



UNITED
NATIONS

EP

UNEP/MED WG.461/14



UNITED NATIONS
ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME
MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN

15 May 2019
Original: English

Fourteenth Meeting of SPA/BD Thematic Focal Points

Portorož, Slovenia, 18-21 June 2019

Agenda Item 6: Conservation of sites of particular ecological interest

6.1. Evaluation of the implementation of the Roadmap for a Comprehensive Coherent Network of Well-Managed MPAs to Achieve Aichi Target 11 in the Mediterranean

Draft report on the evaluation of the implementation of the roadmap for a comprehensive coherent network of well-managed MPAs to achieve Aichi Target 11 in the Mediterranean

For environmental and cost-saving reasons, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies

Table des matières

Summary of the Roadmap evaluation	5
Background	9
Context of the evaluation and previous steps and recommendations.....	9
<i>Towards the Roadmap for MPAs in the Mediterranean region, a Barcelona Convention process</i>	9
<i>PAs and MPAs in the international context: CBD and Aichi targets, OECM and criteria</i> .	12
<i>Other international instruments in the Mediterranean region</i>	13
<i>PAs and MPAs in the regional or sub-regional context</i>	13
<i>The specificities of European countries</i>	14
<i>PAs and MPAs in the national context</i>	15
Part I: The Roadmap for MPAs and elements for its evaluation	17
1.1. The Roadmap scope.....	17
1.2. The Roadmap objectives and priority actions.....	17
1.3. Information available for realising the evaluation	19
a. The documentation analysis.....	19
b. The National reports to the Barcelona Convention and SPA/RAC.....	19
c. The specific questionnaire sent to countries.....	19
1.4. Proposed criteria for evaluation.....	23
Part II: Roadmap evaluation and proposal for actions	25
<i>Q1: Is the MPAs and OECMs coverage reached 10% (of waters under national jurisdiction).</i>	25
<i>Q2: Are the existing MPAs and OECMs effectively and equitably managed?</i>	26
<i>Q3: Is the existing network of MPAs and OECMs ecologically representative?</i>	26
<i>Q4: Is the existing network of MPAs and OECMs well-connected?</i>	27
<i>Q5: Has the concept of OECM been defined and introduced in the national legislation?</i> ..	27
<i>Q6: Has the country prepared a Strategy and an Action Plan for MPAs and OECMs, based on a gap analysis of the representativity of national biodiversity and ecosystems, based on accurate scientific information and proposing a list of future MPAs to complete the existing national network, all this with the effective participation of stakeholders?</i>	28
<i>Q7: Has the country assessed and amended/reviewed the institutional and legal system applicable to MPAs and OECMs, improving therefore the effectiveness of the governance and management systems, and checking that each MPA has clear objectives and concrete measures for its management?</i>	28
<i>Q8: Has the country considered or developed negotiations with neighbouring contracting parties for managing jointly networks of MPAs, including in their existing or future EEZ areas?</i>	29

Q9: Has the country developed approved an overall policy for the sustainable use of marine and coastal environment (ICZM, land use planning and management associated to marine spatial planning and management) based on the participation and involvement of all components of the society, on the equitable sharing of the social and economic benefits of environmental and natural resources (including within MPAs and OECMs)?.....29

Q10: Has the country developed/implemented a strategy and an action plan for long term funding of nature conservation considering all the necessary components?.....30

Part III. Recommendations for priority actions beyond 2020 for MPAs and OECMs ...34

ANNEXES1

ANNEX 1: References by question (Q1 to Q10).....2

ANNEX 2: Guidelines for OECMs, extract from the IUCN document for the CBD, 2018.
.....7

ANNEX 3: ROADMAP NATIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE9

ANNEX 4: Document for self-evaluation by each country14

ANNEX 5: Table for regional evaluation, average of all countries will provide a value and according ranking according to the same scale.....15

ANNEX 6: MAPAMED data collection.....16

List of Acronyms

ABNJ: Area Beyond National Jurisdiction
 ACCOBAMS: Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and contiguous Atlantic Area
 BR: Biosphere Reserve (UNESCO)
 CBD: Convention on Biological Diversity
 CCH: Cetacean Critical Habitats (ACCOBAMS)
 CITES: Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
 CMS: Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (Bonn Convention)
 COP: Conference of Parties
 EBSA: Ecologically or Biologically Significant marine Area (CBD)
 EC: European Commission
 EcAp: Ecosystem Approach (Barcelona Convention)
 EEA: European Environment Agency
 EEZ: Exclusive Economic Zone
 EIA: Environmental Impact Assessment
 EU: European Union
 FAO: Food and Agriculture Organization
 FRA: Fisheries Restricted Area (FAO/GFCM)
 GES: Good Environmental Status
 GFCM: General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (FAO)
 GIS: Geographic Information System
 IBA: Important Bird Area
 ICZM: Integrated Coastal Zone Management
 IMAP: Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Programme (Barcelona Convention)
 IMMA: Important Marine Mammal Area
 IMO: International Maritime Organisation (Convention)
 IUCN: International Union for the Conservation of Nature
 IUCN-Med: International Union for Conservation of Nature Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation
 MAP: Mediterranean Action Plan
 MAPAMED: Database on sites of interest for the conservation of the marine environment in the Mediterranean Sea
 MARPOL: International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships
 MCPA: Marine and Coastal Protected Area
 MCPA-RWP: Regional Working Programme for the marine and coastal protected areas in the Mediterranean including the High Sea
 MedPAN: Network of Marine Protected Area Managers in the Mediterranean
 MedPO: Mediterranean Project Office of WWF
 MPA: Marine Protected Area
 MSFD: Marine Strategy Framework Directive
 MSP: Marine Spatial Planning (or Maritime Spatial Planning in the European Union context)
 NGO: Non-Governmental Organization
 OECM: Other Effective area-based Conservation Measure (CBD)
 OSPAR: Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic
 PA: Protected Area
 PAc: Priority Action
 PSSA: Particularly Sensitive Sea Area (IMO)
 pSCI: Proposed Site of Community Importance (EC Habitats Directive)
 Q: Question
 SAC: Special Area of Conservation (EC Habitats Directive)
 SAP BIO: Strategic Action Programme for the Conservation of Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean region
 SCI: Site of Community Importance (EC Habitats Directive)

SDG: Sustainable Development Goal

SEPA: Special Environmental Protection Area (Turkey specific designation)

SPA: Special Protection Area (Birds Directive)

SPA: Specially Protected Area (Barcelona Convention)

SPA/BD Protocol: Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean

SPAMI: Specially Protected Area of Mediterranean Importance (Barcelona Convention)

SPA/RAC: Specially Protected Areas Regional Activity Centre

UfM: Union for the Mediterranean

UN: United Nations

UNECE: United Nations Economic Commission for Europe

UN Environment: new denomination of UNEP, the United Nations Environment Programme

UNEP: United Nations Environment Programme

UNEP-MAP: United Nations Environment Programme - Mediterranean Action Plan

UNEP-WCMC: United Nations Environment Programme - World Conservation Monitoring Centre

UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

UNCLOS: United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea

VME: Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems (CBD)

WCPA: World Commission on Protected Areas (IUCN)

WDPA: World Database on Protected Areas

WWF: World Wide Fund for Nature

WHS: World Heritage Site (UNESCO)

Summary of the Roadmap evaluation

The MPA roadmap provides a suitable framework for marine conservation in the Mediterranean region, and the countries could be able to identify their strengths and weaknesses regarding the roadmap, based on a set of questions taking into account, on one side the text of the Aichi target 11 as it is the ultimate objective of the roadmap and on the other side the main identified actions included under the four objectives.

Ten questions have been identified in order to make the evaluation more effective and provide the best answers based on the national reports to SPA/RAC and the Barcelona Convention, the questionnaires sent to all the National Focal Points and selected regional organizations, the identified criteria by the Convention on Biological Diversity and the indicators under development within the framework of the Barcelona Convention for the protection and conservation of biodiversity.

The ten questions considered for the evaluation are the following:

- Q1. Has the MPAs and OECMs coverage reached 10% of waters under national jurisdiction?
- Q2. Are the existing MPAs and OECMs effectively and equitably managed?
- Q3. Is the existing network of MPAs and OECMs ecologically representative?
- Q4. Is the existing network of MPAs and OECMs well connected?
- Q5. Has the concept of OECM been defined and introduced in the national legislation?
- Q6. Has the country prepared a Strategy and an Action Plan for MPAs and OECMs, based on a gap analysis of the representativity of national biodiversity and ecosystems, based on accurate scientific information and proposing a list of future MPAs to complete the existing national network, all this with the effective participation of stakeholders?
- Q7. Has the country assessed and amended/reviewed the institutional and legal system applicable to MPAs and OECMs, improving therefore the effectiveness of the governance and management systems, and checking that each MPA has clear objectives and concrete measures and support for its management?
- Q8. Has the country considered or developed negotiations with neighbouring Contracting Parties for managing jointly networks of MPAs, including in their existing or future EEZ areas?
- Q9. Has the country developed/approved an overall policy for the sustainable use of marine and coastal environment (land use planning and management associated to marine spatial planning and management) based on the participation and involvement of all components of the society, on the equitable sharing of the social and economic benefits of the protected environmental and its natural resources (including within MPAs and OECMs)?
- Q10. Has the country developed/implemented a strategy and an action plan for long term funding of nature conservation considering all the necessary components?

The responses to these questions have been drafted based on the review of existing knowledge, the national reports by countries to different international and regional instruments and the answers to a specific questionnaire by National Focal Points and regional organizations. For each of them, a specific paragraph has been drafted for review and a list of references or links is provided in annex on the relevant topic. Some of the most important points are developed in the following paragraphs.

One of the major gaps in the existing network of conservation and protection areas in the Mediterranean is that the countries consider and declare Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) but do not consider what is called by the CBD the Other Effective Area-based Conservation measures or OECMs. Even, some countries do not consider the declaration of marine conservation areas under other international instruments, such as the Ramsar sites (Ramsar Convention), the Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems (VME of CBD), the Particularly Sensitive Sea Areas (PSSA of IMO) or the Biosphere Reserves and World Heritage Sites (BR and WHS of UNESCO) or the regional ones, such as the

Fisheries Restricted Areas of the GFCM. All these sites need to be gathered and reported in the countries international and regional reports, integrating all the components.

Therefore, MPAs and OECMs definitions and categories have to be approved at the regional level and if possible inserted in the national legal framework (see option in the box for OECMs). The inclusion of OECMs in potential conservation areas is a way to assist the country in achieving the Aichi target 11, as for most of these areas the management is under another administration and enforcement can be stricter, as for military zones and cultural heritage sites.

The management of existing MPAs is a weak point in the Mediterranean, due to different factors, and in particular the lack of:

- Political will
- Strategy and action plan for MPAs and OECMs
- Dedicated administration with a proper mandate
- Coordination between administrations
- Proper legislation allowing control, enforcement and dissuasive fines
- Budget for management including staff equipment and running costs
- Funding options for emergencies
- Options for adaptive management for quick response to threats or impacts

The preparation of a medium to long-term strategy and action plan for MPAs and OECMs will assist the countries in the development of their network. The identification of a proper administrative mechanism has to be part of the strategy and action plan, as well as the assessment of the existing legislations, of its gaps and hindrances, and the identification of the funding sources for the network and each site as well as the reduction of threats and the mitigation of impacts.

Even if the gap in knowledge or the lack of study at the local level is frequently quoted as an element that is essential to decide to declare a MPA for conserving the health and the renewal of the marine biodiversity and resources, such a declaration could be done based on a precautionary approach. In fact, some models can allow to have a provisional list of ecosystems and species in specific areas, needing just rapid assessment missions to confirm the presence of essential ecosystems (seagrasses meadow, coralligenous formations, etc.) and endangered or threatened species. The identification of Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems (VMEs) as recommended by the CBD is also based on limited knowledge.

Considering the regional actions by all countries together, the spatial coverage of 10% has been reached if one considers all the MPAs and OECMs. Some countries are late and the efforts have to be focusing on them, in particular for developing the governance, improving the national capacity for management and including the missing elements ensuring connectivity and representativity.

Based on the 10 questions and on the table prepared for a self-evaluation, countries could identify quickly the urgent actions to be taken and include them in the next programme of work at the national level.

An exercise led and supported by the SPA/RAC and assisted by experts from countries could be launched to tackle all the gaps and needs for support to reach a coherent and representative regional network. Such an action could be one of the priorities of the SPA/RAC programme of work for the next biennium.

The main proposed actions or recommendations resulting from the 10 questions are as follow:

Proposed actions for the MPAs and OECMs coverage:

- Support to the countries that are still to achieve the coverage target could be a priority for the next phase of the MPA roadmap implementation, namely with the number of proposed sites that have been

identified and are still not declared.

- Support to countries to improve their strength of protection and the effective management of these areas and their surroundings could be a second priority for the next phase of the MPA roadmap implementation.
- Introduce the concept of OECMs at the national level and their declaration in the national reporting

Proposed actions for management effectiveness and equitability:

- Assessing management effectiveness should be considered a top priority by countries, in terms of capacity and management actions and regulations.
- Defining guidelines for measuring equitable management.
- Assessing and reinforcing the capacity of national administrations to monitor and improve management effectiveness.

Proposed action for MPAs and OECMs network ecological representativeness:

The creation of a group of experts to prepare guidelines to define how to measure coherence and representativity (indicators).

Proposed action for MPAs and OECMs connectivity:

The creation of a group of experts to define and measure connectivity could be an option for the next SPA/RAC programme of work concerning the MPA roadmap.

Proposed action for OECMs definition and introduction in the national legislation:

The creation of a working group to propose a definition of OECM for the marine environment in the Mediterranean region, based on the CBD definition, to be approved by the Contracting Parties for being included in the regional database MAPAMED and their national reports to international and regional instruments.

Proposed action for a National Strategy and Action Plan for MPAs and OECMs:

Continue to assist countries in the preparation of a Strategy and Action Plan for MPAs and OECMs based on a gap analysis.

Proposed actions for the assessment and amendment/revision of the institutional and legal system applicable to MPAs and OECM:

- Assist countries in assessing the adequacy of their institutional and legal system for ensuring a full development of their network of MPAs and OECMs.
- Assist countries with developing or reviewing objectives and measures of MPAs to allow optimal management, including adaptive management.

Proposed Action for coordination with neighbouring countries on MPAs and OECMs:

Support countries for identifying their marine boundaries and developing coordinated declaration and management of MPAs or OECMs.

Proposed actions for an integrated management of land and sea at the national level:

- Support countries with the development of systematic conservation planning taking into account ICZM, land use/marine use planning and management aspects in the context of MSP.
- Foster a better integration of stakeholders in MSP for systematic conservation planning.

Proposed Actions for long term funding strategy and action plan of nature conservation:

- Support the development of the MPA trust fund at the regional level and of environmental funds at the national levels.
- Support the development of national or sub-regional trust funds or other innovative sustainable financing mechanisms in order to sustain the adequate management of MPAs along with the capacity of MPAs to develop long term mechanisms for sustaining their management.

Based on the process realized for answering the questions considering the data available for each country, and the lack of data for some of the questions, a self-evaluation system has been developed.

This could allow the countries to evaluate their progress regarding the roadmap for MPAs. Then when all the self-evaluation have been conducted, regional or sub regional evaluations could be conducted, allowing to review and reinforce the roadmap using the results and the priorities identified for each countries and for all of them together.

This will provide an identification of the gaps and weaknesses of the system(s) of Mediterranean MPAs and OECMs and of the efforts needed for specific matters to reach the 2020 target in a reasonable delay.

Background

Context of the evaluation and previous steps and recommendations

Towards the Roadmap for MPAs in the Mediterranean region, a Barcelona Convention process

Established by the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention, the Specially Protected Areas Regional Activity Centre (SPA/RAC) mission is to assist the Mediterranean countries in implementing the Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean (SPA/BD Protocol). The Protocol main objective is to contribute to the protection, preservation and sustainable management of marine and coastal areas of particular natural and cultural value and threatened and endangered species of flora and fauna in the Mediterranean.

Confronted with the complexity and size of the pressure on marine and coastal biological diversity, the Contracting Parties judged that they needed a concerted strategy. Adopted by the thirteenth ordinary meeting to the Barcelona Convention (COP 13, Catania, Italy, November 2003) in 2003, SPA/RAC launched in 2004, the implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the Conservation of Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean region (SAP BIO) with the objective of providing the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention, international and national organizations, NGOs, donors and all other actors involved in the protection and management of the Mediterranean natural environment, with principles, measures and concrete and coordinated actions at national, transboundary and regional level for the conservation of the Mediterranean marine and coastal biodiversity.

The strategic actions aim to:

- Improving knowledge about marine and coastal biodiversity,
- Protecting sensitive species, habitats and sites,
- Reducing negative impacts on biological diversity,
- Promoting sector-based policies that encourage biodiversity (tourism, agriculture, etc.),
- Adopting institutional and legal measures,
- Building capacity, raising awareness and enhancing participation,
- Coordinating the biodiversity activities of the MAP centres and cooperating with other regional organizations.

The SAP BIO identified 30 concrete strategic Priority Actions to guide countries over the fifteen following years in planning and implementing protection activities. Of these Priority Actions (PAs), the following ones concern more precisely the conservation of sensitive habitats, species and sites, therefore marine and coastal biodiversity conservation and protected areas:

- PA5: Harmonise, update, coordinate and enforce legislation to conserve biodiversity;
- PA6: Develop actions to conserve threatened and endangered (marine and coastal) Mediterranean species;
- PA7: Develop and protect marine and coastal sites of particular interest;
- PA8: Declare and develop new coastal and marine protected areas;
- PA9: Strengthen existing Marine and Coastal Protected Areas.

The Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention adopted, during their sixteenth ordinary meeting (Marrakesh, Morocco, November 2009), the “Regional Working Programme for the coastal and marine protected areas in the Mediterranean including the High Sea” (MCPA-RWP). This MCPA-RWP aimed at helping the Mediterranean countries to achieve the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) 2012 targets (CBD’s Programme of Work on Protected Areas, 2004) by establishing a representative network of marine protected areas (MPAs) in the Mediterranean.

The MCPA-RWP was elaborated by SPA/RAC in consultation with its regional partners: the Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans in the Black Sea Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Atlantic Area (ACCOBAMS), the International Union for Conservation of Nature Centre for

Mediterranean Cooperation (IUCN-Med), the Network of Marine Protected Area Managers in the Mediterranean (MedPAN) and the World Wild Fund for Nature Mediterranean Programme Office (WWF-MedPO).

During their nineteenth ordinary meeting (Athens, Greece, February 2016), the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention adopted the “Roadmap for a Comprehensive Coherent Network of Well-Managed MPAs to Achieve Aichi Target 11 in the Mediterranean” (MPA Roadmap) as guidance to update and implement the MCPA-RWP (Decision IG.22/13).

The MPA Roadmap drafting process was made in consultation with the same regional partners, as well as the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM). It was elaborated to guide the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention and harmonize their efforts to achieve the globally agreed Aichi Target 11.

The activities proposed in the roadmap were oriented towards achieving the following four objectives:

- Objective 1: Strengthen networks of protected areas at national and Mediterranean levels, including in the high seas and in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ), as a contribution to the relevant globally agreed goals and targets;
- Objective 2: Improve the network of Mediterranean MPAs through effective and equitable management;
- Objective 3: Promote the sharing of environmental and socio-economic benefits of Mediterranean MPAs, and the MPAs integration into the broader context of sustainable use of the marine environment and the implementation of the ecosystem and marine spatial planning approaches; and
- Objective 4: Ensure the stability of the network of Mediterranean MPAs by enhancing their financial sustainability.

By its Decision IG.22/13, the nineteenth ordinary meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention (COP 19) also requested SPA/RAC to undertake an evaluation of the implementation of the MCPA-RWP supported by the MPA Roadmap, and report the results to twentieth ordinary meeting of the Contracting Parties (Tirana, Albania, December 2017). Such report has been prepared with the active contribution of SPA/RAC Focal Points and presented as an information document to the 20th ordinary meeting of the Contracting Parties: UNEP(DEPI)/MED IG.23/Inf.7.

It provided an evaluation of the progress made during the 2010-2016 period, including the state of knowledge country by country, and orientations for further improvement.

Furthermore, according to the MPA Roadmap timeframe, by the end of year 2019, an evaluation should be made at regional level to assess the progress made (including success and possible failure) by the Mediterranean countries towards achieving the Aichi Target 11.

To that end, and during the 2018-2019 biennial period, SPA/RAC was entrusted with the mission of assessing the progress made in implementing the MPA Roadmap by the Contracting Parties.

All this process is in line with CBD objectives and activities as described and summarized below in the table 1.

Table 1: Important steps taken by the CBD and the Barcelona Convention concerning MPAs and OECMs

CBD	Date	Barcelona Convention
Article 6 of the CBD: (a) Develop national strategies, plans or programmes for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity or adapt for this purpose existing strategies, plans or programmes which shall reflect, inter alia, the measures set out in this Convention relevant to the Contracting Party concerned.	1992 May	
	1995	Adoption of the Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean, SPA/BD Protocol (revising the SPA Protocol of 1982).
	1999 Dec.	Entry into force of the SPA/BD Protocol.
	2003 Nov.	COP 13 (Catania): Adoption of the Strategic Action Programme for the Conservation of Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean region (SAP BIO).
CBD Programme of work on protected areas.	2004	
	2009 Nov.	COP 16 (Marrakesh): Adoption of the Regional Working Programme for the marine and coastal protected areas in the Mediterranean including the High Sea (MCPA-RPW).
COP 10 (Nagoya): Adoption of the Strategic Action Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and Aichi Biodiversity Targets, including Aichi Target 11 on protected areas for 2020.	2010 Oct.	
OECM identified in Aichi Target 11	2010	
OECM Guidelines prepared by IUCN	2015	
By 2015, National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plan (NBSAP) adopted or revised by all Parties.	2015	
	2016 Feb.	COP 19 (Athens): Adoption of the Roadmap for a Comprehensive Coherent Network of Well-Managed MPAs to Achieve Aichi Target 11 in the Mediterranean (MPA Roadmap) to implement MCPA-RPW, to be both evaluated in 2017.
COP 13 (Cancun): Request to clarify the OECM concept.	2016 Dec.	
	2017 Dec.	COP 20 (Tirana): Mid-term MPA Roadmap evaluation completed (doc UNEP(DEPI)/MED IG.23/Inf.7).
COP 14 (Sharm El-Sheikh): Adopts the definition of OECMs (https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-14/cop-14-dec-08-en.pdf).	2018 Nov.	
	2019 Dec.	COP 21 (Palermo): MPA Roadmap evaluation and mandate for the elaboration of a post-2020 strategic document on MPAs and OECMs in the Mediterranean
Deadline for Aichi Target 11.	2020	
COP 15 (Beijing): Development and adoption of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework.	2020 Oct.	
	2020- 2021	New MPA roadmap to be prepared and adopted during COP 22 (2021).

PAs and MPAs in the international context: CBD and Aichi targets, OECM and criteria

Since 2004, the CBD initiated a programme of work on biodiversity that culminated in 2010 during the CBD COP 10 with the adoption of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets for 2020 and in particular the Target 11 concerning protected areas that proposes:

« By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water areas and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscape and seascape ».

The CBD provided details on the different points included in the target:

- *Include areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services* - such as areas high in species richness or threatened species, threatened biomes and habitats, areas with particularly important habitats (key biodiversity areas, high conservation value areas, important plant areas, sensitive marine areas, etc.) and areas which are important for the continued provision of ecosystem services (such as areas important for water supply, erosion control, sacred sites);
- *Be ecologically representative* – protected area systems should contain adequate samples of the full range of existing ecosystems and ecological processes, including at least 10% of each eco-region within the country;
- *Be effectively and equitably managed* – with planning measures in place to ensure ecological integrity and the protection of species, habitats and ecosystem processes, with the full participation of indigenous and local communities, and such that costs and benefits of the areas are fairly shared.
- *Be well-connected* – to the wider landscape or seascape using corridors and ecological networks to allow connectivity, adaptation to climate change, and the application of the ecosystem approach.

The CBD identifies also possible indicators for MPAs and OECMs:

- Trends in extent of the territorial waters coverage and offshore;
- Trends in representative coverage of rare or threatened species, habitats or ecosystems and key biodiversity areas;
- Trends in management effectiveness;
- Trends in connectivity;
- Trends in the delivery of ecosystem services;
- Trends in the delivery of equitable benefits.

Of these proposed indicators, the first 2 are easy to measure, but all the others need a common approach for defining the methodology to be applied for measuring and monitoring them, in particular management effectiveness, connectiveness, valuation of ecosystem services and follow up of benefit sharing, at least at the regional level.

The target 11 refers to two categories of areas: MCPAs as defined in national legislation and *other effective area based conservation measures* (quoted nowadays as OECMs. At the request of the countries, the CBD requested a clarification on the definition of OECM that was provided in Guidelines prepared by IUCN and adopted during the CBD COP 14 (November 2018 <https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-14/cop-14-dec-08-en.pdf>)

Presently, MAPAMED, the database of MPAs and other sites of interest for the conservation of the marine environment in the Mediterranean Sea, includes national MPAs, transboundary MPAs, sites covering the marine environment as declared within the framework of international conventions and regional agreements, such as the Ramsar sites, World Heritage Sites, Biosphere Reserves, Particularly Sensitive Sea Areas (IMO) or the Fisheries Restricted Areas (GFCM) including a conservation

objective. They are considered as part of their protection efforts by most countries in the Mediterranean and included in the national reports to the Barcelona Convention.

Entering in the OECMs categories could be sites declared at the national level, such as corridors between MPAs or for migratory species, permanent national fisheries reserves and some Fisheries Restricted Areas of GFCM, cultural sites such as shipwrecks, indigenous people managed areas, private properties areas, military areas, navigation channels, all established with as primary, secondary or ancillary objectives, the conservation of marine biodiversity or ecosystems. In this list, the fisheries reserves could be included quickly with the agreement of the country, as an inventory has been realized by GFCM and their inclusion in MAPAMED database could be considered.

Other international instruments in the Mediterranean region

Several international conventions are supporting the conservation of species or areas, some of them with specific instruments or labels promoting the ecological or cultural importance of sites and they are recognized by most Mediterranean countries. Among them, the most relevant for the Mediterranean region are the following:

- The Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar Convention) aims to develop and maintain an international network of wetlands considered important for the conservation of global biological diversity and for sustaining human life through the ecological and hydrological functions they perform. Ramsar sites (98 of them connected to the Mediterranean Sea, MedPAN 2016) are designated on account of their international significance in terms of ecology, botany, zoology, limnology or hydrology.
- The Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (World Heritage Convention - UNESCO) World Heritage sites (three in the Mediterranean) cover cultural and/or natural heritage considered of outstanding value to humanity, and have thus been inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List.
- UNESCO has also a specific Man and Biosphere Programme (MAB) allowing the declaration of Biosphere reserves (seven in the Mediterranean) managed by the relevant States.
- The Intergovernmental Maritime Organisation (IMO) is a Convention under the UN umbrella that can declare Particularly Sensitive Sea Areas (PSSAs – one in the Mediterranean). These areas of high ecological, socio-economic and/or scientific value which need special protection because of their vulnerability to be damaged by international maritime activities.

PAs and MPAs in the regional or sub-regional context

The Barcelona Convention and its Protocols were developed by the United Nations Environment Programme (now UN Environment) within the framework of the Regional Seas Programme. The Mediterranean Action Plan (UN Environment/MAP) has different regional activity centres and numerous programmes for the conservation and the sustainable use of the Mediterranean marine and coastal environment. The Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean (SPA/BD Protocol - 1995) follows up on the CBD objectives and encourages the Contracting Parties to establish marine and coastal protected areas, and has developed a label for Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance (SPAMIs). The Specially Protected Areas Regional Activity Centre (SPA/RAC) is following all matters concerning biodiversity under the Barcelona Convention. SPA/RAC, among numerous activities, is in charge of the implementation of the Roadmap for MPAs and for this purpose has developed in 2010 a regional database for MPAs and OECMs called MAPAMED, jointly with MedPAN, the network of managers of marine protected areas in the Mediterranean.

In the recent years, the Ecosystem Approach (EcAp) has been chosen as the guiding principle to MAP Programme of Work and all policy implementation and development undertaken under the auspices of UNEP/MAP Barcelona Convention, with the ultimate objective of achieving the Good Environmental Status (GES) of the Mediterranean Sea and Coast.

Within the framework of the application of the Ecosystem Approach (EcAp) to the management of the Mediterranean marine and coastal environment, the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention adopted a series of common indicators to be regularly calculated using data to be collected through standardized methodologies. For this aim, they have adopted at their COP 19 (Athens, Greece, February 2016), the Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Programme of the Mediterranean Sea and Coast and related Assessment Criteria (IMAP).

IMAP is meant as a collaborative effort aiming at assessing through a set of indicators the state of the marine and coastal environment in the Mediterranean. For each common indicator, a methodological sheet and monitoring protocols have been developed to allow data to be collected by countries according to a common methodology allowing consistency and comparability of the results obtained. Most of these sheets recommend the inclusion of reference sites that are sites in or close to having Good Environmental Status. These sites could be in particular MPAs or SPAMIs.

The General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM) is a regional fisheries management organization (RFMO). The Agreement for its establishment, under the provisions of Article XIV of the FAO constitution, was approved by the FAO Conference in 1949 and entered into force in 1952. Consisting of 23 member countries along with the European Union, the GFCM's objectives are to promote the development, conservation, rational management and best utilization of living marine resources, as well as the sustainable development of aquaculture in the Mediterranean, Black Sea and connecting waters. The GFCM plays a critical role in fisheries governance in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea, as it has the authority to adopt binding recommendations for fisheries conservation and management. GFCM supports the identification and declaration of Fisheries Restricted Areas (FRAs) and of Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems (VMEs) in the region, with an objective of sustainable use of halieutic resources and the conservation of species or ecosystems supporting these resources.

The Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and contiguous Atlantic area (ACCOBAMS) is a legal conservation tool based on cooperation, established under the auspices of the Bonn Convention (UNEP/CMS). Its purpose is to reduce threats to cetaceans notably by improving current knowledge on these animals. This intergovernmental Agreement provides the demonstration of the commitment of riparian countries to preserve all species of cetaceans and their habitats within the Agreement geographical area by the enforcement of more stringent measures than those defined in the texts adopted previously. ACCOBAMS has identified Cetacean Critical Habitats (CCH) in the region and is assisting the countries in their conservation efforts.

The specificities of European countries

At European Union (EU) level, several instruments, directives or policies have been particularly important for marine conservation. They concern presently eight Mediterranean countries, other being under accession process, such as Albania and Montenegro.

The Birds Directive (adopted in 1979, consolidated in 2009) and the Habitats Directive (adopted in 1992) require EU Member States to protect important habitats and species, including coastal and marine, *inter alia* by establishing protected areas known as Natura 2000 sites. Under the Habitats Directive, Member States submit lists of proposed Sites of Community Importance (pSCIs) to the European Commission. Once adopted by the Commission, these proposed sites become Sites of Community Importance (SCIs), and Member States must then designate them as Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) within six years at most. Under the Birds Directive, Member States are required to classify the most suitable territories for birds as Special Protection Areas (SPAs). Under both directives site designation is done according to relevant scientific criteria. SPAs and SACs constitute the network of sites of Natura 2000 and Member States are required to implement the necessary

conservation management measures in order to maintain or improve the conservation statuses of species and habitats for which the sites are designated¹.

The Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) which came into force in 2008 aims to achieve the Good Environmental Status (GES) of European Union marine waters by 2020 through the development of national strategies for marine waters. This Directive promotes the Ecosystem Approach and encourages cooperation between EU Member States. In synergy with this European Directive, the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention have committed since 2008 to apply the ecosystem approach to the management of human activities and defined a roadmap to achieve the GES. This holistic approach is a roadmap in seven steps and emphasizes the links between ecosystems, living beings that inhabit them and human well-being. Its application brings out priorities to respond more effectively to the needs of management and conservation. Recently, the Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Programme (IMAP) was adopted with the main aim to build and implement a regional monitoring system gathering reliable and up-to-date data and information on the marine and coastal Mediterranean environment.

The Water Framework Directive, adopted in 2000 sets the broad scope for action and ambitious goals for the protection of inland surface waters, transitional waters, coastal waters and groundwater.

The Directive establishing a framework for Maritime Spatial Planning, adopted in 2014, recognizes the benefits of environment protection and the importance of sustainability in the development of maritime activities. This Directive also promotes an integrated approach in the planning of these activities.

The 1970 EU Common Fisheries Policy (CFP, amended in 2014) lays down a set of rules for managing European fishing fleets and for conserving fish stocks and the marine ecosystem. It includes provisions to facilitate the implementation of fishery conservation measures to fulfil the objectives of the Birds and Habitats directives and the MSFD.

At EU level, there are regular meetings to ensure that some key articles that target a specific issue are aligned and not contradictory with international or regional instruments, in particular with the Barcelona Convention, benefiting therefore all Mediterranean countries.

PAs and MPAs in the national context

Although some strong similarities exist between countries, the national context can be very different from one country to another in terms of administrations, legislation and even denominations for MPAs designation (about 50 different names are used).

The administrative leadership for MPAs can be, depending on countries, one or more of the following administrations: the ministries of Environment, Fisheries, Agriculture, other ministries or specialized agencies. However, the management is rarely a collaborative mechanism between administrations and/or delegated to NGOs or private entities (co-management).

The legal system often does not include important elements such as - the identification of a budget for MPAs when they are declared, - the existence of an environmental police or of a specialized administration to observe, prosecute and penalize environmental offenses, - adapted penalties for environmental damage, or, - the creation of an environmental fund for financing conservation actions and fight against pollution.

¹ Information on the establishment and management of marine Natura 2000 is available at: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/marine/index_en.htm

The inventories of MPAs and OECMs is done differently in each country, but for a regional vision of the existing areas of conservation, the country often refer to the MAPAMED database, a joint initiative of SPA/RAC and MedPAN, that will be shortly described later.

Part I: The Roadmap for MPAs and elements for its evaluation

The present evaluation of the MPA Roadmap was based on the following elements:

1.1. The Roadmap scope

The roadmap was adopted with the following title:

“Roadmap for a comprehensive coherent network of well-managed MPAs to achieve Aichi Target 11 in the Mediterranean”.

The evaluation has therefore to refer first to the wording of the Aichi Target 11:

“By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water areas and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscape and seascape”.

The five main questions that each country will have to answer when considering reporting on its commitment related to the Aichi Target 11 are listed hereafter:

Q1: Is the MPAs and OECMs coverage reaching 10% (of waters under national jurisdiction)?

Q2: Are the existing MPAs and OECMs effectively and equitably managed?

Q3: Is the existing network of MPAs and OECMs ecologically representative?

Q4: Is the existing network of MPAs and OECMs well connected?

Q5: Has the concept of OECM been defined and introduced in the national legislation?

1.2. The Roadmap objectives and priority actions

The “**Roadmap for a Comprehensive Coherent Network of Well-Managed MPAs to Achieve Aichi Target 11 in the Mediterranean**”, adopted in 2016 (COP 19 of the Barcelona Convention), defines 4 objectives and for each of them proposes some specific activities for the Contracting Parties and also for regional and international organizations. The suggested actions considered here are those addressed to the Contracting Parties.

Objective 1: ***Strengthen networks of protected areas*** at national and Mediterranean levels, including in the high seas and in ABNJ, as a contribution to the relevant globally agreed goals and targets.

- 1.1. Undertake, at national level, *gap analysis to identify the ecosystems* and other components of marine *biodiversity* that are under-represented in the existing MPA system;
- 1.2. Identify and propose area-based conservation/management measures or candidate MPAs for *listing in the regionally and globally recognized area-based management classifications*;
- 1.3. Make use amongst other sources, of the *scientific information regarding the description of areas meeting EBSA criteria*;
- 1.4. *Establish and implement national plans* to formally designate and/or extend, as appropriate, MPAs and other area-based marine management measures.

For this Objective 1, the country will have to answer only one question, covering all the points in italic.

Q6: Has the country prepared a Strategy and an Action Plan for MPAs and OECMs, based on a gap analysis of the representativity of national biodiversity and ecosystems, based on accurate scientific

information and proposing a list of future MPAs to complete the existing national network, all this with the effective participation of stakeholders?

Objective 2: Improve of the network of Mediterranean MPAs through *effective and equitable management*.

- 2.1. Review, and where necessary amend, existing *institutional and legal systems* applicable to MPAs;
- 2.2. Assess the *effectiveness of the existing governance and management system* for each MPA;
- 2.3. Ensure that for each MPA *clear objectives and concrete* measures, based on the best available knowledge and with appropriate stakeholder involvement, are prepared, adopted, implemented and revised when necessary (...), and that all MPAs have adequate management teams in terms of skills and staff number;
- 2.4. Engage in *discussions* [...] *with neighbouring Contracting Parties* in the development of joint mechanisms for the management of networks of MPAs, and MPAs extending over multiple jurisdictions and/or into ABNJ.

For this Objective 2, the country will have to answer only two questions, covering all the points in italic.

Q7: Has the country assessed and amended/reviewed the institutional and legal system applicable to MPAs and OECMs, improving therefore the effectiveness of the governance and management systems, and checking that each MPA has clear objectives and concrete measures and support for its management?

Q8: Has the country considered or developed negotiations with neighbouring Contracting Parties for managing jointly networks of MPAs, including in their existing or future EEZ areas?

Objective 3: Promote the *sharing of environmental and socio-economic benefits* of Mediterranean MPAs, and the MPAs integration into the broader context of sustainable use of the marine environment and the implementation of the ecosystem and marine spatial planning approaches.

- 3.1. Ensure conciliation between the conservation objectives and the requirements for the *local economic and social development*;
- 3.2. Promote *cross-sectorial policies and mechanisms* for integrating the MPA national strategies and policies with other human activity sectors;
- 3.3. Develop systems enabling *civil society to engage effectively in MPA management*;
- 3.4. Establish MPAs in areas particularly suitable for the *conservation of living marine resources, both for extractive and non-extractive use*, and encourage the *equitable sharing of social and economic benefits* deriving from MPAs.

For this Objective 3, the country will have to answer only one question, covering all the points in italic.

Q9. Has the country developed/approved an overall policy for the sustainable use of marine and coastal environment (land use planning and management associated to marine spatial planning and management) based on the participation and involvement of all components of the society, on the equitable sharing of the social and economic benefits of the protected environment and its natural resources (including within MPAs and OECMs)?

Objective 4: Ensure the stability of the network of Mediterranean MPAs by enhancing their *financial sustainability*.

- 4.1. Review, and where necessary, amend *existing relevant legal and institutional frameworks* with the view of improving the governance of existing MPAs and boosting the creation of new MPAs;
- 4.2. Assess the *financial needs* and gaps for MPAs and develop *funding strategies*;
- 4.3. Secure the *financial resources* necessary to the establishment of MPAs during their initial years;

- 4.4. Assist MPA managers in enhancing their *fundraising capacities*, in particular through the development of their business plans;
- 4.5. Establish *national environmental funds and/or other mechanisms* for supporting conservation actions and particularly MPAs creation and management.

For this Objective 4, the country will have to answer only one question, covering all the points in italic.

Q10. Has the country developed/implemented a strategy and an action plan for long term funding of nature conservation considering all the necessary components?

1.3. Information available for realising the evaluation

a. The documentation analysis

The first phase of the evaluation was dedicated to the gathering, compilation, review and analysis of existing knowledge, information and data from multiple sources (previous similar assessment reports made at regional, sub-regional or national levels; databases, including the Marine Protected Areas in the Mediterranean Database (MAPAMED5) and the Barcelona Convention reporting system; other relevant papers, reports and studies). One of the objective was to evaluate the gaps in knowledge to be further assessed based on questionnaires and interviews. This phase will be continued until the final report of the evaluation is completed and a specific report will be provided.

The preliminary analysis has allowed to predefine a set of criteria to assess the progress made in achieving the four objectives and related actions of the MPA Roadmap and some specific questions were identified for the on-line questionnaire.

b. The National reports to the Barcelona Convention and SPA/RAC

National reports to the Barcelona Convention and SPA/RAC have been consulted, the main elements collected and the most relevant included in the answers to the identified questions. The last comprehensive analysis of these national reports was realized in 2017 for each country and is included in the information document to the 20th ordinary meeting of the Contracting Parties: UNEP(DEPI)/MED IG.23/Inf.7. The national reports for the 21th ordinary meeting of the Contracting Parties are still under preparation, but the ones available have been consulted for 9 countries and the European Union.

This has allowed the identification of complementary elements for the questionnaire sent to countries.

c. The specific questionnaire sent to countries

Based on the available data and identified gaps related to the implementation of the MPA Roadmap, tailored questionnaires to fill those gaps have been prepared for Mediterranean countries/Contracting Parties governments (represented by SPA/RAC Focal Points). The format of this questionnaire can be found in annexe to this report.

When considered necessary, complementary direct or phone interviews with a sample of SPA/RAC Focal Points have taken place to precise the questions, better understand the situation of MPAs at national and regional levels and further identify possible weaknesses and challenges that hinder the timely and full implementation of the actions proposed within the MPA Roadmap.

A second questionnaire was as well as to the relevant regional and international organizations, including ACCOBAMS, GFCM, IUCN, MedPAN, WWF, the MAP and its Components and any other relevant stakeholder or partner, following consultations with SPA/RAC.

For the countries questionnaires, only 10 replies were received, from 8 countries and some countries have still indicated that they were preparing their answers. The reason for this low level of response

(less than 40%) could be different from country to country. Even if the validity of the process is weakened by the lack of answers, the responses to the main questions are presented hereafter in percentage of the proposed choices, with the highest percentage highlighted.

IN GENERAL, HAS YOUR COUNTRY FOSTERED OR ADOPTED ANY NEW POLICY, LEGAL OR PROGRAMMATIC INITIATIVE, OR TAKEN PART IN RELEVANT PROJECT(S) TO SUPPORT MPAs OF YOUR COUNTRY?

- | | |
|--|-------|
| 0 – No action has taken place as far as I know | (0%) |
| 1 – Some routine action has taken place or is currently taking place | (20%) |
| 2 – Some small new action has taken place or is currently taking place | (0%) |
| 3 – Some significant actions have been taken or are currently taking place | (80%) |

ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE TERM ‘OTHER EFFECTIVE AREA-BASED CONSERVATION MEASURE’ (OECM) AND IS YOUR INSTITUTION/ORGANISATION USING THIS TERM WITHIN NEW POLICIES, PLANNING, STRATEGIES, PROJECTS OR OTHER INITIATIVES RELATING TO MPAs AND MARINE CONSERVATION IN YOUR COUNTRY?

- | | |
|--|-------|
| 0 – I don’t know this term / I don’t understand this term | (0%) |
| 1 – I know of this term but it is not used where I work | (70%) |
| 2 - I know of / understand this term and we have started using it where I work | (0%) |
| 3 – I understand this term and it is widely used where I work | (30%) |

OBJECTIVE 1 – Strengthen Networks of Protected Areas at National and Mediterranean levels, including in the high seas and in ABNJ, as a contribution to the relevant globally agreed goals and targets

HAS YOUR COUNTRY DECLARED NEW MPAs SINCE 2016?

- | | |
|---|-------|
| 0 - Nothing new has happened since 2016 | (30%) |
| 1 - A new MPA / new MPAs are about to be declared | (20%) |
| 2 - A new MPA has been declared since 2016 | (10%) |
| 3 - New MPAs have been declared since 2016 | (40%) |

HAS YOUR COUNTRY EXTENDED THE SURFACE COVERAGE OF EXISTING MPAs SINCE 2016?

- | | |
|--|-------|
| 0 - Nothing new has happened since 2016 | (50%) |
| 1 - An MPA is about to be extended | (10%) |
| 2 - The surface of an MPA has been extended since 2016 | (20%) |
| 3 - The surface of several MPAs has been extended since 2016 | (20%) |

HAS YOUR COUNTRY DECLARED NEW NO-FISHING, NO-TAKE OR NO-ACCESS AREAS WITHIN EXISTING MPAs SINCE 2016?

- | | |
|--|-------|
| 0 – No | (50%) |
| 1 - No, but such a zone(s) is/are about to be declared | (0%) |
| 2 - Yes, such a zone has been declared | (20%) |
| 3 - Yes, several such zones have been declared | (20%) |
| No answer | (10%) |

HAS YOUR COUNTRY EXTENDED THE COVERAGE OF EXISTING NO-FISHING, NO-TAKE OR NO-ACCESS AREAS WITHIN EXISTING MPAs SINCE 2016?

- | | |
|--|-------|
| 0 – No | (50%) |
| 1 - No, but such a zone(s) is/are about to be extended | (0%) |
| 2 - Yes, such a zone has been extended | (20%) |
| 3 - Yes, several such zones have been extended | (30%) |

HAS YOUR COUNTRY CONDUCTED A GAP ANALYSIS TO CHECK THAT ALL COMPONENTS OF MARINE BIODIVERSITY ARE REPRESENTED IN THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF MPAs?

- | | |
|--|-------|
| 0 – No | (70%) |
| 1 - No, but a gap an analysis is about to take place | (10%) |
| 2 - Yes, a gap analysis is under way | (20%) |
| 3 - Yes, a gap analysis has been completed | (0%) |

DOES YOUR COUNTRY IMPLEMENT AN MPA NETWORK APPROACH INVOLVING KEY FUNCTIONAL AREAS ACROSS THE DIFFERENT MARINE AREAS?

- 0 - No, there is no network approach, there is no MPA plan for my country, and key functional areas have not all been identified across all marine areas (20%)
- 1 - There is no network approach but there is an MPA plan for my country; however, key functional areas have not all been identified across all marine areas (40%)
- 2 - There is a network approach and an MPA plan for my country; however, key functional areas have not all been identified across all marine areas (20%)
- 3 - There is a network approach and an MPA plan for my country based on the identification of all key functional areas across all marine areas (20%)

HAS YOUR COUNTRY PROPOSED REGIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL TYPES OF DESIGNATIONS FOR ABNJ?

- 0 - No (70%)
- 1 - No, but my country is about to propose (an) area(s) for a regional/international designation (10%)
- 2 - Yes, my country has proposed (an) area(s) for a regional/international designation but it/they is/are not yet designated (20%)
- 3 - Yes, my country has proposed (an) area(s) for a regional/international designation and it/they has/ve been designated (0%)

OBJECTIVE 2 – Improve the Mediterranean MPA network through effective and equitable management**HAS A REVIEW OF GOVERNANCE / INSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL FRAMEWORKS TAKEN PLACE IN YOUR COUNTRY TO ENSURE POSSIBLE BARRIERS TO MPA MANAGEMENT IN THE SHORT TO THE LONGER TERM ARE LIFTED?**

- 0 - No review has taken place and there are still barriers (60%)
- 1 - A review has taken place and barriers have been identified, but no action has taken place (0%)
- 2 - A review has taken place, barriers have been identified and action is taking/has taken place (20%)
- 3 - No review has taken place because there doesn't seem to be barriers or issues (10%)
- No answer (10%)

ASSESSING MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS FOR ALL MPAS (including Natura 2000 for EU members)?

- 0 - No action has been taken (50%)
- 1 - Some small action(s), routine type (20%)
- 2 - Some potentially relevant action(s), yet starting or incomplete (20%)
- 3 - Significant action(s) has(ve) been taken (0%)
- No answer (10%)

IMPROVEMENT IN THE NUMBER OR UPDATING OF MANAGEMENT PLANS FOR ALL MPAs (including Natura 2000 sites for EU members)? (0-3)

- 0 - No action has been taken (30%)
- 1 - Some small action(s), routine type (40%)
- 2 - Some potentially relevant action(s), yet starting or incomplete (10%)
- 3 - Significant action(s) has(ve) been taken (10%)
- No answer (10%)

IMPROVEMENT IN THE NUMBER AND/OR CAPACITY OF MPAs STAFF INCLUDING SHARING EXPERIENCE AMONG MPAs? (0-3)

- 0 - No action has been taken (20%)
- 1 - Some small action(s), routine type (40%)
- 2 - Some potentially relevant action(s), yet starting or incomplete (30%)
- 3 - Significant action(s) has(ve) been taken (0%)
- No answer (10%)

IMPROVEMENT WITH EFFICIENT SURVEILLANCE AND ENFORCEMENT (e.g. number of hours of surveillance, collaborations for increased surveillance, increase number/capacity of sworn staff)? (0-3)

- 0 - No action has been taken (40%)

1 – Some small action(s), routine type	(30%)
2 – Some potentially relevant action(s), yet starting or incomplete	(10%)
3 – Significant action(s) has(ve) been taken	(10%)
No answer	(10%)

IMPROVEMENT WITH DECENTRALIZING AND DEPLOYING ADEQUATE CAPACITY IN THE FIELD? (0-3)

0 – No action has been taken	(40%)
1 – Some small action(s), routine type	(20%)
2 – Some potentially relevant action(s), yet starting or incomplete	(30%)
3 – Significant action(s) has(ve) been taken	(0%)
No answer	(10%)

HAVE YOU MAPPED THE PRESSURES IN AND AROUND MPAs AND ADAPTED REGULATIONS IN RELATION TO PRESSURES / CUMULATIVE PRESSURES?

0 – No there are no maps of pressures for any of the MPAs	(40%)
1 – There are maps of pressures for some of the MPAs and none / a few have adapted regulations	(20%)
2 – There are maps of pressures for most MPAs and most have adapted their regulations in relation to pressures	(20%)
3 – There are maps of pressures for all MPAs and most / all have adapted their regulations in relation to pressures	(10%)
No answer	(10%)

OBJECTIVE 3 – Promote the sharing of environmental and socio-economic benefits of Mediterranean MPAs and the MPAs integration into the broader context of sustainable use of the marine environment and the implementation of the ecosystem and marine spatial planning approaches

HAS THERE BEEN PROGRESS IN YOUR COUNTRY CONCERNING CROSS-SECTORAL POLICIES OR STRATEGIES THAT ALLOW BETTER INTEGRATING MPAs WITH OTHER SECTORS OF ACTIVITY, NAMELY ECONOMIC (including with zoning, spatial planning, ICZM...)?

0 – No action has been taken	(0%)
1 – Some small action(s), routine type	(40%)
2 – Some potentially relevant action(s), yet starting or incomplete	(40%)
3 – Significant action(s) has(ve) been taken	(10%)
No answer	(10%)

HAS THERE BEEN PROGRESS IN YOUR COUNTRY CONCERNING BETTER INVOLVEMENT OF LOCAL STAKEHOLDERS AND CIVIL SOCIETY IN THE PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT OF MPAs?

0 – No action has been taken	(0%)
1 – Some small action(s), routine type	(30%)
2 – Some potentially relevant action(s), yet starting or incomplete	(10%)
3 – Significant action(s) has(ve) been taken	(50%)
No answer	(10%)

OBJECTIVE 4 – Ensure the stability of the Mediterranean MPA network by enhancing their financial sustainability

HOW HAS EVOLVED SINCE 2016 THE BUDGET ALLOCATED BY YOUR COUNTRY TO THE MANAGEMENT OF MPAs (management, not planning or establishing new sites)?

0 – the Budget has decreased	(30%)
1 – the Budget has slightly increased allowing to reinforce management, surveillance and monitoring in some MPAs	(40%)
2 – the Budget has increased allowing to reinforce management, surveillance and monitoring in some / most MPAs	(20%)
3 - the Budget has significantly increased allowing to reinforce management, surveillance and monitoring in most / all MPAs	(0%)
No answer	(10%)

HOW HAS EVOLVED SINCE 2016 THE BUDGET ALLOCATED BY YOUR COUNTRY TO PLANNING AND ESTABLISHING NEW MPAs?

0 – the Budget has decreased	(40%)
1 – the Budget has slightly increased allowing to plan new MPAs	(30%)
2 – the Budget has increased allowing to plan and establish new MPAs but remains insufficient for running the management	(20%)
3 - the Budget has significantly increased allowing to plan, establish and run new MPAs	(0%)
No answer	(10%)

HAS YOUR COUNTRY CONDUCTED AN ANALYSIS ON FUNDING NEEDS ACROSS MPAs AND HAS A FUNDING STRATEGY BEEN DEVELOPED FOR YOUR SYSTEM OF PROTECTED AREAS TO SUPPORT THE ESTABLISHMENT AND THE MANAGEMENT OF EXISTING MPAs, INCLUDING THE SETUP OF SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENTAL FUNDS?

0 – No strategy	(60%)
1 – A strategy is underway	(10%)
2 – A strategy has been developed but doesn't concern all MPAs (new & existing)	(20%)
3 – A strategy has been developed and covers the needs of all MPAs (new and existing)	(0%)
No answer	(10%)

HAS YOUR COUNTRY PROVIDED TRAINING AND/OR SUPPORT TO MPAs MANAGERS IN ORDER TO ENHANCE THEIR FUNDRAISING CAPACITIES OR ABILITY TO DEVELOP BUSINESS PLAN FOR THEIR MPA?

0 – No action has been taken	(60%)
1 – Some small action(s), routine type	(30%)
2 – Some potentially relevant action(s), yet starting or incomplete	(0%)
3 – Significant action(s) has(ve) been taken	(0%)
No answer	(10%)

HAS ANY INNOVATIVE MPA FUNDING PROJECT BEEN DEVELOPED AT THE NATIONAL OR LOCAL LEVEL? (e.g. fees for the use of natural resources, licenses, local taxes, debt swaps, Trust Funds, Blue Carbon...)

0 – Not at all	(60%)
1 – Some plans in that direction	(20%)
2 – Some potentially relevant actions have been taken, yet starting or incomplete	(10%)
3 – Significant results have been achieved	(0%)
No answer	(10%)

For these 23 questions, 15 provide a negative answers on action taken, indicating the need for a strong support for the governance and management of MPAs and OECMs in numerous countries, justifying the extension of the work to be done based on the roadmap, while considering a revision to target most pressing issues according to countries.

1.4. Proposed criteria for evaluation

The evaluation will be based on the answers to the 10 questions (Q1 to Q10) identified in point 1.1 and 1.2, and on the responses collected from the existing available documentation.

- Q1. Has the MPAs and OECMs coverage reached 10% of waters under national jurisdiction?
- Q2. Are the existing MPAs and OECMs effectively and equitably managed?
- Q3. Is the existing network of MPAs and OECMs ecologically representative?
- Q4. Is the existing network of MPAs and OECMs well connected?
- Q5. Has the concept of OECM been defined and introduced in the national legislation?
- Q6. Has the country prepared a Strategy and an Action Plan for MPAs and OECMs, based on a gap analysis of the representativity of national biodiversity and ecosystems, based on accurate scientific information and proposing a list of future MPAs to complete the existing national network?
- Q7. Has the country assessed and amended/reviewed the institutional and legal system applicable to MPAs and OECMs, improving therefore the effectiveness of the governance and management systems, and checking that each MPA has clear objectives and concrete measures for its management?

Q8. Has the country considered or developed negotiations with neighbouring contracting parties for managing jointly networks of MPAs, including in their existing or future EEZ areas?

Q9. Has the country developed/approved an overall policy for the sustainable use of marine and coastal environment (land use planning and management associated to marine spatial planning and management) based on the participation and involvement of all components of the society, on the equitable sharing of the social and economic benefits of environmental and natural resources (including within MPAs)?

Q10. Has the country developed/implemented a strategy and an action plan for long term funding of nature conservation considering all the necessary components?

The present report, in the Part II below, takes into account the results of the questionnaires according to the received replies, a presentation of the present knowledge according to the data collected and a set of specific recommendations for each question identified in Part I.

Part II: Roadmap evaluation and proposal for actions

The following section includes elements collected to answer to the 10 questions (Q1 to Q10) according to the existing knowledge, reports and questionnaires collected. Recommendations are identified according to the topic concerned. Important references or documents are quoted in Annex 1 for each question (Q1 to Q10).

Q1. Is the MPAs and OECMs coverage reached 10% (of waters under national jurisdiction).

Present knowledge

The Mediterranean covers about 2.5 million of square kilometres, while the territorial waters cover about 1 million of square kilometres. The 10% surface coverage of the CBD Aichi target is therefore of about 250,000 km² for the whole Mediterranean or 100,000 km² for the territorial waters.

To date, the MPAs and OECMs coverage is estimated to reach 8.9% of the Mediterranean (SOED, 2019, under preparation) and about 13% of the territorial waters, but all the potential OECMs have not yet been officially characterized nor included in national reports to international or regional instruments.

For example, the FRA declared by GFCM and approved by all countries that prohibits the use of towed dredges and trawl nets at depth greater than 1000 m and which covers 58% of the Mediterranean, is not taken into account. This decision was taken to avoid damage and provide protection to unknown species and communities, such as deep corals, gorgonians and sponges and to maintain their potential ecosystem services, even if the knowledge was insufficient, respecting the precautionary principle. In several countries territorial waters, the area covered by this FRA deeper than 1000m is important (such as the following countries with the percentage of their territorial waters: Algeria 16%, Cyprus 19%, France 31%, Greece 11%, Lebanon 23%, Spain 10%, Syria 24%) (Source, Juan Luis de Vivero, personal communication).

The MPA coverage situation at the country level is different with the following data from MAPAMED (2019, see Annex 6 for a short description of MAPAMED content):

More than 10%: Cyprus, France, Monaco, Spain and Turkey;

Between 9 and 10%: Croatia and Italy;

Between 3 and 9%: Israel and Malta;

Less than 3%, 12 countries (Albania, Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Egypt, Greece, Lebanon, Libya, Montenegro, Morocco, Slovenia, Syria and Tunisia).

Three points are to be raised in relation to the Objective 1 of the Roadmap:

- The countries with limited or no coverage (12 countries with less than 3%) have to be supported in order to improve in the coming years: Albania, Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Egypt, Greece, Lebanon, Libya, Montenegro, Morocco, Slovenia, Syria and Tunisia.
- Although there may be seemingly achieved coverage, the strength of the type of designation may not be so effective at protecting key species and/or ecosystems with less than a cumulative 0.10% of the Mediterranean Sea under strict designation (no-access, no-take or no-fishing) (SPA/RAC and MedPAN, Main findings 2016).
- The coverage achievement does not necessarily mean that there is effective management of these areas and their surroundings.

Proposed actions for the MPAs and OECMs coverage:

- Support to the countries that are still to achieve the coverage target could be a priority for the next phase of the MPA roadmap implementation, namely with the number of proposed sites that have been identified and are still not declared.

- Support to countries to improve their strength of protection and the effective management of these areas and their surroundings could be a second priority for the next phase of the MPA roadmap implementation.

- Introduce the concept of OECMs at the national level and their declaration in the national reporting (see Q5)

Q2: Are the existing MPAs and OECMs effectively and equitably managed?

Present knowledge:

Most of the countries have included in their legislation the obligation of adoption, implementation and revision of management plans. Nevertheless, management effectiveness remains one of the weakest points in the Mediterranean, where it is estimated that only about 10% of the sites declared have a proper implementation of a management plan, with sufficient funds and trained staff for ensuring all the necessary tasks. The assessment of the national capacity for management is an essential preliminary step before considering the effectiveness and the equitability of the management .

The terminology “equitably managed” refers to the fact that all stakeholders and local communities benefit equally from the ecological, social and economic impact of the existing MPA or OECM. But there is currently no specific tool designed for evaluating this concept.

Proposed actions for management effectiveness and equitability:

- Assessing management effectiveness should be considered a top priority by countries, in terms of capacity and management actions and regulations.*
- Defining guidelines for measuring equitable management.*
- Assessing and reinforcing the capacity of national administrations to monitor and improve management effectiveness.*

Q3: Is the existing network of MPAs and OECMs ecologically representative?

Present knowledge:

There is no document consulted or answer in the questionnaires indicating that a country has done a real analysis of the ecological representativeness (or coherence) of its network, if indeed there has been a true network approach in designing the set of MPAs and OECMs. In the past, the choice of sites to put under protection in the Mediterranean has been rather random and opportunistic. Currently in most countries, the selection of sites follows the identification of rare, endangered or threatened species, and of selected ecosystems or seascapes. Furthermore, in the literature, there is no convincing methodology for analyzing an existing network and prove that it is ecologically representative of the country or sub regions biodiversity and habitats.

However, no specific definition for the terms “Ecological Coherence” and “Ecological Representativeness” has been formally agreed upon internationally or regionally, and the terms are not widely used terms in marine science. Only a few theoretical concepts and practical approaches have been developed for assessing the ecological coherence of a network of MPAs. These criteria are in accordance with the 4 generally agreed primary principles of ecological representativeness or coherence which were defined during the 8th Conference of the Parties to the CBD:

- Adequacy of MPAs and of the network,
- Connectivity between the protected features,
- Replication, and,
- Representativity of functions and features of marine biodiversity.

Recently, a document has been prepared by SPA/RAC and UN Environment/MAP (2018), titled “Practical guide on gap analysis and MPA system planning for the Mediterranean area”, but this document does not provide a definition of adequacy, connectivity, replication or representativity, that are all necessary for defining representativeness or coherence, only collecting existing information and processes and providing a first approach to define gaps.

Proposed action for MPAs and OECMs network ecological representativeness:

The creation of a group of experts to prepare guidelines to define how to measure coherence and

representativity (indicators), adapted to the specificities of the Mediterranean region.

Q4: Is the existing network of MPAs and OECMs well-connected?

Present knowledge:

As for the previous question, the notion of connectedness (or connectivity) in the marine environment is discussed between scientists. Biologically, there is no convincing methodology to demonstrate it, as the present knowledge of the life cycle of numerous species is limited and sometimes inexistent. In addition, measuring connectivity needs a multi disciplinary approach as it is permanently changing according to the physical and chemical conditions, in relation with climate.

To date, the research is focusing mainly on fish species and larval dispersal and also on mortality, spawning grounds, nurseries and food availability, but there is an important need for extending the studies to other species, ecosystems and sectors, including genetic connectivity.

Some authors have proposed to consider that connectivity between MPAs could be reached if the distance between them is within a certain range, but their positions differ according to the sites studied or methodology used: 10 to 20 km for Shanks *et al.* (2003), 10 to 100 km for invertebrates or 50 to 200 km for fishes by Palumbi (2004), 20 to 200 km for Halpern *et al.* (2006), or 50 to 100 km for Anadón *et al.* (2013).

Proposed action for MPAs and OECMs connectivity:

The creation of a group of experts to define and measure connectivity could be an option for the next SPA/RAC programme of work concerning the MPA roadmap.

Q5: Has the concept of OECM been defined and introduced in the national legislation?

Present knowledge:

The guidelines prepared by IUCN and adopted by the CBD COP 14 in November 2018, provide clear indication of what is an OECM in the marine environment. In this document are defined the eight types of sites that could be considered for the marine and coastal environment are as follow:

1. Areas identified as Key Biodiversity Areas that are managed in ways that deliver long-term in-situ conservation of biodiversity through, for example, regulation or other effective approaches.
2. Natural areas managed by universities for biological research.
3. Permanent or long-term fisheries closure areas designed to protect complete ecosystems for stock recruitment, to protect specialised ecosystems in their entirety, or protect species at risk through the in-situ conservation of biodiversity as a whole, and are demonstrated to be effective against fishery and non-fishery threats alike.
4. Territories and areas managed by Indigenous Peoples and/or local communities to maintain natural or near-natural ecosystems, with low levels of use of natural resources practised on a sustainable basis and in a way that does not degrade the areas' biodiversity. For example, coastal and marine areas where local community-based harvesting and management practices result in de facto conservation of fish populations and other associated marine biodiversity.
5. Areas successfully restored from degraded or threatened ecosystems, to provide important ecosystem services but which also contribute to effective biodiversity conservation (e.g. coastal wetlands restored for flood protection or carbon storage).
6. Areas that contribute to conservation because of their role in connecting protected areas and other areas of particular importance for the conservation of biodiversity, thereby contributing to the long-term viability of larger ecosystems.
7. Coastal and marine areas protected for reasons other than conservation, but that nonetheless achieve the in-situ conservation of biodiversity (e.g., historic wrecks, war graves, etc.)
8. Military lands and waters, or portions of military lands and waters that are managed for the purpose of defence, but also achieve the effective conservation of biodiversity in the long

term.

An extract of the IUCN Guidelines for OECM (2018), adopted by the CBD COP 14, explaining the different approaches for OECMs and the types of sites that could be considered, is provided as Annex 3.

As an example of potential OECM in the Mediterranean, there are over 120 national fisheries reserves, also termed “national FRAs” by GFCM. In addition to targeting the sustainable use of fishing resources, many also have an objective of conservation of species or ecosystems. However, they have not yet been considered as OECMs at national level. As such, it appears advisable that each site declaration text be reviewed in order to identify their specific objectives and gauge whether they could qualify as OECMs.

Proposed action for OECMs definition and introduction in the national legislation:

The creation of a working group to propose a definition of OECM for the marine environment in the Mediterranean region, based on the CBD definition, to be approved by the Contracting Parties for being included in the regional database MAPAMED and their national reports to international and regional instruments.

Q6: Has the country prepared a Strategy and an Action Plan for MPAs and OECMs, based on a gap analysis of the representativity of national biodiversity and ecosystems, based on accurate scientific information and proposing a list of future MPAs to complete the existing national network, all this with the effective participation of stakeholders?

Present knowledge:

Within the framework of the CBD, countries have to prepare and adopt a National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP). Most of them have done so, for a given period, and are presently revising it. Some others have adopted it until 2030 (Egypt and Algeria). These documents normally include a section on marine and coastal protected areas (MCPAs).

In addition, some Mediterranean countries have prepared or adopted a specific national strategy or plan for MCPAs or for MPAs, such as Albania, Algeria, Croatia, Egypt, France, Lebanon, Libya, Montenegro, Morocco, Tunisia and Turkey. If necessary, other countries could be assisted to do so.

The document prepared by SPA/RAC and UN Environment/MAP (2018), titled “Practical guide on gap analysis and MPA system planning for the Mediterranean area”, collects existing information and processes on gap analysis and provides a first approach to define gaps.

Proposed action for a National Strategy and Action Plan for MPAs and OECMs:

Continue to assist countries in the preparation of a Strategy and Action Plan for MPAs and OECMs based on a gap analysis.

Q7: Has the country assessed and amended/reviewed the institutional and legal system applicable to MPAs and OECMs, improving therefore the effectiveness of the governance and management systems, and checking that each MPA has clear objectives and concrete measures for its management?

Present knowledge:

During the period 2010-2019, eleven 11 Contracting Parties have made modifications in their administrative framework to improve the declaration and management of marine and coastal protected areas.

Thirteen countries now have a specialized agency or an authority for protected areas, national parks, marine protected areas, environment, biodiversity or nature (Albania, Algeria, Croatia, France, Libya, Malta, Montenegro, Slovenia, Spain, Tunisia and Turkey).

During the same period, 13 Contracting Parties have modified their existing legislation or adopted new laws for marine and coastal protected areas or for area-based management measures with an objective of conservation of natural resources or landscapes/seascapes.

Other legislation adopted during the same period, and concerning marine spatial planning or ICZM, are of direct relevance, as they allow to marine and coastal protected areas a better implementation of the management, including control and surveillance, funding, fisheries or maritime transport.

Proposed actions for the assessment and amendment/revision of the institutional and legal system applicable to MPAs and OECMs:

- Assist countries in assessing the adequacy of their institutional and legal system for ensuring a full development of their network of MPAs and OECMs.

- Assist countries with developing or reviewing objectives and measures of MPAs to allow optimal management, including adaptive management.

Q8: Has the country considered or developed negotiations with neighbouring contracting parties for managing jointly networks of MPAs, including in their existing or future EEZ areas?

Present knowledge:

Negotiations have been held between France, Italy and Monaco (Pelagos Sanctuary), Spain and Morocco (Intercontinental Biosphere Reserve of the Mediterranean - RBIM), Croatia and Italy for the Jacomo Pit and France and Italy (International Marine Park of the Strait of Bonifacio, between Corsica and Sardinia).

While these previous sites have been established jointly by several countries, others have been the subject of discussions between several countries but declared by a single country, such as for the area declared by France for the Gulf of Lion after negotiation with Spain. Some other countries have initiated discussions and are considering transboundary MPAs or OECMs.

At the regional level, countries are involved in discussions on designations for which they take joint decisions in declaring, such as FRAs, and negotiations could be further developed on the management of such areas.

As for MPAs that have been agreed upon as SPAMIs, it has to be underscored that this means all countries Parties to the Barcelona Convention endorse joint responsibility for these sites.

Proposed Action for coordination with neighbouring countries on MPAs and OECMs:

Support countries for identifying their marine boundaries and developing coordinated declaration and management of MPAs or OECMs.

Q9: Has the country developed approved an overall policy for the sustainable use of marine and coastal environment (ICZM, land use planning and management associated to marine spatial planning and management) based on the participation and involvement of all components of the society, on the equitable sharing of the social and economic benefits of environmental and natural resources (including within MPAs and OECMs)?

Present knowledge:

ICZM has been in the focus in the Mediterranean since the adoption of the Barcelona Convention ICZM Protocol in 2008. Land Use planning and Management and Marine Spatial Planning and Management processes are under development in all European countries for implementing the existing directives and in particular:

- the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (2008);
- the 2014 EU Directive on establishing a framework for maritime spatial planning;
- the new EC decision on the 11 descriptors to achieve Good Environmental Status (GES) adopted in 2017;

- the Annex III of the Directive amended in 2017 to better link pressures, uses and conservation.

For other countries, the situation is variable from no marine spatial concern to some initiatives, but the coordination and cooperation between administrations seems to be the main factor for limited progress. Furthermore, competition between different economic sectors over the use of marine space comes to reinforce this lack of administrative inter-sectorial cooperation.

The legal and institutional aspects of participation of all stakeholders in the different aspects of development and conservation, in particular for MPAs or OECMs are taken into consideration by all countries, usually under the Environmental Impact Assessment process, respecting the principles of the UNECE Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus Convention). Some practical aspects of involving all stakeholders appear however sometimes difficult to conduct due to the lack of spokespeople of some underrepresented and less structured sectors, although this has improved since 2016.

Proposed actions for an integrated management of land and sea at the national level:

- *Support countries with the development of systematic conservation planning taking into account ICZM, land use/marine use planning and management aspects in the context of MSP.*
- *Foster a better integration of stakeholders in MSP for systematic conservation planning.*

Q10: Has the country developed/implemented a strategy and an action plan for long term funding of nature conservation considering all the necessary components?

Present knowledge:

The 2016 status of Mediterranean MPAs (MedPAN & SPA/RAC, 2016, MPA status main findings) indicates that about 10% of the MPAs of the Mediterranean are properly managed, mainly due to a lack of funding. Binet et al. (2016), based on a limited number of sites, consider that funding is insufficient in numerous countries and that less than 10% of what could be necessary is available, explaining partly the existing situation.

The origin of the funds allocated for the MPAs, MCPAs or OECMs can come from different sources, but in many cases, they are not secured at a level allowing the management to be efficient over the longer term. Among the most common sources of funding are the following elements that can come as a combination:

- State funding is the basis for all countries.
- Sub-national administrative entity funding (region or community, commune, local authority), is important in particular for France, Italy and Spain where the regionalisation is more developed.
- A national environmental fund or a similar facility for financing MPAs or nature conservation, is rarely used in the region, as it is the case in three countries: Egypt and Croatia, with an Environmental Fund, and Greece, with a Green Fund. Two other countries have created funds, Bosnia and Herzegovina, with a federal and cantonal environmental fund and Turkey with a fund for national parks, but it is not clear if they are operational and could be used for marine protected areas. Finally, Albania is studying a system that could allow keeping the income from protected areas in their budget.
- Private funding: there is a need for more research to know if the management could be delegated to private entities, such as in Italy.
- As regards EU, several financing opportunities for MPA designation and management exist under EU funds, e.g. the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund, INTERREG, LIFE, and are being used by Member States. Financing needs and priorities for Natura 2000 sites are identified in Prioritized Action Frameworks established by the Member States with Commission assistance.
- A Trust Fund for Mediterranean MPAs (MPA-Trust Fund) was launched jointly by France, Monaco, and Tunisia during the high-level session of the International Marine Protected Areas Congress (IMPAC3) held in October 2013 in Ajaccio, France. The MPA Trust Fund received political support from riparian countries, in the framework of the Barcelona Convention and the Union for the Mediterranean (UfM). This led to the establishment of an Association for the

Sustainable Financing of Mediterranean MPAs, named M2PA, which main objective is to support the development of the trust fund for Mediterranean MPAs. The fund received the support of multiple entities in the Mediterranean and beyond, such as the Specially Protected Areas Regional Activity Centre (SPA/RAC), the Network of Marine Protected Areas managers in the Mediterranean (MedPAN), WWF Mediterranean, the International Union for Conservation of Nature – Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation (IUCN-Med), Mediterranean Small Islands Organization, the French Coastal Protection Agency, the Prince Albert II of Monaco Foundation, the Oceanographic Institute, Prince Albert I of Monaco Foundation and the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF). Private donors have joined the initiative, such as the Leonardo Di Caprio Foundation. The Basel Zoo, the Oceanographic Institute and the Prince Albert I of Monaco Foundation provide part of their admission fees proceeds to support M2PA. Members of the M2PA have adopted a sound strategy for the sustainable financing of Mediterranean MPAs, as well as an action plan for implementation during 2018-2022. The initiative was developed with the support of the government of the Principality of Monaco that contributed 500,000 Euros to the fund. In cooperation with the non-profit environmental organization Conservation International, the M2PA received in 2018 technical and financial support from the Global Environment Facility (GEF – 1 M\$) and the French Global Environment Facility (FFEM – 1.5 M€) to design the most appropriate institutional, legal, and financial structure to manage the MPA Environmental Fund and to fund marine protected areas in the south and east shore on the Mediterranean.

- So far, financial support for implementation on the ground has been provided through the M2PA for the improvement of management of three MPAs: - Al Hoceima National Park in Morocco, implemented through the NGO AGIR, in partnership with the relevant national administration, the Kuriat Islands in Tunisia, implemented by the governmental agency APAL - Coastal Protection and Planning Agency) and the NGO Notre Grand Bleu, and Karaburun Sazan Marine Park in Albania implemented through a local NGO named Flag Pine in partnership with the Regional department of the National Protected Area Agency. A study is ongoing to assess financial needs of 20 marine protected areas in 7 Mediterranean countries: Tunisia, Albania, Morocco, Montenegro, Lebanon, Algeria and Turkey. This assessment will lay the foundation for a second round of investments in 2019 and 2020 and will refine the capitalization target of the Fund. In addition, management effectiveness indicators will be established in order to monitor the impact of M2PA funding.
- National and international projects are used and several countries rely on such source of funding, in particular to develop research, monitoring or public participation and awareness. However, this source of funding is not secured on the long term.

Proposed Actions for long term funding strategy and action plan of nature conservation:

- *Support the development of the MPA trust fund at the regional level and of environmental funds at the national levels.*
- *Support the development of national or sub-regional trust funds or other innovative sustainable financing mechanisms in order to sustain the adequate management of MPAs along with the capacity of MPAs to develop long term mechanisms for sustaining their management.*

2.1. From the answers to questions to a self-evaluation mechanism

Each country could realize a self-evaluation by filling the following table, scoring 0 for no action, 0.5 for an action started and 1 for completion. The total of the scores would provide an evaluation of the implementation of the roadmap according to the following scale:

0-2	Unsatisfactory
3-5	Moderately Satisfactory
6-8	Satisfactory
9-10	Highly Satisfactory

Lines with 0 to 2 need to be the focus for action.

The table has been filled with a theoretical example and the total score is 5.5 therefore considered as moderately satisfactory. A strong need for action is necessary for Q3, Q5 and Q10.

Question to countries	No	Partly	Yes	Max
	0	0.5	1	1
Q1. Has the MPAs and OECMs coverage reached 10% of waters under national jurisdiction?			1	1
Q2. Are the existing MPAs and OECMs effectively and equitably managed?		0.5		0.5
Q3. Is the existing network of MPAs and OECMs ecologically representative?	0			0
Q4. Is the existing network of MPAs and OECMs well connected?		0.5		0.5
Q5. Has the concept of OECM been defined and introduced in the national legislation?	0			0
Q6. Has the country prepared a Strategy and an Action Plan for MPAs and OECM, based on a gap analysis of the representativity of national biodiversity and ecosystems, based on accurate scientific information and proposing a list of future MPAs to complete the existing national network?			1	1
Q7. Has the country assessed and amended/reviewed the institutional and legal system applicable to MPAs and OECMs, improving the effectiveness of the governance and management systems, and checking that each MPA has clear objectives and concrete measures for its management?		0.5		0.5
Q8. Has the country considered/developed negotiation with neighbouring contracting parties for managing networks of MPAs, including in their future EEZ areas?		0.5		0.5
Q9. Has the country developed/approved an overall policy for the sustainable use of marine and coastal environment (land use planning and management associated to marine spatial planning and management) based (1) on the participation and involvement of all components of the society, and (2) on the equitable sharing of the social and economic benefits of environmental and natural resources?		0.5		0.5
Q10. Has the country developed/implemented a strategy and an action plan for long term funding of nature conservation considering all the necessary components?	0			0
Total				4.5

0 = no action; 0,5 = started; 1= completed

The evaluation has not realized this exercise for each country, as the knowledge provided by the literature, the national reports and the questionnaires was not allowing to cover all the topics without direct consultations with the countries. This exercise could be realized by countries, assisted by SPA/RAC experts when preparing with the countries its programme of work on MPAs and OECMs. When all the countries have replied to the questions it is easy to identify the priority actions to develop for filling the gaps and improving the regional situation.

2.2. From the countries self-evaluation to a regional programme of work.

The following table for countries and questions will provide priorities and urgent actions, by countries, at the regional or the sub-regional levels. It can only be filled when the national tables have been filled.

Countries	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Total
Albania											
Algeria											
Bosnia-Her.											
Croatia											
Cyprus											
Egypt											
France											
Greece											
Israel											
Italy											
Lebanon											
Lybia											
Malta											
Monaco											
Montenegro											
Morocco											
Slovenia											
Spain											
Syria											
Tunisia											
Turkey											
Total for 21 countries											

0 = no action; 0,5 = started; 1: completed

Part III. Recommendations for priority actions beyond 2020 for MPAs and OECMs

One of the first recommendation for a country is to process to a self evaluation of their situation regarding the roadmap for MPAs, using the proposed system that will allow a regional and sub-regional evaluation.

This will provide an identification of the gaps and weaknesses of the system(s) of Mediterranean MPAs and OECMs and of the efforts needed for specific matters to reach the 2020 target in a reasonable delay.

At the regional level and for the future programme of work for MPAs and OECM, the following proposed actions are recommended, as a response to the ten questions raised:

Proposed actions for the MPAs and OECMs coverage:

- *Support to the countries that are still to achieve the coverage target could be a priority for the next phase of the MPA roadmap implementation, namely with the number of proposed sites that have been identified and are still not declared.*
- *Support to countries to improve their strength of protection and the effective management of these areas and their surroundings could be a second priority for the next phase of the MPA roadmap implementation.*
- *Introduce the concept of OECMs at the national level and their declaration in the national reporting*

Proposed actions for management effectiveness and equitability:

- *Assessing management effectiveness should be considered a top priority by countries, in terms of capacity and management actions and regulations.*
- *Defining guidelines for measuring equitable management.*
- *Assessing and reinforcing the capacity of national administrations to monitor and improve management effectiveness.*

Proposed action for MPAs and OECMs network ecological representativeness:

- *The creation of a group of experts to prepare guidelines to define how to measure coherence and representativity (indicators).*

Proposed action for MPAs and OECMs connectivity:

- *The creation of a group of experts to define and measure connectivity could be an option for the next SPA/RAC programme of work concerning the MPA roadmap.*

Proposed action for OECMs definition and introduction in the national legislation:

- *The creation of a working group to propose a definition of OECM for the marine environment in the Mediterranean region, based on the CBD definition, to be approved by the Contracting Parties for being included in the regional database MAPAMED and their national reports to international and regional instruments.*

Proposed action for a National Strategy and Action Plan for MPAs and OECMs:

- *Continue to assist countries in the preparation of a Strategy and Action Plan for MPAs and OECMs based on a gap analysis.*

Proposed actions for the assessment and amendment/revision of the institutional and legal system applicable to MPAs and OECM:

- *Assist countries in assessing the adequacy of their institutional and legal system for ensuring a full development of their network of MPAs and OECMs.*
- *Assist countries with developing or reviewing objectives and measures of MPAs to allow optimal management, including adaptive management.*

Proposed Action for coordination with neighbouring countries on MPAs and OECMs:
Support countries for identifying their marine boundaries and developing coordinated declaration and management of MPAs or OECMs.

Proposed actions for an integrated management of land and sea at the national level:
- Support countries with the development of systematic conservation planning taking into account ICZM, land use/marine use planning and management aspects in the context of MSP.
- Foster a better integration of stakeholders in MSP for systematic conservation planning.

Proposed Actions for long term funding strategy and action plan of nature conservation:
- Support the development of the MPA trust fund at the regional level and of environmental funds at the national levels.
- Support the development of national or sub-regional trust funds or other innovative sustainable financing mechanisms in order to sustain the adequate management of MPAs along with the capacity of MPAs to develop long term mechanisms for sustaining their management.

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: References by question (Q1 to Q10)

Q1

ADRIAPAN database for Adriatic: <http://www.adriapan.org/index.php/en/network-it>

EEA database for European countries: <https://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps>

MAPAMED database and GIS (permanently updated): <http://www.rac-spa.org/fr/mapamed>

MPA Status 2016, main findings: http://rac-spa.org/sites/default/files/doc_spa/2016_mpa_status_mains_findings.pdf

WDPA at the global level: <https://www.protectedplanet.net/marine>

Q2:

- Carter, E., Soemodinoto, A. & White, A. (2010) Guide for Improving Marine Protected Area Management Effectiveness in Indonesia. Bali, Indonesia: The Nature Conservancy Indonesia Marine Program, xi + 49p.

- CBD: <https://www.iucn.org/sites/dev/files/import/downloads/maangementeffectiveness2008.pdf>

- Cifuentes, M., Izurieta, A. and de Faria, H. (2000) 'Measuring protected area management effectiveness.' (WWF,GTZ,IUCN)

- Corrales, L., Godoy, J. C. and Márquez, H. (2006) 'Estado del Monitoreo y Resultados sobre la Efectividad de Manejo de las Áreas Protegidas en Centroamérica, 2000-2006.' PROARCA - SICA, CCAD, USAID, TNC.

- Corrigan *et al.* 2017. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/conl.12397>

- Dudley, N., Belokurov, A., Higgins-Zogib, L., Hockings, M., Stolton, S. and Burgess, N. (2007) 'Tracking progress in managing protected areas around the world.' WWF International, Gland, Switzerland.

- Fraschetti *et al.*, 2005

- Fouda, M., Grainger, J., Salama, W., Baha El Din, S., Paleczny, D., Zalat, S. and Gilbert, F. (2006) 'Management Effectiveness Evaluation Of Egypt's Protected Area System - Draft.' Nature Conservation Sector, Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency, Ministry of State for Environmental Affairs.

- Gubbay, S. (2005) 'Evaluating the management effectiveness of marine protected areas: Using UK sites and the UK MPA programme to illustrate different approaches.' WWF.

- Horta e Costa *et al.* 2016. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0308597X16300197>

- Leverington F., Hockings M. and Lemos Costa K. 2008. Management effectiveness evaluation in protected areas: Report for the project 'Global study into management effectiveness evaluation of protected areas', The University of Queensland, Gatton, IUCN WCPA, TNC, WWF, Australia.

- Leverington F., Hockings M., Pavese H., Lemos Costa K. and Courrau J., 2008. Management effectiveness evaluation in protected areas – A global study. Supplementary report No.1: Overview of approaches and methodologies. The University of Queensland, Gatton, TNC, WWF, IUCN-WCPA, Australia.

- METT tracking tool:

<https://www.protectedplanet.net/system/comfy/cms/files/files/000/000/057/original/METT.pdf>

- Neil D. Burgess N., Danks F., Newham R., Franks P. and Roe D., 2014. Towards Equitably Managed Protected Areas: A review of synergies between Protected Area Management Effectiveness and Social or Governance Assessment. IIED Discussion Paper. IIED, London.

- Pomeroy, R., Parks, J. and Watson, L. (2004) 'How is your MPA doing? A Guidebook of Natural and Social Indicators for Evaluating Marine Protected Area Management Effectiveness.' (IUCN, WWF, Gland and the US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA): Gland and Cambridge)

- Scianna *et al.*, 2018 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301479718306406>

- Staub, F. and Hatziolos, M. E. (2004) 'Score Card to Assess Progress in Achieving Management Effectiveness Goals for Marine Protected Areas.' World Bank.

- Tempesta, M. and Otero, M.; IUCN. 2008. <https://www.iucn.org/content/how-your-mpa-doing>

- Wells, S. and Mangubhai, S. (2004) 'A Workbook for Assessing Management Effectiveness of Marine Protected Areas in the Western Indian Ocean.' IUCN Eastern African Regional Programme., Nairobi, Kenya.

- Wells, S. (2006) Case Study I: Evaluation of marine protected areas in the Western Indian Ocean. In 'Evaluating effectiveness: a framework for assessing the management of protected areas second edition'. (Eds M. Hockings, S. Stolton, N. Dudley, F. Leverington and J. Courrau). (IUCN Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series: Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK)

Zupan *et al.* 2018

(a) <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0006320717314246>

(b) <https://esajournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/fee.1934>

Q3

- Balbar & Metaxas. 2019. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2351989418304347>

- Foster, Rees *et al.* 2017 – <https://esajournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/ecs2.1688>

- Lieberknecht & Jones. 2016. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0308597X16302172>

- Rees *et al.* 2018. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0308597X16306613>

<https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmars.2018.00402/full>

- Ross *et al.* <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0967063717300948>

- SPA/RAC – UN Environment/MAP, 2018. Practical Guide on Gap Analysis and MPA System Planning for the Mediterranean Area. By Lanfredi C. and Notarbartolo di Sciarra G., Tethys Research Institute. Ed SPA/RAC, Tunis. 42 pages + annexes.

- Von Nordheim *et al.* 2018. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-60156-4_46

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2351989418304426>

- Wolters *et al.* (2015)

<https://www.bipindicators.net/indicators/protected-area-representativeness-index-parc-representativeness>

Q4

- Aliani, S., Berta, M., Borghini, M. *et al.* Rend. Fis. Acc. Lincei (2015) 26: 37.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12210-014-0357-2>

- Anadon, J. D., M. M. Mancha-Cisneros, B. D. Best, and L. R. Gerber. 2013. Habitat-specific larval dispersal and marine connectivity: implications for spatial conservation planning. *Ecosphere* 4(7):82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1890/ES13-00119.1>

Boero F., Fogliani F., Frascchetti S., Goriup P., Macpherson E., Planes S., Soukissioan T., 2016. CoCoNet: Towards coast to coast networks of marine protected areas (from the shore to the high and deep sea), coupled with sea-based wind energy potential. *Scientific Research and Information Technology (SCIRES)*, vol 6, Supplement 2016, pp1-95.

- Calò *et al.* (2013); Calò, A., Félix-Hackradt, F. C., García, J., Hackradt, C. W., Rocklin, D., Trevino, Otón J., García Charton, J. A., 2013. A review of methods to assess connectivity and dispersal between fish populations in the Mediterranean Sea. *Adv. Oceanogr. Limnol.* 4, 150–175.

- Calò *et al.* (2016);

- Carlson *et al.* (2016);

- CIESM (2016); CIESM 2016. Marine connectivity - migration and larval dispersal. CIESM Workshop Monograph n48, 172 p., CIESM Publisher, Monaco.

- Corell *et al.* (2012);

- Di Franco *et al.* (2015);

- Di Franco and Guidetti (2016);

G. Dubois, L. Bastin, B. Bertzky, A. Mandrici, M. Conti, S. Saura, A. Cottam, L. Battistella, J. Martínez-López, M. Boni, M. Graziano. Integrating multiple spatial datasets to assess protected areas: lessons learnt from the Digital Observatory for Protected Areas (DOPA). *ISPRS Int. J. Geo-Inf.*, 5 (2016), p. 242

- Gargano *et al.* (2017); *Fisheries Oceanography* Volume 26, Issue 4 Exploring connectivity between spawning and nursery areas of *Mullus barbatus* (L., 1758) in the Mediterranean through a dispersal model

Gargano F., Garofalo G., Fiorentino, F 2017 Exploring connectivity between spawning and nursery areas of *Mullus barbatus* (L., 1758) in the Mediterranean through a dispersal model. *JO - Fisheries Oceanography*

- Halpern, B. S., H. M. Regan, H. P. Possingham, and M. A. McCarthy. 2006. Accounting for uncertainty in marine reserve design. *Ecology Letters* 9:2–11.
- Jonsson et al. (2016);
- Paterno M, Schiavana M, Aglieri G, Ben Souissi J., Boscarei C., Casagrandi R., Chassanite A., Chiantore M., Congiu L., Guarnieri G., Kruschel C., Macic V., Marino I., Papetti C., Patarnello T., Zane L., Melia P., 2017. Population genomics meet Lagrangian simulations: Oceanographic patterns and long larval duration ensure connectivity among *Paracentrotus lividus* populations in the Adriatic and Ionian seas. *Ecology and Evolution*, 7, pp 2463-2479.
- Pujolar, J. M., Schiavina, M., Di Franco, A., Melià, P., Guidetti, P., Gatto, M., ... Zane, L. (2013). Understanding the effectiveness of marine protected areas using genetic connectivity patterns and Lagrangian simulations. *Diversity and Distributions*, 19, 1531–1542.
- Rossi V., Ser-Giacomi E., Lopez C., Hernandez Garcia E., 2014. Hydrodynamic provinces and oceanic connectivity from a transport network help designing marine reserves. *Physics Ao*, 12p.
- Planes S (2016) Patterns of Fish Connectivity between a Marine Protected Area and Surrounding Fished Areas. *PLoS ONE* 11(12): e0167441. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0167441
- Shanks et al. (2003);
- Palumbi, S. R. (2003). Population genetics, demographic connectivity, and the design of reserves. *Ecological Applications*, 13, 146–158.
- Shanks A., Grantham B., Carr M., 2003. Propagule dispersal distance and the size and spacing of marine reserves. *Ecological Applications* 13(1), Supplement pp S159-S169.
- Smith J., (2018) decision tree / connectivity for MPA design - https://scholar.google.fr/scholar?as_ylo=2018&q=connectivity+marine+protected+areas&hl=fr&as_sd t=0,5

Q5

- OECM definition as adopted by the CBD COP 14. <https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-14/cop-14-dec-08-en.pdf>
- Coll / Katsanevakis) <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0308597X18307103>
- IUCN (2018) https://www.iucn.org/sites/dev/files/content/documents/guidelines_for_recognising_and_reporting_oecms_-_january_2018.pdf
- Petza *et al.* 2019 (under press) – value of FRAs for marine conservation – proposed framework (with
- Shabtay *et al.* 2019. OECMs linked to MSP (with Michelle Portman’s view) <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969718339470>
- Rees & Pitman (to check)

Q6

- Policy, Strategy or Action Plan for MPAs for Mediterranean countries: Albania, Algeria, Egypt, France, Lebanon, Libya, Tunisia and Turkey.
- Guidance document for NBSAP <https://www.cbd.int/doc/publications/pa-national-action-en.pdf>
- SPA/RAC guidelines on numerous topics

Q7

- Reports on assessment for Croatia, Montenegro and Albania realized by SPA-RAC
- IUCN-Med for Slovenia and North-African countries (Maghreb) (not published)

Q8

- Bastari *et al.* 2016. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0308597X1630094X>
- Berzi & Ariza, 2018 - A Local Transboundary Approach to the Governance of Mediterranean Coastal Borderlands <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/08920753.2018.1498713>
- Gissi *et al.* 2018 - Addressing transboundary conservation challenges through marine spatial prioritization - <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/cobi.13134>
- Gjerde, L. L. Nordtvedt Reeve, H. Harden-Davies, J. Ardron, R. Dolan, C. Durussel, S. Earle, J. A. Jimenez, P. Kalas, D. Laffoley, N. Oral, R. Page, C. Riberiro, J. Rochette, A. Spadone, T. Thiele, H. L. Thomas, D. Wagner, R. M. Warner, A. Wilhelm & G. Wright, 'Protecting Earth's last conservation

frontier: scientific, management and legal priorities for MPAs beyond national boundaries' (2016) 26 (Suppl. 2) Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems 45-60.

<https://ro.uow.edu.au/lhapapers/2510/>

- Scovazi T. & Tani I. 2016 – in Marine Transboundary Conservation and Protected Areas – Ed P. Mackelworth - <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/e/9781317530466>
- (Costello & Molina 2019 – Transboundary MPAs)

Suarez de Vivero J. L. (2010). Jurisdictional Waters in the Mediterranean and Black Seas. Study Carried Out for European Commission Directorate-General for Internal Policies of the Union-Policy Department B: Structural and Cohesion Policy-Fisheries, 134 pp.

Q9

- Alvarez Romero *et al.* 2018 Research advances and gaps in marine planning: towards a global database in systematic conservation planning

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0006320717311114>

- Ansong, *et al.* 2017. An approach to ecosystem-based management in maritime spatial planning process. (also with Gissi, E.) - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0964569117302284>

- Barbosa *et al.*, 2019 - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S004896971834316X>

- Cinnirella, S., Sardà, R., Suárez de Vivero, J.□L., Brennan, R., Barausse, A., Icely, J., Luisetti, T., March, D., Murciano, C., Newton, A., O'Higgins, T., Palmeri, L., Palmieri, M.□G., Raux, P., Rees, S., Albaigés, J., Pirrone, N., & Turner, K. (2014).

Steps Toward a Shared Governance Response for Achieving Good Environmental Status in the Mediterranean Sea. *Ecology and Society*, 19(4), 47.

- Gissi *et al.* 2019. Incorporating change in marine spatial planning: a review.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0308597X18300460>

- Jones, P.J.S. *et al.* 2016. Marine spatial planning in reality: Introduction to case studies and discussion of findings - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0308597X16302147>

- Picone *et al.* 2017 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304380017302648>

- MSP in the Adriatic Sea: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S004896971731985X>

- MSP in Europe: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0308597X18300460>

- Ramieri *et al.* 2019. Linking Integrated Coastal Zone Management to Maritime Spatial Planning: The Mediterranean Experience - https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-98696-8_12

- Rochette, J., Wemaëre, M., Billé, R., & du Puy-Montbrun, G. (2012). A Contribution to the Interpretation of Legal Aspects of the Protocol on Integrated Coastal Zone Management in the Mediterranean. UNEP/MAP, Priority Actions Programme— Regional Activity Centre, Split, 72 p. + annexes.

- De Santo, E.

<https://books.google.fr/books?hl=fr&lr=&id=GVmrCwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA95&dq=Mediterranean+Maritime+spatial+planning&ots=ALs1owZR2b&sig=R5R-0WuLy0BY1F2nVPTtm1KhMmU#v=onepage&q=Mediterranean%20Maritime%20spatial%20planning&f=false>

Q10

- MPA Trust Fund:

https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/25455/mssd_objective1_MPATrustFund.PDF?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

MedPAN *et al.* 2016. The 2016 status of Marine Protected Areas in the Mediterranean: Main findings. Brochure MedPAN & UN Environment/MAP - SPA/RAC

Monbrison D., Rais C., Lopez A., Romani M., 2016, Updated Mediterranean MPA roadmap.

MedPAN, SPA/RAC, Turkish General Directorate of Natural Assets Protection, UNDP Turkey/GEF project, Haut Commissariat aux Eaux et Forêts et à la Lutte contre la Désertification 56 p.

- Binet, T., Diazabakana, A., Hernandez, S. 2015. Sustainable financing of Marine Protected Areas in the Mediterranean: a financial analysis. Vertigo Lab, MedPAN, SPA/RAC, WWF Mediterranean. 114 pp.

- Binet, T., Diazabakana, A., Keurmeur, N., 2016. Economic valuation of the Karaburun-Sazan Marine and Coastal Protected Area. Vertigo Lab, UNDP. 74pp

http://www.rac-spa.org/sites/default/files/doc_medmpanet/final_docs_regional/55_study_on_the_sustainable_financing_of_mediterranean_mpas.pdf

- The association for implementing the trust fund for sustaining Mediterranean MPAs (M2PA) - trust fund initiative and associated projects.

<https://en.gouv.mc/Policy-Practice/The-Environment/An-undertaking-at-international-level/News/M2PA-The-Association-for-the-Sustainable-Financing-of-Mediterranean-MPAs-Grants-its-First-Funding-to-Marine-Protected-Areas-in-the-Maghreb>

ANNEX 2: Guidelines for OECMs, extract from the IUCN document for the CBD, 2018.

OECM approaches, their definitions and examples of sites

Three different approaches, primary, secondary and ancillary conservation

Primary conservation

‘Primary conservation’ - refers to areas that may meet all elements of the IUCN definition of a protected area, but which are not officially designated as such because the governance authority does not want the area to be recognised or reported as a protected area. For example, in some instances Indigenous Peoples and local communities may not want areas of high biodiversity value that they govern to be designated as protected areas or recorded in government protected area databases. The governance authority has the right to withhold or give its consent to an area being recognised as an OECM, assuming it meets the OECM criteria.

Examples include:

1. - Some territories or areas governed by Indigenous Peoples, local communities or private entities that have a primary conservation objective and deliver the in-situ conservation of biodiversity, but where the governing body wishes the territories or areas to be recognised and reported as OECMs, rather than as protected areas.
2. - Privately conserved areas, which are managed with a specific conservation objective but which are not recognised as protected areas under national legislation.
3. - Areas identified as Key Biodiversity Areas that are managed in ways that deliver long-term in-situ conservation of biodiversity through, for example, regulation or other effective approaches.
4. - Some permanently set-aside areas of forest, such as old-growth, primary, or other high-biodiversity value forests, which are protected from both forestry and non-forestry threats.
5. - Some natural areas managed by universities for biological research.

Secondary conservation

‘Secondary conservation’ - is achieved through the active conservation of an area where biodiversity outcomes are a secondary management objective. For example, enduring watershed protection policies and management may result in effective protection of biodiversity in watersheds, even though the areas may be managed primarily for objectives other than conservation. Sites managed to provide ecological connectivity between protected areas or other areas of high biodiversity, thereby contributing to their viability, may also qualify as OECMs.

Examples include:

6. - Territories and areas managed by Indigenous Peoples and/or local communities (or sections of these areas) to maintain natural or near-natural ecosystems, with low levels of use of natural resources practised on a sustainable basis and in a way that does not degrade the areas’ biodiversity. For example, coastal and marine areas where local community-based harvesting and management practices result in de facto conservation of fish populations and other associated marine biodiversity.
7. - Traditional management systems that maintain high levels of associated biodiversity. These could include certain agricultural systems that maintain native species and their habitat, such as pastures of native grassland managed in ways that support livestock grazing while maintaining native biodiversity.
8. - Urban or municipal parks managed primarily for public recreation but which are large enough and sufficiently natural to also effectively achieve the in-situ conservation of biodiversity (e.g. wild grassland, wetlands) and which are managed to maintain these biodiversity values.
9. - Military lands and waters, or portions of military lands and waters that are primarily managed for the purpose of defence, but with specific secondary objectives focused on the conservation of biodiversity.
10. - Watersheds or other areas managed primarily for water resource management that also result in the in-situ conservation of biodiversity. This can include, for example, water meadows, riverine forest,

coastal forests, wetlands, streams, upland catchments, or other areas managed for long-term soil and slope stabilisation, flood mitigation, or other ecosystem services.

11. - Permanent or long-term fisheries closure areas designed to protect complete ecosystems for stock recruitment, to protect specialised ecosystems in their entirety, or protect species at risk through the in-situ conservation of biodiversity as a whole, and are demonstrated to be effective against fishery and non-fishery threats alike.
12. - Hunting reserves that maintain natural habitats and other flora and fauna as well as viable populations of hunted and non-hunted native species.
13. - Areas successfully restored from degraded or threatened ecosystems, to provide important ecosystem services but which also contribute to effective biodiversity conservation (e.g. freshwater and coastal wetlands restored for flood protection).
14. - Areas that contribute to conservation because of their role in connecting protected areas and other areas of particular importance for the conservation of biodiversity, thereby contributing to the long-term viability of larger ecosystems.

Ancillary conservation

‘Ancillary conservation’ - refers to areas that deliver in-situ conservation as a by-product of management activities, even though biodiversity conservation is not a management objective. For example, Scapa Flow in the Orkney Islands protects shipwrecks and war graves from World War II. This protection has led to the ancillary conservation of important biodiversity

Examples include:

15. - Sacred natural sites with high biodiversity values that are protected and conserved long term for their associations with one or more faith groups.
16. - Coastal and marine areas protected for reasons other than conservation, but that nonetheless achieve the in-situ conservation of biodiversity (e.g., historic wrecks, war graves, etc.)
17. - Military lands and waters, or portions of military lands and waters that are managed for the purpose of defence, but also achieve the effective conservation of biodiversity in the long term.

ANNEX 3: ROADMAP NATIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

INTRODUCTION:

The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) to which your Country is a Contracting Party approved the Aichi Targets for 2020. Aichi Target 11 states that *“By 2020, at least [...] 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscape and seascape.”*

At the 19th meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention (Athens, February 2016), a [Roadmap](#) was adopted for a Comprehensive Coherent Network of Well-managed Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) to achieve Aichi Target 11 in the Mediterranean. The Roadmap process is under the leadership of the UNEP/MAP Specially Protected Areas Regional Activity Centre (SPA/RAC).

A [first evaluation](#) was conducted in 2017 for Contracting Parties (based on information of 2016) to share the steps that had been taken since the inception of the Roadmap (reporting took place during COP 20).

The current short questionnaire intends to assess how your Country has progressed since February 2016 with implementing the [Regional Working Programme](#) for the coastal and marine protected areas in the Mediterranean, including the high seas, with the goal to achieve Aichi Target 11 by 2020. This reporting requirement is specified in paragraph 19 of the Roadmap.

Your answers to this questionnaire are important for your Country to report to the Barcelona Convention on actions and achievements. They will also inform future decisions on moving forward with marine conservation and ocean management at large.

We look forward to your response by 31 January 2019.

Details on the respondent:

NAME:
POSITION:
INSITUATION/ORGANIZATION:
COUNTRY:
EMAIL:
TELEPHONE:

**1. HAVE YOU BEEN FOLLOWING THE ROADMAP PROCESS SINCE ITS ADOPTION?
(YES/PARTIALLY/NO)**

**THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS REFER TO ACTIONS TAKEN SINCE FEBRUARY 2016
IN SUPPORT OF MARINE PROTECTED AREAS IN THE MEDITERRANEAN SEA**

**2. IN GENERAL, HAS YOUR COUNTRY FOSTERED OR ADOPTED ANY NEW POLICY, LEGAL
OR PROGRAMMATIC INITIATIVE, OR TAKEN PART IN RELEVANT PROJECT(S) TO SUPORT
MPAs OF YOUR COUNTRY?**

- 0 – No action has taken place as far as I know
- 1 – Some routine action has taken place or is currently taking place
- 2 – Some small new action has taken place or is currently taking place
- 3 – Some significant actions have been taken or are currently taking place

**3. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE TERM “OTHER EFFECTIVE AREA-BASED
CONSERVATION MEASURE” (OECM) AND IS YOUR INSTITUTION/ORGANISATION USING
THIS TERM WITHIN NEW POLICIES, PLANNING, STRATEGIES, PROJECTS OR OTHER
INITIATIVES RELATING TO MPAs AND MARINE CONSERVATION IN YOUR COUNTRY?**

- 0 – I don't know this term / I don't understand this term
- 1 – I know of this term but it is not used where I work
- 2 - I know of / understand this term and we have started using it where I work
- 3 – I understand this term and it is widely used where I work

***OBJECTIVE 1 – Strengthen Networks of Protected Areas at National and Mediterranean levels, including in
the high seas and in ABNJ, as a contribution to the relevant globally agreed goals and targets***

4. WHAT IS THE OFFICIAL PERCENTAGE OF YOUR COUNTRY WATERS COVERED BY MPAs?

- Country Waters in km²:
- % covered by MPAs:

5. HAS YOUR COUNTRY DECLARED NEW MPAs SINCE 2016?

- 0 - Nothing new has happened since 2016
- 1 - A new MPA / new MPAs are about to be declared
- 2 - A new MPA has been declared since 2016
- 3 - New MPAs have been declared since 2016

If 2 or 3:

Does the new MPA includes no-fishing, no-take or no-access zone(s). No - Yes
Do the new MPAs include no-fishing, no-take or no-access zone(s). No – Partly - Yes
Were EBSA descriptions taken into account when designing the MPA(s). No – Yes – Don't know
This/these new MPA(s) add(s) to the total surface coverage of MPAs. No – in part – fully

**6. HAS YOUR COUNTRY EXTENDED THE SURFACE COVERAGE OF EXISTING MPAs SINCE
2016?**

- 0 - Nothing new has happened since 2016
- 1 - An MPA is about to be extended
- 2 - The surface of an MPA has been extended since 2016
- 3 - The surface of several MPAs has been extended since 2016

7. HAS YOUR COUNTRY DECLARED NEW NO-FISHING, NO-TAKE OR NO-ACCESS AREAS WITHIN EXISTING MPAs SINCE 2016?

- 0 - No
- 1 - No, but such a zone(s) is/are about to be declared
- 2 - Yes, such a zone has been declared
- 3 - Yes, several such zones have been declared

8. HAS YOUR COUNTRY EXTENDED THE COVERAGE OF EXISTING NO-FISHING, NO-TAKE OR NO-ACCESS AREAS WITHIN EXISTING MPAs SINCE 2016?

- 0 - No
- 1 - No, but such a zone(s) is/are about to be extended
- 2 - Yes, such a zone has been extended
- 3 - Yes, several such zones have been extended

9. HAS YOUR COUNTRY CONDUCTED A GAP ANALYSIS TO CHECK THAT ALL COMPONENTS OF MARINE BIODIVERSITY ARE REPRESENTED IN THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF MPAs?

- 0 - No
- 1 - No, but a gap analysis is about to take place
- 2 - Yes, a gap analysis is under way
- 3 - Yes, a gap analysis has been completed

Regarding Knowledge on marine biodiversity to implement the Roadmap, please indicate what are the main scientific challenges to be tackled at national level to help the process?

10. DOES YOUR COUNTRY IMPLEMENT AN MPA NETWORK APPROACH INVOLVING KEY FUNCTIONAL AREAS ACROSS THE DIFFERENT MARINE AREAS?

- 0 - No, there is no network approach, there is no MPA plan for my country, and key functional areas have not all been identified across all marine areas
- 1 - There is no network approach but there is an MPA plan for my country; however, key functional areas have not all been identified across all marine areas
- 2 - There is a network approach and an MPA plan for my country; however, key functional areas have not all been identified across all marine areas
- 3 - There is a network approach and an MPA plan for my country based on the identification of all key functional areas across all marine areas

If 1, 2 or 3: Does the MPA plan refer to the Promise of Sydney (6th IUCN World Park Congress) of 30% of marine habitat type to be covered by MPAs? Yes – No

If 1, 2 or 3: Does the MPA plan for your country takes into account the identification of future sites of interest/future priority sites?

11. HAS YOUR COUNTRY PROPOSED REGIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL TYPES OF DESIGNATIONS FOR ABNJ?

- 0 - No
- 1 - No, but my country is about to propose (an) area(s) for a regional/international designation
- 2 - Yes, my country has proposed (an) area(s) for a regional/international designation but it/they is/are not yet designated
- 3 - Yes, my country has proposed (an) area(s) for a regional/international designation and it/they has/ve been designated

OBJECTIVE 2 – Improve the Mediterranean MPA network through effective and equitable management

12. HAS A REVIEW OF GOVERNANCE / INSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL FRAMEWORKS TAKEN PLACE IN YOUR COUNTRY TO ENSURE POSSIBLE BARRIERS TO MPA MANAGEMENT IN THE SHORT TO THE LONGER TERM ARE LIFTED?

- 0 – No review has taken place and there are still barriers
- 1 – A review has taken place and barriers have been identified, but no action has taken place

- 2 – A review has taken place, barriers have been identified and action is taking/has taken place
- 3 – No review has taken place because there doesn't seem to be barriers or issues

13. ASSESSING MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS FOR ALL MPAS (including Natura 2000 for EU members)?

- 0 – No action has been taken
- 1 – Some small action(s), routine type
- 2 – Some potentially relevant action(s), yet starting or uncomplete
- 3 – Significant action(s) has(ve) been taken

14. IMPROVEMENT IN THE NUMBER OR UPDATING OF MANAGEMENT PLANS FOR ALL MPAs (including Natura 2000 sites for EU members)? (0-3)

- 0 – No action has been taken
- 1 – Some small action(s), routine type
- 2 – Some potentially relevant action(s), yet starting or uncomplete
- 3 – Significant action(s) has(ve) been taken

If 2&3, can these plans be adaptive and changed quickly when facing new situations? (Yes/No)

15. IMPROVEMENT IN THE NUMBER AND/OR CAPACITY OF MPAs STAFF INCLUDING SHARING EXPERIENCE AMONG MPAs? (0-3)

- 0 – No action has been taken
- 1 – Some small action(s), routine type
- 2 – Some potentially relevant action(s), yet starting or uncomplete
- 3 – Significant action(s) has(ve) been taken

16. IMPROVEMENT WITH EFFICIENT SURVEILLANCE AND ENFORCEMENT (e.g. number of hours of surveillance, collaborations for increased surveillance, increase number/capacity of sworn staff)? (0-3)

- 0 – No action has been taken
- 1 – Some small action(s), routine type
- 2 – Some potentially relevant action(s), yet starting or uncomplete
- 3 – Significant action(s) has(ve) been taken

17. IMPROVEMENT WITH DECENTRALIZING AND DEPLOYING ADEQUATE CAPACITY IN THE FIELD? (0-3)

- 0 – No action has been taken
- 1 – Some small action(s), routine type
- 2 – Some potentially relevant action(s), yet starting or uncomplete
- 3 – Significant action(s) has(ve) been taken

18. HAVE YOU MAPPED THE PRESSURES IN AND AROUND MPAs AND ADAPTED REGULATIONS IN RELATION TO PRESSURES / CUMULATIVE PRESSURES?

- 0 – No there are no maps of pressures for any of the MPAs
- 1 – There are maps of pressures for some of the MPAs and none / a few have adapted regulations
- 2 – There are maps of pressures for most MPAs and most have adapted their regulations in relation to pressures
- 3 – There are maps of pressures for all MPAs and most / all have adapted their regulations in relation to pressures

OBJECTIVE 3 – Promote the sharing of environmental and socio-economic benefits of Mediterranean MPAs and the MPAs integration into the broader context of sustainable use of the marine environment and the implementation of the ecosystem and marine spatial planning approaches

19. HAS THERE BEEN PROGRESS IN YOUR COUNTRY CONCERNING CROSS-SECTORAL POLICIES OR STRATEGIES THAT ALLOW BETTER INTEGRATING MPAs WITH OTHE SECTORS OF ACTIVITY, NAMELY ECONOMIC (including with zoning, spatial planning, ICZM...)?

- 0 – No action has been taken
- 1 – Some small action(s), routine type
- 2 – Some potentially relevant action(s), yet starting or uncomplete

3 – Significant action(s) has(ve) been taken

20. HAS THERE BEEN PROGRESS IN YOUR COUNTRY CONCERNING BETTER INVOLVEMENT OF LOCAL STAKEHOLDERS AND CIVIL SOCIETY IN THE PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT OF MPAs?

- 0 – No action has been taken
- 1 – Some small action(s), routine type
- 2 – Some potentially relevant action(s), yet starting or uncomplete
- 3 – Significant action(s) has(ve) been taken

OBJECTIVE 4 – Ensure the stability of the Mediterranean MPA network by enhancing their financial sustainability

21. HOW HAS EVOLVED SINCE 2016 THE BUDGET ALLOCATED BY YOUR COUNTRY TO THE MANAGEMENT OF MPAs (management, not planning or establishing new sites)?

- 0 – the Budget has decreased
- 1 – the Budget has slightly increased allowing to reinforce management, surveillance and monitoring in some MPAs
- 2 – the Budget has increased allowing to reinforce management, surveillance and monitoring in some / most MPAs
- 3 – the Budget has significantly increased allowing to reinforce management, surveillance and monitoring in most / all MPAs

If 2 or 3: What is the proportion of this Budget that comes from sources external to the State resources (e.g. From project money, donors, etc.) – Over 75% - Over 50% - Between 25 and 50% - Less than 25%.

22. HOW HAS EVOLVED SINCE 2016 THE BUDGET ALLOCATED BY YOUR COUNTRY TO PLANNING AND ESTBLISHING NEW MPAs?

- 0 – the Budget has decreased
- 1 – the Budget has slightly increased allowing to plan new MPAs
- 2 – the Budget has increased allowing to plan and establish new MPAs but remains insufficient for running the management
- 3 – the Budget has significantly increased allowing to plan, establish and run new MPAs

If 2 or 3: What is the proportion of this Budget that comes from Sources external to the State resources (e.g. From project money, donors, etc.) – Over 75% -Over 50% - Between 25 and 50% - Less tan 25%.

23. HAS YOUR COUNTRY CONDUCTED AN ANALYSIS ON FUNDING NEEDS ACROSS MPAs AND HAS A FUNDING STRATEGY BEEN DEVELOPED FOR YOUR SYSTEM OF PROTECTED AREAS TO SUPPORT THE ESTABLISHMENT AND THE MANAGEMENT OF EXISTING MPAs, INCLUDING THE SETUP OF SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENTAL FUNDS?

- 0 – No strategy
- 1 – A strategy is underway
- 2 – A strategy has been developed but doesn't concern all MPAs (new and existing)
- 3 – A strategy has been developed and covers the needs of all MPAs (new and existing)

24. HAS YOUR COUNTRY PROVIDED TRAINING AND/OR SUPPORT TO MPAs MANAGERS IN ORDER TO ENHANCE THEIR FUNDRAISING CAPACITIES OR ABILITY TO DEVELOP BUSINESS PLAN FOR THEIR MPA?

- 0 – No action has been taken
- 1 – Some small action(s), routine type
- 2 – Some potentially relevant action(s), yet starting or uncomplete
- 3 – Significant action(s) has(ve) been taken

25. HAS ANY INNOVATIVE MPA FUNDING PROJECT BEEN DEVELOPED AT THE NATIONAL OR LOCAL LEVEL? (e.g. fees for the use of natural resources, licenses, local taxes, debt swaps, Trust Funds, Blue Carbon...)

- 0 – Not at all
- 1 – Some plans in that direction
- 2 – Some potentially relevant actions have been taken, yet starting or uncomplete
- 3 – Significant results have been achieved

ANNEX 4: Document for self-evaluation by each country

Question to countries	No	Partly	Yes	T
	0	0.5	1	
Q1. Has the MPAs and OECMs coverage reached 10% of waters under national jurisdiction?				
Q2. Are the existing MPAs and OECMs effectively and equitably managed?				
Q3. Is the existing network of MPAs and OECMs ecologically representative?				
Q4. Is the existing network of MPAs and OECMs well connected?				
Q5. Has the concept of OECM been defined and introduced in the national legislation?				
Q6. Has the country prepared a Strategy and an Action Plan for MPAs and OECM, based on a gap analysis of the representativity of national biodiversity and ecosystems, based on accurate scientific information and proposing a list of future MPAs to complete the existing national network?				
Q7. Has the country assessed and amended/reviewed the institutional and legal system applicable to MPAs and OECMs, improving the effectiveness of the governance and management systems, and checking that each MPA has clear objectives and concrete measures for its management?				
Q8. Has the country considered/developed negotiation with neighbouring contracting parties for managing networks of MPAs, including in their future EEZ areas?				
Q9. Has the country developed/approved an overall policy for the sustainable use of marine and coastal environment (land use planning and management associated to marine spatial planning and management) based (1) on the participation and involvement of all components of the society, and (2) on the equitable sharing of the social and economic benefits of environmental and natural resources?				
Q10. Has the country developed/implemented a strategy and an action plan for long term funding of nature conservation considering all the necessary components?				
Total				

0 = no action; 0,5 = started; 1= completed

Total provides an evaluation of the implementation of the roadmap according to the following scale

- 0-2 Unsatisfactory
- 3-5 Moderately Satisfactory
- 6-8 Satisfactory
- 9-10 Highly Satisfactory

Lines with 0 need to be the focus for action

ANNEX 5: Table for regional evaluation, average of all countries will provide a value and according ranking according to the same scale.

Countries	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Total
Albania											
Algeria											
Bosnia-Her.											
Croatia											
Cyprus											
Egypt											
France											
Greece											
Israel											
Italy											
Lebanon											
Lybia											
Malta											
Monaco											
Montenegro											
Morocco											
Slovenia											
Spain											
Syria											
Tunisia											
Turkey											
Total for 21 countries											

0 = no action; 0,5 = started; 1: completed

ANNEX 6: MAPAMED data collection

MAPAMED is a database on MPAs and OECMs, gathering data on sites of interest for the conservation of the marine environment in the Mediterranean Sea. Since 2010, it is run jointly by the MedPAN organization and UNEP/MAP/SPA-RAC, and adopts a broad approach of marine conservation by recording a large variety of sites, including sites that are not (yet) protected but have somehow been recognized as ecologically important.

MAPAMED stores information on:

Nationally designated MPAs,

Natura 2000 sites at sea (European Union Countries),

Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance (SPAMIs, Barcelona Convention),

Ramsar sites (Ramsar Convention),

Biosphere reserves (UNESCO),

World Heritage sites (UNESCO)

Particularly Sensitive Sea Areas (PSSAs, IMO),

Fisheries Restricted Areas (FRAs, GFCM)

Cetacean Critical Habitats (CCH, ACCOBAMS),

Ecologically or Biologically Significant Areas (EBSAs, CBD),

Important Birds and Biodiversity Areas (IBAs)

OECMs