

HUMAN RIGHTS,  
DEMOCRACY  
AND THE RULE OF LAW

COUNCIL OF EUROPE



CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

DROITS DE L'HOMME,  
DÉMOCRATIE  
ET ÉTAT DE DROIT

Standing Committee of the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife  
and Natural habitats  
44th meeting (Strasbourg, 2-6 December 2024)

Proposed revision of the Emerald Network Standard Data Form (SDF)

Laura P. Gavián Iglesias & Marc Roekaerts

3<sup>rd</sup> December 2024

## Stay of play

- Group of experts on Protected Areas and Ecological Networks (GoEPAEN ) was informed of the revised N2000 SDF at the 14<sup>th</sup> meeting (17<sup>th</sup> April 2024), explaining the most significant changes in the format.
- GoEPAEN was informed on the new reporting platform created by the European Environment Agency (EEA): **Reportnet 3**.
- This new platform will replace the Central Data Repository (CDR) and is designed according to the schemas of the new Natura 2000 SDF.
- Reportnet 3 will not be able to collect Emerald Network data using the current format and the maintenance of the CDR is not foreseen beyond 2029.
- GoEPAEN welcomed the proposal of update the Emerald Network SDF and asked for an informative document on the implications of adopting a new Emerald Network SDF.
- The SC is invited to mandate the revision of the Emerald SDF to keep it harmonised with the Natura 2000 SDF.

## Documents produced in 2024 to inform on this topic

- Discussion paper assessing the opportunity for a revision of the Emerald Network Standard Data Form
- Informative paper on the implications of a revision of the Emerald Network Standard Data Form

## Main changes

Proposed changes aim to fill gaps in information, such as:

- basic indication of conservation objectives, measures and management effectiveness,
- make the SDF more coherent with the reporting under the Resolution No.8 (2012), and
- better inform on the Strategic Plan of the Bern Convention for the period to 2030.

## Main changes, new fields

- Period of last data collection
- Significance (to replace D category)
- Degree of conservation: category, area, method used, occupied percentage classes (species)
- Conservation objectives
- Reference and validity of management plans
- Conservation measures: detailed information and status
- Management effectiveness

## Main changes, amended fields

- Non-presence
- Relative surface for HT/population for species (A1:  $100\% \geq p > 75\%$ ; A2:  $75\% \geq p > 50\%$ ; A3:  $50\% \geq p > 25\%$ ; A4:  $25\% \geq p > 15\%$ )
- Motivation
- Existence, reference and validity of management plans

# Implications

From changes (new, deleted and modified fields), approx. 5 out of 47 are considered to have high implications:

- ✓ 3.1.12.2 Degree of conservation- area
- ✓ 3.1.12.3 Degree of conservation- method used

3.1.12.1 → Degree of conservation -- categorised

- Pre-defined options:
- A: excellent degree of conservation (nearly all of the habitat area in good condition)
  - B: good degree of conservation (most of the habitat area in good condition)
  - C: reduced degree of conservation (most of the habitat area in not good condition)
  - X: unknown degree of conservation (most or all of the habitat area in unknown condition)

3.1.12.2 → Degree of conservation -- area

- Give the area in hectares for each of the categories:
- Good condition: ... [ha]
  - Not good condition: ... [ha]
  - Unknown condition: ... [ha]

3.1.12.3 → Degree of conservation -- method used

- Complete survey or statistically robust estimate in hectares (for example taken from mapping in management plans)
- Based mainly on extrapolation from a limited amount of data (expert judgement)
- Based mainly on expert opinion with very limited data (based on partial mapping data)
- Insufficient or no data available

## ✓ 3.2.15.3 Degree of conservation- occupied percentage classes (species)

3.2.15.3 → Degree of conservation – occupied percentage classes ☐

Estimated area of the habitat occupied by the species with sufficient quality ¶

0-25%  26-50%  51-75%  76-100% ¶

Estimated area of the habitat occupied by the species with non-sufficient quality ¶

0-25%  26-50%  51-75%  76-100% ¶

Estimated area of the habitat occupied by the species for which the quality is unknown ¶

0-25%  26-50%  51-75%  76-100% ☐

## ✓ 3.1.10 Relative surface

## ✓ 3.2.13 Population

Pre-defined options: ¶

→ A1:  $100\% \geq p > 75\%$  ¶

→ A2:  $75\% \geq p > 50\%$  ¶

→ A3:  $50\% \geq p > 25\%$  ¶

→ A4:  $25\% \geq p > 15\%$  ¶

→ B:  $15\% \geq p > 2\%$  ¶

→ C:  $2\% \geq p > 0\%$  ☐

## Potential timeline:

Discussion/agreement

on new fields  
GoEPAEN 2025



New Emerald  
SDF  
in Reportnet 3  
2026?



Testing phase  
for CP  
proposed for  
2026?



New fields  
can be left  
blank  
2026-2029?



Information on  
new fields should  
provided  
From 2029?



Adoption of the  
new  
Emerald SDF by  
the SC 2025 ?

Webminar on  
Reportnet 3  
2026?

If the new Emerald Network SDF is eventually adopted, CP will deliver their Emerald Network data to EEA via the new Reportnet 3 delivery platform from 2026



Thank you for your attention