

SPAMI periodic review report

SPAMI name : Isole Egadi

Review type : Ordinary Review

Review year : 2025

Members of the Technical Advisory Commission (TAC)

Salvatore Livreri Console

Leonardo TUNESI

Robert Turk

Chedly Rais

Renato Chemello

SPAMI Manager

Focal Point

Independent Expert

Independent Expert

National Expert

SPAMI periodic review report

SPAMI name: Isole Egadi

Review year: 2025

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</p> <p>Yes : 1</p>	<p>1</p>

Rationale for the note

The MPA fulfills most of the criteria related to the regional Mediterranean value required for a SPAMI:

1) PRESENCE OF ECOSYSTEMS/HABITATS SPECIFIC TO THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION:

I.4.1. Biocenosis of supralittoral rock,

- II.4.1. Biocenosis of the upper mediolittoral rock,

- II.4.2. Biocenosis of the lower mediolittoral rock,

- III.6.1. Biocenosis of infralittoral algae (tot 1.841ha);

- III.5.1. Posidonia Oceanica meadows (tot 12.536 ha);

- III.2.2. III.3.2. Biocenosis of coarse sands and fine gravels as a result of underwater currents (tot 3871 ha);

- IV.2.2. Biocenosis of coastal detritus (tot 344 ha); - V.III.1. Coralligenous, V.3.1. Biocenosis of deep sea corals present in the Mediterranean's bathyal zone, IV.3.3. Biocenosis of shelf-edge rock (tot 102 ha).

2) PRESENCE OF HABITATS THAT ARE CRITICAL TO ENDANGERED, THREATENED OR ENDEMIC SPECIES:

Posidonia meadows: *Posidonia oceanica*, *Cymodocea nodosa*, *Pinna nobilis*, *Asterina pancerii*.

Vermetid reef: *Cystoseira* complex of species, *Dendropoma petraeum* complex of species, *Lithophyllum bissoides*.

Caves of Marettimo: *Monachus monachus*, *Hydrobates pelagicus*.

Shallow water coralligenous outcrop: *Astroides calycularis*, *Cladocora caespitosa*, *Lithophyllum bissoides*.

Deep water coralligenous: *Anthipatella subpinnata*, *Madreopora oculata*, *Axinella cannabina*, *Savalia savaglia*.

Marettimo's intertidal rocky shore: *Patella ferruginea*.

3) Educational Interest:

The presence of a Marine Protected Area managed and monitored by a managing Body, the creation of functional facilities for the conservation and protection of the species (such as the Observatory monk seal in Marettimo and the Sea Turtle Rescue Centre in Favignana), the natural peculiarities and the high biodiversity of the area are all elements that contribute to make the site interesting from an educational point of view.

4) Scientific Interest:

The presence of several endemic species of the Mediterranean Sea makes the MPA relevant to research. Equally, the presence of prehistorical and historical settlements represents a significant feature of conservation importance.

The MPA is also rich in archaeological finds, which can be admired also through diving tours.

5) Aesthetic Interest:

The caves of Marettimo and the intense karst of the island are the most representative feature of the carbonate nature of the Egadi coastline. The numerous caves and tunnels are equally distributed along the coasts and underwater, including aerial, submerged and semi-submerged caves. Around the Egadi islands, a number of rocky shallows provide an impressive natural scenery from an aesthetic point of view as well as in terms of remarkable presence of animal populations, gorgonians and sponges.

The Calcarenes quarries: the longtime mining, especially in the eastern part of Favignana, has affected the coastal landscape, which is characterized by the presence of caves and tunnels. The abandoned caves have now turned into underground gardens with typical Mediterranean vegetation and are an element of anthropogenic origin with distinctive natural features that make them particularly attractive to visitors.

The caves: several submerged or semi-submerged caves occur along the coastline of the three islands forming a unique landscape scenery.

One of the best known is Grotta del Genovese in Levanzo where it is possible to admire prehistoric paintings portraying scenes of hunting and fishing (tuna fish).

A succession of semi-submerged caves characterizes the coast of Marettimo too and is a major tourist attraction. The "Grotta del Cammello" takes its name from a rock at the entrance that looks like a camel's head; the cave presents a large cavern with a small pebble beach. The "Grotta del Presepe" is said to resemble the nativity scene for the shapes taken by the stalactites and stalagmites. The "Grotta della Bombarda" derives its name from the characteristic "blow" made by the sea storms in the little cracks of the rocks.

6) Main cultural features:

In Favignana, the ancient tuna processing factory "Tonnara Florio" provides an example. The factory is no longer in function and the renewed premises host today an important Museum of history which is a primary tourist attraction for visitors from all parts of the world.

On the mainland of Favignana calcarenites stone quarries are also present, which represent an example of industrial archeology. The economy, in fact, since the days of the Roman domination, has been linked to the production of this high quality material for the building industry.

Score

2

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.

Rating scale

<p>Significant changes : 0</p> <p>Moderate changes : 1</p> <p>Slight changes : 2</p> <p>No adverse change : 3</p>	
<p>2. LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS</p> <p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p>	
<p><i>Pinna nobilis</i>, as in other areas of the Mediterranean, has been subject to the phenomenon of infection and mortality caused by <i>Haplosporidium pinnae</i>.</p>	<p>Score</p>
<p>However the observed change during the evaluation period is considered not significant as it impacted only one species under the effect of a Mediterranean sea urchin.</p> <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>2</p>
<p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>Significant negative change in the legal status of the SPAMI : 0</p>	<p><u>Score</u></p>
<p>Slight negative change in the legal status of the SPAMI : 1</p> <p>13. Are the objectives, set out in the original SPAMI application for designation, actively pursued?</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>Yes, it is still managed by the Municipality of Favignana on behalf of the Italian Ministry for the Environment and Energy Security, without any change in the legal status.</p> <p>Only some of them : 1</p>	
<p>Yes for most of them : 2</p> <p>Yes for all of them : 3</p>	
	<p><u>Score</u></p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>2.2. Are competencies and responsibilities clearly defined in the texts governing Management activities conducted in the SPAMI are maintained and strengthened over time. The objective is sustainable development, which maintains the area between environmental protection and economic and social development</p>	<p>2</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><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The MPA Regulation clearly defines the different actors involved in the management of the area together with their respective tasks and functions, in order to avoid any possible overlapping of roles and responsibilities. The management of the area is carried out in synergy between the Municipality of Favignana, the Authorities responsible for sea control, the Regional "State Property Office and the Superintendence of Sea Cultural Heritage, each within the scope of their own competences and in compliance with the requirements of sustainable development.</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>	2
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The SPAMI has a fully dedicated managing body, belonging to the Municipality of Favignana, by mandate of the Ministry for the Environment and Energy Security.</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>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>	3
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The Regulations set in the management plan of the Marine Protected Area (Decree of the Ministry of the Environment of 1 June 2010), together with the additional municipal provisions adopted by the Management Body, regulate the exercise of professional and recreational activities both on land and at sea.</p> <p>The conservation measures have also been approved and an updated version of the Regulation that integrates the conservation measures is being evaluated by the Ministry for the Environment and Energy Security.</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>	2

<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>The Regulation set out in the management plan of the Marine Protected Areas allows to regulate all human activities conducted in the area, both recreational and professional. Furthermore, depending on the protection needs, possibly changed over time, it is updated with municipal approval tools, to guarantee a sustainable use of the sea and the territory in compliance with the protection of the environment.</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>	2
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The SPAMI staff is composed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • full time Director • 3 marine biologists assigned (part time - 50%) acting as technical instructors. • 11 fully dedicated staff qualified and trained (biologists, architects, archeologists, lawyer, skipper. professional scuba divers) provided through a contracted company. • 3 full time municipal police units, patrolling the sea in summer season 	

	<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>	2

Very low : 0	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The adequacy of the financial and material means is assessed as adequate thanks to the availability of EU projects.</p> <p>The SPAMI receives funds from the Ministry for the Environment and Energy Security for management functions and also for the necessary investments.</p> <p>Furthermore, it uses its own funds from the issuing of permits or fines.</p> <p>Some activities, such as the Turtle Recovery Center, have received contributions from private individuals, given the collective value of the activity carried out.</p> <p>Finally, the management body participates in European programs, such as the Life program or Interreg, to assure the economic resources necessary to achieve specific protection objectives</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>	2
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The monitoring programme covers the main environmental and socio-economic elements foreseen in the management plan but there is the need to improve it in terms of number of monitoring stations and frequency.</p> <p>During the evaluation period, within the Marine Strategy Framework Directive monitoring activities, SPAMI has conducted monitoring campaigns on the main indicators of interest. Through participation in the Life SEA.NET project, the Management Body is implementing the campaigns conducted with a new updated data set on <i>Posidonia oceanica</i> and <i>Pinna nobilis</i>.</p> <p>Through collaboration agreements with Research Institutes (ISPRA, CNR, Stazione Zoologica A. Dohrn, University of Palermo and Chieti) it conducts monitoring campaigns on habitats and species of conservation interest.</p> <p>Finally, with its own funds, the Management Body conducts monitoring campaigns on recreational fishing and the sea urchin <i>Paracentrotus lividus</i>, to monitor the effect of harvesting .</p>	

	<u>Score</u>
<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>	2

<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>As provided for by the Regulation, the results of the monitoring activities are used to adjust the regulation of specific activities. An improved monitoring would have a positive impact on the application of the adaptive management approach</p>	

	<u>Score</u>
<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>	<p>2</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The current management plan is fully implemented.</p> <p>A new version under revision in order to be harmonized also with the mandatory conservation measures of the EU SAC. It has been sent to the Ministry for the Environment and Energy Security for approval and subsequent adoption.</p>	

	<u>Score</u>
<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>	<p>2</p>

Rationale for the note

The applied conservation measures, the monitoring and research activities, the awareness-raising activities, are all aimed at achieving the objectives of the conservation measures, with particular attention to the main habitats (*P. oceanica* and coralligenous), as well as the species (*Patella ferruginea*, *Tursiops truncatus*, *Monachus monachus*, *Myliobatis aquila*, *Caretta caretta*, *Pinna nobilis*)

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>	3
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p>	

	<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>	Not Applicable

No efforts : 0 Little efforts : 1 Some efforts : 2 Significant efforts : 3 (If applicable: Not applicable if the answer to question 4.1.1. a) is “no threats”.)	
<u>Rationale for the note</u>	

	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>1</p>
<u>Rationale for the note</u> During summer period the touristic presence greatly increases with an impact on biodiversity. Visitors trips and boats anchoring represent the main threat to marine habitats and species. Large stretches of shallow water are subject to over-fishing of sea-urchins. Moreover, the presence of NIS (especially <i>Caulerpa taxifolia</i>) affect the native benthic habitats. Recently the presence of <i>Callinectes sapidus</i> has also been reported	

	Score
<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>3</p>

No efforts : 0 Little efforts : 1 Some efforts : 2	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Efforts undertaken during the evaluation period including mainly information campaigns aimed at the population and stakeholders, communications to Research Institutes in case of reporting of NIS and to the Ministry of the Environment and Energy Security</p> <p>During the evaluation period, five additional mooring fileds were put in place.</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>	1
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The Municipality of Favignana showed no substantial growth of the population over the years, thus the demographic increase is not expected to be a threat.</p> <p>Tourist pressure, especially after the end of the restrictions of the COVID pandemic, shows an increasing trend in the summer period both from sea and land</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>	3

No efforts : 0 Little efforts : 1	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The SPAMI has devoted a great deal of effort to mitigate the human impact through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness campaigns • Patrolling • Upgrading the regulation to reduce the pressure of tourists in time and space <p>During the evaluation period, five additional mooring fields were also put in place.</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>	<p>2</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The main conflicts arise between professional and recreational fishing or between nautical tourism, conducted with the use of large vessels, as opposed to local tourism, which operates with small vessels.</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>3</p>

No efforts : 0 Little efforts : 1 Some efforts : 2 Significant efforts : 3	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The SPAMI, to reduce conflicts between professional and recreational fishermen, revised the regulation in order to limit the use of fishing gear and periods of recreative fishing overlapping, in terms of catches, with professional fishing.</p> <p>To reduce conflicts between nautical tourism, conducted with the use of large vessels, as opposed to local tourism, which operates with small vessels, the SPAMI, revised the regulation in order to identify specific areas devoted to each of these different typologies of tourism.</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>illegal fishing (in particular recreational and bottom trawling);</p> <p>anchoring,</p> <p>trampling,</p> <p>coverage increase of the Caulerpa NIS,</p> <p>noise due to the boat traffic.</p>
--

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

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>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 4.1.2. a).</p>	<p>2</p>

Rationale for the note

marine litter is still a non-significant problem, thanks also to the territorial conformation of SPAMI and the marine currents to which the area is subjected.

The same goes for other sources of pollution, such as oil spills, in areas outside the area.

Occasional phenomena were immediately managed and eliminated.

Score

3

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.

Rating scale

No efforts : 0

Little efforts : 1

Some efforts : 2

Significant efforts : 3

(If applicable: Not applicable if the answer to question 4.2.1. a) is “no threats”.)

Rationale for the note

The SPAMI, in evaluation period, organised marine litter and ghost net removal campaigns.

During the summer period the "sweeper" boat of the MPA was used as well as hydrocarbon absorbing systems.

Score

3

4.2.2.a. Significant impacts on landscapes and on cultural values. See 5.2.2 in AF.

Rating scale

No threats : 3

Weak threats : 2

Serious threats : 1

Very serious threats : 0

(If the answer is “no threats”, pass directly to question 4.2.3. a).

Rationale for the note

<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 Little efforts : 1 Some efforts : 2 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 Weak threats : 2 Serious threats : 1 Very serious threats : 0</p> <p>(If the answer is “no threats”, pass directly to question 4.2.4. a).</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p>	

<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>Not Applicable</p>

<p>No efforts : 0 Little efforts : 1 Some efforts : 2 Significant efforts : 3 (If applicable: Not applicable if the answer to question 4.2.3. a) is “no threats”.)</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></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>noise due to the boat traffic.</p>

<p>Please include the list of threats (not evaluated or mentioned above) that were of concern and were eliminated or solved :</p> <p>illegal fishing (in particular recreational and bottom trawling fishing): positioning of anti-trawling deterrents on the seabed anchor damage: installation of mooring fields on the three main islands; replanting of P. oceanica damage caused by the of divers,; regulation of scuba diving, including limitations on the number of divers in sensitive sites</p>
--

	Score
<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 Yes : 1</p>	1
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Italy adopted a Maritime Spatial Plan.</p>	

	Score
<p>4.4. Does the management plan for the SPAMI have influence over the</p>	1

<p>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>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The size and proximity of the SPAMI to the Sicilian coast influence the governance of maritime activities</p>	

5. ENFORCEMENT OF PROTECTION MEASURES

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

	Score
<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>	1
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The MPA and its boundaries are officially indicated on the national nautical charts and on the harbour handbooks. The A zones (no entry-no take) of the MPA are delimited by specific buoys. A specific app is available in order to inform the sea-users of the zoning and conservation measures applicable to their location.</p>	

	Score
<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>	1

<p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No : 0 Yes : 1</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Surveillance both at sea and on the coast is provided by the Coastguard that the competent authority. The other collaborating authorities are Carabinieri and Guardia di Finanza.</p>	

	<u>Score</u>
<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 Yes : 1</p>	<p>0</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p>	

	<u>Score</u>
<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 Yes : 1</p>	<p>1</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The national rules are effectively enforced by the management authority. The Managing Authority brought forward a proposal to amend the current national rules in order to be more effective.</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 Yes : 1</p>	1
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></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 Yes : 1</p>	1
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The Ministry for the Environment and Energy Security has an active action protocol in the case of emergency situations.</p> <p>The SPAMI is a part of the local Contingency Plan. The managing body has activated training courses for the management of any accidental phenomena.</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>	3

No : 0 Weakly : 1 Fairly : 2 Excellent : 3	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>According to the agreements in force, the MPA conducts research and monitoring activities with the support of scientific institutions (i.e. universities, CoNISMa, ISPRA, CNR, NGOs).</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 Insufficient : 1 Fairly : 2 Excellent : 3</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>At a national level, the exchange of good practices and the opportunities for comparison are very good. As regards the exchange and comparison activities with other foreign SPAMIs, the MPA is participating to SPAMI twinning programme which is very useful for promoting knowledge and harmonizing management activities.</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 6 (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 17 (Max : 23)

5. ENFORCEMENT OF PROTECTION MEASURES

Total score 5 (Max : 6)

6. COOPERATION AND NETWORKING

Total score 6 (Max : 6)

Overall total score 57 (Max : 72)

Recommendations for future evaluation

1 - Most of the current MPA staff have been recruited on fixed-term contracts. Although this current staff ensures a good level of implementation of protection and management measures, it is recommended to increase the number of permanent staff to ensure more sustainability of the good management of the MPA.

2 - Although the monitoring programme covers the main environmental and socio-economic elements of the management plan, it is recommended that it be increased in terms of spatial and temporal coverage.

Signatures

Salvatore Livreri Console
SPAMI Manager



Robert Turk
Independent Expert



Renato Chemello
National Expert



Leonardo TUNESI
Focal Point



Chedly Rais
Independent Expert



Chedly RAIS