

SPAMI periodic review report

SPAMI name : Cap de Creus Natural Park

Review type : Ordinary Review

Review year : 2024

Members of the Technical Advisory Commission (TAC)

Ponç Feliu Latorre

SPAMI Manager

Francisco Guil Celada

Focal Point

Hocein BAZAIRI

Independent Expert

Kate Hogg

Independent Expert

Bernat Hereu

National Expert

SPAMI periodic review report

SPAMI name: Cap de Creus Natural Park

Review year: 2024

Section I: 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))

1. MEDITERRANEAN VALUE OF THE SPAMI

	<u>Score</u>
<p>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.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No : 0 Yes : 1</p>	1
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The SPAMI has important meadows of <i>Posidonia oceanica</i>, maerl beds, deep canyons, submerged or partially submerged sea caves. It is also home to important endangered species under the Annex of the SPA protocol: <i>Tursiops truncatus</i>, <i>Caretta caretta</i>, <i>Pinna nobilis</i>, <i>Corallium rubrum</i> as well as 8 important seabirds such as <i>Larus audouinii</i> and <i>Hydrobates pelagicus</i>.</p>	

	<u>Score</u>
<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><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>Significant changes : 0 Moderate changes : 1 Slight changes : 2 No adverse change : 3</p>	2

Rationale for the note

The monitoring activities undertaken by the University of Barcelona did not detect major changes in the habitats and species of the SPAMI. Some fish populations have increased in abundance.

However some slight adverse changes have been observed due to climate change as well as the mortality of *Pinna nobilis* which has been general in the Western Mediterranean and not due to the management of the SPAMI.

	<u>Score</u>
<p>1.3. Are the objectives, set out in the original SPAMI application for designation, actively pursued?</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No : 0</p> <p>Only some of them : 1</p> <p>Yes for most of them : 2</p> <p>Yes for all of them : 3</p>	3
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The SPAMI is actively pursuing the conservation and management of the species and habitats in the area and in particular those under the Annexes of the SPA protocol.</p>	

2. LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

	<u>Score</u>
<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><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>Significant negative change in the legal status of the SPAMI : 0</p> <p>Slight negative change in the legal status of the SPAMI : 1</p> <p>The SPAMI has maintained or improved its legal status : 2</p>	2
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The Legal status of the SPAMI has not changed.</p> <p>In addition, the Generalitat de Catalunya has declared a moratorium on the extraction of red Coral (<i>Corallium rubrum</i>) in all Catalan waters from 2017 to 2027. It will be re-evaluated in 2027 based on the status of conservation of the species.</p>	

Score

<p>2.2. Are competencies and responsibilities clearly defined in the texts governing the area?</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>Competencies and responsibilities are not clearly defined : 0</p> <p>The definition of competencies and responsibilities needs slight improvements : 1</p> <p>The SPAMI has clearly defined competencies and responsibilities : 2</p>	<p>2</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The legal texts governing the area clearly define the mandates and responsibilities for various actors involved in the management of the area and the natural resources.</p>	

<u>Score</u>	
<p>2.3. Does the area have a management body, endowed with sufficient powers?</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No management body, or the management body is not endowed with sufficient powers : 0</p> <p>The management body is not fully dedicated to the SPAMI : 1</p> <p>The SPAMI has a fully dedicated management body and sufficient powers to implement the conservation measures : 2</p>	<p>1</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The SPAMI has a fully dedicated management body that has clear mandates for the management of the area.</p> <p>However, given that most of the coastal lands are private property, some of the conservation measures require the approval of land owners to be implemented. (there are over 6000 Land owners in the area of the Park)</p>	

3. MANAGEMENT AND AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES

<u>Score</u>	
<p>3.1. Does the SPAMI have a management plan?</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p>	<p>2</p>

<p>No management plan : 0</p> <p>The level of implementation of the management plan is assessed as “insufficient” : 1</p> <p>The management plan is not officially adopted but its implementation is assessed as “adequate” : 2</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The management plan is currently undergoing a thorough stakeholder consultation process (over 160 meetings have been organised) and it will soon be approved (spring 2025).</p> <p>Meanwhile, various management measures have been successfully implemented to meet the objectives of the SPAMI.</p>	

	<u>Score</u>
<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 Protocole ASP/DB and Section 8.2.3 of the Annotated Format (AF).</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>Low : 0</p> <p>Medium : 1</p> <p>Good : 2</p> <p>Excellent : 3</p>	<p>2</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Currently the management plan is about to be approved with many stakeholders involving all sectors that are involved with the Park.</p> <p>It was based on a situation analysis taken into account the status of various habitats, species and threats. The current draft measures tackle most threats and activities in the area, it also considers a monitoring and research programme to feed back into an adaptive management.</p>	

	<u>Score</u>
<p>3.3. Assess the adequacy of the human resources available to the SPAMI.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>Very low/Insufficient : 0</p> <p>Low : 1</p> <p>Adequate : 2</p> <p>Excellent : 3</p>	<p>1</p>

Rationale for the note

The current management team of the Park consists of a staff of 10 people in addition to seasonal staff for maintenance and surveillance. Most of this staff is dedicated to the terrestrial part of the Park and others are shared with other Natural Parks.

This level is only barely adequate, particularly for the marine part of the SPAMI. In addition, the effective implementation of the management plan currently being finalised will require significant additional human resources.

	<u>Score</u>
<p>3.4. Assess the adequacy of the financial and material means available to the SPAMI</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>Very low : 0</p> <p>Low : 1</p> <p>Adequate : 2</p> <p>Excellent : 3</p>	2
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The Park currently has a budget that comes from the Generalitat. The marine part cannot generate and manage incomes from user fees. This is a general problem common with other MPAs in Spain.</p> <p>The SPAMI has only one boat that is only operated during summer season.</p>	

	<u>Score</u>
<p>3.5. Does the area have a monitoring programme?</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No monitoring programme : 0</p> <p>The level of implementation of the monitoring programme is assessed as “insufficient” : 1</p> <p>The monitoring programme needs improvement to cover other parameters that are significant for the SPAMI : 2</p> <p>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 : 3</p>	3

Rationale for the note

The SPAMI has a good monitoring plan that is being implemented by the University of Barcelona since 2006. It covers several indicator species of various groups and habitats.

It was designed to cover the main species and habitats and is replicable with a good methodology. There are over 10 indicators being evaluated every 2 years. The Cap de Creus is one of the few MPAs in the Mediterranean that has a regular monitoring evaluating the main biodiversity aspects with long series of data.

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?</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>Low : 0</p> <p>Medium : 1</p> <p>Good : 2</p> <p>Excellent : 3</p>	2

Rationale for the note

The monitoring programme was designed in collaboration between the scientists and managers, and its design has taken into account management needs, including climate change.

The management team is in constant communication with the monitoring team.

The results of the monitoring programme have been used as a basis for the development of the draft management plan.

Score	
<p>3.7. Is the management plan effectively implemented?</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>Low : 0</p> <p>Medium : 1</p> <p>Good : 2</p> <p>Excellent : 3</p>	2

Rationale for the note

The plan is about to be approved. It will be in spring 2025 and it will help a lot to manage the marine area of the Park.

	Score
<p>3.8. Have any concrete conservation measures, activities and actions been implemented?</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>Low : 0</p> <p>Medium : 1</p> <p>Good : 2</p> <p>Excellent : 3</p>	3
Section II: FEATURES PROVIDING A VALUE-ADDED TO THE AREA	

4. THREATS AND SURROUNDING CONTEXT

Rationale for the note

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).

Under section 4.1, questions are asked in two parts: part a) enquiring on the existence of threats within the site, and part b) asking about the response made to mitigate such threats. If the answer to part a) is “no threats”, part b) is not applicable. Whereas, when threats are reported under part a), part b) should be answered. The score achieved in response to part b) is considered as a bonus and has no impact on the score evaluation and consequently the result of the review.

	Score
<p>4.1.1.a. Unregulated exploitation of natural resources (e.g. sand mining, water, timber, living resources) See 5.1.1. in AF.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No threats : 3</p> <p>Weak threats : 2</p> <p>Serious threats : 1</p> <p>Very serious threats : 0</p> <p>(If the answer is “no threats”, pass directly to question 4.1.2. a).</p>	2

Rationale for the note

Some uses are clearly banned or regulated such as sand mining. Fishing is regulated more strictly in some zones of the SPAMI than others. Another possible threat is a wind mill project, although it will be not inside the Park but it can affect some habitats and species.

		Score
<p>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.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No efforts : 0 Little efforts : 1 Some efforts : 2 Significant efforts : 3</p> <p>(If applicable: Not applicable if the answer to question 4.1.1. a) is “no threats”.)</p>	<p>2</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Disturbance, global change and introduced alien species are important threats. However, disturbance (such as anchoring, fishing) is regulated by SPAMI management; the other threats are regional or global in nature and much harder to reduce.</p>		

		Score
<p>4.1.2.a. Threats to habitats and species (e.g. disturbance, desiccation, pollution, poaching, introduced alien species) See 5.1.2. in AF.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No threats : 3 Weak threats : 2 Serious threats : 1 Very serious threats : 0</p> <p>(If the answer is “no threats”, pass directly to question 4.1.3. a).</p>	<p>2</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Just small occasional pollution and poaching, and some alien species</p>		

		<u>Score</u>
<p>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.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No efforts : 0 Little efforts : 1 Some efforts : 2 Significant efforts : 3</p> <p>(If applicable: Not applicable if the answer to question 4.1.2. a) is “no threats”.)</p>	<p>2</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Some action to prevent pollution have been made by new water treatment in towns and villages, also by reinforcing Rangers control</p>		

		<u>Score</u>
<p>4.1.3.a. Increase of human impact (e.g. tourism, boats, building, immigration...) See 5.1.3. in AF.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No threats : 3 Weak threats : 2 Serious threats : 1 Very serious threats : 0</p> <p>(If the answer is “no threats”, pass directly to question 4.1.4. a).</p>	<p>1</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Human impacts remain one of the highest threats for this SPAMI. It has increased since the last evaluation in 2019 but the monitoring programme did not detect major adverse changes on the biodiversity.</p> <p>The new management plan contemplates areas where human impacts are reduced to a minimum, particularly for anchoring on <i>Posidonia</i> meadows to evaluate the natural dynamics in contrast to the anthropogenic effects.</p> <p>Also wind mill projects in the future are possible threats,</p>		

	<u>Score</u>
<p>4.1.3.b. Efforts undertaken during the evaluation to address/mitigate the increase of human impact (e.g. tourism, boats, building, immigration...) See 5.1.3. in AF.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No efforts : 0 Little efforts : 1 Some efforts : 2 Significant efforts : 3</p> <p>(If applicable: Not applicable if the answer to question 4.1.3. a) is “no threats”.)</p>	2
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Some areas have been protected to prevent boat access. The new management plan contemplates areas where no mooring is allowed and other with just public buoys mooring, a part from other local actions.</p>	

	<u>Score</u>
<p>4.1.4.a. Conflicts between users or user groups. See 5.1.4. and 6.2 in AF.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No threats : 3 Weak threats : 2 Serious threats : 1 Very serious threats : 0</p> <p>(If the answer is “no threats”, pass directly to question 4.1.5. a).</p>	2
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Some conflicts can happen between different groups such navigation, scuba diving, professional and recreation fishing activities, etc.</p>	

		<u>Score</u>
<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.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No efforts : 0</p> <p>Little efforts : 1</p> <p>Some efforts : 2</p> <p>Significant efforts : 3</p> <p>(If applicable: Not applicable if the answer to question 4.1.4. a) is “no threats”.)</p>	<p>2</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The new management plan contemplates areas with just some of the activities, such as professional but not recreational fishing, and areas with main scuba diving activities, a part from other actions.</p>		

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

- Global change
- Alien species
- Over-frequantation in some places and periods
- Anchoring on *Posidonia*
- Fishing on coralligenous communities
- Ghost fishing
- Recreational fishing
- Leisure boating
- Wind mill projects

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.

Under section 4.2, questions are asked in two parts: part a) enquiring on the existence of external threats, and part b) asking about the response made to mitigate such threats. If the answer to part a) is “no threats”, part b) is not applicable. Whereas, when threats are reported under part a), part b) should be answered. The score achieved in response to part b) is considered a bonus and has no impact on the score evaluation and consequently the result of the review.

		<u>Score</u>
<p>4.2.1.a. Pollution problems from external sources including solid waste and those affecting waters up-current. See 5.2.1 in AF.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p>	<p>2</p>	

<p>No threats : 3</p> <p>Weak threats : 2</p> <p>Serious threats : 1</p> <p>Very serious threats : 0</p> <p>(If the answer is “no threats”, pass directly to question 4.1.2. a).</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Plastic waste and ghost nets are the only possible external sources the can affect the Natural Park waters.</p>	

	<u>Score</u>
<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 AF.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No efforts : 0</p> <p>Little efforts : 1</p> <p>Some efforts : 2</p> <p>Significant efforts : 3</p> <p>(If applicable: Not applicable if the answer to question 4.2.1. a) is “no threats”.)</p>	2
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Plastic waste – there is a collection management of plastic waste on the urban beaches</p> <p>There is also a special programme to remove ghost nets throughout Catalunya.</p>	

	<u>Score</u>
<p>4.2.2.a. Significant impacts on landscapes and on cultural values. See 5.2.2 in AF.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p>	3

<p>No threats : 3</p> <p>Weak threats : 2</p> <p>Serious threats : 1</p> <p>Very serious threats : 0</p> <p>(If the answer is “no threats”, pass directly to question 4.2.3. a).</p>	
---	--

<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>No impacts at the moment, However, a wind mill project located at 12 kms from the Natural Park can be a threat in the future for several habitats and specials, a part from landscape.</p>

	<u>Score</u>
<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.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No efforts : 0</p> <p>Little efforts : 1</p> <p>Some efforts : 2</p> <p>Significant efforts : 3</p> <p>(If applicable: Not applicable if the answer to question 4.2.2. a) is “no threats”.)</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>

	<u>Score</u>
<p>4.2.3.a. Expected development of threats upon the surrounding area. See 6.1 in AF.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No threats : 3</p> <p>Weak threats : 2</p> <p>Serious threats : 1</p> <p>Very serious threats : 0</p> <p>(If the answer is “no threats”, pass directly to question 4.2.4. a).</p>	<p>2</p>

Rationale for the note

As previously explained, wind mill project can be a major threat in the futures.

Also waste water treatment plants could be of insufficient capacity during peak summer season

Climate change impacts may increase significantly in the coming years, as well as an increase in the occurrence of alien invasive species.

	<u>Score</u>
<p>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.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No efforts : 0</p> <p>Little efforts : 1</p> <p>Some efforts : 2</p> <p>Significant efforts : 3</p> <p>(If applicable: Not applicable if the answer to question 4.2.3. a) is “no threats”.)</p>	2

Rationale for the note

Waste water treatment plants are being increased in several towns and villages.

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

- Transit of large ships and oil spills
- Plastic waste
- Wind mill project (possible in the future, not a present threat)

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

- The moratorium on red coral extraction has facilitated the monitoring and enforcement for illegal harvesting of coral

	<u>Score</u>
<p>4.3. Is there an integrated coastal management plan or land-use laws in the area</p>	1

<p style="text-align: center;">bordering'.' or surrounding the SPAMI? (B4.e Annex I). See 5.2.3. in AF.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No : 0 Yes : 1</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>There is a detailed land use master plan (2006)_for the coastal area in and around the Park that regulates urbanization and building codes.</p>	

	<u>Score</u>
<p>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.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No : 0 Yes : 1</p>	1
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Certain activities in municipalities outside the Park, particularly related to tourism need to consider impacts on the Park and their permitting is subject to approval from the Park authorities.</p>	

5. ENFORCEMENT OF PROTECTION MEASURES

5.1. Assess the degree of enforcement of the protection measures In particular

	<u>Score</u>
<p>5.1.1. Are the boundaries of the area adequately marked on land and, if applicable, adequately marked at sea? See 8.3.1. in the AF.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No : 0 Yes : 1</p>	0

Rationale for the note

There is some signage of the Park limit mainly for the terrestrial areas. The Marine area is indicated on navigational charts and maps and is well known to some users (fishermen and dive operators).

However more signage of the marine limits may be necessary for the tourists.

The future plan will consider this action.

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.

1

Rating scale

No : 0

Yes : 1

Rationale for the note

There is a collaboration with the “Agents Rurals” (Department of Interior) and with the “Mossos d’Esquadra” (the Police equivalent) of the Generalitat in the enforcement of management measures.

Score

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

1

Rating scale

No : 0

Yes : 1

Rationale for the note

Both the “Mossos d’Esquadra” and the “Agents Rurals” are empowered to enforce the SPAMI regulations.

Score

0

<p>5.1.4. Are there adequate penalties and powers for effective enforcement? See 8.3.4. in AF.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No : 0</p> <p>Yes : 1</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The penalty system was insufficient and inadequate to dissuade poaching within the SPAMI because it was old and was not been updated but it's currently being revised and it will be approved next spring.</p>	

		<u>Score</u>
<p>5.1.5. Is the field staff empowered to impose sanctions? See 8.3.4. in AF.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No : 0</p> <p>Yes : 1</p>	<p>0</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The regulations only permit to Agents Rurals and Mossos d'Esquadra to impose sanctions, but not the Park staff.</p>		

		<u>Score</u>
<p>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).</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No : 0</p> <p>Yes : 1</p>	<p>1</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>A contingency plan exists for the entire Catalan coasts and includes the areas of the SPAMI.</p>		

6. COOPERATION AND NETWORKING

	<u>Score</u>
<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.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No : 0</p> <p>Weakly : 1</p> <p>Fairly : 2</p> <p>Excellent : 3</p>	2
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>There is some collaboration in particular with universities and research centres. There is a proposal being developed to secure funding for working with fishermen to elaborate spatial management between France and Spain and other European Projects</p> <p>Collaboration with international organisations has increased in the last few years due to more budget in the Generalitat to contribute the necessary cofounding.</p>	

	<u>Score</u>
<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).</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No : 0</p> <p>Insufficient : 1</p> <p>Fairly : 2</p> <p>Excellent : 3</p>	2
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The SPAMI is part of the MedPan network. There are also various collaboration programmes and projects with other MPAs in the region (MPAEngage, ResMed, ResMed 2, etc.)</p>	

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

7. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE PREVIOUS EVALUATIONS

<u>Score</u>

<p>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</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>'No' for all of them : 0 'Yes' for some of them : 1 'Yes' for most of them : 2 'Yes' for all of them : 3</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Yes, all of them</p>	

		<p><u>Score</u></p>
<p>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</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>'No' for all of them : 0 'Yes' for some of them : 1 'Yes' for most of them : 2 'Yes' for all of them : 3</p>	<p>2</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Yes, most of them</p>		

CONCLUSION* (based on score*) :

Based on the results obtained, the SPAMI is maintained in the ordinary revision process.

*Evaluation of the score:

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 in one or more of the following questions: 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6;
- a score < 2 in one or more of the following questions: 1.2, 1.3, 7.1 and 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 54 for a coastal national SPAMI (= 70% of the maximum total score without bonus: 78);
- the total score of the evaluation is less than 50 for a coastal national SPAMI subject to its first ordinary periodic review (= 70% of the maximum total score without bonus: 72);
- the total score of the evaluation is less than 58 for a multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMI (= 70% of the maximum total score without bonus: 83);
- the total score of the evaluation is less than 53 for a multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMI subject to its first ordinary periodic review (=70% of the maximum total score without bonus: 77).

The bonus will count only in the case where the SPAMI has not reached the minimum score without the bonus. Then, the bonus will be added to the total score achieved by the SPAMI.

**Section I: 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))**

1. MEDITERRANEAN VALUE OF THE SPAMI

Total score 6 (Max : 7)

2. LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

Total score 5 (Max : 6)

3. MANAGEMENT AND AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES

Total score 17 (Max : 24)

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

4. THREATS AND SURROUNDING CONTEXT

Total score 16 (Max : 23)

5. ENFORCEMENT OF PROTECTION MEASURES

Total score 3 (Max : 6)

6. COOPERATION AND NETWORKING

Total score 4 (Max : 6)

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

5 (Max : 6)

Overall total score**56 (Max : 78)****Recommendations for future evaluation**

1 - Although the protected area has an emergency plan at the regional and national level it could be a good idea to consider producing a very simple protected area level plan of action. This could be as straightforward as producing a document for park staff that provides the steps to be taken and points of contact. But could also be elaborated to detail specific steps the park could take to treat/recover animals etc that may have been affected by a disaster such as an oil spill.

2 - It would be a good idea to continue to make efforts to reinforce collaboration between 3rd parties and other authorities to improve conservation efforts

3 - Ways to improve the feedback loop for surveillance should be explored

4 - Continue to work on the effective implementation of the management plan that was under development during the evaluation phase.

5 - Make efforts to try and introduce / improve soft enforcement strategies (e.g., signage, demarcation, education and outreach)

Signatures

Ponç Feliu Latorre
SPAMI Manager



Francisco Guil Celada
Focal Point



Hocein BAZAIRI
Independent Expert



Kate Hogg
Independent Expert



Bernat Hereu
National Expert

