



AMENDMENT

| | |
|---|--|
| Item of the Agenda | WHC/21/44.COM/7B |
| Amended Draft Decision | 44 COM 7B.40 |
| Amendment submitted by the Delegation of.... | Ethiopia, Saudi Arabia, Australia, Egypt, Kyrgyzstan, Spain, Uganda, Russian Federation, South Africa |
| Date of submission | 16/07/2021 |

TEXT

Budapest, including the Banks of the Danube, the Buda Castle Quarter and Andrásy Avenue (Hungary) (C 400bis)

Draft Decision: 44 COM 7B.40

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC/21/44.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision 43 COM 7B.84, adopted at its 43rd session (Baku, 2019),
- 2.3. Noting that due to the COVID-19 pandemic the current 44th extended session of the World Heritage Committee takes place online;
- 3.4. 3.Notes Welcomes the reorganization of State administration in charge of World Heritage properties' protection at the national level and the designation of World Heritage properties as Highly Determinative Sites in Terms of Protected Urban Landscape, through enabling amendments to the 2011 World Heritage Act;
- 4.5. Takes note of the State Party's efforts to strengthen the planning framework through guidance documents and enhanced coordination of its relevant planning authorities;
- 5.6. 4.Also welcomes Acknowledges the consistent commitments and recent efforts made by the State Party to address urban development issues through legal and regulatory measures taking into consideration the approach of the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape, notably through 2018 amendments to the "High-Level House Act" limiting the height of all new constructions to 65 meters;
- 6.7. 5. Recalling that ex post facto law is prohibited in every constitutional state, Also notes that the amended "High-Level House Act" is not applicable for the one and only high-rise building construction permits issued before it became law and that in absence of relevant legal

~~provision the constructions, such as and so works on the 120-meter-high MOL Campus building located at a distance of 2 kilometers from the buffer zone~~ in District 11 are ongoing;

7.8. ~~6.~~ Further notes that the revision of the regulation regarding Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs) to ensure that they meet the ICOMOS Guidance is planned in the near future and that 3D visual simulations will also be prepared, and urges the State Party to ensure its processes for commissioning HIAs, including Visual Impact Assessments and visual simulations address impacts on relevant attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) and relevant views of the property as well as requests clarifications whether the revised regulation would be applicable to development projects already planned and ongoing;

8.9. ~~11.~~ Notes moreover that the Management Plan could not be finalized as foreseen in 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic and recalls Decision 39 COM 7B.79, which requested the State Party to finalize, as soon as possible the Management Plan of the property including details of the protective measures and regulatory regimes and submit it to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies; as well as Decision 43 COM 7B.84, which requested the State Party to halt further projects (in the whole property) for conservation, restoration, and new developments in the property and the buffer zone until a Management Plan integrated with the city development plan in line with the HUL Recommendation, as well as building guidelines have been prepared, and reviewed by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;

9.10. ~~7.~~ Observes with concern that as a result of the delay of the finalization of the Management Plan, construction works on a number of major new developments within the property and its buffer zone have continued or have already been completed despite the Committee's request in 43 COM 7B.84, to halt reiterates its request to the State Party to submit all relevant documents including plans, drawings, and HIAs for all proposed projects within the property and the buffer zone to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies further projects for conservation, restoration, and new developments until the completion of the updated Management Plan for the property in line with the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape;

10.11. ~~8.~~ Notes with regret that so far the State Party has not complied with Recalling Decision 43 COM 7B.84, notes that the as works relating to have not been halted on the National Hauszmann Programme (NHP) for the Buda Castle Quarter are ongoing, and that as a result the state of conservation of the property has been and continues to might be highly negatively impacted by planned reconstruction and new construction which have had and continue to may have a cumulative negative impact on the OUV of the property including its authenticity and integrity, and requests the State Party to ensure that, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, any planned larger-scale projects in the immediate and wider setting of the World Heritage property be submitted to the World Heritage Centre as soon as possible, and that adequate time be allowed for thorough review of each project by the Advisory Bodies before any decision is taken;

12. ~~9.~~ Acknowledging the efforts made by the State Party to corroborate the ideological basis of the NHP, urges further discussion and close collaboration based on open dialogue between ~~Notes furthermore~~ that the State Party, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre regarding the interpretation of the argues that its justification for the NHP, - namely the lies in its desire to return some elements of outstanding importance of national identity within the Buda Castle to its pre-World War II form so that it will better reflect the 'national identity' of the pre-Communist era, while at the same time emphasizing that it is also a major part of the inscribed property contributing to its OUV, - in order to determine:

a. and considers that whether this approach challenges the authenticity and integrity of the property,

b. and runs counter how the NHP aligns to prevailing international norms and standards of conservation and reconstruction, and

~~a.c. whether there are~~ requiring resolving contradictions between national objectives and international obligations to the World Heritage Convention;

~~10. Regrets that the State Party did not respond to Decision 39 COM 7B.79 to engage in dialogue with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies with the aim of modifying the NHP so that it maintains the OUV while also respecting its pre World War II attributes;~~

Original paragraph 11. moved to new paragraph 9.

~~12. Also regrets the apparent demolition of the Radetzky Barracks and the outlined proposal for the demolition of the Ministry of Finance facade towards Szentháromság Square;~~

~~13. Also considers that the state of conservation of the property is impacted highly negatively by the recent, ongoing and large scale reconstruction and development works at the Buda Castle, which are not in line with international conservation norms for protecting the OUV of a World Heritage property, collectively and cumulatively diminish the authenticity and integrity of the property, and present ascertained and potential threats to the property, in conformity with Paragraph 179 of the Operational Guidelines;~~

~~14. Concludes that, as a result of the considerations noted above, the property is in danger in conformity with Chapter IV.B of the Operational Guidelines, and decides to inscribe Budapest, including the Banks of the Danube, the Buda Castle Quarter and Andrassy Avenues (Hungary) on the List of World Heritage in Danger;~~

11.13. ~~Takes note that the State Party has begun to comply with the requests of the World Heritage Committee and recommendations of the 2018 and 2019 missions and defers consideration of the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger to its 45th session in 2022;~~

~~15. Requests the State Party, to develop a set of corrective measures, a timeframe for their implementation, and a Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger (DSOCR) in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 45th session in 2022;~~

12.14. ~~16. Reiterates its request to the State Party to consider halting all ongoing and planned works at Buda Castle and invites the State Party to request, as a matter of urgency, and to initiate (on-line) ICOMOS Advisory Assistance to develop alternative conservation approaches for interventions in line with international norms for conservation of the OUV of World Heritage properties, for development of the Buda Castle Quarter;~~

13.15. ~~17. Also reiterates its requests to the State Party to ensure that, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, details of interventions that could impact the OUV are submitted with appropriate HIAs, in line with ICOMOS Guidelines, to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies;~~

Original paragraph 16. moved to new paragraph 14.

Original paragraph 17. moved to new paragraph 15.

~~18. Further requests the State Party to adopt the recommendations of the 2019 Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission, as well as the ICOMOS Technical Review in relation to the Budapest Eye, the MAHART Scientific Building, the Former Electric Power Dispatch Centre, the MOL Campus buildings, the Biodome, and the Museum of Ethnography;~~

14.16. ~~19.~~Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2022**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 45th session in 2022.

|