0.1 Member State	Π
0.2.1 Species code	1033
0.2.2 Species name	Unio elongatulus
0.2.3 Alternative species	Unio mancus, Unio pictorum, Unio glaucinus
scientific name	
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

_					
7 1	D:	~~~		hicol	Region
/ 1	BIO	としいと	ואזי	mm ai	REPION

### 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 Information, unpublished data and expert judgements have been provided by Marco Bodon (Genova).

Birindelli S., 2006. Guida alle specie liguri della Rete Natura 2000. Schede per il riconoscimento, la gestione, il monitoraggio. Regione Liguria, pp. 35-46.

### 2.3 Range

<ul> <li>2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km²)</li> <li>2.3.2 Method - Range surface area</li> <li>2.3.3 Short-term trend period</li> <li>2.3.4 Short-term trend direction</li> </ul>	20900 Estimate based on p 2001-2012 stable (0)	artial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)
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 $(\approx)$
	unkown	No
	method	Expert opinion
2.3.10 Reason for change	Use of different met	hod

### 2.4 Population

2.4.1 Population size	Unit	N/A			
(individuals or agreed exception)	min		max		
2.4.2 Population size (other than individuals)	Unit min	number of 120	map 10x	x10 km grid o 120	cells (grids10x10)
2.4.3 Additional information		ion of locality		t available	

09/04/2014 10.41.19 Page 1 of 8

ii, iv aliu v species (Ali	ilex bj		
	Problems	it is impossible to con	vert grids 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 decrease (-) min		oppolation and/or modelling (2) onfidence interval inimal sampling (1)
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 population	N/A min N/A number operator more th unknown No method Expert of	nan (>)	onfidence interval
2.4.15 Reason for change	Use of different met	•	
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) 2.5.10 Reason for change	Absent data (0) Moderate Expert opinion 2001-2012 decrease (-) N/A Genuine Use of diffe	erent method	
2.6 Main Pressures			
Pressure		ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
pollution to surface waters by industri		medium importance (M)	<u> </u>
diffuse pollution to surface waters due forestry activities (H01.05)	e to agricultural and	high importance (H)	N/A
diffuse pollution to surface waters due and waste waters (H01.08)	e to household sewage	high importance (H)	N/A
2.6.1 Method used – pressures	based only on exper	t judgements (1)	
2.7 Main Threats			
Threat		ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
diffuse pollution to surface waters due forestry activities (H01.05)	e to agricultural and	high importance (H)	N/A
diffuse pollution to surface waters via urban run-off (H01.04)	storm overflows or	medium importance (M)	N/A
diffuse pollution to surface waters due and waste waters (H01.08)	e to household sewage	high importance (H)	N/A
2.7.1 Method used – threats	expert opinion (1)		

09/04/2014 10.41.19 Page 2 of 8

### 2.8 Complementary Information

2.8.1 Justification of % thresholds for trends

2.8.2 Other relevant Information

The populations formerly attributed in central and southern Italy to U. elongatulus, are now attributed to U. mancus (following some Authors synonym of U. pictorum); the taxonomy is still very confused and in urgent need of clarification.

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

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

qualifiers stable (=)

assessment Inadequate (U1) qualifiers declining (-)

Inadequate (U1)

declining (-)

2.9.2. Population 2.9.3. Habitat 2.9.4. Future prospects 2.9.5 Overall assessment of **Conservation Status** 2.9.5 Overall trend in

### 3. Natura 2000 coverage and conservation measures - Annex II species

### 3.1 Population

**Conservation Status** 

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 Marco Bodon (Genova).

Birindelli S., 2006. Guida alle specie liguri della Rete Natura 2000. Schede per il riconoscimento, la gestione, il monitoraggio. Regione Liguria, pp. 35-46.

### 2.3 Range

2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km²)

2.3.2 Method - Range surface area

2.3.3 Short-term trend period

35400

Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2) 2001-2012

09/04/2014 10.41.19 Page 3 of 8

ii, it and t species (Ain	ick b <sub>j</sub>		
<ul><li>2.3.4 Short-term trend direction</li><li>2.3.5 Short-term trend magnitude</li></ul>	stable (0) 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)	and the state of the state of	1(.)
	operator unkown	approximately equal	to (≈)
	method	No Expert opinion	
2.3.10 Reason for change	Use of different met		
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 cell	s (grids10x10)
(other than individuals)	min 190	max 190	
2.4.3 Additional information	Definition of locality		
	Conversion method	not available	
	Problems	it is impossible to	convert grids into individuals
2.4.4 Year or period	2007-2012	•	
2.4.5 Method – population size		artial data with some e	xtrapolation and/or modelling (2)
2.4.6 Short-term trend period	2001-2012		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
2.4.7 Short term trend direction	unknown (x)		
2.4.8 Short-term trend magnitude	min	max	confidence interval
2.4.9 Short-term trend method	Estimate based on ex	xpert opinion with no o	r 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		
2.4.14 Favourable reference	number		
population	operator more the	nan (>)	
	method Expert	oninion	
2.4.15 Reason for change	Use of different met	•	
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			
2.5.8 Long term trend direction	N/A		
2 F 0 A (C. trabile believe /1 2)			

09/04/2014 10.41.19 Page 4 of 8

Genuine Use of different method

2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat (km²)

2.5.10 Reason for change

2.6 Main Pressures		
Pressure	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
pollution to surface waters by industrial plants (H01.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
diffuse pollution to surface waters due to agricultural and forestry activities (H01.05)	high importance (H)	N/A
diffuse pollution to surface waters due to household sewage and waste waters (H01.08)	high importance (H)	N/A
Canalisation & water deviation (J02.03)	high importance (H)	N/A
reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
2.6.1 Method used – pressures based only on expert	t judgements (1)	
2.7 Main Threats		
Threat	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
pollution to surface waters by industrial plants (H01.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
diffuse pollution to surface waters due to agricultural and forestry activities (H01.05)	high importance (H)	N/A
diffuse pollution to surface waters due to household sewage and waste waters (H01.08)	high importance (H)	N/A
Canalisation & water deviation (J02.03)	high importance (H)	N/A
reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)	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

2.8.2 Other relevant Information

The populations formerly attributed in Northern Italy to U. elongatulus, are now attributed to U. mancus (maybe synonym of U. pictorum), Unio pictorum (Illyric species present in northeastern Italy) and U. glaucinus for Lake Garda; the taxonomy is still very confused and in urgent need of clarification.

2.8.3 Trans-boundary assessment

### 2.9 Conclusions (assessment of conservation status at end of reporting period)

2.5 Conclusions (assessment of co	inservation status at end of re
2.9.1 Range	assessment Favourable (FV) qualifiers N/A
2.9.2. Population	assessment Inadequate (U1) qualifiers declining (-)
2.9.3. Habitat	assessment Inadequate (U1) qualifiers declining (-)
2.9.4. Future prospects	assessment Inadequate (U1) qualifiers declining (-)
2.9.5 Overall assessment of Conservation Status	Inadequate (U1)
2.9.5 Overall trend in Conservation Status	declining (-)

## 3. Natura 2000 coverage and conservation measures - Annex II species

09/04/2014 10.41.19 Page 5 of 8

### 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)

2001-2012

area (km²)

N/A

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 Marco Bodon (Genova).

Ruffo S., Stoch F. (eds.), 2006 - Checklist and distribuito of the Italian fauna. 10,000 terrestri and inland waters species. Memorie del Museo Civico di Storia Naturale di Verona, 2.serie, Sezione Scienze della Vita, 17: 307 pp. + CD-ROM

### 2.3 Range

2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km²) 9800

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

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

2.3.8 Long-term trend magnitude min max

2.3.9 Favourable reference range

operator approximately equal to (≈)

unkown No

method Expert opinion

2.3.10 Reason for change Use 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) min 64 max 64

2.4.3 Additional information Definition of locality

Conversion method not available

Problems it is impossible to convert grids into individuals

2.4.4 Year or period 2007-2012

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 stable (0)

09/04/2014 10.41.19 Page 6 of 8

<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></ul>	min Estimate based on	max expert opinion with n	confidence interval o or minimal sampling (1)
<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><li>population</li></ul>	N/A min N/A number operator approunknown No	max eximately equal to (≈)	confidence interval
	method Exper	t opinion	
2.4.15 Reason for change	Use of different me	ethod	
2.5 Habitat for the Species			
<ul> <li>2.5.1 Surface area - Habitat (km²)</li> <li>2.5.2 Year or period</li> <li>2.5.3 Method used - habitat</li> <li>2.5.4 a) Quality of habitat</li> </ul>	Absent data (0) Moderate		
<ul><li>2.5.4 b) Quality of habitat - method</li><li>2.5.5 Short term trend period</li><li>2.5.6 Short term trend direction</li></ul>	Expert opinion 2001-2012 unknown (x)		
<ul> <li>2.5.7 Long-term trend period</li> <li>2.5.8 Long term trend direction</li> <li>2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat (km²)</li> </ul>	N/A		

2.6 Main Pressu	res
-----------------	-----

2.5.10 Reason for change

Pressure	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
diffuse pollution to surface waters due to agricultural and forestry activities (H01.05)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Canalisation & water deviation (J02.03)	medium importance (M)	N/A
reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A

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

### 2.7 Main Threats

Threat	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
diffuse pollution to surface waters due to agricultural and forestry activities (H01.05)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Canalisation & water deviation (J02.03)	medium importance (M)	N/A
reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)	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 The po

The populations formerly attributed in Northern Italy to U. elongatulus, are now attributed to U. mancus and U. glaucinus for Lake Garda; the taxonomy is still very confused and in urgent need of clarification.

Genuine Improved knowledge/more accurate data Use of different method

### 2.8.3 Trans-boundary assessment

09/04/2014 10.41.19 Page 7 of 8

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 Inadequate (U1) qualifiers unknown (x)				
2.9.4. Future prospects	assessment Inadequate (U1) qualifiers declining (-)				
2.9.5 Overall assessment of Conservation Status	Inadequate (U1)				
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 min	N/A	max
<ul><li>3.1.2 Method used</li><li>3.1.3 Trend of population size within</li></ul>	N/A N/A		
3.2 Conversation Measures			

09/04/2014 10.41.19 Page 8 of 8