



**COMUNE DI MATERA**  
Settore Gestione del Territorio

AI

**Ministero della Transizione Ecologica**

[VA@pec.mite.gov.it](mailto:VA@pec.mite.gov.it)

[dosa.alessandra@mase.gov.it](mailto:dosa.alessandra@mase.gov.it)

e p.c.

**Sindaco**

**All'Assessore alla Città e Territorio**

**SEDE**

**Oggetto:** [ID: 11173] Istanza per il rilascio del provvedimento di VIA ai sensi dell'art. 23 del D.Lgs. n. 152/2006, relativa al progetto di un impianto eolico denominato "Matera", costituito da n. 14 aerogeneratori, di cui 5 da 6,0 MW e 9 da 6,6 MW, per una potenza complessiva dell'impianto pari a 89,4 MW, da realizzarsi nel Comune di Matera (MT), con opere di connessione ricadenti anche nei Comuni di Laterza (TA) e Castellaneta (TA). Proponente: Wind S.r.l. – Valutazioni

Con riferimento a quanto riportato in oggetto, in data 27 marzo 2023 il Ministero dell'Ambiente e della Sicurezza Energetica ha trasmesso comunicazione, acquisita in pari data al protocollo del Comune n. 0035047/2024, in merito alla procedibilità dell'istanza, alla pubblicazione della documentazione e al responsabile del procedimento.

L'esame della documentazione pubblicata presso il portale del Ministero dell'Ambiente e della Sicurezza Energetica ha messo in evidenza i seguenti aspetti critici del progetto:

**1. L'intervento ricade interamente in sito non idoneo per impianti fotovoltaici di grande generazione secondo le disposizioni della LR 54/2015. e in particolare:**

**A. Interferisce con Aree sottoposte a tutela del paesaggio, del patrimonio storico, artistico e archeologico:**

- con riferimento al punto 1.1 dell'allegato A, l'intervento ricade interamente all'interno del buffer di mt 8000 dal perimetro del sito patrimonio Mondiale dell'UNESCO denominato IT670 "I Sassi ed il parco delle chiese rupestri di Matera";
- con riferimento al punto 1.2 dell'allegato A, l'intervento ricade in parte all'interno del buffer di mt 3000 relativo a beni monumentali "Sono comprese in questa tipologia i beni monumentali individuati e normati dagli artt. 10, 12 e 46 del D.Lgs. n. 42/2004. Per i beni monumentali esterni al perimetro dei centri urbani (Ambito Urbano da RU o da Zonizzazione Prg/PdF) si prevede, per gli impianti eolici di grande generazione, un buffer di 3000 mt dal perimetro del manufatto vincolato e, o

*qualora esistente, dalla relativa area di tutela indiretta. Il buffer si incrementa fino a 10.000 mt nei casi di beni monumentali isolati posti in altura.*

- con riferimento al punto 1.4 dell'allegato A, l'intero territorio comunale di Matera risulta "area interessata da vincoli paesaggistici in itinere" (artt. 136 e 157 del D.Lgs n. 42/2004 ex L. 1497/39).

**B. Interferisce con Aree comprese nel sistema ecologico funzionale territoriale:**

- con riferimento al punto 2.7 dell'allegato A, parte degli aero-generatori interessano alberi monumentali e relativa fascia di rispetto. *Sono comprese in questa tipologia gli alberi monumentali, tutelati a livello nazionale ai sensi del D.Lgs.42/2004 e della L. 10/2013 (art. 7), nonché dal D.P.G.R. 48/2005, comprese le relative aree di buffer di 500 mt di raggio intorno all'albero stesso.*

**2. L'intervento risulta in contrasto con il Piano Regolatore Generale. La proposta, infatti interessa la zona agricola (ZONE 12 della VEP) del territorio comunale di Matera, ove non sono ammessi impianti di produzione di energia.**

Il PRG, quale strumento di esercizio delle competenze dell'Amministrazione Comunale, contiene disposizioni volte alla tutela dell'ambiente del paesaggio del patrimonio storico e artistico, delle tradizioni agroalimentari locali, della biodiversità e del paesaggio rurale, individuando obiettivi di protezione che non risultano compatibili con l'insediamento in queste determinate aree di specifiche tipologie e/o dimensioni di impianti, quali quello di cui alla presente proposta.

Le aree agricole del territorio Materano, nello specifico le aree interessate dall'intervento, costituiscono carattere distintivo del paesaggio rurale, come componente essenziale dell'identità culturale regionale. Il paesaggio agrario rappresenta, infatti, "*...quella forma che l'uomo, nel corso ed ai fini delle sue attività produttive agricole, coscientemente e sistematicamente imprime al paesaggio naturale...*". È il risultato dell'integrazione nello spazio e nel tempo di fattori economici, sociali ed ambientali, e pertanto svolgono il ruolo di una risorsa complessa da preservare, a fronte delle radicali trasformazioni che negli ultimi sessanta anni hanno interessato l'agricoltura ed il sistema agro-alimentare, e dunque l'intervento come proposto, per le sue caratteristiche dimensionali, altera inequivocabilmente il parterre del paesaggio agricolo in cui si inserisce.

**Le aree proposte per la realizzazione dell'impianto risultano inoltre classificate ad l'alta capacità del suolo**, come desumibile dalla carta della Capacità d'uso del Suolo redatta nell'ambito del sistema delle tutele del Piano Paesaggistico regionale<sup>1</sup>, secondo cui le aree di intervento ricadono interamente su suoli in **categoria I e II**. Sono comprese in questa tipologia le aree connotate dalla presenza di suoli del tutto o quasi privi di limitazioni e suoli con limitazioni moderate.

**3. L'intervento contribuisce alla determinazione di conseguenze negative sulla percezione di un paesaggio naturale, rurale ed antropizzato di altissima qualità e di riconosciuto interesse internazionale (SITO Unesco), delle immagini storicizzate, simboliche ed universalmente conosciute del contesto storico-paesaggistico dell'altopiano Murgico del Parco Archeologico delle chiese rupestri in diretta relazione visiva con le ondulazioni collinari del paesaggio agrario della contrada "Iesce" che ha costituito nei secoli il "cuore" agricolo del territorio materano;**

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://rsdi.regione.basilicata.it/capacita-uso-suoli/>

Si rileva il possibile rischio che la presenza di questi impianti possa determinare per il sito UNESCO, compromettendone l'integrità, con conseguente pericolo di un declassamento dello stesso da "Beni Patrimonio Mondiale" a "Beni in pericolo", con conseguenti gravissimi danni all'immagine internazionale della città, peraltro impegnata dal titolo riconosciuto di Capitale Europea della Cultura 2019.

A conferma di tale assunto, si richiama e si allega l'esito del ciclo di rendicontazione periodica del sito UNESCO in parola, riferito all'anno 2014, che individua gli impianti di energia rinnovabile quali fattori esterni al sito, ad impatto negativo.

Si aggiunge altresì che l'elaborato A\_17\_3\_1 denominato "TAV 01 IMPIANTI FER ESISTENTI, AUTORIZZATI ED IN ITER" mostra l'effetto degli impatti cumulativi sul paesaggio degli impianti già autorizzati e in corso di autorizzazione, non solo dal punto di vista percettivo ma in misura maggiormente rilevante sulla **progressiva disintegrazione dell'unitarietà della distese collinari che circondano l'Altopiano Murgico in cui si colloca il sito UNESCO.**

A conferma delle valutazioni sopra riportate, in data 30 settembre 2021 la Regione Basilicata ha trasmesso **proposta** della Soprintendenza archeologia, belle arti e paesaggio della Basilicata **di dichiarazione di notevole interesse pubblico dell'intero territorio comunale di Matera, ai sensi dell'articolo 137 del D.lgs 42/04, in ragione dell'unicità del suo contesto paesaggistico, geomorfologico, storico-archeologico e naturale e per la continuità tra città e campagna, tra costruito e paesaggio agrario.**

La perdita dei valori percettivi, ambientali ed ecologici dello spazio circostante il sito UNESCO rappresenta una minaccia attuale e concreta, che investe il paesaggio inteso come bene primario e assoluto, la cui tutela è prevalente su qualsiasi altro interesse giuridicamente rilevante, sia di carattere pubblico che privato, da considerare come bene «primario» ed «assoluto», in quanto abbraccia l'insieme «dei valori inerenti il territorio» concernenti l'ambiente, l'eco-sistema ed i beni culturali che devono essere tutelati nel loro complesso, e non solamente nei singoli elementi che la compongono. (CdS 2222/2014).

#### **4. Contrasto con le direttive europee in tema di impianti alimentati da fonti rinnovabili.**

Gli attuali indirizzi dell'Unione Europea (da ultimo la direttiva UE 2018/2001 RED II) sulla promozione dell'uso dell'energia da fonti rinnovabili puntano con decisione sulla "generazione diffusa", basata prevalentemente su impianti di piccola taglia, sulle comunità di energia rinnovabile, sull'agri-solare, sui sistemi energetici passivi.

Nell'ambito di questo modello, al fine di conseguire gli obiettivi previsti dalle politiche nazionali ed europee, i grandi impianti non vengono tassativamente esclusi, ma il loro insediamento deve essere limitato ad aree industriali dismesse e altre aree compromesse, aree abbandonate e marginali non idonee ad usi agricoli, come cave dismesse, aree inquinate e bonificate, zone degradate.

La corretta applicazione degli indirizzi comunitari consentirebbe di minimizzare l'impatto ambientale e di tenere conto delle esigenze di tutela del patrimonio culturale e del paesaggio, delle aree agricole e forestali e dei corpi idrici, con la conseguenza di accrescere l'accettazione dell'opinione pubblica di progetti nell'ambito delle energie rinnovabili e di garantire la diffusione a livello locale.

A tale scopo il decreto legislativo n.199/2021 di attuazione della direttiva UE 2018/2001 all'art. 20 (Disciplina per l'individuazione di superfici e aree idonee per l'installazione di

impianti a fonti rinnovabili) prevede che nelle more dell'individuazione con legge regionale delle aree idonee all'insediamento, effettuato sulla base di principi e criteri omogenei stabiliti con decreto del MiTE, sono considerate aree idonee:

- a) i siti ove sono già installati impianti della stessa fonte e in cui vengono realizzati interventi di modifica non sostanziale ai sensi dell'articolo 5, commi 3 e seguenti, del decreto legislativo 3 marzo 2011 n. 28;
- b) le aree dei siti oggetto di bonifica individuate ai sensi del Titolo V, Parte quarta, del decreto legislativo 3 aprile 2006, n.152;
- c) le cave e miniere cessate, non recuperate o abbandonate o in condizioni di degrado ambientale.

Per quanto sopra evidenziato le aree individuate dalla Wind s.r.l. per l'installazione dell'impianto eolico non possono essere considerate idonee in quanto non rispettano nessuno dei criteri indicati dal D.lgs. n.199/21.

## **5. Contrasto con il Piano Nazionale Integrato Energia e Clima (PNIEC, 31.12.2019)**

Il PNIEC è un importante documento di programmazione, fondamentale nell'attuazione delle politiche energetiche europee "identifica politiche e misure nazionali per ottemperare agli obiettivi vincolanti europei al 2030 in tema di energia e clima nell'ambito del Quadro 2030 per le politiche dell'energia e del clima".

Il Piano prevede al 2030 un importante contributo delle fonti rinnovabili sui consumi finali lordi di energia e, in questa prospettiva, è fortemente indirizzato nel favorire le produzioni diffuse, nell'evitare ulteriore consumo di suolo, in particolare agricolo, e nel privilegiare:

"... strumenti calibrati sulla base dei settori d'uso, delle tipologie di interventi e della dimensione degli impianti, con un approccio che mira al contenimento del consumo di suolo e dell'impatto paesaggistico e ambientale, comprese le esigenze di qualità dell'aria. ...fare ampio uso di superfici edificate o comunque già utilizzate, valorizzando le diverse forme di autoconsumo, anche con generazione e accumuli distribuiti" (pag.8).  
"...investimenti di revamping e repowering sull'eolico esistente con macchine più evolute ed efficienti, sfruttando la buona ventosità su siti già conosciuti ed utilizzati, consentirà anche di limitare l'impatto sul consumo di suolo" (pag. 56).

"In particolare per i grandi impianti da fonte eolica, si stimoleranno gli operatori affinché adeguata priorità a potenziamento e rinnovamento degli impianti obsoleti" (pag. 126).

È evidente come il progetto d'impianto in esame, collocandosi in un obsoleto modello accentrato, privo di condivisione delle scelte con la comunità locale e produttore di elevati impatti e consumi di suolo, si pone in contrasto con gli obiettivi del PNIEC.

## **6. Difformità dal D.lgs. 387/2003 e dal D.M. 10.09.2010 "Linee guida per l'autorizzazione degli impianti alimentati da fonti rinnovabili."**

L'art. 12, comma 7, del Decreto Legislativo 29 dicembre 2003, n. 387 "Attuazione della direttiva 2001/77/CE relativa alla promozione dell'energia elettrica prodotta da fonti energetiche rinnovabili nel mercato interno dell'elettricità", recita:

"7. Gli impianti di produzione di energia elettrica, di cui all'articolo 2, comma 1, lettere b) e c), possono essere ubicati anche in zone classificate agricole dai vigenti piani urbanistici. Nell'ubicazione si dovrà tenere conto delle disposizioni in materia di sostegno nel settore agricolo, con particolare riferimento alla valorizzazione delle tradizioni agroalimentari

locali, alla tutela della biodiversità, così come del patrimonio culturale e del paesaggio rurale di cui alla legge 5 marzo 2001, n. 57, articoli 7 e 8, nonché del decreto legislativo 18 maggio 2001, n. 228, articolo 14.”.

La parte IV delle Linee guida prevede che:

“Nell'autorizzare progetti localizzati in zone agricole caratterizzate da produzioni agroalimentari di qualità (produzioni biologiche, produzioni D.O.P., I.G.P., S.T.G., D.O.C., D.O.C.G., produzioni tradizionali) e/o di particolare pregio rispetto al contesto paesaggistico-culturale, deve essere verificato che l'insediamento e l'esercizio dell'impianto non comprometta o interferisca negativamente con le finalità perseguite dalle disposizioni in materia di sostegno nel settore agricolo, con particolare riferimento alla valorizzazione delle tradizioni agroalimentari locali, alla tutela della biodiversità, così come del patrimonio culturale e del paesaggio rurale.”

Si noti che le norme, riferendosi a “paesaggio rurale” e “contesto paesaggistico-culturale”, prescindono dall'insistenza fisica o meno dell'aero-generatore direttamente in aree adibite a colture di qualità, mirando a salvaguardare la complessiva valenza paesaggistico-culturale dell'ambito in cui si colloca l'impianto.

Il territorio materano è stato oggetto di conferimento di denominazioni:

- Lenticchia di Altamura (REG. UE. N. n. 2362 della Commissione del 5 dicembre 2017)
- IGP Pane di Matera (REG. CE. N. n. 160 del 21 febbraio 2008)
- DOP Vini Matera (REG UE N. 1308 del 17 dicembre 2013)
- Mozzarella di Gioia del Colle DOP (regolamento (CE) n. 1151 del 21 novembre 2012).

Per cui si può concludere che i terreni interessati dal progetto in esame ricadono nelle aree “non idonee” all'installazione di impianti per l'energia rinnovabile, anche per effetto dei citati D.lgs 387/2003 e D.M. 10.09.2010.

## **7. Interferenze con le progettualità promosse nell'area d'interesse**

Le aree proposte per l'intervento sono interessate dai seguenti progetti:

- Progetto di valorizzazione e promozione del sito promosso dal Ministero della Cultura e che coinvolge quattro Regioni (Lazio, Campania, Basilicata e Puglia), denominato “Appia Regina Viarum”. Valorizzazione e messa a sistema del cammino lungo il tracciato romano”, avviato in data 11 gennaio 2023 con la firma del Protocollo di Intesa **per la candidatura all'iscrizione della nella lista del Patrimonio Mondiale UNESCO<sup>2</sup>**;
- **Progetto EuroVelo 53**, detta anche «la via Romea Francigena», è una pista ciclabile parte della rete del programma europeo EuroVelo. Lunga 3.900 chilometri, una volta terminata, unendo Londra a Brindisi, passando per Milano e Roma, ricalcando in parte il percorso della via Francigena.

### **In considerazioni delle valutazioni sopra riportate,**

- Vista la documentazione richiamata;
- Visto il TUEL n. 267/2000;
- Visto l'art. 6 bis delle Legge 241/1990;

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://appia.beniculturali.it/appia/>

<sup>3</sup> <https://en.eurovelo.com/ev5/along-the-roman-via-appia>

- Visto lo Statuto Comunale;
- Visti i vigenti regolamenti comunali;

IL DIRIGENTE DEL SETTORE GESTIONE DEL TERRITORIO

**esprime parere non favorevole** al progetto di impianto eolico denominato "Matera", costituito da n. 14 aerogeneratori, di cui 5 da 6,0 MW e 9 da 6,6 MW, per una potenza complessiva dell'impianto pari a 89,4 MW, da realizzarsi nel Comune di Matera (MT), con opere di connessione ricadenti anche nei Comuni di Laterza (TA) e Castellaneta (TA).  
Proponente: Wind S.r.l.

Il Dirigente  
Ing. Giuseppe GAUDIANO



## Periodic Report - Second Cycle Matera

## Section II-The Sassi and the Park of the Rupestrian Churches of

### 1. World Heritage Property Data

#### 1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

The Sassi and the Park of the Rupestrian Churches of Matera

#### 1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

##### State(s) Party(ies)

- Italy

##### Type of Property

cultural

##### Identification Number

670

##### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1993

#### 1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
The Sassi and the Park of the Rupestrian Churches of Matera	40.666 / 16.61	1016	4365	5381	1993
<b>Total (ha)</b>		<b>1016</b>	<b>4365</b>	<b>5381</b>	

#### 1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Perimetrazione del sito UNESCO Sassi di Matera e della zona tampone, scale 1:20,000	27/06/2005	

##### Comment

A more complete version of the maps that do not imply any modification of boundaries or other data about the property is available.

#### 1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Adele Cesi  
Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali  
Funzionario  
Ufficio Patrimonio Mondiale UNESCO, Segretariato Generale - Servizio 1

##### Comment

Ministero dei Beni e delle Attività Culturali e del Turismo  
Francesca Riccio Funzionario Ufficio Patrimonio Mondiale UNESCO, Segretariato Generale - Servizio 1 Via del Collegio Romano, 27 00186 Roma Italy Telephone: +39 06 67232140 Fax: +39 06 67232105 Email: francesca.riccio@beniculturali.it

#### 1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Salvatore Adduce  
Municipality of Matera  
Sindaco

##### Comment

Since 1987 it has been constituted the Sassi Office of the Municipality of Matera that directly deals about the territory management of the Unesco Site in collaboration with the Managing Agency of the Rupestrian Churches Park instituted by the Regional Law of Basilicata in 1998.

#### 1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

- [Comune di Matera \(only in Italian\)](#)

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

### 2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

#### 2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

##### Comment

The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value has been revised in compliance with the new format, based on the Decision 34 COM 10B.3 of the World Heritage Committee in 2007. It is currently subject to the evaluation of Advisory Bodies

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

(iii)(iv)(v)

#### 2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

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

The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value has been revised in compliance with the new format, based on the Decision 34 COM 10B.3 of the World Heritage Committee in 2007. It is currently subject to the evaluation of Advisory Bodies

#### 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			
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Buildings and Development</b>					
3.1.3	Industrial areas					
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities					
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>					
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure					
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Services Infrastructures</b>					
3.3.2	Renewable energy facilities					
3.3.4	Localised utilities					
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Pollution</b>					
3.4.5	Solid waste					
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Biological resource use/modification</b>					
3.5.3	Land conversion					
3.5.4	Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals					
3.5.5	Crop production					
<b>3.6</b>	<b>Physical resource extraction</b>					
3.6.2	Quarrying					
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Local conditions affecting physical fabric</b>					
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)					
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>					
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses					
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage					
3.8.4	Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system					
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community					
<b>3.9</b>	<b>Other human activities</b>					
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage					
<b>3.10</b>	<b>Climate change and severe weather events</b>					
3.10.2	Flooding					
<b>3.11</b>	<b>Sudden ecological or geological events</b>					
3.11.2	Earthquake					
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)					
<b>3.13</b>	<b>Management and institutional factors</b>					
3.13.3	Management activities					
<b>Legend</b>	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	
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Buildings and Development</b>					
<b>3.1.3</b>	Industrial areas	restricted	on-going	minor	medium capacity	static
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>					
<b>3.2.4</b>	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	localised	on-going	significant	low capacity	decreasing
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Pollution</b>					
<b>3.4.5</b>	Solid waste	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
<b>3.6</b>	<b>Physical resource extraction</b>					



	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend
3.6.2 Quarrying	restricted	on-going	minor	medium capacity	static
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric				
3.7.6 Water (rain/water table)	widespread	one off or rare	minor	medium capacity	static
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage				
3.8.4 Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system	widespread	on-going	significant	low capacity	static
3.8.5 Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community	widespread	on-going	significant	low capacity	static
3.9	Other human activities				
3.9.2 Deliberate destruction of heritage	restricted	one off or rare	minor	medium capacity	decreasing

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

#### 3.17.1 - Comments

The next required actions will have to adjust the transit and vehicles parking even on weekdays; prevent the abandonment of wastes in areas not yet recovered; complete the delocalization of the batching plant; improve the outflow of abundant rainfalls in order to avoid the surface runoff and subsequent flooding; sensitize the students to the knowledge and safeguard of the site; increase the monitoring to prevent acts of vandalism on the rupestrian heritage.

## 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 the management authority but **are not known by local residents / communities / landowners.**

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

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

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

It is currently being assessed the possibility of an adapting of the boundaries of buffer zones.

## 4.2. Protective Measures

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

The whole site's area is protected by general Italian Laws enforceable throughout the national territory as well as laws

specifically drawn up and exclusively enforceable on the site. As far as the zone of the Sassi Quarters is concerned, the enforceable law is number 771/1986 that aims at the "preservation and architectonic, urban, environmental and economic restructuring of the Sassi Quarters of Matera and the protection of the overlooking Murgia Plateau". With regards to the Park, the enforceable Regional law is L. number 11/1990 for the "Establishment of the archaeological, historical, natural park of Rock Churches". Legislative Decree number 42/2004 "Cultural Heritage and Landscape code" is enforceable on all artistic, historical, archaeological and monumental heritage and on areas of landscape and natural interest on the site.

Over 60% of the real estate belonging to the Sassi Quarters is the property of the Italian Government and therefore protected by Legislative Decree. In 1998 the procedures to transfer these real estate in concession to the Local Government of Matera for 99 years was completed. The Municipality of Matera can also transfer them in concession through 30 year agreements to private individuals and/or organisations and associations that request them and agree to bear the restoration expenses through the benefit of rent reduction. At the present about 30% of the state properties available have been transferred in sub-concession from the local government.

### Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

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

Submitted on Friday, October 28, 2005

#### • Question 6.02

The whole site's area is protected by general Italian Laws enforceable throughout the national territory as well as laws specifically drawn up and exclusively enforceable on the site. As far as the zone of the Sassi Quarters is concerned, the enforceable law is number 771/1986 that aims at the "preservation and architectonic, urban, environmental and economic restructuring of the Sassi Quarters of Matera and the protection of the overlooking Murgia Plateau".

With regards to the Park, the enforceable Regional law is L. number 11/1990 for the "Establishment of the archaeological, historical, natural park of Rock Churches". Legislative Decree number 42/2004 "Cultural Heritage and Landscape code" is enforceable on all artistic, historical, archaeological and monumental heritage and on areas of landscape and natural interest on the site.

#### 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?

An adequate legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property exists but there are **some deficiencies in implementation**

#### 4.2.4 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the area surrounding the World

**Heritage property and buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?**

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

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

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

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

Both the core and the buffer zone are safeguarded by the General Provisions of the Sassi Recovery, by the Framework Plan of the Park of Rupestrian Churches and by the General Plan of the Municipality of Matera. These plans are periodically updated to adapt them to the requirements of protection, safeguarding and development.

**4.3. Management System / Management Plan**

**4.3.1 - Management System**

The levels of public authority who are primarily involved with the management of the site are national; regional; local (Municipality of Matera, the Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities, the territorially competent branch offices of the Ministry itself, the Basilicata Region and the Managing Body of the Rock Churches).

The management is under traditional protective measures or customary law (consensual management).

A Management plan has been implemented since December 1988. The last revision occurred in December 2005 and further to it a revised management plan was adopted in December 2006. The conservation and rehabilitation works in the Sassi Quarters are regulated by the "biennial programmes of implementation" established under Law. It is to be expected that an "Action Plan" for the entire site will be drawn up on the basis of the UNESCO's guidelines and MiBAC's methods. Responsible for over-seeing the implementation of the management plan and monitoring its effectiveness are the Biennial Programmes and the General Restructure Plan, which have been developed by the Sassi Office with the professional advice of external consultants; furthermore, the Plan for the Park has been developed by the Technical Office of the park's managing body.

**Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2**

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

Submitted on Friday, October 28, 2005

**• Question 5.04** Plans in place to set up a "steering group:

During the drawing up of the management plan a coordinating core will be established to direct the development of the site. For this purpose an agreement is planned to be drawn up between the Municipality of Matera, the Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities, the territorially competent branch offices of the Ministry itself, the Basilicata Region and the Managing Body of the Rock Churches.

**• Question 5.05**

- Overall management system of the site
  - Management under protective legislation
  - Management under traditional protective measures or customary law
  - Consensual management

**4.3.2 - Management Documents**

**Comment**

The management tools in force currently in the Site area are: the General Plan, the General Predictions of the recovery of Sassi, the Framework Plan of the Rupestrian Churches, the Framework Plan for the Cultural Systems of Municipal Area. The management bodies of the Site have signed an agreement of understanding for the processing of the Management Plan, that is undergoing completion.

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

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

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

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

**4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?**

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

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

**No annual work / action plan** exists

**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	Fair
Visitors	Fair
Researchers	Poor
Tourism industry	Fair
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?**

Indigenous peoples have **some input** into discussions relating to management but no direct role

**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**

It's necessary to improve the involvement of the local community in the management processes of the Site, also to raise public awareness about the importance of the Site. It's essential to build a management structure that involves all the key stakeholders managers to harmonizing and coordinating the actions of conservation and enhancement.

**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 regulatory framework doesn't have undergone any significant change, the approval of the General Recovery provisions allowed a refinement of some aspects of the interventions implementation in the Sassi. The drafting of the Management Plan has been a good opportunity for the relations development between the different actors, responsables for the management.

**4.4. Financial and Human Resources**

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

Multilateral funding (GEF, World Bank, etc)	0%
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Governmental (National / Federal)	20%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	70%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	9%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	1%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	0%
Other grants	0%

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

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

The available budget is **inadequate** for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage

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

Existing sources of funding are **not secure**

**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 **little or no** equipment or facilities despite an identified need

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

There is **little or no** maintenance of existing equipment and facilities, despite an identified need.

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

It needs find a steady annual financial source in order to plan actions in the control and maintenance of the site area. Other financings must be intercepted to carry out specific projects for the preservation and enhancement of the Site heritage.

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

Full-time	100%
Part-time	0%

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

Permanent	100%
Seasonal	0%

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

Paid	100%
Volunteer	0%

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

Human resources are **inadequate** 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	Poor
Promotion	Poor
Community outreach	Non-existent
Interpretation	Poor
Education	Non-existent
Visitor management	Poor
Conservation	Good
Administration	Poor
Risk preparedness	Non-existent
Tourism	Poor

Enforcement (custodians, police)	Poor
----------------------------------	------

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

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

No capacity development plan or programme is in place; management is implemented by external staff and skills are not transferred

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

There is no development plan for the staff capacities internal to the individuals responsible for the management. There is no plan for the transfer of skills developed from current staff to new subjects able to provide replacement in the future.

**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**

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

**4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building**

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

In many locations and easily visible to visitors

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

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

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

There is no education and awareness programme, despite an identified need

**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	Poor
Site museum	Poor
Information booths	Adequate
Guided tours	Adequate
Trails / routes	Adequate
Information materials	Adequate
Transportation facilities	Poor
Other	Adequate

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

The activities that affect the education, the information and the awareness concerning the Site are sporadic and

uncoordinated and they don't often produce any relapse on the local community.

#### 4.7. Visitor Management

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

Last year	Minor Increase
Two years ago	Minor Increase
Three years ago	Minor Increase
Four years ago	Minor Increase
Five years ago	Minor Increase

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

Accommodation establishments
------------------------------

##### 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?

There is **some management** of the visitor use of the World Heritage property

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

There is contact between those responsible for the World Heritage property and the tourism industry but this is largely **confined to administrative or regulatory matters**

##### 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, but it makes **no 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

#### 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	Poor
--	------

Local / Municipal authorities	Poor
Local communities	Poor
Researchers	Non-existent
NGOs	Not applicable
Industry	Non-existent
Local indigenous peoples	Not applicable

##### 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
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Buildings and Development</b>					
<b>3.1.3</b>	<b>Industrial areas</b>	Criterion (v): The town and park represent an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement and land-use showing the evolution of a culture which has maintained over time a harmonious relationship with its natural environment.	Mediation with the company owners for the delocalization of an industrial plant.	Control on the plant activity, the situation is stationary.	Times not determinable.	Municipality of Matera and the Park Managing Body of Rupestrian Churches.  A batching plant, previous to the site inclusion in the WHL, falls within the core area; the negotiations with the owners for relocation are under way.
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>					
<b>3.2.4</b>	<b>Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure</b>	Criterion (v): The town and park represent an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement and land-use showing the evolution of a culture which has maintained over time a harmonious relationship with its natural environment.	In the Sassi, the parking of vehicles is reserved mainly to the residents but there are areas where parking is permitted for vehicles of no residents, with an excessive presence of vehicles.	The monitoring is continuous, the situation is slowly improving.	Definite times for problem resolution are not predictable.	Municipality of Matera.  In the Sassi the available spaces for parking are few and quite often busy, they were realized of parking outside the site but they are distant and little-used. The stationary vehicles in the Sassi area worsen the perception of the site.
<b>3.6</b>	<b>Physical resource extraction</b>					
<b>3.6.2</b>	<b>Quarrying</b>	Criterion (v): The town and park represent an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement and land-use showing the evolution of a culture which has maintained over time a harmonious relationship with its natural environment.	There are 3 quarries of different companies that manufacture materials used for construction equipment (tufa stone, gravel, clay). The tuff is essential for recovery interventions in the Sassi, other materials are used from the nearby cement plant.	The monitoring is continuous but the situation is stationary.	The times for the solution depend on the renewal of concessions issued by region of Basilicata..	Basilicata Region.  The extraction of the tuff for building has characterized the UNESCO site throughout the centuries. The ancient quarries fall within the core zone, the smallest in the Sassi, in the park the largest caves of the seventeenth and eighteenth century.
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Local conditions affecting physical fabric</b>					
<b>3.7.6</b>	<b>Water (rain/water table)</b>	Criterion (iv): The town and park constitute an outstanding example of an architectural ensemble and landscape illustrating a number of significant stages in human history.	Regimentation of stormwater and remaking of the disposal networks.	The monitoring is constant, the situation is slowly improving.	Definite times for problem resolution are not predictable.	Municipality of Matera  In the Sassi the more frequent and intense rains cause floods and damage to already renovated buildings, the buildings not yet restructured may undergo structural failure or even partial collapses..
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>					

		World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
3.8.4	Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system	Criterion (iii): Matera's I Sassi and park represent an outstanding example of a rock-cut settlement, adapted perfectly to its geomorphological setting and its ecosystem and exhibiting continuity over more than two millennia. Criterion (iv): The town and park constitute an outstanding example of an architectural ensemble and landscape illustrating a number of significant stages in human history. Criterion (v): The town and park represent an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement and land-use showing the evolution of a culture which has maintained over time a harmonious relationship with its natural environment.	No possible action.	The monitoring is continuous but the situation is slowly getting worse.	Times for problem resolution are not predictable.	Municipality of Matera and the Park Managing Body of Rupestrian Churches.	The change of habits and lifestyle of the population is slowly changing the overall perception of the Site. The presence of residences and economic activities ensures the survival of the site but affects the meaning.
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community	Criterion (iii): Matera's I Sassi and park represent an outstanding example of a rock-cut settlement, adapted perfectly to its geomorphological setting and its ecosystem and exhibiting continuity over more than two millennia. Criterion (iv): The town and park constitute an outstanding example of an architectural ensemble and landscape illustrating a number of significant stages in human history. Criterion (v): The town and park represent an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement and land-use showing the evolution of a culture which has maintained over time a harmonious relationship with its natural environment.	No action possible.	The monitoring is continuous but the situation is slowly getting worse.	Times for problem resolution are not predictable.	Municipality of Matera and the Park Managing Body of Rupestrian Churches.	The inconvenience of living in the Sassi reduces the number of residences in favor of B & B and of commercial and tourist activities. In the coming years there could be a significant decrease of population with loss of the Site identity housing.

## 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	An adjustment of site boundaries and of the buffer zone is expected.	The time required by this action cannot be predicted.	Municipality of Matera and the Park Managing Body of Rupestrian Churches, in cooperation with the structures of Ministry for the Heritage and Cultural Activity and Tourism.	In some parts of the core areas there is not a buffer zone that needs to be redefined; we would like to extend the UNESCO site also to the Crypt of the Original Sin and to the archaeological sites of Timmari and Serra d'Alto that currently are excluded.		
4.4 Financial and Human Resources							
4.4.12	Human resources inadequate for management needs	It plans to set up a specific UNESCO Office of the Municipality of Matera for proper management of the Site.	The next six months parallel with the adoption of the Management Plan.	Municipality of Matera	The establishment of the UNESCO Office will enable a better approach to management issues related to cultural and turistic aspects that currently can not be addressed by the staff mainly technical of the Sassi office.		



4.4.15	<b>No capacity development plan or programme is in place</b>	After forming the UNESCO Office' and valued the skills of the staff, will be identified the needs for capacity building and will be programmed the activities necessary to fill the gaps and constantly update the staff.	12 - 18 months.	Municipality of Matera and the Park Managing Body of Rupestrian Churches.	Since the UNESCO Office will be formed by internal staff of Administrations, responsible for managing, the skills transfer will be based on the normal turnover of staff.
<b>4.5 Scientific Studies and Research Projects</b>					
4.5.2	<b>Research in the property is not planned</b>	Drafting of Management Plan	On the next 6 months	Municipality of Matera and the Park Managing Body of Rupestrian Churches, other stakeholders.	With the approval of the Management Plan they will start projects and specific studies about criticalities raised by the plan.
<b>4.7 Visitor Management</b>					
4.7.4	<b>Some management of visitor use of the property but this could be improved</b>	Increase the tourism promotion in the area and collaboration between the public and private sectors working in the tourism management	The time required for this action is not predictable.	Municipality of Matera.	The goal is to increase the cooperation between the Regional Company for Tourist Board, the tourist operators and local cultural associations, for improving the integration between the Site promotion, hospitality and offer of attractive cultural activities.
<b>4.8 Monitoring</b>					
4.8.2	<b>Key indicators have not been defined</b>	The indicators are provided in the the Management Plan.	On the next 6 months	Municipality of Matera and the Park Managing Body of Rupestrian Churches, other stakeholders	In the Management Plan the main criticalities and indicators to be monitored were identified to verify the correctness of implementation.

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

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

The inclusion in the WHL generated positive effects on many factors regarding the Site and the city of Matera. The increase in international notoriety has significantly improved tourist flows for the benefit of the economic activities of the area. The coordination between the management bodies is improved; they have been refined the standards for the protect and restoration; it's improved the perception that inhabitants have of the city; they have been started partnerships and exchanges with other Italian UNESCO sites.

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

Site Manager/Coordinator/World Heritage property staff
--

### 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	Fair
State Party Representative	Very good
Advisory Body	Fair

### 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	None
State Party	None
Site Managers	None
Advisory Bodies	None

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

#### • Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Reason for update: The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value has been revised in compliance with the new format, based on the Decision 34 COM 10B.3 of the World Heritage Committee in 2007. It is currently subject to the evaluation of Advisory Bodies

#### • Map(s)

Reason for update: A more complete version of the maps that do not imply any modification of boundaries or other data about the property is available.

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