “Regulation on the Substance and Procedures of the Establishment and Duties of the Site Management and the Monument Council and Identification of Management Sites” (*Alan Yönetimi ile Anıt Eser Kurulus ve Görevleri ile Yönetim Alanlarının Belirlenmesine İlişkin Usul ve Esaslar Hakkında Yönetmelik*) was published and entered into force (KVMGM, 2005). Since then, management plan studies have been conducted for World Heritage sites, properties on the World Heritage Tentative List, and other heritage sites. The primary objective of the Regulation is to ensure the effective conservation of archaeological sites, heritage areas, and buffer zones within the framework of a sustainable management plan, while clarifying the responsibilities and authorities of actors involved in site management. Accordingly, the Regulation is structured to cover the entire process from the preparation to the implementation of management plans.

Within the scope of the Regulation, “site management” is a process coordinated by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. This process involves identifying the area to be managed, preparing a management plan, and forming a team responsible for its development. The prepared plan is reviewed by the Advisory Committee and, ultimately, approved, implemented, and supervised by the Coordination and Audit Board. The roles and responsibilities of the actors involved in site management—the site manager, members of the Advisory Committee, and members of the Coordination and Audit Board—are clearly defined. It is also emphasized that site management practices should be carried out with the participation of local authorities, universities, civil society organizations, and local communities. The Ministry of Culture and Tourism is responsible for appointing the actors to these roles. The preparation of the management plan can be conducted directly within the Ministry or delegated to relevant local institutions through a formal protocol.

The Regulation defines a “management plan” as the principal planning document prepared to ensure the conservation, preservation, development, and sustainable management of a heritage site. It provides a comprehensive framework that outlines the site’s current condition, challenges, vision, objectives, policies and strategies, planned projects, implementation timeline, responsible institutions and organizations, financial resources, as well as monitoring and evaluation processes (*KVMGM, 2005*).

The concept of *site management* represents a holistic understanding of conservation. This approach not only entails the systematic collection and integration of all information related to the site and the establishment of robust decision-making mechanisms (Mumcu & Batmaz, 2023: 169), but also incorporates a multidisciplinary planning process that embraces education, awareness-raising, economic development, and tourism (UNESCO, 2013). Within the multidisciplinary structure of cultural heritage management, achieving success requires addressing diverse cultural frameworks through intersubjective and/or inter-institutional approaches and ensuring collective action. Numerous scholars engaged in history and historical objects or sites participate—directly or indirectly, consciously or unconsciously—in the practice of cultural heritage management. This management process necessitates the collaboration of various disciplines, including anthropologists, archaeologists, architects, urban planners, archivists, engineers, historians, and folklorists, alongside experts in material sciences, decision-makers, and the active participation of the public (Altınörs Çırak 2022: 188).

In this context, the initiation of site management and management plan practices for heritage structures of both historical and touristic significance, such as Ishak Pasha Palace, emerges as a critical tool for their protection, effective administration, and transmission to future generations.

As of 2025, Türkiye is represented by 22 sites on the UNESCO World Heritage List and 79 sites on the Tentative World Heritage List. Among the 22 World Heritage sites, 15 have approved management plans, a situation resulting from UNESCO’s requirement, since 2005, for management plans to be prepared for newly inscribed World Heritage sites. Although UNESCO requires the preparation of a

management plan for newly nominated World Heritage Sites, it has not made this requirement mandatory for sites that were inscribed in earlier years. However, it has recommended that management plans also be developed for those sites that were previously included on the World Heritage List (Gündüz&Demirkaya 2025:20). Consequently, sites inscribed prior to 2005—including Divriği Great Mosque and Hospital, Hattusha-Hittite Capital, Xanthos-Letoon, Safranbolu Town, Troy Ancient City, Göreme National Park and Cappadocia, and Pamukkale-Hierapolis—still lack comprehensive management plans. Nevertheless, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism prioritizes management activities for sites on the Tentative List and ensures, in accordance with national legislation, that management plans are developed for other protected heritage sites as well (Table 1).

Table 1. Managed Heritage Sites of Türkiye (KVMGM, 2025)

Category	Number	Managed Heritage Sites
World HeritageList	19	*Afyonkarahisar Grand Mosque; *Ahi Şerefeddin Mosque; Archaeological Site of Ani; Aphrodisias; ArslantepeMound; Pergamon and its Multi-Layered Cultural Landscape; Bursa and Cumalıkızık; Çatalhöyük; Diyarbakır Fortress and Hevsel Gardens Cultural Landscape; Selimiye Mosque and its Social Complex; Ephesus; *Eşrefoğlu Mosque; Gordion; Göbekli Tepe; Historic Areas of Istanbul; *Kastamonu Mahmut Bey Mosque; Mount Nemrut; Sardis and Bintepe LydianTumuli; *Sivrihisar Grand Mosque
World HeritageTentativeList	9	Amasya Harşena Mountain and Pontic King RockTombs; Ancient City of Anazarbos; Harran; Historical Port City of Izmir; İznik; LateAntique and Medieval Churches and Monasteries of Midyat and Surrounding Area (Tur ‘Abdin); Historic Guild Town of Mudurnu; YesemekQuarry and Sculpture Workshop; Zerzevan Castle and Mithraeum
Other	4	Artuklu; Küçükyalı Archaeopark; Savur; Sinop
Total	32	

4. RESTORATION PROCESSES AT ISHAK PASHA PALACE

The Ishak Pasha Palace exemplifies a unique synthesis of Ottoman, Seljuk, Iranian, Western, and regional architectural traditions. However, as detailed below, the structure suffered extensive damage during the Russian-Ottoman War, when the Russian army occupied the region. The initial repair initiatives undertaken in the early Republican period were constrained by the limited technical knowledge and material resources available at the time. Restoration efforts in the 1960s, meanwhile, resulted in the loss of several original architectural elements.

• Afyonkarahisar Grand Mosque, Eşrefoğlu Mosque, Ahi Şerefeddin Mosque, Sivrihisar Grand Mosque, and Kastamonu Mahmut Bey Mosque were inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2023 as a serial nomination under the title ‘*Wooden Hypostyle Mosques of Anatolia*’. However, since these mosques are located in different cities, an individual management plan has been implemented for each of them.

By the late twentieth century, it became increasingly evident that the monument required conservation within the framework of modern preservation principles and a comprehensive “holistic conservation” approach. The inclusion of the site on the UNESCO World Heritage Tentative List in 2000 marked a significant step toward international recognition of its cultural value. Nevertheless, despite this designation, both aesthetic and structural issues stemming from earlier interventions continue to be subjects of scholarly and professional debate.

4.1. Destruction in the Historical Process

Located on the Ottoman Empire’s eastern frontier, Ishak Pasha Palace faced repeated military conflicts. It suffered major damage during the Ottoman–Russian wars of 1828–1830, 1854, 1877–1878, and 1914–1917. Its strategic position made it a frequent military target, and occupations caused severe deterioration to both the structure and its decorative features.

Following the withdrawal of Russian forces, the building was temporarily used as a cavalry barracks. This inappropriate use, together with a fire that reportedly broke out in the kitchen area, further accelerated the physical destruction of the monument.

In 1938, when the administrative center of Bayezid was relocated to its current site in the İstasyon district, Ishak Pasha Palace was abandoned and left without supervision. The absence of maintenance and protective measures during this period resulted in the gradual dismantling of its architectural fabric. Local inhabitants removed stones and other materials from the palace to reuse them in new constructions nearby.

As noted by Zühtü (1934) in the architectural journal *Mimar*, some of the carved stone blocks from the ceremonial hall and the harem quarters were transported and reused as *spolia* in the courtyard walls of surrounding mansions. This long phase of neglect and material loss had a profound impact on the integrity and authenticity of the monument, creating irreversible damage to its architectural character.

4.2. Early Research, Restoration Efforts and Protection Status

The first official and systematic studies on Ishak Pasha Palace were initiated during the Republican period under the leadership of the Ministry of Culture. In this context, in 1956, the General Directorate of Antiquities and Museums appointed the archaeologist Mahmut Akok to conduct detailed architectural surveys. His comprehensive measured survey represented the first scientific documentation of the palace and established a solid foundation for future conservation studies (Akok, 1961) (Fig.2)



Fig.2. Ishak Pasha Palace measured survey by Akok (Akok, 1961: lev.XXXI)

The documentation and analytical surveys led by Akok marked an essential step toward understanding the architectural configuration and spatial integrity of the monument. These efforts provided valuable baseline data for the conservation of its original plan and structural layout (fig.3)



Fig.3. General view of Ishak Pasha Palace in the 1960 (Akok,1961: lev.XX, fig.1)

The interventions carried out between 1960 and 1961 were relatively limited in scope, focusing mainly on clearing debris from ruined areas and performing minor repairs. Although these early efforts did not constitute a comprehensive restoration by today's standards, they nonetheless laid the groundwork for subsequent conservation and management processes.

Overall, the initiatives of this period reflect the emerging awareness of cultural heritage preservation in mid-20th-century Turkey and highlight the gradual institutionalization of architectural conservation practices under state supervision.

Ishak Pasha Palace received its first legal protection in 1982 when the High Council of Immovable Antiquities and Monuments officially registered the palace as an immovable cultural property, placing it under national legal protection. In 2000, the Erzurum Regional Council for the Conservation of Cultural and Natural Properties designated Ishak Pasha Palace and its surroundings—including the Urartian rock tomb, the fortress remains, the Shafi'i Mosque, the historic cemetery, and the Mausoleum of Ahmad-i Khani—as a first-degree archaeological site. The same decision classified the Old Doğubayazıt settlement as a third-degree archaeological site and defined the area between Sarıdama Village and Karadere as an interaction–transition zone. These designations highlighted the need for an integrated conservation approach aimed at preserving the cultural landscape as a whole, ensuring a sustainable balance between protection and use.

4.3. Development of Modern Restoration and Archaeological Studies

The early repair interventions at Ishak Pasha Palace were insufficient to preserve the monument's original architectural integrity. The restoration campaigns conducted between 1961 and 1962 were limited in scope and effectiveness. In particular, many architectural components of the harem section—rooms, halls, corridors, kitchens, hearths, doors, windows, and lighting elements—had been severely damaged by warfare and natural factors. These areas were reconstructed without adequate documentation or archaeological investigation, relying instead on approximate data and assumptions. The techniques applied at that time reflected temporary protective measures rather than a systematic restoration approach. Consequently, the conservation activities of the 1960s lacked a scientific foundation and failed to offer sustainable solutions for the long-term preservation of the monument (Gündoğdu, 1996:129).

During the 1980s, Ishak Pasha Palace once again became a subject of national attention. In 1984, Hamza Gündoğdu's presentation at the *National Palaces Symposium* emphasized the urgent need for a comprehensive restoration project to safeguard the palace's original architectural values. This advocacy prompted the Ministry of Culture to include the palace within the national conservation program.

In this context, a large-scale restoration project was launched under the Ministry's coordination in 1992. The initiative represented the first comprehensive conservation campaign for Ishak Pasha Palace undertaken in accordance with modern preservation principles. The project, completed in 1994, was officially approved by the Erzurum Regional Council for Conservation of Cultural and Natural Properties. Simultaneously, between 1992 and 1995, archaeological excavations directed by Hamza Gündoğdu were carried out to complement the architectural restoration Works (Fig.4).



Fig.4. General view of Ishak Pasha Palace during the early days of restoration and excavation works, 1994. (Gündoğdu,1996:131,fig.2).

Among the major interventions of this period was the removal of previously used concrete mortar in certain wall sections and its replacement with lime mortar compatible with the original stone texture. Masonry walls outside the harem section were repaired, while collapsed portions were reconstructed using surviving material traces and archival documentation. In 1995, the dungeon area was cleared, and test excavations in the forecourt revealed the remains of terracotta water conduits supplying the palace. In the *selamlık*, original stone pavements were uncovered, and deteriorated wall and floor surfaces in the courtroom were renewed. Two-storey chambers located on the southern side of the second courtyard were excavated and structurally supported with iron scaffolding due to severe cracking.

One of the main focuses of the project was the conservation of the harem cells. Except for the *Muayede Hall*, all openings were temporarily covered with pitched roofs to protect the interiors (Fig.5). Excavations conducted in the harem and courtyard areas uncovered the palace's historical water distribution system and terracotta pipelines (Gündoğdu, 1996; Belli, 2011). During 1997–1998, extensive restoration works were undertaken on the portal façade, tower staircases, and outer stone cladding, contributing significantly to the recovery of the palace's façade coherence.



Fig.5. Roofing practice in the 1990s, (CSB, 2025).

However, structural assessments conducted between 2004 and 2006 revealed significant technical flaws in several interventions from the 1990s, particularly in the roofing and support systems. As a result, the

erroneous components were dismantled in 2007, and a new restoration contract was commissioned. By 2010s, the reinforcement of the walls had been completed, and a new 3,000 m² glass-covered wooden roof was installed (Fig.6). Yet, this contemporary design drew criticism for being incompatible with the palace's authentic architectural character, as the use of modern materials was perceived as an intrusive intervention that disrupted the historical fabric (Yıldırım, 2011: 82–84).



Fig.6. Glass-covered wooden roof (Belli, 2012:84)

5. CASE STUDY FINDINGS

Comprehensive research, archival documentation, and systematic field investigations undertaken at Ishak Pasha Palace have revealed a series of structural, managerial, and socio-environmental deficiencies that hinder the site's effective conservation and transmission to future generations. These findings, derived from interdisciplinary assessment, are examined under the following thematic categories.

5.1. Environmental Pressures and Structural Vulnerabilities

The palace's stone façades exhibit progressive and accelerated deterioration, manifested through extensive cracking, exfoliation, and surface loss—particularly on wind-exposed elevations. Such decay patterns are consistent with freeze–thaw cycles commonly observed at high-altitude heritage sites. The lack of a systematic monitoring program and preventive maintenance regime has intensified the site's structural fragility, while previous restoration campaigns were often sporadic, uncoordinated, and devoid of scientific continuity. These conditions underscore the necessity for an integrated conservation approach grounded in diagnostic analysis, material science, and adherence to traditional craftsmanship (Jokilehto, 1999; Feilden, 2003; ICCROM, 2016). A long-term, evidence-based conservation strategy is therefore imperative to ensure the integrity and authenticity of the monument's original fabric.

5.2. Risk Assessment and Emergency Preparedness

Currently, no formalized emergency response or risk mitigation framework exists for Ishak Pasha Palace. The site is exposed to multiple natural hazards—including seismic activity, extreme snowfall,

and high winds—as well as anthropogenic pressures arising from unregulated visitation and nearby development. Scholarly research and international frameworks emphasize that resilience in heritage conservation relies on proactive, rather than reactive, strategies such as hazard mapping, emergency preparedness, and staff capacity-building (UNESCO, 2010; ICCROM, 2016). Establishing an integrated risk management plan, supported by interdisciplinary expertise and institutional collaboration, is therefore critical to safeguarding both the palace’s physical structure and its intangible cultural significance.

5.3. Local Community and Institutional Involvement

Local community participation and institutional coordination remain markedly limited. Empirical evidence demonstrates that participatory governance and co-management models significantly enhance heritage sustainability by fostering a sense of collective ownership (Chirikure & Pwiti, 2008). There exists a strong interconnection between the preservation of World Heritage Sites and the welfare of local communities. Local populations play a pivotal role in both the conservation and management of these heritage sites; therefore, they must be equipped with comprehensive knowledge of the sites’ historical, architectural, and natural characteristics. Enhancing social awareness of heritage values is essential to ensure sustainable protection and community engagement (Çetin & Akkaya, 2013: 644). Strengthening collaboration among local authorities, universities, and civil society organizations can promote shared stewardship, generate socio-economic benefits through heritage-driven education and tourism, and embed conservation practices within the community’s cultural identity. Empowering local actors in decision-making processes would ensure that heritage management at Ishak Pasha Palace evolves into an inclusive and socially resilient framework.

5.4. Visitor Management Systems and Tourism

Visitor management at Ishak Pasha Palace remains underdeveloped and largely unregulated. The absence of a centralized visitor center, interpretive signage, and coherent circulation routes results in spatial disorientation and inadvertent damage to sensitive architectural areas. Evidence from comparable heritage sites shows that implementing interactive interpretation systems, digital guidance tools, and controlled circulation pathways effectively mitigates such risks while enhancing educational engagement (ICOMOS, 2002; Pedersen, 2002). Visitor numbers frequently surpass the site’s physical and managerial capacity, leading to material degradation and diminished visitor satisfaction. In alignment with UNESCO and ICOMOS recommendations, carrying capacity assessments should be integrated into the site’s spatial and tourism planning to ensure sustainable visitation (ICOMOS, 2002; UNESCO, 2013). The introduction of designated circuits, observation platforms, and access control mechanisms would maintain the delicate balance between conservation and tourism. Unregulated visitor flow—particularly in the dungeon and courtyard zones—combined with poor lighting and minimal signage, poses safety concerns and weakens interpretive coherence. Empirical studies affirm that unmanaged visitation can directly compromise both the authenticity of heritage assets and the quality of the visitor experience (Timothy & Boyd, 2003). Implementing structured visitor routes, interpretive programs, and trained guiding personnel is therefore vital for harmonizing visitor engagement with conservation imperatives. Beyond the physical and managerial aspects of site visitation, the interpretive dimension plays a crucial role in transforming a simple visit into a meaningful cultural experience. Effective interpretation not only guides visitors through the site but also fosters awareness, learning, and emotional connection with the heritage itself.

The most distinctive feature that differentiates cultural tourism from other forms of tourism is its inherent educational function. Culture encompasses the elements of what people think (attitudes, beliefs, ideas, and values), what they do (behavioral patterns and ways of life), and what they create (artworks, handicrafts, and other cultural products). From this perspective, cultural tourism extends beyond the mere visitation of sites and monuments; it involves engaging with and learning about the lifestyle, traditions, and social practices of the communities within the visited destination (Çetin, 2010: 182). In this regard, the integration of web-based Geographic Information Systems (GIS) into museum information systems offers an innovative approach to cultural heritage management, enabling the digital documentation, analysis, and visualization of heritage assets. Such technological frameworks enhance

interpretive accessibility while contributing to the sustainable preservation and management of cultural sites (Pekçetin & Döker, 2025).

5.5. Education and Awareness

The absence of structured educational and awareness programs at the site represents a critical gap in its long-term sustainability. Education serves as a cornerstone of effective heritage conservation (Hoobler, 2006; UNESCO, 2013), fostering awareness, empathy, and accountability among diverse audiences. Collaboration with academic institutions, cultural NGOs, and local schools could facilitate the development of museum-based learning modules, guided interpretive tours, and outreach campaigns. Such initiatives would transform conservation from an administrative obligation into a shared social responsibility, ensuring the enduring protection of the palace's cultural and historical values.

5.6. Management and Planning

The absence of an operational management plan has resulted in fragmented conservation practices and the lack of long-term strategic direction. Without a defined management framework, restoration activities risk becoming reactive, inconsistent, and disconnected from broader heritage policies. Establishing an operational management plan—through a formal protocol between the Ministry of Culture and a designated local authority—would delineate clear management boundaries, responsibilities, and procedures. The plan should align with UNESCO's World Heritage Management Guidelines and national heritage regulations to ensure systematic coordination, accountability, and sustainability in all conservation and development interventions (Feilden, 2003; Jokilehto, 2005; Ringbeck, 2008; UNESCO, 2013).

6. CONCLUSION

Ishak Pasha Palace, located along the eastern frontier of Anatolia—a region historically shaped by diverse cultural interactions—represents a remarkable example of late Ottoman architecture that synthesizes Ottoman artistic traditions with regional architectural influences. Despite its architectural and historical significance, the preservation of the palace has been challenged by prolonged neglect, discontinuous restoration interventions, and the absence of a comprehensive management framework. Environmental pressures, including extreme climatic conditions, wind erosion, and temperature fluctuations, continue to accelerate structural deterioration, particularly in the absence of systematic monitoring and preventive maintenance.

The findings of this study demonstrate that the conservation challenges observed at Ishak Pasha Palace correspond with broader issues identified in the cultural heritage management literature. Previous studies emphasize that sustainable conservation of heritage sites requires not only physical restoration but also integrated management strategies that combine conservation, tourism management, community engagement, and risk preparedness (Feilden, 2003; Jokilehto, 1999; UNESCO, 2013). Similar management deficiencies have been documented at other heritage sites, where the absence of coordinated planning frameworks leads to fragmented conservation practices and increased vulnerability to environmental and human pressures (Pedersen, 2002; Timothy & Boyd, 2003). In this respect, the case of Ishak Pasha Palace reflects a wider structural problem frequently encountered in heritage sites that lack formally implemented management plans.

The study also highlights that visitor pressure and insufficient interpretive infrastructure constitute critical challenges for the long-term sustainability of the site. Research on cultural tourism indicates that unmanaged visitor flows can negatively affect both the physical integrity of heritage structures and the quality of visitor experience (ICOMOS, 2002; Timothy & Boyd, 2003). The absence of clearly defined visitor routes, interpretive systems, and visitor capacity assessments at Ishak Pasha Palace therefore represents a significant management gap that must be addressed within a comprehensive planning framework.

Another key finding concerns the limited involvement of local communities and institutional actors in the conservation process. Contemporary heritage management approaches increasingly emphasize participatory governance models that integrate local stakeholders into decision-making processes (Chirikure & Pwiti, 2008). Such models not only strengthen social awareness of heritage values but also enhance the long-term sustainability of conservation efforts. In the case of Ishak Pasha Palace,

strengthening collaboration between local authorities, universities, civil society organizations, and the Ministry of Culture and Tourism would contribute to the development of a more inclusive and resilient management structure.

Within this context, the development of a comprehensive site management plan emerges as a fundamental priority. Management plans provide the strategic framework necessary to coordinate conservation, tourism management, risk mitigation, and community participation within a unified system (Ringbeck, 2008; UNESCO, 2013). Although national legislation in Türkiye provides the legal basis for the preparation of such plans, the absence of an operational management framework at Ishak Pasha Palace continues to hinder the implementation of sustainable conservation strategies.

The case of Ishak Pasha Palace illustrates the critical importance of integrated heritage management for historically significant monuments located in environmentally sensitive and socially dynamic contexts. A participatory and interdisciplinary management model—supported by scientific monitoring, visitor carrying capacity analysis, risk preparedness strategies, and education programs—would significantly enhance both the protection and sustainable use of the site. Beyond its local significance, the findings of this study contribute to the broader cultural heritage management literature by demonstrating how the absence of coordinated management frameworks can undermine conservation efforts at heritage sites of outstanding historical value. The development of such integrated management strategies therefore represents a key step toward ensuring the long-term preservation and accessibility of Ishak Pasha Palace and similar heritage sites.

REFERENCES

- Akok, M. (1961). Ağrı Doğubayazıt'ta İshak Paşa Sarayı röleve ve mimarisi. *Türk Arkeoloji Dergisi*, X(II), 30–48.
- Altınörs Çırak, A. (2022). Kültürel miras yönetimi üzerine kavramsal ve yöntemsel bir araştırma. *Megaron*, 17(1), 183–194.
- Arseven, C. E. (1970). *Türk sanatı*. İstanbul.
- Belli, V. E. (2012). İshak Paşa Sarayı restorasyon çalışmalarına toplu bir bakış. In *İkinci Uluslararası Aras Havzası Sempozyumu* (13–15 Aralık 2011). Iğdır.
- Bingöl, Y. (1998). *İshak Paşa Sarayı*. Ankara.
- Bulat, S. (2014). Doğubayazıt İshak Paşa Sarayı hayat ağacı motifleri. *The Journal of Academic Social Science*, 2(2/2), 169–179.
- Chirikure, S., & Pwiti, G. (2008). Community involvement in archaeology and cultural heritage management: An assessment from case studies in southern Africa and elsewhere. *Current Anthropology*, 49(3), 467–485.
- CSB. (2025). Çevre Şehircilik ve İklim Değişikliği Bakanlığı, İshak Paşa Sarayı çatı uygulaması. Retrieved October 17, 2025, from <https://csb.gov.tr/askin-ruhu-ishak-pasa-sarayi>
- Çetin, T. (2010). Cumalıkızık köyünde kültürel miras ve turizm algısı. *Millî Folklor*, 22(87), 1–10.
- Çetin, T., & Akkaya, M. (2013). The awareness of university students about the cultural heritage and the touristic values of Turkey in the UNESCO World Heritage List. In A. Drujinin, Z. Kostova, I. Sharuho, & E. Atasoy (Eds.), *The science and education at the beginning of the 21st century in Turkey* (pp. 640–660). Sofia: St. Kliment Ohridski University Press.
- Çetin, Y. (2012). Doğubayazıt İshak Paşa Sarayı'nın Selçuklu sanatı etkileri bakımından değerlendirmesi. In *Uluslararası Katılımlı XV. Ortaçağ ve Türk Dönemi Kazıları ve Sanat Tarihi Araştırmaları Sempozyumu Bildirileri Kitabı* (Vol. 1, pp. 213–234). Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi.
- Çetin, Y., & Yeni, Ö. (2014). Ağrı'daki Osmanlı dönemi eserlerinin Selçuklu etkileri bakımından bir değerlendirmesi. In *Uluslararası Malazgirt'ten Osmanlı'ya Selçuklu Sempozyumu* (Kastamonu).
- Feilden, B. M. (2003). *Conservation of historic buildings* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Architectural Press.

- Feilden, B. M., & Jokilehto, J. (1998). *Management guidelines for World Cultural Heritage Sites*. Rome: ICCROM.
- Göktürk, I. (2023). Cumhuriyet'in 100. yılında sürdürülebilir kültürel miras yönetimi ve tarihsel perspektifle Ankara Etnografya Müzesi. *Kent Akademisi Dergisi*, 16(Special Issue for the 100th Anniversary of the Republic of Türkiye), 577–596.
- Gündoğdu, H. (1985). Doğubayazıt'taki İshak Paşa Sarayı ve gerçekler. In *Milli Saraylar Sempozyumu* (15–17 Kasım, İstanbul), 36–42.
- Gündoğdu, H. (1986). Osmanlı hanedan sarayları hakkında bir deneme ve Doğubayazıt'ta İshak Paşa Sarayı. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Araştırma Dergisi*, 14, 1–12.
- Gündoğdu, H. (1991). *Doğubayazıt İshak Paşa Sarayı*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Gündoğdu, H. (1996). İshak Paşa restorasyonunda son durum. In *Aslanapa Armağanı* (pp. 129–140). İstanbul.
- Gündüz, A. E., & Demirkaya, Y. (2025). Tarihi alan yönetimi: İstanbul ve Roma alan planlarının analizi. *Global Social Sciences Bulletin (GSSB)*, 2(1), 1–25.
- Hoobler, E. (2006). “To take their heritage in their hands”: Indigenous self-representation and decolonization in the community museums of Oaxaca, Mexico. *American Indian Quarterly*, 30(3–4), 441–460.
- Hoşkara, Ş., Lombardi, A., & Doğaner, S. (2021). Sürdürülebilir kalkınma amaçlarına ulaşmada kültürel mirasın korunması ve yönetiminin rolü: Disiplinlerarası bir yaklaşım. *Journal of the Faculty of Engineering and Architecture of Gazi University*, 36(4), 1963–1975.
- ICCROM. (2016). *A guide to risk management of cultural heritage*. Rome: International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property.
- ICOMOS. (1999). *The Burra Charter*. Retrieved from https://australia.icomos.org/wp-content/uploads/BURRA_CHARTER.pdf
- ICOMOS. (2002). *ICOMOS International Cultural Tourism Charter: Principles and guidelines for managing tourism at places of cultural and heritage significance*. Paris: International Council on Monuments and Sites.
- ICOMOS. (2023). *Cultural tourism & visitor management framework workbook*. Retrieved October 27, 2025, from <https://publ.icomos.org/publicomos/jlbSai?html=Bur&base=technica&ref=43711&file=2357.pdf&path=ctvm-framework-workbook-final.pdf>
- Jokilehto, J. (1999). *A history of architectural conservation*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Jokilehto, J. (2005). *Definition of cultural heritage: References to documents in history*. Rome: ICCROM.
- KVMGM. (2005). *Kültür Varlıkları ve Müzeler Genel Müdürlüğü, Alan Yönetimi ile Anıt Eser Kurulunun Kuruluş ve Görevleri ile Yönetim Alanlarının Belirlenmesine İlişkin Usul ve Esaslar Hakkında Yönetmelik*. Retrieved May 2, 2025, from <https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr>
- KVMGM. (2025). *Kültür Varlıkları ve Müzeler Genel Müdürlüğü, Ulusal Yönetim Planları*. Retrieved October 27, 2025, from <https://kvmgm.ktb.gov.tr/TR-204384/ulusal-yonetim-planlari.html>
- Mumcu, B., & Batmaz, N. Y. (2023). *Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler Dergisi*, 32(4), 165–192.
- Pedersen, A. (2002). *Managing tourism at World Heritage Sites: A practical manual for World Heritage site managers*. Paris: UNESCO World Heritage Centre.
- Pekçetin, R., & Döker, M. F. (2025). Web tabanlı coğrafi bilgi sistemleri ile kültürel mirasın yönetimi: Müze bilgi sistemi uygulaması. *Journal of Anatolian Geography*, 2(1), 1–9.
- Ringbeck, B. (2008). *Management plans for World Heritage Sites — A practical guide*. Bonn: German Commission for UNESCO.

- Thomas, L., Middleton, J., & Philips, A. (2003). *Guidelines for management planning of protected areas (Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series No. 10)*. Gland: IUCN.
- Timothy, D. J., & Boyd, S. W. (2003). *Heritage tourism*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- UNESCO. (1972). *Convention concerning the protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*. Retrieved October 27, 2025, from <https://whc.unesco.org/archive/convention-en.pdf>
- UNESCO. (2000). *Tentative list: Ishak Pasha Palace*. Paris: UNESCO World Heritage Centre.
- UNESCO. (2002). Retrieved from <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/1217/>
- UNESCO. (2010). *Managing disaster risks for World Heritage*. Paris: UNESCO World Heritage Centre.
- UNESCO. (2013). *Managing cultural World Heritage*. Paris: UNESCO World Heritage Centre.
- UNESCO. (2016). *A guide to risk management of cultural heritage*. Retrieved October 10, 2025, from https://www.iccrom.org/sites/default/files/Guide-to-Risk-Management_English.pdf
- UNESCO. (2025). *Operational guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. Retrieved March 12, 2025, from <https://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines/>
- Ünsel, Z. (1965). İshak Paşa Sarayı. *Türk Tarih Mecmuası*.
- Yıldırım, B. (2011). Transformation of Ishak Pasha Palace. *WIT Press*, 118, 73–85.
- Yurttaş, H. (2004). Türk saray mimarisi içerisinde İshak Paşa Sarayı'nın yeri. In *Güneşin Doğduğu Yer: Doğubayazıt Sempozyumu Bildirileri*. İstanbul.
- Zühtü, İ. (1934). Beyazıt Kalesi İshak Paşa Sarayı. *Mimar*, 3, 12–15.

Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article

Kültürel Miras Alan Yönetimi ve Yönetim Planı: İshak Paşa Sarayı Örneği

Cultural Heritage Site Management and Management Plan: The Case of Ishak Pasha Palace

Şehnaz ERASLAN 

DOI : [10.63556/ankad.v10i1.372](https://doi.org/10.63556/ankad.v10i1.372)

Geliş/Received: 05/11/2025

Kabul/Accepted: 09/04/2026

GENİŞ ÖZET

1. Giriş

Bu çalışma, Osmanlı mimarisinin geç dönemine ait en özgün yapılardan biri olan **İshak Paşa Sarayı'nın korunması, yönetimi ve sürdürülebilirliği** konularını, çağdaş kültürel miras yönetimi ilkeleri ışığında değerlendirmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Saray, yalnızca Osmanlı mimari geleneğinin değil, aynı zamanda Selçuklu, İnan ve yerel Doğu Anadolu mimari unsurlarının da sentezlendiği çok katmanlı bir yapıdır. Ancak bu tarihî ve kültürel zenginlik, coğrafî, iklimsel ve yönetsel nedenlerle önemli tehditlerle karşı karşıyadır. Çalışma, sarayın korunmasına ilişkin mevcut durumun bütüncül biçimde analiz edilmesini, yönetim planı eksikliklerinin ortaya konulmasını ve UNESCO Dünya Mirası çerçevesinde sürdürülebilir bir koruma modelinin oluşturulmasına katkı sağlamayı hedeflemektedir.

2. Amaç ve Yöntem

Araştırma; arşiv taramaları, literatür incelemesi, alan gözlemleri ve mevcut koruma raporlarının değerlendirilmesi yoluyla yürütülmüştür. Elde edilen veriler, UNESCO (2013, 2017), ICOMOS (2002) ve ICCROM (2016) gibi uluslararası kurumların koruma ve yönetim ilkeleriyle karşılaştırılmıştır. Bu karşılaştırmalı analiz yöntemi, yalnızca fiziksel koruma sorunlarını değil, aynı zamanda yönetsel, toplumsal ve eğitimsel eksiklikleri de değerlendirmeyi mümkün kılmıştır. Araştırmanın temel yaklaşımı, **kültürel mirasın korunmasının yalnızca fiziksel restorasyonla sınırlı olmadığı**, aynı zamanda sürdürülebilir yönetim, risk önleme, toplum katılımı ve eğitim politikalarıyla desteklenmesi gerektiği anlayışına dayanmaktadır.

3. Bulgular ve Değerlendirme

Araştırma bulguları, İshak Paşa Sarayı'nın mevcut koruma sürecinde çok boyutlu sorunların bulunduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Bunlar altı temel başlık altında değerlendirilmiştir:

3.1. Çevresel Baskılar ve Yapısal Zayıflıklar

Sarayın taş cephelerinde donma-çözülme döngüsüne bağlı ciddi yüzey bozulmaları, çatlaklar ve malzeme kayıpları gözlenmiştir. Düzenli izleme ve önleyici bakım eksikliği, bu bozulmaları hızlandırmaktadır. Önceki restorasyon girişimlerinin süreklilik ve bilimsel temelden yoksun olması, yapının özgün malzeme bütünlüğünü tehdit etmektedir. Bu durum, bilimsel temelli, malzeme analizine dayalı koruma stratejilerinin acilen geliştirilmesi gerektiğini göstermektedir.

3.2. Risk Değerlendirmesi ve Acil Durum Hazırlığı

Saray için herhangi bir resmî risk yönetimi veya acil durum planı bulunmamaktadır. Yapı; deprem, kar yükü, rüzgâr ve insan kaynaklı tahribat gibi risklere açıktır. UNESCO ve ICCROM'un rehberlerine göre, risk haritalarının hazırlanması, tahliye planlarının oluşturulması ve personel eğitimi gibi önleyici adımlar, kültürel miras alanlarının dayanıklılığını artırmaktadır. Bu bağlamda, İshak Paşa Sarayı için bütüncül bir risk yönetim protokolünün oluşturulması zorunludur.

3.3. Yerel Toplum ve Kurumsal Katılım

Araştırmada, yerel yönetimler, akademik kurumlar ve sivil toplum kuruluşlarıyla iş birliğinin yetersiz olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Oysa katılımcı yönetim modelleri, miras alanlarının uzun vadeli sürdürülebilirliği açısından kritik öneme sahiptir. Yerel halkın koruma sürecine aktif biçimde dahil edilmesi, aidiyet duygusunu güçlendirecek ve koruma çalışmalarını toplumsal temele oturtacaktır.

3.4. Ziyaretçi Yönetimi ve Turizm:

Sitede merkezi bir ziyaretçi merkezi ve yönlendirme sistemi bulunmamaktadır. Bu durum, ziyaretçilerin bilinçsiz dolaşımına, yön kaybına ve hassas alanların zarar görmesine yol açmaktadır. UNESCO (2013) ve ICOMOS (2023) rehberleri, ziyaretçi taşıma kapasitesi analizlerinin yapılmasını ve buna bağlı yönlendirme güzergâhlarının belirlenmesini önermektedir. Sarayda kontrollü gezi rotaları, dijital rehber sistemleri, etkileşimli sergiler ve bilgilendirici tabelalar oluşturulması hem ziyaretçi deneyimini zenginleştirecek hem de fiziksel aşınmayı azaltacaktır.

3.5. Eğitim ve Farkındalık:

Yerel toplum ve ziyaretçiler için sürdürülebilir miras yönetimine yönelik bir eğitim programı bulunmamaktadır. Oysa UNESCO (2013) raporları, eğitimin kültürel mirasın korunmasında temel bir araç olduğunu vurgular. Yerel okullar, üniversiteler ve sivil toplum kuruluşlarıyla yapılacak iş birlikleri aracılığıyla, sarayın tarihi değerini tanıtıcı etkinlikler, rehberli turlar ve farkındalık kampanyaları düzenlenmesi önerilmektedir.

3.6. Yönetim ve Planlama Eksiklikleri:

Saray için yürürlükte bir yönetim planı (management plan) bulunmamaktadır. Bu eksiklik, koruma faaliyetlerinde süreksizlik ve koordinasyonsuzluk yaratmaktadır. Yönetim planı, alanın sınırlarını, yetki paylaşımını, izleme yöntemlerini ve sürdürülebilir kullanım ilkelerini belirleyecek temel bir dokümandır. Ulusal mevzuat ve UNESCO standartları doğrultusunda, ilgili bakanlık ile yerel kurumlar arasında resmî bir protokol çerçevesinde yönetim planının hazırlanması gerekmektedir.

4. Sonuç ve Öneriler

İshak Paşa Sarayı, tarihsel, sanatsal ve mimari açıdan eşsiz bir kültürel miras alanıdır. Ancak mevcut koruma ve yönetim yaklaşımları, bütüncül sürdürülebilirlik ilkelerinden uzaktır. Çalışma, koruma sürecinde bilimsel temelli restorasyon, risk yönetimi, toplum katılımı, ziyaretçi kontrolü ve eğitim politikalarının bütünlükte uygulanmasının zorunluluğunu vurgulamaktadır. Bu bağlamda, İshak Paşa Sarayı için önerilen eylem planı;

- Düzenli izleme ve belgeleme sisteminin kurulması,
- Yönetim planının hazırlanması ve uygulanması,
- Yerel paydaşların yönetime dahil edilmesi,
- Ziyaretçi taşıma kapasitesine dayalı planlama yapılması,
- Eğitim ve farkındalık faaliyetlerinin kurumsallaştırılması,
- Tüm koruma girişimlerinin uluslararası standartlara göre yürütülmesi gibi temel ilkelerden oluşmaktadır.

Bu öneriler doğrultusunda geliştirilecek çok aktörlü, katılımcı ve bilimsel temelli bir yönetim modeli, yalnızca İshak Paşa Sarayı'nın değil, benzer miras alanlarının da sürdürülebilir korunması için örnek teşkil edebilecektir. Çalışma, böylece hem yerel hem de uluslararası düzeyde kültürel miras yönetimi literatürüne katkı sunmayı hedeflemektedir.