Detailed draft conclusions on the representation of animal species from Res. No. 6 (1998) of the Bern Convention in proposed Emerald Network Sites in Belarus, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine (Alpine, Boreal, Continental, Pannonian and Steppic)

This project is funded by the European Union
European Environment Agency
ENI SEIS II EAST Project

Important Notes:

1. This file includes all conclusions which previously were insufficient (IN MIN, IN MOD, IN MAJ, SR) and thus they are of high priority for discussion.
2. Glossary:

SUF (Sufficient): the occurrence of the species/habitat type is sufficiently well covered by the current ASCIs; no further sites are required.
IN MIN (Insufficient minor): no new sites are required, but this species/habitat type should be added to the list of qualifying features on one or several of sites that have already been proposed for other species/habitat types.
IN MOD (Insufficient moderate): one or several additional ASCIs (or extensions of ASCIs) must be proposed to achieve a sufficient coverage of the Emerald network for this species/ habitat type (IN MOD GEO means additional site(s) are only required in a specifically named region)
IN MAJ (Insufficient major): none of the sites where this species/habitat type occurs have been proposed as ASCIs so far; in order to achieve a sufficient coverage of the Emerald network for the species/habitat type, one or several of these new ASCIs must therefore be proposed.
SR (Scientific reserve): further research is required to identify the most appropriate ASCIs for this species/habitat type (research on identifying the most appropriate sites, on clarifying the correspondence of a habitat present to the definition of Res. 4 habitats, etc.)
SR Ref List (Scientific reserve on the Reference List): the regular occurrence of this species/habitat type is still uncertain and needs to be confirmed
Delete from Ref List (delete from the Reference List): this species/habitat type is not naturally occurring and will be removed from the Reference List; no sites are required for this species/habitat type
CD (Correction of data): the information about this species/habitat type in the Standard Data Form needs to be corrected/completed/deleted

Codes can be combined, for example 'IN MOD/ CD' would indicate that additional sites are required and that the existing proposals need correcting or completing.

The fields for the conclusions and comments of the previous seminars relate to different first seminars: for the Boreal region, the seminar took place in Petrozavodsk in September 2015, for the Alpine, Continental and Pannonian regions, the seminar took place in Chisinau in May 2016 and for the Steppic region they relate to the seminar in Kiev in September 2016.

Previously SUF decisions will be re-opened (discussed) only if significant negative changes occurred which calls for a review of the sufficiency assessment or if there is significant new information. So-called "low priority conclusions" are given in a separate document.

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
					Mammals				
1303	Rhinolophus hipposideros	MD	CON	IN MOD/CD	1 site	8	(1B 7C)	Added to 2 new and 5 existing sites. Possibly sufficient, but population assessments suggest low coverage (1B9C)?	?
1303	Rhinolophus hipposideros	MD	STE	IN MOD		2	(2C)	No change. Red book suggests a wider distribution.	IN MOD?
1303	Rhinolophus hipposideros	UA	ALP-Car	IN MOD		16	(4B 7C 5D)	Added to 3 new sites. Now sites cover the most of the region. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1303	Rhinolophus hipposideros	UA	CON	IN MOD/CD	Khmelnytskyi, Vinnytsia, Lviv, Ternopilska Region	14	(4B 3C 7D)	Added to 2 new sites, apparently in Vinnytsa region. Thus probably more sites are required?	?
1303	Rhinolophus hipposideros	UA	PAN	IN MOD		4	(2B 2C)	Added to 2 new sites. Probably sufficient?	SUF?
1303	Rhinolophus hipposideros	UA	STE	IN MOD/SR/CD	IN MOD: N Odessa, SR: Crimea, CD: delete NE site in Crimea	10	(7B 3D)	No change. Any new information regarding scientific reserve? Conclusion remains?	IN MOD/SR/CD?
1304	Rhinolophus ferrumequinum	MD	CON	SR	check old data	2	(1B 1C)	No change, except population of one site downgraded from A to B. Has old information been verified?	?
1304	Rhinolophus ferrumequinum	MD	STE	IN MAJ	1 site	0		No change, no site.	IN MAJ?
1304	Rhinolophus ferrumequinum	UA	ALP-Car	IN MOD/CD		6	(3B 3C)	Added to one new site. Possibly sufficient?	SUF/ CD?
1304	Rhinolophus ferrumequinum	UA	PAN	SR	check old data	4	(3B 1C)	Added to 2 new sites. Is this a solution of scientific reserve? Sufficient?	?
1304	Rhinolophus ferrumequinum	UA	STE	IN MOD/SR/CD	IN MOD: Kerch peninsula, CD and SR: Crimea	14	(8B 3C 3D)	Added to one new and one existing site in Kerch penninsula. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
1307	Myotis blythii	MD	CON	IN MIN/CD	3 sites	6	(1B 5C)	Added to one new and 4 existing sites. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1307	Myotis blythii	MD	STE	IN MAJ/SR	IN MAJ: Prut River	0		No change. No site. Any new information about scientific reserve?	IN MAJ/SR?
1307	Myotis blythii	UA	ALP-Car	IN MOD		4	(2B 1C 1D)	Added to 2 new sites. Any clue of % population covered? Possibly sufficient?	?
1307	Myotis blythii	UA	CON	IN MAJ	Khmelnytskyi, Vinnytsia Oblast	0		Still no sites in UA_CON for this species.	IN MAJ?
1307	Myotis blythii	UA	PAN	SR		3	(2B 1C)	Added to 2 new sites. Possibly sufficient as the sites now cover large part of UA_PAN?	SUF?
1307	Myotis blythii	UA	STE	IN MOD/SR/CD	IN MOD: Kerch peninsula, S Crimea, N Odesa oblast, SR - in general, CD - Crimea	11	(7B 3C 1D)	One new and one existing site added to Kerch penninsula (Crimea). Has the scentific reserve been resolved?	SR?
1308	Barbastella barbastellus	BY	CON	IN MIN		4	(2A 2D)	No change. Conclusion remains?	IN MIN?
1308	Barbastella barbastellus	MD	STE	IN MAJ	N part of the region.	0		No change, no site.	IN MAJ?
1308	Barbastella barbastellus	UA	ALP-Car	IN MOD/CD		13	(7B 5C 1D)	Added to 5 new sites. Possibly sufficient, since sites now cover most of the region?	SUF?
1308	Barbastella barbastellus	UA	CON	IN MOD		33	(22B 4C 7D)	Added to 6 new sites. Geographical coverage has much improved, yet is there still a gep in the centre/centre-west of the region?	?
1308	Barbastella barbastellus	UA	PAN	IN MOD	Tisza, Borzava	6	(5B 1C)	Added to 4 new sites, including Tisza. But none of added sites carry "Borzava" in their names (is this a problem). Possibly sufficient, since sites now cover most of the region?	SUF?
1308	Barbastella barbastellus	UA	STE	SR/CD	SR: Crimea	10	(7B 2C 1D)	Added to one existing site in Crimea. Thus scientific reserve has been solved?	?
1310	Miniopterus schreibersi	UA	ALP-Car	SR		2	(1B 1C)	No change. Has scientific reserve been solved?	?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
1310	Miniopterus schreibersi	UA	PAN	SR		1	(1C)	No change. Has scientific reserve been solved?	?
1318	Myotis dasycneme	BY	BOR	IN MOD	e.g. Vitebsk region	18	(16C 2D)	Added to 12 new sites; mainly in Vitebsk region, but also elsewhere. Possibly suffucient?	SUF?
1318	Myotis dasycneme	BY	CON	IN MIN		8	(1A 4C 3D)	Added to Bieloweza. No other change. All locations probably covered, according to Red Book. Sufficient?	SUF?
1318	Myotis dasycneme	MD	CON	IN MOD	Dniester	8	(1B 7C)	Added to 2 new and one existing sites (the latter on Dniestr). Thus possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1318	Myotis dasycneme	MD	STE	IN MOD/IN MIN	IN MIN: 1 site in center; IN MOD - Prut	2	(2C)	No change. Conclusion remains?	IN MOD/IN MIN?
1318	Myotis dasycneme	UA	ALP-Car	IN MOD		3	(1B 2D)	No change. Previous note: "There is a significant discrepancy between current Emerald proposals and localities given in the Red Book. The latter shows only one location in the western part.	IN MOD?
1318	Myotis dasycneme	UA	CON	IN MOD/CD		22	(12B 6C 4D)	Added to 6 new sites in various parts of the region. Still there seems to be a gap in centre/centre-north (Kiev, Poltava, Chernihiv)?	?
1318	Myotis dasycneme	UA	PAN	IN MOD	Tisza, Borzava	1	(1B)	No change. To be added to Tisza (provided that there is a site already)?	IN MIN?
1318	Myotis dasycneme	UA	STE	IN MAJ/SR	S part of Odesa oblast, Mykolajev oblast, Kharkyv oblast, Donecka oblast	2	(2C)	Added to 2 new sites, one in Odessa and one in Kharkiv oblasts. Still sites are missing from Mykolajev and Donetsk oblasts? Is any element of scientific reserve resolved?	IN MOD?
1321	Myotis emarginatus	MD	STE	IN MIN/SR	Prut river	0		No change, no site. Has scientific reserve been addressed?	IN MIN/SR

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
1321	Myotis emarginatus	UA	ALP-Car	SR		2	(1B 1D)	No change. Has scientific reserve been addressed?	SR?
1321	Myotis emarginatus	UA	CON	SR/CD	Check old data	4	(1B 2C 1D)	Added to one new site in Lutsk region. Is this a partial or full solution of scientific reservation?	?
1321	Myotis emarginatus	UA	PAN	SR		3	(1B 2C)	Added to one new site. Is this a partial or full solution of scientific reservation?	?
1321	Myotis emarginatus	UA	STE	SR/CD	Crimea	5	(1B 3C 1D)	No change. In Crimea "old" sites remain. Conclusion remains?	SR/CD?
1323	Myotis bechsteini	MD	STE	IN MIN/SR		0		No change, no sites in MD_STE region. Conclusion remains?	IN MIN/SR
1323	Myotis bechsteini	UA	ALP-Car	IN MOD/CD		8	(5B 1C 2D)	Added to 2 new sites. Coult it be sufficient?	SUF?
1323	Myotis bechsteini	UA	CON	SR		8	(5B 2C 1D)	No change in the CON region. Scientific reserve is still to be solved?	SR?
1323	Myotis bechsteini	UA	PAN	IN MOD	Tisza	4	(4B)	Added to 2 new sites, but not to Tisza which is also a new site.	IN MIN?
1324	Myotis myotis	MD	CON	SR		1	(1A)	No change, but the only site is upgraded from C to A. Probably sufficient if this is the only site?	SUF?
1324	Myotis myotis	MD	STE	IN MIN/SR	IN MIN: Prut	0		No additions to Prut area. Is there a solution of scientific reserve?	?
1324	Myotis myotis	UA	ALP-Car	IN MOD/CD		14	(5B 4C 5D)	Added to 4 new sites. Presumably sufficient?	SUF?
1324	Myotis myotis	UA	CON	IN MOD/CD		22	(10B 4C 8D)	Added to 5 new sites. Presumably sufficient?	SUF?
1324	Myotis myotis	UA	PAN	IN MOD	Tisza	4	(4B)	3 new sites added, including the Tisza site. Presumably sufficient?	SUF?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
1335	Spermophilus citellus	MD	CON	IN MOD		4	(1B 3C)	Added to one existing site (NW part of the region). Uncommon in MD_CON? Population assessments suggest low coverage. Present in more existing sites? Absent from MD_STE?	?
1335	Spermophilus citellus	UA	CON	SR	Update distribution	3	(1B 2D)	No change. Has scientific reserve been addressed? Any new information?	?
1337	Castor fiber	BY	BOR	IN MOD/IN MIN	IN MOD for NE part of the country, IN MIN for the rest	49	(48C 1D)	Added to 17 new and existing sites combined. Additions concern also NE part. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1337	Castor fiber	BY	CON	IN MIN		49	(2B 39C 8D)	Added to 6 new and existing sites combined. Now sites well represent the whole CON region. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1337	Castor fiber	UA	ALP-Car	IN MOD		7	(2B 3C 2D)	Added to 3 new sites. Does beaver occur only in the northern part of UA_ALP region? Possibly sufficient if this is the case?	?
1337	Castor fiber	UA	PAN	IN MOD/IN MIN	Tisza, Borzova	0		No change, no site. Conclusion remains?	IN MOD/IN MIN?
1349	Tursiops truncatus	UA	STE	IN MOD		9	(6B 3C)	No new marine sites. Previous remark: "More offshore sites needed, e.g. around Crimea. Does it occur in Azov sea? Are any distinct concentration sites known?"	?
1351	Phocoena phocoena	UA	STE	IN MOD		15	(1A 2B 10C 2D)	No new marine sites. Previous remark: "More offshore sites needed, e.g. around Crimea. Does it occur in Azov sea? Are any distinct concentration sites known?"	?
1352	Canis lupus	BY	BOR	IN MOD	Mogilev region (Cherikovsky, Surazhsky reserve, Babinowichsky)	35	(1B 34C)	Added to 16 new sites, including in Mogilev region. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
1352	Canis lupus	BY	CON	IN MIN	1 site	35	(3B 26C 6D)	Added to 3 new and one existing site. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1352	Canis lupus	MD	CON	IN MIN	Central part	4	(4B)	Added to one existing site, approximately in the central part. Current population estimate gives 10-75% population within the network? What would be actual coverage? Present in more existing sites?	?
1352	Canis lupus	MD	STE	n/a		1	(1B)	Added to one existing site. Should wolf be added to the Reference List of MD_STE?	?
1352	Canis lupus	UA	STE	IN MIN		35	(10B 7C 18D)	Added to 10 new and one existing site. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1354	Ursus arctos	BY	BOR	IN MOD	Surazhsky reserve	13	(1A 12C)	Added to 4 new sites. Is species restricted to the northern part of the region? Posssibly sufficient?	
1354	Ursus arctos	BY	CON	IN MIN	2 sites	1	(1?)	Still one site (with unreported population) remains also in BY_CON, which corresponds also to sites in UA_CON across the border.	SUF?
1354	Ursus arctos	UA	ALP-Car	IN MOD	2 sites	17	(5B 8C 4D)	Added to one new site. Is it planned to designate other site? In theory proposed sites cover large part of the region?	?
1355	Lutra lutra	BY	BOR	IN MOD		38	(1B 34C 3D)	Added to 20 new sites. The region is well covered.	SUF?
1355	Lutra lutra	BY	CON	IN MOD/IN MIN		40	(1B 25C 14D)	Added to 2 new and one existing site. Not ocurring in Neman in NW of the region?	?
1355	Lutra lutra	MD	CON	IN MOD/IN MIN		13	(1B 11C 1D)	Added to 11 new and existing sites combined. Not present in the centre (there are some riverine sites)? Present in more existing sites?	?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
1355	Lutra lutra	MD	STE	IN MIN	2-3 sites	5	(5C)	Added to one new site. Probably more sites could be expected, preferably also in the centre?	?
1355	Lutra lutra	UA	ALP-Car	IN MIN		23	(7B 9C 7D)	Added to 6 new sites. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1355	Lutra lutra	UA	CON	IN MIN		124	(1A 28B 44C 51D)	Added to about 30 new and existing sites combined. Now the region is well covered.	SUF?
1355	Lutra lutra	UA	PAN	IN MOD	Tisza	2	(2B)	Tisza site is designated, but otter is not recorded there. Is this correct?	IN MIN?
1355	Lutra lutra	UA	STE	IN MIN/SR/CD	SR:Seversky Doneck river. CD:in general - check pop.assesments.	44	(14B 14C 16D)	Added to 10 new and existing sites combined. Additions include also Severny Donetsk river. What is the interpretation of D population category in this case?	SUF/ CD?
1356	Mustela lutreola	BY	BOR	SR	Surazhsky, Lowat reserve and Luchosa river.	1	(1A)	Deleted from one site (Yelnya) and added (A population) to one new site Luchosa River Floodplain. Present in 2 other sites: Surazhsky and Lowat reserve (could not find such names in the database)?	?
1356	Mustela lutreola	MD	CON	SUF/CD		1	(1C)	Added to one existing site and deleted from 2 sites on Prut. Both were B populations. Please explain the reason, i.e. was it part of scientific reserve as in MD_STE?	?
1356	Mustela lutreola	MD	STE	SUF/SR/CD	SR: validate if the species is still present	2	(2B)	Deleted from 2 sites on Prut. Both were B populations. Was this as a part of solving scientific reserve? Please also check population assessments. 2B1C populations now suggests low coverage.	?
1356	Mustela lutreola	UA	ALP-Car	IN MOD/IN MIN/SR/CD	SR-check old data	7	(1B 2C 4D)	No change. Has scientific reserve been solved, i.e. old data verified?	?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
1356	Mustela lutreola	UA	CON	IN MIN/SR	SR-check old data; IN MIN - 13 Sites	20	(5B 8C 7D)	Added to 3 new and one existing site. IN MIN was about 13 sites, thus is it planned to designate more sites? Has scientific reserve been solved?	?
1356	Mustela lutreola	UA	STE	SR	To refresh the data	17	(7B 4C 6D)	Added to one existing site (on border with UA_CON). Population assessments changed for 2 sites. Is this action a result of solving scientific reserve?	?
1361	Lynx lynx	BY	BOR	IN MOD	e.g. Surazhsky reserve, Cherikovsky, Babinowichsky	25	(1B 23C 1D)	Added to 10 new sites, including mentioned sites. Possibly sufficient, but could not check the mentioned names - are they included?	SUF?
1361	Lynx lynx	BY	CON	IN MIN	S part	19	(2B 13C 3D)	Added to 2 new sites, but not in the southern part. Present in other large Pripyat sites? Conclusion remains?	IN MIN?
1361	Lynx lynx	UA	ALP-Car	IN MOD	2 sites	19	(4B 7C 8D)	Two new sites added. Possibly sufficient? Sites now cover a large part of the region.	SUF?
1361	Lynx lynx	UA	CON	IN MIN/CD	connectivity with PL	14	(7B 2C 5D)	No change. Have sites along western border been checked?	?
1373	Ovis gmelini musimon	UA	STE	n/a		1	(1D)	Introduced? In HD Directive as Ovis ammon musimon. In HD context site designation applies only to natural populations. Also, the rule is that there should not be only D sites. Upgrade to A or delete?	?
1910	Pteromys volans	BY	BOR	SR REF	Surazhsky reserve	1	(1D)	One new site added, but why D population? Has scientific reserve been solved? But this site is not called "Surazhsky reserve" but "Lovat", BY0000025. May be this is the same?	?
2021	Sicista subtilis	MD	STE	SR		0		No change, no site. Has scientific reserve been solved?	?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
2021	Sicista subtilis	UA	CON	SR REF		3	(1B 2C)	Added to 2 new and one existing site. Is this a result of resolving scientific reserve? Now sufficient?	?
2021	Sicista subtilis	UA	STE	IN MOD/SR/CD	IN MOD: Kerch peninsula, Dniepropetrovsk	17	(8B 7C 2D)	Added to 3 new and one existing site (this includes Kerch penninsula and Dniepropetrovsk). This was an element of scientic reserve? Now sufficient?	?
2604	Desmana moschata	UA	CON	IN MOD/CD		3	(1B 2D)	No change. Population assessments suggest low coverage. Conclusion remains?	IN MOD/CD?
2608	Spermophilus suslicus	BY	CON	SR		0		No change, no site. Has scientific reserve been solved?	?
2608	Spermophilus suslicus	MD	CON	IN MAJ		2	(1B 1C)	Added to one new and one exising site. Are these only known locations? Population assessments (1B3C) suggest that there are more locations?	?
2608	Spermophilus suslicus	MD	STE	IN MOD		2	(2C)	Added to a new site. Are these only known locations?	?
2608	Spermophilus suslicus	UA	CON	IN MOD	W&C parts	7	(2B 2C 3D)	Added to 3 new and one existing site, however none in western nor central parts. Is the adding to an existing site in the north correct? Conclusion probably remains?	IN MOD?
2608	Spermophilus suslicus	UA	STE	IN MOD/SR/CD	IN MOD: 2 localities in Mikolayev oblast	13	(6B 3C 4D)	Added to 5 new and one existing site. Only the existing site is from Mykolaiv region. Can more sites be expected? Is there any unresolved element of scientific reserve?	IN MOD?
2612	Microtus tatricus	UA	ALP-Car	IN MOD/CD		3	(1B 2D)	One new site added. Present mainly in the southern part of the region? How actually 'D' population should be interpreted in this case? Revise population assessments?	CD/?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
2613	Spalax graecus	UA	ALP-Car	IN MOD/CD	enlargment of exsisting sites	1	(1C)	No change. Conclusion remains. Check population assessments.	IN MOD/CD?
2613	Spalax graecus	UA	CON	IN MOD/CD	enlargment of exsisting sites	1	(1C)	No change. Conclusion remains. Check population assessments.	IN MOD/CD?
2633	Mustela eversmannii	MD	CON	IN MOD	in N & C part	2	(2B)	Deleted from 2 sites. No additions. Conclusion remains?	In MOD?
2633	Mustela eversmannii	MD	STE	IN MAJ		1	(1C)	Added to one existing site. 2B 1C suggest that there could be more sites?	?
2633	Mustela eversmannii	UA	CON	IN MOD		4	(3C 1D)	Added to one new and one existing site. Both Red Book and IUCN suggest a wide distribution across all region. Possibly more sites needed?	IN MOD?
2633	Mustela eversmannii	UA	STE	IN MIN/SR	IN MIN: 14 sites	32	(5B 18C 9D)	Added to 11 new and existing sites combined. Are some important locations missing (14 sites mentioned in the previous conclusion)? Is the scientific reserve solved?	?
2635	Vormela peregusna	UA	STE	SR		3	(2C 1D)	No change. Has scientific reserve been solved? Any new data? No doubt, current population assessments suggest low coverage.	SR/CD?
2647	Bison bonasus	BY	CON	IN MIN/CD	CD - delete the D site	5	(2A 2B)	Added to one existing and one new site; deleted from one site. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
2647	Bison bonasus	UA	CON	IN MOD		2	(1B 1D)	Added to one new riverine site. Was this the missing site? Not present in Polesye (there are BY sites next to UA border)?	?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
					Reptiles				
1220	Emys orbicularis	BY	BOR	IN MIN	Krassny bor	1	(1D)	Added to existing site Krassny bor. Change population from D to C?	SUF/ CD?
1220	Emys orbicularis	MD	CON	IN MOD/IN MIN		5	(3B 2C)	Added to one new site. Distributed throughout the country, according to Munteanu et al. (2013). Not present in the northern and southern part of the region?	?
1220	Emys orbicularis	MD	STE	IN MOD/IN MIN		9	(5B 4C)	Added to 3 new and one existing site. Now proposed sites well cover the region. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1220	Emys orbicularis	UA	CON	IN MOD		111	(1A)	Added to 40 new and existing sites combined. Now site distribution well covers the whole region. Sufficient?	SUF?
1220	Emys orbicularis	UA	PAN	IN MOD	Tisza	2	(1B 1C)	Tisza is proposed as site, but the species is not added to it?	IN MIN ?
1220	Emys orbicularis	UA	STE	IN MOD/CD	Check presence in Crimea steppe areas	57	(22B 19C 16D)	Added to 21 new and existing sites combined. The additions obviously include Crimea and steppe areas. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1279	Elaphe quatuorlineata	MD	CON	IN MOD	1 site	2	(2C)	Added to one existing site (upper Dniestr). Was it the site expected? Are there any other sites? 1B 3C sites in country suggest a low coverage?	?
1279	Elaphe quatuorlineata	MD	STE	IN MOD	in total should be 3 sites	2	(1B 1C)	No change. Still only 2 sites in the MD_STE region.	IN MOD?
1279	Elaphe quatuorlineata	UA	STE	IN MOD/CD	IN MOD: steppe habitats. CD:N Azov	22	(2B 9C 11D)	Added to 5 new and one existing site. Few large sites in probably steppic habitats and one north of Azov sea. Is this sufficient? What is the interpretation of D sites for reptiles in UA?	?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
1293	Elaphe situla	UA	STE	IN MIN/CD	CD: delete Northernmost site	9	(5B 1C 3D)	Added to one existing site. No deletion, thus should CD remain?	SUF/CD?
1298	Vipera ursinii	MD	CON	SR REF		1	(1B)	Added to one existing site (3 rivers?). Is this a solution of scientific reserve? Previous sources guessed that probably extinct.	?
1298	Vipera ursinii	MD	STE	SR	Review of information	1	(1B)	No change. Any new data/ results of review?	?
1298	Vipera ursinii	UA	CON	IN MOD/CD	IN MOD South/South East	8	(2B 2C 4D)	Added to 4 new sites, right in the S/ SE part. Could it be now sufficient combined with the key population in the STE region?	?
1298	Vipera ursinii	UA	STE	IN MOD/CD	IN MOD: E part/steppe habitats. CD: doubtful in W	58	(13B 16C 29D)	Added to 18 new and existing sites combined. Now sites cover most of the region. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
					Amphibians				
1166	Triturus cristatus	BY	BOR	IN MOD/CD	1 more site will be added Cherekovsky. CD for population assesment	13	(9C 4D)	5 sites added, 4 of them new. One of them: BY0000070, Berezina Valley with Chernevskiy and Chernevichskiy Reserves. CD possibly remains as popultion assessments suggest very low coverage. Can some of sites be B or A?	SUF/CD?
1166	Triturus cristatus	BY	CON	IN MOD/CD	E part	17	(11C 6D)	1 new site and added to 1 existing site. Both in the E part. CD: populations changed in 2 sites, still, current assessments suggest very low coverage.	SUF/CD?
1166	Triturus cristatus	MD	CON	IN MOD/IN MIN		17	(6B 11C)	3 new sites added in the south. Distributed throughout the country, according to Munteanu et al. (2013). There is obviosly a gap in the central part of the region? Present in more existing sites?	IN MOD/IN MIN?
1166	Triturus cristatus	MD	STE	IN MOD		2	(2B)	No change. From previous notes: "Red Book and trans-boundary UA sites suggest a wider distribution (e.g. SW and SE)".	IN MOD?
1166	Triturus cristatus	UA	CON	IN MOD	Central part	109	(71B 20C 18D)	Added to 25 sites in the region, many of them in the central part. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1166	Triturus cristatus	UA	PAN	IN MOD	Tisza	1	(1D)	No change. Is species there? Triturus dobrigicus is probably present in UA_PAN, according to IUCN?	?
1166	Triturus cristatus	UA	STE	IN MOD	7 sites	22	(17B 3C 2D)	8 sites added, 5 of them with B populations. At least 2 sites are new. Distribution of sites for the species has much improved and corresponds to the range given by IUCN and Pysanets (2007).	SUF?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
1171	Triturus karelinii	UA	STE	IN MOD/CD	CD: N site	3	(3D)	Previous note: "various sources (Red Book, IUCN, Pysanets 2007), including information supplied by UA authorities, indicate population in Crimea. Current 2 (insignificant (D) by coding) sites do not cover the whole distribution range. No change - conclusion remains.	IN MOD/CD?
1188	Bombina bombina	BY	BOR	IN MOD/CD	CD for pop.assesment	13	(10C 3D)	3 new sites added; 2 new in Mogilev district, plus added to one existing site there. Possibly sufficient, but CD has to be revisited: curent coding still suggests low population coverage.	SUF/CD?
1188	Bombina bombina	BY	CON	IN MOD	Central part (near Minsk)	25	(1B 16C 7D)	2 new and 1 existing site added for the species. They are indeed in central Continental area, but not exactly near Minsk, which is more or less in Boreal. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1188	Bombina bombina	MD	CON	IN MIN		33	(1A 18B 14C)	Added to 6 existing sites and several new sites in the region. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1188	Bombina bombina	MD	STE	IN MIN		13	(1A 9B 3C)	Added to 6 new sites; 2 sites modified. Geographical coverage has much improved. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1188	Bombina bombina	UA	CON	IN MOD	Chernihiv, Vinnytsa Poltava Zhytomyr regions	132	(35B 63C 34D)	Added to many new sites across the region. New sites include Chernihiv, Vinnytsa, Poltava and Zhytomyr regions (see map). Possibly sufficient.	SUF?
1188	Bombina bombina	UA	PAN	IN MOD	Tisza	1	(1B)	No change. Numerous sites for this species just across the border in SK, HU, RO.	IN MOD?
1188	Bombina bombina	UA	STE	IN MOD/CD		37	(22B, 7C, 8D)	Added to 10 new sites in the region. Geographical coverage has much improved. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
1193	Bombina variegata	MD	CON	IN MIN	3 sites	3	(3C)	Added to 3 existing sites. Possibly sufficient if these are the required sites (probably).	SUF?
1193	Bombina variegata	UA	ALP-Car	IN MIN		22	(1A 12B 7C 2D)	Added to 8 new sites. Now the sites cover a large part of the region. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1193	Bombina variegata	UA	CON	IN MOD		7	(1B 5C 1D)	Added to 6 new sites, but also deleted from 2 northernmost sites (with previously reported D populations). Possibly sufficient, given that the species is quite marginal to the CON region.	SUF?
1193	Bombina variegata	UA	PAN	IN MOD	Tisza	2	(1B 1C)	1 new site added in the South, but not Tisza river? Any clarification? Can be added also to Tisza?	?
1993	Triturus dobrogicus	MD	STE	IN MAJ		0		No change. No site.	?
1993	Triturus dobrogicus	UA	PAN	IN MOD		1	(1B)	From the previous notes: "Red Book and Pysanets (2007) suggest another location in the eastern end of the region (the currently proposed site is in the west)". No change since the last evaluation. Conclusion remains IN MOD?	IN MOD?
1993	Triturus dobrogicus	UA	STE	SR	1) overlap with T.cristatus ; 2) distribution (Khersonska, Mykolaivska)	3	(2B 1D)	No change in proposed sites. Has scientific reserve (i.e. overlap with T.cristatus and distribution in Kherson, Mykolaiv regions) been solved? Any new clarification?	SR?
2001	Triturus montandoni	UA	ALP-Car	IN MOD		21	(5A 3B 11C 2D)	7 new sites added. Now sites cover most of the region. Population reported in SDFs suggest high coverage - close to 100%. Sufficient?	SUF?
2001	Triturus montandoni	UA	CON	IN MOD/IN MIN	IN MIN - Stilske Horbohiria	5	(1A 4C)	Added to 4 new sites. The species, however, has not been yet added to the indicated site: Stilske Horbohiria, UA0000177.	IN MIN?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
2001	Triturus montandoni	UA	PAN	IN MOD	Tisza	1	(1C)	No change. Conclusion remains? See also B. variegata, T. cristatus, B. bombina. - the question is about presumably the same site.	IN MOD?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
					Fish				
1096	Lampetra planeri	BY	BOR	IN MOD	for example: Luchesa, Obol and Ula rivers	15	(1B 13C 1D)	Added to 12 new sites. Present also in the centre (there seems to be a gap)? Population coverage suggests only 2-41%? Occurs in more existing sites? Have the mentioned rivers been covered (i.e. Luchesa, Obol, Ula)?	?
1096	Lampetra planeri	BY	CON	IN MOD	Nemun, Dnieper	5	(4C 1D)	One new site in NW of the region. Surely no new sites in Dnieper. Low population coverage (even combined with BOR)?	?
1096	Lampetra planeri	UA	ALP-Car	SR	Check NGO data	1	(1C)	Has scientific reserve been resolved? One new site has been added on the border of CON and ALP regions.	?
1096	Lampetra planeri	UA	CON	SR REF	Vistula basin	1	(1C)	Has scientific reserve been resolved? One new site has been added on the border of CON and ALP regions. In fact this river belongs to Vistula basin. Sufficient if this is the only location in UA, please confirm. See also above (ALP).	SUF?
1099	Lampetra fluviatilis	BY	BOR	IN MAJ	Viliya and Tartak river	2	(1B 1C)	2 new sites added: Viliya River Valley and Nishcha River; presumably these are only locations in Belarus? But is the river in the N land-locked?	SUF?
1105	Hucho hucho	MD	CON	IN MAJ		4	(1B 3C)	2 existing and 2 new sites have been added for this species on Prut. Possibly sufficient if Prut is the only location for hucho in Moldova.	SUF?
1105	Hucho hucho	UA	ALP-Car	IN MOD/IN MIN	enlarge the sites on White & Blak Cheremosh	10	(7A 2B 1C)	Added to 3 new and one existing site. But not very clear if the dark green site on the map covers the Cheremosh river? New sites include 1A2B1C populations. High population cover, thus presumably sufficient?	SUF?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
1105	Hucho hucho	UA	PAN	IN MOD	Upper Tisza	2	(1A 1B)	One new site added on Tisza.	SUF?
1106	Salmo salar	BY	BOR	IN MAJ	Viliya	1	(1A)	Viliya river added (new site).	SUF?
1122	Gobio uranoscopus/ Romanogobio uranoscopus 6145	UA	PAN	IN MOD	Tisza & other rivers	3	(1A 2B)	Two new sites added, including Tisza.	SUF?
1124	Gobio albipinnatus/ Romanogobio albipinnatus 6144	BY	CON	IN MOD/IN MIN	IN MOD - Dnieper; IN MIN - Pripyat	7	(1A 1B 5C)	Added to 2 new and 3 existing sites, both on Dnieper and Pripyat. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1124	Gobio albipinnatus/ Romanogobio albipinnatus 6144	UA	PAN	n/a		1	(1B)	The only site is primarily ALP. Does the species occur in PAN part of the site? If not, it should be excluded from the UA_PAN Reference List.	?
1124	Gobio albipinnatus/ Romanogobio albipinnatus 6144	UA	STE	IN MIN	1 site (Tylihul River, Odeska region)	9	(9C)	Added to 2 new sites in NE. Does species occur in Odessa region? IUCN does not suggest so (mostly NE Ukraine). Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1130	Aspius aspius	BY	BOR	IN MOD	Rivers of N and NE: Soz, Dniepr, East Biarezina and Obol	15	(13C 2D)	Added to 11 sites across the region, including N and NE. Could be sufficient for this common and widespread species.	SUF?
1130	Aspius aspius	BY	CON	IN MIN		17	(1B 12C 4D)	Added to 4 existing sites and one new site. Possibly sufficient for common and widespread species.	SUF?
1130	Aspius aspius	MD	CON	IN MAJ/IN MIN		10	(4B 6C)	Added to 7 existing sites and 3 new sites. Does it occur only in large rivers Dniestr and Prut, i.e. no populations in the centre of CON region?	?
1130	Aspius aspius	MD	STE	IN MIN	Central part of STE region	5	(1B 4C)	One new site in the NE part of the region. No changes in the central part of STE region (as indicated in previous conclusion). Conclusion remains?	IN MIN?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
1130	Aspius aspius	UA	PAN	IN MOD	Tisza	2	(1C)	One new site on Tisza	SUF?
1131	Leuciscus souffia/ Telestes souffia 6147	UA	PAN	IN MOD	Tisza	2	(1B 1C)	Added to the new Tizsa site. Now possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1134	Rhodeus sericeus amarus/ 5339 Rhodeus amarus	BY	BOR	IN MIN/CD	Rivers of N and NE: Soz, Besed and Luczes. CD for revising of population assesments	12	(1B 7C 4D)	Added to 4 new and one existing site, 3 of them in the N/NE. Coverage has much improved. CD: Still 4 first sites (those with D population) are under code 1134, the rest under code 5339. Please use one code consistently (e.g. 5339).	SUF?
1134	Rhodeus sericeus amarus/ 5339 Rhodeus amarus	BY	CON	IN MOD/CD	In MIN Neman, Pripyat	19	(12C 7D)	Added to 4 new and 4 existing sites, incuding Neman and Pripyat. Geographical coverage is almost complete. Possibly sufficient? All records are under 5339 in this region.	SUF/CD?
1134	Rhodeus amarus/ 5339 Rhodeus amarus	MD	CON	IN MIN		10	(2B 8C)	Added to 10 new and existing sites; mostly Prut and Dniester. Possibly sufficient, but does it also occur in the centre of the region? All records are under 5339 in this region.	?/ CD
1134	Rhodeus sericeus amarus/5339 Rhodeus amarus	UA	PAN	IN MOD	Tisza, Latoritsa	2	(2C)	One new site added, possibly other river than Tisza. Is it possible to add to Tisza? CD: Harmonise species records, now both codes 1134 and 5339 are in use.	IN MIN?
1138	Barbus meridionalis	MD	CON	IN MOD	Prut, Dniester	7	(1B 6C)	Added to 5 existing and one new site. These sites are both on Prut and Dniester. Apparently sufficient?	SUF?
1138	Barbus meridionalis	UA	PAN	n/a		1	(1B)	Added to one new site (Tisza). Possibly sufficient, but please confirm if it occurs in the PAN part of the site.	?
1145	Misgurnus fossilis	BY	BOR	IN MOD	Rivers of N and NE: Luchesa, Obol, Besed and Bobr	40	(35C 5D)	Added to 26 new sites across country. Many of these sites in the N and NE. Now the region is well covered.	SUF?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
1145	Misgurnus fossilis	BY	CON	IN MOD		28	(1B 23C 4D)	Added to 7 new and 4 existing sites. Now the region is well covered. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1145	Misgurnus fossilis	MD	CON	IN MAJ/IN MIN		8	(1B 7C)	Added to two new and 6 existing sites. All these sites represent valleys of Prut and Dniedter. Does it occur also in the centre of the region? Munteanu et al. (2013) suggests presence in north-west and east-centre of the region.	?
1145	Misgurnus fossilis	MD	STE	IN MOD	central part of STE region	4	(1B 3C)	One new site added in the NE of the region. No change in the central part, as indicated in the previous conclusion.	IN MOD?
1145	Misgurnus fossilis	UA	STE	IN MIN		31	(28C 3D)	Added to 3 new sites, N and NE. Possibly sufficient?	SUF
1146	Sabanejewia aurata	BY	CON	IN MAJ	Neman, Dnieper, Sozh	1	(1B)	Added to one existing site. This is obviously not sufficient (previous conclusion lists also Neman, Dnieper, Sozh). Neighbouring UA sites also suggest wider occurence. Occurs also in BOR region? This is new species for LT and LV.	IN MOD?
1146	Sabanejewia aurata	MD	CON	IN MAJ/IN MIN	Dniester etc.	7	(1B 6C)	Added to one new site and to 6 existing sites on Prut and Dniester. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1146	Sabanejewia aurata	MD	STE	IN MOD/IN MIN		3	(1B 2C)	No change. Still a gap in the central part of the region?	IN MOD/ IN MIN?
1146	Sabanejewia aurata	UA	ALP-Car	IN MIN		23	(1A 12B 10C)	Added to 7 new and 4 existing sites. Coverage has much improved, including centre of the region. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
1146	Sabanejewia aurata	UA	CON	IN MIN		37	(20B 13C 4D)	Added to about 20 new and existing sites. Previous remark: "species could be recorded in more already existing sites in the north (Chernihov oblast), south east (Poltava) and south-east (Lviv)? Added sites include all mentioned locations.	SUF?
1146	Sabanejewia aurata	UA	PAN	SR REF	connectivity with Natura 2000	2	(1B 1C)	Added to one new and one existing site. Does that mean that scientific reservation has been solved "positively"? Sufficient?	?
1146	Sabanejewia aurata	UA	STE	IN MIN		5	(5C)	Probably marginal to the STE region? Added to 2 large sites in the NE. Possibly sufficient?	?
1149	Cobitis taenia	BY	BOR	IN MOD/CD	E part: Besed and Soz rivers. CD for Revision of pop.assesments.	32	(32C)	Added to 25 sites across the region, many sites from the East part. Population assessments (32C) is now OK in this context.	SUF?
1149	Cobitis taenia	BY	CON	IN MOD		17	(1B 16C)	Added to 4 new sites. Yet a possible gap still remains in the centre-north. Is this important?	?
1149	Cobitis taenia	MD	STE	IN MAJ		1	(1B)	Added to 1 new site. Really absent from the CON region? Previous note: "Must be present, according to IUCN map and there are sites all around Moldova". If no inventory data - may be SR?	?
1149	Cobitis taenia	UA	PAN	n/a		1	(1B)	Added to one new site which is entirely in UA_PAN region. Add to the Reference List? Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1157	Gymnocephalus schraetzer	MD	CON	IN MIN	Prut	1	(1C)	Added to one existing site on Prut. Possibly SUF if this is the only location, but in such case population assessment cannot be C (should be most probably A)?	SUF/CD?
1157	Gymnocephalus schraetzer	UA	PAN	IN MOD	Latoritsa, Tisza and other rivers	2	(2C)	Added to one new site, but certainly not to the Tisza site. Difficult to judge about "other rivers". To be added to Tisza?	IN MIN?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
1158	Zingel asper	MD	CON	n/a		1	(1C)	Added to one existing site. To be added to the Reference List? Yet CD needs to be revisited - the only site cannot be with C population.	? CD
1159	Zingel zingel	MD	CON	IN MAJ/IN MIN		7	(7C)	Present in Prut and Dniestr according to Munteanu et al. (2013). Added to four existing sites on Prut and Dniestr. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1160	Zingel streber	MD	CON	IN MAJ/IN MIN	mid Dniester, Prut	6	(1B 5C)	Added to 5 existing and one new site, both in mid Dniester and Prut. Possibly sufficient, however, are population assessments correct (i.e. should be more A and B sites?)	SUF/ CD?
1160	Zingel streber	UA	PAN	IN MOD	Tisza	2	(1B)	One new site added, but not Tisza. Conclusion remains?	IN MOD?
1163	Cottus gobio	BY	BOR	IN MOD/CD	CD for correction of pop.assesments. rivers E part: Besed and Soz	12	(10C 2D)	Added to 10 new sites, including some 4 sites in the eastern part. Soz is covered only in a small section (but there is another site on Soz where the species is not listed). Is Besed river covered - could not trace from available map?	IN MIN/IN MOD?
1163	Cottus gobio	BY	CON	IN MOD/IN MIN		8	(1B 5C 2D)	Added to one existing and one new site. More sites available in the northern part of the region? Previous note: "Kottelat& Freyhof (2007) suggests that present mostly in the N part"? Conclusion remains?	IN MOD/IN MIN?
1163	Cottus gobio	MD	CON	IN MAJ	mid Dniester	1	(1A)	Added to one existing site in "Mid-Dniester of the region". Possibly sufficient if this is the only location?	SUF?
2011	Umbra krameri	MD	STE	IN MAJ		1	(1B)	Added to one existing site in lower Dniestr. Is this only site? Red Book indicates presence in Prut and Dniestr. 1B possibly suggests that there are other sites for the species?	?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
2011	Umbra krameri	UA	ALP-Car	n/a		2	(2B)	2 new sites added, but does species occur in the ALP region? Include in the Refererence List or not? Not discussed previously	?
2011	Umbra krameri	UA	PAN	IN MAJ		4	(4B)	Added to 2 new and 2 existing sites. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
2484	Eudontomyzon mariae	BY	BOR	IN MAJ	Dniepr, West and East Biarezina, Besed, Soz, and Neman?	4	(1B 3C)	Added to 2 new and 2 existing sites. One site on Dniepr (margin with CON), Possibly 2 sites on West and East Berezina, one touches Soz. Neman apparently applies for CON region (also a new site here). Are these most important sites? 4B7C is 8-74%.	?
2484	Eudontomyzon mariae	BY	CON	SR	clarify new data	7	(3B 4C)	Added to 4 new and 3 existing sites. The note says "clarify new data", so has the scientific reserve been solved, possibly also in context of BY_BOR?	?
2484	Eudontomyzon mariae	MD	CON	SR	clarify new data	6	(6C)	Added to 6 existing sites. Is this a solution of scientific reserve? Possibly sufficient if it occurs only in Prut and Dniester?	?
2484	Eudontomyzon mariae	MD	STE	SR	verify existing records	3	(3C)	No change. Any new research of collation of data? Is scientific reserve solved, possibly in the context with MD_CON region?	?
2484	Eudontomyzon mariae	UA	CON	IN MOD/IN MIN	IN MOD - Desna	33	(2B 24C 2D)	Added to 5 new sites. One site relates to Desna river. Can be added to more existing sites? Otherwise N Ukraine is well covered: possibly sufficient?	?
2484	Eudontomyzon mariae	UA	STE	IN MIN/SR	SR: check other sites, IN MIN: Odesa	16	(1B 13C 2D)	Added to 2 existing sites in Odessa region. On large new site in NE of the region. Can scientific reserve thus be considered as solved, i.e. sufficient?	?
2511	Gobio kessleri/Romanogobio kesslerii 6134	MD	CON	IN MAJ/IN MIN	IN MIN - Prut, Dniester	7	(7C)	Added to 4 existing and one new site, on Prut and Dniester. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
2511	Gobio kessleri/Romanogobio kesslerii 6134	MD	STE	IN MOD	Central part of the region	3	(3C)	Added to one new site in NE, but no change in the central part of the region. Conclusion remains?	IN MOD?
2511	Gobio kessleri/Romanogobio kesslerii 6134	UA	ALP-Car	IN MIN		9	(2B 7C)	Added to 4 existing sites and one new site in the North of the region. Possibly sufficient? But please harmonise all records to 6134.	SUF? CD
2511	Gobio kessleri/Romanogobio kesslerii 6134	UA	PAN	IN MOD		1	(1B)	Added to one (small) existing site. This action does not correspond to previous IN MOD conclusion. Should have been added to the new Tisza site?	?
2511	Gobio kessleri/Romanogobio kesslerii 6134	UA	STE	EXCL REF		2	(2D)	Added to one existing site near Odessa. Is this an error or intentional record?	CD?
2522	Pelecus cultratus	BY	BOR	IN MAJ	Dniepr, Sozl and East Biarezina	3	(3C)	Added to 3 new sites. All rivers but Dniepr are covered. Does Dniepr remains an important gap?	IN MOD?
2522	Pelecus cultratus	BY	CON	IN MOD/IN MIN/CD	IN MOD-Dnieper, Neman, IN MIN - Pripyat, Dnieper; CD-check exsisting sites	9	(1B 7C 1D)	Added to 4 new and one existing site. New sites Dniepr (S part), Neman. One new site on Pripyat. No additions to existing sites linked with above names. Could be present in more existing sites? Population assessments still suggest low coverage (2-45%)?	?
2522	Pelecus cultratus	MD	STE	IN MAJ	3 sites	2	(2B)	Added to 2 sites on lower Prut. Unfortunately, no names given for the 3 sites mentioned in previous conclusion. Which is the 3rd site missing?	?
2555	Gymnocephalus baloni	BY	CON	IN MIN/CD		4	(1A 2C 1D)	One new A site added. Does it now covers the distribution, e.g. isn't species present in all Pripyat sites, but just a selection of them?	?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
2555	Gymnocephalus baloni	MD	STE	IN MAJ/IN MIN	3 sites - Lower Prut, Lake Beleu, Lake Manta	2	(2B)	Added to 2 sites in lower Prut, including lakes. Possibly sufficient? Not found in MD_CON - UA site on their par of Dniestr river?	SUF?
4009	Phoxinus percnurus/ Rhynchocypris percnurus 6236	BY	BOR	IN MAJ	Consider: lake Borowucha, Reservoir Rudeia and West Biarezina river - Poloczany	2	(2C)	Added to one new site in the North. Is this the only site? Or SR is better, as for BY_CON? 2C1D populations for country suggest that not all sites are covered?	?
4009	Phoxinus percnurus/ Rhynchocypris percnurus 6236	BY	CON	SR	Distribution in Pripyat	2	(1C 1D)	Scientific Reserve has not been obviously resolved? Please update, if there is any new information. CD: please harmosise all records - change to 6236.	SR CD
4009	Phoxinus percnurus/ Rhynchocypris percnurus 6236	UA	CON	IN MIN/SR	Update distribution in E and Central part	18	(5B 10C 3D)	Added to 3 new sites (approx. E and Central parts) and population assessments modified in a number of sites with this species - is this a result of SR? Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
4009	Phoxinus percnurus/ Rhynchocypris percnurus 6236	UA	STE	n/a		1	(1C)	One new site added in the NE of the region. Add to the Reference List, or this is an error?	?
4123	Eudontomyzon danfordi	UA	PAN	IN MOD	Tisza	2	(1C)	Added to Tisza site which is new. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
4125	Alosa immaculata	MD	STE	n/a		2	(2B)	Added to one new and one existing site on Dniester. Add to the Reference List?	?
4126	Alosa maeotica	MD	STE	IN MAJ	Lower Dniestr and 2 more sites	0		No change. Check synonyms - is the expected change as for Alosa immaculata, 4125, linked to this species? Or both species occur in MD? Need coherence with UA reported species.	?
4126	Alosa maeotica	UA	STE	IN MOD	2 sites	18	(16B 2C)	No change. See remark from MD_STE.	IN MOD?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
4127	Alosa tanaica	MD	STE	IN MAJ/IN MIN	Dniestr, Prut, Beleu, Manta	2	(1B 1C)	Added to one new and one existing site in Dniestr. No additions to Prut, Beleu, Manta. Possibly IN MIN, because remaining sites are already designated?	IN MIN?
4127	Alosa tanaica	UA	STE	IN MOD	2 sites	22	(13B 9C)	No change, except deletion from lower Dniepr. Which are the two sites missing?	?
5312	Cobitis arachthosensis	BY	BOR	CD	Error			OK. Sites deleted.	Deleted from RL

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
					Invertebrates				
1013	Vertigo geyeri	BY	BOR	SR REF		0		Any new information? Has there been an attempt to resolve scientific reservation?	?
1013	Vertigo geyeri	UA	CON	IN MAJ		0		No change. Conclusion remains, or this is rather an issue of SR?	?
1014	Vertigo angustior	BY	BOR	IN MAJ	3-4 sites	3	(1A 2B)	Added to 2 new and one existing site. Possibly sufficient if these are only known sites?	SUF?
1014	Vertigo angustior	BY	CON	SR		0		No change. Any new information? Has scientific reserve been resolved?	?
1014	Vertigo angustior	MD	CON	SR		2	(2C)	Added to one existing site. Is this a result of scientific reserve? 2C sites suggest low coverage and that there should be more sites?	?
1014	Vertigo angustior	UA	ALP-Car	IN MAJ		0		No change, no site.	?
1014	Vertigo angustior	UA	CON	IN MOD/CD		4	(2C 2D)	Added to 2 new sites. CD: please revisit population assessments only C and D sites: is this correct? Are these only known sites?	? CD
1014	Vertigo angustior	UA	STE	IN MOD	Dniepropetrovsk, Luhansk	2	(1C 1D)	Added to one new site, which is in NE - approx. Luhansk region. No sites in Dnepropetrovsk?	? CD
1015	Vertigo genesii	BY	BOR	SR REF		0		No site. Any new information?	?
1016	Vertigo moulinsiana	BY	BOR	IN MAJ	3 sites	1	(1B)	One new site added. So 2 more sites can be expected to come? 1B population also suggest that there are more sites?	IN MOD?
1016	Vertigo moulinsiana	BY	CON	SR		0		No site. Any new information?	?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
1016	Vertigo moulinsiana	MD	CON	SR		2	(2C)	Added to one existing site. Is this as aresult of dealing with scientific reservation? 2C populations suggest that there are more locations for species?	?
1016	Vertigo moulinsiana	UA	CON	IN MOD	Volyn	1	(1D)	Added to one site in the NW of the region, probably Volyn. Possibly sufficient, but why the only site has D population?	SUF/CD?
1032	Unio crassus	BY	BOR	IN MOD	e.g. Central part	4	(1A 2C 1D)	One existing A site added in central part. Is species really so rare in BY? But sufficient, if this is true.	SUF ?
1032	Unio crassus	BY	CON	SR	Prypyat, Belovez	2	(1A 1B)	One new and one existing site added, exactly Prypyat and Belovez. Same remark as above: probably sufficient?	SUF ?
1032	Unio crassus	MD	CON	IN MOD/IN MIN		1	(1B)	No change. Conclusion remains?	IN MOD/IN MIN?
1032	Unio crassus	MD	STE	n/a		2	(2B)	Added to two existing sites on Prut. New findings? Add to the Reference List?	SUF?
1032	Unio crassus	UA	ALP-Car	IN MOD/CD		6	(1B 3C 2D)	Added to 4 new sites. Possibly sufficient, yet population assessment suggests low coverage? CD remains?	? CD
1032	Unio crassus	UA	CON	IN MOD/CD		19	(1B 8C 10D)	Added to eleven new sites. Is the distribution so sporadic? Can it be present in more riverine sites, particularly in the North of the region?	?
1032	Unio crassus	UA	PAN	IN MAJ	Latoritsa, Apshytsia, Borrzava, Uzh	0		No change. No site.	IN MAJ?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
1032	Unio crassus	UA	STE	EXCL REF		4	(2C 2D)	Deleted from one reservoir in the south, but added to 2 new sites in NE. Two sites remain on the Black Sea coast. Is this new information? Add to the Reference List? If so, probably sufficient?	?
1037	Ophiogomphus cecilia	BY	BOR	IN MOD		2	(1C 1D)	Added to one new site in the North. Previous note: "Extensive LT, LV populations, sites in Pskov oblast, as well as Dragonflies of Belarus, may suggest that the species is distributed more widely in BY_BOR".	IN MOD?
1037	Ophiogomphus cecilia	BY	CON	IN MOD		7	(7C)	Added to one new and 5 existing sites. Same as above. Previous note: "Red Book indicates more localities (up to 5), mainly in Pripyat catchment, i.e. Southern part of the region". Also not present in N, NW?	IN MOD?
1037	Ophiogomphus cecilia	UA	ALP-Car	IN MIN		10	(2B 8C)	Added to two new sites. Possibly sufficient?	?
1042	Leucorrhinia pectoralis	BY	BOR	IN MOD/IN MIN		8	(7C 1D)	Added to 5 existing and 2 new sites. Still very sporadic - does it reflect actual distribution or current knowledge?	?
1042	Leucorrhinia pectoralis	BY	CON	IN MOD	N part	11	(8C 3D)	Added to 4 existing and 2 new sites, some of them in the N part of the region. Same remark as above: do sites represent the whole range?	?
1042	Leucorrhinia pectoralis	MD	STE	IN MAJ/IN MIN	Lower Dniestr	1	(1B)	Added to one existing site in lower Dniestr. Is this the only known site? Not present in MD_CON?	SUF?
1044	Coenagrion mercuriale	MD	CON	SR REF		0		Has scientific reservation been resolved? Any new data?	?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
1052	Hypodryas maturna/ Euphydryas maturna 6169	BY	BOR	IN MOD/CD	E part. CD for pop.assesment	7	(4C 3D)	Added to one new and 2 existing sites. Two of them in the E part. So sporadic distribution, or poor knowledge? Population assessments suggest low coverage?	?
1052	Hypodryas maturna/ Euphydryas maturna 6169	MD	CON	IN MAJ		2	(2B)	Added to one existing site. Are these only known localities?	?
1052	Hypodryas maturna/ Euphydryas maturna 6169	MD	STE	IN MIN	1 site (Stepa Bugeacului)	1	1B	Added to one existing site, Stepa Bugeacului.	SUF?
1052	Hypodryas maturna/ Euphydryas maturna 6169	UA	PAN	IN MOD/CD		2	(2A)	Added to one new site. Judging from site assessment, this is the only known site?	SUF?
1059	Maculinea teleius/ Phenagris teleius 6177	BY	CON	IN MOD/CD	1 site in N (Kamari?)	11	(2B 6C 3D)	Added to 5 existing and one new site. But not in the North, as in previous conclusion? Please harmonise species names.	IN MOD/CD?
1059	Maculinea teleius/ Phenagris teleius 6177	MD	CON	SR REF		0		Is scientific reserve resolved?	SR REF
1059	Maculinea teleius/ Phenagris teleius 6177	UA	ALP-Car	IN MOD/CD		7	(1A 4B 2D)	Added to one new and 4 existing sites. Deleted from 3 sites. Possibly sufficient, but what was a reason of deletions? Solving CD?	?
1059	Maculinea teleius/ Phenagris teleius 6177	UA	CON	IN MOD/CD		28	(1B 9C 18D)	Added to 2 sites (one new) and deleted from 2 sites. Please clarify what was a reason of deletions? Why so many D sites?	?
1059	Maculinea teleius/ Phenagris teleius 6177	UA	PAN	IN MAJ		2	(1A 1B)	Added to 2 existing sites. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1059	Maculinea teleius/ Phenagris teleius 6177	UA	STE	SR	E part	3	(2C 1D)	One new site added in Kharkiv region (as 6177), but 2 records modified: population assessments have been added (C) in the Eastern part. Are the records on the Azov coast valid? Should SR remain?	?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
1060	Lycaena dispar	BY	BOR	IN MOD/CD		20	(15C 5D)	Added to one new and many existing sites. Now sites generally cover the BY_BOR region. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1060	Lycaena dispar	BY	CON	IN MOD/CD	Central part	31	(25C 6D)	Added to one new and many existing sites, including few in the central part. Now sites generally cover the BY_BOR region. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1060	Lycaena dispar	MD	CON	IN MAJ	1 site	2	(2B)	Added to two existing sites. Present also along UA border (UA has several sites there)? Was it supposed to have also one new site?	?
1060	Lycaena dispar	MD	STE	IN MIN	Nistrul de Jos	2	(2B)	Added to two existing sites, including Nistrul de Jos. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1060	Lycaena dispar	UA	PAN	IN MOD		5	(5C)	Added to 3 new sites. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1061	Maculinea nausithous/6179 Phenagris nausithous	BY	CON	IN MOD	SE	9	(1B 7C 1D)	Added to one new and 4 existing sites, including SE. Possibly sufficient? But please harmonise species name in all records; change to 6179 Phenagris nausithous throughout.	SUF/CD?
1061	Maculinea nausithous/6179 Phenagris nausithous	UA	ALP-Car	IN MOD		4	(2C 2D)	No change.	IN MOD?
1061	Maculinea nausithous/6179 Phenagris nausithous	UA	CON	IN MOD		25	(9C 16D)	No change, except many populations changed from blank to D. Why so many D sites?	IN MOD/ CD?
1061	Maculinea nausithous/6179 Phenagris nausithous	UA	PAN	IN MAJ		0		No change, no site.	IN MAJ?
1065	Euphydryas aurinia	BY	BOR	IN MOD/CD	CD of pop.assesment	4	(3C 1D)	Added to 3 existing sites. Population assessment (combined with CON) still suggests low coverage. Need to a new site (prev. conclusion was IN MOD)?	IN MOD?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
1065	Euphydryas aurinia	BY	CON	IN MOD/CD	1 site	9	(7C 2D)	Added to 4 existing sites. Population assessment (combined with BOR) still suggests low coverage. Need to a new site (prev. conclusion was IN MOD)?	IN MOD?
1065	Euphydryas aurinia	UA	ALP-Car	SR	distribution	4	(1C 3D)	No change, except populations for 2 sites changed from blank to D. Has scientific reserve been addressed? New data?	?
1065	Euphydryas aurinia	UA	CON	IN MOD/CD		11	(2C 9D)	No change, except populations for 8 sites changed from blank to D. Why so many D records?	IN MOD/CD?
1071	Coenonympha oedippus	BY	BOR	n/a		1	(1C)	No change. Is this existing site a valid record? Red book does not expect it in BOR region.	?
1071	Coenonympha oedippus	BY	CON	IN MOD/CD	1 site	11	(7C 4D)	Added to 4 existing sites. Current site proposals match with the localities shown in the Red Book. Possibly sufficient? But please revisit population assessments.	SUF/CD?
1071	Coenonympha oedippus	UA	CON	IN MOD/CD	Chernigiv	12	(5C 7D)	Added to 2 new sites in Lutsk and Zhytomyr. Not in Chernigiv oblast. Conclusion remains? Still high number of D sites.	?
1074	Eriogaster catax	UA	CON	IN MOD	along the border of PL	1	(1C)	No change. Conclusion remains?	IN MOD?
1078	Callimorpha quadripunctaria/ 6199 Eupalagia quadripunctaria	MD	CON	IN MOD/CD		13	(3B 10C)	Added to 5 new and 4 existing sites. Not present in the central part of the region?	?
1078	Callimorpha quadripunctaria/ 6199 Eupalagia quadripunctaria	MD	STE	IN MIN/CD		5	(2B 3C)	Added to one new site. Present in more existing sites?	?
1078	Callimorpha quadripunctaria/ 6199 Eupalagia quadripunctaria	UA	ALP-Car	SR	update distribution	12	(6C 7D)	Added to two new sites. Is this a solution of scientific reserve?	?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
1079	Limoniscus violaceus	UA	ALP-Car	IN MAJ		0		No change, no site.	
1079	Limoniscus violaceus	UA	PAN	IN MAJ		0		No change, no site.	
1081	Dytiscus latissimus	BY	BOR	IN MOD/CD	CD of pop.assesments	5	(2C 3D)	No change.	IN MOD/CD?
1081	Dytiscus latissimus	UA	CON	IN MOD/CD		23	(1A 22D)	Added to one new site. The range, as given in the Red Book, is covered (and more), thus probably sufficient. Please revisit population assessments - many D's!	SUF/CD?
1082	Graphoderus bilineatus	BY	BOR	IN MOD	More sites (~2) in S and N	2	(2D)	No change.	IN MOD?
1082	Graphoderus bilineatus	BY	CON	IN MOD/CD	2 sites	7	(5C 2D)	Added to two existing sites. Any new site still to come (the conclusion was IN MOD)? Population assessments suggest low coverage.	?
1082	Graphoderus bilineatus	UA	CON	SR/CD	CD - pop assessment; SR - update old data distribution	39	(1B 1C 37D)	Is scientific reserve resolved? Added only to one existing site. Still many D sites, need to check population assessments.	SR/CD?
1082	Graphoderus bilineatus	UA	PAN	IN MAJ		0		No change, No site.	IN MAJ?
1082	Graphoderus bilineatus	UA	STE	SR/CD		5	(5D)	No change. Apparently conclusion remains?	SR/CD
1083	Lucanus cervus	MD	STE	IN MOD		7	(5B 2C)	Added to 4 new sites. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1083	Lucanus cervus	UA	ALP-Car	IN MOD/CD		14	(1C 13D)	Added to 3 new sites. Not present in N/NE part?	? CD?
1083	Lucanus cervus	UA	CON	IN MOD/IN MIN/CD		102	(1B 13C 88D)	Added to 37 new sites. Now sites cover the whole region. Could be sufficient, but 88 sites have insignificant populations! Please explain.	?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
1084	Osmoderma eremita / Osmoderma barnabita 5378	BY	BOR	IN MOD/CD		0		The only site has been deleted. Red book still suggests that the species (now as O. barnabita) is present in BY_BOR. Conclusion is now IN MAJ?	IN MAJ?
1084	Osmoderma eremita / Osmoderma barnabita 5378	BY	CON	IN MOD		5	(2C 3D)	Added to one existing site. No new sites (was In MOD), thus conclusion remains? Population assessments also suggest low coverage.	IN MOD?
1084	Osmoderma eremita	MD	CON	SR REF		0		No change, no site. Has scientific reserve been solved?	?
1084	Osmoderma eremita / Osmoderma barnabita 5378	MD	STE	IN MOD/IN MIN		2	(2B)	Added to one existing site. But probably more designation effort has been expected (previous conclusion includes also IN MOD, i.e. A need for a new site)?	?
1084	Osmoderma eremita / Osmoderma barnabita 5378	UA	CON	IN MOD/CD		5	(1C 4D)	Added to one new site which is probably not enough. The whole central part is not covered by current site proposals. According to Red Book, improvements necessary also in south-west and north-east of the region (see connectivity with PL, BY, RU)	IN MOD?
1084	Osmoderma eremita / Osmoderma barnabita 5378	UA	STE	IN MIN	1 site (Samarsky forest)	3	(3D)	Added to one new existing site. Still Samarsky forest missing? All sites are Ds?	IN MIN?
1085	Buprestis splendens	BY	CON	SR REF		0		Deleted from the site. Does that mean that scientific reserve concluded to delete species from the Reference List?	?
1086	Cucujus cinnaberinus	BY	BOR	IN MOD	2 more sites	1	(1D)	Changes in opposite direction than previous conclusion. Deleted from one site and 1D site remaining. Is this based on any new information? Please explain.	?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
1086	Cucujus cinnaberinus	BY	CON	IN MOD/CD		3	(1C 2D)	No change. Conclusion remains, including and obvious need to review population assessments.	In MOD/CD?
1086	Cucujus cinnaberinus	MD	CON	IN MOD/CD	1 site	2	(2B)	Added to one existing site, but previous conclusion obviously expected adding a new site? Are these only known locations in the country? 2B (=4-30%) suggest that there could be more?	?
1086	Cucujus cinnaberinus	UA	ALP-Car	IN MOD/CD	in NW part	6	(6D)	No change. All sites with 'D' populations are very confusing. There are, however, one PL, one SK and one RO site in the neighbouring areas in Carpathians.	IN MOD/CD?
1086	Cucujus cinnaberinus	UA	CON	IN MIN/CD	N part	22	(22D)	Added to 3 new sites which are marginal with STE in the eastern part. No change in the N part. Conclusion remains? Please revisit population assessments.	IN MIN/CD
1086	Cucujus cinnaberinus	UA	PAN	SR REF	connectivity with Natura 2000	0		No change, no site. Has scientific reserve been solved?	?
1086	Cucujus cinnaberinus	UA	STE	n/a		3	(1B 2D)	Added to 2 new and one existing site. Are these additions correct? The species was considered to be absent from UA_STE? Also the existing site seems to be a reservoir?	?
1087	Rosalia alpina	MD	CON	IN MOD	1 site	3	(1B 2C)	Added to one existing site. Should the addition concern a new site? 1B 2C suggest a low population coverage. Are there other sites known for this species?	IN MOD?
1087	Rosalia alpina	UA	ALP-Car	IN MOD		18	(2C 16D)	Added to 3 new sites. Possibly sufficient unless the western part can be considered a gap? Population assessments doubtful - many D's.	? CD

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
1087	Rosalia alpina	UA	CON	SR	update distribution	5	(1C 4D)	Added to 3 new sites marginal to other regions. Is this in connection with the scientific reserve? Any new information available?	?
1087	Rosalia alpina	UA	PAN	SR	update distribution	2	(2D)	No change. Has scientific reserve been solved? New information?	?
1088	Cerambyx cerdo	BY	CON	IN MIN/CD	1 site mid Prypyat	4	(1C 3D)	Added to one existing site (mid Pripyat) and deleted from one site. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
1088	Cerambyx cerdo	MD	CON	IN MOD/CD		7	(4B 3C)	Added to 3 existing sites. Derjanshi et al. (2012), suggest distribution in the centre of the MD_CON? Also, the previous conclusion was In MOD (no changes in existing site area)?	?
1088	Cerambyx cerdo	MD	STE	EXCL REF		1	(1C)	Added to one new site. Is this a valid record? Add to the Reference List?	?
1088	Cerambyx cerdo	UA	CON	IN MOD/CD		72	(5C 67D)	Added to 13 new sites. Distribution has substantially improved. Possibly sufficient?	SUF/CD?
1088	Cerambyx cerdo	UA	PAN	IN MOD/CD		3	(3D)	Added to one new site. Possibly sufficient?	SUF/CD?
1088	Cerambyx cerdo	UA	STE	IN MIN/CD	Khakovsky reserve	37	(3C 34D)	Added to 14 new and existing sites, including Kharkovsky reserve. Sufficient, but check population assessments.	SUF/CD?
1089	Morimus funereus	MD	CON	IN MOD/CD	5 sites	8	(4B 4C)	Added to 2 existing sites. Previous conclusion has a reference to 5 and new sites?	?
1089	Morimus funereus	MD	STE	IN MIN	1 site (Lower Dniestr)	0		No change, no site. Conclusion remains?	IN MIN?
1920	Boros schneideri	BY	BOR	IN MOD	W part	6	(4C 2D)	Added to one new and one existing site, yet the new site is in the north (eastern) part. More sites to be expected (assessments suggest a low coverage).	?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
1920	Boros schneideri	BY	CON	SR	Central part	8	(2B 3C 3D)	Added to one new and one existing site. No change in the centre. Thus is scientific reserve resolved?	?
1920	Boros schneideri	UA	CON	SR	check old data	32	(32D)	No change. Is scientific reserve resolved (about old data)? Revisit population assessments.	? CD
1920	Boros schneideri	UA	STE	n/a		1	(1D)	One site remains, but it is partly continental.	n/a
1923	Mesosa myops	BY	BOR	SR				Deleted from the remaining site. Is this a solution of scientific reserve?	?
1924	Oxyporus mannerheimii	BY	BOR	SR				Deleted from the remaining site. Is this a solution of scientific reserve?	?
1926	Stephanopachys linearis	BY	BOR	SR		0		No change, no site. Any new information? Scientific reserve remains?	?
1927	Stephanopachys substriatus	BY	BOR	SR		0		No change, no site. Any new information? Scientific reserve remains?	?
4011	Bolbelasmus unicornis	MD	CON	n/a		2	(2B)	Added to 2 existing sites. Add to the Reference List? Indeed, there are few RO sites close to the border with MD	SUF?
4011	Bolbelasmus unicornis	MD	STE	IN MAJ	1 site	1	(1B)	Added to one existing site. Sufficient, if these are only known sites? But then at least one of them (together with CON sites) should have A population?	?
4011	Bolbelasmus unicornis	UA	STE	IN MOD/IN MIN/SR	IN MIN: 1 site. SR: elsewhere	2	(2D)	No change. Conclusion remains?	IN MOD/IN MIN/SR?
4012	Carabus hampei	UA	ALP-Car	IN MIN/CD		6	(6D)	Added to 3 new sites. Possibly sufficient, but check population estimates.	SUF?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
4012	Carabus hampei	UA	PAN	IN MAJ		3	(3D)	Added to 3 new sites. Possibly sufficient, but check population estimates.	SUF?
4013	Carabus hungaricus	MD	CON	IN MIN	1 site (Kodri?)	2	(2C)	Added to 2 existing sites, including Codru. Sufficient?	SUF?
4013	Carabus hungaricus	UA	STE	IN MOD/CD		37	(1B 36D)	Added to 24 new and existing sites combined. Possibly sufficient. Still population assessments difficult to understand: what is the difference between one B site (UA0000008) and all other D sites?	SUF?
4014	Carabus variolosus	MD	CON	IN MOD	4 sites	4	(1B 3C)	Added to 3 existing sites (4 sites now altogether). Are these only sites; 1B3C suggest that no? Or population assessments need to be revisited?	?
4020	Pilemia tigrina	UA	CON	SR REF		3	(3D)	No change. Any new information for consideration?	?
4020	Pilemia tigrina	UA	PAN	SR REF		2	(2D)	No change. Any new information for consideration?	?
4021	Phryganophilus ruficollis	BY	BOR	SR		0		No site, no change. Any new information?	?
4021	Phryganophilus ruficollis	BY	CON	SR REF		0		No site, no change. Any new information?	?
4021	Phryganophilus ruficollis	UA	STE	n/a		1	(1D)	No change. The site is UA0000096, probably wrong region record in the tabular database. (see also 1926 above).	SUF/CD?
4022	Probaticus subrugosus	UA	STE	SR	check Zaporozje	28	(28D)	Added to 7 existing sites, but not exactly in Zaporozje. Is this change a solution of scientific reserve or more sites to come? CD: population assessments.	CD ?
4026	Rhysodes sulcatus	BY	CON	IN MAJ		2	(2C)	Added to 2 existing sites. Are these only sites in the region? 2C suggest low coverage? 3 locations according to Red Book.	?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
4026	Rhysodes sulcatus	UA	ALP-Car	IN MIN	Connectivity with Natura 2000	0		No change, no site.	IN MIN?
4026	Rhysodes sulcatus	UA	CON	IN MOD/CD		8	(1C 7D)	Added to one new site. IUCN map suggests distribution all along western, north-western and northern border of the region. Also some Natura 2000 sites in Poland suggests a need for continuous habitat.	IN MOD?
4027	Arytrura musculus	BY	CON	IN MIN	2 sites	0		No change.	IN MIN?
4027	Arytrura musculus	UA	CON	IN MAJ		0		No change.	IN MAJ?
4027	Arytrura musculus	UA	STE	IN MAJ	Harkovska, Luhanska, Dniepropetrovska oblasts	0		No change.	IN MAJ?
4028	Catopta thrips	MD	STE	SR	check data	0		No change, no site. Has scientific reserve been solved?	?
4028	Catopta thrips	UA	ALP-Car	SR REF		4	(4D)	No change. Any new information?	?
4030	Colias myrmidone	BY	CON	IN MOD		6	(6C)	Added to 4 existing sites. But no new sites. More sites in the southern part? 6C suggests low coverage?	?
4030	Colias myrmidone	MD	CON	IN MIN	1 site	1	(1B)	Added to one existing site (upper Dniestr). Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
4030	Colias myrmidone	MD	STE	SR REF		0		No change, no site. Has SR been resolved? Any new information?	?
4030	Colias myrmidone	UA	ALP-Car	EXCL REF		2	(1C 1D)	Previous conclusion was to exclude from the Reference List. But added to a new site, however, this site extends into CON region. Occurs in the ALP part of the site?	?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
4030	Colias myrmidone	UA	CON	IN MOD/CD		41	(3C 38D)	Added to 3 new sites. Previous assessment suggested a need for possible improvements, e.g., in the south-centre and north-east of the region. One site was added in north-east. More sites to come? CD: population assessments.	? CD?
4030	Colias myrmidone	UA	STE	IN MOD	Harkov, Luhansk oblasts	3	(3D)	Added to one site in Donetsk region, but not in any of regions previously mentioned (Harkov, Luhansk). Conclusion remains?	IN MOD?
4032	Dioszeghyana schmidtii	UA	PAN	SR REF		0		No change, no site. Any new information?	?
4035	Gortyna borelii lunata	UA	PAN	SR REF		0		No change, no site. Any new information?	?
4036	Leptidea morsei	MD	CON	IN MOD/CD	6 sites	2	(1B 1C)	Added to one existing site.	IN MOD/CD?
4036	Leptidea morsei	UA	ALP-Car	SR/CD	SR - check identification	7	(7D)	No change. Any new information, remarks about identification problems, reviews? CD: check population assessments.	?
4036	Leptidea morsei	UA	CON	IN MOD/CD		19	(19D)	No change. CD: check population assessments.	IN MOD/CD?
4036	Leptidea morsei	UA	PAN	IN MAJ		0		No change. Is the adding to the Reference List problematic and rather this case can be attributed to SR?	IN MAJ?
4036	Leptidea morsei	UA	STE	IN MOD	Doneck oblast	2	(2D)	No change, i.e. in Donetsk oblast.	IN MOD?
4038	Lycaena helle	BY	BOR	IN MAJ	1 site (Berezensky)	1	(1C)	No change (not added to Berezensky).	IN MAJ?
4038	Lycaena helle	BY	CON	IN MAJ	2 sites	3	(1B 2C)	Added to 3 existing sites. Possibly sufficient?	SUF?
4038	Lycaena helle	UA	CON	IN MOD/CD		5	(5D)	No change. Please revisit population assessments.	IN MOD/CD?
4039	Nymphalis vaualbum	BY	BOR	SR		0		No change, no site. Has scientific reserve been resolved?	?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
4042	Polyommatus eroides	BY	CON	SR		0		No change, no site. Has scientific reserve been resolved?	?
4042	Polyommatus eroides	UA	STE	EXCL REF/CD		2	(1C 1D)	Still one new site added, which does not conform to previous conclusion. Is this an an error or a result of a new study? Also, it remains in the other one site.	?
4043	Pseudophilotes bavius	UA	CON	SR REF		0		No change, no site. Any new information?	?
4043	Pseudophilotes bavius	UA	STE	IN MIN/CD	1 site	17	(17D)	Added to one existing and one new site. Possibly sufficient, but check population assessments.	SUF/CD?
4045	Coenagrion ornatum	BY	CON	SR/CD		1	(1D)	No change. One D site remains. Has the decision been taken about the Reference List?	?
4045	Coenagrion ornatum	MD	CON	SR	Check old data	0		No change, no sites. Any new information?	?
4045	Coenagrion ornatum	MD	STE	SR		1	(1C)	Added to one new site. But it's location does not conform with information earlier supplied by MD authorities which was in in SE part of the region. So is this the only site? The C category does not suggest so?	?
4045	Coenagrion ornatum	UA	STE	IN MAJ/IN MIN		4	(2B 2D)	Added to 2 new and 2 existing sites. Is this correct? Possibly sufficient if these are only known sites. Very sparsely distributed.	SUF?
4050	Isophya stysi	UA	ALP-Car	IN MAJ		0		No change, no sites.	IN MAJ?
4050	Isophya stysi	UA	PAN	IN MAJ		0		No change, no sites.	IN MAJ?
4052	Odontopodisma rubripes	UA	ALP-Car	IN MAJ		0		No change, no sites.	IN MAJ?
4052	Odontopodisma rubripes	UA	PAN	IN MAJ		0		No change, no sites.	IN MAJ?

Code	Species Name	iso	bio geo	Final Conclusion previous	Final Comments previous	pASCI 2018	population assessment 2018	Draft Conclusion Comments 2019	Draft Conclusion 2019
4053	Paracaloptenus caloptenoides	MD	CON	EXCL REF		1	(1B)	Added to one new site. New information?	?
4053	Paracaloptenus caloptenoides	MD	STE	SR		1	(1B)	Added to one existing site. Is this a result of solution of scientific reserve? 2Bs (as reported) for the whole country suggest more locations?	?
4054	Pholidoptera transsylvanica	UA	ALP-Car	IN MAJ		0		No change, no sites.	IN MAJ?
4054	Pholidoptera transsylvanica	UA	PAN	IN MAJ		0		No change, no sites.	IN MAJ?
4055	Stenobothrus eurasius	MD	STE	SR		0		No change, no sites. Any new information?	?
4055	Stenobothrus eurasius	UA	STE	IN MAJ		0		No change, no sites.	IN MAJ
4056	Anisus vorticulus	BY	BOR	IN MAJ	1 site (Drsvjati ozero)	0		No change.	IN MAJ?
4056	Anisus vorticulus	BY	CON	SR REF	Belovez			No change. Any assessment of Belovez?	SR REF?
4056	Anisus vorticulus	UA	CON	IN MAJ		4	(3C 1D)	Added to 4 new sites, SE. Does this cover the actual distribution range?	?
4056	Anisus vorticulus	UA	PAN	SR REF		0		No site, no change.	?
4056	Anisus vorticulus	UA	STE	EXCL REF		2	(1C 1D)	Added to 2 sites which are entirely in STE region. Error, or any other explanation of this?	?
4064	Theodoxus transversalis	MD	CON	n/a		1	(1B)	Added to one existing site (Prut). Thus to add to the Reference List and sufficient?	SUF?
4064	Theodoxus transversalis	MD	STE	IN MIN	Prut	3	(3B)	Added to the existing lower Prut site. Sufficient?	SUF?