0.1 Member State	Π
0.2.1 Species code	1074
0.2.2 Species name	Eriogaster catax
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	2007-2012
1.1.4 Additional map	No
1.1.5 Range map	Yes

## 2. Biogeographical Or Marine Level

2.1 B	iogeog	raphi	cal Re	gion
-------	--------	-------	--------	------

#### 2.2 Published sources

### **Mediterranean (MED)**

The present species assessment (fields 0.1-2.9) has been compiled by Fabio Stoch (on behalf of the Comitato Scientifico per la Fauna d'Italia) and Anna Alonzi, Piero Genovesi, Francesca Ronchi (ISPRA). Information, unpublished data and expert judgements have been provided by Alberto Zilli (Rome).

Parenzan P., Porcelli F., 2006. I Macrolepidotteri italiani. Phytophaga, 15 (CD-Rom): 1-1051.

#### 2.3 Range

2.3.10 Reason for change	Improved knowl	edge/more accurate data
	unkown method	No Expert opinion
	operator	approximately equal to (≈)
2.3.9 Favourable reference range	area (km²)	
2.3.8 Long-term trend magnitude	min	max
2.3.7 Long-term trend direction	N/A	
2.3.6 Long-term trend period		
2.3.5 Short-term trend magnitude	min	max
2.3.4 Short-term trend direction	stable (0)	
2.3.3 Short-term trend period	2001-2012	
2.3.2 Method - Range surface area	Estimate based of	on expert opinion with no or minimal sampling (1)
2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km²)	13900	

#### 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	localities (localities)
(other than individuals)	min	50	max 500
2.4.3 Additional information	Definition	on of locality	Site where a population was recorded
	Convers	sion method	not available

08/04/2014 13.33.07 Page 1 of 8

• •	•			
	Problems	it is impossible to co	onvert localities into individuals	
2.4.4 Year or period	2007-2012			
2.4.5 Method – population size		expert opinion with no or	minimal sampling (1)	
2.4.6 Short-term trend period	2001-2012			
2.4.7 Short term trend direction	stable (0)			
2.4.8 Short-term trend magnitude	min		confidence interval	
<ul><li>2.4.9 Short-term trend method</li><li>2.4.10 Long-term trend period</li></ul>	Estimate based on	expert opinion with no or	minimal sampling (1)	
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	THU A		
2.4.14 Favourable reference	number			
population	operator appro	oximately equal to (≈)		
	unknown <b>No</b>			
	method Expe	rt opinion		
2.4.15 Reason for change				
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 data (0)			
2.5.4 a) Quality of habitat	Good			
2.5.4 b) Quality of habitat - method		Expert opinion		
<ul><li>2.5.5 Short term trend period</li><li>2.5.6 Short term trend direction</li></ul>	2001-2012			
	stable (0)			
2.5.7 Long-term trend period	1989-2012			
<ul><li>2.5.8 Long term trend direction</li><li>2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat (km²)</li></ul>	increase (+)			
2.5.10 Reason for change	Improved knowle	dge/more accurate data Us	se of different method	
	improved knowles	age, more accurate data of	or different method	
2.6 Main Pressures				
Pressure		ranking	pollution qualifier(s)	
removal of hedges and copses or scrub	(A10.01)	medium importance (I	M) N/A	
2.6.1 Method used – pressures	based only on exp	ert judgements (1)		
2.7 Main Threats				
Threat		ranking	pollution qualifier(s)	
removal of hedges and copses or scrub	(A10.01)	medium importance (I	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 cor	nservation status a	t end of reporting period	d)	

08/04/2014 13.33.07 Page 2 of 8

assessment Favourable (FV)

qualifiers N/A

2.9.1 Range

2.9.2. Population

assessment Favourable (FV)

qualifiers N/A

2.9.3. Habitat

assessment Favourable (FV)

qualifiers N/A

2.9.4. Future prospects

assessment Favourable (FV)

qualifiers N/A

Favourable (FV)

2.9.5 Overall assessment of

**Conservation Status** 

2.9.5 Overall trend in **Conservation Status** 

N/A

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

Measures needed, but not implemented (1.2)

()

### 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 Fabio Stoch (on behalf ot the Comitato Scientifico per la Fauna d'Italia) and Anna Alonzi, Piero Genovesi, Francesca Ronchi (ISPRA). Information, unpublished data and expert judgements have been provided by Alberto Zilli (Rome).

Parenzan P., Porcelli F., 2006. I Macrolepidotteri italiani. Phytophaga, 15 (CD-Rom): 1-1051.

2.3 Range

2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km²)

16300 2.3.2 Method - Range surface area Estimate based on expert opinion with no or minimal sampling (1)

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

min N/A

> min max

area (km²)

2001-2012

stable (0)

approximately equal to (≈) operator

max

unkown

method **Expert opinion** 

08/04/2014 13.33.07 Page 3 of 8

2.3.10 Reason for change	Improved knowledg	ge/more accurate dataUse	of different method
2.4 Population			
2.4.1 Population size (individuals or agreed exception)	Unit N/A	max	
2.4.2 Population size (other than individuals)		localities (localities)	
2.4.3 Additional information	min 15  Definition of locality		ion was recorded
	Conversion method		ion was recorded
	Problems		nvert localities 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 2.4.10 Long-term trend period	2001-2012 stable (0) min	expert opinion with no or n  max expert opinion with no or n	onfidence interval
2.4.11 Long term trend direction 2.4.12 Long-term trend magnitude 2.4.13 Long-term trend method 2.4.14 Favourable reference	N/A min N/A number		onfidence interval
population	unknown No	han (>) opinion	
2.4.15 Reason for change			
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) Moderate Expert opinion 2001-2012 stable (0) N/A		
2.5.10 Reason for change	Improved knowled	ge/more accurate data Use	e of different method
2.6 Main Pressures			
Pressure		ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
removal of hedges and copses or scru	b (A10.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
2.6.1 Method used – pressures	based only on expe	rt judgements (1)	
2.7 Main Threats			
Threat		ranking	pollution qualifier(s)

08/04/2014 13.33.07 Page 4 of 8

high importance (H)

N/A

removal of hedges and copses or scrub (A10.01)

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 Favourable (FV)

qualifiers N/A

assessment Unknown (XX)

qualifiers N/A Inadequate (U1)

2.9.5 Overall assessment of

**Conservation Status** 

2.9.4. Future prospects

2.9.5 Overall trend in

**Conservation Status** 

unknown (x)

### 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
Establish protected areas/sites (6.1)	Administrative	low importance (L)	Both	Maintain Enhance Long term
Legal protection of habitats and species (6.3)	Legal Administrative	high importance (H)	Both	Maintain Enhance Long term Unknown

## 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 Fabio Stoch (on behalf of the Comitato Scientifico per la Fauna d'Italia) and Anna Alonzi, Piero Genovesi, Francesca Ronchi (ISPRA). Information, unpublished data and expert judgements have been provided by Alberto Zilli (Rome).

Parenzan P., Porcelli F., 2006. I Macrolepidotteri italiani. Phytophaga, 15 (CD-

08/04/2014 13.33.07 Page 5 of 8

Rom): 1-1051.

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	2001-2012 stable (0) min  N/A min area (km²) operator unkown method	max much m No Expert o	
2.3.10 Reason for change	Improved know	vledge/more ac	curate 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	er of localities (I max	ocalities) 10
2.4.3 Additional information	Definition of loc Conversion met Problems	thod not a	where a population was reported wailable npossible to convert localities into individuals
<ul><li>2.4.4 Year or period</li><li>2.4.5 Method – population size</li><li>2.4.6 Short-term trend period</li><li>2.4.7 Short term trend direction</li></ul>	2007-2012 Estimate based 2001-2012 unknown (x)	on expert opini	on with no or 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><li>2.4.11 Long term trend direction</li></ul>	min Absent data (0) N/A	max	confidence interval
2.4.12 Long-term trend magnitude 2.4.13 Long-term trend method 2.4.14 Favourable reference population	min N/A number operator unknown No	max uch more than ( ) pert opinion	confidence interval
2.4.15 Reason for change	metriod LX	per copinion	
2.5 Habitat for the Species			
2.5.1 Surface area - Habitat (km²)			

08/04/2014 13.33.07 Page 6 of 8

Absent data (0)

Expert opinion

Bad

2.5.2 Year or period

2.5.3 Method used - habitat

2.5.4 b) Quality of habitat - method

2.5.4 a) Quality of habitat

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

2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat (km²)

2.5.10 Reason for change

Improved knowledge/more accurate data Use of different method

#### 2.6 Main Pressures

Pressure	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
removal of hedges and copses or scrub (A10.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
roads, motorways (D01.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A

2.6.1 Method used – pressures based only on expert judgements (1)

N/A

#### 2.7 Main Threats

2.7 Wall Till Cats		
Threat	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
removal of hedges and copses or scrub (A10.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
roads, motorways (D01.02)	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 Bad (U2) 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 Conservation Status

Bad (U2)

unknown (x)

### 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

08/04/2014 13.33.07 Page 7 of 8

3.2 Conversation Me	easures			
3.2.1 Measure	3.2.2 Type	3.2.3 Ranking	3.2.4 Location	3.2.5 Broad Evaluation
Legal protection of hab and species (6.3)	oitats Legal	high importance (H)	Both	Long term Unknown

08/04/2014 13.33.07 Page 8 of 8