0.1 Member State	IT
0.2.1 Species code	1190
0.2.2 Species name	Discoglossus sardus
0.2.3 Alternative species scientific name	N/A
0.2.4 Common name	Discoglosso sardo

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 Information, unpublished data and experts' judgments have been provided by Anna Rita Di Cerbo, Francesco Ficetola, Roberto Sindaco.

Bielby, J., Bovero, S., Sotgiu, G., Tessa, G., Favelli, M., Angelini, C., Doglio, S., Clare, F.C., Gazzaniga, E., Lapietra, F., Garner, T.W.J., 2009. Fatal chytridiomycosis in the Tyrrhenian Painted Frog. EcoHealth 6, 27-32.

Capula, M., 2007. Discoglossus sardus Tschudi in Otth, 1837, In Fauna d'Italia, Vol. XLII: Amphibia. eds B. Lanza, F. Andreone, M.A. Bologna, C. Corti, E. Razzetti, pp. 318-323. Calderini, Bologna.

De Pous P., Speybroeck J., Bogaerts S., Pasmans F., Beukema W. 2012. A contribution to the atlas of the terrestrial herpetofauna of Sardinia. Herpetology Notes, volume 5: 391-405

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 degli habitat e delle 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".

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.

2.3 Range

09/04/2014 16.06.47 Page 1 of 4

ii, it alia t species (/ iiii	ick 5 ₁		
 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 	16000 Complete survey/Con 2001-2012 stable (0) min N/A min area (km²) operator unkown method	max max approximately equa No Expert judgement	atistically robust estimate (3)
2.3.10 Reason for change	Use of different meth	nod	
2.4 Population			
2.4.1 Population size (individuals or agreed exception)	Unit N/A min	max	
2.4.2 Population size	Unit number of r	nap 10x10 km grid ce	lls (grids10x10)
(other than individuals)	min 72	max 72	
2.4.3 Additional information	Definition of locality		
	Conversion method		
	Problems	populations decli Bielby 2009	ning because of chytridiomicosis. See
2.4.4 Year or period2.4.5 Method – population size2.4.6 Short-term trend period2.4.7 Short term trend direction	2000-2012 Complete survey/Cor 2001-2012 decrease (-)	mplete survey or a sta	atistically robust estimate (3)
2.4.8 Short-term trend magnitude	min	max	confidence interval
2.4.9 Short-term trend method2.4.10 Long-term trend period	Estimate based on pa	ortial data with some	extrapolation and/or modelling (2)
2.4.11 Long term trend direction	N/A		
2.4.12 Long-term trend magnitude2.4.13 Long-term trend method	min N/A	max	confidence interval
2.4.14 Favourable reference	number		
population		mately equal to (≈)	
	unknown No		
2.4.15 Descen for change		udgement	
2.4.15 Reason for change	Improved knowledge	/more accurate data	
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 	2000-2012 Absent data (0)		

and agriculture intensifications
2.5.5 Short term trend period
2.5.6 Short term trend direction
2001-2012
decrease (-)

2.5.4 a) Quality of habitat

2.5.4 b) Quality of habitat - method

09/04/2014 16.06.47 Page 2 of 4

loss and modification of breeding wetlands because of landscape modifications

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

N/A

Improved knowledge/more accurate data

	_	
	1 / -	Pressures
<i>,</i> 6 i	vioin	Dracciirac
 U I	viaiii	r i essui es

Pressure	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
introduction of disease (microbial pathogens) (K03.03)	high importance (H)	N/A
invasive non-native species (I01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
collection of animals (insects, reptiles, amphibians) (F03.02.01)	low importance (L)	N/A
use of biocides, hormones and chemicals (A07)	low importance (L)	N/A
droughts and less precipitations (M01.02)	low importance (L)	N/A
reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
modification of cultivation practices (A02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
fire and fire suppression (J01)	low importance (L)	N/A
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Urbanised areas, human habitation (E01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
human induced changes in hydraulic conditions (J02)	high importance (H)	N/A

2.6.1 Method used – pressures

mainly based on expert judgement and other data (2)

.7 M	lain	Thre	eats

Threat	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
introduction of disease (microbial pathogens) (K03.03)	high importance (H)	N/A
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)	high importance (H)	N/A
human induced changes in hydraulic conditions (J02)	high importance (H)	N/A
Urbanised areas, human habitation (E01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
droughts and less precipitations (M01.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
use of biocides, hormones and chemicals (A07)	low importance (L)	N/A
anthropogenic reduction of habitat connectivity (J03.02)	high importance (H)	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 Bad (U2)
qualifiers declining (-)

09/04/2014 16.06.47 Page 3 of 4

2.9.3. Habitat2.9.4. Future prospects2.9.5 Overall assessment of Conservation Status2.9.5 Overall trend in Conservation Status

assessment Inadequate (U1) qualifiers declining (-) assessment Bad (U2) qualifiers declining (-)

Bad (U2)

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	N/A						
3.2 Conversation Meas	ures						
3.2.1 Measure	3.2.2 Type		3.2.3 R	anking	3.2.4 Location	3.2.5 Broad Evaluation	
Other spatial measures	Administra	ative	mediu	medium importance (M)	Both	Maintain	
(6.0)			import			Enhance	
						Long term	
Legal protection of habita and species (6.3)	ts Legal		mediui import	m ance (M)	Both	Maintain	

09/04/2014 16.06.47 Page 4 of 4