

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Hortobágy National Park - the *Puszta*

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- Hungary

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

474rev

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1999

1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Hortobágy National Park - the	47.595 / 21.157	74820	199380	274200	1999
Total (ha)		74820	199380	274200	

Comment

The currently recorded area is based on digital mapping information and is the result of a more correct measurement method. The current 74,865 ha should be regarded as correction. See also 1.4.

1.4 - Map(s)

Comment

Due to a greater technical precision available today as compared to the time of nomination. 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 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

- Zsuzsa Tolnay
Hortobágy National Park Directorate
Expert on World Heritage

Comment

Zsuzsa Tolnay World Heritage coordinator

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

1. [Hungary Tourism](#)

Section II-Hortobágy National Park - the *Puszta*

Comment

WHS official website: www.hnp.hu The Tourism Hungary website is not the official website, but includes information on the property.

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

Comment

The area of the Hortobágy National Park holds other designations with full or partial overlap with the WHS. These are: Hortobágy National Park (1973, extension 1998, IUCN category II) Hortobágy Biosphere Reserve (1980) Hortobágy Ramsar Site (1980, extensions 1997, 2008) Natura 2000 Site (SPA, SAC) Hortobágy HUH 10002, Hortobágy HUH 20002, Tisza-tó HUH 20003 Hortobágy Dark Sky Park (2011)

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

Brief synthesis

The nearly 75 000 ha area of the World Heritage property "Hortobágy National Park – the Puszta", located on the Great Hungarian Plain in the eastern part of Hungary, is an outstanding example of a cultural landscape which preserves intact and visible evidence of its traditional pastoral use over more than two millennia and represents the harmonious interaction between people and nature. The Puszta consists of vast plains where specific land-use practices such as animal husbandry, including grazing of hardy livestock breeds adapted to the natural conditions of alkaline pastures, steppes, meadows and wetlands.

Significant scientific discoveries made since the inscription of the property attest that treeless alkaline grasslands dominated the landscape from the end of the Pleistocene period. The open character of the Hortobágy, suitable for their grazing practices, presented adequate conditions for the settlement and population of the region. Numerous peoples migrated from the east into the Carpathian Basin in prehistory. The nomadic groups that arrived around 2000 BC were the first to leave their imprint on the natural landscape in the form of many burial mounds (kurgans), mostly found on dry land, but located near a source of water. They were often used for secondary burials by later peoples, and in some cases Christian churches were built on them. Also found in the park are the low mounds (tells) that mark the sites of ancient settlements back from the Neolithic. The Hungarians arrived in the Carpathian Basin at the end of the 9th century and occupied the lands around the Tisza River. Settlements in the Middle Ages followed the Debrecen – Tiszafüred route. The main group was in the area defined by the existing settlements of Hortobágy, Nagyhegyes, Nádudvar and Nagyiván. Documentary records have shown that many of these had churches. By the early 13th century there was a dense network of settlements in the Hortobágy, with an economy based on pastoralism.

With the progressive depopulation of the region from the 14th century onwards, the settlements disappeared. The only manmade features in the wide plains of the Puszta were light temporary structures of reeds and branches, used to provide seasonal shelter for animals and men. The most significant surviving structures from the 18th and the early 19th century, which were public buildings built from stone and brick, are

bridges, including the Nine Arch Bridge and the Zádor Bridge, and the *csárdas*, provincial inns to provide drink, food and lodging for travellers, which usually consist of two buildings facing one another, both single-storeyed and thatched or, occasionally, roofed with shingles or tiles. The best known of the *csárdas* are at the outskirts of Balmazújváros, Hortobágy, Nagyhegyes, Nagyiván and Tiszafüred. From the middle 19th century, water regulation systems were set up to control over flooding of the Tisza River. This resulted in the partial draining of former wetlands, which were converted to grasslands or arable farming. Reduction of the water available for the natural pastures decreased their productivity, which was one of the main reasons of serious overgrazing in the early part of the 20th century. Efforts were made to diversify the land use of the Hortobágy, the most successful of which was the creation of artificial fishponds between 1914 and 1918 and again in the 1950s. The cultural landscape of the *Puszta* represents the highest scenic quality, with pleasing and dramatic patterns and combinations of landscape features which give it a distinctive character, including aesthetic qualities and topographic and visual unity. The unbroken horizon is only occasionally disrupted by trees, groves, settlements or linear establishments (open wire lines and dikes). Manmade elements fit harmoniously into this landscape and sustainable land-use practices have contributed to the conservation of a diversity of species and biotopes and the maintenance of the landscape. There is almost no permanent human population within the property itself, but in the grazing season, from April to October, hundreds of stock-breeders graze their animals here. Their traditional pastoralism, with the related social customs and handicraft activities manifests itself in their intangible cultural heritage.

Criterion (iv): The Hungarian *Puszta* is an exceptional surviving example of a cultural landscape constituted by a pastoral society.

Criterion (v): The landscape of the Hortobágy National Park maintains intact and visible traces of its traditional land-use forms over several thousand years, and illustrates the harmonious interaction between people and nature.

Integrity

The *Puszta*, represented by the Hortobágy National Park, is a complex mosaic of natural grasslands, loess ridges, alkaline pastures, meadows and smaller and larger wetlands (mostly marshes), which has presented ideal conditions for pastoralism since prehistoric times and which existed before the appearance of large animal-breeding cultures in this area. In this grassland-wetland mosaic habitat, the natural basis of the cultural landscape, the evidence of traditional and continuous use over more than four millennia has been preserved and is expressed through a variety of attributes, including manmade elements related to traditional animal husbandry and pastoralism. Legal protection as a nature conservation area guaranteed by the establishment of the Hortobágy National Park in 1972 has provided appropriate conditions for the preservation of these attributes and the continued use of the landscape within the property. Organically connected and separate grassland fragments, which continue to function as undisturbed, traditional grazing lands, can be found to some extent outside the National Park, which warrants the establishment of a buffer zone.

Authenticity

The main elements of historic land-use (extensive grazing with partly traditional breeds of domestic animals, as well as unused areas sustained in their natural conditions) still remain and the cultural landscape has preserved its structure, and functional complexity. The proportions of the scenery have inspired many artists, poets and writers throughout the centuries. The manmade elements of the landscape in service

of the traditional land-use (dug wells made of wood, *csárdas*, bridges, temporary accommodations) preserve and sustain the features and technologies that evolved through the centuries, in their materials (e.g. adobe and reed), in their forms, in their structural construction (or the characteristic absence of certain elements, such as fences), and in the ways of their usage. The safeguarding of pastoral, handicraft and other community traditions (popular customs, fairs) related to land-use is ensured by their conscious practice and their transmission.

Protection and management requirements

The Hortobágy National Park was established in 1972. The *Act LIII of 1996 on the Protection of Nature* regulates the activities that may have an impact on the character and qualities of the property including the different forms of land-use (grazing, hay and reed cutting, etc.) construction, and visitor management. At the time of inscription the area of the National Park was 74 820 ha. Since then, the Park was extended to almost 81 000 ha. The entire property is part of the Natura 2000 network of the European Union, in which Special Protected Areas and Special Areas of Conservation were designated in a way that they contain and encompass the area of the National Park including organically connected or separate grassland mosaic areas that are outside the National Park. The protection thus ensured by the Natura 2000 areas provides an appropriate basis for the establishment of a buffer zone. A conservational management plan of the National Park was prepared in 1997. Based on the national *World Heritage Act of 2011*, a World Heritage management plan will enter into legal force as a governmental decree. The Hortobágy National Park Directorate, having the land owner's right on 75% of the property, acts as the World Heritage management body and has been re-appointed by the Minister responsible for culture. The World Heritage Act ensures the operation of a World Heritage Regional Architectural Planning Jury which facilitates high quality architectural developments aligned to the values of the property.

The archaeological sites and historic monuments of the property are protected by the Act on the Protection of Cultural Heritage of 2001 and are listed in an official national register. Kurgans are *ex lege* protected by the Act on Nature Conservation of 1996. There is also a register of kurgans and draw wells established by the Ministry of Rural Development and the Hortobágy National Park Directorate. Furthermore, TÉKA (landscape elements inventory) is a nationwide cadastre representing landmarks, historical monuments, cultural and natural landscape values *inter alia* in the World Heritage property. The rehabilitation of the protected buildings of the Meggyes, the Hortobágyi and the Kadarcs *csárdas* has been carried out by the Hortobágy National Park. The rehabilitation of the protected Nine-Arch-Bridge also has been carried out by the Hajdú-Bihar County Road Operator Company.

Once approved and finalized, the World Heritage management plan will provide clear governance arrangements that involve representatives of the 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 World Heritage management plan will be reviewed at least every seven years. In order to maintain the traditional land-use practices, especially common grazing, review of the land rental and farming contracts is essential, in particular with regard to areas under 100 ha. One of the strategic conservation goals is to extend the scope of the nature conservation-oriented horizontal agricultural subsidies as much as possible to grassland use in the property and in the future buffer zone. Another main objective is to decrease the

ratio of hay cutting in favour of traditional grazing activities. Since they are detrimental to the grasslands, under- and overgrazing must be avoided together with intensive hay farming that leads to the deterioration of originally grazed habitats. The future buffer zone may remain the location for the more modern arable and grassland farming practices, but large constructions that disturb the landscape should be avoided. The unfavourable modernization of stock-keeping farms mandated by domestic and international laws and regulations needs to be prevented by the derogation of the relevant EU regulations, especially concerning concrete manure storage facilities. A short-term goal is the completion of landscape rehabilitation projects already in progress: elimination of linear establishments (canals and dikes), replacing open wire lines with underground cable. Other urgent tasks include combating invasive plant species, possibly by blocking their known migratory corridors; updating the inventory of pastoral buildings (stables, huts and sweep wells) and completing their monument protection survey; establishing a financial assistance system for the renovation of pastoral buildings; delineation of a buffer zone and its integration into regional and local development plans.

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

(iv)(v)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

(iv) - remains and traces of a sequence of migrating peoples (most notably kurgans) - tangible (structures of animal husbandry, listed buildings and structures, handicrafts) and non-tangible (oral traditions) cultural assets of a pastoral society that retains these assets even today (v) - micro formations of alkaline soil - dynamic habitat patterns based on natural phenomena and maintained by grazing - open, uninterrupted vistas - traditional breeds adapted to local conditions

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)

Legal and other regulations that are not optimal for the WHS.

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							
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure							
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure							
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure							
3.3	Services Infrastructures							
3.3.1	Water infrastructure							
3.3.2	Renewable energy facilities							
3.3.4	Localised utilities							
3.3.5	Major linear utilities							
3.4	Pollution							
3.4.2	Ground water pollution							
3.4.3	Surface water pollution							
3.4.5	Solid waste							
3.4.6	Input of excess energy							
3.5	Biological resource use/modification							
3.5.4	Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals							
3.5.5	Crop production							
3.5.8	Commercial hunting							
3.5.10	Forestry /wood production							
3.6	Physical resource extraction							
3.6.4	Water (extraction)							
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage							
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							
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events							
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)							
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species							
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species							
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	
3.3	Services Infrastructures					
3.3.1	Water infrastructure	localised	on-going	significant	medium capacity	decreasing
3.3.4	Localised utilities	restricted	one off or rare	minor	low capacity	static
3.3.5	Major linear utilities	localised	on-going	significant	high capacity	decreasing

		Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend
3.4	Pollution					
3.4.6	Input of excess energy	restricted	frequent	minor	low capacity	decreasing
3.6	Physical resource extraction					
3.6.4	Water (extraction)	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	decreasing
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage	localised	on-going	minor	no capacity and / or resources	static
3.8.4	Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system	widespread	on-going	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community	extensive	frequent	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species					
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	increasing

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 no buffer zone, but there is a need for one

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 property had **no buffer zone** at the time of its inscription on the World Heritage List

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 property had **no buffer zone** at the time of its inscription on the World Heritage List

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

The managing body, i.e. Hortobágy National Park Directorate has attempted and made preparatory steps to establish a buffer zone, but so far these have proved to be a failure for administrative reasons.

4.2. Protective Measures

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

The Hortobágy National Park was established in 1972 by Presidential Decree of the National Authority for Nature Conservation No 1850. The original 52,000ha was extended by further 11,422ha in 1993 and it reached its present extent in 1996.

The Act LIII of 1996 on the Protection of Nature regulates the activities that may have an impact on the character and qualities of the property including the different forms of land-use (grazing, hay and reed cutting, etc.) construction, and visitor management. At the time of inscription the area of the National Park was 74 820 ha. Since then, the Park was extended to almost 81 000 ha. The entire property is part of

the Natura 2000 network of the European Union, in which Special Protected Areas and Special Areas of Conservation were designated in a way that they contain and encompass the area of the National Park including organically connected or separate grassland mosaic areas that are outside the National Park. The protection thus ensured by the Natura 2000 areas provides an appropriate basis for the establishment of a buffer zone. The archeological sites and historic monuments of the property are protected by the Act on the Protection of Cultural Heritage of 2001 and are listed in an official national register.

The national World Heritage Act of 2011 is in force since January 2012. The scope of this Act covers:

- a) World Heritage areas and Tentative World Heritage areas,
- b) 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
- c) organisations and persons carrying out, or affected by the activities under point b).

Comment

The NATURA2000 network would be inappropriate for the establishment of a buffer zone for the mere fact that these areas outside the boundaries of the WHS are too small. However, a new legislative measure (the law on historic landscapes) might provide the legal basis for the establishment of a buffer zone. The possibilities are being investigated.

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 property had **no buffer zone** at the time of inscription on the World Heritage List

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

Some legislation that is appropriate outside the WHS is not optimal for the management of the WHS in some limited cases, e.g. forestry regulations being restrictive on cutting trees even in such an open landscape as the Hortobágy is and even if these are non-native species, or building regulations of agricultural buildings requiring such facilities that would greatly impair the visual integrity and authenticity of traditional buildings, might even cause landscape "scars" and hazard to wildlife.

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

A conservational management plan of the National Park was prepared in 1997. Based on the national World Heritage Act of 2011, a World Heritage management plan will enter into legal force as a governmental decree. The Hortobágy National Park Directorate, having the land owner's right on 75% of the property, acts as the World Heritage management body and has been re-appointed by the Minister responsible for culture. The World Heritage Act ensures the operation of a World Heritage

Regional Architectural Planning Jury which facilitates high quality architectural developments aligned to the values of the property. Kurgans are ex lege protected by the Act on Nature Conservation of 1996. There is also a register of kurgans and draw wells established by the Ministry of Rural Development and the Hortobágy National Park Directorate. Furthermore, TÉKA (landscape elements inventory) is a nationwide cadastre representing landmarks, historical monuments, cultural and natural landscape values inter alia in the World Heritage property. The rehabilitation of the protected buildings of the Meggyes, the Hortobágyi and the Kadarcs csárdas has been carried out by the Hortobágy National Park. The rehabilitation of the protected Nine-Arch-Bridge also has been carried out by the Hajdú-Bihar County Road Operator Company. Once approved and finalized, the World Heritage management plan will provide clear governance arrangements that involve representatives of the 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 World Heritage management plan will be reviewed at least every seven years.

Comment

A new conservation management plan of the NP is being elaborated, too. It is important to harmonize the two management documents in order to avoid inconsistencies. All issues concerning the management of the site has to be validated by the ministers responsible for agriculture, building and planning, development, organizing public administration, the archaeological and built heritage, nature conservation, spatial planning (county and national, as well as municipality level) and tourism

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Comment

The (nature) conservation management plan and the WH management plan for the Hortobágy NP are being elaborated side by side providing an excellent opportunity to create positive interlinkages.

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?

No annual work / action plan exists

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	Fair
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Good
Visitors	Good
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Good
Industry	Fair

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 contact but only **some cooperation** 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

A staff member joined the Hortobágy NPD with an MSc degree on World Heritage management (graduated in UCD, Dublin as a Fellow of the UNESCO - Vocations Patrimoine Fellowship Programme).

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 Hortobágy National Park Directorate (HNPD) has been appointed officially the managing body for the site for the period of 2013-2019. A three-lateral contract btw the Ministry of Human Resources, the Ministry of Rural Development and the HNPD has been signed with annual budget allocation. The elaboration of the World Heritage Management Plan started in September 2013 and is anticipated to be completed by September of 2014 and later becomes effective as a GovernmentDecree.

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)	1%
Governmental (National / Federal)	24%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	0%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	0%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	2%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	0%
Other grants	73%

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

Comment

May 10 2000 Emergency Assistance for the Hortobágy National Park Amount: 50,000 USD Reason: cyanide pollution of the River Tisza, which was caused by the spill of 30 January 2000 at the Romanian Baia Mare mining site. The event potentially threatened the artificial and natural wetlands of the site. Structures were built to halt the impacts of the pollution and a monitoring programme was put in place. No long term impact could be detected, but similar events are a potential threat to the WH.

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

The available budget is **sufficient** but further funding would enable more effective management to international best practice standard

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?

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

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	99%
Part-time	1%

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

Permanent	77%
Seasonal	23%

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

Paid	95%
Volunteer	5%

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

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 fully implemented**; all technical skills are being transferred to those managing the property locally, who are assuming leadership in management

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

There is a social employment scheme in place and most of the seasonal employees are contracted via this programme (their number varies to a large extent year by year).

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** for most key areas **but there are gaps**

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 a **small amount** of research, but it is not planned

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

Sümegei, P. and Szilágyi, G. (2010) 'New Landscape Evolution Model for Hortobágy, and the Authenticity of Alkalinization', *Acta Biol. Debr. Oecol. Hung.* 24/1: 21-29 Sümegei, P. and Szilágyi, G. (2011) 'A quarter-malacological inventory of Hungarian kurgan's', in *Kurgan Studies: An environmental and archaeological multiproxy study of burial mounds in the Eurasian steppe zone*

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

The scope and topics of research could and should be widened if funds are available. The dissemination of research results should be ensured.

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	Excellent
Local businesses and industries	Excellent

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 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	Excellent
Site museum	Excellent
Information booths	Excellent
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	Decreasing
Two years ago	Decreasing
Three years ago	Decreasing
Four years ago	Decreasing
Five years ago	Decreasing

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

Entry tickets and registries
Accommodation establishments

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

Comment

While there is no specific visitor management plan the general management plan includes a chapter on these issues. There is a visitor regulation document tackling several management issues.

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 **limited 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 **some 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

The fees collected do not represent a considerable income, therefore they cannot be regarded as 'making a substantial contribution'.

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	Excellent
Local / Municipal authorities	Poor
Local communities	Poor
Researchers	Excellent
NGOs	Excellent
Industry	Poor
Local indigenous peoples	Not applicable

Section II-Hortobágy National Park - the *Puszta*

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

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

The WH management plan to be completed would tackle most of the above issues.

4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs

4.9.1 - Please select the top 6 management 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
3.3	Services Infrastructures						
3.3.1	Water infrastructure	Criterion v	Elimination of former linear water management objects that interfere the natural water table. Such landscape rehabilitations have been completed and further ones should be implemented.	The length of eliminated ditches and dykes, as well as the number of demolished water management objects have to be monitored, along with the effect these rehabilitation projects induce.	2014-2028	Hortobágy National Park Directorate.	Dependent on financial sources.
3.3.5	Major linear utilities	Criterion v Open vistas	High voltage power lines crossing the site and running in the surrounding area should be replaced with buried cables. These lines both reduce the visual integrity of the site, as well as they represent a high risk of electrocution for birds.	The length of high voltage lines replaced.	2014-2030	Hortobágy National Park Directorate, E-on, MAVIR.	Dependent on financial sources.
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage						
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage	Criteria iv, v	Systems and mechanisms that support and strengthen the status of herdsmen: - limiting the use of electric fences - promoting community grazing	Size of areas where electric fences are used. Number of units that adopt community grazing.	2014-2024	Hortobágy National Park Directorate, Hortobágy Gene Conservation and Nature Conservation Public Company, Chamber of Agriculture, Ministry of Rural Development.	Legislative and financial measures are necessary.
3.8.4	Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system	Criteria iv, v	Establishing an education scheme (curriculum and institution) training herdsmen: - tending traditional breeds - animal welfare - extensive grazing and herding - tangible and intangible heritage, etc	training established yes/no, if yes in what form, number of herdsmen trained, number of trained herdsmen employed	2014-2020	Hortobágy National Park Directorate, Hortobágy Gene Conservation and Nature Conservation Public Company, Chamber of Agriculture, Secondary school of agriculture.	Capacity building and financial leverages are necessary.
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community	Criteria iv, v.	Establishment of the Alliance of Puszta Pastoralists that accept members from all strata of local society provided that they do service to promote local traditions (both in their own profession and in the pastoral heritage).	Pastoral order established yes/no, if yes: number of members distribution of members	2014-2020	Hortobágy National Park Directorate, Hortobágy Gene Conservation and Nature Conservation Public Company, Municipalities of the 21 settlements surrounding the WHS.	Criteria and mechanisms are to be elaborated.
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species						
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species	Criterion v	Eradication programmes, particularly for the most aggressive species and the most infected areas.	Area covered by invasive species. Regeneration of invasive species and population dynamics in managed areas.	2014-2030	Hortobágy National Park Directorate, National Forestry, Environmental and Nature Conservation Authority.	Dependent on financial sources.

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

4.1.1	There is a need for a buffer zone	Investigation of the possibilities to establish a buffer zone, i.e. on what legal ground and by what legal instrument. Re-contacting and negotiating with stakeholders, most importantly municipalities. Launch preparatory work.	2014-2016	Hortobágy National Park Directorate, Ministry of Rural Development, Ministry of Human Resources, Forster Heritage Centre.	-
4.8 Monitoring					
4.8.1	Some monitoring, but it is not planned	Identification of proper indicators to monitor the state of attributes and generally the WHS. Elaboration of a monitoring strategy. Implementation of the strategy. Assessment and feedback mechanisms.	2014-2026	Lead agency: Hortobágy National Park Directorate, Others: Ministry of Rural Development, Ministry of Human Resources, Forster Heritage Centre, NGO's, scientific institutions, universities.	A monitoring strategy will be part of the WH management plan that is due in 2014.
4.8.2	Key indicators have not been defined	Key indicators are to be identified.	2014-2015	Lead agency: Hortobágy National Park Directorate Others: Ministry of Rural Development, Ministry of Human Resources, Forster Heritage Centre. NGO's, scientific institutions, universities.	It will be part of the WH management plan that is due in 2014.

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	Positive
Management effectiveness	Positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	No impact
Recognition	Very positive
Education	Very positive
Infrastructure development	Positive
Funding for the property	Positive
International cooperation	Positive
Political support for conservation	No impact
Legal / Policy framework	Positive
Lobbying	No impact
Institutional coordination	Very positive
Security	No impact
Other (please specify)	No impact

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
Local community
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

It would be good to exclude ambiguous or rather contradicting statements in the very same question, particularly where it uses Likert-scale assessment.

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	Very 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

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	Satisfactory
State Party	Satisfactory
Site Managers	Not Applicable
Advisory Bodies	Not Applicable

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

• **Geographic Information Table**

Reason for update: The currently recorded area is based on digital mapping information and is the result of a more correct measurement method. The current 74,865 ha should be regarded as correction. See also 1.4.

• **Map(s)**

Reason for update: Due to a greater technical precision available today as compared to the time of nomination. 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