

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	5097
0.2.2 Species name	Barbus tyberinus
0.2.3 Alternative species scientific name	N/A
0.2.4 Common name	barbo tiberino

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	1998-2012
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 Sibia (Associazione Italiana Ittiologi Acque dolci - AIAD) 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 Information, unpublished data and experts' judgments have been provided by Francesco Nonnis Marzano, Massimo Lorenzoni, Pippo Maio, Armando Piccinini, Elisabetta Pizzul, Cesare M. Puzzi, Lorenzo Tancioni, Paolo Turin, Marco Zanetti (AIAD).

A.R.S.I.A.L., 2009. Carta della Biodiversità ittica della Provincia di Frosinone - Schede di campionamento. Regione Lazio - Università degli Studi di Roma Tor Vergata. Technical Report, published on internet. 165 pp.;

A.R.S.I.A.L., 2012. Carta della Biodiversità Ittica delle Acque Correnti del Lazio, Provincia di Rieti. Regione Lazio -Acquaprogram Vicenza - Lynx Natura e Ambiente s.r.l. - TEMI s.r.l. R Technical Report, published on internet. 161 pp.;

Acquaprogram s.r.l., 2008. Fauna Ittica del Parco Regionale della Valle del Treja. Unpublished data;

Acquaprogram s.r.l., 2009. Realizzazione della "Carta della Biodiversità Ittica del Lazio, Province di Viterbo e Latina". Relazione conclusiva - Allegato 1, Schede di campionamento morfologico ed ittico ed elaborazioni Schede Indice Funzionalità Fluviale Provincia di Latina. Technical Report, published on internet;

Banca dati IGF;

Bernardi L., Favilli L., Manganelli G., Nelli L., Piazzini S., Querci G., Radi M., Leonzio C., 2004. Carta delle Vocazioni Ittiofaunistiche della Provincia di Grosseto. Dipartimento Scienze Ambientali, Università di Siena;

Bianco P.G e Frezza V. in Bianco P.G. e de Filippo G. (eds.) 2011. Contributo alla conoscenza della fauna ittica d'acqua dolce in aree protette d'Italia. Res.Wildl.Conserv. 3. IGF Publ., USA;

Falconi R., Rossi G., De paoli A., Zaccanti F., Cesarini M., Campostagno S., Marchi A., Zuffi G., 2012. Carta ittica della Provincia di Firenze - secondo livello. Technical Report, published on internet. 510 pp.;

Lorenzoni M., Ghetti L., Carosi A., Dolciami R., 2010, La fauna ittica e i corsi d'acqua dell'Umbria. Sintesi delle Carte Ittiche regionali dal 1986 al 2009.

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

Petruzzi Editore, Perugia. 288 pp.;

Nocita A., Busatto T., Maio G., Bonaretti R., 2010. Carta Ittica della Provincia di Pisa, Amministrazione provinciale di Pisa pp. 228;

Nonnis Marzano F., Piccinini A., Palanti E., Nocita A., Apollonio M., 2010. Stato delle popolazioni ittiche del territorio toscano con particolare riferimento alle specie a rischio. Regione Toscana Vol II pp. 197;

Piccinini A., 2011. Aggiornamento della Carta Ittica della Provincia di Grosseto. Anno 2010-2011;

Provincia di Arezzo, 2012. Aggiornamento della Carta delle Vocazioni Ittiche della Provincia di Arezzo. Technical Report, G.R.A.I.A. srl. 631 pp.;

Provincia di Avellino, 2004. Carta Ittica della Provincia di Avellino. Provincia di Avellino, 227 pp.;

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

Tancioni L. e Cataudella S. (Ed.) (2009). Carta Ittica della Provincia di Roma - Contributo alla conoscenza Ecologica delle acque correnti superficiali della Provincia. Università degli Studi di Roma "Tor Vergata" e Provincia di Roma-Assessorato alle Politiche dell'Agricoltura. Roma, 363 pp.

Turin P., Ruggieri L., Zanetti M., Bilò M. F., Rossi V., Loro R., 1998. Carta ittica della Provincia di Chieti. Provincia di Chieti, Ass. Pesca, 184 pp.

2.3 Range

2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km ²)	50300
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	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 (km ²) operator more than (>) 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 (individuals or agreed exception)	Unit N/A min max
2.4.2 Population size (other than individuals)	Unit number of map 10x10 km grid cells (grids10x10) min 184 max 184
2.4.3 Additional information	Definition of locality Conversion method not available Problems it's not possible to convert grids into individuals
2.4.4 Year or period	1998-2012
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	decrease (-)

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

2.4.8 Short-term trend magnitude	min	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	min	max	confidence interval
2.4.13 Long-term trend method	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)		
2.4.14 Favourable reference population	number	operator	more than (>)
	unknown	No	
	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 (km ²)	Absent data (0)
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	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	1989-2012
2.5.8 Long term trend direction	decrease (-)
2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat (km ²)	Improved knowledge/more accurate data Use of different method
2.5.10 Reason for change	

2.6 Main Pressures

Pressure	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)	low importance (L)	N/A
genetic pollution (animals) (I03.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
human induced changes in hydraulic conditions (J02)	high importance (H)	N/A
Water abstractions from surface waters (J02.06)	high importance (H)	N/A
reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
antagonism arising from introduction of species (K03.05)	high importance (H)	N/A
predation (K03.04)	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)
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)	low importance (L)	N/A
genetic pollution (animals) (I03.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
human induced changes in hydraulic conditions (J02)	high importance (H)	N/A
Water abstractions from surface waters (J02.06)	high importance (H)	N/A
reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
antagonism arising from introduction of species (K03.05)	high importance (H)	N/A

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

predation (K03.04)	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	Barbus tyberinus, unlike Barbus plebejus, is listed in Annex V and not in Annex II. Both of them should be listed in the same Annex II.	
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	N/A
2.9.2. Population	assessment	Inadequate (U1)
	qualifiers	N/A
2.9.3. Habitat	assessment	Inadequate (U1)
	qualifiers	N/A
2.9.4. Future prospects	assessment	Inadequate (U1)
	qualifiers	N/A
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

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 Alessandra Ippoliti, Andrea Sibia (Associazione Italiana Ittiologi Acque dolci - AIAD) 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, Pippo Maio, Armando Piccinini, Elisabetta Pizzul, Cesare M. Puzzi, Lorenzo Tancioni, Paolo Turin, Marco Zanetti (AIAD).

Falconi R., Rossi G., De paoli A., Zaccanti F., Cesarini M., Campostagno S., Marchi A., Zuffi G., 2012. Carta ittica della Provincia di Firenze - secondo livello. Technical Report, published on internet. 510 pp.;
Lorenzoni M., Ghetti L., Carosi A., Dolciami R., 2010, La fauna ittica e i corsi d'acqua dell'Umbria. Sintesi delle Carte Ittiche regionali dal 1986 al 2009.

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

Petruzzi Editore, Perugia. 288 pp.;

Nonnis Marzano F., Piccinini A., Palanti E., Nocita A., Apollonio M., 2010. Stato delle popolazioni ittiche del territorio toscano con particolare riferimento alle specie a rischio. Regione Toscana Vol II pp. 197;

Provincia di Arezzo, 2012. Aggiornamento della Carta delle Vocazioni Ittiche della Provincia di Arezzo. Technical Report, G.R.A.I.A. srl. 631 pp.;

Turin P., Ruggieri L., Zanetti M., Bilò M. F., Rossi V., Loro R., 1998. Carta ittica della Provincia di Chieti. Provincia di Chieti, Ass. Pesca, 184 pp.

2.3 Range

2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km ²)	12300
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	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 (km ²) operator more than (>) unknown 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 (individuals or agreed exception)	Unit N/A min max
2.4.2 Population size (other than individuals)	Unit number of map 10x10 km grid cells (grids10x10) min 67 max 67
2.4.3 Additional information	Definition of locality Conversion method not available Problems it's not possible to convert grids into individuals
2.4.4 Year or period	1998-2012
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	decrease (-)
2.4.8 Short-term trend magnitude	min 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	min max confidence interval
2.4.13 Long-term trend method	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)
2.4.14 Favourable reference population	number operator more than (>) unknown No method Expert opinion
2.4.15 Reason for change	Improved knowledge/more accurate data Use of different method

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

2.5 Habitat for the Species

2.5.1 Surface area - Habitat (km ²)	
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	1989-2012
2.5.8 Long term trend direction	decrease (-)
2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat (km ²)	
2.5.10 Reason for change	Improved knowledge/more accurate data Use of different method

2.6 Main Pressures

Pressure	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)	low importance (L)	N/A
genetic pollution (animals) (I03.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
human induced changes in hydraulic conditions (J02)	high importance (H)	N/A
Water abstractions from surface waters (J02.06)	high importance (H)	N/A
reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
antagonism arising from introduction of species (K03.05)	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)
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)	low importance (L)	N/A
genetic pollution (animals) (I03.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
human induced changes in hydraulic conditions (J02)	high importance (H)	N/A
Water abstractions from surface waters (J02.06)	high importance (H)	N/A
reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
antagonism arising from introduction of species (K03.05)	high importance (H)	N/A
predation (K03.04)	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 Barbus tyberinus, unlike Barbus plebejus, is listed in Annex V and not in Annex II. Both of them should be listed in the same Annex II.

2.8.3 Trans-boundary assessment

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

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

2.9.1 Range	assessment Inadequate (U1) qualifiers N/A
2.9.2. Population	assessment Inadequate (U1) qualifiers N/A
2.9.3. Habitat	assessment Inadequate (U1) qualifiers N/A
2.9.4. Future prospects	assessment Inadequate (U1) qualifiers N/A
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

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