Report on the main results of the surveillance under article 11 for annex II, IV and V species (Annex B)

0.1 Member State	**IT**
0.2.1 Species code	**1156**
0.2.2 Species name	**Padogobius nigricans**
0.2.3 Alternative species scientific name	N/A
0.2.4 Common name	ghiozzo di ruscello

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	2000-2012
1.1.4 Additional map	No
1.1.5 Range map	Yes

2. Biogeographical Or Marine Level

2.1 Biogeographical Region

Mediterranean (MED)

2.2 Published sources

The present species assessment (fields 0.1-2.9) has been compiled by Alessandra Ippoliti, Andrea Sibilia (Associazione Italiana Ittiologi Acque dolci - AIIAD) and Anna Alonzi, Piero Genovesi, Francesca Ronchi (Institute for Environmental Protection and Research - ISPRA). Information, unpublished data and experts' judgments have been provided by Francesco Nonnis Marzano, Massimo Lorenzoni, Giuseppe Maio, Massimo Pascale, Armando Piccinini, Elisabetta Pizzul, Cesare M. Puzzi, Lorenzo Tancioni, Paolo Turin (AIIAD).

.R.S.I.A.L., 2009. Carta della Biodiversità ittica della Provincia di Frosinone - Schede di campionamento. Regione Lazio - Università degli Studi di Roma Tor Vergata. Technical Report, published on internet. 165 pp.
A.R.S.I.A.L., 2012. Carta della Biodiversità Ittica delle Acque Correnti del Lazio, Provincia di Rieti. Regione Lazio -Acquaprogram Vicenza - Lynx Natura e Ambiente s.r.l. - TEMI s.r.l. R Technical Report, published on internet. 161 pp.
Acquaprogram s.r.l., 2008. Fauna Ittica del Parco Regionale della Valle del Treja. Unpublished data.
Acquaprogram s.r.l., 2009. Realizzazione della “Carta della Biodiversità Ittica del Lazio, Province di Viterbo e Latina”. Relazione conclusiva - Allegato 1, Schede di campionamento morfologico ed ittico ed elaborazioni Schede Indice Funzionalità Fluviale Provincia di Latina. Technical Report, published on internet.
Bianco P.G e Santoro E. in Bianco P.G. e de Filippo G. (eds.) 2011. Contributo alla conoscenza della fauna ittica d’acqua dolce in aree protette d’Italia. Res.Wildl.Conserv. 3. IGF Publ., USA.
Falconi R., Rossi G., De paoli A., Zaccanti F., Cesarini M., Campostagno S., Marchi A., Zuffi G., 2012. Carta ittica della Provincia di Firenze - secondo livello. Technical Report, published on internet. 510 pp.
Lorenzoni M. et al., 2007. Carta Ittica Regionale. Bacino del F. Paglia e del F. Chiani. Assessorato Agricoltura e foreste, Servizio Programmazione Forestale, Faunistico Venatoria, Economia montana. Rapporto tecnico pubblicato sul web. 305 pp.
Lorenzoni M. et al., 2007. Carta Ittica Regionale. Bacino del fiume Tevere. Perugia, Regione dell'Umbria. Rapporto tecnico pubblicato sul web. 337 pp.

Report on the main results of the surveillance under article 11 for annex II, IV and V species (Annex B)

Lorenzoni M., Ghetti L., Carosi A., Dolciami R., 2010, La fauna ittica e i corsi d'acqua dell'Umbria. Sintesi delle Carte Ittiche regionali dal 1986 al 2009. Petruzzi Editore, Perugia. 288 pp.
Nocita A., Busatto T., Maio G., Bonaretti R., 2010. Carta Ittica della Provincia di Pisa, Amministrazione provinciale di Pisa pp. 228
Parco Regionale Valle del Treja, 2006. Fauna Ittica del Parco Regionale della Valle del Treja. Unpublished data.
Pascale M., Chines A., 2009. Carta ittica della Provincia di Lucca. Fipsas - Enal Pesca - Arci pesca Fisa, Comitati Regionali Toscani - Unpem Coordinamento Regionale Toscano. Technical Report. Provincia di Lucca. 403 pp.
Provincia di Arezzo, 2012. Aggiornamento della Carta delle Vocazioni Ittiche della Provincia di Arezzo. Technical Report, G.R.A.I.A. srl. 631 pp.
Provincia di Pistoia, 2001. Carta Ittica della provincia di Pistoia. Rapporto tecnico pubblicato sul web. 151 pp.
Provincia di Viterbo, 2004. La Carta ittica dei Fiumi Mignone, Paglia e Marta. Rapporto tecnico pubblicato sul web. 285 pp.
Sarrocco S., Maio G., Celauro e Tancioni L., 2012. Carta della Biodiversità ittica delle acque correnti del Lazio. Edizioni ARP, Roma, 194
Tancioni L. e Cataudella S. (Ed.) (2009). Carta Ittica della Provincia di Roma - Contributo alla conoscenza Ecologica delle acque correnti superficiali della Provincia. Università degli Studi di Roma "Tor Vergata" e Provincia di Roma-Assessorato alle Politiche dell'Agricoltura. Roma, 363 pp.

2.3 Range

2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km²)	28100	
2.3.2 Method - Range surface area	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)	
2.3.3 Short-term trend period	2001-2012	
2.3.4 Short-term trend direction	decrease (-)	
2.3.5 Short-term trend magnitude	min	max
2.3.6 Long-term trend period	1989-2012	
2.3.7 Long-term trend direction	decrease (-)	
2.3.8 Long-term trend magnitude	min	max
2.3.9 Favourable reference range	area (km²)	
	operator	much more than (>>)
	unkown	No
	method	Expert opinion
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	113	max	113
2.4.3 Additional information	Definition of locality			
	Conversion method	not available		
	Problems	it's not possible to convert grids into individuals		
2.4.4 Year or period	2000-2012			
2.4.5 Method – population size	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)			
2.4.6 Short-term trend period	2001-2012			

Report on the main results of the surveillance under article 11 for annex II, IV and V species (Annex B)

2.4.7 Short term trend direction	decrease (-)		
2.4.8 Short-term trend magnitude	min	max	confidence interval
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	1989-2012		
2.4.11 Long term trend direction	decrease (-)		
2.4.12 Long-term trend magnitude	min	max	confidence interval
2.4.13 Long-term trend method	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)		
2.4.14 Favourable reference population	number		
	operator	much more than (>>)	
	unknown	No	
	method	Expert opinion	
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	Absent data (0)
2.5.4 a) Quality of habitat	Moderate
2.5.4 b) Quality of habitat - method	Expert opinion
2.5.5 Short term trend period	2001-2012
2.5.6 Short term trend direction	decrease (-)
2.5.7 Long-term trend period	1989-2012
2.5.8 Long term trend direction	decrease (-)
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)
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
human induced changes in hydraulic conditions (J02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Water abstractions from surface waters (J02.06)	high importance (H)	N/A
reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
invasive non-native species (I01)	high importance (H)	N/A
predation (K03.04)	low importance (L)	N/A
reduction in migration/ migration barriers (J03.02.01)	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)
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
human induced changes in hydraulic conditions (J02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Water abstractions from surface waters (J02.06)	high importance (H)	N/A
reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
invasive non-native species (I01)	high importance (H)	N/A

predation (K03.04)	low importance (L)	N/A
reduction in migration/ migration barriers (J03.02.01)	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: Inadequate (U1); qualifiers: N/A

2.9.4. Future prospects — assessment: Bad (U2); qualifiers: N/A

2.9.5 Overall assessment of Conservation Status: Bad (U2)

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
Other wetland-related measures (4.0)	Administrative	low importance (L)	Inside	Maintain
Establish protected areas/sites (6.1)	Administrative	medium importance (M)	Inside	Maintain Enhance Long term
Regulation/ Management of hunting and taking (7.1)	Administrative	low importance (L)	Both	Maintain

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 Alessandra Ippoliti, Andrea Sibilia (Associazione Italiana Ittiologi Acque dolci - AIIAD) and Anna Alonzi, Piero Genovesi, Francesca Ronchi (Institute for Environmental

Report on the main results of the surveillance under article 11 for annex II, IV and V species (Annex B)

Protection and Research - ISPRA). Information, unpublished data and experts' judgments have been provided by Francesco Nonnis Marzano, Massimo Lorenzoni, Giuseppe Maio, Massimo Pascale, Armando Piccinini, Elisabetta Pizzul, Cesare M. Puzzi, Lorenzo Tancioni, Paolo Turin (AIIAD).

Falconi R., Rossi G., De paoli A., Zaccanti F., Cesarini M., Campostagno S., Marchi A., Zuffi G., 2012. Carta ittica della Provincia di Firenze - secondo livello. Technical Report, published on internet. 510 pp.
Lorenzoni M. et al., 2007. Carta Ittica Regionale. Bacino del F. Paglia e del F. Chiani. Assessorato Agricoltura e foreste, Servizio Programmazione Forestale, Faunistico Venatoria, Economia montana. Rapporto tecnico pubblicato sul web. 305 pp.
Lorenzoni M. et al., 2007. Carta Ittica Regionale. Bacino del fiume Tevere. Perugia, Regione dell'Umbria. Rapporto tecnico pubblicato sul web. 337 pp.
Lorenzoni M., Ghetti L., Carosi A., Dolciami R., 2010, La fauna ittica e i corsi d'acqua dell'Umbria. Sintesi delle Carte Ittiche regionali dal 1986 al 2009. Petruzzi Editore, Perugia. 288 pp.
Provincia di Arezzo, 2012. Aggiornamento Della Carta delle Vocazioni Ittiche della Provincia di Arezzo. Technical Report, G.R.A.I.A. srl. 631 pp.

2.3 Range

2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km²)	8600	
2.3.2 Method - Range surface area	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)	
2.3.3 Short-term trend period	2001-2012	
2.3.4 Short-term trend direction	decrease (-)	
2.3.5 Short-term trend magnitude	min	max
2.3.6 Long-term trend period	1989-2012	
2.3.7 Long-term trend direction	decrease (-)	
2.3.8 Long-term trend magnitude	min	max
2.3.9 Favourable reference range	area (km²)	
	operator	much more than (>>)
	unkown	No
	method	Expert opinion
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	57	max	57
2.4.3 Additional information	Definition of locality			
	Conversion method	not available		
	Problems	it's not possible to convert grids into individuals		
2.4.4 Year or period	2002-2012			
2.4.5 Method – population size	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)			
2.4.6 Short-term trend period	2001-2012			
2.4.7 Short term trend direction	decrease (-)			

Report on the main results of the surveillance under article 11 for annex II, IV and V species (Annex B)

2.4.8 Short-term trend magnitude	min	max	confidence interval
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	1989-2012		
2.4.11 Long term trend direction	decrease (-)		
2.4.12 Long-term trend magnitude	min	max	confidence interval
2.4.13 Long-term trend method	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)		
2.4.14 Favourable reference population	number		
	operator	much more than (>>)	
	unknown	No	
	method	Expert opinion	
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	Absent data (0)
2.5.4 a) Quality of habitat	Moderate
2.5.4 b) Quality of habitat - method	Expert opinion
2.5.5 Short term trend period	2001-2012
2.5.6 Short term trend direction	decrease (-)
2.5.7 Long-term trend period	1989-2012
2.5.8 Long term trend direction	decrease (-)
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)
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
human induced changes in hydraulic conditions (J02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Water abstractions from surface waters (J02.06)	high importance (H)	N/A
reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
invasive non-native species (I01)	high importance (H)	N/A
predation (K03.04)	low importance (L)	N/A
reduction in migration/ migration barriers (J03.02.01)	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)
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
human induced changes in hydraulic conditions (J02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Water abstractions from surface waters (J02.06)	high importance (H)	N/A
reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
invasive non-native species (I01)	high importance (H)	N/A
predation (K03.04)	low importance (L)	N/A

reduction in migration/ migration barriers (J03.02.01)	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	Inadequate (U1)
	qualifiers	N/A
2.9.4. Future prospects	assessment	Bad (U2)
	qualifiers	N/A
2.9.5 Overall assessment of Conservation Status	Bad (U2)	
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
Establish protected areas/sites (6.1)	Administrative	medium importance (M)	Inside	Maintain Enhance Long term
Regulation/ Management of hunting and taking (7.1)	Administrative	low importance (L)	Both	Maintain