

1. World Heritage Property Data**1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property**

Early Christian Necropolis of Pécs (Sopianae)

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details**State(s) Party(ies)**

- Hungary

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

853rev

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2000

1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Early Christian Necropolis of Pécs (Sopianae)	46.074 / 18.228	3.76	4.87	8.63	2000
Total (ha)		3.76	4.87	8.63	

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Early Christian Necropolis of Pécs (Sopianae) - map of inscribed property	02/12/2000	

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 National Focal Point Dr Gábor Soós, Head of Division of World Heritage and International Relations Gyula Forster National Centre for CH Management Táncsics M. u. 1. H 1014 Budapest +3612254873 gabor.soos@forsterkozpont.hu

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Attila Üveges
Zsolnay Örökségkezelő Nonprofit Kft.
Head of Division
World Heritage Division

Comment

Zsolnay Heritage Management Non-Profit LLC István Márta director P.O.Box 27 Pécs 7603 Hungary Contact: Attila Üveges Head of Division World Heritage Division Telephone: +36 30 698 31 65 Fax: +36 72 510 629 Email: uveges.attila@zsn.hu

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)**Comment**

Add also: www.pecsorokseg.hu

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

Replace "11/1997 KTM Decree" with "13/1997 KTM Decree"

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value**2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance****Statement of Outstanding Universal Value****Brief synthesis**

In the 4th century A.D. a remarkable series of decorated tombs were constructed in the cemetery in the town of Sopianae, in the Roman Province of Pannonia, the ruins of which survived under the ground and are situated in the current city of Pécs, in South Hungary. The burial chambers, chapels and mausoleum excavated on the site of the Sopianae cemetery form a complex that bears witness to an ancient culture and civilization that had a lasting impact. It is the richest collection of structural types of sepulchral monuments in the northern and western Roman provinces reflecting a diversity of cultural sources. These monuments are important both structurally and architecturally as they were built above ground and served as both burial chambers and memorial chapels. They are also significant in artistic terms because of their richly decorated murals of outstanding quality depicting Christian themes.

The Roman cemetery was found by archaeological excavations which began two centuries ago. Subsequent excavations revealed that the early Christian complex of monuments provides exceptional evidence of a historical continuity that spanned the turbulent centuries from the decline of the Roman Empire in the 4th century to the conquest of the Frankish Empire in the 8th century. Sixteen structures constitute the World Heritage property, although the cemetery includes over five hundred more modest graves which cluster around the major monuments.

Criterion (iii): The burial chambers and memorial chapels of the Sopianae cemetery bear outstanding testimony to the strength and faith of the Christian communities of the Late Roman Empire.

Criterion (iv): The unique Early Christian sepulchral art and architecture of the northern and western Roman provinces is exceptionally well and fully illustrated by the Sopianae cemetery at Pécs.

Integrity

The property includes a collection of 16 monuments which are part of the Early Christian Necropolis of Sopianae. They have been revealed through archaeological excavations which are ongoing; further delimitation of the property may change as a result of this ongoing research. With regard to the surviving attributes, all of which are under the ground level today, the intactness of the ruins and of their historic interrelations is sustained to the extent possible considering that subsequent urban layers, including the contemporary living city, are sedimented over the property.

Authenticity

Burial chambers, memorial chapels and other sepulchral remains and fragments excavated since the 18th century have been preserved at their original location following scientific research and restoration, using techniques available at the given time as well as technical solutions available today. Modern interventions necessary to conserve and present the remains are distinguished from original fabric.

Protection and management requirements

The property and its buffer zone are situated within a Historic Monuments Area declared in 1966. The Roman cemetery is also protected as an archaeological site. At local level, City Government Order No. 40 of 1994 declared the historic centre of the city and the area of the Roman cemetery a historic zone. The city has also passed several other ordinances in relation to the protection of historical and architectural values within the context of city development. Ownership of the sixteen monuments is varied: two belong to the Hungarian State, thirteen to the City of Pécs, and one to Baranya County. Based on *National World Heritage Act of 2011*, a new management plan will enter into legal force as a governmental decree and will be reviewed at least every seven years. The management body is the World Heritage Division of Zsolnay Heritage Management Nonprofit Ltd. Once finalized and approved, the Management Plan and the management body will provide clear governance arrangements that involve representatives of different stakeholders. Based on the *World Heritage Act*, the state of the property, as well as threats and preservation measures will be regularly monitored and reported to the National Assembly; the management plan will be reviewed at least every seven years. Balance has to be kept between the preservation of authenticity and contemporary needs of presentation. In order to ensure increased authenticity of the attributes, modernisation of earlier technical solutions is an on-going management task. Ongoing research within the area of the former Necropolis may provide a base for the extension of the property in the future.

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

(iii)(iv)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

RELICS OF RELIGIOUS HISTORY: Biblical murals; early Christian symbols; burial chambers in a two-level layout; numerous tombs depicting early Christian themes; complexity of the cemetery; Christians and pagans buried within same area; major Christian settlement lying over early Christian cemetery and clearly traceable to C11th; cultural and religious continuity spanning 1700 years
RELICS OF CULTURAL HISTORY: Uniform architectural principles; al secco and al fresco murals; a diversity of iconography

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

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					
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure					
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities					
3.3	Services Infrastructures					
3.3.4	Localised utilities					
3.3.5	Major linear utilities					
3.4	Pollution					
3.4.3	Surface water pollution					
3.4.4	Air pollution					
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric					
3.7.2	Relative humidity					
3.7.3	Temperature					
3.7.4	Radiation/light					
3.7.5	Dust					
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)					
3.7.8	Micro-organisms					
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses					
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage					
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation					
3.9	Other human activities					
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage					
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	
3.9	Other human activities					
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	decreasing

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

3.17.1 - Comments

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 **do not limit** the ability to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value but they could be improved

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 both the management authority and 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 both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

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

4.2. Protective Measures

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

Comment

Act LXIV of 2001, on the Protection of Cultural Heritage Act LXXVII of 2011, on World Heritage Government regulation 315/2011.

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 **excellent** capacity / resources to enforce legislation and / or regulation in the World Heritage property

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

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

Ownership of the sixteen monuments is varied: five belong to the Hungarian State, seven to the Bishopric of Pécs, and four to Baranya County. A Management Plan Committee has been set up by the Secretariat of the Hungarian National World Heritage Committee, under the direction of the Ministry of National Cultural Heritage. It is composed of representatives of the National Committee, the City of Pécs, Baranya County, the Bishopric of Pécs, the Treasury, and private stakeholders. Its role is to regulate every activity relating to the designated monuments, from day-to-day maintenance to long-term planning. A detailed plan has been produced which covers research strategies, conservation of the monuments and their surroundings, public presentation, tourism, and transportation, and involvement of the local community.

Based on National World Heritage Act of 2011, a new management plan will enter into legal force as a governmental decree and will be reviewed at least every seven years. The management body is the World Heritage Division of Zsolnay Heritage Management Nonprofit Ltd. Once finalized and approved, the Management Plan and the management body will provide clear governance arrangements that involve representatives of different stakeholders. Based on the World Heritage Act, the state of the property, as well as threats and preservation measures will be regularly monitored and reported to the National Assembly; the management plan will be reviewed at least every seven years. Balance has to be kept between the preservation of authenticity and contemporary needs of presentation. In order to ensure increased authenticity of the attributes, modernisation of earlier technical solutions is an on-going management task. Ongoing research within the area of the former Necropolis

may provide a base for the extension of the property in the future.

Comment

Since the year 2000, there has been a change in the ownership of the sixteen monuments. Today, two belong to the Hungarian State, ten to the City of Pécs, three to the Bishopric of Pécs and one to Baranya County. Consenting ministers include those responsible for culture; building and planning; development; organising public administration; spatial planning at county and national level; spatial planning at municipality level; and tourism; respectively.

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Comment

Pursuant to the National World Heritage Act of 2011, a new management plan is now under development and will be enacted as a governmental decree in 2015.

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 **excellent coordination** between all bodies / levels involved in the management of the property

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?

An annual work / action plan exists and **many activities** are being implemented

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

Local communities / residents	Fair
Local / Municipal authorities	Good
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Good
Visitors	Good
Researchers	Fair
Tourism industry	Good
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 **no input** into decisions relating to the 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

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

Since 2011 the management body has been the World Heritage Division of Zsolnay Heritage Management Non-Profit LLC. Pursuant to the National World Heritage Act of 2011, a new management plan is now under development and will be enacted as a governmental decree in 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)	
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	
Governmental (National / Federal)	2%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	61%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	37%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	
Other grants	

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

Comment

not relevant

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 **adequate** equipment and facilities

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

Equipment and facilities are **well maintained**

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

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

Full-time	100%
Part-time	

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

Permanent	100%
Seasonal	

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

Paid	100%
Volunteer	

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

Human resources are **adequate** for management needs

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	Fair
Community outreach	Good
Interpretation	Good
Education	Good
Visitor management	Good
Conservation	Good
Administration	Good
Risk preparedness	Good
Tourism	Good
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Not applicable

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	Low
Promotion	Low
Community outreach	Low
Interpretation	Low
Education	Low
Visitor management	Low
Conservation	High
Administration	Low
Risk preparedness	High
Tourism	Low
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Not applicable

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 in place and **partially implemented**; some technical skills are being transferred to those managing the property locally **but most of the technical work is carried out by external staff**

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

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 widely** with the local, national and international audiences

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

Krisztina Hudák – Levente Nagy, Megfestett mennyország. Barangolás a pécsi ókeresztény temetőben / A Fine and Private Place. Discovering the Early Christian Cemetery of Sopianae Visy Zsolt (ed.), Pécs története I. Az őskortól a püspökség megalapításáig. Pécs Története Alapítvány – Kronosz Kiadó. Pécs 2013, with English summary.

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

There is ongoing research into the pictorial representations and symbolism of the burial chamber murals, as well as into the structure of the burial chambers and burial chapels.

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	Average
Local Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Local landowners	Average
Visitors	Average
Tourism industry	Average
Local businesses and industries	Poor

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 planned education and awareness programme but it only **partly meets the needs** and could be improved

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 **partially influenced** education, information and awareness building activities

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	Adequate
Site museum	Adequate
Information booths	Not needed
Guided tours	Excellent
Trails / routes	Adequate
Information materials	Adequate
Transportation facilities	Adequate
Other	Adequate

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

4.7. Visitor Management

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

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

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

Entry tickets and registries
Tourism industry
Visitor surveys

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 **effectively managed** and does not impact its Outstanding Universal Value

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

There is **excellent co-operation** between those responsible for the World Heritage property and the tourism industry to present the Outstanding Universal Value and increase appreciation

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

The fee is collected and makes a **substantial contribution** to the management of the World Heritage property

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

Pursuant to Act LXXVII/2011 on World Heritage, a new management plan is now under development.

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?

There is **little or no information available** on the values of the World Heritage property to define key indicators

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

World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff	Excellent
Local / Municipal authorities	Poor
Local communities	Poor
Researchers	Excellent
NGOs	Non-existent
Industry	Non-existent
Local indigenous peoples	Non-existent

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

No relevant Committee recommendations to implement

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

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

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
3.9	Other human activities					
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage	Vandalism does not affect directly WH criteria and attributes in Pécs. All the WH treasures are found within various buildings that provide protection. Only such buildings (and not what is inside) are exposed to potential vandalism.	The municipality is planning to install CCTV surveillance to control vandalism in public spaces at the UNESCO World Heritage property.	The new management plan will include a monitoring system.	The CCTV system is planned to be installed before the end of 2015.	Municipality of Pécs 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		
4.1.2	Boundaries could be improved	Since 2000, several Late Roman burial buildings have been unearthed during excavations outside the buffer zone. Therefore, a minor modification of the buffer zone is necessary to include more 'outstanding values' in the World Heritage Site of Pécs.	until 2020	WH Management Body in Pécs; Ministry of Human Resources, National Focal Point Gyula Forster National Centre for CH Management	no comment	
4.6 Education, Information and Awareness Building						
4.6.4	World Heritage status has partially influenced education, information and awareness building activities	The WH Management Body has an education programme for local schools. Their plan is to allow free visits to the sites in order to raise awareness of the World Heritage status of these local treasures.	The Education Programme is to be launched in September 2014.	Zsolnay Heritage Management Non-Profit LLC István Márta director P.O.Box 27 Pécs 7603 Hungary Contact: Attila Úveges Head of Division World Heritage Division Telephone: +36 30 698 31 65 Fax: +36 72 510 629 Email: uveges.attila@zsn.hu	no comment	
4.8 Monitoring						
4.8.1	Some monitoring, but it is not planned	Pursuant to the National World Heritage Act of 2011, a new Management Plan will be enacted as a government decree in 2015. The Management Plan will provide clear governance arrangements including monitoring.	May, 2015.	Zsolnay Heritage Management Non-Profit LLC István Márta director P.O.Box 27 Pécs 7603 Hungary Contact: Attila Úveges Head of Division World Heritage Division Telephone: +36 30 698 31 65 Fax: +36 72 510 629 Email: uveges.attila@zsn.hu	no comment	
4.8.2	Little or no information to define key indicators	A new Management Plan will be enacted as a government decree in 2015. Based on such Management Plan, a Management Manual will be prepared to define key indicators.	May 2015.	Zsolnay Heritage Management Non-Profit LLC István Márta director P.O.Box 27 Pécs 7603 Hungary Contact: Attila Úveges Head of Division World Heritage Division Telephone: +36 30 698 31 65 Fax: +36 72 510 629 Email: uveges.attila@zsn.hu	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 and the state of conservation of the World Heritage property are **predominantly intact**

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

5.4.1 - Comments

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

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

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
Non Governmental Organization
External experts

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	Good
State Party Representative	Very good
Advisory Body	Good

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

All required information was accessible

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

The World Heritage Convention
The concept of Outstanding Universal Value
The property's Outstanding Universal Value
The concept of Integrity and / or Authenticity
The property's Integrity and / or Authenticity
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	Not Applicable
State Party	Not Applicable
Site Managers	Not Applicable
Advisory Bodies	Not Applicable

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

Automatically generated in online version

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