



UNITED
NATIONS

EP

UNEP/MED WG.461/18



UNEP



UNITED NATIONS
ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME
MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN

17 May 2019
Original: English

Fourteenth Meeting of SPA/BD Thematic Focal Points

Portorož, Slovenia, 18-21 June 2019

Agenda item 6: Conservation of sites of particular ecological interest
6.3. List of Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance (SPAMI List)
6.3.3. Updating of the Format for the periodic review of SPAMIs

Draft updated Format for the periodic review of SPAMIs

For environmental and cost-saving reasons, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies

Draft updated Format for the periodic review of SPAMIs

I. Background

1. During their Fifteenth Ordinary Meeting (Almeria, Spain, 15-18 January 2008), the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols adopted the “Procedure for the revision of the areas included in the List of Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance (the SPAMI List)”, including a Format for the periodic review (Decision IG.17/12¹).

2. The adopted Format for the periodic review has been used for SPAMI ordinary periodic reviews between the 2008-2009 and 2014-2015 biennia. During this period, 39 SPAMIs have been evaluated (including 13 SPAMIs that have been evaluated twice).

3. In 2015, 22 SPAMIs were evaluated, and the most recurrent recommendation arising from these evaluations was related to the need of revising the Format for the periodic review of SPAMIs based on the experience gained from the evaluations undertaken until then.

4. The Twelfth Meeting of Focal Points for Specially Protected Areas (Athens, Greece, 25-29 May 2015) took note of this recommendation and, given the urgency of the matter, requested SPA/RAC to draft a revised format with a view to submitting it to the Nineteenth Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties in February 2016.

5. SPA/RAC prepared a first draft, which was subject to consultation and review by the SPA/BD Focal Points and relevant partner organizations, and then submitted to the Nineteenth Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties.

6. The revised format was intended to be established online, in a way that (i) keeps records of the main elements of the SPAMI presentation report, the previous review reports and recommendations, and any other relevant official documentation, and (ii) includes guidance on how to translate the results of the assessment into scores. A SPAMI achieving a score less than a threshold minimum score should be proposed for inclusion in a period of provisional nature, as provided for by the procedure.

7. The Nineteenth Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties (Athens, Greece, 9-12 February 2016) took note of the revised format, and requested SPA/RAC to prepare the online version and to use it, on a trial basis, for the evaluation of SPAMIs of 2017, along with the old version of the evaluation format (Decision IG.22/14²).

8. During the 2016-2017 biennial period, SPA/RAC established the online SPAMI Evaluation System (http://rac-spa.org/spami_eval/spami.php) and tested it during the 2017 ordinary review of three coastal national SPAMIs.

¹ Decision IG.17/12:

https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/7257/08ig17_10_annex5_17_12_eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

² Decision IG.22/14:

https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/6076/16ig22_28_22_14_eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

9. The Twentieth Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties (Tirana, Albania, 17-20 December 2017) requested SPA/RAC to continue supporting the use of the online evaluation system for evaluating coastal national SPAMIs and test it for transboundary high-sea SPAMIs (Decision IG.23/9³).
10. The evaluation of the Pelagos Sanctuary for the Conservation of Marine Mammals, undertaken in 2019, allowed the testing of the online SPAMI Evaluation System for transboundary high-sea SPAMIs.
11. At the end of the review, Technical Advisory Commission (TAC) in charge of the evaluation of the Pelagos Sanctuary provided suggestions of modifications to the Format for the Periodic Review of SPAMIs. These suggestions appear in Annex I to the present document.
12. The TACs in charge of the 2018-2019 evaluation of the other eighteen coastal national SPAMIs have also provided comments and proposals for the improvement of the SPAMI review format and related online evaluation system. All these comments are in line with those proposed by the Pelagos TAC.
13. The present document proposes an updated version of the Format for the periodic review of SPAMIs, based on the proposals and comments received from the TACs involved in the SPAMI ordinary reviews.
14. Once endorsed, this updated format will be reflected on the online SPAMI Evaluation System.
15. The online SPAMI Evaluation System (www.rac-spa.org/spami_eval) will be also technically upgraded and improved, in order to offer a more user-friendly, comprehensive and secure system.

³ Decision IG.23/9: http://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/id/74414/17ig23_23_2309_eng.pdf

II. Draft updated Format for the periodic review of SPAMIs

www.rac-spa.org/spami_eval

The SPAMI List was established in 2001 (Monaco Declaration) in order to promote cooperation in the management and conservation of natural areas, as well as in the protection of threatened species and their habitats. Furthermore, the areas 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.

During their COP 15 (Almeria, Spain, January 2008), the Contracting Parties adopted a procedure for the revision of the areas included in the SPAMI List and requested SPA/RAC to implement it.

The procedure aims to evaluate the SPAMI sites in order to examine whether they meet the [SPA/BD Protocol](#)'s criteria. An ordinary review of SPAMIs shall take place every six years, counting from the date of the inclusion of the site in the SPAMI List.

SPAMI Name:	
--------------------	--

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

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. Assessment scale: 0 = No, 1 = Yes</p>	?
Score justification	

	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>Assessment scale: 0 = Significant changes 1 = Moderate changes 2 = Slight changes 3 = No adverse change</p>	?
Score justification	

	Score
<p>1.3 Are the objectives, set out in the original SPAMI application for designation, actively pursued?</p> <p>Assessment scale: 0 = No 1 = Only some of them 2 = Yes for most of them 3 = Yes for all of them</p>	?
Score justification	

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>Assessment scale: 0 = Significant negative change in the legal status of the SPAMI 1 = Slight negative change in the legal status of the SPAMI 2 = The SPAMI has maintained or improved its legal status</p>	?
Score justification	

	Score
<p>2.2 Are competencies and responsibilities clearly defined in the texts governing the area?</p> <p>Assessment scale: 0 = competencies and responsibilities are not clearly defined 1 = The definition of competencies and responsibilities needs slight improvements 2 = The SPAMI has clearly defined competencies and responsibilities</p>	?
Score justification	

	Score
<p>2.3 Does the area have a management body, endowed with sufficient powers? (Not applicable for multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMIs)</p> <p>Assessment scale: 0 = No management body, or the management body is not endowed with sufficient powers 1 = The management body is not fully dedicated to the SPAMI 2 = The SPAMI has a fully dedicated management body and sufficient powers to implement the conservation measures</p>	?
Score justification	

In the case of multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMIs:

	Score
<p>2.3 Does the area have governance bodies in line with the original application for inclusion in the SPAMI List?</p> <p>Assessment scale: 0= No governance bodies 1= Only some governance bodies are in place 2= The governance bodies are in place, but they are not functioning on a regular basis (e.g.: no regular meetings or works) 3= The SPAMI has fully dedicated governance bodies and sufficient powers to address the conservation challenges</p>	?
Score justification	

3. MANAGEMENT AND AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES

	Score
<p>3.1 Does the SPAMI have a management plan? Assessment scale: 0 = No management plan 1 = The level of implementation of the management plan is assessed as “insufficient” 2 = The management plan is not officially adopted but its implementation is assessed as “adequate” 3 = The management plan is officially adopted and adequately implemented</p>	?
Score justification	

	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 Protocol and Section 8.2.3 of the Annotated Format (AF⁴). Assessment scale: 0 = Low 1 = Medium 2 = Good 3 = Excellent</p>	?
Score justification	

	Score
<p>3.3 Assess the adequacy of the human resources available to the SPAMI. Assessment scale: 0 = Very low/Insufficient 1 = Low 2 = Adequate 3 = Excellent</p>	?
Score justification	

⁴ Annotated format for the presentation reports for the areas proposed for inclusion of the SPAMI list

	Score
<p>3.4 Assess the adequacy of the financial and material means available to the SPAMI (Not applicable for multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMIs)</p> <p>Assessment scale: 0 = Very low 1 = Low 2 = Adequate 3 = Excellent</p>	?
Score justification	

In the case of multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMIs:

	Score
<p>3.4.1. Assess the adequacy of the financial and material means available for the implementation of the SPAMI conservation/management measures at national level</p> <p>Assessment scale: 0 = Low 1 = Medium 2 = Good 3 = Excellent</p>	?
Score justification	

In the case of multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMIs:

	Score
<p>3.4.2. Assess the adequacy of the financial and material means available to the multilateral governance bodies of the SPAMI</p> <p>Assessment scale: 0= Low 1= Medium 2= Good 3= Excellent</p>	?
Score justification	

	Score
<p>3.5 Does the area have a monitoring programme?</p> <p>Assessment scale: 0 = No monitoring programme 1 = The level of implementation of the monitoring programme is assessed as “insufficient” 2 = The monitoring programme needs improvement to cover other parameters that are significant for the SPAMI 3 = 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>	?
<p>Score justification If the TAC identified important parameters that are not covered by the monitoring programme of the SPAMI, these should be listed here with the related rationale.</p>	

	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>Assessment scale: 0 = Low 1 = Medium 2 = Good 3 = Excellent</p>	?
<p>Score justification</p>	

	Score
<p>3.7 Is the management plan effectively implemented?</p> <p>Assessment scale: 0= Low 1= Medium 2= Good 3= Excellent</p>	?
<p>Score justification</p>	

	Score
<p>3.8 Have any concrete conservation measures, activities and actions been implemented?</p> <p>Assessment scale: 0 = Low 1 = Medium 2 = Good 3 = Excellent</p>	?
Score justification	

SECTION II: 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))

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).

In particular:

	Score
4.1.1. a) Unregulated exploitation of natural resources (e.g. sand mining, water, timber, living resources) See 5.1.1. in AF Score: 0 means “no threats”; 3 means “very serious threats”	?
Score justification	

	Score
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 Score: 0 means “no effort”; 3 means “significant effort”	?
Score justification	

	Score
4.1.2. a) Threats to habitats and species (e.g. disturbance, desiccation, pollution, poaching, introduced alien species) See 5.1.2. in AF Score: 0 means “no threats” ; 3 means “very serious threats”	?
Score justification	

	Score
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 Score: 0 means “no effort”; 3 means “significant effort”	?
Score justification	

	Score
<p>4.1.3. a) Increase of human impact (e.g. tourism, boats, building, immigration...) See 5.1.3. in AF Score: 0 means “no threats”; 3 means “very serious threats”</p>	?
Score justification	

	Score
<p>4.1.3. b) Efforts (actions) undertaken during the evaluation period to address/mitigate the increase of human impact (e.g. tourism, boats, building, immigration...) See 5.1.3. in AF Score: 0 means “no effort”; 3 means “significant effort”</p>	?
Score justification	

	Score
<p>4.1.4. a) Conflicts between users or user groups. See 5.1.4. and 6.2. in AF Score: 0 means “no threats”; 3 means “very serious threats”</p>	?
Score justification	

	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 Score: 0 means “no effort”; 3 means “significant effort”</p>	?
Score justification	

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

In particular:

	Score
4.2.1. a) Pollution problems from external sources including solid waste and those affecting waters up-current. See 5.2.1. in the AF. Score: 0 means “no threats”; 3 means “very serious threats”	?
Score justification	

	Score
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 the AF. Score: 0 means “no effort”; 3 means “significant effort”	?
Score justification	

	Score
4.2.2. a) Significant impacts on landscapes and on cultural values. See 5.2.2 in AF. Score: 0 means “no threats”; 3 means “very serious threats”	?
Score justification	

	Score
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. Score: 0 means “no effort”; 3 means “significant effort”	?
Score justification	

<p>4.2.3. a) Expected development of threats upon the surrounding area. See 6.1. in AF. Score: 0 means “no threats”; 3 means “very serious threats”</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Score</p> <p style="text-align: center;">?</p>
<p>Score justification</p>	

<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. Score: 0 means “no effort”; 3 means “significant effort”</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Score</p> <p style="text-align: center;">?</p>
<p>Score justification</p>	

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

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

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>Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Score</p> <p style="text-align: center;">?</p>
<p>Score justification</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>Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Score</p> <p style="text-align: center;">?</p>
<p>Score justification</p>	

5. ENFORCEMENT OF PROTECTION MEASURES

5.1 Assess the degree of enforcement of the protection measures

In particular:

	Score
5.1.1. Are the area boundaries adequately marked on land and, if applicable, adequately marked at sea? See 8.3.1. in AF (Not applicable for multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMIs) Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes	?
Score justification	

In the case of multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMI:

	Score
5.1.1. a) Is the area officially delimited on the international marine / terrestrial maps? Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes	?
Score justification	

In the case of multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMI:

	Score
5.1.1. b) Is the area officially reported on the marine / terrestrial maps of each SPAMI Member State? Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes	?
Score justification	

In the case of multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMI:

	Score
5.1.1. c) Are the coordinates of the area easily accessible (maps, internet, etc.)? Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes	?
Score justification	

	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 Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes</p>	?
<p>Score justification</p>	

	Score
<p>5.1.3. Are third party agencies also empowered to enforce regulations relating to the SPAMI protective measures? (Not applicable for multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMIs) Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes</p>	?
<p>Score justification</p>	

	Score
<p>5.1.4. Are there adequate penalties and powers for effective enforcement? See 8.3.4. in AF Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes</p>	?
<p>Score justification</p>	

	Score
<p>5.1.5. Is the field staff empowered to impose sanctions? See 8.3.4. in AF Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes</p>	?
<p>Score justification</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) Score: 0 = No / 1 = Yes</p>	?
<p>Score justification</p>	

6. COOPERATION AND NETWORKING

	Score
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 Score: 0 = No / 1 = Weakly / 2 = Fairly / 3 = Excellent	?
Score justification	

	Score
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) Score: 0 = No / 1 = Insufficient / 2 = Fairly / 3 = Excellent	?
Score justification	

SECTION III: FOLLOW-UP OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE PREVIOUS EVALUATION(S)

(If applicable: Not applicable for SPAMIs undergoing their first ordinary periodic review)

7. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE PREVIOUS EVALUATIONS

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

	Score
Assessment scale: 0 = 'No' for all of them 1 = 'Yes' for some of them 2 = 'Yes' for most of them 3 = 'Yes' for all of them	?

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

	Score
Assessment scale: 0 = 'No' for all of them 1 = 'Yes' for some of them 2 = 'Yes' for most of them 3 = 'Yes' for all of them	?

CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. MEDITERRANEAN VALUE OF THE SPAMI

Total Score: ?

(Coastal national SPAMI - max: 7; **Multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMI - max: 7**)

2. LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

Total Score: ?

(Coastal national SPAMI - max: 6; **Multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMI - max: 7**)

3. MANAGEMENT AND AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES

Total Score: ?

(Coastal national SPAMI - max: 24; **Multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMI - max: 27**)

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

4. THREATS AND SURROUNDING CONTEXT

Total Score: ?

(Coastal national SPAMI - max: 42; **Multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMI - max: 42**)

5. ENFORCEMENT OF PROTECTION MEASURES

Total Score: ?

(Coastal national SPAMI - max: 6; **Multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMI - max: 7**)

6. COOPERATION AND NETWORKING

Total Score: ?

(Coastal national SPAMI - max: 6; **Multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMI - 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 (Not applicable for SPAMIs undergoing their first ordinary periodic review)

Total Score: ?

(National SPAMI - max: 6; **Multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMI - max: 6**)

GRAND TOTAL SCORE: ?

(National SPAMI - max: 99⁵; **Multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMI - max: 104⁶**)

⁵ 93 if the SPAMI is subject to its first ordinary periodic review.

⁶ 98 if the SPAMI is subject to its first ordinary periodic review.

Score evaluation:

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 for 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, or 3.6
- a score < 2 for 1.2, 1.3, 7.1 or 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 69⁷ for a coastal national SPAMI or less than 72⁸ for a multilateral (transboundary high sea) SPAMI (=70% of the maximum total score of 99 and 104, respectively).

CONCLUSION (BASED ON THE SCORE EVALUATION) BY THE TAC FOR THE PRESENT EVALUATION:

RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE TAC FOR THE FUTURE EVALUATION:

Recommendation 1:

Recommendation 2:

etc.

SIGNATURES

National Focal Point

Independent Experts

SPAMI Manager(s)

National Expert

⁷ 65 if the SPAMIs subject to its first periodic review.

⁸ 68 if the SPAMI is subject to its first ordinary periodic review.

Annex I

**Suggestions of modifications to the Format for the Periodic Review of SPAMIs
provided by the Technical Advisory Commission (TAC)
in charge of the 2019 ordinary review of the Pelagos Sanctuary**



Suggestions of modifications to the Format for the Periodic Review of SPAMIs

At the occasion of its meeting for the evaluation of the SPAMI "Pelagos Sanctuary" (Monaco, 29 March 2019), the *Technical Advisory Commission* (TAC) identified a series of inconsistencies in the Format for the Periodic Review of SPAMIs and decided accordingly to submit the following recommendations to SPA/RAC.

1. Recommendations of relevance for the evaluation of all SPAMIs

- The scoring scale for Section 3 of the Format (MANAGEMENT AND AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES) should be extended as follows for all questions:
 - 0= Low
 - 1= Medium
 - 2= Good
 - 3= Excellent
- In Section 3 of the Format (MANAGEMENT AND AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES) add questions about:
 - the implementation of the management plan;
 - the implementation of concrete conservation measures, activities and actions.
- The present scoring scale for threats under Section 5 (THREATS AND SURROUNDING CONTEXT) implies that the existence of threats is a weakness for the evaluated SPAMI, while the SPA/BD Protocol considers that the existence of threats is among the characteristics and factors that should be considered as favourable for the inclusion of a proposed site in the SPAMI List (paragraph "a" of article 4 in Section B of the Annex 1 to the Protocol). The TAC suggests therefore to:
 - invert the scoring to make it in line with the Criteria set in the Protocol (ex: 0 means "no threats"; 3 means "very serious threats")
and
 - add a new question about the effort(s) made during the evaluation period to mitigate threats.
(ex: Mitigation of the threats existing at the inclusion of the area on the SPAMI List: 0 means none of the threats, 3 means all the threats were mitigated)



2. Recommendations of special relevance for the multilateral SPAMIs

- The question 2.3 (*Does the area have management bodies in line with the original SPAMI application for designation?*) should be replaced with:
“Does the area have governance bodies in line with the original SPAMI application for designation? Assessment scale:
0= No governance bodies;
1= Only some governance bodies are in place;
2= The governance bodies are in place but they are not functioning on a regular basis (ex: no regular meetings or works);
3= The SPAMI has fully dedicated governance bodies and sufficient powers to address the conservation challenges”.
- The item 3.4 (*Assess the adequacy of the financial and material means available to the SPAMI*) should be split into 2 separate items:
 - Assess the adequacy of the financial and material means available for the implementation of the SPAMI conservation/management measures at national level and
 - Assess the adequacy of the financial and material means available to the multilateral governance bodies of the SPAMI.

In Section 5 (ENFORCEMENT OF PROTECTION MEASURES):

- The question: *Are third party agencies also empowered to enforce regulations relating to the SPAMI protective measures?* is not relevant for the multilateral SPAMIs;
- The question: *Are the area boundaries adequately marked on land and, if applicable, adequately marked on the sea?* is not applicable for the multilateral SPAMIs.
It could be replaced by:
 - Is the area officially delimited on the international marine / terrestrial maps?
 - Is the area officially reported on the marine / terrestrial maps of each SPAMI Member State?
 - Are the coordinates of the area easily accessible (maps, internet, etc.)?