

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Budapest, including the Banks of the Danube, the Buda Castle Quarter and Andrassy Avenue

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

• Hungary

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

400bis

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987, 2002


1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
	0 / 0	?	?	?	
	0 / 0	?	?	?	
Budapest, the Banks of the Danube and the Buda Castle Quarter, Budapest, Hungary	47.467 / 19.067	415.1	0	415.1	1987
Andrassy Avenue and the Underground, Budapest, Hungary	47.489 / 19.087	57.85	239.61	297.46	2002
Total (ha)		472.95	239.61	712.56	

Comment

This table contains factual errors. The correct data is:
Budapest, the Banks of the Danube and the Buda Castle Quarter, Budapest, Hungary Property: 413 ha Buffer zone: 0
Total: 413 ha
Andrassy Avenue and the Underground, Budapest, Hungary Property: 55 ha Buffer zone: 508 ha
Total: 563 ha
Total Property: 468 ha
Total Buffer zone: 508 ha
Total: 976 ha

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
The World Heritage site of Budapest, including the banks of the Danube, the Buda castle quarter and Andrassy avenue, scale 1:20000	30/11/2007	

Comment

We intend to submit an updated, good quality map and after consultation with the WH Centre decide on the appropriate procedure (MBM or clarification).

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

Comment

Mr. János Lázár, Minister Responsible for the Prime Minister's Office. Prime Minister's Office, H 1357 Budapest, Pf. 6, Tel.: +36-1-795 500, E-mail: titkarsag@me.gov.hu (details are expected later) National Focal Point Dr Gábor Soós, Head of Division of World Heritage and International Relations Gyula

Forster National Centre for CH Management Táncsics u. 1. H 1014 Budapest +3612254873 gabor.soos@forsterkozpont.hu

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

• Zoltan Cselovszki
Gyula Forster Centre for Cultural Heritage Management
Chairman

Comment

Gyula Forster National Centre for Cultural Heritage Management (include "National") write "President" in the title instead of "Chairman" Telephone: +36-1-225-4850

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

- [Budapest City Hall \(hungarian only\)](#)
- [Welcome to Budapest](#)
- [Budapest World Heritage \(OWHC-CEER\)](#)

Comment

the relevant websites: www.forsterkozpont.hu - www.vilagorokseg.hu - budapest.hu - www.ovpm.org/en/hungary/budapest Please delete the non relevant websites.

1.8 - Other designations / Conventions under which the property is protected (if applicable)

Comment

Danube River Protection Convention Natura 2000

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

Brief synthesis

This stretch of the Danube has been the location of human settlement since the Palaeolithic. It was the site of the Roman city of Aquincum, situated to the north of the inscribed property which comprises parts of two originally quite separate cities: Buda on the spur on the right bank and Pest on the plain on the left bank. Pest was the first medieval urban centre, devastated in 1241-2. A few years later the castle of Buda was built on a rocky spur on the right bank by King Bela IV. Thereafter, the city reflected the history of the Hungarian monarchy. After the end of the Turkish occupation, recovery did not really begin until the 18th century. In the 19th century, the city's role as a capital was enhanced by the foundation of the Hungarian Academy, housed from 1862 in a neo-renaissance palace, and by the construction of the imposing neo-gothic Parliament building (1884–1904). W.T. Clark's suspension bridge, finalised in 1849, symbolised the reunification of Buda and Pest, which did not actually come about until 1873. The symbol of the development of the city as a modern metropolis was the radial Andrassy Avenue, which was included in the property in 2002. From 1872, the Avenue radically transformed the urban structure of Pest, together with the construction of the European continent's first underground railway beneath it in 1893-6.

As a centre for receiving and disseminating cultural influences, Budapest is an outstanding example of urban development in Central Europe, characterised by periods of devastation and revitalisation. Budapest has retained the separate structural characteristics of the former cities of Pest, Buda and Óbuda.

One example thereof is the Buda Castle Quarter with its medieval and characteristically Baroque style, which are distinct from the extended and uniquely homogeneous architecture of Pest (with its historicising and art nouveau styles) which is characterised by outstanding public buildings and fitted into the ringed-radial city structure. All this is organized into a unity arising from the varied morphological characteristics of the landscape and the Danube, the two banks of which are linked by a number of bridges. The urban architectural ensemble of the Andrassy Avenue ('The Avenue') and its surroundings (Heroes' Square, the City Park, historic inner city districts and public buildings) are high-quality architectural and artistic realisations of principles of urbanism reflecting tendencies, which became widespread in the second part of the 19th century. The scenic view of the banks of the Danube as part of the historic urban landscape is a unique example of the harmonious interaction between human society and a natural environment characterised by varied morphological conditions (Gellert Hill with the Citadel and the Buda Hills partly covered with forests, the broad Danube river with its islands and Pest's flat terrain rising with a slight gradient).

Criterion (ii): Aquincum played an essential role in the diffusion of Roman architectural forms in Pannonia, then in Dacia. Buda Castle played an essential role in the diffusion of Gothic art in the Magyar region from the 14th century. In the reign of Matthias Corvinus, Buda was an artistic centre comparable, due to its influence, to that of Cracow. As a result of the unification of Pest, Buda and Óbuda in 1872-73, Budapest became once more a significant centre in the second part of the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th century due to the amount and quality of heritage built during those periods. It was a centre which absorbed, integrated and disseminated outstanding and progressive European influences of urbanism and of architecture as well as modern technological developments such as the Millennium Underground Railway, built under Andrassy Avenue, the first in Continental Europe, all of which was in line with its role as a metropolis.

Criterion (iv): Buda Castle is an architectural ensemble which, together with the nearby old district (the Buda Castle Quarter) illustrates two significant periods of history which were separated by an interval corresponding to the Turkish invasion. The Parliament is also an outstanding example of a great official building on a par with those of London, Munich, Vienna and Athens, exemplifying the eclectic architecture of the 19th century, whilst at the same time symbolising the political function of the second capital of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Andrassy Avenue (1872-1885) and the Millenary Underground Railway (1893 - 1896) are representative examples of the implementation of planning solutions associated with the latest technical facilities of the day to meet the requirements of an emerging modern society. Architecturally, the Avenue has great integrity in its eclectic, neo-renaissance buildings.

Integrity

The delimitation of the extended property meets the requirements of integrity, since it includes the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value and their historical and structural role is preserved in the urban fabric. Despite the ruinous or missing buildings in certain parts and especially in the Buda Castle Quarter, and despite the reconstructions within the panorama of the Danube banks following World War II, the overall integrity of the property is sustained. In order to reinforce integrity, it is justified to review the delimitation on the Buda side as well as the inclusion of Margaret Island and the extension of the protected area up to the Grand Boulevard

(Nagykorút). The original form of Andrassy Avenue with its buildings has been preserved reasonably well in terms of its conception its relation to the surrounding urban environment, as well as the building fabric. Attention is also given to the preservation and appropriate design of small elements that form part of the street furniture. There are some problems, for example, in the physical condition of the buildings: wooden roof structures have suffered from humidity and metal structures have corroded, requiring maintenance and repair. There have also been some changes in the occupation, offices tending to replace the earlier residential use, which is a common problem in central urban areas. There have been problems with regard to development in the setting of the World Heritage property, both in terms of demolition and inappropriate new structures. Other challenges are the insurance of heritage-friendly traffic management and the mitigation of climate change impact on the natural and built environment (for example extreme water-levels of the Danube, air-pollution and deterioration of limestone structures).

Authenticity

In its attributes and the sum of its constituent parts, the property preserves the defining characters of the architectural heritage created by consecutive layers of historical periods. The restoration and partial reconstruction of the Buda Castle Quarter after World War II, carried out mainly between 1960 and 1980, as well as the degree of authenticity of the surviving historicising buildings are in line with the requirements of the Operational Guidelines. The majority of the replaced buildings in the panorama of the Danube banks conform to their original scales. The big public buildings, such as the Parliament, the Opera House, the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the Market Hall, have also retained their original functions. Three of the four bridges across the Danube situated in the property have been authentically renovated. The 20th century design of the new Elisabeth Bridge fits in well into the line of bridges preserving its authentic image. Andrassy Avenue, with its trees alongside and its environment, preserve its historicity in its conception and constituent parts. The majority of public buildings have preserved their original function, however, the transformation of residential buildings into offices is an unfavourable trend. The renovated Underground Railway plays a functional role in the city infrastructure. The stations under the Avenue have retained their original features, while those in the City Park have been changed from their original position above-ground and are now built under the surface which represents a certain degree of compromise with regard to the authenticity of the railway. One of the guarantees of the property's authenticity lies in the authentic conservation of the historic urban structure and the buildings in the buffer zone.

Protection and management requirements

The World Heritage property with its buffer zone has been legally protected as a historic monuments area since 1965; this protected area was enlarged in 2005 - after the extension of the property in 2002 - under the Act on the Protection of Cultural Heritage. A great number of historic buildings as well as the bridges and the embankments are also individually protected. The proposed revision of the boundaries of the property is prompted not only by decisions of the World Heritage Committee, but also by recent evolution in the appreciation of the heritage values of the property and its surroundings, as well as by the appearance of new threats. The property and its buffer zone lie within nine administrative districts of Budapest, another municipality being that of the Capital of Budapest itself. These ten municipalities concerned have not yet established an overall management body. Architectural Planning Juries, both at the level of the districts and at the level of the Capital of Budapest, facilitate high

quality architectural developments in accordance with the values of the property. The Gyula Forster National Centre for Cultural Heritage Management is the World Heritage Management Body. Based on the national World Heritage Act of 2011, the state of conservation of the property, as well as threats and preservation measures will be regularly monitored and reported to the National Assembly, while the management plan will be reviewed at least every seven years. Once finalised and approved, the management plan and the management body provide transparent governance arrangements with clear responsibilities, where different interests can manifest themselves and where the institutional framework and methods for the cooperation of the different stakeholders are available.

A management requirement is the establishment of an urban conservation and development plan for the buffer zone, fully respecting the principal architectural and urban values of each quarter with a strict enforcement.. In a complementary manner, additional funding (for example tax incentives and grants) has to be sought, and in a dynamic manner, private building investment has to be directed to rehabilitation operations and restoration rather than demolition and reconstruction. Due to the complexity of the property and its context, special attention has to be paid to developing appropriate monitoring tools and mechanisms as well as to their proper application.

2.2 - The criteria (2005 revised version) under which the property was inscribed

(ii)(iv)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

Criterion(ii):Progressive European influences on urbanism/architecture and modern technological developments from the late 19th and early 20th centuries.Andrassy Ave as a symbol of the city's development into a modern metropolis.Criterion(iv):Distinct structural characteristics of the former towns of Pest, Buda and Óbuda retained.A uniquely homogeneous architecture of Pest (Historicising and Art Nouveau styles).A harmonious blend of a built environment with a varied landscape and the Danube.

2.4 - If needed, please provide details of why the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be revised

2.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

no comment

3. Factors Affecting the Property

3.14. Other factor(s)

3.14.1 - Other factor(s)

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact						Origin	
3.1	Buildings and Development								
3.1.1	Housing								
3.1.2	Commercial development								
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure								
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities								
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure								
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure								
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure								
3.2.5	Underground transport infrastructure								
3.3	Services Infrastructures								
3.3.1	Water infrastructure								
3.3.2	Renewable energy facilities								
3.4	Pollution								
3.4.4	Air pollution								
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric								
3.7.5	Dust								
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)								
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage								
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses								
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage								
3.8.4	Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system								
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community								
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation								
3.9	Other human activities								
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage								
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events								
3.10.1	Storms								
3.10.2	Flooding								
3.10.6	Temperature change								
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events								
3.11.2	Earthquake								
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)								
3.13	Management and institutional factors								
3.13.1	Low impact research / monitoring activities								
3.13.3	Management activities								
Legend	Current	Potential	Negative	Positive	Inside	Outside			

3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend
3.1	Buildings and Development				
3.1.2	Commercial development	restricted	one off or rare	significant	medium capacity
3.4	Pollution				

		Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend
3.4.4	Air pollution	widespread	on-going	minor	no capacity and / or resources	increasing
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric					
3.7.5	Dust					
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	low capacity	static
3.8.4	Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system	extensive	on-going	minor	low capacity	static
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	no capacity and / or resources	static
3.9	Other human activities					
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage	restricted	one off or rare	significant	low capacity	static
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events					
3.10.6	Temperature change					

4.2. Protective Measures

4.2.1 - Protective designation (legal, regulatory, contractual, planning, institutional and / or traditional)

The property includes the Budapest, the Banks of the Danube and the Buda Castle Quarter (property component 400 Ha) inscribed in 1987 and the Andrassy Avenue and the Underground Budapest (property component: 57.85 Ha and its buffer zone: 239.61 Ha) inscribed as an extension in 2002. The City of Budapest has 23 Districts. The World Heritage Area comprising the WH property and its buffer zone cover the area of 9 Districts. The whole World Heritage area is composed of 1369 monuments and plots with 793 individually protected buildings and 684 buildings under territorial protection.

The whole world heritage property with its buffer zone has been legally protected as a historic monuments area since 1965, the protected area was enlarged in 2005 - after the extension of the property in 2002 - under the *Act on the Protection of Cultural Heritage*. A great number of historic buildings as well as the bridges and the embankments are also individually protected.

The protection of the monuments in Hungary is based on Act No.LXIV, 2001, on the Protection of Cultural Heritage, which covers the areas of archaeology, built heritage and the protection of movable objects. This Act defines the specific responsibilities of owners with regard to state, local government and private (including Church) enterprises, and lays down rules for the protection and utilization of heritage. A modification of this Cultural Heritage Law (Act LXIV/2001), passed by Parliament on 26 November 2012, established the new concepts of historic and national memory sites, with 36 items belonging to the historic, and nine to the national list. The amendment separates the responsibility for the preservation of archaeological heritage and historic properties, which belong to the Ministry of the Interior, from the responsibility for cultural goods, assigned to the Ministry of Human Resources.

On 14 June 2011, the Hungarian Parliament adopted Act LXXVII, 2011, on World Heritage (the World Heritage Law). The law came into force on 1 January 2012. This Act LXXVII/2011 on Hungarian World Heritage aims to put on a solid legal and institutional basis the efficient implementation of the World Heritage Convention in Hungary and to ensure the efficient management of the Hungarian sites inscribed on the World Heritage list.

The scope of this Act covers:

- World Heritage areas and Tentative World Heritage areas,
- activities related to World Heritage areas and Tentative World Heritage areas as well as concerning the outstanding universal value of World Heritage areas and the outstanding value of Tentative World Heritage areas, furthermore
- organisations and persons carrying out, or affected by the activities under point b).

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

Source: [Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 \(2001-2006\)](#)

Submitted on Monday, October 31, 2005

• Question 6.02

- the basic Hungarian legislative text on the Protection of Cultural Heritage: Act LXIV of 2001 on the Protection of Cultural Heritage
- Metropolitan Master Plan
- Building Acts
- Local municipality regulations

3.17. Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to factors affecting the property

3.17.1 - Comments

For some factors, our negative impact ratings would actually be somewhere between minor and significant. We have chosen to mark these as significant with a view to increasing the efficiency of the management of the World Heritage property. The ongoing large-scale conservation projects (Kossuth Square and Várkert Bazár) in these sites have a positive impact on the properties.

4. Protection, Management and Monitoring of the Property

4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is a buffer zone

4.1.2 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are **adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.1.3 - Are the buffer zone(s) of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The buffer zones of the World Heritage property **do not limit the ability to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value but they could be improved**

4.1.4 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property known?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are known by the management authority but **are not known by local residents / communities / landowners.**

4.1.5 - Are the buffer zones of the World Heritage property known?

The buffer zones of the World Heritage property are known by the management authority but **are not known by local residents / communities/landowners.**

4.1.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to boundaries and buffer zones of the World Heritage property

4.1.3-quote from WHC/ICOMOS Joint mission report Budapest 2013: "The mission members, taking account of the location of the Island, its context and setting,emphasize the opportunities offered by an extension of the buffer zone to include Margit Island.Moreover,the mission recommends the buffer zone be extended to include the landscape which surrounds all the components of the property..."

4.2.2 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

The legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property provides **an adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection

4.2.3 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

The legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property provides **an adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection

4.2.4 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

The legal framework for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone provides **an adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection of the property, contributing to the maintenance of its Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity

4.2.5 - Can the legislative framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) be enforced?

There is **acceptable** capacity / resources to enforce legislation and / or regulation in the World Heritage property but some deficiencies remain

4.2.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to protective measures

The development of the World Heritage management plan has started. The management plan will be a more effective tool to enforce the existing regulations and to achieve alignment of the different rules of the districts. This is necessary in order to, among other things, to protect the urban fabric. The Budapest World Heritage Management Body can help guarantee this happening.

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

An important reform of the administration responsible for Cultural Heritage was made within the recent National Administrative Reform in Hungary. In conformity with the Acts and Governmental Decrees the protection of Hungary's cultural heritage has been placed under the supervision of three ministries: the Ministry of the Interior (legislative and professional direction), the Ministry of Human Resources (matters related to the World Heritage Convention and the management of World Heritage properties remained with this Ministry responsible for culture) and the Ministry of Public Administration and Justice (legal supervision of local governments). According to Governmental Decree 393/2012 (XII. 20) (on the regulations related to the protection of archaeological heritage and historic monument values), in Budapest two District

Construction and Heritage Protection Agencies administer the tasks associated with cultural heritage protection as primary heritage protection authorities within their defined jurisdictions. The Budapest Metropolitan Government's Construction and Heritage Protection Agency has jurisdiction as the heritage protection appeals board for issues related to the protection of historic and archaeological assets in the Budapest World Heritage area.

The entire Budapest World Heritage area (property and buffer zone) continues to be protected as a listed Area of Historic Significance and the listed monument buildings are still protected as historic properties.

Governmental Decree requires the district construction and heritage preservation agency to consult the Gyula Forster National Centre for Cultural Heritage Management over matters affecting World Heritage areas.

Based on the World Heritage Act of 2011, the state of the property, as well as threats and preservation measures will be regularly monitored and reported to the National Assembly, while the management plan will be reviewed at least every seven years.

Ministers carrying out state tasks related to the "Budapest - the Banks of the Danube with the Gellert Hill and the Castle Hill, the Buda Castle Quarter and Andrassy Avenue" in agreement with the minister responsible for culture :

Consenting Ministers	
Minister	responsible for supervising state assets
Minister	responsible for construction
Minister	responsible for development policy
Minister	responsible for organising public administration
Minister	responsible for nature protection
Minister	responsible for spatial planning
Minister	responsible for settlement development and settlement planning
Minister	responsible for tourism

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

Source: [Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 \(2001-2006\)](#)

Submitted on Monday, October 31, 2005

• **Question 5.04** Plans in place to set up a "steering group: Establishing a World Heritage „steering group" is ordered in the Act of LXXXIX of 2005 on the Protection of Cultural Heritage, 2. paragraph 5/A, (1)-(3)).

• **Question 5.05**



Overall management system of the site

- Management under protective legislation
- Management under traditional protective measures or customary law

Comment

Please, add this to the list of Consenting Ministers: Minister responsible for the protection of archaeological heritage and monuments

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Title	Status	Available	Date	Link to source
Budapest World Heritage Programme	N/A	Available	01/00/1999	
"Management Plan"	N/A	Available	01/01/2001	

Comment

Pursuant to Hungary's World Heritage Act (WHA) and relating decrees of implementation, the development of a Management Plan is currently underway in accordance with the WHA and Decree 315/2011 (XII. 27) on World Heritage Management Plans.

4.3.3 - How well do the various levels of administration (i.e. national / federal; regional / provincial / state; local / municipal etc.) coordinate in the management of the World Heritage Property ?

There is coordination between the range of administrative bodies / levels involved in the management of the property **but it could be improved**

4.3.4 - Is the management system / plan adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value ?

The management system/plan is only **partially adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?

The management system is **only partially** being implemented

4.3.6 - Is there an annual work / action plan and is it being implemented?

No annual work / action plan exists **despite an identified need**

4.3.7 - Please rate the cooperation / relationship with World Heritage property managers / coordinators / staff of the following

Local communities / residents	Poor
Local / Municipal authorities	Fair
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Not applicable
Visitors	Non-existent
Researchers	Fair
Tourism industry	Fair
Industry	Not applicable

4.3.8 - If present, do local communities resident in or near the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?

Local communities have **some input** into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management

4.3.9 - If present, do indigenous peoples resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?

No indigenous peoples are resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone

4.3.10 - Is there cooperation with industry (i.e. forestry, mining, agriculture, etc.) regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone?

There is **little or no contact** with industry regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and /

or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone

4.3.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training

no comment

4.3.12 - Please report any significant changes in the legal status and / or contractual / traditional protective measures and management arrangements for the World Heritage property since inscription or the last Periodic report

The Budapest World Heritage Management Body was appointed in January 2013 by Minister of Human Resources Zoltán Balog pursuant to Act LXXVII/2011 on World Heritage (World Heritage Act). The Budapest World Heritage Management Body is part of the Forster Gyula National Centre for Cultural Heritage Management. The development of the World Heritage Management Plan was started in 2014. It will be enacted as a government decree by the end of 2015.

4.4. Financial and Human Resources

4.4.1 - Costs related to conservation, based on the average of last five years (relative percentage of the funding sources)

Multilateral funding (GEF, World Bank, etc)	0%
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Governmental (National / Federal)	15%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	0%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	20%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	0%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	0%
Other grants	65%

4.4.2 - International Assistance received from the World Heritage Fund (USD)

4.4.3 - Is the current budget sufficient to manage the World Heritage property effectively?

The available budget is **acceptable** but could be further improved to fully meet the management needs

4.4.4 - Are the existing sources of funding secure and likely to remain so?

The existing sources of funding **are secure** in the medium-term and planning is underway to secure funding in the long-term

4.4.5 - Does the World Heritage property provide economic benefits to local communities (e.g. income, employment)?

There is **some flow** of economic benefits to local communities

4.4.6 - Are available resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure sufficient to meet management needs?

There are **some** adequate equipment and facilities, but deficiencies in at least one key area **constrain** management at the World Heritage property

4.4.7 - Are resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure adequately maintained?

There is **basic** maintenance of equipment and facilities

4.4.8 - Comments, conclusion, and / or recommendations related to finance and infrastructure

The site Management Body and financing are new instruments, that is why there is an apparent inconsistency in the above answers. 4.4.1 - The numbers are based on estimates. There are projects on the World Heritage property which are partly or fully financed from European funds under governmental operational programmes.

4.4.9 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Full-time	100%
Part-time	0%

4.4.10 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Permanent	100%
Seasonal	0%

4.4.11 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Paid	100%
Volunteer	0%

4.4.12 - Are available human resources adequate to manage the World Heritage property?

A range of human resources exist, but these are **below optimum** to manage the World Heritage Property.

4.4.13 - Considering the management needs of the World Heritage property, please rate the availability of professionals in the following disciplines

Research and monitoring	Fair
Promotion	Poor
Community outreach	Poor
Interpretation	Fair
Education	Fair
Visitor management	Non-existent
Conservation	Good
Administration	Fair
Risk preparedness	Poor
Tourism	Fair
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Good

4.4.14 - Please rate the availability of training opportunities for the management of the World Heritage property in the following disciplines

Research and monitoring	Medium
Promotion	High

Community outreach	High
Interpretation	Medium
Education	Medium
Visitor management	High
Conservation	Low
Administration	Low
Risk preparedness	High
Tourism	High
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Low

4.4.15 - Do the management and conservation programmes at the World Heritage property help develop local expertise?

A capacity development plan or programme is drafted or in place, but is **not being implemented**

4.4.16 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training

no comment

4.5. Scientific Studies and Research Projects

4.5.1 - Is there adequate knowledge (scientific or traditional) about the values of the World Heritage property to support planning, management and decision-making to ensure that Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?

Knowledge about the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient**

4.5.2 - Is there a planned programme of research at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?

There is **considerable** research but it is **not directed** towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?

Research results are **shared with local participants and some national agencies**

4.5.4 - Please provide details (i.e. authors, title, and web link) of papers published about the World Heritage property since the last Periodic Report

World Heritage Treasures in Hungary by Tamás Fejérdy and János Tardy; Facts about Hungary,2012 by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; World Heritage Encyclopaedia (edited by Szilvia Széll Füzesiné); Our Natural and Cultural Treasures under UNESCO Protection, published by Kossuth Kiadó, 2011; World Heritage – Cultural and Natural Treasures of Mankind, Partvonal Kiadó, 2010

4.5.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to scientific studies and research projects

no comment

4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building

4.6.1 - At how many locations is the World Heritage emblem displayed at the property?

In many locations and easily visible to visitors

4.6.2 - Please rate the awareness and understanding of the existence and justification for inscription of the World Heritage property amongst the following groups

Local communities / residents	Average
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Excellent
Local Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Local landowners	Average
Visitors	Excellent
Tourism industry	Excellent
Local businesses and industries	Average

4.6.3 - Is there a planned education and awareness programme linked to the values and management of the World Heritage property?

There is a **limited and ad hoc** education and awareness programme

4.6.4 - What role, if any, has designation as a World Heritage property played with respect to education, information and awareness building activities?

World Heritage status has influenced education, information and awareness building activities, **but it could be improved**

4.6.5 - How well is the information on Outstanding Universal Value of the property presented and interpreted?

The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is adequately presented and interpreted **but improvements could be made**

4.6.6 - Please rate the adequacy for education, information and awareness building of the following visitor facilities and services at the World Heritage property

Visitor centre	Not provided but needed
Site museum	Adequate
Information booths	Not provided but needed
Guided tours	Adequate
Trails / routes	Excellent
Information materials	Adequate
Transportation facilities	Poor
Other	Not needed

4.6.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to education, information and awareness building

no comment

4.7. Visitor Management

4.7.1 - Please provide the trend in annual visitation for the last five years

Last year	Minor Increase
-----------	----------------

Two years ago	Minor Increase
Three years ago	Minor Increase
Four years ago	Major Increase (100%+)
Five years ago	Decreasing

4.7.2 - What information sources are used to collect trend data on visitor statistics?

Tourism industry

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

4.7.4 - Is there an appropriate visitor use management plan (e.g. specific plan) for the World Heritage property which ensures that its Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?

Visitor use of the World Heritage property is **not being actively managed** despite an identified need

4.7.5 - Does the tourism industry contribute to improving visitor experiences and maintaining the values of the World Heritage property?

Although the tourism industry is active in the property, there is **little or no contact** between tourism operators and those responsible for the World Heritage property

4.7.6 - If fees (i.e. entry charges, permits) are collected, do they contribute to the management of the World Heritage property?

No fees are collected

4.7.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to visitor use of the World Heritage property

There are entrance fees to places open to visitors at the World Heritage property. However, the income from such fees are not even partially credited to the property management budget.

4.8. Monitoring

4.8.1 - Is there a monitoring programme at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?

There is a **small amount** of monitoring, but it is not planned

4.8.2 - Are key indicators for measuring the state of conservation used to monitor how the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is maintained?

Information on the values of the World Heritage property is sufficient to define key indicators, **but this has not been done**

4.8.3 - Please rate the level of involvement in monitoring of the following groups

World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff	Average
Local / Municipal authorities	Poor
Local communities	Poor
Researchers	Average
NGOs	Average
Industry	Not applicable

Local indigenous peoples	Not applicable
--------------------------	----------------

4.8.4 - Has the State Party implemented relevant recommendations arising from the World Heritage Committee?

Implementation is **underway**

4.8.5 - Please provide comments relevant to the implementation of recommendations from the World Heritage Committee

no comment

4.8.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to monitoring

no comment

4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs

4.9.1 - Please select the top 6 managements needs for the property (if more than 6 are listed below)

Please refer to question 5.2

5. Summary and Conclusions

5.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

5.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property

		World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
3.1	Buildings and Development						
3.1.2	Commercial development	This factor primarily affects Criterion (iv)	The management plan must determine the scope of developments.	Separate monitoring of the Property and Buffer Zone. There is a need to record the changes in the number of commercial establishments, and changes in average floor area they occupy.	Short-term: an assessment of the current situation, compiling proposals - 18 months Section 2: continued implementation of the required measures and interventions - 36 months	With the coordination of the management body.	The creating of the management plan is in progress.
3.4	Pollution						
3.4.4	Air pollution	Air pollution impacts against the preservation, it affects all criteria.	This factor is within the purview of the Municipality of Budapest. The Management Body collaborates with the Municipality of Budapest.	This factor is within the purview of the Municipality of Budapest. The Management Body collaborates with the Municipality of Budapest.	in progress	This factor is within the purview of the Municipality of Budapest. The Management Body collaborates with the Municipality of Budapest.	no comment
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage						
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage	This factor affects both Criterion (iv) and Criterion (ii).	Education, training and public information can improve the public image of heritage. Cyclically recurring events to be organised about the world heritage. It is essential that these actions should be aimed at all age groups.	There is a need to measure the number of events organised, the number of participants, media reports and media coverage.	in progress	Initiated and coordinated by and in consultation with Management Body.	no comment
3.8.4	Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system	Changes in lifestyle have resulted in changes in needs. These changing needs have caused changes in functions and use of buildings. This factor affects both criteria.	The original function must be retained if possible. Buildings should be adapted to meet the changing needs, but heritage must be preserved. Start rehabilitation projects.	The number of redundant buildings, re-used buildings, rehabilitation projects and functional changes must be measured. The amount of favorable and unfavorable changes, and how they rate relative to one another in functional changes must be analyzed.	in progress	Initiated and coordinated by and in consultation with Management Body. The management body formulates proposals to the Municipality of Budapest.	no comment
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community	This factor affects both Criterion (iv) and Criterion (ii).	The value consciousness of the society must be raised. Organise World Heritage-driven community movements. Present our own values in international context through international collaboration. To support grassroots community initiatives	The number of events organised, participants (organisational and individual), media reports and media coverage must be measured.	in progress	The role of the Management Body is to organize, coordinate and initiate such actions.	no comment
3.9	Other human activities						
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage	This factor affects both Criterion (iv) and Criterion (ii).	Any deliberate destruction of heritage must be minimized and brought to end through law enforcement.	The number of unauthorized interventions and authorized interventions with a negative impact on heritage must be measured.	in progress	Planning, Building Control and Heritage Preservation Office in consultation with the Management Body	no comment

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

4.1 Boundaries and Buffer Zones					
		Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
4.1.4	The boundaries of the World Heritage property are not known by local residents / communities / landowners	Visualise the boundaries of the World Heritage property. Those affected to be Immediately notified . Organise events. Step up communication. Contact and cooperate with institutions in the area.	in progress	Management Body	no comment
4.1.5	The buffer zones of the World Heritage property are not known by local residents / communities/landowners	Visualise the boundaries of the World Heritage property. Those affected to be Immediately notified . Organise events. Step up communication. Contact and cooperate with institutions in the area.	in progress	Management Body	no comment
4.3 Management System / Management Plan					
4.3.6	No annual work / action plan exists	Prepare Management Plan as per Gov Decree 315/2011 on WH Management Plans, Complex WH Impact Assessment Documentation and World Heritage Tentative Lists	A public procurement procedure is being prepared. The Plan will be enacted as a government decree by the end of 2015.	Management Body, Gyula Forster National Centre for CH Management, Ministry of Human Resources	no comment
4.7 Visitor Management					
4.7.4	Visitor use of the property is not being actively managed	This should be elaborated in the Management Plan. Until the Management Plan is submitted, the Management Body must work closely with representatives of the tourism industry.	in progress	Management Body to collaborate with: Municipality of Budapest, districts, major institutions, owners of national monuments, tourism professionals, organizations and institutions for the tourism sector	no comment
4.7.5	There is little or no contact with the tourism industry	This should be elaborated in the Management Plan. Until the Management Plan is submitted, the Management Body must work closely with representatives of the tourism industry.	in progress	Management Body to collaborate with: tourism professionals, organizations and institutions for the tourism sector	no comment
4.8 Monitoring					
4.8.1	Some monitoring, but it is not planned	Monitoring is in place and efficient in some areas, such as air pollution measurements. However, systematic and complex WHS monitoring is expected to be introduced with the adoption and implementation of the Management Plan.	in progress	Management Body	no comment

5.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.3.1 - Current state of Authenticity

The authenticity of the World Heritage property has been **preserved**

5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity

The integrity of the World Heritage property is **intact**

5.3.3 - Current state of the World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value

The World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value has been **maintained**.

5.3.4 - Current state of the property's other values

Other important cultural and / or natural values are being **partially degraded** but the state of conservation of the World Heritage property has not been significantly impacted

5.4. Additional comments on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.4.1 - Comments

Some projects planned previously could have been able to have a negative impact on the conservation status. A part of these projects was never realised, while others were modified. Such projects will not be planned in the future.

6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise

6.1 - Please rate the impacts of World Heritage status of the property in relation to the following areas

Conservation	Positive
Research and monitoring	Positive
Management effectiveness	No impact
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Positive
Recognition	Positive
Education	No impact
Infrastructure development	Positive
Funding for the property	No impact
International cooperation	Positive
Political support for conservation	Positive
Legal / Policy framework	Positive
Lobbying	No impact
Institutional coordination	Positive
Security	No impact
Other (please specify)	Not applicable

6.2 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to World Heritage status

no comment

6.3 - Entities involved in the preparation of this Section of the Periodic Report

Governmental institution responsible for the property

Site Manager/Coordinator/World Heritage property staff
Staff from other World Heritage properties
Non Governmental Organization
Local community
External experts
Advisory bodies

6.4 - Was the Periodic Reporting questionnaire easy to use and clearly understandable?

yes

6.5 - Please provide suggestions for improvement of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire

6.6 - Please rate the level of support for completing the Periodic Report questionnaire from the following entities

UNESCO	Very good
State Party Representative	Very good
Advisory Body	Very good

6.7 - How accessible was the information required to complete the Periodic Report?

Most of the required information was accessible

6.8 - The Periodic Reporting process has improved the understanding of the following

Managing the property to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value
Monitoring and reporting
Management effectiveness

6.9 - Please rate the follow-up to conclusions and recommendations from previous Periodic Reporting exercise by the following entities

UNESCO	Excellent
State Party	Satisfactory
Site Managers	Satisfactory
Advisory Bodies	Satisfactory

6.10 - Summary of actions that will require formal consideration by the World Heritage Committee

• Geographic Information Table

Reason for update: This table contains factual errors. The correct data is: Budapest, the Banks of the Danube and the Buda Castle Quarter, Budapest , Hungary Property: 413 ha Buffer zone: 0 Total: 413 ha Andrassy Avenue and the Underground, Budapest , Hungary Property: 55 ha Buffer zone: 508 ha Total: 563 ha Total Property: 468 ha Total Buffer zone: 508 ha Total: 976 ha

• Map(s)

Reason for update: We intend to submit an updated, good quality map and after consultation with the WH Centre decide on the appropriate procedure (MBM or clarification).

6.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to the Assessment of the Periodic Reporting exercise

Only two extremities can be selected in assmt. of some factors; in-between values ought to be added. Many questions are quite irrelevant for many sites, while others ambiguous

(e.g. marine transport incl. lake transport?). Max. character count in text boxes to be upped for many questions. QNR impossible/difficult to use for cross-border/serial sites (spec. facility needed to cover these next time)