



Note : The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this document do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNEP concerning the legal status of any State, Territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of their frontiers or boundaries. The opinions expressed in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of RAC/SPA and UNEP.

© 2007 United Nations Environment Programme  
Mediterranean Action Plan  
Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas (RAC/SPA)  
Boulevard du leader Yasser Arafat  
B.P.337 –1080 Tunis CEDEX  
E-mail : [car-asp@rac-spa.org](mailto:car-asp@rac-spa.org)

The original version (English) of this document has been prepared for the Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas (RAC/SPA) by:

Members of the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) Marine, Mediterranean Group.

#### Field

Dr. Carlo Franzosini, Miramare Marine Reserve – Shoreline Company  
Dr. Fabio Badalamenti, CNR – IAMC – Castellammare del Golfo  
Dr. Julian Roberts, IUCN Global Marine Program  
Dr. Tony Roupael, Independent Consultant

#### Supervisory and Review

Dr. Giuseppe Notarbartolo di Sciara, Tethys Institute  
Dr. Ameer Abdulla, IUCN Global Marine Program

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>II. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
II.1. BACKGROUND .....	1
II.2. ASSIGNMENT TASKS.....	2
II.3. ASSIGNMENT DELIVERABLES .....	2
II.4. STRUCTURE OF REPORT .....	2
<b>III. METHODS</b> .....	<b>2</b>
III.1. REVIEW OF DOCUMENTATION .....	2
III.2. FIELD WORK.....	3
<b>IV. RESULTS</b> .....	<b>3</b>
IV.1. STRENGTHS OF PROPOSED EVALUATION APPROACH .....	3
<i>a Probationary period (called the Extraordinary Review)</i> .....	3
<i>b Independent assessor</i> .....	3
<i>c Site visit</i> .....	3
<i>d Multidisciplinary evaluation team</i> .....	3
IV.2. WEAKNESSES OF THE PROPOSED EVALUATION APPROACH.....	3
<i>a Mandatory criteria missing from Section 1 of the Format for the Periodic Review</i> .....	3
<i>b Uncertainty as to what constitutes the primary objectives of a SPAMI</i> .....	4
<i>c Mandatory criteria inaccurately transferred from the Protocol to the Format for the Periodic Review and inaccurate cross-referencing</i> .....	4
<i>d Some mandatory criteria are ambiguous or are too brief for precise interpretation</i> .....	4
<i>e No allowances made to review supporting documents such as monitoring reports</i> .....	5
IV.3. RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE THE <i>FORMAT FOR THE PERIODIC REVIEW</i> AND THE OVERALL EVALUATION APPROACH .....	5
<i>a Specific recommendations to improve Section 1 of the Format for the Periodic Review</i> .....	5
<i>b Generic recommendations to improve the Format for the Periodic Review</i> .....	9
<i>c Recommendations to improve the overall evaluation approach</i> .....	10
<b>V. CONCLUSION</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>VI. REFERENCES</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>VII. APPENDIX A: <i>FORMAT FOR PERIODIC REVIEW</i> AND NOTES ILLUSTRATING INCONSISTENCIES WITH THE CRITERIA DESCRIBED IN ANNEX I OF THE PROTOCOL.</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>VIII. APPENDIX B: PROPOSED EXAMPLE TO OPERATIONALLY DEFINE THE APPLICATION OF THE CRITERIA.</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>IX. APPENDIX C: PROPOSED MODIFIED VERSION OF THE EVALUATION APPROACH INCORPORATING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THIS DOCUMENT</b> .....	<b>21</b>



## I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean (hereafter the 'Protocol') came into force in 1999. Annex I of the Protocol lists mandatory criteria for eligibility for inclusion within the SPAMI list. To facilitate the inclusion of sites into the SPAMI list or to remove those that failed to meet the mandatory criteria, the Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas (RAC/SPA) drafted a generic evaluation approach described in *Procedure for the Revision of Areas included in the SPAMI List* (RAC/SPA 2005), including an evaluation form called the *Format for Periodic Review*. The *Format for Periodic Review* is given in Section 4 of RAC/SPA (2005).

The purpose of this report is present the findings of a study aimed at identifying the weaknesses and strengths of the proposed RAC/SPA evaluation approach, and to make recommendations to rectify some of the weaknesses.

Strengths and weaknesses of the proposed evaluation approach are summarised in the following table.

Strengths	Weaknesses
Probationary period	Mandatory criteria missing from Section 1
Independent assessor	Uncertainty as to what constitutes the primary objectives of SPAMI sites
Site visit	Mandatory criteria inaccurately transferred from the Protocol to the Format for the Periodic Review and inaccurate cross-referencing
Multidisciplinary evaluation team	Some mandatory criteria ambiguous or too brief for precise interpretation
	No allowances made to review supporting documents such as monitoring reports

Recommendations are provided to improve the "*Format for the Periodic Review*" and the overall evaluation approach. The recommendations fall into three broad groups: specific recommendations to improve the current draft of *Format for Periodic Review*; generic recommendations to improve the *Format for Periodic Review*; and recommendations to improve the overall evaluation approach.

## II. INTRODUCTION

### II.1. Background

The Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean (hereafter the 'Protocol') came into force in 1999. The Protocol provides for the establishment of a List of Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance (SPAMI) "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" (Article 8.1 of the Protocol).

Annex I of the Protocol lists mandatory criteria for eligibility for inclusion within the SPAMI List. These are described in sections B, C and D of the Annex. The Protocol also provides provisions for removing a site from the SPAMI List if there are important reasons for doing

so, e.g. changes in the delimitation or legal status in the area (Article 10).

To facilitate the inclusion of sites into the SPAMI List or to remove those that failed to meet the mandatory criteria, the Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas (RAC/SPA) drafted a generic evaluation approach described in *Procedure for the Revision of Areas included in the SPAMI List* (RAC/SPA (2005)), including an evaluation form called the *Format for Periodic Review*. The *Format for Periodic Review* is given in Section 4 of RAC/SPA (2005).

## II.2. Assignment Tasks

Examine the evaluation approach proposed by RAC/SPA in the document entitled "*Procedure for the Revision of Areas included in the SPAMI List*".

Test the evaluation approach on the two voluntary SPAMIs designated by RAC/SPA, in accordance with the proposal of the Concerned Parties

Identify and describe the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation approach, and

Provide recommendations to improve the evaluation approach.

## II.3. Assignment Deliverables

Submit a report that summarises findings from Tasks 3 and 4

## II.4. Structure of Report

Part 3 identifies the methods used to review the RAC/SPA evaluation approach. Part 4 presents the results of the review and is subdivided into three sections: strengths of the evaluation approach; weaknesses of the approach; and recommendations to improve the approach. Part 5 is the conclusion and Part 6 lists the references.

## III. METHODS

The methods used to review the evaluation approach falls into two categories: review of documentation and field work.

### III.1. Review of documentation

Six documents were reviewed for this study (Table 1). The *Format for Periodic Review* is the primary assessment tool and is found in *Procedure for the Revision of Areas included in the SPAMI List* (RAC/SPA 2005).

Table 1: Documents used for the review

Title	Description
Procedure for the Revision of Areas included in the SPAMI List (RAC/SPA 2005)	A description of the proposed evaluation approach
Format for the Periodic Review (a chapter in the above document)	The template or proposed structure used to assess each site.
Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean (1999)	This document lists the criteria that a PA must have to be eligible for inclusion within the SPAMI List.
The Annotated Format	The objective of the Annotated Format is to ensure PA managers produce reports of comparable content, including information for the adequate evaluation of the conformity of the proposed site with the criteria set out in the Protocol.
National Marine Protected Area Portofino SPAMI Report and Regulations	Completed example of the Annotated Format.
The Cabo de Gata – Nijar Natural Park SPAMI Report	Completed example of the Annotated Format

### **III.2. Field work**

Two SPAMI sites, the National Marine Protected Area Portofino (Italy) and the Cabo de Gata - Nijar Natural Park (Spain), were visited during the period 22 to 27 April to 'field test' the evaluation approach and to discuss the approach with the PA managers.

The assessment team was comprised of:

Dr. Carlo Franzosini (Miramare Marine Reserve – Shoreline Company) Dr. Fabio Badalamenti (CNR – IAMC – Castellammare del Golfo) Dr. Julian Roberts (IUCN Global Marine Program) Dr. Tony Rouphael (Independent Consultant)

This report benefited greatly from discussion with the managers and scientists of the PAs:

Mr. Giorgio Fanciulli, Director of Portofino Marine Reserve, Italy. Prof. Riccardo Cattaneo Vietti, University of Genoa, Italy. Mr. Jose Perez Martinez (Coordinador provincial) and Mr. Jesus Garcia Lozano (Coordinador adjunto) from Cabo De Gata-Nijar Natural Park, Spain.

## **IV. RESULTS**

### **IV.1. Strengths of proposed evaluation approach**

Four key strengths are recognised in the current approach.

#### ***a Probationary period (called the Extraordinary Review)***

RAC/SPA proposed that the evaluation period consist, if necessary, of two parts: an initial evaluation that permits partial compliance to the Protocol and, following a probationary period (the Extraordinary Review), a final evaluation to assess complete compliance. The probationary period gives the PA staff a six-year time span to take action to ensure all mandatory criteria are met.

#### ***b Independent assessor***

The evaluation approach seeks to ensure that the assessment approach is independent by including in the evaluation team a team member independent of UNEP.

#### ***c Site visit***

A site visit is an essential component of the evaluation approach because it allows the evaluation team to meet the PA staff on a more personal level and to discuss the criteria in an informal environment. It also allows the opportunity to assess progress in PA management, such as infrastructures, equipment, personnel, or the consistency of monitoring data/reporting.

#### ***d Multidisciplinary evaluation team***

The current study also demonstrated the importance of the evaluation team having expertise in different disciplines as it allowed a more thorough and complete evaluation.

### **IV.2. Weaknesses of the proposed evaluation approach**

There are five broad weaknesses associated with the proposed evaluation approach.

#### ***a Mandatory criteria missing from Section 1 of the Format for the Periodic Review***

For purposes of this study the evaluation team defined mandatory criteria as those criteria

listed in Annex 1 of the Protocol and containing the word “...must ...” within the sentence or paragraph. At least three of these, Criteria D1, D2 and D5 in Annex 1 (see below), have not been included in Section 1 of *Format for the Periodic Review*.

#### Criteria D1

“Conservation and management objectives must be clearly defined in the texts relating to each site, and will constitute the basis for assessment of the adequacy of the adopted measures and the effectiveness of their implementation at the revisions of the SPAMI list.”

#### Criteria D2

“Protection, planning and management measures applicable to each area must be adequate for the achievement of the conservation and management objectives set for the site in the short and long-term and take in particular into account the threats on it.”

#### Criteria D5

“In the respect of the specificity characterising each protected site, the protection measures for a SPAMI must take account of the following basic aspects:

- (a) the strengthening of the regulation of the release or dumping of wastes and other substances likely directly or indirectly to impair the integrity of the area;
- (b) the strengthening of the regulation of the introduction or reintroduction of any species into the area;
- (c) the regulation of any activity or act likely to harm or disturb the species, or that might endanger the conservation status of the ecosystems or species or might impair the natural, cultural or aesthetic characteristics of the area;
- (d) the regulation applicable to the zones surrounding the area in question.”

#### ***b Uncertainty as to what constitutes the primary objectives of a SPAMI***

Annex I D.1 states that the “conservation and management objectives must be clearly defined in the texts relating to each site”. However, there is some uncertainty as to what would constitute the core objectives of each SPAMI. Do they relate to the objectives listed in Article 4 of the Protocol for Specially Protected Areas or to the tasks listed in Article 8?

#### ***c Mandatory criteria inaccurately transferred from the Protocol to the Format for the Periodic Review and inaccurate cross-referencing***

Some criteria listed in the *Format for Periodic Review* are inaccurate or incomplete copies of those given in Annex I of the Protocol. Discrepancies are highlighted in Appendix A, with criteria from the Protocol juxtaposed against the inaccurate or shortened versions in the *Format for Periodic Review*. Some of these incomplete translations convey a misleading interpretation to that of the original. This caused some confusion for both the PA managers and the evaluation team.

In addition, some cross-referencing used in the *Format for Periodic Review* to link criteria with the relevant articles in the Protocol is wrong. For example Section II, Criterion 5.1 of the *Format for Periodic Review*, states:

“5.1 Assess the level of threats within the site to the ecological, biological, aesthetic and cultural values of the area (B4.a of the Annex I) See 5.1., consider also 3.5.2.b, 6.3 & 6.4. in the AF.”

The reference to B4 is wrong and should refer to D5e-d.

#### ***d Some mandatory criteria are ambiguous or are too brief for precise interpretation***

Some mandatory criteria are ambiguous or do not contain sufficient information to allow the



evaluation to be objective or to be consistent among sites. This weakness can be illustrated using Criteria D6 and D8.

Criterion D6 states: “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.”

It is unclear what would constitute ‘sufficient’ powers.

Criterion D8 states: “To be included in the SPAMI list, an area will have to be endowed with a monitoring programme. This programme 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.”

It remains uncertain what constitutes “significant parameters” or how monitoring should be used to assess the state or evolution of an area. These statements could be interpreted in numerous ways.

The need to operationally define the application of the criteria is recognised in Section 8.2.3 of the Annotated Format, which provides guidance on the content of the management plan.

***e No allowances made to review supporting documents such as monitoring reports***

The proposed assessment approach requires a one-off visit to a SPAMI site in which the evaluation team asks the PA manager pre-defined questions to determine if the PA meets the SPAMI mandatory criteria. It was obvious during this study that a one-off visit using the current draft of the *Format for the Periodic Review* provides, on its own, insufficient information to rigorously assess if a site is meeting its SPAMI obligations. A robust assessment would require a review of supporting documentation including the management plan, survey and monitoring reports, zoning maps and regulations.

**IV.3. Recommendations to improve the *Format for the Periodic Review* and the overall evaluation approach**

The recommendations given here fall into two broad types: recommendations to improve the primary evaluation tool – the *Format for the Periodic Review*; and recommendations to improve the overall evaluation approach.

***a Specific recommendations to improve Section 1 of the Format for the Periodic Review***

**1. CONSERVATION STATUS**

***Objectives***

Question 1.1 seeks information as to whether the SPAMI maintains the status of populations of its protected species, defined as those on Annex II of the Protocol.

Neither Articles 4 nor 8 of the Protocol specify that SPAMIs must protect only Annex II species. Thus the intent of this question should be modified to reflect the objectives of SPAMIs as defined in the protocol.

**Recommendation**

- As an overriding question, it should be established whether the SPAMI meets the objectives set out in Article 4 of the Protocol at the time of the evaluation.

- Question 1.1 should focus more on what the objectives of the individual SPAMI were/are and whether it can be demonstrated that these objectives are being actively pursued.
- A sub-question should be included to establish whether the SPAMI provides specific protection for Annex II species, but this should not be the major focus of the question.

#### *Avoidance of Impacts to the SPAMI*

Question 1.1 focuses on whether the SPAMI itself maintains the status of populations etc. However, no consideration is given to the impact of external factors on the SPAMI which are outside the control of the SPAMI managers (e.g. climate change and invasive species).

As a philosophical question, we would question whether the purpose of a SPAMI should be to “maintain” the status of habitats and populations within the area rather than to “enhance” these factors over time.

#### Recommendation

- The focus of the evaluation should be on those activities and impacts that can have an adverse impact on the functioning of the ecosystem which are within the control of the SPAMI management. The key threats and their respective mitigation/protective measures should be addressed in the management plan.

## 2. LEGAL STATUS

#### *Coordination between Land and Sea Management*

Question 2.4 queries whether coordination exists between land and sea authorities. While the integration of land and marine protection is relevant, the application of a simple Yes/No response to this is problematic. The question presupposes that such legal frameworks exist at a national level and that the SPAMI management framework can implement this. It is unlikely that each of the 21 Contracting Parties will have sufficiently rigorous legal frameworks in place and therefore the question penalizes those SPAMIs within States with no such arrangements.

#### Recommendation

- Question 2.4 should focus on the manageable threats identified to the SPAMI, and their control and management.
- Correct the last word of the sentence: “In case there is no sea within the SPAMI, this question would be non-applicant” to “not applicable”.
- A separate question should also address extent to which external influences to the SPAMI have been taken into account in the management plan, and what measures have been adopted to address these.

## 3. MANAGEMENT METHODS

#### *Management Body*

Question 3.1 Seeks information on the existence of a management body. Implicit in the question are a number of factors that should be assessed individually to determine the effectiveness of the management body.

Recommendation

- Question 3.1 should include a set of sub-questions addressing the relevant factors to be considered in a management body.

*Management Plans*

- Question 3.2 focuses on approval of the Management Plan. A more fundamental question is whether a Management Plan exists (it may but may not have been approved) and whether the Management Plan addresses the requirements set out in Article 7 of the Protocol and Section 8.2.3 of the Annotated Format.

Recommendation

- Question 3.2 should address both (i) the development and (ii) the approval of a Management Plan. The question should cross reference to and include the criteria specific in Section 8.2.3 of the AF.

#### 4. RESOURCES AND INFORMATION

*Monitoring Programme*

Question 4.2 focuses on the existence of a Monitoring Programme. While the subtext for the question includes a number of parameters that should be present, the Yes / No approach to this question is problematic.

A monitoring programme should be a fundamental requirement for any protected area, as required under Article 7 of the Protocol. The specific elements of the monitoring programme should be closely linked to demonstrating that the objectives listed in the Management Plan are met, and should provide a feedback mechanism to test whether the establishment and functioning of the specific protected area are being effectively implemented. Simply requiring a monitoring programme that is not targeted to these objectives is of limited value.

Recommendation

- Question 4.2 should list a set of criteria and requirements that should be found in a monitoring programme. There should be a process to verify the linkage between the results of monitoring and the objectives of the Management Plan and therefore the effectiveness of the protected area.

#### 5. THREATS AND SURROUNDING CONTEXT

*Internal and External Threats*

Questions 5.1 and 5.2 require an assessment of the level of threats (external and internal) to the SPAMI. These factors are difficult to assess independently and the mechanism for doing so should be described in greater detail.

The questions also need to take into account the relationship between the different levels of governance at the national level. Many activities may be regulated at a national level but can not be regulated at the site level. If an individual SPAMI is penalized because of a statutory mechanism it has no control over, the issue should be raised for attention by the nationally competent body.

Recommendation

- Consider including or requiring a prescriptive list of threats that are of concern and that should be evaluated individually.

### *Management Plan*

Question 5.4 relates to the inclusion of regulations for surrounding areas in the management plan. This is a problematic area since in many cases the SPAMI will not have the competence to deal with such issues. They will instead be addressed at a national or regional level.

The focus of this question should be changed to reflect the influence that the SPAMI designation has over the governance of the surrounding area rather than its legal regulation.

#### Recommendation

- Question 5.4 should focus on the “influence” the SPAMI has on the governance of surrounding areas, rather than whether regulations are provided for the surrounding areas.

## 6. REGULATIONS

Question 6.1 focuses on regulation of activities/impacts. It is unclear whether this relates to regulation under the SPAMI designation /Management Plan or whether this reflects a generic interest in regulation of these activities.

If the former applies, this question is problematic. Items (a) (b) & (d) are almost certain to be regulated at the national level rather than within the SPAMI, since they relate largely to international obligations upon the State. If these issues are not regulated nationally it is beyond the competence of the SPAMI to regulate these individually.

#### Recommendation

- The assessment process should include an assessment of the national governance framework that responds to these issues and provides an overarching framework within the SPAMI protection sites.

## 7. MANAGEMENT

### Management Plan – Q. 7.1

It is unclear why the assessment checklist has de-linked the level of detail and contents of the management plan from the requirement to have one (Q. 3.2). In the view of the assessment team this is undesirable and should be rectified. The Annotated Framework includes a list of items that should be found in a management plan and it is considered that these should be specifically addressed as a mandatory requirement of the evaluation rather than an “added value” item.

#### Recommendation

- Merge Question 7.1 with Question 3.2 as a mandatory requirement.

From an outcome perspective, whether the management options are included in a document called a Management Plan is less important than whether they have been addressed. As such, the focus of this question could be more useful if it addressed whether such items have been considered and provided for rather than whether they are in the management plan. The

effect of the existing question is that where such items have been addressed but not included in the management plan, the SPAMI will score 0-1 whereas if the assessment focuses on the actual deliverables this will provide a more accurate reflection on the state of preparedness for the SPAMI.

#### Recommendation

- Change the focus of the assessment from strict inclusion in a management plan to whether specific items have been addressed by the management body.

### 8. PROTECTION MEASURES

In some cases field staff may not be empowered to enforce regulations. This would result in a low or zero score. However, the assessment framework does not recognize the possibility for other enforcement options to be considered. In the case of Portofino such powers are provided to local Police and military officers.

#### Recommendation

- Include an additional question which tests whether third party agencies are also empowered to enforce regulations relating to the SPAMI protective measures.

### 11. INFORMATION AND KNOWLEDGE

Questions 11.1 & 11.2 require an assessment of the extent of information and knowledge of the area. In the view of the evaluation team, it is not possible to address these questions in the context of a site visit and evaluation alone. A more effective mechanism would be to identify relevant sources of information in advance of the assessment visit. This information would be provided to the members of the evaluation team in advance and reviewed prior to visiting the specific SPAMI.

#### Recommendation

- A more robust process should be established which includes identifying and reviewing key documents and information in advance of the field evaluation. The assessment framework under review should form part of that overall process but should not be considered as the sole component of such a review.

#### ***b Generic recommendations to improve the Format for the Periodic Review***

### MANDATORY CRITERIA MISSING FROM SECTION 1 OF THE *FORMAT FOR THE PERIODIC REVIEW*

#### Recommendation

- Formally define what constitutes a mandatory criterion.
- Ensure all mandatory criteria are included in Section 1 of *Format for the Periodic Review*.

### UNCERTAINTY AS TO WHAT CONSTITUTES THE PRIMARY OBJECTIVES OF SPAMI SITES

#### Recommendation

- Clarify whether Article 4 or Article 8 of the Protocol list the primary objectives of a SPAMI site.

#### MANDATORY CRITERIA INACCURATELY TRANSFERRED FROM THE PROTOCOL TO THE *FORMAT FOR THE PERIODIC REVIEW* AND INACCURATE CROSS-REFERENCING

#### Recommendation

- Modify the criteria listed in the *Format for Periodic Review* to ensure they are direct copies of the criteria found in Annex I of the Protocol.
- Correct the inaccurate cross-referencing of articles given in the *Format for Periodic Review*.

#### SOME MANDATORY CRITERIA ARE AMBIGUOUS OR TOO BRIEF TO ALLOW PRECISE INTERPRETATION

#### Recommendation

- Operationally define the application of all criteria in Section 1 of the *Format for Periodic Review* by listing sub-questions beneath each criterion (an example to operationally define a criterion is given in Appendix B to this document or see Section 8.2.3 of the Annotated Format for guidance).
- Ensure that the stakeholders agree to the proposed sub-questions before they are formally used during an evaluation.

#### ***c Recommendations to improve the overall evaluation approach***

#### OVERALL EVALUATION APPROACH

A single site visit is insufficient for the evaluation team to make a robust assessment of whether a PA is meeting its SPAMI obligations. Instead, a more thorough and time consuming process will be required.

#### Recommendation

- The PA manager completes the *Format for Periodic Review* prior to the site visit by the evaluation team and that his/her responses to the sub-questions are crossed reference to supporting documentation.
- Modify the existing evaluation approach to allow the evaluation team to receive the completed *Format for Periodic Review* and supporting documentation prior to the site visit (A suggested list of supporting documentation is given in the Table in Appendix C).
- The evaluation team should make a preliminary assessment of SPAMI compliance prior to the site visit (a proposed modified version of the evaluation approach incorporating the recommendations is given in Appendix C).

#### EVALUATION TEAM

At least one member of the evaluation team involved in the country visit must have a working knowledge of the language of that country (should not assume the PA staff can speak English, although this would be desirable).

#### THE PROTECTED AREA STAFF OR MANAGER

##### Recommendation

At least one member of the PA staff or manager who is to be interviewed must have knowledge of the PA legal or statutory framework used to declare or manage the PA.

#### V. CONCLUSION

This report identifies the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed RAC/SPA approach for the revision of areas included in the SPAMI List. Four main strengths were identified: probationary period; independent assessor, site visit and multidisciplinary evaluation team. Weaknesses identified included: mandatory criteria missing from Section 1; uncertainty as to what constitutes the primary objectives of SPAMI sites; mandatory criteria inaccurately transferred from the Protocol to the *Format for the Periodic Review*; some mandatory criteria are ambiguous or are too brief for precise interpretation; and no allowances made to review supporting documents such as monitoring reports. The report highlights recommendations to rectify some of these weaknesses. The recommendations fall into three broad groups: specific recommendations to improve the *Format for Periodic Review*; generic recommendations to improve the *Format for Periodic Review*; and recommendations to improve the overall evaluation approach.

#### VI. REFERENCES

Cabo de Gata – Nijar Natural Park (undated). The Cabo de Gata – Nijar Natural Park SPAMI Report.

EU (1999). Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean (1999). Protocol of the European Community.

National Marine Protected Area Portofino (undated). National Marine Protected Area Portofino SPAMI Report.

National Marine Protected Area Portofino (undated) Regulations.

RAC/SPA (2005) Procedure for the Revision of Areas included in the SPAMI List. Report by the Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas.

RAC/SPA (undated) The Annotated Format. Report by the Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas.

## **VII. APPENDIX A: FORMAT FOR PERIODIC REVIEW AND NOTES ILLUSTRATING INCONSISTENCIES WITH THE CRITERIA DESCRIBED IN ANNEX I OF THE PROTOCOL.**

Some criteria listed in the *Format for Periodic Review* are inaccurate or incomplete copies of those given in Annex I of the Protocol (see Section 4.2.3 of this report). Discrepancies are highlighted here, with criteria from the Protocol (red text) juxtaposed against the inaccurate or shortened versions in the *Format for Periodic Review* (black and blue text).

At least 2/3 of the questions (c.a. 6 out of 9) should have a positive answer in the first review, but this performance should improve in consecutive reviews until scoring full “yes” responses. In each question, crossed references to the Annotated Format (AF) are given.

UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.268/8 -Pages 21 -30

### **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)

#### **1. CONSERVATION STATUS**

**1.1. Does the SPAMI 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)**

If “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.

#### *Article 4*

*The objective of specially protected areas is:*

*(a) to safeguard representative types of coastal and marine ecosystems of adequate size to ensure their long-term viability and to maintain their biological diversity;*

*(b) to safeguard habitats which are in danger of disappearing in their natural area of distribution in the Mediterranean or which have a reduced natural area of distribution as a consequence of their regression or on account of their intrinsically restricted area;*

*(c) to safeguard habitats critical to the survival, reproduction and recovery of endangered, threatened or endemic species of flora or fauna;*

*(d) to safeguard sites of particular importance because of their scientific, aesthetic, cultural or educational interest.*

*Article 8.2 The SPAMI list may include sites which:.. are of importance for conserving the components of biological diversity in the Mediterranean,.. contain ecosystems specific to the Mediterranean area or the habitats of endangered species,.. are of special interest at the scientific, aesthetic, cultural or educational levels.*

*Annex*

*1*

#### *B. GENERAL FEATURES OF THE AREAS THAT COULD BE INCLUDED IN THE SPAMI LIST*

*2. The regional value is a basic requirement of an area for being included in the SPAMI list. The following criteria should be used in evaluating the Mediterranean interest of an area.*

#### *D. PROTECTION, PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES*

*Conservation and management objectives must be clearly defined in the texts relating to each site, and will constitute the basis for assessment of the adequacy of the adopted measures and the effectiveness of their implementation at the revisions of the SPAMI list.*

*Protection, planning and management measures applicable to each area must be adequate for the achievement of the conservation and management objectives set for the site in the short and long-term and take in particular into account the threats on it.*

#### **2. LEGAL STATUS**

**2.1. Does the area maintain 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

*Annex I A(e)*

*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. To this end, the Parties ensure that sites included in the list are provided with adequate legal status, protection measures and management methods and means.*

### **C. LEGAL STATUS**

*All areas eligible for inclusion in the SPAMI list must be awarded a legal status guaranteeing their effective long-term protection.*

*To be included in the SPAMI list, an area situated in a zone already delimited over which a Party exercises sovereignty or jurisdiction must have a protected status recognised by the Party concerned.*

**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

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

*Annex I D4. The competence and responsibility with regard to administration and implementation of conservation measures for areas proposed for inclusion in the SPAMI list must be clearly defined in the texts governing each area.*

**2.4. Does the legal text clearly establish coordination means between land and sea authorities?** (D4 in 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

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

*Annex I D4. The competence and responsibility with regard to administration and implementation of conservation measures for areas proposed for inclusion in the SPAMI list must be clearly defined in the texts governing each area.*

*Article 7.4. When specially protected areas covering both land and marine areas have been established, the Parties shall endeavour to ensure the coordination of the administration and management of the specially protected area as a whole.*

## **3. MANAGEMENT METHODS** (General principles « D » in Annex 1)

**3.1. Existence of a management body with sufficient powers** (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 8.1. in the AF

*Article 7.2*

*(d) the adoption of mechanisms for financing the promotion and management of specially protected areas, as well as the development of activities which ensure that management is compatible with the objectives of such areas;*

*(f) the training of managers and qualified technical personnel, as well as the development of an appropriate infrastructure.*

*Annex 1 D*

*6. 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.*

**3.2. Has the management plan been officially adopted?**

(D7 in Annex I) See 8.2.1, 8.2.2. in the AF

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

*Annex D*

*7. To be included in the SPAMI list an area will have to be endowed with a management plan. The main rules of this management plan are to be laid down as from the time of inclusion and implemented immediately. A detailed management plan must be presented within three years of the time of inclusion. Failure to respect this obligation entails the removal of the site from the list.*

*Conservation and management objectives must be clearly defined in the texts relating to each site, and will constitute the basis for assessment of the adequacy of the adopted measures and the effectiveness of their implementation at the revisions of the SPAMI list.*

*Protection, planning and management measures applicable to each area must be adequate for the achievement of the conservation and management objectives set for the site in the short and long-term and take in particular into account the threats on it.*

#### **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

**4.2.. Does the area have a monitoring program?** (D8 in 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

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.

*Annex I D*

*8. To be included in the SPAMI list, an area will have to be endowed with a monitoring programme. This programme 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. To this end further necessary studies are to be commissioned.*

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

*(Section B4 of the Annex I, and other obligatory for a SPA (Arts. 6 and 7 of the Protocol))*

In this Section, higher scores mean more appropriate conservation status, protection measures and management. "Yes" has a 3 score, "No" has 0. Other questions have a 0,1,2,3 scoring. This order has been inverted in the following Point "5.Threats", where answers have a negative sense. The adding of all partial scores will provide a general score for the SPAMI, which is expected to increase or at least be maintained in the successive Periodic Reviews every six years.

### **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 of the Annex I)** [See 5.1., consider also 3.5.2.b, 6.3 & 6.4. in the AF](#)

**In particular: (3 means "no threat"; 0 means very serious threat):**

Unregulated exploitation of natural resources (*e.g. sand mining, water, timber, living resources*)

[See 5.1.1. in the AF](#)

Serious threats to habitats and species (*e.g. disturbance, desiccation, pollution, poaching, introduced alien species ....*)

[See 5.1.2. in the AF](#)

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

[See 5.1.3. in AF](#)

Historic and current conflicts (between users or user groups)

[See 5.1.4., 6.2. in the AF](#)

**(0 = Very high level of threats; 3 = no threat)**

**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](#)

Significant impacts on landscapes and on cultural values [See 5.2.2](#)

Expected development of threats upon the surrounding area [See 6.1. in the AF](#)

**(0 = Very high level of threats; 3 = no threat)**

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

**(yes=3; no=0)**

**5.4. Does the management plan for the SPAMI provide regulations for the surrounding zones?. (D5-d in Annex I)** [See 7.4.4. in the AF](#)

**(yes=3; no=0)**

## Score 5. Threats

### Annex 1 D

5. In the respect of the specificity characterising each protected site, the protection measures for a SPAMI must take account of the following basic aspects:  
(d) the regulation applicable to the zones surrounding the area in question.

## 6. REGULATIONS

**6.1. Assess the degree of legal regulations** [See 7.4.2. in the AF](#) [See AF](#) In particular:

- a) 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 in the Annex I](#))
- b) 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 in the Annex I](#))
- c) 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 in the Annex I](#))
- d) Regulations concerning the Environmental Impact Assessment for the activities and projects that could significantly affect the protected areas ([Art. 17 in the Protocol](#))

yes=3; no=0

## Score 6. Regulations

## 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 Mgmt.Plan / 1= Weak / 2 = Adequate / 3= Excellent

### Annex 1 D

7. To be included in the SPAMI list an area will have to be endowed with a management plan. The main rules of this management plan are to be laid down as from the time of inclusion and implemented immediately. A detailed management plan must be presented within three years of the time of inclusion. Failure to respect this obligation entails the removal of the site from the list.

AF Section 8.2.3. Contents and application of the Management Plan State the degree of detail in the MP by entering YES or NO in the following list of potential contents, and assess the degree of implementation of the MP by using the 0-1-2-3 score on the right hand side:

	Existing in MP	Degree of application
--	----------------	-----------------------

<i>Detailed management objectives</i>	YES	NO	0	1	2	3
<i>Zoning</i>	YES	NO	0	1	2	3
<i>Regulations for each zone</i>	YES	NO	0	1	2	3
<i>Governing body(ies)</i>	YES	NO	0	1	2	3
<i>Management programmes as:</i>						
<i>Administration</i>	YES	NO	0	1	2	3
<i>Protection</i>	YES	NO	0	1	2	3
<i>Natural resource management</i>	YES	NO	0	1	2	3
<i>Tourism and Visitation</i>	YES	NO	0	1	2	3
<i>Education and Training</i>	YES	NO	0	1	2	3
<i>Research and Monitoring</i>	YES	NO	0	1	2	3
<i>Services and Concessions</i>	YES	NO	0	1	2	3
<i>Fund raising activities</i>	YES	NO	0	1	2	3
<i>Periodic revisions of the MP</i>	YES	NO	0	1	2	3

## 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

**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](#)

**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

**7.5. Is the management plan binding for other national/local administrations with competencies in the area?**

Y N

[See 8.2.2 in the AF](#)

*AF Section 8.2.2. Formulation and approval of the Management Plan*

*Mention how the MP was formulated, e.g. by an expert team and/or under consultation and/or participation with other institutions or stakeholders. State the legal status of the MP, whether it is officialized, and how, and if it is binding for other institutions and sectors involved in the area.*

**Score 7. Management**

## 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](#)**

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](#)

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](#)

Has the area established a contingency plan in case of accidental pollution or other serious emergencies? ([Art. 7.3. in the Protocol, recom. 13th Parties Meeting](#))

*Article 7.3 Protocol*

*3. The Parties shall ensure that national contingency plans incorporate measures for responding to incidents that could cause damage or constitute a threat to the specially protected areas.*

## Score 8. Protection measures

### 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](#)

Are there other permanent staff in the field?

(e.g. *technicians, wardens, guides, ...*)

[See 9.1.2. in the AF](#)

#### 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 training level: 0 = Very Insufficient / 1= Low / 2 = Adequate / 3= Excellent

## Score 9. Human resources

### 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

#### 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

**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

## Score 10. Financial and material means

### 11. INFORMATION AND KNOWLEDGE

**11.1. Assess the extent of knowledge about the area and its surrounding zones.** (D3 of the 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

*Annex I D*

*3. Protection, planning and management measures must be based on an adequate knowledge of the elements of the natural environment and of socioeconomic and cultural factors that characterise each area. In case of shortcomings in basic knowledge, an area proposed for inclusion in the SPAMI list must have a programme for the collection of the unavailable data and information.*

**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

*Annex I D*

*8. To be included in the SPAMI list, an area will have to be endowed with a monitoring programme. This programme 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. To this end further necessary studies are to be commissioned.*

**Score 11. Information and knowledge**

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

[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)

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

**Score 12. Cooperation and networking**

COMMENTS by the Technical Advisory Commission

CONCLUSION

RECOMMENDATIONS

SIGNATURES

National Focal Point

Independent Experts

SPAMI Manager(s) (

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

## VIII. APPENDIX B: PROPOSED EXAMPLE TO OPERATIONALLY DEFINE THE APPLICATION OF THE CRITERIA.

We recommend that all criteria in Section 1 of the *Format for Periodic Review* be operationally defined by listing sub-questions beneath each criterion (this is consistent with Section 8.2.3 of the Annotated Format). This Appendix illustrates how criteria could be operationally defined using Criterion D7 as an example. If operational definitions are given for the criteria, however, it is important that the stakeholders agree on the definitions before they are formally used in an assessment.

Criteria D7 states “To be included in the SPAMI list an area will have to be endowed with a management plan. The main rules of this management plan are to be laid down as from the time of inclusion and implemented immediately. A detailed management plan must be presented within three years of the time of inclusion. Failure to respect this obligation entails the removal of the site from the list.”

Below are recommended sub-headings that will guide a PA manager in the application of Criterion D7 and to assist the evaluation team to determine if this criterion has been comprehensively applied are:

Is there a management plan?

Does the management plan list PA management objectives?

Does the management plan contain the PA boundaries in text (latitudes and longitudes) and on a map?

Does the management plan describe the methods used to achieve these objectives?

Does the management plan include zoning maps? Does the management plan give the PA regulations?

Does the management plan contain a process to assess if the management objectives are being achieved and is this linked to the PA monitoring plan? Are the monitoring results being used to evaluate management effectiveness?

These headings could be based on minimum standards recommended by IUCN (Kelleher 1999, Pomeroy *et al.* 2002, or Salm and Clark 2000) or other world conservation groups. Section 8.2.3 of the Annotated Format offers a similar check list designed to guide the application of this criterion.

Kelleher G., 1999. Guidelines for Marine Protected Areas. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.

López Ornat A. (Ed.). 2006. Guidelines for the establishment and management of Mediterranean marine and coastal protected areas. MedMPA project. Ed: UNEP-MAP RAC\SPA.Tunis.

Pomeroy R, Parks J, Watson L. 2002. How is your MPA doing? A guidebook of natural and social indicators for evaluating marine protected area management. WWF, NOAA and IUCN.

Salm R., and Clark J., 2000. Marine and Coastal Protected Areas. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.



**IX. APPENDIX C: PROPOSED MODIFIED VERSION OF THE EVALUATION APPROACH INCORPORATING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THIS DOCUMENT**

#	Steps	Notes
1	Forward the <i>Format for Periodic Review</i> and a list of required documents (see notes) to the PA manager no less than two months before the evaluation visit	Relevant documentation that should be provided by the PA manager to the evaluation team should include: Management plan; monitoring reports; zonation maps; survey results of Annex II species and habitat maps.
2	Items listed in Step 1 sent to the evaluation team	
3	Evaluation team make preliminary evaluation based on available documentation	
4	Evaluation team agree on a list of clarification questions to be sent to the PA manager	
5	The question sheet is sent to the PA manager before the evaluation team visit the site	
6	Evaluation team visits the PA.	
7	Evaluation team make their assessment.	Response: Yes – PA fully compliant with SPAMI No – PA not fully compliant.
8	The decision of the evaluation team is sent to PA manager who can respond to the decision	
9	A noncompliant PA enters Extraordinary Review (6 yr) process consistent with existing approach	
10	At the end of 6 yrs, assess if the PA is compliant with the Protocol	
11	A noncompliant PA removed from SPAMI list	

