



UNITED  
NATIONS

EP

UNEP(DEPI)/MED WG.421/Inf.27



UNITED NATIONS  
ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME  
MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN

11 September 2015  
Original: English

Meeting of the MAP Focal Points

Athens, Greece, 13-16 October 2015

**Agenda item 5: Specific Matters for Consideration and Action by the Meeting and**

**Agenda item 5.14: Draft Decision on the List of Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance (SPAMI List)**

**Revised Format for the Periodic Review of SPAMIs**

For environmental and economic 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.

## Revised Format for the Periodic Review of SPAMIs

The draft revised Evaluation Format presented in this document has been elaborated by RAC/SPA and revised taking into account the comments and suggestions provided by the Focal Points for SPAs and partner organisations. It is proposed to be used on **a trial basis** for the evaluation of SPAMIs that will be undertaken in 2017, **along with the old version** of the Evaluation Format. It will be then reviewed by the Thirteenth Meeting of the Focal Points for SPAs (mid-2017) in the light of the trial results. The Thirteenth Meeting of Focal Points for SPAs will also examine options to further adapt the Evaluation Format to the case of transboundary SPAMIs or SPAMIs covering ANBJ zones.

It is also intended to establish an Online Review Format that keeps records of the main elements of the SPAMI presentation report (using the Annotated Format), the previous review reports and recommendations, and any other relevant official documentation. The Online Review Format will include guidance on how to translate the results of the assessment in scores.

### Background

The SPAMI List was established in 2001 (Monaco Declaration) in order to promote cooperation in the management and conservation of natural areas, as well as in the protection of threatened species and their habitats. Furthermore, the areas included in the SPAMI List are intended to have a value of example and model for the protection of the natural heritage of the region. To date, 33 areas, including the Pelagos Sanctuary, are included in the SPAMI List.

During their Fifteenth Ordinary Meeting (Almeria, Spain, January 2008), the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols adopted the *Procedure for the revision of the areas included in the List of Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance (SPAMI List)* and requested RAC/SPA to implement the adopted Procedure (Decision IG.17/12).

Annex I to the *Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean* (SPA/BD Protocol) lists “Common criteria for the choice of protected marine and coastal areas that could be included in the SPAMI List”. The adopted Procedure aims to evaluate the SPAMI sites in order to examine whether they meet the Protocol’s criteria.

Consequently, 12 SPAMIs<sup>1</sup> have been evaluated in 2009, 2 SPAMIs<sup>2</sup> in 2011, 3 SPAMIs<sup>3</sup> in 2013 and 22 SPAMIs<sup>4</sup> in 2015. During these ordinary evaluation exercises, 13 SPAMIs have been evaluated twice and 17 independent experts have been involved.

---

<sup>1</sup> The 12 areas included in the SPAMI List in 2001: Port-Cros National Park (France), Alboran Island, Natural Park of Cabo de Gata-Nijar, Natural Park of Cap de Creus, Columbretes Islands, Sea Bottom of the Levante of Almeria, Mar Menor and Oriental Mediterranean zone of the Region of Murcia coast, Medes Islands (Spain), La Galite Archipelago, Kneiss Islands, Zembra and Zembretta National Park (Tunisia), and the Sanctuary for the Conservation of Marine Mammals (France, Italy and Monaco).

<sup>2</sup> The 2 areas included in the SPAMI List in 2003: Archipelago of Cabrera National Park, and Maro-Cerro Gordo Cliffs (Spain).

<sup>3</sup> The 3 areas included in the SPAMI List in 2005: Banc des Kabyles Marine Reserve, Habibas Islands (Algeria), and Portofino Marine Protected Area (Italy).

<sup>4</sup> The 22 areas included in the SPAMI List in 2001, 2003, 2008 and 2009: Bouches de Bonifacio Natural Reserve, Port-Cros National Park (France), Pelagos Sanctuary for the Conservation of Marine Mammals (France, Italy, Monaco), Marine Protected Area and Natural Reserve of Torre Guaceto, Marine Protected Area of Capo Caccia-Isola Piana, Marine Protected Area of Tavolara-Punta Coda Cavallo, Miramare Marine Protected Area, Plemmirio Marine Protected Area, Punta Campanella Marine Protected Area (Italy), Al-Hoceima National Park (Morocco), Alboran Island, Archipelago of Cabrera National Park, Cabo de Gata-Nijar Natural Park, Cap de Creus Natural Park, Columbretes Islands, Mar Menor and Oriental Mediterranean zone of the Region of Murcia coast, Maro-Cerro Gordo Cliffs, Medes Islands, Sea Bottom of the Levante of Almeria (Spain), Kneiss Islands, La Galite Archipelago, and Zembra and Zembretta National Park (Tunisia).

The most recurrent recommendation arising from the 2015 evaluation was related to the need of revising the Review Format based on the experience gained from the evaluations of SPAMIs undertaken so far.

### **Rationale for the elaboration of the revised Format**

During their Twelfth Meeting held in Athens, Greece, on 25-29 May 2015, the Focal Points for SPAs took note of the recommendation made in the SPAMI evaluation reports regarding the need of revising the Format for the Periodic Review of SPAMIs, based on the experience gained from the SPAMI evaluations undertaken so far. Given the urgency of the recommendation, the Meeting agreed to elaborate a revised Format with a view to submitting it for adoption by the next meeting of the Contracting Parties (COP 19, February 2016). The meeting invited RAC/SPA to prepare a first draft and take advantage of the SPAMI Conference (Tunis, Tunisia, 9-12 June 2015) in order to consult with the attending Focal Points, before circulating the revised Ordinary Review Format for further comments and finalization in time for submission to the forthcoming meeting of MAP Focal Points (mid-October 2015). In this context, RAC/SPA prepared a first draft and circulated it to all the Focal Points for SPAs and relevant partner organisations. The comments and suggestions received were integrated in the draft Format presented hereinafter.

### **Requested follow-up by COP 19**

After careful consideration and the running, during July 2015, of the e-mail consultation with the Focal Points for SPAs and relevant partner organizations, it was decided to present this “Revised Format for the Periodic Review of SPAMIs” to COP 19 as an information document and not in view of its adoption.

Furthermore, the present version is intended to be tested, further developed and improved during the 2016-2017 biennium, especially in view of adapting it to the case of transboundary SPAMIs or SPAMIs covering ANBJ zones. The final version of the format will be then presented for adoption by COP 20 in 2017.

## Revised Format for the Periodic Review of SPAMIs

SPAMI Name:

### SECTION I: CRITERIA WHICH ARE MANDATORY FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN AREA IN THE SPAMI LIST

#### 1. MEDITERRANEAN VALUE OF THE SPAMI

	Score
<p><b>1.1. The SPAMI still fulfils at least one of the criteria related to the regional Mediterranean value as presented in the SPA/BD Protocol's Annex I.</b></p> <p><u>Scoring:</u> Yes = 1, No = 0.</p>	?
<b>Score justification:</b>	

	Score
<p><b>1.2. Level of adverse changes occurred during the evaluation period for the habitats and species considered as natural features in the SPAMI presentation report submitted for the inclusion of the area in the SPAMI List.</b></p> <p><u>Assessment scale:</u> 0 = Significant changes, 1 = Moderate changes, 2 = Slight changes, 3 = No adverse change.</p>	?
<b>Score justification:</b>	

	Score
<p><b>1.3. Are the objectives, set out in the original SPAMI application for designation, actively pursued?</b></p> <p><u>Assessment scale:</u> 0 = No, 1 = Only some of them, 2 = Yes for most of them, 3 = Yes for all of them.</p>	?
<b>Score justification:</b>	

## 2. LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

	Score
<p><b>2.1. The legal status of the SPAMI (with reference to its legal status at the date of the previous evaluation report).</b></p> <p><u>Assessment scale:</u>            0 = Significant negative change in the legal status of the SPAMI,            1 = Slight negative change in the legal status of the SPAMI,            2 = The SPAMI has maintained or improved its legal status.</p>	?
<b>Score justification:</b>	

	Score
<p><b>2.2. Are competencies and responsibilities clearly defined in the texts governing the area?</b></p> <p><u>Assessment scale:</u>            0 = competencies and responsibilities are not clearly defined,            1 = The definition of competencies and responsibilities needs slight improvements,            2 = The SPAMI has clearly defined competencies and responsibilities.</p>	?
<b>Score justification:</b>	

	Score
<p><b>2.3. Does the area have a management body, endowed with sufficient powers?</b></p> <p><u>Assessment scale:</u>            0 = No management body, or the management body is not endowed with sufficient powers,            1 = The management body is not fully dedicated to the SPAMI,            2 = The SPAMI has a fully dedicated management body, endowed with sufficient powers.</p>	?
<b>Score justification:</b>	

### 3. MANAGEMENT AND AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES

	Score
<p><b>3.1. Does the SPAMI have a management plan?</b>  <u>Assessment scale:</u>                      0 = No management plan or the level of implementation of the management plan is assessed as “insufficient”,                      1 = The management plan is not officially adopted but its implementation is assessed as “adequate”,                      2 = The management plan is officially adopted and adequately implemented.</p>	?
<b>Score justification:</b>	

	Score
<p><b>3.2. Assess the adequacy of the management plan taking into account the SPAMI objectives and the requirements set out in Article 7 of the SPA/BD Protocol and Section 8.2.3 of the Annotated Format<sup>5</sup> (AF)</b>  <u>Assessment scale:</u>                      0 = Low,                      1 = Fair,                      2 = Excellent.                      More details useful for assessing the adequacy of the management plan are given in the Annex to this Form.</p>	?
<b>Score justification:</b>	

	Score
<p><b>3.3. Assess the adequacy of the human resources available to the SPAMI.</b>  <u>Assessment scale:</u>                      0 = Low,                      1 = Fair,                      2 = Excellent.                      More details useful for assessing the adequacy of the human resources are given in the Annex to this Form.</p>	?
<b>Score justification:</b>	

<sup>5</sup> Annotated Format for the presentation reports for the areas proposed for inclusion in the SPAMI List.

	Score
<p><b>3.4. Assess the adequacy of the financial and material means available to the SPAMI.</b></p> <p><u>Assessment scale:</u> 0 = Low, 1 = Fair, 2 = Excellent. More details useful for assessing the adequacy of the financial and material means are given in the Annex to this Form.</p>	?
<p><b>Score justification:</b></p>	

	Score
<p><b>3.5. Does the area have a monitoring programme?</b></p> <p><u>Assessment scale:</u> 0 = No monitoring programme, or the level of implementation of the monitoring programme is assessed as “insufficient”, 1 = The monitoring programme needs improvement to cover other parameters that are significant for the SPAMI, 2 = The monitoring programme is adequately implemented and allows the assessment of the state and evolution of the area, as well as the effectiveness of protection and management measures.</p>	?
<p><b>Score justification:</b> In case of Score = 1, this section should also include the list of the parameters to include and the related rationale.</p>	

	Score
<p><b>3.6. Is there a feedback mechanism that establishes an explicit link between the monitoring results and the management objectives, and which allows adaptation of protection and management measures?</b></p> <p><u>Assessment scale:</u> 0 = The SPAMI has no efficient mechanism allowing to adapt the protection and management measures in accordance with the results of the monitoring programme, 1 = The existing feedback mechanism needs improvement, 2 = The SPAMI has an adequate feedback mechanism.</p>	?
<p><b>Score justification:</b> In case of Score =1, this section should also include concrete recommendations to improve the existing feedback mechanism.</p>	

## SECTION II: FEATURES PROVIDING A VALUE-ADDED TO THE AREA

(Section B4 of Annex I, and other obligatory for a SPAMI, and Art. 6 and 7 of the SPA/BD Protocol)

### 4. THREATS AND SURROUNDING CONTEXT

**4.1. Assess the level of threats within the site to the ecological, biological, aesthetic and cultural values of the area (B4.a of Annex I).**

**In particular:**

Unregulated exploitation of natural resources  
(e.g. sand mining, water, timber, living resources). See 5.1.1. in AF.  
(Score: 0 means “very serious threats”; 3 means “no threats”)

Threats to habitats and species (e.g. disturbance, desiccation, pollution, poaching, introduced alien species...). See 5.1.2. in AF.  
(Score: 0 means “very serious threats”; 3 means “no threats”)

Increase of human presence (e.g. tourism, boats, building, immigration...). See 5.1.3. in AF.  
(Score: 0 means “very serious threats”; 3 means “no threats”)

Conflicts between users or user groups. See 5.1.4. and 6.2. in AF.  
(Score: 0 means “very serious threats”; 3 means “no threats”)

Please include a prescriptive list of threats that are of concern and are evaluated individually.

**4.2. Assess the level of external threats to the ecological, biological, aesthetic and cultural values of the area (B4.a of Annex I). See 5.2. in AF.**

**In particular:**

Pollution problems from external sources including solid waste and those affecting waters up-current. See 5.2.1. in AF.  
(Score: 0 means “very serious threats”; 3 means “no threats”)

Significant impacts on landscapes and on cultural values. See 5.2.2. in AF.  
(Score: 0 means “very serious threats”; 3 means “no threats”)

Expected development of threats upon the surrounding area. See 6.1. in AF.  
(Score: 0 means “very serious threats”; 3 means “no threats”)

Please include a prescriptive list of external threats that are of concern and are evaluated individually.



**4.3. Is there an integrated coastal management plan or land-use laws in the area bordering or surrounding the SPAMI? (B4.e of Annex I). See 5.2.3. in AF.**  
(Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

**4.4. Does the management plan for the SPAMI have influence over the governance of the surrounding area? (D5.d of Annex I). See 7.4.4. in AF.**  
(Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

## **5. ENFORCEMENT OF PROTECTION MEASURES**

### **5.1. Assess the degree of enforcement of the protection measures**

#### **In particular:**

Are the area boundaries adequately marked on land and, if applicable, adequately marked on the sea? See 8.3.1. in AF.  
(Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

Is there any collaboration from other authorities in the protection and surveillance of the area and, if applicable, is there a coastguard service contributing to the marine protection? See 8.3.2. and 8.3.3. in AF.  
(Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

Are third party agencies also empowered to enforce regulations relating to the SPAMI protective measures?  
(Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

Are there adequate penalties and powers for effective enforcement? See 8.3.4. in AF.  
(Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

Is the field staff empowered to impose sanctions? See 8.3.4. in AF.  
(Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

Has the area established a contingency plan to face accidental pollution or other serious emergencies? (Art. 7.3. of the Protocol, Recommendation of 13<sup>th</sup> Meeting of Contracting Parties).  
(Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

## 6. COOPERATION AND NETWORKING

Are other national or international organizations collaborating to provide human or financial resources? (*e.g. researchers, experts, volunteers...*). See 9.1.3. in AF.

**(Score: 0 = No / 1 = Weakly / 2 = Fairly / 3 = Excellent)**

Assess the level of cooperation and exchange with other SPAMIs (especially in other nations) (*Art. 8, Art. 21.1, Art. 22.1. and Art. 22.3 of the Protocol, A.d in Annex I*).

**(Score: 0 = No / 1 = Insufficient / 2 = Fair / 3 = Excellent)**

## SECTION III: FOLLOW-UP OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE PREVIOUS EVALUATION(S)

(If applicable)

### 7. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE PREVIOUS EVALUATIONS

**7.1. Assess to what extent the recommendations possibly made by the previous evaluations were implemented: Recommendations made by the TAC(s) and/or approved by the Focal Points for SPAs regarding Section I.**

Assessment scale: 0 = “No” for all of them, 1 = “Yes” for only some of them, 2 = “Yes” for most of them, 3 = “Yes” for all of them.

List of recommendations for the SPAMI (to be filled in by RAC/SPA)

Recommendation (Year)	Not Implemented	Partially Implemented	Fully Implemented

**7.2. Assess to what extent the recommendations possibly made by the previous evaluations were implemented: Recommendations made by the TAC(s) and/or approved by the Focal Points for SPAs regarding Section II.**

Assessment scale: 0 = “No” for all of them, 1 = “Yes” for only some of them, 2 = “Yes” for most of them, 3 = “Yes” for all of them.

List of recommendations for the SPAMI (to be filled in by RAC/SPA)

Recommendation (Year)	Not Implemented	Partially Implemented	Fully Implemented

## **CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **SECTION I: CRITERIA WHICH ARE MANDATORY FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN AREA IN THE SPAMI LIST**

**1. MEDITERRANEAN VALUE OF THE SPAMI**

Total Score: ? (Max: 7)

Comments by the TAC:

**2. LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS**

Total Score: ? (Max: 6)

Comments by the TAC:

**3. MANAGEMENT AND AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES**

Total Score: ? (Max: 12)

Comments by the TAC:

### **SECTION II: FEATURES PROVIDING A VALUE-ADDED TO THE AREA**

**4. THREATS AND SURROUNDING CONTEXT**

Total Score: ? (Max: 23)

Comments by the TAC:

**5. ENFORCEMENT OF PROTECTION MEASURES**

Total Score: ? (Max: 6)

Comments by the TAC:

**6. COOPERATION AND NETWORKING**

Total Score: ? (Max: 6)

Comments by the TAC:

### **SECTION III: FOLLOW-UP OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE PREVIOUS EVALUATION(S)**

**7. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE PREVIOUS EVALUATIONS**

Total Score: ? (Max: 6)

Comments by the TAC:

**GRAND TOTAL SCORE: ? (Max: 66)**

### **Score evaluation:**

The TAC will propose to include the SPAMI in a period of provisional nature (in accordance with paragraph 6 of the Procedure for the revision of the areas included in the SPAMI List) if the SPAMI has:

- a score < 1 for any of the following items: 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5 **or** 3.6;
- or
- a score < 2 for any of the following items: 1.2, 1.3, 7.1 **or** 7.2.

Furthermore, considering that the sites included in the SPAMI List are intended to have a value of example and model for the protection of the natural heritage of the region (Paragraph A.e of Annex 1 to the SPA/BD Protocol), the TAC shall also propose to include the SPAMI in a period of provisional nature if the total score of the evaluation is **less than 46** (= 70% of the maximum total score of 66).

### **Recommendations of the Technical Advisory Commission**

The TAC shall include here its recommendations to overcome the possible gaps and weaknesses identified during the evaluation

### **SIGNATURES**

**National Focal Point**

**Independent Experts**

**SPAMI Manager(s)**

**(ADDITIONAL PAGES MAY BE ADDED FOR EACH MEMBER'S COMMENTS)**

## Annex

### Elements for assessing the adequacy of the management plan (3.2)

#### **Assess the degree of detail of the management plan**

(e.g. zoning, regulations for each zone, competencies and responsibilities, governing bodies, management programs as protection, natural resource management, tourism, public use, education, research, monitoring, maintenance, services and concessions....). See 8.2.3. in AF.

(Score: 0 = No Management Plan / 1 = Weak / 2 = Fair / 3 = Excellent)

#### **Assess to what extent land ownership is well determined**

(Undetermined land tenure regimes and registrations are a common source of conflicts in most protected areas world-wide). See 7.3. in AF.

(Score: 0 = Undetermined / 1 = Weak / 2 = Fair / 3 = Excellent)

**Is there a body representing the public, professional and non-governmental sector and the scientific community linked to the management body?** (B4.b, B4.c of the Annex I to the SPA/BD Protocol).

(Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

#### **Assess the quality of the involvement by the public, and particularly of local communities, in the planning and management of the area** (B4.b of the Annex I to the SPA/BD Protocol).

(e.g. adequate planning involves local stakeholders and accommodates within appropriate management regimes a spectrum of possible multiple uses and regulated human activities, within the primary objective of conservation of marine and coastal environments). See 8.1.4. in AF.

(Score: 0 = No involvement / 1 = Low / 2 = Fair / 3 = Excellent)

### Elements for assessing the adequacy of the human resources (3.3)

**Adequacy of the human resources available to the management body** (Art.7.2-f in the SPA/BD Protocol, D6 in Annex I) (e.g. enough number of employees to ensure adequate management and protection of the area). See 9.1.1. in AF.

Is there a permanent field administrator of the area? See 9.1.2. in AF.

(Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

Are there other permanent staffs in the field?

(e.g. technicians, wardens, guides, ...). See 9.1.2. in AF.

(Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

**Assess the adequacy of the training level of available staff** (Art.7.2-f in the Protocol, D6 in Annex I) (e.g. enough training level to ensure protection of the area). See 9.1.2. in AF.

(Score: 0 = Very Insufficient / 1 = Low / 2 = Fair / 3 = Excellent)

**Elements for assessing the adequacy of the financial and material means (3.4)**

**Assess the degree of adequacy of the financial means**

Sufficient resources for the development and implementation of the management plan, including e.g. interpretation, education, training, research, surveillance and enforcement of regulations. *See 9.2.1. in AF.*

**(Score: 0 = Very Insufficient / 1 = Low / 2 = Fair / 3 = Excellent)**

**Assess the basic infrastructure** (*Art.7.2.f in the SPA/BD Protocol*)

Administrative premises in the site, visitors' facilities (reception centre, trails, signs...), specific information, education and awareness materials.

**(Score: 0 = Very Insufficient / 1 = Low / 2 = Fair / 3 = Excellent)**

**Assess the equipment**

Guard posts and signs on the main accesses, means to respond to emergencies, marine and terrestrial vehicles, radio and communication equipments. *See 9.2.3. in AF.*

**(Score: 0 = Very Insufficient / 1 = Low / 2 = Fair / 3 = Excellent)**