

Format for the Periodic Review of the SPAMIs

SPAMI Name : MIRAMARE MPA

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

(Art. 8.2. of the Protocol and General Principles and C and D of Annex I)

In each question, crossed references to the Annotated Format (AF) are given.

1. CONSERVATION STATUS

1.1. Does the SPAMI fulfill one of the criteria related to Mediterranean interest as presented in Protocol's (Annex I section B para. 2), strictly maintain the status of populations of its protected species (those in Annex II to the Protocol), the status of its habitats and no adverse significant changes in the functioning of its ecosystems? (Article 8.2.) (See 3.4. and 4 in the AF)

1.1: YES: a) Uniqueness.

Cfr Annotated format, "Executive summary":

"the protected area constitutes a unique environment, in itself able to represent the full complement of special features of the Gulf of Trieste. In addition, there is an important tidal zone with an excursion of about 2 m, which is an unusual feature for the Mediterranean, where tidal excursions are not so large"

1.2 If "yes", are the objectives, set out in the original SPAMI application for designation, actively pursued?

In detail, the objectives pursued are:

- Impart knowledge about the environmental and ecological features of the areas, with technical/scientific activity.
- Develop relationships with the adult population through the schools. Here, schoolchildren visiting CEAM can spread knowledge and values within their own social nuclei.
- Broaden the physical limits of the protected area. This concept can be included considering that the action of education and consequent response in behaviour can be expressed beyond the limits of the Reserve itself – "if I don't pollute within a protected area because it is wrong, I won't do it outside either". Extending educational activities beyond the limits of the Reserve means a cultural broadening of the protected area.
- Propose a new environmental tourism, offering new ways to use the sea.
- Modify positively the existing, widespread forms of marine environmental tourism.
- Act as a support instrument for schools, offering field activities.
- Update and train teachers and/or operators working within areas of a similar kind. The proposals include experimental training courses using simulation to present the methodologies applied in the CEAM activities.

2. LEGAL STATUS

2.1. Does the area maintains or has improved its legal protection status from the date of the previous report? (A-e and C-2, Annex I).

See 7.1.2 in the AF

YES, even improved:

- “decreto anti-inchino”: ordinanza 44/14 del 28/10/14, “*Limitazione della Navigazione nelle fasce di mare prospicienti la riserva Marina di Miramare*”
- Natura2000 Site of Interest

2.2. Does the legal declaration of this area consider the conservation of natural values as the primary objective? (A-a and D1 in Annex I).

See 7.1.3 in the AF

YES, the “protection and enhancement of the environment and geomorphological characteristics, the bentonic and pelagic fauna and flora of the area concerned”

2.3. Are competencies and responsibilities clearly defined in the texts governing the area? (D4 Annex I). See 7.4.3 in the AF

The protected area is governed by the institutional decree of november 12th, 1986. Its management regulation has been provided by the Ministry of Environment (last edition: 2009). The management body is WWF Italy, as per the management agreement undersigned with the Ministry of Environment

2.4. Are external influences/threats been taken into account in the legal framework of the SPAMI? Does the legal text clearly establish coordination means between land and sea authorities? (D4 Annex I, Art.7.4. in the Protocol).

WWF Italy, among all the italian MPAs, is the sole operator not being a public body. Such fact means that any collaboration with local authorities needs specific protocols and agreements.

The most relevant action in this regard was the establishment of the UNESCO MAB Reserve (see attached maps) the Marine Protected Area of Miramare and its coast that includes the signing of memoranda of understanding with all local authorities who control the Gulf of Trieste and its famous coast. The goal of these partnerships is the implementation of sustainable development models linked, for example in the fishing and agriculture. The most important are the ones signed with the Region "Friuli Venezia Giulia", for its expertise on marine and coastal planning, and with the Port Authority of Trieste, which regulates the maritime trade including those of the oil tankers directed to SIOT terminal. There is also a specific institutional cooperation with the Port Police for enforcement and surveillance at sea

Indicate measures that have been adopted to address these influences/threats. In case of any “no” answer, indicate the reasons that have motivated the deficiencies and, if possible, the date in which they are expected to be overcome.

- Miramare MPA takes part in an active way to the Environmental Impact Assessment of such proposals.

- Becoming an UNESCO MAB Reserve will give further strength to our conservation efforts

3. **MANAGEMENT METHODS (General principles D Annex 1)**

3.1. Does the area have the same or an improved management body/authority as when the SPAMI was established and/or last evaluated?

Existence of a management body with sufficient powers (*Art. 7.2.d, 7.2.f*). *D6 - Annex I: "To be included in the SPAMI List, a protected area must have a management body, endowed with sufficient powers as well as means and human resources to prevent and/or control activities likely to be contrary to the aims of the protected area". See 8.1. in the AF*

Yes

3.2. Is the management plan in force?

Has the management plan been officially adopted? (*D7 Annex I*). See 8.2.1, 8.2.2. in the AF

YES (ISEA)

3.3. Does the management plan address the requirements set out in article 7 of the Protocol and Section 8.2.3 of the Annotated Format?

YES - Miramare MPA has adopted an ISEA national standardized three-years management plan, approved by the Ministry of Environment. It is available on a specific website (see attachments: 2011-2013 Management Plan, and 2011-2013 Three-year Management Results).

Miramare MPA management plan is based on the identification of specific conservation biotargets that are related to pursuant management strategies; the strategies are funded annually by the State (see: conceptual model of the management plan).

The participation of local stakeholders was guaranteed until 2008 by a specific "Commission" intervening in the work programs; this Commission had only a consultative role and then was suppressed in all the Italian MPAs. Recently they have been reactivated and the one for Miramare is presently awaiting the appointment of its new members.

An important implication of local stakeholders has been ensured along the project leading to the MAB-UNESCO reserve; this project provided a table of coordination with local authorities. Nowadays the managing body of the MPA collaborates with the Coastal Action Group "Friuli Venezia Giulia" for the development of "pescaturismo", sustainable fishing and nature tourism.

As for fundraising activity applied to the management, WWF Italy has recently implemented a project with Telecom Italy Foundation: this activity aimed at the environmental monitoring of the surrounding areas and to the dissemination of the data which were collected.

The regulation of the MPA is operational and effective, as complementary local regulations are banning any fishing in the area surrounding the National Reserve. The permanent staff of the MPA is provided by the "WWF Oasi", the inhouse company of WWF and by SHORELINE cooperative.

More details useful for the evaluation of the management plan are addressed in question 7.1 of this questionnaire.

In case of any “no” answer, indicate the reasons that have motivated the deficiencies and, if possible, the date in which they are expected to be overcome.

4. AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES AND INFORMATION

4.1. Is there basic equipment, human and financial resources ensured to the management body?

(Art. 7.2.d, 7.2.f. D6 in Annex I: “To be included in the SPAMI List, a protected area must have a management body, endowed with sufficient powers as well as means and human resources to prevent and/or control activities likely to be contrary to the aims of the protected area”). See 9.1, 9.2. in the AF

Yes - The annual funds are allocated by the Italian Ministry of the Environment to all national MPAs according to a set of criteria that take into account the biodiversity, the extension of the area, the level of human pressure, the effectiveness of its management and the spending capability (SoDeCri scheme).

Miramare management body is co-financing the activities with own resources and special projects as for about 35%.

4.2. Does the area have a monitoring program?

(D8 - Annex I: “The program should include the identification and monitoring of a certain number of significant parameters for the area in question, in order to allow the assessment of the state and evolution of the area, as well as the effectiveness of protection and management measures implemented, so that they may be adapted if need be”). See 9.3.3. in the AF

YES

If yes, what are the monitoring parameters and the management objectives being addressed by these parameters?

Miramare MPA has an annual monitoring program (see attached document) which is checking the overall status of the area and the biotargets listed in the management plan. As from 2013, Miramare is enrolled in a program coordinated by the Ministry of environment, aiming at the environmental accounting of the biological resources (i.e. evaluation of protected stocks and areals, calculation of species biomass).

4.3 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?

Yes, there is a specific monitoring program of the results being achieved, as reflected in the conceptual model of the management plan.

All management processes undergo EMAS certification. The certification has recently been renewed by an accredited institution.

In case of any “no” answer, indicate the reasons that have motivated the deficiencies, their relative seriousness, and the date in which they are expected to be overcome.

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

5. THREATS AND SURROUNDING CONTEXT

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

See 5.1. consider also 3.5.2.b, 6.3 & 6.4. in the AF

In particular:

Unregulated exploitation of natural resources

(e.g. sand mining, water, timber, living resources) See 5.1.1. in the AF

(SCORE: 0 means "very serious threats"; 3 means "no threats")

SCORE: 3

Serious threats to habitats and species (e.g. disturbance, desiccation, pollution, poaching, introduced alien species) See 5.1.2. in the AF

(SCORE: 0 means "very serious threats"; 3 means "no threats")

SCORE: 2

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")

SCORE: 3

Historic and current conflicts between users or user groups See 5.1.4., 6.2. in the AF

(SCORE: 0 means "very serious threats"; 3 means "no threats"):

SCORE: 3

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

- the healing of the wall facing the sea along Miramare promontory
- the dredging of the nearby Monfalcone port

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

Management objectives are monitored also in reference to specific anthropogenic pressures, over which we try to intervene with outreach programs and environmental awareness.

The MPA is also a Site of Community Importance, hence it participate to the Environmental Impact Assessment within and outside its borders if there may be any negative impacts to the biological resources.

For example:

- a study has been drawn for the Environmental Impact Assessment for maintaining works of the wall facing the sea along the promontory.
- observations were made for the EIA of an Liquefied Natural Gas terminal in the Gulf of Trieste and for the new master plan for the Port of Trieste.

In particular:

Pollution problems from external sources including solid waste and those affecting waters up-current. See 5.2.1. in the AF

(SCORE: 0 means “very serious threats”; 3 means “no threats”)

SCORE: 1 (minor wastewater treatment plants, local torrents)

Significant impacts on landscapes and on cultural values. See 5.2.2

(SCORE: 0 means “very serious threats”; 3 means “no threats”)

SCORE: 3

Expected development of threats upon the surrounding area See 6.1. in the AF

(SCORE: 0 means “very serious threats”; 3 means “no threats”)

SCORE: 2

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

- the maintenance works of the wall facing the sea along Miramare promontory
- the dredging of the nearby Monfalcone port

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

(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

SCORE: 0

5.4. 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 : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

SCORE: 1

6. REGULATIONS

6.1. Assess the degree of legal regulations See 7.4.2. in the AF

The MPA institutional decree of 12/11/1986 provides effective protection through specific prohibitions and activities controlled by the manager, it has further been implemented through the Management Regulation of 2009. Being a marine Site of Community Importance improves the possibilities for protection of specific marine and coastal resources.

At the local level, specific regulations are prohibiting fishing activity in the area surrounding the MPA. Fishing with lamps is also regulated all along the year, as it could affect fish stocks from the MPA.

In particular, within the national framework:

Regulations concerning the strengthening of the application of the other Protocols to the Barcelona Convention, particularly dumping, passage of ships and modification of the soil (*Art. 6b, 6c, 6e in the Protocol, D5-a Annex I*)

(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

SCORE: 1

Regulations on the introduction of any species not indigenous to the specially protected area in question, or of any genetically modified species, (*Art. 6 d in the Protocol, D5-b Annex I*)

(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

SCORE: 1

Regulations concerning the Environmental Impact Assessment for the activities and projects that could significantly affect the protected areas (*Art. 17 in the Protocol*)

(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

SCORE: 1

In particular, within the SPAMI framework:

Regulations for fishing, hunting, taking of animals and harvesting of plants or their destruction, as well as trade with animals, parts of animals, plants, parts of plants, which originate in the area (*Art. 6 g in the Protocol, D5-c Annex I*)

(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

SCORE: 1

7. MANAGEMENT

7.1. 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 the AF

(SCORE: 0= No Management Plan / 1= Weak / 2= Adequate / 3= Excellent)

SCORE: 2

7.2. 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 the AF

(SCORE: 0= Undetermined / 1= Weak / 2= Adequate / 3= Excellent)

SCORE: 3

7.3. Is there a body representing the public, professional and non-governmental sector and the scientific community linked to the management body? (B4b, B4c of the Annex I). See 8.1.2. & 8.1.3

(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

SCORE: 1

7.4. 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)

(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 the AF

(SCORE: 0= No involvement / 1= Low / 2= Adequate / 3= Excellent)

SCORE: 2

- Stakeholders joining MAB agreement
- Coastal Action Group

7.5. Is the management plan binding for other national/local administrations with competencies in the area? See 8.2.2 in the AF

(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

SCORE: 0

8. PROTECTION MEASURES

8.1. 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 the AF

(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

SCORE: 1

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. 8.3.3. in AF

(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

SCORE: 1

Are third party agencies also empowered to enforce regulations relating to the SPAMI protective measures ?

(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

SCORE: 1

Are there adequate penalties and powers for effective enforcement of regulations and is the field staff empowered to impose sanctions? See 8.3.4. in the AF

(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

SCORE: 1

Has the area established a contingency plan to face accidental pollution or other serious emergencies? (*Art. 7.3. in the Protocol, Recom. 13th Parties Meeting*)

(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

SCORE: 1

9. HUMAN RESOURCES

9.1. Adequacy of the human resources available to the management body (*Art.7.2-f in the 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 the AF

Is there a permanent field administrator of the area?

See 9.1.2. in the AF

(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

SCORE: 1

Are there other permanent staffs in the field?
(e.g. technicians, wardens, guides, ...) See 9.1.2. in the AF
(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)
SCORE: 1

9.2. Asses 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 the AF
(SCORE: 0= Very Insufficient / 1= Low / 2= Adequate / 3= Excellent)
SCORE: 3

10. FINANCIAL AND MATERIAL MEANS

10.1. 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 the AF
(SCORE: 0= Very Insufficient / 1= Low / 2= Adequate / 3= Excellent)
The national funding is inadequate, therefore the fundraising activity of the Management body assures the implementation of the management plan.
This situation in fact turns to be a major factor for the long term management of the area.
SCORE: 1

10.2. Assess the basic infrastructure (Art.7.2-f in the 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= Adequate / 3= Excellent)
SCORE: 2

10.3. Assess the equipment.
Guard posts and signs on the main accesses, means to respond to emergencies, marine and terrestrial vehicles, radio and communications equipment. See 9.2.3. in the AF
(SCORE: 0= Very Insufficient / 1= Low / 2= Adequate / 3= Excellent)
SCORE: 3

11. INFORMATION AND KNOWLEDGE

11.1. Assess the extent of knowledge about the area and its surrounding zones. (D3 - Annex I: Considering at least specific maps, habitat distribution, species inventories, and socio-economical factors)
See 9.3.1. in the AF
(SCORE: 0= Very Insufficient / 1= Low / 2= Adequate / 3= Excellent)
SCORE: 3

11.2. Assess the adequacy of the program for data collection and the monitoring program.

See 9.3.2. in the AF

(SCORE: 0= Inexistent / 1= Insufficient / 2= Adequate / 3= Excellent)

SCORE: 3

12. COOPÉRATION AND NETWORKING

Since 2008, Miramare MPA coordinates together with Torre Cerrano MPA, a network of coastal and marine areas along the Adriatic Sea, called AdriaPAN.

AdriaPAN activities and objectives are published on the website www.adriapan.org.

AdriaPAN network is mentioned as an example in the "Maritime Strategy of the European Union for the Adriatic Sea and the Ionian Sea", document adopted by the European Commission and officially presented to the Parliament and the European Council on 30 November 2013 (Com 2012 - 713 final).

Miramare MPA is also part of MEDPAN network, whose activities and objectives are published on the website www.medpan.org.

Since 1979, Miramare is part of Unesco's Biosphere reserves network.

12.1. Are other national or international organizations collaborating with human or financial resources? (e.g. researchers, experts, volunteers..).

See 9.1.3. in the AF

(SCORE: 0= No / 1= Weakly / 2= Satisfactory / 3= Excellent)

SCORE: 3

12.2. 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, A.d in Annex I)

(SCORE: 0= No / 1= Insufficient / 2= Adequate / 3= Excellent)

SCORE: 1

COMMENTS by the Technical Advisory Commission

The Management Body presented to the TAC the activities carried out in the MPA in order to reach the conservation and management goals and fulfill the SPAMI criteria.

The TAC recognises the huge experience of the management body and staff of the MPA, that was the first marine protected area in Italy.

Taking in consideration the presentation, and in particular the foreseen relocation of the offices far from the protected site, the TAC is of the opinion that this might have a negative impact on the management efficiency. The same consequences could be expected from the fact that, the management body is obliged to spend a lot of its time raising additional funds.

CONCLUSION

The TAC changed slightly the values given by the Management Body and is of the opinion that the Miramare MPA fulfills the SPAMI criteria set up in the SPA & BD Protocol.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The TAC appreciated the efforts and the results obtained and presented by the Management Body. In order to further improve the efficiency of the management of the area the TAC suggests:

- to avoid the relocation of the offices or try to identify a new solution allowing to accommodate the management body very close to the marine protected area and to avoid any additional costs due to the actual fragile financial situation of the MPA.

Regarding the improvement of SPAMI management, the TAC suggests to the RAC SPA to facilitate the collaboration among SPAMIs.

Trieste, 03 February 2015

SIGNATURES

National Focal Point

Antonio Tani

Independent Experts

[Signature]

SPAMI Manager(s)

Mario Jek

National Expert

[Signature]

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

SPAMI VALUE-ADDED

Questions		Score obtained	Maximum
5	Threats and surrounding context	18	23
6	Regulations	4	4
7	Management	8	11
8	Protection measures	5	5
9	Human resources	5	5
10	Financial and material means	6	9
11	Information and knowledge	6	6
12	Cooperation and networkings	4	6
TOTAL		56	69