LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE STUDIES, www.jlas.upit.ro
e-ISSN: 2344-6900, ISSN-L: 1583-0772
No.1 (34), Year XXV, 2026, pp. 104-122

HISTORICAL MONUMENTS REGISTERS AS INSTRUMENTS OF CULTURAL GOVERNANCE: A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN ROMANIA AND THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

Viorica URSU
ORCID [ID]: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4194-4799
Diana MOROȘAN
ORCID [ID]: https://orcid.org/0009-0006-0157-047X
Email: diana.morosan@adm.utm.md
Affiliation[1,2]: Faculty of Civil Engineering, Geodesy and Cadastre, Technical University of Moldova, 168 Stefan cel Mare Blvd, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova

***Abstract*:** *The protection of built cultural heritage represents one of the essential directions of contemporary policies on sustainable development, territorial governance, and the preservation of states' historical and cultural identity. In this context, registers of historical monuments constitute fundamental legal and administrative instruments for the identification, classification, and protection of immovable cultural heritage assets. This study provides a comparative analysis of the mechanisms for recording and managing historical monument registers in Romania and the Republic of Moldova, with a particular focus on the regulatory framework, institutional structures, administrative procedures, and the level of digitalization of systems used in the cultural heritage sector.*

The research highlights that both states maintain official registers of historical monuments and dedicated legal mechanisms for cultural heritage protection; however, significant differences exist in terms of administrative organization, data standardization, and interoperability of informational infrastructures. The analysis demonstrates that the Romanian system exhibits a more advanced level of organization and codification of historical monuments, as well as a stronger integration of protection regimes into cadastral and urban planning systems. At the same time, both Romania and the Republic of Moldova face persistent challenges related to the updating of registers, fragmentation of databases, and insufficient digital interoperability between cultural heritage systems and territorial management platforms.

Furthermore, the study underscores the impact of digital transformation on cultural heritage administration and emphasizes the need to develop interoperable digital registers compatible with European standards on open data, GIS technologies, and digital governance. The research findings demonstrate that the effectiveness of cultural heritage protection depends not exclusively on the existence of official registers, but also on their capacity to function as integrated informational infrastructures capable of supporting contemporary administrative, urban planning, and cadastral processes.

Keywords**:** *cultural heritage; historical monuments; digital register; interoperability; legal protection*.

Introduction

Built cultural heritage represents a vital component of a state's historical and cultural identity, possessing not only artistic or memorial value but also playing a significant role in urban development, tourism, education, and the consolidation of collective memory. In the context of intensifying urbanization, growing real estate investments, and the accelerated transformation of the built environment, the protection of historic monuments has become a major concern for both national public authorities and specialized international cultural heritage organizations.

Over recent decades, the preservation of built heritage has evolved beyond simple administrative record-keeping. It has become increasingly intertwined with digital transformation, institutional interoperability, and smart territorial management. Historic monument registers are no longer mere descriptive lists of state-protected assets. Instead, they function as complex information infrastructures essential for integrating cultural heritage into modern cadastral, urbanistic, and territorial systems. Consequently, the effectiveness of the legal protection of historic monuments directly depends on the quality of the mechanisms used for recording, updating, and exchanging data among the institutions responsible for cultural heritage administration.

Both Romania and the Republic of Moldova possess official registers of historic monuments and dedicated legal mechanisms to safeguard built cultural heritage. In Romania, the primary regulatory

framework is established by *Law No. 422/2001 on the Protection of Historic Monuments*, (Legea nr. 422 privind protejarea monumentelor istorice, 2001), and the recording system is organized via the List of Historic Monuments (LMI), managed by the Ministry of Culture and the National Heritage Institute. In the Republic of Moldova, the legal foundation is constituted by *Law No. 1530/1993 on the Protection of Monuments* (Legea nr. 1530 privind ocrotirea monumentelor, 1993) and the Register of State-Protected Monuments, coordinated by the Ministry of Culture and specialized cultural heritage institutions.

Although both states utilize relatively similar classification and protection models, a comparative analysis reveals important differences regarding administrative organization, register structure, updating mechanisms, digitalization levels, and interoperability with other public information systems. Concurrently, both nations face shared difficulties, including fragmented databases, insufficient integrated digital infrastructures, and administrative vulnerabilities caused by the lack of synchronization between cultural heritage registers and cadastral or urban planning systems.

The significance of this research is further highlighted by recent shifts in European policies regarding cultural heritage and digital governance. Currently, the European Union promotes the development of interoperable digital ecosystems and open-data platforms designed to facilitate the smart administration of the built environment and its integration into sustainable development and urban planning policies. In this context, modernizing historic monument registers becomes a necessary prerequisite for increasing the efficiency of cultural heritage protection mechanisms and reducing risks associated with unauthorized interventions, degradation, or the demolition of historic monuments.

The objective of this study is to provide a comparative analysis of the recording and management mechanisms of historic monument registers in Romania and the Republic of Moldova. It emphasizes the legal framework, institutional structures, digitalization levels, and the interoperability of information systems utilized within the cultural heritage sector. The research aims to identify the main convergences and differences between the two administrative models, while highlighting

current limitations and modernization prospects in light of European trends in public administration digitalization and cultural heritage protection.

1. Materials and Methods

This research is grounded in a comparative analysis of the legal, administrative, and informational frameworks governing the organization and functioning of historic monument registers in Romania and the Republic of Moldova. The study evaluates the mechanisms for recording and managing built cultural heritage, focusing on the structure of official registers, listing procedures, digitalization levels, and the interoperability of systems utilized in the cultural heritage sector.

The documentary foundation of this study consists of national normative acts, official registers of historic monuments, public institutional sources, and relevant literature from the field of cultural heritage protection. For Romania, the research draws upon the provisions of *Law No. 422/2001 on the Protection of Historic Monuments*, (Legea nr. 422 privind protejarea monumentelor istorice, 2001), orders of the Ministry of Culture regarding the updating of the List of Historic Monuments, information published by the National Heritage Institute, and data available on institutional and open-data platforms dedicated to cultural heritage. For the Republic of Moldova, the analysis is based on *Law No. 1530/1993 on the Protection of Monuments*, Parliamentary Decision No. 1531/1993 approving the Register of State-Protected Monuments, t (Hotărârea Parlamentului Republicii Moldova nr. 1531-XII, 1993), information provided by the Ministry of Culture and the National Council of Historic Monuments, as well as registers and datasets published on official government portals. Information provided by the Ministry of Culture and the National Council of Historic Monuments, as well as registers and datasets published on official government portals.

The study comparatively analyzes the structure of historic monument registers, classification categories, monument identification and codification mechanisms, administrative listing and de-listing procedures, documentation required for register inclusion, and the legal

measures applicable once historic monument status is acquired. Furthermore, it examines the institutional organization of authorities responsible for cultural heritage protection and the level of integration of historic monument registers into cadastral and urban planning systems.

The research methodology relies primarily on the comparative method to identify convergences and differences between the administrative and legal systems of both states. This method facilitates an evaluation of the development level of information infrastructures used in cultural heritage administration and highlights specific characteristics regarding the digitalization of historic monument registers.

Additionally, a normative analysis method was applied by examining legislative provisions relevant to cultural heritage, urban planning, and cadastral records. This approach allowed for the identification of legal mechanisms protecting historic monuments and an analysis of the relationship between the cultural heritage regime and territorial management systems.

The research also incorporates elements of documentary and institutional analysis by leveraging reports, official communiqués, digital platforms, and publicly available online registers. In this context, the accessibility of public data, the digital formats used for publishing registers, and the existence of interoperability or open-data tools in the cultural heritage field were examined.

Furthermore, the study adopts an interdisciplinary approach situated at the intersection of law, public administration, cultural heritage, cadastre, and digital governance. This approach allows historic monument registers to be evaluated not merely as legal protection tools, but as essential information infrastructures for urban planning, territorial development, and the smart management of built cultural heritage.

The limitations of this research stem from differences in the recording systems used in the two states, varying levels of public data accessibility, and the lack of fully complete interoperable digital platforms in the cultural heritage sector. Nonetheless, the comparative analysis provides relevant conclusions regarding the current organization and digitalization of historic monument registers, underlining the need for modernization in alignment with contemporary European standards.

2. Results and Discussion

2.1. Comparative analysis of recording and management mechanisms for historic monuments in romania and the republic of moldova

The mechanisms for recording and managing historic monuments represent a fundamental element of cultural heritage protection policies. The effectiveness of the legal regime applied to monuments depends directly on the quality of systems used for inventorying, updating, monitoring, and institutionally integrating built heritage data. While both Romania and the Republic of Moldova maintain official registers of state-protected historic monuments, comparative analysis reveals significant differences in administrative structure, digitalization levels, updating mechanisms, and system interoperability with related fields like cadastre, urban planning, and local public administration.

In Romania, the regulatory framework for protecting immovable cultural heritage is governed primarily by *Law No. 422/2001 on the Protection of Historic Monuments* (Legea nr. 422 privind protejarea monumentelor istorice, 2001) , which establishes the List of Historic Monuments (LMI) as the official instrument for recording and classifying real estate assets with heritage value. The Romanian system features a well-organized structure of institutional responsibilities. The Ministry of Culture, the National Heritage Institute, County Directorates for Culture, and the National Commission for Historic Monuments all participate in listing, monitoring, and updating the registers.

The Romanian LHM is structured by counties and the Municipality of Bucharest, encompassing four primary categories of monuments: archaeological monuments, architectural monuments, public monuments, and memorial or funerary monuments. In terms of value, monuments are classified into Category A (monuments of national interest) and Category B (monuments of local interest). Each asset is assigned a unique alphanumeric LMI code reflecting its county, category, and identification number (e.g., "CJ-I-s-B-06921"). This coding system streamlines the

individualization of cultural assets and their integration into administrative and territorial records.

In comparison, the primary legal basis in the Republic of Moldova is *Law No. 1530/1993 on the Protection of Monuments* (subsequently republished) (Legea nr. 1530 privind ocrotirea monumentelor, 1993), r and *Parliamentary Decision No. 1531/1993 approving the Register of State-Protected Monuments*. (Hotărârea Parlamentului Republicii Moldova nr. 1531-XII, 1993). System administration is carried out by the Ministry of Culture in cooperation with public authorities and structures competent in cultural heritage protection, including advisory and control bodies. However, unlike the Romanian model, the Moldovan mechanism continues to face more pronounced institutional fragmentation and an insufficiently clear delineation of administrative competencies, which impacts the efficiency of updating and monitoring built cultural heritage.

In the Republic of Moldova, the Register of State-Protected Monuments is organized by districts and localities. It includes information such as the entry number, administrative location, monument type, chronology, domain, and protection category (N for monuments of national importance; L for monuments of local importance). Unlike the Romanian model, the Moldovan register utilizes a predominantly descriptive structure and lacks a national, unified technical coding system comparable to the LHM.

A major difference between the two systems lies in data organization and information standardization. In Romania, the standardized alphanumeric code assigned to each monument in the LMI facilitates rapid identification and simplifies correlation with other administrative or territorial databases. For instance, standardized coding enables relatively easy integration into GIS systems, urban planning databases, and construction permitting procedures. Conversely, the descriptive structure used in the Republic of Moldova—relying on entry numbers, locations, categories, and typologies—hinders digital interoperability and information synchronization among different public institutions. In practice, this creates obstacles during cadastral verifications, urban permitting, and the monitoring of interventions on historic monuments.

The procedures for listing historic monuments also vary significantly. In Romania, listing involves a phased administrative mechanism usually initiated by County Directorates for Culture, reviewed by the National Commission for Historic Monuments, and finalized through a Ministry of Culture Order published in the Official Gazette (*Monitorul Oficial*). The law allows for the listing order to be contested within 30 days. Additionally, the LHM is legally required to be updated periodically at approximately five-year intervals, though in practice major updates occur less frequently.

In the Republic of Moldova, additions or modifications to the Register of State-Protected Monuments are enacted via government or parliamentary decisions following approval by the National Council of Historic Monuments. For example, in 2023, the Government of the Republic of Moldova approved the inclusion of 8 new monuments of national importance into the Register based on evaluations conducted by cultural heritage specialists.

The comparative analysis also reveals variations in digitalization and public accessibility. In Romania, while the LMI is predominantly published in PDF format and lacks a fully interoperable system based on linked open-data standards, initiatives have been launched to publish data in reusable formats via the *data.gov.ro* platform and dedicated heritage GIS projects. Furthermore, the National Heritage Institute manages related digital tools and databases, such as the National Archaeological Record and records of movable cultural heritage, contributing to a more complex information infrastructure than that found in Moldova.

In the Republic of Moldova, data regarding historic monuments is mainly available in PDF or XLS formats on government portals and open-data platforms. However, the system currently lacks interactive query applications, public APIs, or interoperable digital infrastructures that would allow advanced use of cultural data in administrative or urbanistic processes. The absence of modern digital standards limits the register's utility within smart governance and sustainable urban development frameworks. In both states, information is published primarily in static

formats, and the lack of modern RDF, linked-data, or public API standards curtails automated data reuse.

Another critical dimension is the relationship between historic monument registers and cadastral/urban planning systems. In Romania, legislation mandates the registration of specific legal elements of the historic monument regime—such as obligations and easements—into the Land Registry (*Cartea Funciară*) without additional fees. This measure strengthens legal certainty and ensures citizens are informed about special protection regimes, facilitating heritage integration into urban planning and construction permitting, even though technical database interoperability remains incomplete.

In the Republic of Moldova, despite legal obligations to protect historic monuments and their designated protection zones, the actual integration of heritage registers into cadastral and urban systems remains limited. In practice, the lack of synchronization between cultural heritage records and urban or cadastral databases creates major administrative vulnerabilities, including the risk of permitting interventions incompatible with protection regulations.

In both countries, listing procedures require complex technical documentation, including historical studies, technical expertise, photographic documentation, cadastral plans, GIS coordinates, and specialized permits. In Romania, the Historic Monument Sheet (*Fișa Monumentului Istoric*) serves as a key technical tool for evaluating and recording listed cultural assets.

Ultimately, both states grapple with shared issues: slow register updates, insufficient financial resources, and a lack of integrated digital platforms. While Romania possesses a more mature institutional structure and higher alignment with European cultural heritage policies, it has yet to develop a fully automated, interoperable management model. In the Republic of Moldova, these challenges are amplified by constrained administrative capacity and incomplete legislative and institutional modernization.

Both nations participate in international cooperation mechanisms, including the application of the 1972 UNESCO Convention (UNESCO, 1972) and cross-border digitalization projects. Romania benefits to a

greater extent from access to European funds and mechanisms like the Historic Monuments Stamp (Timbrul Monumentelor Istorice 2025, 2025) or the National Restoration Program (PNR) (Programul Național de Restaurare (PNR), fără an), Meanwhile, the Republic of Moldova is gradually developing co-financing mechanisms through the National Culture Fund (Fondul național al culturii - noul mecanism ce va susține sectorul cultural independent și privat din domeniul artelor și industriilor creative, 2023) and international assistance programs.

Consequently, the comparative analysis demonstrates that the efficacy of record-keeping and administrative mechanisms for historic monuments does not rely solely on the existence of an official register; rather, it depends fundamentally on its capacity to operate as an integrated, interoperable, and continuously updated digital system capable of correlating cultural, cadastral, and urban planning data within a coherent administrative framework adapted to the exigencies of contemporary digital governance.

2.2. Digital interoperability and current limitations of historic monument registers in Romania and the Republic of Moldova

The digital transformation of public administration has necessitated a reconsideration of how cultural heritage registers are managed, particularly alongside the growth of territorial information systems, digital urban planning, and public database interoperability. Historic monument registers can no longer be viewed as mere administrative inventories; they are essential information infrastructures for built heritage protection, urban planning, territorial management, and the prevention of illegal interventions. Comparative analysis shows that both Romania and the Republic of Moldova face significant hurdles regarding digital interoperability, although their institutional and technological development levels differ.

A primary issue in both systems is the fragmented nature of the information infrastructures used for cultural heritage management. Heritage records function largely in isolation from cadastral, urban

planning, and construction permitting systems. The absence of automated data exchange mechanisms undermines administrative verification efficiency and impedes synchronized updates regarding the legal status of historic monuments, creating administrative vulnerabilities when issuing urban planning certificates and building permits.

In Romania, despite a standardized structure and unified technical codification for the LMI, the system remains heavily reliant on documents published in PDF format, restricting automated data reuse and integration into smart digital platforms. The lack of a system-wide public API and the absence of a complete linked open-data infrastructure reduce opportunities to connect heritage registers with GIS systems, cadastral databases, or local urban planning platforms. Although select datasets are available on *data.gov.ro* in reusable formats (e.g., XML or CSV formats populated during initiatives like *Wiki Loves Monuments*), (Wiki Loves Monuments, fără an), they remain partial and insufficient for genuine administrative interoperability. Concurrently, the National Heritage (Repertoriul Arheologic Naţional (RAN), fără an) , (Lista Monumentelor istorice, fără an).

In the Republic of Moldova, these challenges are more pronounced. The Register of State-Protected Monuments (Registrul monumentelor Republicii Moldova ocrotite de stat, fără an) is predominantly available as static PDF or XLS files on government portals. The system lacks official search applications, nationwide interactive geospatial query platforms, or modern digital interoperability standards. This deficit diminishes the capacity of authorities to perform continuous monitoring and rapid updates on the conservation status of the built environment.

Interoperability failures become particularly visible within historic protected zones and urban centers facing intense real estate pressure. Without automated integration between heritage registers and urban planning systems, local authorities may issue permissive acts without fully verifying the heritage restrictions applicable to a property or protected zone. Consequently, the lack of digital interoperability transitions from a technical flaw into a legal and administrative vulnerability that directly threatens built heritage conservation. In recent years, both states have witnessed urban interventions and construction projects generating

conflicts over compliance with historic monument regulations in historical centers and protected built areas. This underscores that an official register alone cannot guarantee protection without digital systems that ensure swift and accurate information flow across institutions.

Furthermore, digital integration difficulties are compounded by the non-uniform nature of databases managed by heritage institutions, which often lack common technical standards for data modeling and exchange. In advanced European states, historic monument registers are embedded into interactive cartographic platforms that map precise locations, delineate protection zones, and monitor urban interventions in real time. In contrast, geospatial technology and GIS tool utilization remain fragmented and limited in both Romania and the Republic of Moldova, with data dispersed across disparate administrative entities.

Additionally, neither nation widely implements modern RDF, SKOS, or linked open-data standards for organizing cultural heritage registers. This status quo restricts international interoperability and limits the integration of national cultural heritage into broader European digital ecosystems and territorial information infrastructures.

Accelerating digital transformation requires coherent public policies, specialized administrative competencies, and adequate financial backing. Romania’s access to European funds and digital culture projects has driven more advanced initiatives in digital heritage. Conversely, the modernization of digital infrastructure in the Republic of Moldova remains heavily reliant on external projects, international cooperation, and European assistance programs. Joint cross-border initiatives and cultural cooperation projects are gradually helping develop these infrastructures, supported by alignment efforts detailed in Moldova's National Adhesion Program.

Ultimately, the principal limitations of historic monument registers in Romania and the Republic of Moldova do not derive solely from legislative gaps, but from the absence of integrated digital ecosystems. Without real interoperability connecting cultural heritage with modern cadastral, urban, and territorial systems, heritage protection risks

remaining formal and reactive, failing to efficiently prevent degradation, illegal demolitions, or incompatible interventions.

Conclusions

The comparative analysis of historic monument registers in Romania and the Republic of Moldova underscores that the protection of built cultural heritage depends heavily on the efficiency of the administrative and digital mechanisms used to manage, update, and integrate this information into territorial and urban planning processes. While both nations have established legal and institutional frameworks dedicated to historic monument recording, their levels of register organization, standardization, and interoperability differ significantly.

In Romania, the normative and institutional framework appears more consolidated, characterized by a unified monument codification system, a relatively clear division of institutional responsibilities, and the integration of protection regimes into the property publicization system (Land Registry). The influence of European policies and funding has fostered advanced initiatives in digital heritage and open data. Nonetheless, the Romanian system remains constrained by slow register updates, database fragmentation, and insufficient interoperability between cultural, cadastral, and urban planning infrastructures.

In the Republic of Moldova, difficulties are amplified by limited administrative resources, a lack of unified digital standards, and a lower degree of institutional integration. Although the Register of State-Protected Monuments serves as the primary tool for heritage tracking, its functionality remains largely static and disconnected from modern territorial management systems. The reliance on PDF or XLS formats and the absence of interoperable platforms sharply reduce monitoring efficiency and the capacity to prevent unauthorized, incompatible interventions.

A key takeaway of this research is that the core vulnerabilities within both systems are technical and administrative rather than purely legislative. Without a functional nexus linking historic monument registers with cadastral records, urban planning platforms, and geospatial

infrastructures, cultural heritage protection risks remaining reactive. In practice, this disconnect leads to difficulties in verifying property legal regimes, administrative delays, and the unintended authorization of interventions detrimental to historic monuments.

Current European trends dictate a transition toward integrated digital registers anchored in interoperability, open data, and GIS technologies, operating in direct synchronization with cadastre and urban planning systems. Accordingly, both Romania and the Republic of Moldova must accelerate the modernization of their cultural heritage registers and cultivate inter-institutional cooperation mechanisms tailored to contemporary digital governance demands.

Consequently, modernizing historic monument registers must be approached not merely as a technical overhaul, but as a strategic pillar of cultural heritage protection and sustainable territorial development. Building interoperable, continuously updated digital platforms aligned with European standards will strengthen the legal security of the built environment, optimize administrative workflows, and safeguard cultural assets of national and local importance from degradation or permanent loss.

Table 1. Comparative Analysis Between Romania and the Republic of Moldova

COMPARATIVE ASPECT	ROMANIA	REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA
Primary Legal Framework	Law No. 422/2001 on the Protection of Historical Monuments.	Law No. 1530/1993 on the Protection of Monuments (republished in 2022).
Key Regulatory Instruments	Emergency Ordinances, Government Decisions, Ministry of	Parliament Decision No. 1531/1993 (approving the Register), various Government

	Culture classification/delisting orders; Civil and Contravening Codes (sanctions).	Decisions on Ministry operations, legislative reform drafts (2023/2024).
Competent Authorities	Ministry of Culture (County Directorates for Culture, National Heritage Institute); National Commission for Historical Monuments (CNMI); Local public authorities.	Ministry of Culture; Institute of Cultural Heritage; National Inspectorate of Monuments; Agency for Monument Inspection and Restoration; National Council of Historical Monuments (CNMI).
Official Registers	List of Historical Monuments (LMI) – published via Ministry Order (e.g., Order 2828/2015). Legally subject to 5-year updates. Organized by counties.	Register of State-Protected Monuments. Approved by Parliament Decision No. 1531/1993; updated periodically via Government/Parliament decrees (e.g., Dec. 2023).
Structure and Data Standardization	Each monument has a unique alphanumeric code (e.g., CJ-I-s-B-06921). Fields: code, name,	Descriptive structure: entry number, locality, monument type, chronology, protection scope,

	locality, address, epoch. Files published in PDF. Lacks public RDF taxonomy.	category (N - National, L - Local). Available in PDF/XLS. Lacks standardized coding.
Scope of Protected Objects	Archaeological, architectural, public art, and memorial/ funerary monuments; grouped into Category A (national) and B (local). Includes buffer zones.	Historical monuments (churches, manors, archaeological sites) and public monuments. Classified as National (N) or Local (L) significance.
Listing Criteria	Set by law/norms (historical value, authenticity, integrity, regional/national significance). Evaluated by technical commissions based on dossiers.	Historical and scientific value proposed by experts or local authorities. Lacks precise technical criteria in primary legislation; proposed by academia.
Listing & Delisting Procedures	1) Proposal by County Directorates; 2) Evaluation by CNMI; 3) Ministerial Order; 4) Publication in	1) Proposal by researchers, owners, or ministries; 2) Endorsement by CNMI; 3) Government or Parliament decree;

	Official Gazette; 5) Registration in Land Registry (within 30 days, free of charge). Appeals allowed within 30 days.	4) Publication in Official Gazette and local notification. Appeal procedures are not explicitly detailed.
Required Documentation	Technical dossier: standardized forms, historical study, technical reports, plans, photos, GIS coordinates, planning consents. Buffer zones determined by studies.	Asset inventory: description, architectural plans, technical reports, historical study, photos, GPS coordinates, cadastral records. Standard forms are emerging.
Post-Listing Safeguards	Special regime: mandatory Ministry permits for interventions; maintenance duties; "Historical Monument" plaque; registration of encumbrances in Land Registry.	Legal protection: mandatory permits for works; buffer zone restrictions; optional physical markers. Demolition or unauthorized modification is strictly prohibited.
Public Portals & Accessibility	Available via Ministry of Culture and National Heritage Institute sites. Partial datasets	Published in PDF/XLS on the government open-data portal (dataset.gov.md) and linked in the

	(CSV/XML) on data.gov.ro (e.g., Wiki Loves Monuments). No system-wide API.	European open-data catalog. No search engine or API.
Update Mechanism	Maintained by National Heritage Institute and County Directorates. Changes made via individual orders or bulk updates (e.g., Order 2828/2015).	Updated through Government or Parliament decisions based on Ministry submissions (e.g., 8 new monuments added in 2023).
Monitoring & Sanctions	Monitored by County Directorates and Ministry. Fines set by Contravention Code; deliberate destruction results in criminal prosecution.	Monitored by Ministry inspections and the Monument Agency. Fines defined in Penal/Contravention Codes, though enforcement remains legally modest.

References

The National Culture Fund - the new mechanism that will support the independent and private cultural sector in the field of arts and creative industries. (2023, 12 13). Retrieved from Ministerul

Culturii : https://mc.gov.md/ro/content/fondul-national-al-culturii-noul-mecanism-ce-va-sustine-sectorul-cultural-independent-si

Decision of the Parliament of the Republic of Moldova No. 1531 XII. (1993). Official Gazette. Retrieved from https://www.legis.md/cautare/getResults?doc_id=148719&lang=ro

Law No. 1530 on the protection of monuments. (1993). Official Gazette. Retrieved from https://www.legis.md/cautare/getResults?doc_id=137389&lang=ro

Law No. 422 on the protection of historical monuments. Official Gazette of Romania. (2001). Retrieved from https://legislatie.just.ro/public/detaliidocument/29761

List of Historical Monuments. (n.d.). Retrieved from Ministerul Culturii: https://www.cultura.ro/lista-monumentelor-istorice/

National Restoration Program (PNR). (n.d.). Retrieved from Institutul Național al Patrimoniului: https://patrimoniu.ro/ro/articles/programul-national-de-restaurare-pnr

Register of monuments of the Republic of Moldova protected by the state. (n.d.). Retrieved from dataset.gov.md: https://dataset.gov.md/resources/2018-05/Registrul%20Monumntelor%20RM.pdf

National Archaeological Directory (RAN). (n.d.). Retrieved from Repertoriul Arheologic Naţional : https://ran.cimec.ro/

Historical Monuments Stamp 2025. (2025). Retrieved from Institutul Național al Patrimoniului: https://patrimoniu.ro/ro/articles/kd-wyca4u83hdw

UNESCO. (1972). Convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage. Retrieved from https://whc.unesco.org/archive/convention-en.pdf

Wiki Loves Monuments. (n.d.). Retrieved from Wiki Loves Monuments: https://www.wikilovesmonuments.org/