0.1 Member State	п
0.2.1 Species code	1167
0.2.2 Species name	Triturus carnifex
0.2.3 Alternative species scientific name	N/A
0.2.4 Common name	Tritone crestato italiano

#### 1. National Level

#### 1.1 Maps

1.1.1 Distribution Map	Yes
1.1.1a Sensitive species	No
1.1.2 Method used - map	Complete survey/Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate (3)
1.1.3 Year or period	2000-2012
1.1.4 Additional map	No
1.1.5 Range map	Yes

### 2. Biogeographical Or Marine Level

#### 2.1 Biogeographical Region

#### 2.2 Published sources

#### Mediterranean (MED)

The present species assessment (fields 0.1-2.9) has been compiled by Anna Rita Di Cerbo, Francesco Ficetola, Roberto Sindaco (Societas Herpetologica Italica). Information, unpublished data and experts' judgments have been provided by Anna Rita Di Cerbo, Francesco Ficetola, Roberto Sindaco.

Distribution data for the following Nature 2000 sites have been inserted by the Ministry of Environment (source: Italian Nature 2000 database): IT9110005; IT5220019; IT5220020

Andreone F., Marconi M., 2006. Triturus carnifex (Laurenti, 1768). In: Atlante degli Anfibi e dei Rettili d'Italia / Atlas of Italians Amphibians and Reptiles, Sindaco R., Doria G., Razzetti E. & Bernini F. (Eds). P. 220-225. Societas Herpetologica Italica. Edizioni Polistampa, Firenze.

Rondinini, C., Battistoni, A., Peronace, V., Teofili, C. (compilatori). 2013. Lista Rossa IUCN dei Vertebrati Italiani. Comitato Italiano IUCN e Ministero dell'Ambiente, del Territorio e del Mare, Roma.

Vanni S., Andreone F., Tripepi S., 2007. Triturus carnifex (Laurenti, 1768). In: Fauna d'Italia, vol. XLII, Amphibia. A cura di Lanza B., Andreone F., Bologna M.A., Corti C., Razzetti E., p. 265-272. Calderini, Bologna.

#### 2.3 Range

2.3 Mange		
2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km²)	78500	
2.3.2 Method - Range surface area	Complete survey/0	Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate (3)
2.3.3 Short-term trend period	2000-2012	
2.3.4 Short-term trend direction	stable (0)	
2.3.5 Short-term trend magnitude	min	max
2.3.6 Long-term trend period		
2.3.7 Long-term trend direction	N/A	
2.3.8 Long-term trend magnitude	min	max
2.3.9 Favourable reference range	area (km²)	

09/04/2014 16.32.52 Page 1 of 11

operator approximately equal to  $(\approx)$ 

unkown No

method Expert judgement

2.3.10 Reason for change Use of different method

2.4 Population

2.4.1 Population size Unit N/A

(individuals or agreed exception) min max

2.4.2 Population size Unit number of map 10x10 km grid cells (grids10x10)

(other than individuals) 439 439 min max

2.4.3 Additional information **Definition of locality** 

Conversion method

**Problems** 

2000-2012 2.4.4 Year or period

2.4.5 Method - population size Complete survey/Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate (3)

2.4.6 Short-term trend period 2001-2012 2.4.7 Short term trend direction decrease (-)

2.4.8 Short-term trend magnitude confidence interval max

2.4.9 Short-term trend method Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)

2.4.10 Long-term trend period 2.4.11 Long term trend direction N/A

2.4.12 Long-term trend magnitude confidence interval min max

2.4.13 Long-term trend method N/A number 2.4.14 Favourable reference

population more than (>) operator

> unknown No

method Expert judgement

2.4.15 Reason for change Improved knowledge/more accurate data

2.5 Habitat for the Species

2.5.1 Surface area - Habitat (km²)

2000-2012 2.5.2 Year or period 2.5.3 Method used - habitat Absent data (0)

2.5.4 a) Quality of habitat Moderate

2.5.4 b) Quality of habitat - method Decrease of habitats and reduction of connectivity due to human activity (e.g. introduction of fish and other predators, alteration of hydrographic functioning of ditches, pollution) and natural process (e.g. silting and drying out of ponds).

2.5.5 Short term trend period 2001-2012

2.5.6 Short term trend direction decrease (-)

2.5.7 Long-term trend period 2.5.8 Long term trend direction N/A

2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat (km²)

2.5.10 Reason for change Improved knowledge/more accurate data

2.6 Main Pressures

09/04/2014 16.32.52 Page 2 of 11

Pressure	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
infilling of ditches, dykes, ponds, pools, marshes or pits (J02.01.03)	high importance (H)	N/A
reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)	high importance (H)	N/A
problematic native species (IO2)	medium importance (M)	N/A
roads, motorways (D01.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Modification of hydrographic functioning, general (J02.05)	high importance (H)	N/A
Silting up (K01.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Interspecific faunal relations (K03)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Landfill, land reclamation and drying out, general (J02.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
anthropogenic reduction of habitat connectivity (J03.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Urbanised areas, human habitation (E01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
antagonism arising from introduction of species (K03.05)	medium importance (M)	N/A
removal of dead and dying trees (B02.04)	low importance (L)	N/A
Fertilisation (A08)	low importance (L)	N/A
invasive non-native species (IO1)	medium importance (M)	N/A
agricultural intensification (A02.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Drying out (K01.03)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Changes in abiotic conditions (M01)	madium importance (MA)	NI/A
Changes in abiotic conditions (MO1)	medium importance (M)	N/A
lack of flooding (J02.04.02)	low importance (L)	N/A
lack of flooding (J02.04.02)	<u> </u>	N/A
lack of flooding (J02.04.02)	low importance (L)	N/A
lack of flooding (J02.04.02)  2.6.1 Method used – pressures mainly based on exp	low importance (L)	N/A
lack of flooding (J02.04.02)  2.6.1 Method used – pressures mainly based on exp  2.7 Main Threats	low importance (L) pert judgement and other data (	N/A 2)
lack of flooding (J02.04.02)  2.6.1 Method used – pressures mainly based on exp  2.7 Main Threats  Threat  infilling of ditches, dykes, ponds, pools, marshes or pits	low importance (L) ert judgement and other data (	N/A  2)  pollution qualifier(s)
lack of flooding (J02.04.02)  2.6.1 Method used – pressures mainly based on exp  2.7 Main Threats  Threat  infilling of ditches, dykes, ponds, pools, marshes or pits (J02.01.03)	low importance (L)  pert judgement and other data (in the second	N/A  2)  pollution qualifier(s)  N/A
lack of flooding (J02.04.02)  2.6.1 Method used – pressures mainly based on exp  2.7 Main Threats  Threat  infilling of ditches, dykes, ponds, pools, marshes or pits (J02.01.03)  reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)  Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine &	low importance (L)  ert judgement and other data (  ranking  high importance (H)  medium importance (M)	N/A  pollution qualifier(s)  N/A  N/A
lack of flooding (J02.04.02)  2.6.1 Method used – pressures mainly based on exp  2.7 Main Threats  Threat  infilling of ditches, dykes, ponds, pools, marshes or pits (J02.01.03)  reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)  Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)	low importance (L)  rert judgement and other data (A)  ranking  high importance (H)  medium importance (M)  high importance (H)	N/A  pollution qualifier(s)  N/A  N/A  N/A
lack of flooding (J02.04.02)  2.6.1 Method used – pressures mainly based on exp  2.7 Main Threats  Threat  infilling of ditches, dykes, ponds, pools, marshes or pits (J02.01.03)  reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)  Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)  problematic native species (I02)	low importance (L)  rert judgement and other data (Section 1988)  ranking  high importance (H)  medium importance (M)  high importance (H)  medium importance (M)	N/A  pollution qualifier(s)  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A
lack of flooding (J02.04.02)  2.6.1 Method used – pressures mainly based on exp  2.7 Main Threats  Threat  infilling of ditches, dykes, ponds, pools, marshes or pits (J02.01.03)  reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)  Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)  problematic native species (I02)  roads, motorways (D01.02)	low importance (L)  ranking high importance (H)  medium importance (M) high importance (H)  medium importance (M) medium importance (M)	N/A  pollution qualifier(s)  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A
lack of flooding (J02.04.02)  2.6.1 Method used – pressures mainly based on exp  2.7 Main Threats  Threat  infilling of ditches, dykes, ponds, pools, marshes or pits (J02.01.03)  reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)  Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)  problematic native species (I02)  roads, motorways (D01.02)  Modification of hydrographic functioning, general (J02.05)	low importance (L)  ranking high importance (H)  medium importance (M) high importance (H)  medium importance (M) high importance (M) high importance (M) high importance (M)	N/A  pollution qualifier(s)  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A
lack of flooding (J02.04.02)  2.6.1 Method used – pressures mainly based on exp  2.7 Main Threats  Threat  infilling of ditches, dykes, ponds, pools, marshes or pits (J02.01.03)  reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)  Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)  problematic native species (I02)  roads, motorways (D01.02)  Modification of hydrographic functioning, general (J02.05)  Silting up (K01.02)	low importance (L)  ranking high importance (H)  medium importance (M) high importance (H)  medium importance (M) medium importance (M) medium importance (M) medium importance (M) high importance (H)	N/A  pollution qualifier(s)  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/
lack of flooding (J02.04.02)  2.6.1 Method used – pressures mainly based on exp  2.7 Main Threats  Threat  infilling of ditches, dykes, ponds, pools, marshes or pits (J02.01.03)  reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)  Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)  problematic native species (I02)  roads, motorways (D01.02)  Modification of hydrographic functioning, general (J02.05)  Silting up (K01.02)  Interspecific faunal relations (K03)	low importance (L)  ranking high importance (H)  medium importance (M) high importance (H)  medium importance (M) high importance (M) medium importance (M) medium importance (M) high importance (H) medium importance (H) medium importance (M)	N/A  pollution qualifier(s)  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/
lack of flooding (J02.04.02)  2.6.1 Method used – pressures mainly based on exp  2.7 Main Threats  Threat  infilling of ditches, dykes, ponds, pools, marshes or pits (J02.01.03)  reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)  Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)  problematic native species (I02)  roads, motorways (D01.02)  Modification of hydrographic functioning, general (J02.05)  Silting up (K01.02)  Interspecific faunal relations (K03)  Landfill, land reclamation and drying out, general (J02.01)	low importance (L)  ranking high importance (H)  medium importance (M) high importance (H)  medium importance (M) medium importance (M) medium importance (M) medium importance (M) high importance (H) medium importance (M) high importance (M) high importance (M)	N/A  pollution qualifier(s)  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/
lack of flooding (J02.04.02)  2.6.1 Method used – pressures mainly based on exp  2.7 Main Threats  Threat  infilling of ditches, dykes, ponds, pools, marshes or pits (J02.01.03)  reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)  Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)  problematic native species (I02)  roads, motorways (D01.02)  Modification of hydrographic functioning, general (J02.05)  Silting up (K01.02)  Interspecific faunal relations (K03)  Landfill, land reclamation and drying out, general (J02.01)  anthropogenic reduction of habitat connectivity (J03.02)	low importance (L)  ranking high importance (H)  medium importance (M) high importance (H)  medium importance (M) medium importance (M) medium importance (M) high importance (H) medium importance (M) high importance (H) medium importance (M) medium importance (M) medium importance (M) high importance (M)	N/A  pollution qualifier(s)  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/
lack of flooding (J02.04.02)  2.6.1 Method used – pressures mainly based on exp  2.7 Main Threats  Threat  infilling of ditches, dykes, ponds, pools, marshes or pits (J02.01.03)  reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)  Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)  problematic native species (I02)  roads, motorways (D01.02)  Modification of hydrographic functioning, general (J02.05)  Silting up (K01.02)  Interspecific faunal relations (K03)  Landfill, land reclamation and drying out, general (J02.01)  anthropogenic reduction of habitat connectivity (J03.02)  Urbanised areas, human habitation (E01)	low importance (L)  ranking high importance (H)  medium importance (M) high importance (H)  medium importance (M) medium importance (M) high importance (M) medium importance (M) high importance (H) medium importance (M) medium importance (M) medium importance (M) medium importance (M) high importance (M) medium importance (M)	N/A  pollution qualifier(s)  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/

09/04/2014 16.32.52 Page 3 of 11

invasive non-native species (I01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
agricultural intensification (A02.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Drying out (K01.03)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Changes in abiotic conditions (M01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
lack of flooding (J02.04.02)	low importance (L)	N/A

2.7.1 Method used – threats expert opinion (1)

#### 2.8 Complementary Information

2.8.1 Justification of % thresholds for trends

2.8.2 Other relevant Information

2.8.3 Trans-boundary assessment

#### 2.9 Conclusions (assessment of conservation status at end of reporting period)

2.9.1 Range assessment Favourable (FV)

qualifiers N/A
2.9.2. Population assessment Inadequate (U1)

qualifiers N/A

2.9.3. Habitat assessment Inadequate (U1)

qualifiers declining (-)

assessment Inadequate (U1)

qualifiers declining (-)

2.9.5 Overall assessment of Inadequate (U1)

Conservation Status

2.9.4. Future prospects

2.9.5 Overall trend in

**Conservation Status** 

max

## 3. Natura 2000 coverage and conservation measures - Annex II species

declining (-)

#### 3.1 Population

3.1.1 Population Size	Unit	N/A
	min	

3.1.2 Method used Absent data (0)

3.1.3 Trend of population size within N/A

#### 3.2 Conversation Measures

3.2.1 Measure	3.2.2 Type	3.2.3 Ranking	3.2.4 Location	3.2.5 Broad Evaluation
Restoring/improving water quality (4.1)	One-off	medium importance (M)	Outside	Maintain
Restoring/improving the hydrological regime (4.2)	Recurrent One-off	medium importance (M)	Inside	Maintain Enhance
Establish protected areas/sites (6.1)	Legal Administrative	high importance (H)	Inside	Maintain Enhance Long term Not evaluated

09/04/2014 16.32.52 Page 4 of 11

Legal protection of habitats Administrative and species (6.3)	medium I importance (M)	Inside	Maintain Enhance Long term
Specific single species or One-off species group management measures (7.4)	high importance I (H)	Inside	Enhance

### 2. Biogeographical Or Marine Level

2.1 Biogeographical Region

#### 2.2 Published sources

#### Continental (CON)

The present species assessment (fields 0.1-2.9) has been compiled by Anna Rita Di Cerbo, Francesco Ficetola, Roberto Sindaco (Societas Herpetologica Italica). Information, unpublished data and experts' judgments have been provided by Anna Rita Di Cerbo, Francesco Ficetola, Roberto Sindaco.

Andreone F., Marconi M., 2006. Triturus carnifex (Laurenti, 1768). In: Atlante degli Anfibi e dei Rettili d'Italia / Atlas of Italians Amphibians and Reptiles, Sindaco R., Doria G., Razzetti E. & Bernini F. (Eds). P. 220-225. Societas Herpetologica Italica. Edizioni Polistampa, Firenze.

Rondinini, C., Battistoni, A., Peronace, V., Teofili, C. (compilatori). 2013. Lista Rossa IUCN dei Vertebrati Italiani. Comitato Italiano IUCN e Ministero dell'Ambiente, del Territorio e del Mare, Roma.

Vanni S., Andreone F., Tripepi S., 2007. Triturus carnifex (Laurenti, 1768). In: Fauna d'Italia, vol. XLII, Amphibia. A cura di Lanza B., Andreone F., Bologna M.A., Corti C., Razzetti E., p. 265-272. Calderini, Bologna.

#### 2.3 Range

2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km²)
2.3.2 Method - Range surface area
2.3.3 Short-term trend period
2.3.4 Short-term trend direction
2.3.5 Short-term trend magnitude
2.3.6 Long-term trend period
2.3.7 Long-term trend direction
2.3.8 Long-term trend magnitude
2.3.9 Favourable reference range

98200

Complete survey/Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate (3)

2001-2012 decrease (-)

min max

N/A

min max

area (km²)

operator more than (>)

unkown No

method Expert judgement

Use of different method

#### 2.4 Population

2.4.1 Population size (individuals or agreed exception)

2.3.10 Reason for change

Unit N/A

min ma:

2.4.2 Population size (other than individuals)

Unit number of map 10x10 km grid cells (grids10x10)

min 669 max 669

2.4.3 Additional information

Definition of locality Conversion method

09/04/2014 16.32.53 Page 5 of 11

	Problems		
2.4.4 Year or period	2000-2012		
2.4.5 Method – population size	Complete su	rvey/Complete survey o	or a statistically robust estimate (3)
2.4.6 Short-term trend period	2001-2012		
2.4.7 Short term trend direction	unknown (x	)	
<ul><li>2.4.8 Short-term trend magnitude</li><li>2.4.9 Short-term trend method</li><li>2.4.10 Long-term trend period</li></ul>	min Absent data	max (0)	confidence interval
2.4.11 Long term trend direction	N/A		
2.4.12 Long-term trend magnitude	min	max	confidence interval
2.4.13 Long-term trend method	N/A		
2.4.14 Favourable reference	number		
population	operator	N/A	
	unknown	Yes	
	method		
2.4.15 Reason for change	Improved kn	owledge/more accurate	e data

#### 2.5 Habitat for the Species

2.5.1 Surface area	a - Habitat (	(km²)
--------------------	---------------	-------

2.5.2 Year or period

2.5.3 Method used - habitat

2.5.4 a) Quality of habitat

2.5.4 b) Quality of habitat - method

2001-2012

Absent data (0)

Moderate

Alteration and loss of habitats due to human activities like introduction of fish, intensive agriculture and pollution, modifications of slowing irrigation canals.

2.5.5 Short term trend period

2.5.6 Short term trend direction

2.5.7 Long-term trend period

2.5.8 Long term trend direction

2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat (km²)

2.5.10 Reason for change

2001-2012 decrease (-)

N/A

Improved knowledge/more accurate data

#### 2.6 Main Pressures

Pressure	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
infilling of ditches, dykes, ponds, pools, marshes or pits (J02.01.03)	high importance (H)	N/A
reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)	high importance (H)	N/A
problematic native species (IO2)	medium importance (M)	N/A
roads, motorways (D01.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Modification of hydrographic functioning, general (J02.05)	high importance (H)	N/A
Silting up (K01.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Interspecific faunal relations (K03)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Landfill, land reclamation and drying out, general (J02.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
anthropogenic reduction of habitat connectivity (J03.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Urbanised areas, human habitation (E01)	medium importance (M)	N/A

09/04/2014 16.32.53 Page 6 of 11

antagonism arising from introduction of species (K03.05)	medium importance (M)	N/A
removal of dead and dying trees (B02.04)	low importance (L)	N/A
Fertilisation (A08)	low importance (L)	N/A
invasive non-native species (I01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
agricultural intensification (A02.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A

2.6.1 Method used – pressures mainly based on expert judgement and other data (2)

		, ,	• •
2.7 Main Threats			
Threat		ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
infilling of ditches, dykes, ponds, pool (J02.01.03)	s, marshes or pits	high importance (H)	N/A
reduction or loss of specific habitat fe	atures (J03.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & t brackish) (H01)	errestrial, marine &	high importance (H)	N/A
problematic native species (IO2)		medium importance (M)	N/A
roads, motorways (D01.02)		medium importance (M)	N/A
Modification of hydrographic function	ning, general (J02.05)	high importance (H)	N/A
Silting up (K01.02)		medium importance (M)	N/A
Interspecific faunal relations (K03)		medium importance (M)	N/A
Landfill, land reclamation and drying of	out, general (J02.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
anthropogenic reduction of habitat connectivity (J03.02)		medium importance (M)	N/A
Urbanised areas, human habitation (E01)		medium importance (M)	N/A
antagonism arising from introduction of species (K03.05)		medium importance (M)	N/A
removal of dead and dying trees (B02.04)		low importance (L)	N/A
Fertilisation (A08)		low importance (L)	N/A
invasive non-native species (IO1)		medium importance (M)	N/A
agricultural intensification (A02.01)		medium importance (M)	N/A
2.7.1 Method used – threats	expert oninion (1)		

2.7.1 Method used – threats

expert opinion (1)

#### 2.8 Complementary Information

2.8.1 Justification of % thresholds for trends

2.8.2 Other relevant Information

2.8.3 Trans-boundary assessment

### 2.9 Conclusions (assessment of conservation status at end of reporting period)

2.9.1 Range

assessment Inadequate (U1)
qualifiers declining (-)

2.9.2. Population

assessment Unknown (XX)
qualifiers N/A

2.9.3. Habitat

assessment Inadequate (U1)

qualifiers declining (-)

2.9.4. Future prospects assessment Inadequate (U1) qualifiers declining (-)

09/04/2014 16.32.53 Page 7 of 11

2.9.5 Overall assessment of **Conservation Status** 

Inadequate (U1)

2.9.5 Overall trend in **Conservation Status** 

declining (-)

### 3. Natura 2000 coverage and conservation measures - Annex II species

## 3.1 Population

3.1.1 Population Size Unit N/A min 3.1.2 Method used

Absent data (0)

3.1.3 Trend of population size within N/A

#### 3.2 Conversation Measures

3.2.1 Measure	3.2.2 Type	3.2.3 Ranking	3.2.4 Location	3.2.5 Broad Evaluation
Other agriculture-related measures (2.0)	Legal	medium importance (M)	Inside	No effect
Restoring/improving the hydrological regime (4.2)	Contractual Recurrent	low importance (L)	Both	Enhance Unknown
Establish protected areas/sites (6.1)	Administrative	medium importance (M)	Inside	Maintain Enhance Long term
Legal protection of habitate and species (6.3)	s Administrative	medium importance (M)	Both	Maintain Enhance Long term
Specific management of traffic and energy transport systems (8.2)	Contractual	low importance (L)	Both	Maintain

max

### 2. Biogeographical Or Marine Level

#### 2.1 Biogeographical Region

#### 2.2 Published sources

#### Alpine (ALP)

The present species assessment (fields 0.1-2.9) has been compiled by Anna Rita Di Cerbo, Francesco Ficetola, Roberto Sindaco (Societas Herpetologica Italica). Information, unpublished data and experts' judgments have been provided by Anna Rita Di Cerbo, Francesco Ficetola, Roberto Sindaco.

Andreone F., Marconi M., 2006. Triturus carnifex (Laurenti, 1768). In: Atlante degli Anfibi e dei Rettili d'Italia / Atlas of Italians Amphibians and Reptiles, Sindaco R., Doria G., Razzetti E. & Bernini F. (Eds). p. 220-225. Societas Herpetologica Italica. Edizioni Polistampa, Firenze.

Rondinini, C., Battistoni, A., Peronace, V., Teofili, C. (compilatori). 2013. Lista Rossa IUCN dei Vertebrati Italiani. Comitato Italiano IUCN e Ministero dell'Ambiente, del Territorio e del Mare, Roma.

Vanni S., Andreone F., Tripepi S., 2007. Triturus carnifex (Laurenti, 1768). In: Fauna d'Italia, vol. XLII, Amphibia. A cura di Lanza B., Andreone F., Bologna M.A., Corti C., Razzetti E., p. 265-272. Calderini, Bologna.

09/04/2014 16.32.53 Page 8 of 11

2.3 Range				
2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km²)	27700			
2.3.2 Method - Range surface area	27700 Complete survey/Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate (3)			
2.3.3 Short-term trend period	2001-2012	imprete survey or a stat	istically robust estimate (s)	
2.3.4 Short-term trend direction	stable (0)			
2.3.5 Short-term trend magnitude	min	max		
2.3.6 Long-term trend period				
2.3.7 Long-term trend direction	N/A			
2.3.8 Long-term trend magnitude	min	max		
2.3.9 Favourable reference range	area (km²)			
	operator	approximately equal	to (≈)	
	unkown	No		
	method	Expert judgement		
2.3.10 Reason for change	Use of different me	thod		
2.4 Population				
2.4.1 Population size	Unit N/A			
(individuals or agreed exception)	min	max		
2.4.2 Population size	Unit number of	map 10x10 km grid cells	s (grids10x10)	
(other than individuals)	min 154	max 154		
2.4.3 Additional information	Definition of locality			
	Conversion method			
	Problems			
2.4.4 Year or period	2000-2012			
2.4.5 Method – population size		imnlete survey or a stati	stically robust estimate (3)	
2.4.6 Short-term trend period	2001-2012	implete survey or a stati	sticully robust estimate (5)	
2.4.7 Short term trend direction	unknown (x)			
2.4.8 Short-term trend magnitude	min	may	confidence interval	
2.4.9 Short-term trend method	Absent data (0)	max	confidence interval	
2.4.10 Long-term trend period	Absent data (b)			
2.4.11 Long term trend direction	N/A			
2.4.12 Long-term trend magnitude	min	max	confidence interval	
2.4.13 Long-term trend method	N/A			
2.4.14 Favourable reference	number			
population	operator N/A			
	unknown Yes			
	method			
2.4.15 Reason for change		e/more accurate data		
2.5 Habitat for the Species				
2.5.1 Surface area - Habitat (km²)				
2.5.2 Year or period	2000-2012			
2.5.3 Method used - habitat	Absent data (0)			
2.5.4 a) Quality of habitat	Moderate			

09/04/2014 16.32.53 Page 9 of 11

of suitable breeding sites.

Loss of habitat mainly because of abandonment of pastoral system in the

mountain. This causes lack of management of ponds, ditches and then drying out

2.5.4 b) Quality of habitat - method

2.5.5 Short term trend period
2.5.6 Short term trend direction
2.5.7 Long-term trend period
2.5.8 Long term trend direction
2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat (km²)

2.5.10 Reason for change

Improved knowledge/more accurate data

Pressure	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
infilling of ditches, dykes, ponds, pools, marshes or pits (J02.01.03)	high importance (H)	N/A
reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)	high importance (H)	N/A
problematic native species (IO2)	medium importance (M)	N/A
intensive grazing (A04.01)	low importance (L)	N/A
abandonment of pastoral systems, lack of grazing (A04.03)	high importance (H)	N/A
roads, motorways (D01.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Modification of hydrographic functioning, general (J02.05)	high importance (H)	N/A
Silting up (K01.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Interspecific faunal relations (KO3)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Landfill, land reclamation and drying out, general (J02.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
anthropogenic reduction of habitat connectivity (J03.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
2.6.1 Method used – pressures mainly based on exp	ert judgement and other data (	(2)
2.7 Main Threats		
Threat	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
infilling of ditches, dykes, ponds, pools, marshes or pits (J02.01.03)	high importance (H)	N/A
reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)	medium importance (M)	
	mearam importance (iii)	N/A
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)	high importance (H)	N/A N/A
•	<u>.</u>	
brackish) (H01)	high importance (H)	N/A
brackish) (H01) problematic native species (I02)	high importance (H) medium importance (M)	N/A N/A
brackish) (H01) problematic native species (I02) intensive grazing (A04.01)	high importance (H)  medium importance (M)  low importance (L)	N/A N/A N/A
brackish) (H01) problematic native species (I02) intensive grazing (A04.01) abandonment of pastoral systems, lack of grazing (A04.03)	high importance (H)  medium importance (M)  low importance (L)  high importance (H)	N/A N/A N/A
brackish) (H01) problematic native species (I02) intensive grazing (A04.01) abandonment of pastoral systems, lack of grazing (A04.03) roads, motorways (D01.02)	high importance (H)  medium importance (M)  low importance (L)  high importance (H)  medium importance (M)	N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A
brackish) (H01) problematic native species (I02) intensive grazing (A04.01) abandonment of pastoral systems, lack of grazing (A04.03) roads, motorways (D01.02) Modification of hydrographic functioning, general (J02.05)	high importance (H)  medium importance (M)  low importance (L)  high importance (H)  medium importance (M)  high importance (H)	N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A
brackish) (H01) problematic native species (I02) intensive grazing (A04.01) abandonment of pastoral systems, lack of grazing (A04.03) roads, motorways (D01.02) Modification of hydrographic functioning, general (J02.05) Silting up (K01.02)	high importance (H)  medium importance (M)  low importance (L)  high importance (H)  medium importance (M)  high importance (H)  medium importance (M)	N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A
brackish) (H01) problematic native species (I02) intensive grazing (A04.01) abandonment of pastoral systems, lack of grazing (A04.03) roads, motorways (D01.02) Modification of hydrographic functioning, general (J02.05) Silting up (K01.02) Interspecific faunal relations (K03)	high importance (H)  medium importance (M)  low importance (L)  high importance (H)  medium importance (M)  high importance (H)  medium importance (M)  medium importance (M)	N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A
brackish) (H01) problematic native species (I02) intensive grazing (A04.01) abandonment of pastoral systems, lack of grazing (A04.03) roads, motorways (D01.02) Modification of hydrographic functioning, general (J02.05) Silting up (K01.02) Interspecific faunal relations (K03) Landfill, land reclamation and drying out, general (J02.01)	high importance (H)  medium importance (M)  low importance (L)  high importance (H)  medium importance (M)  high importance (H)  medium importance (M)  medium importance (M)  high importance (H)	N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A

09/04/2014 16.32.53 Page 10 of 11

2.8.1 Justification of % thresholds for trends2.8.2 Other relevant Information

2.8.3 Trans-boundary assessment

2.9 Conclusions (assessment of conservation status at end of reporting period)

2.9.1 Range assessment Favourable (FV)

qualifiers N/A

2.9.2. Population assessment Unknown (XX)

qualifiers N/A

2.9.3. Habitat assessment Inadequate (U1)

qualifiers N/A

2.9.4. Future prospects assessment Inadequate (U1)

qualifiers N/A

Inadequate (U1)

2.9.5 Overall assessment of Conservation Status
2.9.5 Overall trend in

d in declining (-)

### 3. Natura 2000 coverage and conservation measures - Annex II species

#### 3.1 Population

**Conservation Status** 

3.1.1 Population Size Unit N/A min max

3.1.2 Method used Absent data (0)

3.1.3 Trend of population size within N/A

#### 3.2 Conversation Measures

3.2.1 Measure	3.2.2 Type	3.2.3 Ranking	3.2.4 Location	3.2.5 Broad Evaluation
Other agriculture-related measures (2.0)	Legal	medium importance (M)	Inside	No effect
Other wetland-related measures (4.0)	Legal	medium importance (M)	Inside	Maintain
Restoring/improving water quality (4.1)	Contractual	high importance (H)	Inside	Maintain
Restoring/improving the hydrological regime (4.2)	Contractual Recurrent	low importance (L)	Both	No effect
Specific management of traffic and energy transport systems (8.2)	Contractual	low importance (L)	Both	Maintain

09/04/2014 16.32.53 Page 11 of 11