0.1 Member State	Π
0.2.1 Species code	1115
0.2.2 Species name	Chondrostoma genei
0.2.3 Alternative species scientific name	Protochondrostoma genei
0.2.4 Common name	lasca

#### 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
1.1.4 Additional map
Yes
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 Information, unpublished data and experts' judgments have been provided by Francesco Nonnis Marzano, Massimo Lorenzoni, Giuseppe Maio, Massimo Pascale, Armando Piccinini, Elisabetta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).

Distribution data for the following Nature 2000 sites have been inserted by the Ministry of Environment (source: Italian Nature 2000 database): IT1324909; IT1343502

Provincia di Imperia, 2009. Monitoraggi Ittici. Unpublished data. Provincia di Savona, 2009. Terza Carta ittica della provincia di Savona. Rapporto tecnico pubblicato sul web. 22 pp.

#### 2.3 Range

2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km²) 2.3.2 Method - Range surface area N/A 2.3.3 Short-term trend period 2.3.4 Short-term trend direction N/A 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) N/A operator unkown No method

#### 2.3.10 Reason for change

#### 2.4 Population

09/04/2014 12.22.06 Page 1 of 10

ii, ii aiia i opeaico (i iii			
2.4.1 Population size	Unit N/A		
(individuals or agreed exception)	min	max	
2.4.2 Population size	Unit N/A		
(other than individuals)	min	max	
2.4.3 Additional information	Definition of localit		
2. 113 / Idantional Information	Conversion method		
		J	
2.4.4.V	Problems		
<ul><li>2.4.4 Year or period</li><li>2.4.5 Method – population size</li></ul>	N/A		
2.4.6 Short-term trend period	N/A		
2.4.7 Short term trend direction	N/A		
2.4.8 Short-term trend magnitude	min	max	confidence interval
2.4.9 Short-term trend method	N/A		
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 N/A unknown No		
	method		
2.4.15 Reason for change	methou		
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	N/A		
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	N/A		
2.5.7 Long-term trend period	N1 / A		
2.5.8 Long term trend direction	N/A		
<ul><li>2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat (km²)</li><li>2.5.10 Reason for change</li></ul>			
2.6 Main Pressures			
2.6.1 Method used – pressures	N/A		
2.7 Main Threats			
2.7.1 Method used – threats	N/A		
2.8 Complementary Information	,		
2.8.1 Justification of % thresholds for			
trends			
2.8.2 Other relevant Information			
2.8.3 Trans-boundary assessment			

09/04/2014 12.22.06 Page 2 of 10

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

2.9.1 Range assessment N/A 2.9.2. Population

qualifiers N/A assessment N/A

qualifiers N/A

assessment N/A

qualifiers N/A

assessment N/A qualifiers N/A

N/A

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** 

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

### 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 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).

Distribution data for the following Nature 2000 sites have been inserted by the Ministry of Environment (source: Italian Nature 2000 database): IT3320030; IT5340012; IT20A0020; IT2030004; IT2030005;

Bioprogramm S.c.r.l., 2004 A. Censimenti effettuati per la Provincia di Milano. Amministrazione Provinciale di Milano, Unpublished data;

Castaldelli G. & Rossi R., 2008. Carta ittica dell'Emilia-Romagna Zone B e A. Regione Emilia-Romagna, 324 pp.

Dataset ETP 1988-2012. Regione Friuli Venezia Giulia;

De Paoli A., Esposito M., Capellini G. & Navarrini F., 2011. Carta Ittica dei corsi d'acqua corrente della Provincia di Rimini (rilevamenti di aggiornamento 2005 – 2011). Provincia di Rimini, 240 pp.;

G.R.A.I.A. Srl, 2003. Conservazione della trota marmorata nel Parco Adda Sud.

09/04/2014 12.22.07 Page 3 of 10

Parco Adda Sud. Technical Report, unpublished document;

G.R.A.I.A. Srl, 2004. Progetto Life-Natura di "Conservazione di Salmo marmoratus e Rutilus pigus nel Fiume Ticino" – Life-nat00/it/7268. Life-Nature Programm, Consorzio Parco Lombardo della Valle del Ticino, Pontevecchio di Magenta (MI). Technical Reports, unpublished documents;

G.R.A.I.A. Srl, 2005. Studio di Impatto Ambientale per la via navigabile Locarno-Milano: Comparto Ittico. Relazione tecnica consegnata al Parco del Ticino.

Consorzio Parco Lombardo della Valle del Ticino, Pontevecchio di Magenta (MI). Technical Report, unpublished document;

G.R.A.I.A. Srl, 2005. Carta Ittica della Provincia di Brescia – Provincia di Brescia, settore Caccia e Pesca. Provincia di Brescia, 468 pp.;

G.R.A.I.A. Srl, 2006. Progetto di "Conservazione di Acipenser naccarii nel Fiume Ticino e nel medio corso del Po" – Life-nat03/it/000113. Autorità di Bacino del Fiume Po, Parma. Technical Report, unpublished document;

G.R.A.I.A. Srl, 2006. Progetto di "Conservazione di Acipenser naccarii nel Fiume Ticino e nel medio corso del Po" – Life-nat03/it/000113. Autorità di Bacino del Fiume Po, Parma. Technical Report, unpublished document;

G.R.A.I.A. Srl, 2007. Aggiornamento della Carta delle Vocazioni Ittiche della Provincia di Milano. Amministrazione Provinciale di Milano. Technical Report, unpublished document;

G.R.A.I.A. Srl, 2007. Carta Ittica del Fiume Po. Autorità di Bacino del Fiume Po, Parma. Technical Report, unpublished document;

Lombardi C., 2002. Carta provinciale delle vocazioni ittiche. Provincia di Cremona, Settore Agricoltura, Caccia e Pesca, 400 pp.;

Marconato E., Maio G., Salviati S., 2000. La fauna ittica della Provincia di Venezia. Provincia di Venezia, Ass. Caccia, Pesca e Polizia Provinciale, 176 pp.;

Marconi M., 2006. Carta Ittica della Provincia di Macerata – Acque di Categoria "A". Technical Report, published on internet. 75 pp.;

Marconi M., 2010. Carta Ittica della Provincia di Macerata – Acque di Categoria "B – C". Technical Report, published on internet. 73 pp.;

Melotti P., Roncarati A., Dees A., Felici A., Fortini L., 2007. Carta Ittica della Provincia di Ancona. Carta ittica delle Marche;

Nocita A., 2002. Carta ittica della Provincia di Firenze. Prov. Firenze, Ass. Agricoltura Caccia e Pesca – Mus. St. Nat., Univ. Firenze, Sez. Zool. "La Specola", 260 pp.;

Perosino G., 2006. Monitoraggio della fauna ittica in Piemonte. Regione Piemonte, unpublished data.

Provincia di Pavia, 2007. Aggiornamento della Carta Ittica della Provincia di Pavia. Amministrazione Provinciale di Pavia. Unpublished data;

Provincia di Treviso, 2012. Carta ittica della Provincia di Treviso, aggiornamento 2008-2010. Rapporto tecnico pubblicato sul web. 181 pp.;

Provincia di Verona, 2008. Carta Ittica della Provincia di Verona. Rapporto tecnico pubblicato sul web. 210 pp.;

Provincia di Vicenza, 2012. Aggiornamenti della Carta Ittica della Provincia di Vicenza;

Puzzi C.M., Monicelli F., Trasforini S., Riva M., Gentili G., 2001. Carta ittica della Provincia di Mantova. Provincia di Mantova. Società G.R.A.I.A. srl . Technical Report, unpublished document;

Regione Emilia-Romagna, 2002. Carta ittica dell'Emilia-Romagna Zona "D". Regione Emilia-Romagna, 313 pp;

Regione Emilia-Romagna, 2006. Carta ittica dell'Emilia-Romagna Zona "C". Regione Emilia-Romagna, 160 pp;

Regione Piemonte, 2009. Ittiofauna del Piemonte (anno di monitoraggio 2009) -

09/04/2014 12.22.07 Page 4 of 10

Testo di illustrazione dei parametri fisiogeografici relativi agli ambienti fluviali ed allo stato delle popolazioni ittiche – tabella riassuntiva dati.xls. Technical Report, published on internet;

Turin P., Locatelli R., 2010 "Carta Ittica – Aggiornamento dello stato delle conoscenze sui popolamenti ittici della Provincia di Padova". Ed. Provincia di Padova, 332 pp;

Turin P., Maio G., Zanetti M., Bilò M.F., Rossi V., Salviati S., 1999. Carta Ittica delle acque interne. Provincia di Rovigo, Assessorato alla pesca., 130 pp.;

Turin P., Zanetti M., Caudullo G., Tioli S., Tuzzato B., Mazzetti G., Patroncini D., Turrin D., Zocca A. 2008 – Presenza e distribuzione delle specie ittiche di interesse comunitario nelle acque interne del Veneto, in relazione alle aree SIC. In M. Bon, L. Bonato, F. Scarton (eds.), 2008. Atti 5° Convegno Faunisti Veneti. Boll. Mus. Civ. St. Nat. Venezia, suppl. al vol. 58, pp. 368.

#### 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

68300

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

2001-2012

decrease (-)

min max

1989-2012 decrease (-)

min max

area (km²)

operator much 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)

260 260 min max

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

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

2.4.11 Long term trend direction

1999-2012

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

2001-2012

decrease (-)

confidence interval

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

1989-2012

decrease (-)

09/04/2014 12.22.07 Page 5 of 10

2.4.12 Long-term trend magnitude
2.4.13 Long-term trend method
2.4.14 Favourable reference
population

min max confidence interval
Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)
number
operator much more than (>>)
unknown No

**Expert opinion** 

2.4.15 Reason for change Improved knowledge/more accurate data Use of different method

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 Bad 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 (-)

Improved knowledge/more accurate data Use of different method

2 6	Main	Pressures

2.5.10 Reason for change

2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat (km²)

Pressure	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
Sand and gravel extraction (C01.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Leisure fishing (F02.03)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
invasive non-native species (I01)	high importance (H)	N/A
canalisation (J02.03.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
modifying structures of inland water courses (J02.05.02)	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)	medium importance (M)	N/A
anthropogenic reduction of habitat connectivity (J03.02)	high importance (H)	N/A
competition (fauna) (K03.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
predation (K03.04)	high importance (H)	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)
Sand and gravel extraction (C01.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Leisure fishing (F02.03)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
invasive non-native species (IO1)	high importance (H)	N/A
canalisation (J02.03.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A

09/04/2014 12.22.07 Page 6 of 10

modifying structures of inland water courses (J02.05.02)	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)	medium importance (M)	N/A
anthropogenic reduction of habitat connectivity (J03.02)	high importance (H)	N/A
competition (fauna) (K03.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
predation (K03.04)	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 Bad (U2)
qualifiers N/A

2.9.2. Population

assessment Bad (U2)
qualifiers N/A

2.9.3. Habitat

assessment Bad (U2)
qualifiers N/A

2.9.4. Future prospects

assessment Bad (U2)
qualifiers N/A

2.9.5 Overall assessment of

Bad (U2)

2.9.5 Overall assessment of Conservation Status

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

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
Restoring/improving water quality (4.1)	Legal Recurrent	low importance (L)	Both	Unknown
Other wetland-related measures (4.0)	One-off	low importance (L)	Both	Long term
Other species management measures (7.0)	Administrative	high importance (H)	Both	Maintain

max

### 2. Biogeographical Or Marine Level

09/04/2014 12.22.07 Page 7 of 10

2.1 Biogeographical Region

2.2 Published sources

#### Alpine (ALP)

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).

Dataset ETP 1988-2012. Regione Friuli Venezia Giulia;

Perosino G., 2006. Monitoraggio della fauna ittica in Piemonte. Regione Piemonte, unpublished data;

Regione Piemonte, 2009. Ittiofauna del Piemonte (anno di monitoraggio 2009) - Testo di illustrazione dei parametri fisiogeografici relativi agli ambienti fluviali ed allo stato delle popolazioni ittiche - tabella riassuntiva dati.xls. Technical Report, published on internet.

#### 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

N/A

N/A

min max

N/A

min max

area (km²)

operator N/A unkown No

method

#### 2.3.10 Reason for change

#### 2.4 Population

2.4.1 Population size Unit N/A

(individuals or agreed exception) min max

2.4.2 Population size Unit N/A

(other than individuals) min max

2.4.3 Additional information Definition of locality

Conversion method

Problems

2.4.4 Year or period

2.4.5 Method – population size N/A

2.4.6 Short-term trend period

2.4.7 Short term trend direction N/A

2.4.8 Short-term trend magnitude min max confidence interval

2.4.9 Short-term trend method N/A

2.4.10 Long-term trend period

2.4.11 Long term trend direction N/A

09/04/2014 12.22.07 Page 8 of 10

<ul><li>2.4.12 Long-term trend magnitude</li><li>2.4.13 Long-term trend method</li><li>2.4.14 Favourable reference population</li><li>2.4.15 Reason for change</li></ul>	min max confidence interval N/A number operator N/A unknown No method	
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> <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>	N/A	
<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> <li>2.5.10 Reason for change</li> </ul>	N/A	
2.6 Main Pressures		
2.6.1 Method used – pressures	N/A	
2.7 Main Threats		
2.7.1 Method used – threats	N/A	
2.8 Complementary Information		
<ul><li>2.8.1 Justification of % thresholds for trends</li><li>2.8.2 Other relevant Information</li></ul>		
2.8.3 Trans-boundary assessment		
2.9 Conclusions (assessment of co	servation status at end of reporting period)	
2.9.1 Range	assessment N/A qualifiers N/A	
2.9.2. Population	assessment N/A qualifiers N/A	
2.9.3. Habitat	assessment N/A qualifiers N/A	
2.9.4. Future prospects	assessment N/A qualifiers N/A	
2.9.5 Overall assessment of	N/A	
Conservation Status		

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

09/04/2014 12.22.07 Page 9 of 10

3.1 Population					
3.1.1 Population Size		Unit N	I/A max		
3.1.2 Method used		Absent dat	ta (0)		
3.1.3 Trend of population s  3.2 Conversation Measu		N/A			
3.2.1 Measure	3.2.2 Type		3.2.3 Ranking	3.2.4 Location	3.2.5 Broad Evaluation
Managing water abstraction (4.3)	Legal		medium importance (M)	Both	Not evaluated
Restoring/improving the hydrological regime (4.2)	Legal		medium importance (M)	Both	Not evaluated

09/04/2014 12.22.07 Page 10 of 10

## Notes

Species name: Chondrostom	a genei (1115)	
Field label	Note	User
1.1.4 Additional distribution map	The map rapresents the species' distribution in the no-native area. The grid is $10x10$ Kilometers.	ISPRA AUNA
Species name: Chondrostom	a genei (1115) Region code: CON	
Field label	Note	
	11010	User

09/04/2014 12.21.56 Page 1

F

ı