0.1 Member State	п
0.2.1 Species code	1076
0.2.2 Species name	Proserpinus proserpina
0.2.3 Alternative species scientific name	Proserpinus proserpinus
0.2.4 Common name	Proserpina

### 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
-------	--------	-------	--------	------

2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km²)

### 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 Information, unpublished data and expert judgements have been provided by Alberto Zilli (Rome).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

2.3.2 Method - Range surface area	Estimate based 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	stable (0)			
2.3.5 Short-term trend magnitude	min	max		
2.3.6 Long-term trend period				
2.3.7 Long-term trend direction	N/A			
2.3.8 Long-term trend magnitude	min	max		
2.3.9 Favourable reference range	area (km²)			
	operator	approximately equal to (≈)		
	unkown	No		
	method	Expert opinion		
2.3.10 Reason for change	Improved knowledge/more accurate dataUse of different method			

13500

#### 2.4 Population

2111 Oparación				
2.4.1 Population size	Unit	N/A		
(individuals or agreed exception)	min		max	
2.4.2 Population size	Unit	number of I	ocalities	(localities)
(other than individuals)	min	25	max	50
2.4.3 Additional information	Definition of locality		Locality is a site where a population was recorded	
	Convers	sion method	not	available

09/04/2014 10.33.20 Page 1 of 7

	,				
	Problems	it is impossible to c	onvert localities into individuals		
2.4.4 Year or period	2007-2012				
2.4.5 Method – population size	Estimate based on expert opinion with no or minimal sampling (1)				
2.4.6 Short-term trend period	2001-2012				
2.4.7 Short term trend direction	stable (0)				
2.4.8 Short-term trend magnitude	min max confidence interval				
2.4.9 Short-term trend method	Estimate based on expert opinion with 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 number				
2.4.14 Favourable reference		more viscostalis a sual ta (.)			
population		pproximately equal to (≈) lo			
2.4.45 December 1	method E	xpert 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 Moderate	J)			
2.5.4 a) Quality of habitat					
<ul><li>2.5.4 b) Quality of habitat - method</li><li>2.5.5 Short term trend period</li></ul>	Expert opinion				
2.5.6 Short term trend period	2001-2012 stable (0)				
2.5.7 Long-term trend period	stable (o)				
2.5.8 Long term trend direction	N/A				
2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat (km²)	••/•				
2.5.10 Reason for change	Improved kno	wledge/more accurate data U	se of different method		
2.6 Main Pressures					
			W		
Pressure		ranking	pollution qualifier(s)		
removal of hedges and copses or scrub	(A10.01)	high importance (H)	N/A		
2.6.1 Method used – pressures	based only on	expert judgements (1)			
2.7 Main Threats					
Threat		ranking	pollution qualifier(s)		
removal of hedges and copses or scrub (A10.01)		high importance (H)	N/A		
2.7.1 Method used – threats	expert opinior	ı (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					
		and of some street	4)		
2.9 Conclusions (assessment of cor	iservation stati	is at end of reporting perior	a)		

09/04/2014 10.33.20 Page 2 of 7

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

N/A

3.1.3 Trend of population size within

N/A

#### 3.2 Conversation Measures

## 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 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

2.3.1 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

13300

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

2001-2012

stable (0)

min max

N/A

min

max

area (km²)

operator more than (>)

unkown No

method Expert opinion

09/04/2014 10.33.20 Page 3 of 7

ii, iv and v species (Aii			
2.3.10 Reason for change	Improved knowledge/m	nore accurate dataUse of	different method
2.4 Population 2.4.1 Population size	Unit N/A		
(individuals or agreed exception)	min m	nax	
2.4.2 Population size (other than individuals)		alities (localities) nax 25	
2.4.3 Additional information	Definition of locality	Locality is a site where a	population was recorded
	Conversion method	not available	
	Problems	it is impossible to conve	rt 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> <li>2.4.8 Short-term trend magnitude</li> <li>2.4.9 Short-term trend method</li> </ul>	2001-2012 stable (0) min n	ert opinion with no or mini  max conf  ert opinion with no or mini	idence interval
2.4.10 Long-term trend period	Estimate susca on expe		
<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 N/A number	nax conf	idence interval
population	operator more than unknown No method Expert opin		
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	Absent data (0) Moderate Expert opinion 2001-2012 stable (0)		
2.5.8 Long term trend direction 2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat (km²)	N/A		
2.5.10 Reason for change	Improved knowledge/m	nore accurate data Use of	different method
2.6 Main Pressures			
Pressure	ra	anking	pollution qualifier(s)
removal of hedges and copses or scrub	(A10.01) h	nigh importance (H)	N/A
2.6.1 Method used – pressures	based only on expert ju	dgements (1)	
2.7 Main Threats			
Threat	ra	anking	pollution qualifier(s)

09/04/2014 10.33.20 Page 4 of 7

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 Inadequate (U1)

qualifiers unknown (x)

2.9.2. Population assessment Inadequate (U1)

qualifiers unknown (x)

assessment Favourable (FV)

qualifiers N/A

assessment Favourable (FV)

qualifiers N/A

Inadequate (U1)

2.9.5 Overall assessment of

**Conservation Status** 

2.9.4. Future prospects

2.9.3. Habitat

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 N/A

3.1.3 Trend of population size within N/A

3.2 Conversation Measures

## 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-Rom): 1-1051.

### 2.3 Range

09/04/2014 10.33.20 Page 5 of 7

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	2001-2012 stable (0) min N/A	max	or minimal sampling (1)	
2.3.9 Favourable reference range	min area (km²)	max		
	operator unkown method	approximately equal No Expert opinion	l to (≈)	
2.3.10 Reason for change	Improved knowledg	e/more accurate datal	Jse 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	Unit number of	localities (localities)		
(other than individuals)	min 15	max 35		
2.4.3 Additional information	Definition of locality	Locality is a site w	here a population was recorded	
	Conversion method	not available		
	Problems	it is impossible to	convert localities into individuals	
2.4.4 Year or period	2007-2012			
2.4.5 Method – population size	Estimate based on expert opinion with no or minimal sampling (1)			
<ul><li>2.4.6 Short-term trend period</li><li>2.4.7 Short term trend direction</li></ul>	2001-2012 stable (0)			
2.4.8 Short-term trend magnitude	min	max	confidence interval	
2.4.9 Short-term trend method	Estimate based on expert opinion with no or minimal sampling (1)			
2.4.10 Long-term trend period				
<ul><li>2.4.11 Long term trend direction</li><li>2.4.12 Long-term trend magnitude</li></ul>	N/A min	max	confidence interval	
2.4.13 Long-term trend magnitude	N/A	IIIdX	confidence interval	
2.4.14 Favourable reference	number			
population		mately equal to (≈)		
	unknown No			
2.4.15 Reason for change	method Expert	סטווווסוו		
2.5 Habitat for the Species				
2.5.1 Surface area - Habitat (km²)				

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

09/04/2014 10.33.20 Page 6 of 7

2.5.8 Long term trend direction N/A
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

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

2.7 Main Threats

Threat ranking pollution qualifier(s)

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

3.1.3 Trend of population size within N/A

3.2 Conversation Measures

09/04/2014 10.33.20 Page 7 of 7