



UNEP



# **Format for the Periodic Review of SPAMIs**



RAC/SPA, 2010

# Format for the Periodic Review of the SPAMIs

**SPAMI Name :** Capo Caccia - Isola Piana

## 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)**

Y N  
☒ ☐

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.

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

Y N  
☒ ☐

### 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**

Y N  
☒ ☐

**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**

Y N  
☒ ☐

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

Y	N
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**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).**

Y	N
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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.

In 2012 a specific management plan was adopted in the framework of the ISEA project (Standardized Operations Management in Marine Protected Areas), in 2013 a integrated management between Parco Naturale di Porto Conte (land), MPA Capo Caccia - Isola Piana (sea) , SIC ITB010042 (land and sea), ZPS ITB013044 (land and sea) was planned

### 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?**

Y	N
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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*

**3.2. Is the management plan in force?**

Y	N
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

**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?**

Y	N
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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.

#### 4. AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES AND INFORMATION

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

Y ☒ N ☐

*(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*

**4.2. Does the area have a monitoring program?**

Y ☒ N ☐

*(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?

ISEA (Standardized Operations Management in Marine Protected Areas) as a management plan of the environmental monitoring programs and socio-economic aspect. Monitoring programs of habitats and species included in Directive 43/92 and in Protocol SPAMI through the management of SIC ITB010042. The parameters used are the assessment of effect reserve with the use of the Visual Census and the estimate of spill over effect, even with investigations of genetic type (i.e. P.nobilis, P.ferruginea)

**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?**

Y ☒ N ☐

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.

**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 3  
**(SCORE: 0 means “very serious threats”; 3 means “no threats”)**

Serious threats to habitats and species *(e.g. disturbance, desiccation, pollution, poaching, introduced alien species ....)* See 5.1.2. in the AF 2  
**(SCORE: 0 means “very serious threats”; 3 means “no threats”)**

Increase of human presence *(e.g. tourism, boats, building, immigration...)*  
See 5.1.3. in AF 3  
**(SCORE: 0 means “very serious threats”; 3 means “no threats”)**

Historic and current conflicts between users or user groups See 5.1.4., 6.2. in the AF 2  
**(SCORE: 0 means “very serious threats”; 3 means “no threats”):**

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

Sportfishing / Professional fishing	2
Professional fishing / Diving centers	2
Invasive Non Indigenous Species ( <i>Caulerpa racemosa</i> )	2

**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”)

2

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”)

3

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

Marine litter transported by marine currents and deposited along the coast	2
Recreational vessel traffic and transit tourist	2

**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)

1

**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

## 6. REGULATIONS

### 6.1. Assess the degree of legal regulations See 7.4.2. in the AF

#### In particular, within the national framework:

Regulations concerning the strengthening of the application of the other Protocols to the Barcelona Convention, particularly dumping, passage of ships and modification of the soil (*Art. 6b, 6c, 6e in the Protocol, D5-a Annex I*)

1

(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

Regulations on the introduction of any species not indigenous to the specially protected area in question, or of any genetically modified species, (*Art. 6 d in the Protocol, D5-b Annex I*)

1

(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

Regulations concerning the Environmental Impact Assessment for the activities and projects that could significantly affect the protected areas (*Art. 17 in the Protocol*)

1

(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

#### In particular, within the SPAMI framework:

Regulations for fishing, hunting, taking of animals and harvesting of plants or their destruction, as well as trade with animals, parts of animals, plants, parts of plants, which originate in the area (*Art. 6 g in the Protocol, D5-c Annex I*)

1

(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)



## 7. MANAGEMENT

### 7.1. Assess the degree of detail of the management plan

(e.g. zoning, regulations for each zone, competencies and responsibilities, governing bodies, management programs as protection, natural resource management, tourism, public use, education, research, monitoring, maintenance, services and concessions....) See 8.2.3. in the AF

(SCORE: 0= No Management Plan / 1= Weak / 2= Adequate / 3= Excellent)

2

### 7.2. Assess to what extent land ownership is well determined

(Undetermined land tenure regimes and registrations are a common source of conflicts in most protected areas world-wide)

See 7.3. in the AF

(SCORE: 0= Undetermined / 1= Weak / 2= Adequate / 3= Excellent)

3

### 7.3. Is there a body representing the public, professional and non-governmental sector and the scientific community linked to the management body? (B4b, B4c of the Annex I). See 8.1.2. & 8.1.3

(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

1

### 7.4. Assess the quality of the involvement by the public, and particularly of local communities, in the planning and management of the area (B4.b of the Annex I)

(e.g. adequate planning involves local stakeholders and accommodates within appropriate management regimes a spectrum of possible multiple uses and regulated human activities, within the primary objective of conservation of marine and coastal environments) See 8.1.4. in the AF

(SCORE: 0= No involvement / 1= Low / 2= Adequate / 3= Excellent)

1

### 7.5. Is the management plan binding for other national/local administrations with competencies in the area? See 8.2.2 in the AF

(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

1



## 8. PROTECTION MEASURES

### 8.1. Assess the degree of enforcement of the protection measures

#### In particular:

Are the area boundaries adequately marked on land and, if applicable, adequately marked on the sea? See 8.3.1. in the AF  
(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

1

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. 8.3.3. in AF  
(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

1

Are third party agencies also empowered to enforce regulations relating to the SPAMI protective measures ?  
(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

1

Are there adequate penalties and powers for effective enforcement of regulations and is the field staff empowered to impose sanctions? See 8.3.4. in the AF  
(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

1

Has the area established a contingency plan to face accidental pollution or other serious emergencies? (*Art. 7.3. in the Protocol, Recom. 13<sup>th</sup> Parties Meeting*)  
(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

1

## 9. HUMAN RESOURCES

**9.1. Adequacy of the human resources available to the management body** (*Art.7.2-f in the Protocol, D6 in Annex I*) (e.g. enough number of employees to ensure adequate management and protection of the area)  
See 9.1.1. in the AF

Is there a permanent field administrator of the area?  
See 9.1.2. in the AF  
(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

1

Are there other permanent staffs in the field?  
(e.g. technicians, wardens, guides, ...) See 9.1.2. in the AF  
(SCORE : 0 = No / 1 = Yes)

1

**9.2. Assess the adequacy of the training level of available staff**  
(Art.7.2-f in the Protocol, D6 in Annex I) (e.g. enough training level to ensure protection of the area). See 9.1.2. in the AF  
(SCORE: 0= Very Insufficient / 1= Low / 2= Adequate / 3= Excellent)

3

## 10. FINANCIAL AND MATERIAL MEANS

**10.1. Assess the degree of adequacy of the financial means**  
Sufficient resources for the development and implementation of the management plan, including e.g. interpretation, education, training, research, surveillance and enforcement of regulations. See 9.2.1. in the AF  
(SCORE: 0= Very Insufficient / 1= Low / 2= Adequate / 3= Excellent)

1

**10.2. Assess the basic infrastructure** (Art.7.2-f in the Protocol)  
Administrative premises in the site, visitors' facilities (reception centre, trails, signs...), specific information, education and awareness materials  
(SCORE: 0= Very Insufficient / 1= Low / 2= Adequate / 3= Excellent)

3

**10.3. Assess the equipment.**  
Guard posts and signs on the main accesses, means to respond to emergencies, marine and terrestrial vehicles, radio and communications equipment. See 9.2.3. in the AF  
(SCORE: 0= Very Insufficient / 1= Low / 2= Adequate / 3= Excellent)

3

## 11. INFORMATION AND KNOWLEDGE

**11.1. Assess the extent of knowledge about the area and its surrounding zones.** (D3 - Annex I: Considering at least specific maps, habitat distribution, species inventories, and socio-economical factors)  
See 9.3.1. in the AF  
(SCORE: 0= Very Insufficient / 1= Low / 2= Adequate / 3= Excellent)

3

**11.2. Assess the adequacy of the program for data collection and the monitoring program.**  
See 9.3.2. in the AF  
(SCORE: 0= Inexistent / 1= Insufficient / 2= Adequate / 3= Excellent)

2

## 12. COOPÉRATION AND NETWORKING

**12.1. Are other national or international organizations collaborating with human or financial resources?** (e.g. researchers, experts, volunteers..).

3

See 9.1.3. in the AF

(SCORE: 0= No / 1= Weakly / 2= Satisfactory / 3= Excellent)

**12.2. 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, A.d in Annex I)

2

(SCORE: 0= No / 1= Insufficient / 2= Adequate / 3= Excellent)

### COMMENTS by the Technical Advisory Commission

The Management Body presented to the TAC the activities carried out in the MPA in order to reach the conservation and management goals and fulfill the SPAMI criteria. The TAC gave advice on some statements of single sections of the Format for the Periodic Reviw, specially concerning the monitoring and survey of human activities.

### CONCLUSION

The TAC changed slightly the values given by the Management Body. In spite of the above the TAC is of the opinion that the MPA Capo Caccia Isola Piana fulfills the SPAMI criteria set up in the SPA & BD Protocol.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The TAC appreciated the efforts and the actual results obtained and presented by the Management Body. In order to further improve the efficiency of the management of the area the TAC suggests:

- to further improve the monitoring activities finalized to support management, in particular considering adaptive management;
- to further improve the survey and control over human activities, including diving;
- to reinforce the cooperation between the MPA and the regional park, specially on beach, cliffs and dune management;
- to enhance the collaboration between Marine Coastal Guard and MPA staff .

Regarding the improvement of SPAMI management, the TAC recommends to the RAC . SPA to facilitate the collaboration between SPAMIs

## SIGNATURES

National Focal Point

*Antonio Turi*

Independent Experts

*[Signature]*

SPAMI Manager(s)

*Vittorio Gerale*

National Expert  
*[Signature]*

15.1.2015

(ADDITIONAL PAGES MAY BE ADDED FOR EACH MEMBER'S COMMENTS)

## SPAMI VALUE-ADDED

Questions		Score obtained	Maximum
5	Threats and surrounding context	20	23
6	Regulations	4	4
7	Management	8	11
8	Protection measures	5	5
9	Human resources	5	5
10	Financial and material means	7	9
11	Information and knowledge	5	6
12	Cooperation and networkings	5	6
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>59</b>	<b>69</b>