0.1 Member State	IT
0.2.1 Species code	1316
0.2.2 Species name	Myotis capaccinii
0.2.3 Alternative species scientific name	N/A
0.2.4 Common name	N/A

#### 1. National Level

#### **1.1 Maps**

1.1.1 Distribution Map
Yes
1.1.1a Sensitive species
No
1.1.2 Method used - map
Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)
1.1.3 Year or period
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 Daniele Paoloni, Cristiano Spilinga (Associazione Teriologica Italiana - ATIt) and Anna Alonzi, Piero Genovesi, Francesca Ronchi (Institute for Environmental Protection and Research - ISPRA). Information, unpublished data and experts' judgments have been provided by Paolo Agnelli, Mara Calvini, Luca Cistrone, Michele Ferretto, Mauro Mucedda, Danilo Russo, Dino Scaravelli, Martina Spada, Roberto Toffoli, Simone Vergari (Italian Group for bat Research).

Distribution data for the following Nature 2000 sites have been inserted by the Ministry of Environment (source: Italian Nature 2000 database): IT5210078; IT5210057; IT5210060; IT5210064; IT5210047; IT5210050; IT5210016; IT5210033; IT5210077; IT5210021; IT5210053; IT5210055; IT5210025; IT5210039.

Distribution data for the following grid cells have been inserted by the Ministry of Environment: 10kmE418N185; 10kmE427N191.

Distribution data for the following grid cells have been removed by the Ministry of Environment: 10kmE475N203; 10kmE474N204; 10kmE473N205; 10kmE452N215; 10kmE418N186; 10kmE423N191.

Archivio Osservatorio Regionale per Biodiversità. Regione Umbria.

Bux M., Russo D. e Scillitani G. 2003. La chirotterofauna della Puglia. Hystrix, It. J. Mamm. (n. s.) supp.: 150.

Calvini M., 2010. Monitoraggio delle colonie di chirotteri riproduttive e svernanti di particolare interesse conservazionistico note in Liguria (rapporto interno).

Capizzi et al. (2012) Progetto atlante dei Mammiferi del Lazio - Regione Lazio – ARP.

22/04/2014 15.10.38 Page 1 of 11

Database del Repertorio Naturalistico Toscano.

Mucedda M., Murittu G., Oppes A., Pidinchedda E., 1995. Osservazioni sui Chirotteri troglofili della Sardegna. Boll. Soc. Sarda Sci. Nat., 30: 97-129.

Mucedda M., Bertelli M. L., Pidinchedda E., 2001. Note su Myotis capaccinii (Chiroptera, Vespertilionidae) della Sardegna. Boll. Gruppo Spel. Sassarese, 18: 35-38.

Regione Autonoma della Sardegna - Assessorato Difesa Ambiente, 2012 - "Servizio di monitoraggio dello stato di conservazione degli habitat e delle specie di importanza comunitaria presenti nei siti della Rete Natura 2000 in Sardegna – Linea 4. Redazione del Rapporto sullo stato di conservazione di habitat e specie.

Regione Autonoma della Sardegna - Assessorato Difesa Ambiente - 2008-2009. "Realizzazione del sistema di monitoraggio dello stato di conservazione degli habitat e delle specie di interesse comunitario della Regione Autonoma della Sardegna".

Regione Liguria, 2008, Carta della Biodiversità, www.ambienteinliguria.it

Ruffo S., Stoch F., 2005. Checklist e distribuzione della fauna italiana. Memorie del Museo Civico di storia naturale di Verona, 2.serie, Sezione scienze della Vita 16.

Spilinga C., Russo D., Carletti S., Jiménez Grijalva M.P., Sergiacomi U., Ragni B., (in stampa). Chirotteri dell'Umbria. Distribuzione geografica ed ecologica. Regione Umbria. Università degli Studi di Perugia.

#### 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

73900

Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)

2001-2012

decrease (-)

min max

N/A

min max

area (km²)

operator more than (>)

unkown No

method Expert judgement

2.3.10 Reason for change

Improved knowledge/more accurate dataUse of different method

number of map 10x10 km grid cells (grids10x10)

#### 2.4 Population

2.4.1 Population size

(individuals or agreed exception)

min

Unit

Unit

min max

N/A

2.4.2 Population size (other than individuals)

min 129 max 129

2.4.3 Additional information

**Definition of locality** 

22/04/2014 15.10.38 Page 2 of 11

2.4.4 Year or period	Conversion meth Problems 1985-2012		ert grids to individuals
2.4.6 Short-term trend period 2.4.7 Short term trend direction		on expert opinion with no o	r minimal sampling (1)
<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	max on expert opinion with no o	confidence interval r minimal sampling (1)
<ul><li>2.4.11 Long term trend direction</li><li>2.4.12 Long-term trend magnitude</li><li>2.4.13 Long-term trend method</li><li>2.4.14 Favourable reference</li></ul>	N/A min N/A number	max	confidence interval
population	unknown <b>No</b>	ch more than (>>) ert judgement	
2.4.15 Reason for change	•	edge/more accurate data U	se of different method
2.5 Habitat for the Species			
2.5.1 Surface area - 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 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)	Absent data (0) Bad Expert based 2001-2012 decrease (-)		
2.5.10 Reason for change	Genuine Improve	ed knowledge/more accura	te data
2.6 Main Pressures			
Pressure		ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
closures of caves or galleries (G05.08)		high importance (H)	N/A
recreational cave visits (G01.04.03)		high importance (H)	N/A
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & te brackish) (H01)	errestrial, marine &	high importance (H)	N/A
management of aquatic and bank vege	tation for drainage	high importance (H)	N/A

surface water abstractions by hydro-en	ergy (J02.06.06)	medium importance (M)	N/A	
2.6.1 Method used – pressures	pressures based only on expert judgements (1)			
2.7 Main Threats				
Threat		ranking	pollution qualifier(s)	
closures of caves or galleries (G05.08)		high importance (H)	N/A	
recreational cave visits (G01.04.03)		high importance (H)	N/A	

purposes (J02.10)

22/04/2014 15.10.38 Page 3 of 11

Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)	high importance (H)	N/A
management of aquatic and bank vegetation for drainage purposes (J02.10)	high importance (H)	N/A
surface water abstractions by hydro-energy (J02.06.06)	medium importance (M)	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 Inadequate (U1)
qualifiers N/A

2.9.2. Population

assessment Bad (U2)
qualifiers N/A

2.9.3. Habitat

assessment Bad (U2)
qualifiers N/A

2.9.4. Future prospects

assessment Bad (U2)
qualifiers N/A

2.9.5 Overall assessment of

Bad (U2)

2.9.5 Overall assessment of Conservation Status

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 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
Adapt forest management (3.2)	Administrative	medium importance (M)	Inside	Maintain Long term
Establish protected areas/sites (6.1)	Legal	medium importance (M)	Inside	Unknown
Legal protection of habitats and species (6.3)	s Legal	medium importance (M)	Both	Unknown

## 2. Biogeographical Or Marine Level

2.1 Biogeographical Region

Continental (CON)

2.2 Published sources

The present species assessment (fields 0.1-2.9) has been compiled by Daniele

22/04/2014 15.10.38 Page 4 of 11

Paoloni, Cristiano Spilinga (Associazione Teriologica Italiana - ATIt) and Anna Alonzi, Piero Genovesi, Francesca Ronchi (Institute for Environmental Protection and Research - ISPRA). Information, unpublished data and experts' judgments have been provided by Paolo Agnelli, Mara Calvini, Luca Cistrone, Michele Ferretto, Danilo Russo, Dino Scaravelli, Martina Spada, Roberto Toffoli, Simone Vergari (Italian Group for bat Research).

Distribution data for the following grid cells have been removed by the Ministry of Environment: 10kmE425N245.

Archivio Osservatorio Regionale per Biodiversità. Regione Umbria.

Banca Dati Regionale Emilia Romagna (aggiornamento al 2010).

Calvini M., 2010. Monitoraggio delle colonie di chirotteri riproduttive e svernanti di particolare interesse conservazionistico note in Liguria (rapporto interno).

Dall'Asta A., 1995-1996. Atlante preliminare dei Chirotteri (Chiroptera, Mammalia) della Regione Friuli-Venezia Giulia - Prima Sintesi Cartografica. Tesi di Laurea in Scienze Naturali, Fac. Di Scienze MM. FF. NN. Dell'Università degli Studi di Trieste, Relatori G. A. Amirante & S. Dolce: 1-103.

Database del Repertorio Naturalistico Toscano. Insubria DataBat, 2012. Data base chirotteri dell'Università degli Studi dell'Insubria aggiornato al 2012.

Kryštufek B., Rešek Donev N., 2005. The Atlas of Slovenian Bats (Chiroptera). Scopolia, 55 (2005): 1-92.

Lapini L., Dall'Asta A., Dublo L., Spoto M., Venier E., 1996 (1995). Materiali per una teriofauna dell'Italia Nord - Orientale (Mammalia, Friuli-Venezia Giulia). Gortania 17: 149-248.

Ruffo S., Stoch F., 2005. Checklist e distribuzione della fauna italiana. Memorie del Museo Civico di storia naturale di Verona, 2.serie, Sezione scienze della Vita 16.

Spada M., Preatoni G., Tosi G., Martinoli A., 2010. Piano di monitoraggio dei Vertebrati terrestri di interesse comunitario (Direttive 79/409/CEE e 92/43/CEE) in Lombardia. Il monitoraggio dei Chirotteri. Fondazione Lombardia per l'Ambiente, Università degli Studi dell'Insubria.

Spilinga C., Russo D., Carletti S., Jiménez Grijalva M.P., Sergiacomi U., Ragni B., (in stampa). Chirotteri dell'Umbria. Distribuzione geografica ed ecologica. Regione Umbria. Università degli Studi di Perugia.

Vigorita V., Cucè L., 2008. La fauna selvatica in Lombardia. Rapporto 2008 su distribuzione, abbondanza e stato di conservazione di uccelli e mammiferi. Regione Lombardia. Pp. 364.

#### 2.3 Range

2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km²)2.3.2 Method - Range surface area

9500

Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)

22/04/2014 15.10.38 Page 5 of 11

ii, iv and v species (An	nex B)
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	2001-2012 decrease (-) min max  N/A min max area (km²) operator more than (>) unkown No method Expert judgement
2.3.10 Reason for change	Improved knowledge/more accurate dataUse of different method
2.4 Population	
2.4.1 Population size (individuals or agreed exception)	Unit N/A min max
2.4.2 Population size (other than individuals)	Unit number of map 10x10 km grid cells (grids10x10) min 17 max 17
2.4.3 Additional information	Definition of locality Conversion method Problems Impossible to convert grids into individuals
2.4.4 Year or period 2.4.5 Method – population size 2.4.6 Short-term trend period 2.4.7 Short term trend direction 2.4.8 Short-term trend magnitude 2.4.9 Short-term trend method	1985-2012 Estimate based on expert opinion with no or minimal sampling (1) 2001-2012 decrease (-) min max confidence interval
2.4.10 Long-term trend period 2.4.11 Long term trend direction 2.4.12 Long-term trend magnitude	Estimate based on expert opinion with no or minimal sampling (1)  N/A  min max confidence interval
<ul><li>2.4.13 Long-term trend method</li><li>2.4.14 Favourable reference population</li></ul>	N/A number operator much more than (>>) unknown No method Expert judgement
2.4.15 Reason for change	Improved knowledge/more accurate data Use of different method
2.5 Habitat for the Species	
2.5.1 Surface area - 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 2.5.5 Short term trend period 2.5.6 Short term trend direction 2.5.7 Long-term trend period	Absent data (0) Bad Expert based 2001-2012 decrease (-)
2.5.7 Long term trend period	11/1

22/04/2014 15.10.38 Page 6 of 11

2.5.8 Long term trend direction

2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat (km²)

N/A

2.5.10 Reason for change	Genuine Improved k	a	
2.6 Main Pressures			
Pressure		ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
closures of caves or galleries (G05.08)		high importance (H)	N/A
recreational cave visits (G01.04.03)		high importance (H)	N/A
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & t brackish) (H01)	errestrial, marine &	high importance (H)	N/A
management of aquatic and bank vego purposes (J02.10)	etation for drainage	high importance (H)	N/A
surface water abstractions by hydro-e	nergy (J02.06.06)	medium importance (M)	N/A
2.6.1 Method used – pressures	based only on exper	t judgements (1)	
2.7 Main Threats			
Threat		ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
closures of caves or galleries (G05.08)		high importance (H)	N/A
recreational cave visits (G01.04.03)		high importance (H)	N/A
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)		high importance (H)	N/A
management of aquatic and bank vego purposes (J02.10)	etation for drainage	high importance (H)	N/A
surface water abstractions by hydro-e	nergy (J02.06.06)	medium importance (M)	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 co	nservation status at e	end of reporting period)	
2.9.1 Range	assessment Inadeque qualifiers N/A	uate (U1)	
2.9.2. Population	assessment Bad (U2	2)	

# qualifiers N/A 2.9.3. Habitat assessment Bad (U2) qualifiers N/A 2.9.4. Future prospects assessment Bad (U2) qualifiers N/A

qualifiers N/.
2.9.5 Overall assessment of Bad (U2)

2.9.5 Overall assessment of Bad Conservation Status

2.9.5 Overall trend in

declining (-)

Conservation Status

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

#### 3.1 Population

22/04/2014 15.10.38 Page 7 of 11

3.1.1 Population Size		Unit min	N/A	max			
3.1.2 Method used		Absent data (0)					
3.1.3 Trend of population s	size within	N/A					
3.2 Conversation Measu	ires						
3.2.1 Measure	3.2.2 Type		3.2.3 F	Ranking	3.2.4 Location	3.2.5 Broad Evalua	ition
Other agriculture-related measures (2.0)	Administr	ative	mediu impor	m tance (M)	Inside	No effect	
Other forestry-related measures (3.0)	Administr	ative	mediu impor	m tance (M)	Inside	No effect	
Adapt forest management (3.2)	Administr	ative	mediu impor	m tance (M)	Inside	Maintain Long term	

### 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 Daniele Paoloni, Cristiano Spilinga (Associazione Teriologica Italiana - ATIt) and Anna Alonzi, Piero Genovesi, Francesca Ronchi (Institute for Environmental Protection and Research - ISPRA). Information, unpublished data and experts' judgments have been provided by Paolo Agnelli, Mara Calvini, Luca Cistrone, Michele Ferretto, Danilo Russo, Dino Scaravelli, Martina Spada, Roberto Toffoli, Simone Vergari (Italian Group for bat Research).

Calvini M., 2010. Monitoraggio delle colonie di chirotteri riproduttive e svernanti di particolare interesse conservazionistico note in Liguria (rapporto interno).

Dall'Asta A., 1995-1996. Atlante preliminare dei Chirotteri (Chiroptera, Mammalia) della Regione Friuli-Venezia Giulia - Prima Sintesi Cartografica. Tesi di Laurea in Scienze Naturali, Fac. di Scienze MM. FF. NN. dell'Università degli Studi di Trieste, Relatori G. A. Amirante & S. Dolce: 1-103.

Debernardi P., Patriarca E., 2007. The Bats of the Lake Maggiore Piedmont shore (NW Italy). Hystrix It. J. Mamm. (n.s.) 18 (1): 39-55.

Debernardi P., Garzoli L., Patriarca E., 2012. Demographics, phenology and conservation of the only colony of Myotis capaccinii known for Liguria, Piedmont and Aosta Valley (NW Italy). In: Prigioni C., Balestrieri A., Preatoni D.G., Masseroni E. (Eds.). VIII Congr. It. Teriologia, Hystrix, It. J. Mamm., (N.S.) SUPP. 2012: 110.

Insubria DataBat, 2012. Data base chirotteri dell'Università degli Studi dell'Insubria aggiornato al 2012.

Lapini L., Dall'Asta A., Dublo L., Spoto M., Venier E., 1996 (1995). Materiali per una teriofauna dell'Italia Nord - Orientale (Mammalia, Friuli-Venezia Giulia). Gortania 17: 149-248.

Patriarca E., Debernardi P., 2011. Approfondimento delle conoscenze chirotterologiche riguardanti il territorio di riferimento delle aree protette del

22/04/2014 15.10.38 Page 8 of 11

Lago Maggiore. Periodo 30/04/2009 – 30/04/2011. Interreg Italia – Svizzera 2007-2013. Rapporto interno per conto Ente dei Parchi e delle Riserve naturali del Lago Maggiore. Pp. 48.

Provincia di Trento. Rilevamenti e monitoraggi popolazioni chirotteri della provincia di Trento nel periodo 1999-2012

Ruffo S., Stoch F., 2005. Checklist e distribuzione della fauna italiana. Memorie del Museo Civico di storia naturale di Verona, 2. serie, Sezione scienze della Vita 16.

Spada M., Preatoni G., Tosi G., Martinoli A., 2010. Piano di monitoraggio dei Vertebrati terrestri di interesse comunitario (Direttive 79/409/CEE e 92/43/CEE) in Lombardia. Il monitoraggio dei Chirotteri. Fondazione Lombardia per l'Ambiente, Università degli Studi dell'Insubria.

Vigorita V., Cucè L., 2008. La fauna selvatica in Lombardia. Rapporto 2008 su distribuzione, abbondanza e stato di conservazione di uccelli e mammiferi. Regione Lombardia. Pp. 364.

#### 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

5800

Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)

2001-2012 decrease (-)

min max

N/A

min max

area (km²)

operator more than (>)

unkown

method Expert judgement

2.3.10 Reason for change

Improved knowledge/more accurate dataUse of different method

#### 2.4 Population

2.4.1 Population size

(individuals or agreed exception)

Unit N/A

min max

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

min max 12

2.4.3 Additional information

Definition of locality

Conversion method

**Problems** Impossible to convert grids to individuals

2.4.4 Year or period

1990-2012 2.4.5 Method – population size

Estimate based on expert opinion with no or minimal sampling (1)

2.4.6 Short-term trend period

2.4.7 Short term trend direction

2001-2012 decrease (-)

22/04/2014 15.10.38 Page 9 of 11

2.4.8 Short-term trend magnitude	min	max	confidence interval
2.4.9 Short-term trend method	Estimate b	ased on expert opinion wit	h no or minimal sampling (1)
2.4.10 Long-term trend period			
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	much more than (>>)	
	unknown	No	
	method	Expert judgement	
2.4.15 Reason for change	Improved l	knowledge/more accurate	data Use of different method
2.5 Habitat for the Species			
2.5.1 Surface area - Habitat (km²)			
2.5.2 Year or period			
2.5.3 Method used - habitat	Absent dat	ta (0)	
2.5.4 a) Quality of habitat	Bad		
2.5.4 b) Quality of habitat - method	Expert bas	ed	
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	Genuine In	nproved knowledge/more	accurate data

2.0	IVIAI	n Pi	ressu	ires

Pressure	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
closures of caves or galleries (G05.08)	high importance (H)	N/A
recreational cave visits (G01.04.03)	high importance (H)	N/A
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)	high importance (H)	N/A
management of aquatic and bank vegetation for drainage purposes (J02.10)	high importance (H)	N/A
surface water abstractions by hydro-energy (J02.06.06)	medium importance (M)	N/A

2.6.1 Method used – pressures	based only on expert judgements (1)		
2.7 Main Threats			
Threat		ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
closures of caves or galleries (G05.08	)	high importance (H)	N/A
recreational cave visits (G01.04.03)		high importance (H)	N/A
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & brackish) (H01)	terrestrial, marine &	high importance (H)	N/A
management of aquatic and bank veg purposes (J02.10)	getation for drainage	high importance (H)	N/A
surface water abstractions by hydro-	energy (J02.06.06)	medium importance (M)	N/A
demolishment of buildings & human	structures (E06.01)	low importance (L)	N/A
reconstruction, renovation of buildin	gs (E06.02)	low importance (L)	N/A

Page 10 of 11 22/04/2014 15.10.38

-		
2.7.1 Method used – threats	expert opinion (1)	
2.8 Complementary Information		
<ul><li>2.8.1 Justification of % thresholds for trends</li><li>2.8.2 Other relevant Information</li><li>2.8.3 Trans-boundary assessment</li></ul>		
2.9 Conclusions (assessment of co	nservation status at end of reporting peri	od)
2.9.1 Range	assessment Inadequate (U1)	

2.9.1 Range

assessment Inadequate (U1 qualifiers N/A

2.9.2. Population

assessment Bad (U2) qualifiers N/A

2.9.3. Habitat

assessment Bad (U2) qualifiers N/A

2.9.4. Future prospects

assessment Bad (U2) qualifiers N/A

2.9.5 Overall assessment of

Conservation Status

2.9.5 Overall trend in declining (-)

**Conservation Status** 

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

3.1 Population								
3.1.1 Population Size		Unit N	/A max					
<ul><li>3.1.2 Method used</li><li>3.1.3 Trend of population size within</li></ul>		Absent data (0) 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)	Contractual		medium importance (M)	Inside	No effect			
Other forestry-related measures (3.0)	Contractual		medium importance (M)	Inside	No effect			
Legal protection of habitats and species (6.3)	Legal		high importance (H)	Both	Not evaluated			
Specific single species or species group management measures (7.4)	One-off		high importance (H)	Outside	Not evaluated			

22/04/2014 15.10.38 Page 11 of 11