

Decision IG.24/6**Identification and Conservation of Sites of Particular Ecological Interest in the Mediterranean, including Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance**

The Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and the Coastal Region of the Mediterranean and its Protocols at their 21st Meeting,

Recalling the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, entitled “The future we want”, endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolution 66/288 of 27 July 2012, in particular those paragraphs relevant to oceans and sea and biodiversity,

Recalling also General Assembly resolution 70/1 of 25 September 2015, entitled “Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development”, and acknowledging the importance of conservation, the sustainable use and management of biodiversity in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals,

Recalling further the United Nations Environment Assembly resolution UNEP/EA.4/Res.10 of 15 March 2019, entitled “Innovation on biodiversity and land degradation”,

Mindful of the objectives of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, including the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including the Sustainable Development Goals, in particular Goal 14: Life below water,

Bearing in mind the international community’s commitment expressed in the Ministerial Declaration of the United Nations Environment Assembly at its fourth session to undertake actions to restore and protect marine and coastal ecosystems,

Noting with appreciation the comprehensive and preparatory process for the development of an ambitious and transformational post-2020 global biodiversity framework,

Recalling the Memorandum of Understanding between the United Nations Environment Programme in its Capacity as Secretariat of the Mediterranean Action Plan (UNEP/MAP) and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) on behalf of the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM), and *underlining* the need to implement measures to avoid significant adverse impact of fisheries on threatened Coral Species under annex II to the Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean and to comply with obligations under articles 11 and 12 of the Protocol,

Having regard to the Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean, in particular articles 8, 16, 19 and 23 and annex I thereof, on the establishment of the list of Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance; guidelines and common criteria; publicity, information, public awareness and education; reports to the Parties; and the common criteria for the choice of protected marine and coastal areas that could be included in the list of Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance, respectively,

Recalling Decision IG.17/12, adopted by the Contracting Parties at their 15th Meeting (COP 15) (Almeria, Spain, 15-18 January 2008), on the procedure for the revision of the areas included in the list of Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance, stating that for each of the Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance, a periodic review should be carried out every six years by a mixed national/independent technical advisory commission,

Recalling also Decision IG.19/13, adopted by the Contracting Parties at their 16th Meeting (COP 16) (Marrakesh, Morocco, 3-5 November 2009), on the Regional Working Programme for the Coastal and Marine Protected Areas in the Mediterranean, Including the High Sea,

Recalling further the mandate of SPA/RAC within the MAP-Barcelona Convention System and its relevance to the implementation of this Decision,

Recalling Decision IG.22/13, adopted by the Contracting Parties at their 19th Meeting (COP 19) (Athens, Greece, 9-12 February 2016), on the roadmap for a comprehensive coherent network of well-managed marine protected areas to achieve Aichi Target 11 in the Mediterranean,

Recalling also Decision IG.23/9, adopted by the Contracting Parties at their 20th Meeting (COP 20) (Tirana, Albania, 17-20 December 2017), on the identification and conservation of sites of particular ecological interest in the Mediterranean, including Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance,

Taking note of the definition of “other effective area-based conservation measures” adopted by Decision 14/8 of the 14th Meeting of the conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (Sharm El-Sheikh, Egypt, 17-29 November 2018),

Considering the outcomes of the fourteenth meeting of the thematic focal points for specially protected areas and biological diversity (SPA/BD Thematic Focal Points) (Portoroz, Slovenia, 18-21 June 2019)¹,

Expressing appreciation for the progress made by the Contracting Parties towards achieving the quantitative aspects of Aichi Target 11 in the Mediterranean, and especially with regard to marine protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures coverage estimated to 8.9% of the Mediterranean Sea, and noting the need to further advance to achieve a comprehensive coherent network of well-managed marine protected areas, as the above-mentioned overall coverage shows a geographical unbalance and a strong bias regarding the type of ecosystems protected, as they are mainly coastal and located in waters less than 50 meters deep, resulting in an under-representation of deeper ecosystems,

Having considered the proposals made respectively by France, Italy, Slovenia and Spain, pursuant to article 9(3) of the Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean, and as decided by the 14th Meeting of the SPA/BD Thematic Focal Points (Portoroz, Slovenia, 18-21 June 2019) in accordance with article 25 (h) of the Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean, to include four new areas in the list of Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance,

Having also considered the results of the ordinary review of Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance submitted to the SPA/BD Thematic Focal Points at their 14th Meeting (Portoroz, Slovenia, 18-21 June 2019) and to their recommendations,

Deeply concerned by the outcome of the 2019 ordinary review of Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance, where five Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance out of the 19 reviewed are recommended to be included into a period of provisional nature in line with Decision IG.17/12 (COP 15, Almeria, Spain, 15-18 January 2008) on the procedure for the revision of the areas included in the list of Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance,

¹ See UNEP/MED WG.468/Inf.7 (“Reports of the MAP Components’ Focal Points Meetings (April-June 2019)”: Report of the 14th Meeting of SPA/BD Thematic Focal Points (UNEP/MED WG.461/28)).

1. *Strongly encourage* the Contracting Parties to take significant action towards achieving in the Mediterranean Aichi Target 11, including through setting up an effective and equitable management, enhancing ecological representativeness, connectivity and integration of their marine and coastal protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures into the wider landscape and seascape;
2. *Request* the Secretariat to elaborate an ambitious and transformational post-2020 roadmap on marine protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures in the Mediterranean, in line with the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework of the Convention on Biological Diversity and other regional and global processes, and in consultation with relevant global and regional organizations, for consideration by the Contracting Parties at their 22nd Meeting (COP 22);
3. *Decide* to set up a multidisciplinary ad hoc group of experts for marine protected areas in the Mediterranean to support the Secretariat and the Contracting Parties to progress with the 2020 and post-2020 marine protected areas agenda in the Mediterranean and to work on related issues such as preparing guidelines, setting up definitions and measurable indicators, and tailoring global concepts and approaches to the Mediterranean context;
4. *Request* the Secretariat to establish a directory of Mediterranean Specially Protected Areas according to Articles 16 (guidelines and common criteria), 19 (publicity, information, public awareness and education) and 23 (reports of the Parties) of the Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean, and the Specially Protected Areas Regional Activity Centre to elaborate criteria for inclusion of specially protected areas in the directory, for consideration by the Contracting Parties at their 22nd Meeting (COP 22);
5. *Encourage* the Contracting Parties to promote the role of marine protected areas as reference sites under the Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Programme of the Mediterranean Sea and Coast and Related Assessment Criteria;
6. *Decide* to include the Cerbère-Banyuls Marine Nature Reserve (France), the Egadi Islands Marine Protected Area (Italy), the Landscape Park Strunjan (Slovenia) and the Cetaceans Migration Corridor in the Mediterranean (Spain) in the list of Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance;
7. *Encourage* further cooperation and collaboration in the management and conservation of Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance among Contracting Parties as well as among individual Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance, mainly through (i) technical, institutional and financial support; (ii) transfer of technology; (iii) capacity-building; (iv) best practices and experience sharing; and (v) twinning and other appropriate means;
8. *Request* the Secretariat to draft the concepts in order to set up the Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance Day and Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance Certificate (Mediterranean Diploma for Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance), and submit them for consideration by the Contracting Parties at their 22nd Meeting (COP 22);
9. *Decide* to include the five Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance listed below in a period of provisional nature of a maximum of six years:
 - Palm Islands Nature Reserve (Lebanon),
 - Tyre Coast Nature Reserve (Lebanon),
 - Kneiss Islands (Tunisia),
 - La Galite Archipelago (Tunisia), and
 - Zembra and Zembretta National Park (Tunisia);

10. *Request* the Secretariat to support as a matter of priority Lebanon and Tunisia in identifying and launching a set of adequate corrective measures and informing the 15th Meeting of the SPA/BD Focal Points of the progress made, and encourage other Parties, other SPAMIs and appropriate funding mechanisms to contribute to their implementation;

11. *Request* Lebanon and Tunisia to inform the 15th Meeting of the SPA/BD Focal Points about the identification and launching of the adequate corrective measures for these areas;

12. *Welcome* the willingness of the Environmental Fund for Mediterranean marine protected areas (The MedFund) to support the Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance in general, and in particular those included in a period of provisional nature, and encourage support and sponsorship from any other relevant donors;

13. *Adopt* the updated format for the periodic review of Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance, as set out in the Annex to this Decision, and request the Secretariat to reflect it accordingly in the online evaluation system of Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance;

14. *Request* the Secretariat to work with the relevant designated national authorities in Cyprus, France, Italy, Morocco and Spain to carry out the ordinary periodic review for the 11 Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance listed below, in accordance with the procedure established in Decision IG.17/12, adopted by the Contracting Parties at their 15th Meeting (COP 15) (Almeria, Spain, 15-18 January 2008), and bring the outcome of that review process to the attention of the Contracting Parties at their 22nd Meeting (COP 22);

15. The following five Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance are to be reviewed in 2020:

- Lara-Toxeftra Turtle Reserve (Cyprus),
- Marine Protected Area of Tavolara-Punta Coda Cavallo (Italy),
- Marine Protected Area and Natural Reserve of Torre Guaceto (Italy),
- Miramare Marine Protected Area (Italy), and
- Plemmirio Marine Protected Area (Italy);

16. The following six Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance are to be reviewed in 2021:

- Bouches de Bonifacio Nature Reserve (France),
- Marine Protected Area of Capo Caccia-Isola Piana (Italy),
- Punta Campanella Marine Protected Area (Italy),
- Al-Hoceima National Park (Morocco),
- Archipelago of Cabrera National Park (Spain), and
- Maro-Cerro Gordo Cliffs (Spain).

Annex

**Updated Format for the periodic review of Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean
Importance (SPAMIs)**

Updated Format for the periodic review of SPAMIs

www.rac-spa.org/spami_eval

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.

During their COP 15 (Almeria, Spain, January 2008), the Contracting Parties adopted a procedure for the revision of the areas included in the SPAMI List and requested SPA/RAC to implement it.

The procedure aims to evaluate the SPAMI sites in order to examine whether they meet the [SPA/BD Protocol's](#) criteria. An ordinary review of SPAMIs shall take place every six years, counting from the date of the inclusion of the site in the SPAMI List.

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| 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 |
|----------------------------|---|-------|
| 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. Assessment scale: 0 = No, 1 = Yes | ? |
| Score justification | | |
| | | |

| | Score |
|--|-------|
| <p>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.</p> <p>Assessment scale: 0 = Significant changes 1 = Moderate changes 2 = Slight changes 3 = No adverse change</p> | ? |
| Score justification | |

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

2. LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

| | Score |
|--|-------|
| <p>2.1 The legal status of the SPAMI (with reference to its legal status at the date of the previous evaluation report).</p> <p>Assessment scale: 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> | ? |
| Score justification | |

| | Score |
|--|-------|
| <p>2.2 Are competencies and responsibilities clearly defined in the texts governing the area?</p> <p>Assessment scale: 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> | ? |
| Score justification | |

| | Score |
|---|-------|
| <p>2.3 Does the area have a management body, endowed with sufficient powers? (Not applicable for multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMIs)</p> <p>Assessment scale: 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 and sufficient powers to implement the conservation measures</p> | ? |
| Score justification | |

In the case of multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMIs:

| | Score |
|--|-------|
| <p>2.4 Does the area have governance bodies in line with the original application for inclusion in the SPAMI List?</p> <p>Assessment scale: 0= No governance bodies 1= Only some governance bodies are in place 2= The governance bodies are in place, but they are not functioning on a regular basis (e.g.: no regular meetings or works) 3= The SPAMI has fully dedicated governance bodies and sufficient powers to address the conservation challenges</p> | ? |
| Score justification | |

3. MANAGEMENT AND AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES

| | Score |
|---|-------|
| <p>3.1 Does the SPAMI have a management plan? Assessment scale: 0 = No management plan 1 = The level of implementation of the management plan is assessed as “insufficient” 2 = The management plan is not officially adopted but its implementation is assessed as “adequate” 3 = The management plan is officially adopted and adequately implemented</p> | ? |
| Score justification | |

| | Score |
|--|-------|
| <p>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 Protocol and Section 8.2.3 of the Annotated Format (AF²). Assessment scale: 0 = Low 1 = Medium 2 = Good 3 = Excellent</p> | ? |
| Score justification | |

| | Score |
|--|-------|
| <p>3.3 Assess the adequacy of the human resources available to the SPAMI. Assessment scale: 0 = Very low/Insufficient 1 = Low 2 = Adequate 3 = Excellent</p> | ? |
| Score justification | |

| | Score |
|--|-------|
| | |

² Annotated format for the presentation reports for the areas proposed for inclusion of the SPAMI list

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>3.4 Assess the adequacy of the financial and material means available to the SPAMI (Not applicable for multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMIs)</p> <p>Assessment scale: 0 = Very low 1 = Low 2 = Adequate 3 = Excellent</p> | ? |
| <p>Score justification</p> | |

In the case of multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMIs:

| <p>3.4.1. Assess the adequacy of the financial and material means available for the implementation of the SPAMI conservation/management measures at national level</p> <p>Assessment scale: 0 = Low 1 = Medium 2 = Good 3 = Excellent</p> | <table border="1" style="width: 100%; height: 100%;"> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Score</th> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">?</td> </tr> </table> | Score | ? |
|--|--|-------|---|
| Score | | | |
| ? | | | |
| <p>Score justification</p> | | | |

In the case of multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMIs:

| <p>3.4.2. Assess the adequacy of the financial and material means available to the multilateral governance bodies of the SPAMI</p> <p>Assessment scale: 0= Low 1= Medium 2= Good 3= Excellent</p> | <table border="1" style="width: 100%; height: 100%;"> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Score</th> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">?</td> </tr> </table> | Score | ? |
|--|--|-------|---|
| Score | | | |
| ? | | | |
| <p>Score justification</p> | | | |

| | Score |
|---|-------|
| <p>3.5 Does the area have a monitoring programme? Assessment scale: 0 = No monitoring programme 1 = The level of implementation of the monitoring programme is assessed as “insufficient” 2 = The monitoring programme needs improvement to cover other parameters that are significant for the SPAMI 3 = 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>Score justification If the TAC identified important parameters that are not covered by the monitoring programme of the SPAMI, these should be listed here with the related rationale.</p> | |

| | Score |
|---|-------|
| <p>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? Assessment scale: 0 = Low 1 = Medium 2 = Good 3 = Excellent</p> | ? |
| <p>Score justification</p> | |

| | Score |
|--|-------|
| <p>3.7 Is the management plan effectively implemented? Assessment scale: 0= Low 1= Medium 2= Good 3= Excellent</p> | ? |
| <p>Score justification</p> | |

| | Score |
|--|-------|
| <p>3.8 Have any concrete conservation measures, activities and actions been implemented?</p> <p>Assessment scale: 0 = Low 1 = Medium 2 = Good 3 = Excellent</p> | ? |
| Score justification | |

SECTION II: FEATURES PROVIDING A VALUE-ADDED TO THE AREA*(Section B4 of the Annex I, and other obligatory for a SPAMI, and Art. 6 and 7 of the 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 Annex I).****In particular:**

| | Score |
|--|-------|
| 4.1.1. a) Unregulated exploitation of natural resources (e.g. sand mining, water, timber, living resources) See 5.1.1. in AF Score: 0 means “no threats”; 3 means “very serious threats” | ? |
| Score justification | |

| | Score |
|---|-------|
| 4.1.1. b) Efforts (actions) undertaken during the evaluation period to address/mitigate the unregulated exploitation of natural resources (e.g. sand mining, water, timber, living resources) See 5.1.1. in AF Score: 0 means “no effort”; 3 means “significant effort” | ? |
| Score justification | |

| | Score |
|--|-------|
| 4.1.2. a) Threats to habitats and species (e.g. disturbance, desiccation, pollution, poaching, introduced alien species) See 5.1.2. in AF Score: 0 means “no threats”; 3 means “very serious threats” | ? |
| Score justification | |

| | Score |
|---|-------|
| 4.1.2. b) Efforts (actions) undertaken during the evaluation period to address/mitigate the threats to habitats and species (e.g. disturbance, desiccation, pollution, poaching, introduced alien species) See 5.1.2. in AF Score: 0 means “no effort”; 3 means “significant effort” | ? |
| Score justification | |

| | Score |
|--|-------|
| <p>4.1.3. a) Increase of human impact (e.g. tourism, boats, building, immigration...) See 5.1.3. in AF Score: 0 means “no threats”; 3 means “very serious threats”</p> | ? |
| Score justification | |

| | Score |
|---|-------|
| <p>4.1.3. b) Efforts (actions) undertaken during the evaluation period to address/mitigate the increase of human impact (e.g. tourism, boats, building, immigration...) See 5.1.3. in AF Score: 0 means “no effort”; 3 means “significant effort”</p> | ? |
| Score justification | |

| | Score |
|--|-------|
| <p>4.1.4. a) Conflicts between users or user groups. See 5.1.4. and 6.2. in AF Score: 0 means “no threats”; 3 means “very serious threats”</p> | ? |
| Score justification | |

| | Score |
|---|-------|
| <p>4.1.4. b) Efforts (actions) undertaken during the evaluation period to address/mitigate the conflicts between users or user groups. See 5.1.4. and 6.2. in AF Score: 0 means “no effort”; 3 means “significant effort”</p> | ? |
| Score justification | |

| |
|--|
| <p>Please include here a prescriptive list of threats (not evaluated or mentioned above) that are of concern and are evaluated individually</p> |
|--|

4.2 Assess the level of external threats to the ecological, biological, aesthetic and cultural values of the area (B4.a of the Annex I) and the efforts made to address/mitigate them. See 5.2. in the AF

In particular:

| | Score |
|---|-------|
| <p>4.2.1. a) Pollution problems from external sources including solid waste and those affecting waters up-current. See 5.2.1. in the AF. Score: 0 means “no threats”; 3 means “very serious threats”</p> | ? |
| Score justification | |

| | Score |
|--|-------|
| <p>4.2.1. b) Efforts (actions) undertaken during the evaluation period to address/mitigate the pollution problems from external sources including solid waste and those affecting waters up-current. See 5.2.1. in the AF. Score: 0 means “no effort”; 3 means “significant effort”</p> | ? |
| Score justification | |

| | Score |
|--|-------|
| <p>4.2.2. a) Significant impacts on landscapes and on cultural values. See 5.2.2 in AF. Score: 0 means “no threats”; 3 means “very serious threats”</p> | ? |
| Score justification | |

| | Score |
|---|-------|
| <p>4.2.2. b) Efforts (actions) undertaken during the evaluation period to address/mitigate the significant impacts on landscapes and on cultural values. See 5.2.2 in AF. Score: 0 means “no effort”; 3 means “significant effort”</p> | ? |
| Score justification | |

| | Score |
|--|-------|
| 4.2.3. a) Expected development of threats upon the surrounding area. See 6.1. in AF. Score: 0 means “no threats”; 3 means “very serious threats” | ? |
| Score justification | |

| | Score |
|---|-------|
| 4.2.3. b) Efforts (actions) undertaken during the evaluation period to address/mitigate the expected development of threats upon the surrounding area. See 6.1. in AF. Score: 0 means “no effort”; 3 means “significant effort” | ? |
| Score justification | |

Please include here a prescriptive list of threats (not evaluated or mentioned above) that are of concern and are evaluated individually:

Please include the list of threats (not evaluated or mentioned above) that were of concern and were eliminated or solved:

4.3 Is there an integrated coastal management plan or land-use laws in the area bordering or surrounding the SPAMI? (B4.e Annex I). See 5.2.3. in AF

| | Score |
|----------------------------|-------|
| Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes | ? |
| Score justification | |

4.4 Does the management plan for the SPAMI have influence over the governance of the surrounding area? (D5.d Annex I). See 7.4.4. in the AF

| | Score |
|----------------------------|-------|
| Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes | ? |
| Score justification | |

5. ENFORCEMENT OF PROTECTION MEASURES

5.1 Assess the degree of enforcement of the protection measures

In particular:

| | Score |
|---|-------|
| 5.1.1. Are the area boundaries adequately marked on land and, if applicable, adequately marked at sea? See 8.3.1. in AF (Not applicable for multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMIs) Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes | ? |
| Score justification | |

In the case of multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMI:

| | Score |
|---|-------|
| 5.1.1. a) Is the area officially depicted on the international marine / terrestrial maps? Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes | ? |
| Score justification | |

In the case of multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMI:

| | Score |
|--|-------|
| 5.1.1. b) Is the area officially reported on the marine / terrestrial maps of each SPAMI Member State? Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes | ? |
| Score justification | |

In the case of multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMI:

| | Score |
|---|-------|
| 5.1.1. c) Are the coordinates of the area easily accessible (maps, internet, etc.)? Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes | ? |
| Score justification | |

| | |
|--|--------------|
| | Score |
| 5.1.2. 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 | ? |
| Score justification | |

| | |
|--|--------------|
| | Score |
| 5.1.3. Are third party agencies also empowered to enforce regulations relating to the SPAMI protective measures? (Not applicable for multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMIs) Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes | ? |
| Score justification | |

| | |
|--|--------------|
| | Score |
| 5.1.4. Are there adequate penalties and powers for effective enforcement? See 8.3.4. in AF Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes | ? |
| Score justification | |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| | Score |
| 5.1.5. Is the field staff empowered to impose sanctions? See 8.3.4. in AF Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes | ? |
| Score justification | |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| | Score |
| 5.1.6. Has the area established a contingency plan to face accidental pollution or other serious emergencies? (Art. 7.3. in the Protocol, Recommendation of the 13th Meeting of Contracting Parties) Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes | ? |
| Score justification | |

6. COOPERATION AND NETWORKING

| | Score |
|---|--------------|
| <p>6.1 Are other national or international organizations collaborating to provide human or financial resources? (e.g. researchers, experts, volunteers...). See 9.1.3. in the AF Score: 0 = No / 1 = Weakly / 2 = Fairly / 3 = Excellent</p> | ? |
| Score justification | |

| | Score |
|---|--------------|
| <p>6.2 Assess the level of cooperation and exchange with other SPAMIs (especially in other nations) (Art. 8, Art. 21.1, Art. 22.1., Art. 22.3 of the Protocol, A.d in Annex I) Score: 0 = No / 1 = Insufficient / 2 = Fairly / 3 = Excellent</p> | ? |
| Score justification | |

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

(If applicable: Not applicable for SPAMIs undergoing their first ordinary periodic review)

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

| | Score |
|--|-------|
| Assessment scale: 0 = 'No' for all of them 1 = 'Yes' for some of them 2 = 'Yes' for most of them 3 = 'Yes' for all of them | ? |

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

| | Score |
|--|-------|
| Assessment scale: 0 = 'No' for all of them 1 = 'Yes' for some of them 2 = 'Yes' for most of them 3 = 'Yes' for all of them | ? |

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: ?

(Coastal national SPAMI - max: 7; Multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMI - max: 7)

2. LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

Total Score: ?

(Coastal national SPAMI - max: 6; Multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMI - max: 7)

3. MANAGEMENT AND AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES

Total Score: ?

(Coastal national SPAMI - max: 24; Multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMI - max: 27)

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

4. THREATS AND SURROUNDING CONTEXT

Total Score: ?

(Coastal national SPAMI - max: 42; Multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMI - max: 42)

5. ENFORCEMENT OF PROTECTION MEASURES

Total Score: ?

(Coastal national SPAMI - max: 6; Multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMI - max: 7)

6. COOPERATION AND NETWORKING

Total Score: ?

(Coastal national SPAMI - max: 6; Multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMI - max: 6)

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

1. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE PREVIOUS EVALUATIONS (Not applicable for SPAMIs undergoing their first ordinary periodic review)

Total Score: ?

(National SPAMI - max: 6; Multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMI - max: 6)

GRAND TOTAL SCORE: ?

(National SPAMI - max: 99³; Multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMI - max: 104⁴)

³ 93 if the SPAMI is subject to its first ordinary periodic review.

⁴ 98 if the SPAMI is subject to its first ordinary periodic review.

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 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, or 3.6
- a score < 2 for 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 69⁵ for a coastal national SPAMI or less than 72⁶ for a multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMI (=70% of the maximum total score of 99 and 104, respectively).

| |
|--|
| CONCLUSION (BASED ON THE SCORE EVALUATION) BY THE TAC FOR THE PRESENT EVALUATION: |
|--|

| |
|--|
| RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE TAC FOR THE FUTURE EVALUATION: |
|--|

Recommendation 1:

Recommendation 2:

etc.

SIGNATURES

National Focal Point

Independent Experts

SPAMI Manager(s)

National Expert

⁵ 65 if the SPAMIs subject to its first periodic review.

⁶ 68 if the SPAMI is subject to its first ordinary periodic review.