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	**1374**
0.2.2 Species name	**Rupicapra pyrenaica ornata**
0.2.3 Alternative species scientific name	N/A
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	2001-2012
1.1.4 Additional map	No
1.1.5 Range map	Yes

2. Biogeographical Or Marine Level

2.1 Biogeographical Region

Alpine (ALP)

2.2 Published sources

The present species assessment (fields 0.1-2.9) has been compiled by Daniele Paoloni, Cristiano Spilinga (Associazione Teriologica Italiana - ATIt) and Anna Alonzi, Piero Genovesi, Francesca Ronchi (Institute for Environmental Protection and Research - ISPRA). Information, unpublished data and experts' judgments have been provided by Marco Apollonio, Stefano Grignolio, Sandro Lovari, Luca Pedrotti (ATIt) and Francesco Riga (ISPRA).

Boitani L., Corsi F., Falcucci A., Maiorano L., Marzetti I., Masi M., Montemaggiori A., Ottaviani D., Reggiani G., Rondinini C., 2002. Rete Ecologica Nazionale. Un approccio alla conservazione dei vertebrati italiani. Università di Roma "La Sapienza", Dipartimento di Biologia Animale e dell'Uomo; Ministero dell'Ambiente, Direzione per la Conservazione della Natura; Istituto di Ecologia Applicata. http://www.gisbau.uniroma1.it/REN

Boitani L., Lovari S., Vigna Taglianti A., 2003. Carnivora – Artiodactyla. Fauna d'Italia, vol. XXXVIII, Mammalia III. Ed. Calderini de Il Sole 24 ore Edagricole, Bologna.

Carnevali L., Pedrotti L., Riga F., Toso S., 2009. Banca Dati Ungulati: Status, distribuzione, consistenza, gestione e prelievo venatorio delle popolazioni di Ungulati in Italia. Rapporto 2001-2005. Biol. Cons. Fauna, 117:1-168 [Italian-English text]

Dupré E., A. Monaco e L. Pedrotti (a cura di), 2001. Piano d'azione nazionale per il Camoscio appenninico (Rupicapra pyrenaica ornata). Quad. Cons. Natura, 10, Min. Ambiente - Ist. Naz. Fauna Selvatica.

Mari F., Lovari S., 2007. Il Camoscio appenninico: un ritorno in corso. In Frassinet M. e Petretti F. (Eds.), Salvati dall'Arca Alberto Perdisa Editore, Bologna: 131-142.

2.3 Range

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

2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km²)	2400			
2.3.2 Method - Range surface area	Complete survey/Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate (3)			
2.3.3 Short-term trend period	2001-2012			
2.3.4 Short-term trend direction	increase (+)			
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	increase (+)			
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 judgement		
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	number of individuals (i)			
	min	1200	max	1505	
2.4.2 Population size (other than individuals)	Unit	N/A			
	min		max		
2.4.3 Additional information	Definition of locality				
	Conversion method				
	Problems				
2.4.4 Year or period	2012				
2.4.5 Method – population size	Complete survey/Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate (3)				
2.4.6 Short-term trend period	2001-2012				
2.4.7 Short term trend direction	increase (+)				
2.4.8 Short-term trend magnitude	min	100	max	120	confidence interval
2.4.9 Short-term trend method	Complete survey/Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate (3)				
2.4.10 Long-term trend period	1989-2012				
2.4.11 Long term trend direction	increase (+)				
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 population	number				
	operator	approximately equal to (≈)			
	unknown	No			
	method	Expert judgement			
2.4.15 Reason for change	Genuine 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	Absent data (0)
2.5.4 a) Quality of habitat	Good
2.5.4 b) Quality of habitat - method	Expert based
2.5.5 Short term trend period	2001-2012
2.5.6 Short term trend direction	stable (0)
2.5.7 Long-term trend period	
2.5.8 Long term trend direction	N/A

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

2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat (km²)	687
2.5.10 Reason for change	Improved knowledge/more accurate data Use of different method

2.6 Main Pressures

Pressure	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
introduction of disease (microbial pathogens) (K03.03)	low importance (L)	N/A
antagonism with domestic animals (K03.06)	low importance (L)	N/A
habitat shifting and alteration (M02.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
competition (fauna) (K03.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
reduced fecundity/ genetic depression (K05)	low importance (L)	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)
competition (fauna) (K03.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
introduction of disease (microbial pathogens) (K03.03)	low importance (L)	N/A
habitat shifting and alteration (M02.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
reduced fecundity/ genetic depression (K05)	medium importance (M)	N/A
antagonism with domestic animals (K03.06)	low importance (L)	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 species can be considered as marginal for Continental and Mediterranean biogeographical regions and therefore the full reporting was compiled only for the Alpine one. In Carnevali et al., 2009 is reported an estimate of 1505 individuals. It's believed that this data may be overestimated (Lovari S., pers. Com.). The historical population of Abruzzo, Lazio and Molise National Park has negative trend while the new areas (Gran Sasso-Laga National Park and Majella National Park) have an increasing trend of their populations. The pressure K03.01 refers to interspecific competition with red deer (Cervus elphus). The threats K03.01 refers to the risk of increasing competition with red deer (Cervus elaphus).
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

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

2.9.4. Future prospects	assessment	Favourable (FV)
	qualifiers	N/A
2.9.5 Overall assessment of Conservation Status		Favourable (FV)
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	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
Measures needed, but not implemented (1.2)		()		

Notes

Species name: Rupicapra pyrenaica ornata (1374) Region code: ALP

Field label	Note	User
2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km²)	The area of the range (2.3.1) has been calculated also summing up the grid cells of species' presence in the adjacent biogeographical region of marginal presence. Only cells entirely overlapped to the marginal area have been summed up, in order to avoid an overestimation of the overall species' range.	ISPRA_AUNA
2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat (km2)	The area of suitable habitat (2.5.9) has been calculated by intersecting habitat suitability models with each biogeographical region in which the species is present. The habitat suitability models are those included in the Italian Ecological Network (Rete Ecologica Nazionale – REN; Boitani et al. 2002), and were developed at the national scale for all vertebrate species, based on species-environments relationships defined with inputs from leading species' experts. The models were created integrating into a Geographic Information System geographic and environmental data, such as Corine Land Cover, Digital Terrain Model, water and road networks. Source: Boitani L., Corsi F., Falcucci A., Maiorano L., Marzetti I., Masi M., Montemaggiori A., Ottaviani D., Reggiani G., Rondinini C., 2002. Rete Ecologica Nazionale. Un approccio alla conservazione dei vertebrati italiani. Università di Roma "La Sapienza", Dipartimento di Biologia Animale e dell'Uomo; Ministero dell'Ambiente, Direzione per la Conservazione della Natura; Istituto di Ecologia Applicata. Http://www.gisbau.uniroma1.it/REN	ISPRA_AUNA
2.7 Threats	The threats K03.01 refers to the risk of increasing competition with red deer (Cervus elaphus).	ISPRA_AUNA
2.6 Pressures	The pressure K03.01 refers to interspecific competition with red deer (Cervus elaphus).	ISPRA_AUNA
2.4.2a Population size (other than individuals) - Unit	In Carnevali et al., 2009 is reported an estimate of 1505 individuals. It is believed that this data may be overestimated (Lovari S., pers. Com.). The historical population of Abruzzo, Lazio and Molise National Park has negative trend while the new areas (Gran Sasso-Laga National Park and Majella National Park) have an increasing trend of their populations.	ISPRA_AUNA

_F

_F

_F

_F

_F