

SPAMI periodic review report

SPAMI name : Capo Carbonara

Review type : Ordinary Review

Review year : 2024

Members of the Technical Advisory Commission (TAC)

Valeria Masala	SPAMI Manager
Leonardo TUNESI	Focal Point
Chedly Rais	Independent Expert
Robert Turk	Independent Expert
Fabrizio ATZORI	National Expert

SPAMI periodic review report

SPAMI name: Capo Carbonara

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>	1
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The SPAMI fulfils the criteria related to the regional Mediterranean listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Uniqueness: it contains unique ecosystems and endemic species. b. Natural representativeness: it has highly representative ecological processes, or community or habitat types or other natural characteristics. Representativeness is the degree to which an area represents a habitat type, ecological process, biological community, physiographic feature or other natural characteristic. c. Diversity: it has a high diversity of species, communities, habitats or ecosystems. d. Naturalness: it has a high degree of naturalness as a result of the low level of human-induced disturbance and degradation e. presence of habitats that are critical to endemic species. f. Cultural representativeness: it has a high representative value with respect to the cultural heritage, due to the existence of environmentally sound traditional activities integrated with nature which support the well-being of local populations. <p>Additionally, the MPA is an area of educational, scientific and aesthetic interest.</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>	3

Rationale for the note

There have been no adverse changes during the evaluation period for the habitats and species considered as natural features

	Score
<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

Rationale for the note

Yes, all the objectives set out in the original SPAMI application for designation as well as in the art. 3 of the update of the Institutive Ministerial Decree of 7 February 2012, are actively pursued:

- protection and enhancement of natural, chemical and physical characteristics and of marine and coastal biodiversity, with particular attention to priority habitats of hard and mobile substrate, to *Posidonia oceanica*, also through environmental recovery interventions;
- promotion of environmental education and the dissemination of the marine and coastal environments of the marine protected area knowledge also through the implementation of educational activities and programs;
- implementation of study, monitoring and scientific research programs in the sector of natural sciences and environmental protection, in order to ensure systematic knowledge of the area;
- promotion of sustainable development of the area, with particular regard to the enhancement of traditional activities, local cultures, environmentally friendly tourism and the use by socially sensitive categories.

2. LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

	Score
<p>2.1. The legal status of the SPAMI (with reference to its legal status at the date of the previous evaluation report).</p> <p><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 SPAMI has maintained and improved its legal status: now the SPAMI is also managing three SPAs and two SACs established according to EU Birds and Habitats Directives.

	<u>Score</u>
<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>Yes, the Ministerial Decree of 7 February 2012 has clearly defined competencies and responsibilities for governing the area. In particular the art. 7 defines the management of the MPA, the art. 9 defines the Reserve Commission, the art. 10 defines the maritime property, the art. 11 monitoring and updating, the art.12 surveillance and the art. 13 the sanctions.</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>Yes, the SPAMI has a fully dedicated management body and sufficient powers to implement the conservation measures.</p> <p>The Management Body is the Villasimius Municipality, on delegation of the Ministry of the Environment (Convention of 21.12.1998 for the entrusting the AMP management to the Municipality of Villasimius). The management is carried out by the Director and the staff following the advise of the Reserve Commission.</p> <p>To ensure adequate conservation measures also the surveillance plays a key role. This is entrusted to the Coastguard, the Forestry Department of Sardinia Autonomous Region and the local polices.</p>	

3. MANAGEMENT AND AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES

	<u>Score</u>
	3

<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><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Yes, the SPAMI area has a management plan officially adopted and adequately implemented.</p> <p>The management plan is implemented every year and is based on a conceptual map (ISEA management plan). In the last 6 years the management plan was associated to two triennial monitoring programmes.</p> <p>In addition, the MPA ensures the management of EU NATURA2000 sites included or partially included within the MPA boundaries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special Areas of Conservation - ZSC ITB040020 “Isola dei Cavoli, Serpentara, Punta Molentis e Campulongu” • Special Areas of Conservation - ZSC ITB040021 “Costa di Cagliari” 	

		Score
<p>3.2. Assess the adequacy of the management plan taking into account the SPAMI objectives and the requirements set out in article 7 of the 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>3</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The management plan is adequate to the SPAMI objectives and the requirements set out in article 7 of the Protocol, including all content listed in section 8.2.3 of the Annotated Format.</p>		

		Score
<p>3.3. Assess the adequacy of the human resources available to the SPAMI.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p>	<p>2</p>	

<p>Very low/Insufficient : 0</p> <p>Low : 1</p> <p>Adequate : 2</p> <p>Excellent : 3</p>	
--	--

Rationale for the note

During the evaluation period the MPA staff was composed as follows::

- 1 MPA full time Director, employee of the Villasimius Municipality;
- 1 employee of the Villasimius Municipality, part-time Administrative - financial;
- 2 full-time support staff (financial and administrative);
- 4 full-time support staff (scientific and technical);
- 1 full-time support staff (logistical support).

However the availability of additional staff would help better implement the management activities.

	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>	2
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>During the evaluation period, SPAMI benefited from financial resources provided by the Ministry of the Environment and from financial resources mobilised through EU and regional projects. The available financial and material means enabled an adequate level of implementation of management activities. Additional means would allow for further activities.</p>	

	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>	3

Rationale for the note

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.

The monitoring program provides for:

- marine phanerogams, in particular monitoring, conservation and recovering of *Posidonia oceanica* meadows;
- investigation and monitoring on coralligenous and maerl
- sensitive habitats and species (for example monitoring programme of *Pinna nobilis*, *Paracentrotus lividus*, coralligenous, etc);
- alien species (i.e *Caulerpa cylindracea* and other alien flora and fauna species);
- monitoring of Cetaceans and Sea turtles at local and large scale and specific monitoring in the MPA of *Tursiops truncatus*;
- pleasure boating and diving frequentation;
- fishing activities;
- monitoring of ecological status of water bodies;
- beach and underwater systems monitoring, coastal dynamics and marine hydrodynamism;
- monitoring and recovering of dune systems (in particular priority habitats);
- monitoring of coastl plant diversity;
- monitoring of marine sea birds;
- ichthyofauna and target species;
- marine litter at local and large scale;
- ratt eradications and its positve impact on sea birds.
- monitoring fresh and transitional waters reptiles and amphibians of special conservation importance

	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>	3
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The SPAMI has an adequate feedback mechanism correlated to ISEA and EU SACs and SPAs management plans.</p> <p>Every year, using the results of the monitoring, specific management measures are defined in order to regulate the activity of diving centers, fishermen, pleasure boaters.</p>	

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>	<p>2</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Yes. Through the ISEA, that is the tool by which the MPA identifies the protection needs, the threats and the actions needed to address them, the management plan is effectively implemented.</p>	

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>	<p>3</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Yes. The MPA carried out during the evaluation period the following conservation measures, including in relation to the EU Habitats and Birds Directives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • active and passive protection of marine ecosystems, <i>Posidonia oceanica</i> meadows in particular; • protection and safeguarding habitats and species of conservation interest to ensure the protection of injured or distressed wildlife under the "Regional Marine Fauna Conservation Network (turtles and marine mammals); • management and coordination activities, of the increasingly frequent, nesting sites of the sea turtle <i>Caretta caretta</i>; • strengthening of the remote control system; • additional controlled mooring areas. <p>These conservation measures wer implemented also through private funding and initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prada -Luna Rossa (2021-2023) "Progetto di ripristino degli ecosistemi marini con la riforestazione della prateria di Posidonia oceanica nell' Area Marina Protetta 'Capo Carbonara"; • Ripristino degli ecosistemi marini con la riforestazione della prateria di Posidonia oceanica nell'Area Marina Protetta Capo Carbonara (2022-in progress), MEDSEA Mediterranean Sea and Coast Foundation; • RESCOM (2024-2026), "Strengthening the Resilience of Ecosystems in the Mediterranean". 	

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.

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>	<p>3</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>There non unregulated exploitation of natural resources in the MPA.</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> <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>

<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>2</p>

No threats : 3 Weak threats : 2 Serious threats : 1	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The threats are related to the high tourist frequentation in the summer period but are effectively addressed by the management measures.</p> <hr/>	

	<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>The actions taken to reduce threats are those entrusted to the authorities in charge of surveillance (Coastguard, Regional Forestry and Environmental Surveillance Corp, Finanza, Corpo dei Carabinieri, environmental guards, etc.). Implementation of the video surveillance system that is an indispensable tool aimed at the surveillance and protection of the MPA.</p> <p>Maritime and marine environment surveillance through preventive actions against squatting and marine pollution, for the protection of marine areas and habitats and species. Supervision of recreational boating and the maritime shoreline to protect bathers. Controls on marine fishing.</p> <p>Periodic monitoring of the seabed by scuba diving to promptly identify any critical issues, such as the presence of ghost nets or abandoned fishing gear that may cause damage to habitats or species and/or promptly identify any distressed species.</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>

<p>No threats : 3</p> <p>Weak threats : 2</p> <p>Serious threats : 1</p> <p>Very serious threats : 0</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Summer tourist has grown steadily over the years; consequently, the increase in people on beaches, recreational boats, and diving could threaten the area and some special habitats (such as dunes and beaches of vermetid bioconstruction, seagrass beds, and coral assemblages).</p> <p>But so far, no critical issues are reported.</p>	

	Score
<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</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 4.1.3. a) is “no threats”.)</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The actions taken to reduce threats are also those entrusted to the authorities in charge of surveillance (Port Authority, Forestry and Environmental Surveillance Corps, environmental guards, etc.). Implementation of the video surveillance, that is an indispensable tool for the surveillance and the protection of the MPA.</p>	

	Score
<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>

<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 4.1.5. a).</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>No relevant historical and current conflicts between the users of the site</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>Not Applicable</p>

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

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>3</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>No significant problems or incidents in the evaluation period.</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>	<p>Not Applicable</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></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>	<p>3</p>

<p>No threats : 3</p> <p>Weak threats : 2</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>No significant impact.</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>3</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>No major increase in tourist numbers is expected in summer, the period in which human pressure is the greatest in the area.</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>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:

Maritime traffic in the Sardinia Channel is the most significant threat due to potential oil spills, which was counteracted by the creation of a D zone and the existence of the National Contingency Plan.

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

Tourist frequentation;

Anchoring on Posidonia and coralligenous;

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>1</p>

No : 0 Yes : 1	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Italy adopted a Maritime Spatial Plan.</p> <p>Moreover, under EU Directives, adjacent municipalities fall under the SPA ITB040021 Costa di Cagliari, SAC ITB040051 Bruncu de Su Monte Moru - Geremeas (Mari Pintau), SAC ITB042236 Punta di Santa Giusta (Costa Rei), all of which have a management plan in line with the aims of the Habitats Directive.</p>	

	Score
<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>Yes, through the national Maritime Spatial Planning.</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>	1

<p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No : 0</p> <p>Yes : 1</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Informative devices, panels and posters, are present along the entire coastal perimeter; they also describe the bans that have to be respected and the presence of sensitive species and habitats.</p> <p>All the No-Take Zones (A zones) are signalled by yellow buoys illuminated during the night.</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</p> <p>Yes : 1</p>	<p>1</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The Coast Guard, Guardia di Finanza, Carabinieri, and Forestry Corp are involved in surveillance. Surveillance activities are carried out on land and sea.</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</p> <p>Yes : 1</p>	<p>1</p>

Rationale for the note

Yes, the MPA has a third agency also empowered to enforce regulations relating to the SPAMI protective measures: Coast Guard, Guardia di Finanza, Carabinieri, and Forestry Corp.

<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</p> <p>Yes : 1</p>	<p>1</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The existing penalties are appropriate to dissuade infractions (art. 39 of the MPA regulation on the organisation and implementation of the 2017).</p> <p>For example, infractions in A zones are submitted tare considered as criminal acts and submitted to penal procedures.</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 Coast Guard and the other surveillance corps are empowered to impose sanctions.</p> <p>MPA operators and volunteers involved in surveillance can only inform people about bans and alert the institutional surveillance corps in case of infractions, including the use of the MPA remote surveillance system.</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</p>	<p>1</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">the 13th Meeting of Contracting Parties).</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No : 0</p> <p>Yes : 1</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Yes, the national contingency plan for marine pollution also considers this marine protected area. In addition to that, the MPA contributes, in cooperation with civil defense and other surveillance bodies, to the implementation of the contingency plan concerning accidental pollution or other serious emergencies.</p>	

6. COOPERATION AND NETWORKING

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

Rationale for the note

The Autonomous Region Sardegna provides specific human and financial resources for:

- activities concerning the Regional Network for Marine Fauna Conservation, which supports the management and care of sea turtles and cetaceans in distress and the conservation and safety of sea turtle nesting,
- the Network of Marine Protected Areas of Sardinia, to face specific problems and shared issues (e.g., monitoring the status of *Pinna nobilis* after the recent mass die-off).

Additional human and financial resources are assured through collaborations with scientific institutions:

- Universities of Cagliari, Sassari, Genoa, Milan Bicocca, Palermo,
- CNR,
- CONISMA,
- ISPRA,
- Agenzia Regionale Protezione Ambiente Sardegna
- others.

During the evaluation period the MPA benefited from financial resources through projects funded under EU programs:

- LIFE Project CONCEPTU Maris (2022-2026), “CONservation of CEtaceans and Pelagic sea TURtles in Med: Managing Actions for their Recovery In Sustainability”;
- LIFE TETIDE (2023-2028), “Turning Eradication Targets Into Durable Effects”;
- Blue4All (2023-2026), “Blueprint demonstration for co-created effective, efficient and resilient networks of MPAs”;

It also benefited from projects funded by NGOs: Fondazione Capellino, Greenpeace, Legambiente Onlus, Marevivo for Italy and MEDPAN for the Mediterranean:

- MARE CALDO (2020-in progress), Rete costiera di stazioni di monitoraggio degli impatti dei cambiamenti climatici nei mari italiani, Greenpeace;
- Ripristino degli ecosistemi marini con la riforestazione della prateria di Posidonia oceanica nell’Area Marina Protetta Capo Carbonara (2022-in progress), MEDSEA Mediterranean Sea and Coast Foundation;
- RESCOM (2024-2026), “Strengthening the Resilience of Ecosystems in the Mediterranean”;
- Cleaning coralligenous reefs from abandoned fishing gear in the Capo Carbonara Marine Protected Area (2021-2023), Blue marine foundation and Fondazione Capellino.

	<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>Section III: FOLLOW-UP OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE PREVIOUS EVALUATION(S)</u></p> <p>7. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE PREVIOUS EVALUATIONS di Ventre and Capo Caccia - Isola Piana) and with Torre Guaceto SPAMI.</p>	
<p>No active collaboration with SPAMIs in other countries.</p>	<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>	3

<p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>'No' for all of them : 0</p> <p>'Yes' for some of them : 1</p> <p>'Yes' for most of them : 2</p> <p>'Yes' for all of them : 3</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>During the period of evaluation, the SPAMI increased the number of its staff as recommended.</p>	

	<u>Score</u>
<p>7.2. Assess to what extent the recommendations possibly made by the previous valuations were implemented: Recommendations made by the TAC(s) and/or approved by the Focal points for SPAs regarding Section II</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>'No' for all of them : 0</p> <p>'Yes' for some of them : 1</p> <p>'Yes' for most of them : 2</p> <p>'Yes' for all of them : 3</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>During the evaluation period the MPA significantly improves its surveillance system and strengthened the collaboration with the Coast guard which allowed to impose sanctions where needed.</p> <p>With these two measures, the TAC considered that the MPA implemented in a satisfactory manner the recommendations of the previous evaluation.</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 7 (Max : 7)

2. LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

Total score 6 (Max : 6)

3. MANAGEMENT AND AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES

Total score 21 (Max : 24)

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

4. THREATS AND SURROUNDING CONTEXT

Total score 21 (Max : 23)

5. ENFORCEMENT OF PROTECTION MEASURES

Total score 5 (Max : 6)

6. COOPERATION AND NETWORKING

Total score 5 (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

6 (Max : 6)

Overall total score

71 (Max : 78)

Recommendations for future evaluation

1 - Although the MPA, during the evaluation period, ensured the continuity of its team, the TAC strongly recommends pursuing the efforts concerning the continuity of the staff members, including where possible, proposal of changes in the relevant national legislation.

Signatures

Valeria Masala
SPAMI Manager




Chedly Rais
Independent Expert



Chedly RAIS

Fabrizio ATZORI
National Expert



Leonardo TUNESI
Focal Point



Robert Turk
Independent Expert

