

SPAMI periodic review report

SPAMI name : Sea Bottom of the Levante of Almeria

Review type : Ordinary Review

Review year : 2024

Members of the Technical Advisory Commission (TAC)

Francisco Guil Celada

Zeljka Rajkovic

Monica Montefalcone

Francisco Guil Celada

Juan Manuel Ruiz Fernández

SPAMI Manager

Independent Expert

Independent Expert

Focal Point

National Expert

SPAMI periodic review report

SPAMI name: Sea Bottom of the Levante of Almeria

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

	Score
<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>	<p>1</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The SPAMI meets the criteria of Annex I (uniqueness, exceptional value, natural representativeness, diversity, presence of critical habitats for threatened species, and naturalness).</p> <p>The posidonia meadows located between Villaricos and Terreros are among the most extensive and best preserved on the Spanish coast. These meadows cover a wide area that, in some sections, exceeds 3 km in width, extending from the coast to depths of around 30 metres. The seagrass meadows are in a good state of conservation. Outside the SPAMI, both at shallower and greater depths, there are rocky seabeds in good condition.</p> <p>Regarding <i>Nanozostera noltei</i> and <i>Cymodocea nodosa</i>, , in the last period the mapping in the Cocedores area has been improved, and new points of Nano presence have been identified that were not included in the official mapping.</p>	

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

Rationale for the note

There are several outfalls in the area. The Deretil outfall has caused an irreversible impact on the shallow part of the P. oceanica meadow, which is completely dead about 2 km south of the spill and up to 10 m deep. In addition, there are several anchorages located in areas of P. oceanica meadows. Finally, artificial beach regeneration through sand contributions, as well as inadequate beach cleaning and stranding management, are recognized as activities that generate impacts on the meadows. However, in the rest of the protected area the degree of pressure is considered low.

	<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>Most of the objectives established in the original SPAMI application for the designation have been actively pursued.</p> <p>The site still maintains the considerations for which it was included in the SPAMI List. The presence of typically Mediterranean habitats in a good state of conservation and of endemic or endangered species, and the existence of different elements of educational, scientific and aesthetic interest.</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

Rationale for the note

The ZEPIM space almost entirely coincides with the special conservation area ES6110010 Seabeds of Levante Almeriense. Therefore, the management plan is the same as the ZEC.

https://www.boe.es/diario_boe/txt.php?id=BOE-A-2016-7738

Furthermore, the Guidelines for the management and conservation of marine phanerogams have recently been approved, which improve the protection of the area.

https://www.boe.es/diario_boe/txt.php?id=BOE-A-2024-19883

However, the proliferation of aquaculture discharges in this area could jeopardise this status if adequate distances are not maintained from vulnerable habitats such as the Posidonia meadow.

	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>	2
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The management competences in biodiversity conservation depend completely on the Ministry for the Ecological Transition and the Demographic Challenge.</p> <p>Fisheries competences rely on the Junta de Andalucía.</p>	

	Score
<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>	1
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The staff of the space management agency also have other responsibilities.</p> <p>3. MANAGEMENT AND AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES</p>	

Score

<p>3.1. Does the SPAMI have a management plan?</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></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>The management plan is officially adopted and adequately implemented : 3</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The management plan was officially adopted through Orden AAA/1366/2016, of 4 August, declaring special conservation areas for sites of community importance in the Mediterranean Marine Region of the Natura 2000 Network, approving their corresponding conservation measures and proposing the extension of the geographical boundaries of two sites of community importance.</p> <p>The management plan has defined conservation objectives, based on the favourable conservation status of the habitats types of community interest. These goals are being surveyed with the collaboration of the Spanish Institute of Oceanography (hereafter IEO-CSIC)</p> <p>The management plans do not include information about some relevant and vulnerable habitats such as maerl beds.</p> <p>But, monitoring programmes of the Junta de Andalucía must be considered. To this end more coordination between Ministry and Junta would be necessary so that the different monitoring programmes, the national and the regional, cover complementary aspects, do not overlap.</p> <p>The IEO was created by Royal Decree of April 17, 1914, is a public research organization (OPI) dedicated to research in marine science, especially in relation to scientific knowledge of the oceans, sustainability of fishing resources and the marine environment. The IEO depends on the Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities.</p> <p>The IEO is not limited to carrying out basic and applied research, it also provides scientific and technological advice to administrations in matters related to oceanography and marine sciences. In fact, according to the Marine Fisheries Act of 2001, the IEO is the investigative and advisory body for the fisheries sector policy of the Government. In addition, it is the scientific and technological representative of Spain in most of the forums and international organizations related to the sea and its resources.</p>	

	<p><u>Score</u></p>
<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>

Rationale for the note

We considered the implementation of the management plan as good because:

- It has been officially approved and published as a regulation in the Spanish Official Bulletin (www.boe.es/diario_boe/txt.php?id=BOE-A-2016-7738)
- It has defined conservation objectives
- It has defined pressures and threats
- It has defined conservation measures
- It has a defined surveying and monitoring programme

It can't be considered as excellent because management effectiveness is not periodically evaluated

		Score
<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>2</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Recently, qualified personnel and a boat have been provided for surveillance and control of the area. In any case, the dedication is shared with other spaces, so it is considered as adequate to control the area, and its effectiveness is moderate.</p> <p>The Ministry has also contracted specific rangers for the MPAs in the Spanish Coast (actually, 23 along the Spanish coast), and is finishing the purchasing of a vessel fleet. The main mission of these rangers is enforcement of existing regulations, but they are also cooperating with other tasks. There are 3 rangers in marine waters bordering Málaga, Almería and Murcia, so they come to the SPAMI evenly. The technical staff is able to go the SPAMI seldomly.</p> <p>Finally, there's an ongoing contract with the public enterprise TRAGSATEC which devotes 2 technicians and a pilot for each province.</p>		

		Score
<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>	<p>2</p>	

Rationale for the note

Some aspects of scientific research are in the hands of different universities and regional and federal research centres.

Currently, funds are available for the recovery, transformation and resilience monitoring plan of the space by the Ministry for Ecological Transition and the Demographic Challenge.

The ranger staff is growing slowly, but steadily.

While boats and ROVs are now rented, a tender procedure has been launched to acquire semi-rigid boats, ROVs, optical equipment, and other stuff.

Currently exist a seagrass monitoring programme specific of the SPAMI, and also exist the one of the regional government, with which we are coordinated. Both programmes involves a great economic, material and human investment. However, seems that there is not such coordination efforts in the case of the other habitats, reef, caves...since regional monitoring programmes are not considered for the evaluation of the SPAMI.

	Score
<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>	<p>2</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The main ecological feature of the area are seagrass meadows. Monitoring and evaluation of seagrass habitats has been carried out in different moments, and in 2023 for the last time. Intensive field work was carried out to evaluate the posidonia meadows and other seagrass beds present in the area.</p> <p>The area has other relevant ecological features such as reefs (1170), caves (8330) and maerl beds that are not monitored for the SPAMI. These habitats are being monitored by regional programmes so that a strong coordination must be established between the Ministry and the Regional Government Junta de Andalucía.</p> <p>Anex 3.5 Monitoring program</p> <p>Annex I Levante Ameriense Monitoring program</p> <p>There is also complementary monitoring, with similar parameters, from the Junta de Andalucía:</p> <p>Junta de Andalucía surveys on Levante Almeriense</p> <p>The effectiveness of the monitoring programme is not yet being evaluated. An index on pressures and other problems affecting marine habitats may be useful for the site</p>	
	Score
<p>3.6. Is there a feedback mechanism that establishes an explicit link between the</p>	<p>1</p>

monitoring results and the management objectives, and which allows adaptation of protection and management measures?

Rating scale

Low : 0

Medium : 1

Good : 2

Excellent : 3

Rationale for the note

In Spain, and according to EU guidelines, management plans have to be updated if there are relevant changes in the conservation objectives. If an ecological feature which is relevant for the site needs an increase in the management intensity this should deliver a new plan.

Basically, the information provided by Junta de Andalucia, Conservation objectives in the area should be reviewed considering the presence of relevant habitats other than seagrasses and some potential threats such as aquaculture projects

Score

2

3.7. Is the management plan effectively implemented?

Rating scale

Low : 0

Medium : 1

Good : 2

Excellent : 3

Rationale for the note

The management plan is effectively implemented, and in 2023 the conservation status of the Posidonia meadows was assessed as favourable, according to the Habitats Directive evaluation criteria.

Of course, there are some aspects of the implementation that can be defined as subject to improvement. Such as coordination, governance and dissemination of results.

The management plans do not include information about some relevant and vulnerable habitats such as maerl beds.

Score

2

3.8. Have any concrete conservation measures, activities and actions been implemented?

<p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>Low : 0</p> <p>Medium : 1</p> <p>Good : 2</p> <p>Excellent : 3</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Various activities have been carried out, such as supervising the placement and removal of seasonal tourist services (buoys and beaconing), checking anchorages, searching for traces of sea turtles on beaches, censuses of European shags, as well as monitoring works in the area that require authorization. In addition, surveillance outings are carried out periodically to monitor uses and activities both from land and from a boat.</p> <p>More could be done on anchoring of tourists, more on dealing with the impact of industrial waste from the Deretil factory, more on dealing with impact of fish farms on Posidonia meadows, deep reef and cave habitats and maers beds</p>	

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

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).

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.

	<u>Score</u>
<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>	<p>3</p>

Rationale for the note

There are no threats related to unregulated exploitation of natural resources, as this exploitation is regulated through EIA and Natura 2000 procedures.

		<u>Score</u>
<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</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 4.1.1. a) is “no threats”.)</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	

Rationale for the note

We've contracted 2 rangers that are part-time in the SPAMI, and also launched a contract for the evaluation of pressures and threats in the site, and the surveillance.

		<u>Score</u>
<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</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 4.1.3. a).</p>	<p>2</p>	

<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>According to the management plan, the main threats to habitats and species are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spills of industrial waters, waste waters and marine pipelines. • Presence of some species of exotic algae: <i>Caulerpa cylindracea</i>, <i>Lophocladia lallemandii</i>, <i>Asparagopsis taxiformis</i>. • Use of trammel nets and trawlers (outside of the site) than affect to protected gastropod mollusc species <i>Charonia lampas</i> and echinoderm species <i>Centrostephanus longispinus</i>. • Moreover, since 2016, the presence of the pathogen that has produced the mortality in <i>Pinna nobilis</i>. • Nearby aquaculture installations might be a threat for <i>Posidonia meadows</i>. 	

	<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>3</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Surveillance and threat detection have been increased. Coordinated action has been taken with the relevant administrations, especially for industrial water discharges, waste water and marine pipelines. As regards invasive species, monitoring of seagrass meadows is being carried out, and no impact of these species has been observed.</p> <p>As regards species, a project has been carried out for the reproduction of <i>Pinna nobilis</i> in captivity and the identification of areas free of <i>Haplosporidium pinnae</i> for the reintroduction of juveniles using sentinel seed. The project has contributed to the conservation of <i>Pinna nobilis</i> through the development of aquaculture techniques for its potential reintroduction.</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>2</p>

No threats : 3 Weak threats : 2 Serious threats : 1 Very serious threats : 0	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>According to the management plan, the coastal towns of the SPAMI have experienced a significant increase in population over the last 20 years. In addition, there is a significant increase during the summer season due to tourism.</p> <p>Buoys in Terreros are problematic and should be ordered.</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>	<p>3</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>For the first time, we've hired 2 rangers that are part-time in the SPAMI. We have also launched a contract for the evaluation of pressures and threats on the site, and the surveillance. They detected an average of 1.6 problematic situations per month on this site.</p> <p>The Junta de Andalucía rangers also operate on the area, working in the terrestrial and coastal part.</p> <p>Within the framework of the European Life Posidonia project, ecological anchoring points were installed in this protected area, most of them coinciding with regular diving spots, and which were very well received by the recreational diving sector. They also want to create ecological anchorages for the recreational nautical sector.</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>3</p>

No threats : 3 Weak threats : 2 Serious threats : 1	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>There are not relevant conflicts between user groups.</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 Little efforts : 1 Some efforts : 2 Significant efforts : 3</p> <p>(If applicable: Not applicable if the answer to question 4.1.4. a) is “no threats”.)</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p>	

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

Pressures and threats (P&T) are assessed periodically, as the site is a Natura 2000 site. The Ministry is defining common proposals to standardise the assessment of P&T. These proposals will cover more than 60% of the P&T on the EEA 2023 P&T list.

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>2</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>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Nowadays, all the populations and villages in front of the SPAMI and its watersheds have authorized water treatment facilities, and some of them are being improved. The main threat for pollution comes from an industry, which is being analyzed with the cooperation of the IEO-CSIC.</p> <p>There are nearby fish farms, more than 2 km away from the SPAMI. These fish farms are not consider to be a relevant threat. However, these installations will be monitored and checked to ensure that there is no increase in their impact on the environment, which could constitute a threat.</p>	

	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 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>	3
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>In 2019, the regional government of the Junta de Andalucía has aproved an investment of 22 M€ to improve the water treatment facilities in Mojacar, as seen in this link: https://www.juntadeandalucia.es/organismos/agriculturapescaaguaydesarrollorural/servicios/actualidad/noticias/detalle/378028.html</p> <p>The Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, Water and Rural Development of Andalusia approves the investment for the new EDAR of Mojácar (Almería)</p>	

	Score

<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> <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>3</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>There are no relevant threats on landscape and cultural values in this area.</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>2</p>

<p>No threats : 3</p> <p>Weak threats : 2</p> <p>Serious threats : 1</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The main threats in the area are pollution due to cultivation intensification (N runoff) and to industrial pollution. The industrial pollution is under analysis, and cultivation intensification has reached its tops and it's slowly decreasing. So, these pressures are not expected to grow.</p> <p>Urbanisation is an additional threat to the site. The urbanisation has relatively stopped in the area since 2007.</p> <p>Climate change is not a threat but an actual pressure. In this area, heavy storms can have a relevant role in nutrient cycle, increasing the availability of nutrients (especially P) in marine waters.</p> <p>Thus, non climP&T are not expected to grow</p> <p>One of the nearby aquaculture facilities is not currently in operation but the concession is active so it is possible that it could resume its activity.</p>	

	Score
<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>	<p>3</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Urban wastewater pollution is fought using WFD and MSFD, and Urban Wastewater Treatment Directive.</p> <p>Link with new on water treatment plan: https://www.miteco.gob.es/content/dam/miteco/es/agua/publicaciones/03_Manual_Directiva_91_271_CEE_tcm30-214069.pdf</p> <p>Urbanisation is controlled through the application of Natura 2000 appropriate assessment.</p>	

<p>Please include here a prescriptive list of threats (not evaluated or mentioned above) that are of concern and are evaluated individually:</p> <p>Pressures and threats (P&T) are assessed periodically, as the site is a Natura 2000 site. The Ministry is defining common proposals to standardise the assessment of P&T. They cover more than 60% of the P&T on the EEA 2023 P&T list.</p> <p>According to the Natura 2000 Standard Data Form, the main threats are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whithin the site <p>Invasive non-native species (1-High) Illegal taking/ removal of marine fauna (2-Medium) Scubadiving, snorkelling (2-Medium)</p>
--

<p>Leisure fishing (2-Medium)</p> <p>Illegal taking/ removal of marine fauna (2-Medium)</p> <p>Penetration/ disturbance below surface of the seabed (2-Medium)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Around the site. <p>Marine water pollution (1-High)</p> <p>Industrial or commercial areas (1-High)</p> <p>Urbanised areas, human habitation (2-Medium)</p> <p>Benthic or demersal trawling (2-Medium)</p>
--

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

Irregular extraction of living resources has been eliminated with the increase of rangers.

	<u>Score</u>
<p>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.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No : 0</p> <p>Yes : 1</p>	1
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The first CAMP was developed in this area, and this was the main reason for proposing it as a SPAMI.</p> <p>https://www.juntadeandalucia.es/medioambiente/portal/areas-tematicas/litoral/gestion-integrada-de-zonas-costeras-gizc/camp-levante-de-almeria</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</p> <p>Yes : 1</p>	1

Rationale for the note

The regional administration responsible for environmental matters, within the framework of the procedures established in environmental assessment legislation, outside the territorial scope of the Management Plan, must adopt the necessary measures to prevent the deterioration, pollution, and fragmentation of habitats and disturbances affecting the species of the Management Plan, to the extent that these phenomena have a significant effect on the conservation status of these habitats and species.

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
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Signs of the marine limits do not exist.They should be placed on waterways, ports, “terreros”, etc., to assist in identifying channels, headlands, rock shoals, reefs, hazards and shallow areas. Always refer to a local chart to identify where potential hazards may be.</p>	

	<u>Score</u>
<p>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.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No : 0 Yes : 1</p>	1

Rationale for the note

Institutional collaboration is carried out mainly between the bodies that have competence in the marine part such as the Ministry of the Environment of the Junta de Andalucía and the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, in particular in matters of ecosystem aspects, fisheries and their protection. This collaboration is complementary, so that the available human and material resources are optimized.

Recently, qualified personnel and a boat have been provided for the surveillance and control of the area. In any case, the dedication is shared with other spaces, 'but it is considered adequate for the control of the areas.

The Ministry has also hired specific park rangers for MPAs on the Spanish coast, and is finalising the acquisition of a fleet of boats. The main functions of these actors are related to the conservation and monitoring of the marine environment and species. These officials have the status of Agents of the Authority in the exercise of their functions

[Levante Almeriense Annex 5.1.2 Surveillance monitoring](#)

	Score
<p>5.1.3. Are third party agencies also empowered to enforce regulations relating to the SPAMI protective measures?</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No : 0</p> <p>Yes : 1</p>	1

Rationale for the note

As mentioned in 5.1.2, the guards of the Regional Environmental Ministry of Junta de Andalucía , the Ministry of Agriculture, Fishing and Food and the Ministry of Defence, have capacity to fine those people that do not have authorisation, that commit environmental crimes or that do not follow the rules of each zone.

The Directorate General of Maritime Transport is empowered to enforce the regulations regarding SPAMI protection measures, since most of them are related to maritime transport.

Guardia Civil is often patrolling the area.

	Score
<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>	1

Rationale for the note

The sanctions are enough to dissuade the people. The guards of the Regional Environmental Ministry, as well as the Ministry of Agriculture, Fishing and Food and the Ministry of Defence, have capacity to fine those people that do not have authorisation, that commit environmental crimes or that do not follow the rules of each zone.

Score

5.1.5. Is the field staff empowered to impose sanctions? See 8.3.4. in AF.

1

Rating scale

No : 0

Yes : 1

Rationale for the note

There are two rangers from the Ministry for the Ecological Transition which can impose sanctions. And also the rangers from the Junta de Andalucía that survey in the coastal part.

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).

1

Rating scale

No : 0

Yes : 1

Rationale for the note

The prevention of marine pollution originating from ships is carried out in accordance with the provisions of the international conventions on the subject to which Spain is a Party, and specifically the MARPOL Convention. The space covered by the ZEPIM and its bordering area is considered a restricted zone for the dumping of waste or other materials from ships or aircraft.

The prevention of marine pollution from land sources is carried out in accordance with the provisions of the international conventions on the subject, and specifically the Barcelona Convention, as well as the provisions contained in Spanish legislation on pollution control and Law 41/2010, of December 29, on the protection of the marine environment.

The different contingency plans for marine pollution that are applicable within the scope of this regulation, whether of a state, autonomous or local nature, take into account measures for the conservation of the ZEPIM.

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>The area counts on the technological support and ecological information in the Central Services of the Regional Environmental Government located in Seville, Spain, as well as technicians in diverse environmental issues in the Provincial Environmental Delegation in Almeria.</p> <p>The establishing of regular meetings on the stakeholders, and specially the administrations, should be done regularly.</p> <p>It is also worthwhile to note the existence of scientific support of the Universities of Almeria, Granada and Malaga, the Advanced Centre for Scientific Research of Spain, as well as the Sea Classroom of Cabo de Gata-Nijar.</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>	0
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>We haven't developed any cooperation or exchange with other SPAMIs in other countries. Having in mind this as a problem, our intention is to improve this by the end of 2025, developing a workshop on Posidonia restoration.</p> <p>There should be more direct cooperation with other SPAMIs, and specially Cabo de Gata. There has been more intense cooperation with these site.</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><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The recommendations were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalise the MoU between Junta de Andalucía and the Ministry in order to ensure more human resources on site for the management of the SPAMI <p>More human resources have been provided both in the administration of the SPAMI and in its monitoring and surveillance. Recently, qualified personnel and a boat have been provided for the surveillance and control of the area. The Ministry has also hired specific park rangers for the AMPs on the Spanish coast, and is finalising the acquisition of a fleet of boats.</p>	3

	<u>Score</u>
<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>	2

Rationale for the note

The recommendations were:

- **Improve the collaboration with the SPAMI Cabo de Gata-Níjar given the continuity of some ecosystems:**

During this period there has been a more intense coordination with the SPAMI Cabo de Gata-Níjar, and now the monitoring for most of the parameters has been coordinated.

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 7 (Max : 7)

2. LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

Total score 5 (Max : 6)

3. MANAGEMENT AND AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES

Total score 16 (Max : 24)

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

4. THREATS AND SURROUNDING CONTEXT

Total score 19 (Max : 23)

5. ENFORCEMENT OF PROTECTION MEASURES

Total score 5 (Max : 6)

6. COOPERATION AND NETWORKING

Total score 2 (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**59 (Max : 78)****Recommendations for future evaluation**

- 1 - Expand the SPAMI to cover all the SAC/SCI, and potentially surrounding areas of interest.
- 2 - Minimize the pollution coming from industries, through any available systems, including marine outfalls.
- 3 - Dedicate more field staff for monitoring, surveillance and enforcement.
- 4 - Establish and ensure the proper functioning of coordination mechanism among administrations at all levels.
- 5 - Establish an explicit link between the monitoring results and the management objectives, which allows adaptation of protection and management measures (results of monitoring of seagrass meadows show regression of 2 meadows because of the fish farms).
- 6 - Update the management plan and include the measures to mitigate the emerging threats (ghost nets, new fish farms, etc.) and start monitoring the fishing pressure.
- 7 - Improve the situation with buoys in Terreros and set up ecological anchorages for recreational vessels.
- 8 - Add information panels about the protected area at relevant points of interest along the coast.
- 9 - Improve cooperation and exchange with other SPAMIs at national and international level.

Signatures

Francisco Guil Celada
SPAMI Manager



Monica Montefalcone
Independent Expert



Juan Manuel Ruiz Fernández
National Expert



Zeljka Rajkovic
Independent Expert



Francisco Guil Celada
Focal Point

