

Format for the Periodic Review of the SPAMIs

SPAMI Name : SP 7 Columbretes Islands

(Two administrations are responsible for the management of this SPAMI:

- Spanish Central Administration for the SPAMI's marine area
 - Valencia Autonomous Administration for the SPAMI's terrestrial area
- This contingency will be taken into account when answering to questions from 5 to 12)

SECTION I: CRITERIA WHICH ARE MANDATORY FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN AREA IN THE SPAMI LIST

(Art. 8.2. of the Protocol and General Principles and C and D of Annex I)

In each question, crossed references to the Annotated Format (AF) are given.

1. CONSERVATION STATUS

1.1. Does the SPAMI fulfill one of the criteria related to Mediterranean interest as presented in Protocol's (Annex I section B para. 2), strictly maintain the status of populations of its protected species (those in Annex II to the Protocol), the status of its habitats and no adverse significant changes in the functioning of its ecosystems? (Article 8.2.)
(See 3.4. and 4 in the AF)

In case of "no", indicate the reasons that have motivated the deficiencies, their relative seriousness and, if possible, the date in which they are expected to be overcome.

YES

1.2 If "yes", are the objectives, set out in the original SPAMI application for designation, actively pursued?

YES

2. LEGAL STATUS

2.1. Does the area maintains or has improved its legal protection status from the date of the previous report? (A-e and C-2, Annex I).
See 7.1.2 in the AF

YES (See Appendix 1)

2.2. Does the legal declaration of this area consider the conservation of natural values as the primary objective? (A-a and D1 in Annex I). See 7.1.3 in the AF

YES

2.3. Are competencies and responsibilities clearly defined in the texts governing the area? (D4 Annex I). See 7.4.3 in the AF

YES

2.4. Are external influences/threats been taken into account in the legal framework of the SPAMI? Does the legal text clearly establish coordination means between land and sea authorities? (D4 Annex I, Art.7.4. in the Protocol).

In case there is no sea within the SPAMI, this question would be non-applicant.
See 7.4.3. in the AF

Indicate measures that have been adopted to address these influences/threats. In case of any "no" answer, indicate the reasons that have motivated the deficiencies and, if possible, the date in which they are expected to be overcome.

YES (See appendix 1)

3. MANAGEMENT METHODS (General principles D Annex 1)

3.1. Does the area have the same or an improved management body/authority as when the SPAMI was established and/or last evaluated?

Existence of a management body with sufficient powers (Art. 7.2.d, 7.2.f).
D6 - Annex I: "To be included in the SPAMI List, a protected area must have a management body, endowed with sufficient powers as well as means and human resources to prevent and/or control activities likely to be contrary to the aims of the protected area". See 8.1. in the AF

YES

3.2. Is the management plan in force?

Has the management plan been officially adopted? (D7 Annex I). See 8.2.1, 8.2.2. in the AF

YES (See appendix 1)

3.3. Does the management plan address the requirements set out in article 7 of the Protocol and Section 8.2.3 of the Annotated Format?

More details useful for the evaluation of the management plan are addressed in question 7.1 of this questionnaire.

In case of any "no" answer, indicate the reasons that have motivated the deficiencies and, if possible, the date in which they are expected to be overcome.

YES

4. AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES AND INFORMATION

4.1. Is there basic equipment, human and financial resources ensured to the management body?

(Art. 7.2.d, 7.2.f. D6 in Annex I: "To be included in the SPAMI List, a protected area must have a management body, endowed with sufficient powers as well as means and human resources to prevent and/or control activities likely to be contrary to the aims of the protected area"). See 9.1, 9.2. in the AF

YES (See appendix 1)

4.2. Does the area have a monitoring program?

(D8 - Annex I: "The program should include the identification and monitoring of a certain number of significant parameters for the area in question, in order to allow the assessment of the state and evolution of the area, as well as the effectiveness of protection and management measures implemented, so that they may be adapted if need be"). See 9.3.3. in the AF

If yes, what are the monitoring parameters and the management objectives being addressed by these parameters?

YES (See appendix 1)

4.3 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?

In case of any "no" answer, indicate the reasons that have motivated the deficiencies, their relative seriousness, and the date in which they are expected to be overcome.

YES (See appendix 1)

SECTION II: FEATURES PROVIDING A VALUE-ADDED TO THE AREA
(Section B4 of the Annex I, and other obligatory for a SPA (Art. 6 and 7 of the Protocol))

5. THREATS AND SURROUNDING CONTEXT

5.1 Assess the level of threats within the site to the ecological, biological, aesthetic and cultural values of the area (B4.a Annex I).

See 5.1. consider also 3.5.2.b, 6.3 & 6.4. in the AF

In particular:

Unregulated exploitation of natural resources

(e.g. sand mining, water, timber, living resources) See 5.1.1. in the AF

(SCORE: 0 means "very serious threats"; 3 means "no threats")

3

Serious threats to habitats and species (e.g. disturbance, desiccation, pollution, poaching, introduced alien species) See 5.1.2. in the AF

(SCORE: 0 means "very serious threats"; 3 means "no threats")

2

Increase of human presence (e.g. tourism, boats, building, immigration...)

See 5.1.3. in AF

(SCORE: 0 means "very serious threats"; 3 means "no threats")

2

Historic and current conflicts between users or user groups See 5.1.4., 6.2. in the AF

(SCORE: 0 means "very serious threats"; 3 means "no threats"):

3

Please include a prescriptive list of threats that are of concern and are evaluated individually

(See appendix 1)

5.2 Assess the level of external threats to the ecological, biological, aesthetic and cultural values of the area (B4.a of the Annex I). See 5.2. in the AF

In particular:

Pollution problems from external sources including solid waste and those affecting waters up-current. See 5.2.1. in the AF

(SCORE: 0 means "very serious threats"; 3 means "no threats")

3

Significant impacts on landscapes and on cultural values. See 5.2.2

(SCORE: 0 means "very serious threats"; 3 means "no threats")

3

Expected development of threats upon the surrounding area See 6.1. in the AF

(SCORE: 0 means "very serious threats"; 3 means "no threats")

2

Please include a prescriptive list of external threats that are of concern and are evaluated individually.

(See appendix 1)

5.3. Is there an integrated coastal management plan or land-use laws in the area limiting or surrounding the SPAMI? (B4.e Annex I). See 5.2.3.

(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

Not applicable.

5.4. 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

(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

1