0.1 Member State	п
0.2.1 Species code	1099
0.2.2 Species name	Lampetra fluviatilis
0.2.3 Alternative species scientific name	N/A
0.2.4 Common name	lampreda di fiume

### 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	2002-2012
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 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 Information, unpublished data and experts' judgments have been provided by Francesco Nonnis Marzano, Massimo Lorenzoni, Giuseppe Maio, Massimo Pascale, Armando Piccinini, Elisabetta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).

Personal communication Massimo Pascale;

Nocita A., 2012. Indagine relativa ad alcune specie appartenenti alla fauna ittica d'acqua dolce: analisi della presenza e consistenza di Lampetra fluviatilis, Alosa fallax, Leuciscus lucumonis, Barbus plebejus, Barbus tyberinus, con particolare riferimento al Bacino dell'Arno. Museo di Storia Naturale dell'Università di Firenze. Inedito;

Regione Basilicata, Dipartimento Ambiente, Politiche della Sostenibilità, 2004. Carta Ittica Regionale, pp. 336.;

Regione Liguria, 2008, Carta della Biodiversità, www.ambienteinliguria.it; Report 2006 Regione Campania;

Sarrocco S., Maio G., Celauro e Tancioni L., 2012. Carta della Biodiversità ittica delle acque correnti del Lazio. Edizioni ARP, Roma, 194.

#### 2 3 Range

2.3 Range		
2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km²)	1000	
2.3.2 Method - Range surface area	Estimate based of	on expert opinion with no or minimal sampling (1)
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 (>>)

09/04/2014 15.07.02 Page 1 of 4

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 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) max min 2.4.3 Additional information **Definition of locality** Conversion method not available **Problems** it's not possible to convert grids into individuals 2002-2012 2.4.4 Year or period 2.4.5 Method – population size Estimate based on expert opinion with no or minimal sampling (1) 2.4.6 Short-term trend period 2001-2012 2.4.7 Short term trend direction decrease (-) 2.4.8 Short-term trend magnitude 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 confidence interval min max 2.4.13 Long-term trend method Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2) number 2.4.14 Favourable reference population operator much more than (>>) unknown Nο 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 (-) 1989-2012 2.5.7 Long-term trend period 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

09/04/2014 15.07.02 Page 2 of 4

Pressure	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
invasive non-native species (IO1)	medium importance (M)	N/A
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
reclamation of land from sea, estuary or marsh (J02.01.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Removal of sediments (mud) (J02.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Canalisation & water deviation (J02.03)	medium importance (M)	N/A
modifying structures of inland water courses (J02.05.02)	high importance (H)	N/A
dykes and flooding defence in inland water systems (J02.12.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
reduction in migration/ migration barriers (J03.02.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
predation (K03.04)	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)
invasive non-native species (IO1)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine &	medium importance (M)	N/A

human induced changes in hydraulic conditions (J02) medium importance (M) N/A reclamation of land from sea, estuary or marsh (J02.01.02) medium importance (M) N/A

Removal of sediments (mud...) (J02.02) medium importance (M)

Canalisation & water deviation (J02.03) medium importance (M)

modifying structures of inland water courses (J02.05.02) high importance (H)

dykes and flooding defence in inland water systems medium importance (M) (J02.12.02)

reduction in migration/ migration barriers (J03.02.01) high importance (H) N/A predation (K03.04) medium importance (M) N/A

predation (K03.04) medium importance (M)

2.7.1 Method used – threats expert opinion (1)

### 2.8 Complementary Information

brackish) (H01)

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

09/04/2014 15.07.02 Page 3 of 4

N/A

N/A

N/A

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

Measures needed, but not implemented (1.2)			()				
3.2.1 Measure	3.2.2 Type		3.2.3	Ranking	3.2.4 Location	3.2.5 Broad Evaluation	
3.2 Conversation Measu	res						
<ul><li>3.1.2 Method used</li><li>3.1.3 Trend of population size within</li></ul>		Absent data (0) N/A					
3.1.1 Population Size		Unit	N/A				
3.1 Population							

09/04/2014 15.07.02 Page 4 of 4