

SPAMI periodic review report

SPAMI name : Penisola del Sinis - Isola di Mal di Ventre

Review type : Ordinary Review

Review year : 2024

Members of the Technical Advisory Commission (TAC)

Massimo Marras	SPAMI Manager
Leonardo TUNESI	Focal Point
Chedly Rais	Independent Expert
Robert Turk	Independent Expert
Giorgio MASSARO	National Expert

SPAMI periodic review report

SPAMI name: Penisola del Sinis - Isola di Mal di Ventre

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 MPA fulfils the criteria related to the regional Mediterranean value listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural representativeness: it hosts highly representative ecological processes, communities and habitat types. <i>Posidonia oceanica</i> meadows are the dominant habitat type, which take turns with precoralligenous and coralligenous populations. In deep sites it is possible to observe populations of <i>Corallium rubrum</i>. and colonies of the black coral <i>Savalia savaglia</i>. <i>Cystoseira</i> habitats are present both in mesolitoral and intertidal levels. The fish assemblage includes species listed in the annexes of the SPA/BD Protocol like <i>Epinephelus marginatus</i> and <i>Sciaena umbra</i>. Diversity: it hosts a high diversity of species, communities, habitats and ecosystems. Naturalness: it has a high degree of naturalness as a result of the low level of human-induced disturbance and degradation. Over the 37 km coast line there are only two villages which are used only few months per year. Road accesses to the shore are naturalised, without asphalt or other artificial materials. In the Mal di Ventre Island there is no building or artificial structure, except the little lighthouse. Presence of habitats that are critical to endemic species. (E.g. Islands or Islets are mostly important for water-bird colonies) 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, like fishing. <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>	2

Significant changes : 0	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>During the evaluation period there was no important change. The situation of <i>Pinna nobilis</i>, as reported in the previous evaluation report was still of concern as for the other Mediterranean zone.</p>	

	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
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>All the objectives set out in the original SPAMI application for designation are actively pursued, according to the provision of the art. 3 of the Ministerial Decree of 20 July 2011:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 <i>Posidonia oceanica</i>, 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 its legal status.

	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 Ministerial Decree of 20th July 2011 clearly defines 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 penalties.</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>	2
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The SPAMI has a fully dedicated management body and sufficient powers to implement the conservation measures.</p> <p>The Management Body is the Cabras Municipality, under the supervision of the Ministry of the Environment (Convention of 05.12.2013 to entrust the MPA management to the Municipality of Cabras, updated in July 2023) and the management bodies of the MPA are the Director and the Reserve Commission established by the Italian Ministry of Environment.</p>	

3. MANAGEMENT AND AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES

	Score
	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>The SPAMI area has a management plan officially adopted and adequately implemented.</p> <p>In addition, the MPA benefits of the management plans of EU NATURA2000 areas (SAC, SPA) that include, are included, are adjacent to the SPAMI. In particular from 2022, MPA manages the SAC “Isola di Mal di Ventre and Catalano” and “Stagno di Mistras di Oristano”.</p> <p>SAC ITB030080 “Isola di Mal di Ventre e Catalano” SPA ITB030039 “Isola di Mal di Ventre” “Stagno di Mistras di Oristano” SAC ITB030034 e ITB032239 “San Giovanni di Sinis” SPA ITB034006 “Stagno di Mistras”</p>	

	<u>Score</u>
<p>3.2. Assess the adequacy of the management plan taking into account the SPAMI objectives and the requirements set out in article 7 of the Protocole ASP/DB and Section 8.2.3 of the Annotated Format (AF).</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>Low : 0</p> <p>Medium : 1</p> <p>Good : 2</p> <p>Excellent : 3</p>	3
<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>	

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

<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><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>1 MPA President/Major of Cabras Municipality</p> <p>Full-time staff: 1 MPA Director, 1 expert biologist, 1 expert surveyor, 1 Administrative employee</p> <p>Part-time staff: 1 Chief financial service, 2 Accountant for support of financial service, 1 Responsible general affair, 1 Responsible Technical office, 2 maintenance employees.</p>	

	<u>Score</u>
<p>3.4. Assess the adequacy of the financial and material means available to the SPAMI</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>Very low : 0</p> <p>Low : 1</p> <p>Adequate : 2</p> <p>Excellent : 3</p>	2
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The financial and material means available to the SPAMI are fair; these include both financial resources for the ordinary management of the MPA financed by the Ministry of the Environment and economic resources derived from fines, fares and some other public and private subjects. MPA counts also on annual financial support for managing the SAC/SPA from Autonomous Region of Sardinia.</p>	

	<u>Score</u>
<p>3.5. Does the area have a monitoring programme?</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p>	3

<p>No monitoring programme : 0</p> <p>The level of implementation of the monitoring programme is assessed as “insufficient” : 1</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - marine phanerogams, in particular monitoring, conservation and recovering of <i>Posidonia oceanica</i> meadows; - investigation and monitoring on coralligenous and maerl with ROV and dives - sensitive habitats and species (for example monitoring programme of <i>Pinna nobilis</i>, <i>Paracentrotus lividus</i>, <i>Patella ferruginea</i>, coralligenous, <i>Cystoseira</i> spp etc); - monitoring of Cetaceans and Sea turtles at local and large scale and specific monitoring in the MPA of <i>Tursiops truncatus</i>; - pleasure boating and diving frequentation; - beach and underwater systems monitoring, coastal dynamics and marine hydrodynamism; - monitoring and recovering of dune systems (in particular priority habitats); - monitoring of marine sea birds; - ichthyofauna and <i>Octopus vulgaris</i>; - marine litter at local and large scale; - monitoring of small scale fisheries 	

	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>	<p>2</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The SPAMI has an adequate feedback mechanism correlated to ISEA, SAC and SPA management plans.</p> <p>Based on the results of the monitoring, every year specific management measures are applied in order to regulate the activity of small scale fisheries, recreational fishing, pleasure boaters and to assure the maintenance of the ecological quality of the site and the state of health of more vulnerable ecosystems (e.g. <i>Posidonia oceanica</i> meadows, coralligenous assemblages, <i>Octopus vulgaris</i> and <i>Paracentrotus lividus</i> stocks). The decrease in the density and abundance of sea urchin in the last years, has led to the stop of the collection (since 2020).</p>	

	Score
<p>3.7. Is the management plan effectively implemented?</p>	<p>2</p>

<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 management is effectively implemented however additional human and economic resources would improve the level of implementation of the different management activities.</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>	2
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>During the evaluation program, the following concrete conservation measures were implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a series of anti-trawling reefs were put in place; • the ban on sea-urchin fishing was adopted; • awareness campaigns were carried out (a booklet for boaters, <i>Charadrius alexandrinus</i>); • An annual campaign against quartz sand collection is led by the municipality, together with a specific awareness campaign with the collaboration of volunteers and Legambiente (Sinis Sentinels). 	

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
	3

<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><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>All the exploitations of natural resources are regulated within the MPA.</p>	

Score	
<p>4.1.1.b. Efforts (actions) undertaken during the evaluation period to address/mitigate the unregulated exploitation of natural resources (e.g. sand mining, water, timber, living resources) See 5.1.1. in AF.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No efforts : 0</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>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p>	

Score	
<p>4.1.2.a. Threats to habitats and species (e.g. disturbance, desiccation, pollution, poaching, introduced alien species) See 5.1.2. in AF.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p>	<p>1</p>

<p>No threats : 3</p> <p>Weak threats : 2</p> <p>Serious threats : 1</p> <p>Very serious threats : 0</p> <p>4.1.2.a. 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>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The main traits to habitat and species are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • illegal fishing activities (trawling, poaching of sea-urchin), • anchoring of leisure boats on sensitive habitats, • noise from motorboats, • quartz sand collection. <p>Pollution and contamination are not significant because urban and industrial pressures are very low, although plastics contamination has started to become an issue coming from the sea.</p> <p>Also, the input of freshwaters, and the consequent possible organic and inorganic pollutants, is not significant.</p>	

	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>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 4.1.2. a) is “no threats”.)</p>	3
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>During the evaluation period the MPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • put in place an anti-trawling system, • undertook a complete maintenance and renewal of the mooring fields, approving a new regulation to allow anchoring in several sandy bottom areas. This reduced significantly the illegal anchoring over Posidonia meadows, • banned the sea-urchin collection, • in 2021 organised a special clean up action to contrast pollution, specially from plastics, in the Mal di Ventre island, • every year organizes several clean-ups along the coast, and also organizes awareness raising sections in the schools, • in summer, through the volunteer project “Sinis Sentinels”, brings the information and the sensibilization directly to the beach users. 	

	Score
<p>4.1.3.a. Increase of human impact (e.g. tourism, boats, building, immigration...)</p>	2

<p style="text-align: center;">See 5.1.3. 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 4.1.4. a).</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Summer tourist frequentation has experienced a significant growth over the last years and still a bigger increase is expected in the coming years. The demand for housing facilities and infrastructure and the production of wastes are also expected to increase.</p> <p>This increase in tourist visits and, consequently, the increase of people on the beaches, or pleasure boats, if not well addressed could threaten the area and some special habitats (such as dunes and beaches, vermetids bioconstructions, seagrass beds and coralligenous).</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</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>	2
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Even if human impacts are, at the moment, still low in the MPA, it has to face a growth that is quite fast. To mitigate the impact of tourist growth, some measures were taken (i.e. the parking infrastructures and regulation).</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>	2

<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 4.1.5. a).</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Conflictualities between fisher categories.</p>	

	Score
<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>	2
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>the MPA team has worked to encourage a reduction of conflictualities between fishing categories.</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>No other threats than the ones already mentioned above.</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.

Score	
<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</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>2</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The MPA is affected to a certain extent by floating solid waste (mainly plastic).</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>	<p>2</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>During the evaluation period the MPA organised regular cleaning activities including a specific intervention on the Mal di Ventre Island.</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 Weak threats : 2 Serious threats : 1 Very serious threats : 0</p> <p>(If the answer is “no threats”, pass directly to question 4.2.3. a).</p>	<p>2</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Threats only related to vehicles parking on the dunes in a small portion of the coast in summer period. and quartz sand collection. They have been reduced significantly since 2018 due to new parking regulation and increased controls by the local police, especially in summer season.</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 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>3</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The MPA and the municipality made significant efforts to keep under control the impacts on landscape, including the setup of a series of parking areas in specific sites choosen in orto protect the dune system.</p>		

		<u>Score</u>
<p>4.2.3.a. Expected development of threats upon the surrounding area. See 6.1 in AF.</p>	<p>2</p>	

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 4.2.4. a).

Rationale for the note

There is no expected increase of trawling in the area surrounding the SPAMI. However a slight increase of tourism is expected.

Score

2

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.

Rating scale

No efforts : 0

Little efforts : 1

Some efforts : 2

Significant efforts : 3

(If applicable: Not applicable if the answer to question 4.2.3. a) is “no threats”.)

Rationale for the note

The parking facilities put in place, as well as awareness campaigns aiming at mitigating the impact of frequentation on the MPA, are also contributing in mitigating such impacts on surrounding areas.

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

No other threats than the ones already mentioned above.

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

No other threats than the ones already mentioned above.

--

	<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 Yes : 1</p>	<p>1</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Italy has adopted a Maritime Spatial Plan.</p> <p>Moreover, at Regional and local levels, the following plans are adopted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the PPR (Landscape Regional Plan); • the Local coastal Plan (PUL), in the process of adoption. 	

	<u>Score</u>
<p>4.4. Does the management plan for the SPAMI have influence over the governance' . ' of the surrounding area? (D5.d Annex I). See 7.4.4. in the AF.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No : 0 Yes : 1</p>	<p>1</p>
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>From 2023 the Autonomous Region of Sardinia assigned the management of the two EU NATURA2000 sites “Isola di Mal di Ventre and Catalano” and “Stagno di Mistras” whose perimeters are wider than that of the SPAMI .</p>	

5. ENFORCEMENT OF PROTECTION MEASURES

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

	<u>Score</u>
<p>5.1.1. Are the boundaries of the area adequately marked on land and, if applicable, adequately marked at sea? See 8.3.1. in the AF.</p>	<p>1</p>

<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 regulation that have to be respected and the presence of sensitive species and habitats.</p> <p>All the No-Take Zones (A zones) and one general protection zone (B zone in Seu) are signalled by yellow buoys illuminated during the night.</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> <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, the Guardia di Finanza and the Corpo Forestale e di Vigilanza Ambientale Regionale are involved in the surveillance. Surveillance activities are carried out on land and sea.</p> <p>The surveillance is also assured by the Compagnia Barracellare (local environmental police), by the staff of the MPA and, from 2020, by the "Sinis Sentinels" a program that involves about 100 volunteers each summer to inform and sensibilize users.</p>	

	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>	<p>1</p>

Rationale for the note

Italian Coast Guard can enforce urgent or exceptional measures for safety and security reasons or for accidental pollution.

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 Yes : 1</p>	1
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The existing penalties and fines are appropriate to dissuade infractions (art. 39 of the REO and art. 15 of the detailed regulation approved by the Municipality)</p>	

Score	
<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>	0
<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 regulation and alert the institutional surveillance corps in case of infractions.</p>	

Score	
<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>	1

<p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No : 0</p> <p>Yes : 1</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The national contingency plan for marine pollution also considers this marine protected area. At local level, there is a plan, revised each year and under the authority and leadership of the Coast Guard, with annual exercises, too.</p> <p>Besides, the MPA staff received a special training by ISPRA to face marine pollution (i.e. oil spill) and also purchased floating barriers in order to act immediately in case of oil spills (the most probable pollution case in the area).</p>	

6. COOPERATION AND NETWORKING

	<u>Score</u>
<p>6.1. Are other national or international organizations collaborating to provide human or financial resources? (e.g. researchers, experts, volunteers...). See 9.1.3. in the AF.</p> <p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No : 0</p> <p>Weakly : 1</p> <p>Fairly : 2</p> <p>Excellent : 3</p>	3
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Involvement of the staff of the other regional MPAs and financial resources are available through two different agreements coordinated by RAS (Autonomous Region of Sardinia):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Regional Network for the Conservation of Marine Fauna, that supports for the management and care of Sea Turtles and Cetaceans distressed and conservation and safety of sea turtles nesting. the management of CRES centre, in joint venture with the National Research Council (CNR), that is the reference for other MPAs from Sardinia. <p>Other collaborations, based on specific programs, involve scientific institutions such as the Universities of Cagliari and Sassari, the National Research Council, ISPRA, Lega Ambiente, other international bodies, etc.</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>	2

<p><u>Rating scale</u></p> <p>No : 0</p> <p>Insufficient : 1</p> <p>Fairly : 2</p> <p>Excellent : 3</p>	
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>Collaboration with other Sardinians SPAMIs as Tavolara Punta - Coda Cavallo and Capo Carbonara is particularly active. In 2023, the SPAMI has participated in the twinning program coordinated by SPA/RAC with the SPAMI of “Zembra and Zembretta National park” (Tunisia).</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</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>	2
<p><u>Rationale for the note</u></p> <p>The number of staff has been increased hiring a technical collaborator under a permanent contract.</p>	

	<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>	2

'No' for all of them : 0
'Yes' for some of them : 1
'Yes' for most of them : 2
'Yes' for all of them : 3

Rationale for the note

he videosurveillance system has been renewed totally from 2019 with 6 cameras, and two control rooms, including one in the Coastguard premises.

The MPA has increased the effort for communication:

- design and installation of new informative panels along the coast,
- the "Sinis Sentinel" program,
- the new MPA website,
- the Visit Centre in the city of Cabras during summer,
- new information brochures,
- presence in international events in the area i.e. Open Water Challenge, Sagra del surf.

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 19 (Max : 24)

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

4. THREATS AND SURROUNDING CONTEXT

Total score 16 (Max : 23)

5. ENFORCEMENT OF PROTECTION MEASURES

Total score 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

4 (Max : 6)

Overall total score

61 (Max : 78)

Recommendations for future evaluation

- 1 - Considering the increasing in terms of administrative and financial management, strengthening of administrative staff is recommended.
- 2 - Extent the remote surveillance system by installing camera(s) to better monitor the A zone of the Mal di Ventre Island

Signatures

Massimo Marras
SPAMI Manager



Chedly Rais
Independent Expert



Chedly RAIS

Giorgio MASSARO
National Expert



Leonardo TUNESI
Focal Point



Robert Turk
Independent Expert

