



Strasbourg, 7 October 2025

T-PVS/Inf(2024)38

CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE
AND NATURAL HABITATS

**Discussion paper on the implications of new fields of the
updated Emerald Network Standard Data Form (SDF)**

*Document prepared by
Laura-Patricia Gavilán Iglesias and Marc Roekaerts*

Introduction

The mission of the Bern Convention is to ensure that wild flora, fauna and habitats are maintained or restored to a favourable conservation status. Parties to the Convention have committed to strengthening investment in conservation and to ensure that the management of the Emerald Network meets the needs of the habitats and species it protects.

In this context, the current revision of the Emerald Network Standard Data Form (SDF) responds to two main objectives:

- the need to monitor progress towards the redefined goals and targets of the Emerald Network to 2030; and
- the need to keep data standards up to date, ensuring compatibility with renewed dataflow principles and the Reportnet 3 data delivery platform.

The proposed new and updated fields in the SDF will enable Parties to report the information needed for:

- better information on site management;
- filling critical information gaps (such as conservation objectives, measures and management effectiveness); and
- improving the quality and reliability of Emerald Network data.

These changes are fully aligned with the Strategic Plan of the Bern Convention and the Convention's overarching mission, providing the data necessary to calculate and update some indicators of the Strategic Plan, and to respond effectively to forthcoming biodiversity commitments under other international agreements.

This discussion paper builds on the informative document T-PVS/PA(2024)20 presented to the last Standing Committee as demanded by the 14th meeting of the Group of Experts on Protected Areas and Ecological Networks. It explores in more detail the implications of the proposed revision of the SDF, proposes a categorization of the changes according to their potential impact on efforts required from countries to collect and report the new information (low, medium and high), and presents options regarding the optional or compulsory nature of the new fields and adaptation periods.

Overview of the main proposed changes to the Standard Data Form

The recently adopted Natura 2000 Standard Data Form serves as the basis for updating the current fields of the Emerald Network Standard Data Form (SDF). The proposed changes aim to:

1. provide more robust information for the **indicators** defined in the Strategic Plan;
2. improve **data quality** and reliability;
3. clarify concepts frequently misinterpreted by Contracting Parties;
4. streamline reporting on conservation status under **Resolution No. 8 (2012)**;
5. maintain alignment with **Natura 2000** data;
6. support reporting on new **environmental commitments**; and
7. ensure full compatibility with the new **Reportnet 3** dataflow.

The proposed update of the Emerald SDF introduces four types of modifications:

- **Addition of new fields** (highlighted in light orange in the Annex);
- **Deletion of outdated fields** (not shown in the Annex);
- **Update of existing fields** (highlighted in green in the Annex); and
- **Fields not applicable to the Emerald Network** but present in the Natura 2000 SDF (highlighted in orange, with the note "Not applicable for the Emerald Network").

Most changes occur in the Ecological Information and Site Management sections. These contain the data most needed to fulfil the requirements of the Bern Convention's Strategic Plan and contribute to the reporting under Resolution No.8 (2012). As a result, more precise information will be requested.

For example:

- Dates of surveys and methods used to estimate habitat coverage or species populations will now be required, enabling experts to assess the quality of ecological information
- Identification the areas with good or non-good condition for each habitat type
- Description of the method used to assess the degree of conservation
- Conservation objectives will be expressed in a clearer way
- Conservation measures section becomes compulsory to enable evaluation of site management effectiveness and tracking the implementation of measures.

Discussion of changes implications field-by-field

Implications can be defined as technical and/or content-related. As previously informed, the European Environment Agency (EEA) will not maintain the current Reportnet 2 platform (Central Data Repository) soon because more performant data collection system, Reportnet 3, is already working for the collection of environmental data in Europe. In the case of the collection of Natura 2000 data, the schemas implemented correspond to the new Natura 2000 SDF. As a consequence, if the proposed update of the Emerald Network SDF is not implemented, significant implications for data collection and reporting will arise in the near future.

Although the CDR may remain accessible until 2029, it will not be possible to upload new files once the dataflow is opened in Reportnet 3, and the (Emerald) SDF manager will no longer be maintained after the new Emerald SDF enters into force.

Regarding content-related effects, they will depend on the level of national effort required to collect and/or report new data. **Low implication** coincides with optional fields, fields that have been re-organized, so, the information demanded was previously reported or they are filled in automatically. Changes with **medium implications** refer to those for which the information demanded is easy to report (for instance, dates or fields with pre-defined options), data already provided in the previous SDF or request information supposed to be considered by site managers. Eventually, changes entailing **high implications** correspond to fields requesting new information, that usually imply additional data collection, processing and reporting.

Detailed explanations of the expected workload for each added, deleted or updated field are provided below.

Addition of new fields:

1.3.1 Site name non-Latin alphabet (optional): not significant implications since the field is optional and does not concern all Contracting Parties; it is up to concerned Countries to add (or not) the name of their ASCI in non-Latin alphabet.

1.5.7 Emerald Site Status: no implications since this field will be automatically filled during the creation of a new release. Proposed, Candidate and Adopted sites will be indicated in an automatic way, no action required from countries.

2.1.2 Reason for area difference with spatial dataset (if any): to be filled in when the area in field 2.1.1 differs from the area in the spatial dataset. Although it is a new field, the implications are considered medium since this field does not need to be completed systematically and in addition, there are pre-defined options established.

2.1.3 Reason for area difference – explanations: area difference can be further explained in this field, specially when the category “Other” has been selected. Medium implications because it is a new field requiring free text.

3.1.6 Method used for habitat’s cover: provide information on the method used to calculate the data cover reported for habitat types (3.1.4). This field will inform on the reliability of 3.1.4. Medium

implication for Contracting Parties since they only need to choose one of the three pre-defined options.

3.1.7 Period of last data collection for a habitat type: this field requests further information regarding how recent the assessment of the habitat is. The data is important for evaluators since it informs on reliability of data. It has medium implication since from now, countries will need to fill in the date of the last survey; nevertheless, reporting this date as “unknown” is also possible.

3.1.8 Habitat type significance: no significant impact since the concept was already included in the past. D occurrences for habitats used to be considered as non-significant and were reported under the field “Representativity”. Now the country will indicate this information, separately, in this new field.

3.1.11 Relative surface explanations (optional): additional information on habitat’s relative surface. No significant implication since it is an optional field. For instance, countries might want to report the exact proportion of the habitat area in the site regarding the total area covered by the habitat type within the national territory.

3.1.12.1 Degree of conservation of a habitat– categorised: not significant impact for this new field since this information was already covered by the previous field “Degree of conservation”. Pre-defined options correspond to the previous A-B-C possibilities, but in addition, countries are allowed to report the degree of conservation as “unknown”.

3.1.12.2 Degree of conservation – area: this new field demands information previously not reported. As result, it has significant repercussion since the area in good condition and not-good condition is requested in ha. This field provides excellent basis information for the preparation of management plans and potentially for addressing restoration/conservation efforts. In addition, this information streamlines Resolution No. 8 (2012) reporting of the conservation status of Resolution No. 4 (1996) habitats and Resolution No.6 species (1998).

3.1.12.3 Degree of conservation – method used: this new field demands information previously not reported on the method used to evaluate the area of a habitat in good and non-good condition. This information streamlines with Resolution No. 8 (2012) reporting, helping to report the conservation status of habitats included in the Emerald Network sites. As the options are predefined, the impact is assessed as medium, “no data available” is an option.

3.1.13 Conservation objectives: this new field demands information previously not reported as such. Nevertheless, it has a medium implication because conservation objectives and actions are usually considered by site managers and included in management plans. In case management plans have not yet been prepared for the site, the exercise of reporting conservation objectives and actions will positively contribute to the establishment of base-line information for management plans.

3.1.14 Conservation objectives – explanations: this field collects additional information on the conservation objectives indicated in field 3.1.13, especially when the option “Other” conservation objectives has been indicated. It has a medium implication since the country should provide further information specially when “other” conservation objectives is indicated.

3.1.16 Update date for habitat’s information: this field is needed to clarify when the ecological information on each habitat has been updated. It has not got a significant implication since no investment is required, nevertheless, the implication is considered as medium because countries need to report a date.

3.2.9 Method used for population size: provide information on the type of method used for calculating the species’ population size (3.2.7.1). This new field is useful for assessors because it provides information on data reliability and quality. No significant repercussions for Contracting Parties since species population was already requested by the previous SDF, they only need to choose one of the four pre-defined options, and report “no data available” is also a possibility. The

implication is considered as medium.

3.2.10 Period of last data collection for a species: this field provides information on when species' data was collected. It contributes to data quality, informing assessors on recentness of data (and therefore relevance of population data). It has medium implication because countries only need to fill in the date of the last survey and reporting this date as "unknown" is also possible.

3.2.11 Species significance: no significant impact since the concept was already included in the past under "population". D population occurrences for species and habitats used to be considered as non-significant. Now the country will indicate it separately in this new field.

3.2.14 Population – explanations (optional): additional information on population size. This field can be used to provide more precise information on the proportion of the species' population at site level, in comparison with the national population of the species. No significant implication since it is an optional field.

3.2.15.1 Degree of conservation of a species– categorised: not significant impact for this new field since this information was already covered by the previous field "Degree of conservation" of the species. Pre-defined options correspond to the previous A-B-C possibilities, but in addition, countries are allowed to report the degree of conservation as "unknown".

3.2.15.2 Degree of conservation of a species – occupied area (optional): no significant impact for this new field since this information is optional. Nevertheless, it is recommended to fill it because it provides useful information for the quality of the area occupied by the species within the Emerald Network, thus contributing to Resolution No. 8 (2012) report and providing baseline information for the preparation of the management plan.

3.2.15.3 Degree of conservation of a species – occupied percentage classes: this new field demands significant information previously not reported, it requests information of the quality of the habitat occupied by Resolution No.6 (1998) species. Impact on the inclusion of this new field in the SDF is evaluated as high. Nevertheless, an exact value is not requested, but there are percentage classes to report the proportion of occupied habitat with sufficient or non-sufficient quality. This information streamlines with Resolution No. 8 (2012) reporting, aiding to report the conservation status of species occurring in the Emerald Network and representing baseline information for management plans.

3.2.16 Conservation objectives: this new field demands information previously not reported as such. Nevertheless, it has a medium implication because conservation objectives and actions are usually considered by site managers and included in management plans, so they don't represent completely new data to be gathered. In addition, pre-defined options are proposed.

3.2.17 Conservation objectives – explanations: additional information on conservation objectives for Resolution No. 6 (1998) species can be reported here, especially when "Other" conservation objectives were indicated in 3.2.16. It has a medium implication because it consists of information usually included in management plans and it should be filled in when "Other" conservation objective has been indicated.

4.3.2 Rank of the pressure: it provides information on the impact of pressures on the site: high, medium, low importance. No significant implications since the concept was already included in the past (in the old field 4.3 Threats, pressures and activities with impact on the site).

4.3.3 Location inside/outside: no significant implications since the concept of the location of the pressure was already included in the past (in the old field 4.3 Threats, pressures and activities with impact on the site), although rarely addressed. It is now presented as a distinct field.

4.3.4 Pressure further detailed: additional information on pressures. For instance, provide information with respect to the habitat and/or species the pressure is acting on, or if there are

impacting projects or plans going on. Medium implications for contracting parties, depending on the level of detail they want to report.

4.3.5 Update date (pressures): to indicate when the pressures on the site were last updated. Medium implication in adding this date.

4.4.2 Update date (documentation): to indicate when the documentation of the site has been updated. Medium implication in adding this date.

5.2.3 Further explanations on management plans: if a management plan does not exist and is also not in preparation further explanation should be provided in this field. Medium implications for Contracting Parties, depending on the level of detail they want to report.

5.3.1 Detailed information on measures: medium/high implications for Contracting Parties because this field contains pre-defined options: conservation measures are included in management plans: “yes” or “no”, and if “yes” in which documents. Further explanations on detailed conservation measures should be provided. Currently, conservation measures are an optional field in Emerald Network SDF.

5.3.2 Status of conservation measures: medium implications for Contracting Parties because this field contains pre-defined options to determine whether measures are established and, in the case, they are, whether they are implemented.

5.4 Management effectiveness: medium implications for Contracting Parties because this field contains pre-defined options to inform if the effectiveness of measures is assessed (yes/no/unknown).

Deletion of old fields

2.1 Site centre location: no longer needed since this field is not used in the list of candidates or adopted Emerald Network sites. Low implications.

2.4 Site length (optional): no longer needed. Low implications.

3.1 Habitat type data quality: this information can be deduced from the new field 3.1.6 Method used for cover. No implications.

3.2 Species data quality: this information can be deduced from the new field 3.2.9 Method used for population size. No implications.

4.4 Ownership (optional): information no longer needed. Low implications.

5. Site protection status (optional): this section has been completely removed from the new SDF. The information that used to be reported in fields “5.1 Protection status at national and regional level” and “5.2 Relation of the described site with other sites” can be obtained from other data sources such as the inventory of nationally designated areas (CDDA) for EIONET countries and from the “Protected Planet¹” database of UNEP-WCMC for non-EIONET countries. The impact is low since the report of this information was optional.

Update of existing fields

3.1.3 Non-presence of a Resolution No. 4 (1996) habitat: this field was optional and interpreted differently by countries. The new pre-defined options for this field aid to clarify if the habitat type was never present on the site or is no longer present. The update of this field has positive effects for data quality. The implications of the change are considered medium because the field is optional in the current version of the Emerald Network SDF and it will become compulsory although it is proposed a pre-defined field.

¹ [Explore the World's Protected Areas](#)

3.1.10 Relative surface: the A relative surface has been split into four intervals because in the past it was rather large (between 100%-15% of the national area of the habitat). The A1, A2, A3 and A4 are addressed to provide more precise data. The implication is high since countries will need to re-calculate the required percentage for habitat types with A relative surface to reclassified as A1, A2, A3 or A4.

3.2.5 Non-presence of Resolution No. 6 (1998) species: this field was optional and interpreted differently by countries. The new pre-defined options aid to clarify if the species was never present on the site or is no longer present. The update of this field has positive effects for data quality. The implications of the change are considered medium because the field is optional in the current version of the Emerald Network SDF and it will become compulsory although it is proposed a pre-defined field.

3.2.13 Population: the A population has been split into four intervals A1, A2, A3 and A4 because the old A interval used to be rather large (between 100%-15% of the national population of the species). The new interval A1, A2, A3 and A4 will provide more precise data. The implication is high since countries will need to re-calculate the required percentage for species with A population.

3.3.8 Motivation for the inclusion of other important species of flora and fauna: this field has pre-defined options. Low implication since this section remains optional. The possibility of pointing out invasive alien species of Bern Convention concern is an option, what can be beneficial for management purposes.

5.2.1 Existence of management plans(s): more options beyond “no / yes / in preparation” have been included to report more precise information. Low implication since the information was previously reported in the past and there are pre-defined options.

5.2.2 Reference and validity of the management plan(s): additional information is demanded, including the validity dates of the management plan. The validity of the management plan is essential data for assessors and site’s managers. This updated field has medium implication for countries because they are requested to provide extra information: url and validity dates.

6.1 INSPIRE identifier: new field included in the new section of the SDF “6. Geospatial representation of the site”, which will replace the old section “7. Map of the site”. For EIONET countries, it should be provided by the INSPIRE data provider of each country. Since not all Contracting Parties implement the INSPIRE directive, this section should be proposed as optional in the Emerald Network SDF; as a result, the implication of this new field is foreseen as low.

6.1.1 Namespace: new field included in the new section of the SDF “6. Geospatial representation of the site”. This field corresponds to the Namespace as defined by the national INSPIRE implementation. Since not all Contracting Parties implement the INSPIRE directive, this section should be proposed as optional in the Emerald Network SDF; as a result, the implication of this new field is foreseen as low.

6.1.2 Local identifier: new field included in the new section of the SDF “6. Geospatial representation of the site”. This field corresponds to the local identifier as defined by the national INSPIRE implementation and must be unique within the namespace. Since not all Contracting Parties implement the INSPIRE directive, this section should be proposed as optional in the Emerald Network SDF; as a result, the implication of this new field is foreseen as low.

6.1.3 Version identifier (optional): new field included in the new section of the SDF “6. Geospatial representation of the site”. It corresponds to the identifier of the particular version of the spatial object. It has been defined as optional in the updated Natura 2000 SDF. Nevertheless, the entire section 6 is provided as optional in the update of the Emerald Network SDF.

Fields not applicable to the Emerald Network

These fields are not demanded and will be disabled during the reporting process. They are shown to maintain the same numbering and structure as the Natura 2000 SDF to facilitate the reporting in Reportnet 3. They are: 3.1.2 Priority form of a habitat type and 3.2.12 (Bird) Species meeting ornithological criteria for SPA classification.

No implications to be foreseen, so they have not been considered on the table below.

Table 1 summarizes the impact of the above-mentioned fields:

LOW IMPLICATION	MEDIUM IMPLICATION	HIGH IMPLICATION
1.3.1 Site name non-Latin alphabet	2.1.2 Reason for area difference with spatial dataset	3.1.10 Relative surface
1.5.7 Emerald Site Status	2.1.3 Reasons for area difference-explanations	3.1.12.2 Degree of conservation – area
2.1 Site centre location	3.1.3 Non-presence of a Resolution No. 4 habitat	3.2.13 Population
2.4 Site length (optional)	3.1.6 Method used for habitat’s cover	3.2.15.3 Degree of conservation of a species – occupied percentage classes
3.1 Habitat type data quality	3.1.7 Period of last data collection for a habitat type	
3.1.8 Habitat type significance	3.1.12.3 Degree of conservation – method used	
3.1.11 Relative surface explanations (optional)	3.1.13 Conservation objectives	
3.1.12.1 Degree of conservation of a habitat–categorised	3.1.14 Conservation objectives-explanations	
3.2 Species data quality	3.1.16 Update date for habitat’s information	
3.2.11 Species significance	3.2.5 Non-presence of Resolution No. 6 species	
3.2.14 Population – explanations (optional)	3.2.9 Method used for population size	
3.2.15.1 Degree of conservation of a species–categorised:	3.2.10 Period of last data collection for a species	
3.2.15.2 Degree of conservation of a species – occupied area (optional)	3.2.16 Conservation objectives	

3.3.8 Motivation for the inclusion of other important species of flora and fauna	3.2.17 Conservation objectives – explanations	
4.3.2 Rank of the pressure	4.3.4 Pressure further detailed	
4.3.3 Location inside/outside	4.3.5 Update date (pressures)	
4.4 Ownership (optional)	4.4.2 Update date (documentation)	
5. Site protection status (optional)	5.2.2 Reference and validity of the management plan	
5.2.1 Existence of management plans(s)	5.2.3 Further explanations on management plans	
6.1 INSPIRE identifier	5.3.1 Detailed information on measures	
6.1.1 Namespace	5.3.2 Status of conservation measures	
6.1.2 Local identifier	5.4 Management effectiveness	
6.1.3 Version identifier (optional)		

Discussion on changes with medium and high implications:

Most of the changes are classified as low impact changes. The discussion of these fields is considered as not relevant since they don't have additional consequences for Contracting Parties. Nevertheless, it is worth informing of the decision to propose section 6 Geospatial representation of the site of the new SDF as optional to minimise the impact on non-EIONET countries which don't implement the INSPIRE directive. In addition, the section 5 Site Protection Status (optional) of the current SDF will be completely removed to avoid double reporting, in the case of EIONET countries, the information reported in fields 5.1 Protection status at national and regional level and 5.2 Relation of the described site with other sites is already included in NatDA (former CDDA European inventory of nationally designated protected areas); for non-EIONET countries, this information is usually reported to UNEP-WCMC/Protected planet database.

Regarding the consequences of new fields or updated fields classified as medium or high impact, they vary from those fields requiring collection of new data for which an investment in inventories is needed to those demanding data already available or recalculations. Additionally, the design of the field is equally considered since those fields expressed using pre-defined options or intervals are easier to complete than fields asking for exact figures or free text.

At the top of the ranking of most demanding fields, we find the field **Degree of conservation- area**, asking for the hectares of Resolution No.4 (1996) habitat type in good condition, non-good condition or unknown condition within the site. While this information may be available in some existing management plans when it is not available, surveys should be ideally planned to monitor and measure the conservation degree. Nevertheless, extrapolation from a limited amount of data or expert judgment to calculate the area in good and not good condition is also possible and eventually, surface area of the

habitat type can be indicated under unknown conditions. This field is proposed as compulsory because it will be beneficial to define conservation objectives and will provide excellent information on the conservation status of Resolution No. 4 habitat types (1996) within the Emerald Network sites as demanded in Resolution No.8 (1992). In addition, it constitutes a source of information for target 1.1 (a) Trend in extent and condition of selected habitat and ecosystem types and 1.4 Contribution of the Emerald Network to the conservation status of habitats (see below at the end of this section).

Below, we can find the updated fields **Relative Surface** for habitats and **Population** for species, which demand a more limited level of effort. Former A category has been split into four categories: A1 (100-75%), A2 (75-50%), A3(50-25%) and A4 (25-15%), requiring recalculation of percentage of habitat's area in the site in relation to the national coverage. Although less resource-intensive than surveys, this recalculation demands recalibration of previously reported data and in some cases, re-evaluation of the reference national area if it changed.

In the following block of effort, the **degree of conservation of the habitat occupied by the species** requires an estimation for the proportion of a species' habitat that has sufficient, non-sufficient or unknown condition. Exact hectare figures are not required, nevertheless, Parties must still achieve a clear understanding of habitat quality to provide reliable estimates. This new field constitutes baseline information for setting conservation objectives, and it may be used as source of data for the indicator 2.1. Conservation status of the species, especially for countries not involved in the reporting under Resolution No.8 (2012).

Descending in the level of effort, the fields of section 5.3 **Conservation measures** and 5.4 **Management effectiveness**. Countries will now report whether conservation measures are included in management plans, their status of implementation, and effectiveness is periodically assessed. Both fields represent significant sources of information for the indicator 1.3 Proportion of adopted Emerald Network sites with implemented management plans. A document on "Methods for assessing the management effectiveness of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures" has been produced to guide Parties on the evaluation of effectiveness, as requested by the Working Group on overseeing implementation of the Strategic Plan.

Underneath, those fields related to the **method used** to determine the degree of conservation of a habitat or to measure the cover of a habitat type or the population of a species in the ASCI. Pre-defined options are provided, streamlining with those used in the reporting of the conservation status for habitat and species under Resolution No. 8 (2012), lightening Parties burden.

Next block refers to the **conservation objectives** established for each Resolution No. 4 (1996) habitat and Resolution No. 6 (1998) species occurring in the site. Managers should choose from six different conservation actions, which include maintaining the habitat and species in the current status. When the option "other" conservation objective is marked, this conservation objective(se) should be explained in the field conservation objectives-explanations. These fields are considered not particularly demanding since they are usually integrated into management plans. They represent data sources for indicators 1.1 (a) Trends in condition of selected habitat and ecosystem types and 1.4 Contribution of the Emerald Network to the conservation status of habitats.

The field **Pressure further detailed** is proposed as optional, Contracting Parties may specify on which habitat or species the pressure is acting on.

The field **non-presence** of habitats or species has been redefined to indicate (pre-defined options) if the feature is no **longer present** or it has never been present in the site.

New fields Reason for area difference with spatial dataset and Explanations are proposed as optional, because it affects a few sites, in the case of cliffs or use of projection ETRS8, and the correct data usually is the one included in the SDF.

Eventually, the set of fields demanding **dates** of the last data collection, update of the information

included in the SDF or validity of management plans or conservation measures, inform evaluators on data reliability. SDF are living documents that should reflect the situation in the field, for this reason, it is advised to update the information every 6 years approximately.

Table 2 recapitulates the level of effort expected to complete the SDF and the proposal of fields as optional or compulsory:

Level of Effort (from the highest to the lowest)	Compulsory/Optional fields
3.1.12.2 Degree of conservation – area	Compulsory (transition period of 3 years for adaptation)
3.1.10 Relative surface	Compulsory (transition period of 3 years for adaptation)
3.2.13 Population	Compulsory (transition period of 3 years for adaptation)
3.2.15.3 Degree of conservation of a species – occupied percentage classes	Compulsory (transition period of 3 years for adaptation)
5.4 Management effectiveness	Compulsory (transition period of 3 years for adaptation)
5.3.1 Detailed information on measures	Compulsory (transition period of 3 years for adaptation)
5.3.2 Status of conservation measures	Compulsory (transition period of 3 years for adaptation)
5.2.3 Further explanations on management plans	Optional?
3.1.6 Method used for habitat’s cover	Compulsory (transition period of 3 years for adaptation)
3.1.12.3 Degree of conservation – method used	Compulsory (transition period of 3 years for adaptation)
3.2.9 Method used for population size	Compulsory (transition period of 3 years for adaptation)
3.1.13 Conservation objectives	Compulsory (transition period of 3 years for adaptation)
3.1.14 Conservation objectives- explanations	Optional. Only compulsory if “other” conservation objective is reported
3.2.16 Conservation objectives	Compulsory (transition period of 3 years for adaptation)

Level of Effort (from the highest to the lowest)	Compulsory/Optional fields
3.2.17 Conservation objectives – explanations	Optional. Only compulsory if “other” conservation objective is reported
4.3.4 Pressure further detailed	Optional?
3.1.3 Non- presence of a Resolution No. 4 habitat	Compulsory
3.2.5 Non- presence of Resolution No. 6 species	Compulsory
3.1.7 Period of last data collection for a habitat type	Compulsory
3.1.16 Update date for habitat’s information	Compulsory
3.2.10 Period of last data collection for a species	Compulsory
4.3.5 Update date (pressures)	Compulsory
4.4.2 Update date (documentation)	Compulsory
5.2.2 Reference and validity of the management plan	Compulsory
2.1.2 Reason for area difference with spatial dataset	Optional?
2.1.3 Reasons for area difference- explanations	Optional?

Special attention needs to be paid to those fields of the SDF functioning as data sources for the indicators established to measure the implementation of the Strategic Plan for the Bern Convention for the period to 2030:

1.3 (b) Proportion of adopted Emerald Network sites with implemented management plans:

informs on target 1.3 regarding the Emerald Network sites effectively managed and subject to formal protection. The following fields of the SDF will provide data to this indicator about conservation measures set out in comprehensive management plan or a similar instrument:

- 5.2 Management plans (5.2.1 Existence of management plans, 5.2.2 Reference and validity of the management plans, 5.2.3 Further explanations).
- 5.3 Conservation measures (5.3.1 Detailed information on measures, 5.3.2 Status of conservation measures)
- 5.4 Management effectiveness

This indicator is equally important to measure the proportion of Emerald Network sites already in

Phase III of the constitution process of the network (target set at 40% of site to 2030).

1.1 (a) Trend in extent and condition of selected habitat and ecosystem types: informs on target 1.1 natural and seminatural ecosystems are maintained and where possible restored or rehabilitated, leading to an overall increase in area, connectivity, integrity and resilience of the natural habitats referred to in Resolution No. 4 (1996). Although the main data source for this indicator is Resolution No. 8 (2012), for those countries not involved in the reporting, the following fields of the SDF can provide useful information:

- 3.1.13 Conservation objectives for Resolution No. 4 habitat occurring in the site
- 3.1.12.2 Degree of conservation-area (good, non-good and unknown condition)

1.1(b) Extend of degraded ecosystems under restoration: it also informs on target 1.1 and refers to both restoration and rehabilitation and measures the extent of restoration achievement. The present SDF does not contain standardised information on restoration needs. However, the amendment of the following fields will contribute to providing information for this indicator:

- 3.1.3 Non-presence
- 3.1.12 Degree of conservation
- 3.1.13 Conservation objectives
- 5.3 Conservation measures

1.4 Contribution of the Emerald Network to the conservation status of habitats: informs on target 1.4 the habitats that the Emerald Network aims to conserve are being maintained at, or progressing towards, a satisfactory conservation status. Although the main data source for this indicator is Resolution No. 8 (2012), for those countries not involved in the reporting, the following fields of the SDF can provide useful information:

- 3.1.13 Conservation objectives for Resolution No. 4 habitat occurring in the site
- 3.1.12.2 Degree of conservation-area (good, non-good and unknown condition)

2.1 Conservation status of species, as reported under Resolution No. 8 (2012): informs on target 2.1 the species listed in the Appendices to the Bern Convention and Resolution No. 6 (1998) are recovering towards a satisfactory conservation status. Although the principal source of information for this indicator is the reporting under Resolution No. 8 (2012) for the species listed in Resolution No. 6 (1998), for those countries not involved in the reporting, the following fields of the SDF can provide useful information:

- 3.2.15 Degree of conservation (3.2.15.1 Degree of conservation-categorised, 3.2.15.2 Degree of conservation-occupied area, 3.2.15.3 Degree of conservation- occupied percentage classes)

2.2 Trends in frequency and severity of key anthropogenic pressures impacting on species of wild flora and fauna, as reported under Resolution No. 8 (2012) and the EU nature Directives: informs on target 2.2 anthropogenic causes of actual or potential negative effects on the conservation status of species of wild flora and fauna are reduced as far as possible to levels that are not detrimental to the conservation and recovery of those species, through targeted measures enacted in legislation, policy and/or management. Although the principal source of information for this indicator is the reporting under Resolution No. 8 (2012), for those countries not involved in the reporting, the following fields of the SDF can provide useful information:

- 4.3 Pressures on the site (4.3.1 pressure code, 4.3.2 rank, 4.3.3 location inside/outside Emerald Network site)

Proposed planning

This is an estimative planning since final decisions will be made by Contracting Parties.

2025: discussion on optional/compulsory fields at the 15th meeting of the Group of Experts on Protected Areas and Ecological Networks (October 2025). Revision of the proposed new Emerald Network SDF and final draft to be sent to the Standing Committee. Adoption of the proposed new

Emerald Network SDF by the Standing Committee of the Bern Convention in its 45th meeting (December 2025) and endorsement of the update of Resolution No. 5 (1998) concerning the rules for the Network of Areas of Special Conservation Interest (Emerald Network) annex.

2026: clone and adaptation of the Natura 2000 portal into the Emerald Network portal in Reportnet 3 by EEA developers and CoE contractors, including decisions of reporting validation rules and adaptation of the reporting schemas.

Hands-on training on Reportnet 3 reporting for Contracting Parties. Opening of a testing phase for countries to allow them to familiarize themselves with the tool and test the validation rules. Implementation of results from the testing phase in Reportnet 3.

Contracting Parties can report using the new Emerald Network SDF once the platform is ready in Reportnet 3, tentatively end 2026. Meanwhile, they can still submit their Emerald Network databases in DCR (Data Center Repository, Reportnet 2), using the old Emerald Network SDF.

The preparation of guidelines for submitting Emerald Network data is to be planned for 2026.

Although Contracting Parties will be able to report using the new SDF by the end of 2026, compulsory new fields can be left empty until **2029**.

From 2030, a completed new SDF should be submitted by Contracting Parties.

As previously informed, the use of the new and old SDF simultaneously is not technically possible. Reportnet 3 will only harvest Emerald data under the new Emerald Network SDF schemas.

Summary of the proposed next steps (table 3):

	SDF timeline
Adoption of the new Emerald Network SDF by the Standing Committee	Dec-25
Endorsement of the update of Resolution No. 5 (1998) by the Standing Committee	Dec-25
Update of Resolution No. 5 (1998) annex	2026
Guidelines for filling in the Emerald Network SDF	2026
Reportnet 3 implementation for the Emerald Network database	2026
Training on Reportnet 3	2026
Guidelines for reporting Emerald Network data in Reportnet 3	2026
Testing phase for reporting in Reportnet 3	2026
Opening of the Emerald Network dataflow reporting under Reportnet 3	2026-Q4
Phase I: Transition period (NULL values allowed for new fields)	2026 Q4 -2029
Phase II: Full SDF including provision of data in new fields	2030-onwards

ANNEX

PROPOSED REVISED EMERALD NETWORK STANDARD DATA FORM

This proposed Standard Data Form has six main sections as shown below. Explanatory notes and guidelines to fill the fields will be provided in the near future once an agreement is reached. For the new or revised data fields reference can be made to the guidelines of the revised Natura 2000 Standard Data Form, knowing that they will need to be revised according to the insight of the Group of Experts on Protected Areas and Ecological Networks and the decision of the Standing Committee.

Background colors represent the status of the data field between former and the proposed revised SDF:

	New additional field
	Data field of the Natura 2000 Standard Data Form which is not applicable for the Emerald Network
	Existing data field with modified definitions

Main sections of the Standard Data Form

1.	Site identification	To be filled for each site
2.	Site area and location	
3.	Ecological information	
3.1	Habitat types	To be filled for each Resolution No. 4 (1996) habitat type present on the site
3.2	Species	To be filled for each Resolution No. 6 (1998) species present on the site
3.3	Other species	Optional
4.	Site description	To be filled for each site
5.	Site management	
6.	Geospatial representation	

DATA FIELDS OF THE PROPOSED EMERALD STANDARD DATA FORM

1. Site Identification	n
-------------------------------	----------

1.1	Site type	<p>Pre-defined options:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> A: site only important for Birds <input type="checkbox"/> B: site important for habitats and non-avian species <input type="checkbox"/> C: site important for birds, non-avian species and/or habitats
1.2	Site code	Stable unique code
1.3	Site name	Name of the site in Latin alphabet
1.3.1	Site name non-Latin alphabet (optional)	Name of the site in non-Latin alphabet
1.4	Respondent	
1.4.1	Name of the organisation	Free text and language tag
1.4.2	Contact point in the organisation (optional)	Part of the organisation responsible for the compilation of data in the SDF
1.4.3	Postal address	Free text and language tag
1.4.4	Functional mailbox email address	Functional Email address of functional mailbox, not personal
1.4.5	Website with contact information	Website containing the official contact information of the organisation
1.5	Site classification/proposal/designation dates	
1.5.1	DATE SITE PROPOSED AS ASCI (Emerald):	Date
1.5.2	DATE SITE ACCEPTED AS CANDIDATE ASCI (Emerald):	Date
1.5.3	DATE SITE ACCEPTED AS ASCI (Emerald):	Date
1.5.4	DATE SITE DESIGNATED AS ADOPTED ASCI (Emerald):	Date
1.5.5	National legal reference of ASCI designation:	Free text and language tag; explanations can be given, e.g. for classification or designation dates of sites
1.5.6	Explanations (optional)	Free text and language tag; explanations can be given
1.5.7	Emerald Site Status	<p>Extra field not to be filled by the countries. It will be automatically included during the creation of a new Emerald Network Release</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed <input type="checkbox"/> Candidate <input type="checkbox"/> Adopted <input type="checkbox"/>

2. Site area and location

2.1	Site area	
2.1.1	Area	Area of the site in hectares
2.1.2	Reason for area difference with spatial dataset (if any)	Pre-defined options: <input type="checkbox"/> Cliff or steep area <input type="checkbox"/> Cave <input type="checkbox"/> Projection to ETRS89 <input type="checkbox"/> Other - the spatial representation does not correspond to the area size in field 2.1.1 for other reasons. Give explanation in field 2.1.3
2.1.3	Reason for area difference - explanations	Free text field and language tag. It must be filled if 'Other' is indicated in field 2.1.2.
2.2	Administrative region (optional)	
2.2.1	Administrative region code	Code from NUTS code-list (see Emerald Network reference portal)
2.2.2	Administrative region name	Name from NUTS code-list (see Emerald Network reference portal)
2.3	Biogeographical and marine regions	
2.3.1	Region code	Code-list for biogeographical and marine regions (see Emerald Network reference portal)
2.3.2	Percentage	For sites located across two or more regions, give the percentage coverage in each of these regions

3. Ecological information

3.1 Habitat types of the Annex to Resolution No. 4 (1996)

3.1.a	Essential information (habitat type)	
3.1.1	Habitat type code	Fill in according to code-list for Resolution No. 4 (1996) habitat types (see Emerald Network reference portal)
3.1.2	Priority form Not applicable for the Emerald Network	Indicate if the habitat type is a priority form of 6210, 7130 or 9430

3.1.3 Non-presence	<p>Pre-defined options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> the habitat is no longer present in the site <input type="checkbox"/> the habitat type is not present and was not present at the time of designation but its re-establishment is planned. <p>Only the fields 3.1.1 (Habitat code), 3.1.6 (Method used), 3.1.7 (Period of last data collection), 3.1.13 (Conservation objectives), 3.1.16 (Update date) need to be filled. The field 3.1.4 (Cover) must be 0 (zero). The other fields of section 3.1 should be left blank.</p>
3.1.4 Cover	Cover of the habitat type in hectares
3.1.5 Caves	Number of caves (included in habitat type codes H1 and A1.44, A3 and A4.)
3.1.6 Method used for cover	<p>Pre-defined options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> complete survey or a statistically robust estimate; <input type="checkbox"/> based mainly on extrapolation from a limited amount of data; <input type="checkbox"/> based mainly on expert opinion with very limited data.
3.1.7 Period of last data collection	Start date and end date of the period (month and year); if such information is unknown indicate 'survey older than 2022'.
3.1.b Site assessment (habitat type)	
3.1.8 Significance	<p>Indicate if habitat type occurrence is non-significant; For significant occurrences all fields of section 3.1.b must be filled whereas for non-significant occurrences only the fields 3.1.8 (Significance) and 3.1.16 (Update date) of section 3.1.b have to be filled.</p>
3.1.9 Representativity	<p>Pre-defined options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A: excellent representativity <input type="checkbox"/> B: good representativity <input type="checkbox"/> C: significant representativity

3.1.10 Relative surface	<p>Pre-defined options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A1: $100\% \geq p > 75\%$ <input type="checkbox"/> A2: $75\% \geq p > 50\%$ <input type="checkbox"/> A3: $50\% \geq p > 25\%$ <input type="checkbox"/> A4: $25\% \geq p > 15\%$ <input type="checkbox"/> B: $15\% \geq p > 2\%$ <input type="checkbox"/> C: $2\% \geq p > 0\%$
3.1.11 Relative surface explanations (optional)	Free text and language tag
3.1.12 Degree of conservation	
3.1.12.1 Degree of conservation – categorised	<p>Pre-defined options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A: excellent degree of conservation (nearly all of the habitat area in good condition) <input type="checkbox"/> B: good degree of conservation (most of the habitat area in good condition) <input type="checkbox"/> C: reduced degree of conservation (most of the habitat area in not good condition) <input type="checkbox"/> X: unknown degree of conservation (most or all of the habitat area in unknown condition)
3.1.12.2 Degree of conservation – area	<p>Give the area in hectares for each of the categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Good condition: ...[ha] <input type="checkbox"/> Not-good condition: ...[ha] <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown condition: ...[ha]
3.1.12.3 Degree of conservation – method used	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Complete survey or statistically robust estimate in hectares (for example taken from mapping in management plans) <input type="checkbox"/> Based mainly on extrapolation from a limited amount of data (expert judgement) <input type="checkbox"/> Based mainly on expert opinion with very limited data (based on partial mapping data) <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient or no data available
3.1.13 Conservation objectives	<p>Pre-defined options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Prevent deterioration <input type="checkbox"/> Maintain the habitat type's surface area and its good condition <input type="checkbox"/> Enlarge the area of the habitat type <input type="checkbox"/> Improve the habitat type condition <input type="checkbox"/> Re-establish the habitat type <input type="checkbox"/> Other

3.1.14 Conservation objectives - explanations	Free text and language tag
3.1.15 Global	Pre-defined options: <input type="checkbox"/> A: excellent value <input type="checkbox"/> B: good value <input type="checkbox"/> C: significant value
3.1.16 Update date	Year and month

3.2 Species referred to in Resolution No. 6 (1998)

3.2a Essential information (species)	
3.2.1 Species group	Code-list (see Emerald Network reference portal)
3.2.2 Species code	Code-list (see Emerald Network reference portal)
3.2.3 Scientific name	Species name from the relevant code-list on the reference portal that corresponds to the code used in 3.2.2
3.2.4 Sensitivity of species data	Indicate in case of sensitive species data
3.2.5 Non-presence	Pre-defined options: <input type="checkbox"/> the species is no longer present in the site <input type="checkbox"/> the species is not present and was not present at the time of designation but it's re-establishment is planned. Following fields need to be filled: 3.2.1 to 3.2.5, 3.2.9 (method used), 3.2.10 (period of last data collection) and 3.2.16 (conservation objectives). The field 3.2.7.1 population size minimum and maximum need both to be 0 (zero). The other fields of the section 3.2 should be left blank.
3.2.6 Population type	Pre-defined options: <input type="checkbox"/> Permanent <input type="checkbox"/> Reproducing <input type="checkbox"/> Concentration <input type="checkbox"/> Wintering
3.2.7 Population size and unit	

3.2.7.1 Population size	Give minimum and maximum population size
3.2.7.2 Population unit	Code-list (see Emerald Network reference portal)
3.2.8 Abundance category	Pre-defined options: <input type="checkbox"/> Common <input type="checkbox"/> Rare <input type="checkbox"/> Very rare <input type="checkbox"/> Present
3.2.9 Method used for population size	Pre-defined options: <input type="checkbox"/> Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate <input type="checkbox"/> Based mainly on expert opinion with very limited data <input type="checkbox"/> Based mainly on extrapolation from a limited amount of data <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient or no data available
3.2.10 Period of last data collection	Start date and end date of the period (year and month) or if such information is unknown indicate 'survey older than 2022'
3.2b Site assessment (species)	
3.2.11 Significance	Indicate if occurrence of the species is non-significant. For significant occurrences of species all fields of the section 3.2.b must be filled in whereas for non-significant occurrences of species only the fields 3.2.11 (Significance) and 3.2.20 (Update date) of section 3.2.b have to be filled.
3.2.12 Species meeting ornithological criteria for SPA classification Not applicable for the Emerald Network	Indicate if the bird species met the ornithological criteria used to justify SPA classification.
3.2.13 Population	Pre-defined options: <input type="checkbox"/> A1: $100\% \geq p > 75\%$ <input type="checkbox"/> A2: $75\% \geq p > 50\%$ <input type="checkbox"/> A3: $50\% \geq p > 25\%$ <input type="checkbox"/> A4: $25\% \geq p > 15\%$ <input type="checkbox"/> B: $15\% \geq p > 2\%$ <input type="checkbox"/> C: $2\% \geq p > 0\%$
3.2.14 Population – explanations (optional)	Free text and language tag
3.2.15 Degree of conservation	

<p>3.2.15.1 Degree of conservation - categorised</p>	<p>Pre-defined options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A: excellent degree of conservation (nearly all of the habitat occupied by the species has sufficient quality) <input type="checkbox"/> B: good degree of conservation (most of the habitat occupied by the species has sufficient quality) <input type="checkbox"/> C: reduced degree of conservation (most of the habitat occupied by the species has non-sufficient quality) <input type="checkbox"/> X: unknown degree of conservation (most or all of the habitat occupied by the species has unknown quality)
<p>3.2.15.2 Degree of conservation – occupied area (optional)</p>	<p>Give the area of the habitat occupied by the species in percentages for each of the categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient quality: ...% <input type="checkbox"/> Non-sufficient quality: ...% <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown habitat quality: ...%
<p>3.2.15.3 Degree of conservation – occupied percentage classes</p>	<p>Estimated area of the habitat occupied by the species with sufficient quality</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 0-25 % <input type="checkbox"/> 26-50% <input type="checkbox"/> 51-75% <input type="checkbox"/> 76-100%</p> <p>Estimated area of the habitat occupied by the species with non-sufficient quality</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 0-25 % <input type="checkbox"/> 26-50% <input type="checkbox"/> 51-75% <input type="checkbox"/> 76-100%</p> <p>Estimated area of the habitat occupied by the species for which the quality is unknown</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 0-25 % <input type="checkbox"/> 26-50% <input type="checkbox"/> 51-75% <input type="checkbox"/> 76-100%</p>
<p>3.2.16 Conservation objectives</p>	<p>Pre-defined options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Prevent deterioration <input type="checkbox"/> Maintain the extent and good quality of the habitat of the species and the population size <input type="checkbox"/> Enlarge area of the habitat of the species <input type="checkbox"/> Re-establish habitat for the species <input type="checkbox"/> Improve the quality of the habitat of the species (considering also disturbance and mortality factors) <input type="checkbox"/> Increase the population size <input type="checkbox"/> Reduce pressure on the population (e.g. reduce mortality or disturbance) <input type="checkbox"/> Re-establish the population at the site <input type="checkbox"/> Other
<p>3.2.17 Conservation objectives - explanations</p>	<p>Free text and language tag</p>

3.2.18 Isolation	<p>Pre-defined options:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> A: population (almost) isolated, <input type="checkbox"/> B: population not isolated, but on margins of area of distribution, <input type="checkbox"/> C: population not isolated within extended distribution range
3.2.19 Global	<p>Pre-defined options:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> A: excellent value <input type="checkbox"/> B: good value <input type="checkbox"/> C: significant value
3.2.20 Update date	Year and month
3.3 Other important species of flora and fauna (optional)	
3.3.1 Species group	If the species belongs to one of the species groups on the code-list available on the Emerald Network reference portal use the respective code from this list; otherwise leave the field empty (blank).
3.3.2 Species code	If the species is on the code-lists on the Emerald Network reference portal that are used in field 3.2.2, please use that code, otherwise leave this field empty.
3.3.3 Scientific name	If relevant, insert the scientific name as used in the code lists on the Emerald Network reference portal that are used in field 3.2.2.
3.3.4 Sensitivity of species data	Indicate in case of sensitive species data
3.3.5 Non-presence	Indicate if the species is no-longer present in the site
3.3.6 Population size and unit	
3.3.6.1 Population size	Minimum and maximum population size
3.3.6.2 Population unit	Code-list (see Emerald Network reference portal)

3.3.7 Abundance category	<p>Pre-defined options:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Common <input type="checkbox"/> Rare <input type="checkbox"/> Very rare <input type="checkbox"/> Present
3.3.8 Motivation	<p>Pre-defined options:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Appendix I species <input type="checkbox"/> Appendix II species <input type="checkbox"/> Appendix III species <input type="checkbox"/> Species listed in National Red Lists <input type="checkbox"/> Species listed in Global Red Lists <input type="checkbox"/> Endemic species <input type="checkbox"/> Species listed/protected under international Conventions such as Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals or the Convention of Biological Diversity (CBD) <input type="checkbox"/> Typical species of Resolution No. 4 (1996) habitat types <input type="checkbox"/> Crop Wild Relatives (CWR) / Forest Genetic Resources (FGR) <input type="checkbox"/> Invasive alien species of Bern Convention concern <input type="checkbox"/> Other reasons

4. Site description

4.1 Site characteristics	Free text and language tag
4.2 Quality and importance of the site	Free text and language tag
4.3 Pressures on the site	
4.3.1 Pressure code	Code-list (see Emerald Network reference portal)
4.3.2 Rank	<p>Pre-defined options:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> High importance <input type="checkbox"/> Medium importance <input type="checkbox"/> Low importance
4.3.3 Location inside/outside	<p>Pre-defined options:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Inside Emerald Network site <input type="checkbox"/> Outside Emerald Network site <input type="checkbox"/> Inside and outside Emerald Network site

4.3.4	Pressure further detailed	Free text and language tag
4.3.5	Update date	Year and month
4.4	Documentation	Free text and language tag
4.4.1	Link(s)	URI (URL or DOI)
4.4.2	Update date	Year and month

5. Site management

5.1	Body responsible for the site management	
5.1.1	Name of the organisation	Free text and language tag
5.1.2	Contact point in the organisation (optional)	Part of the organisation responsible for the management of the site
5.1.3	Postal address	Free text and language tag
5.1.4	Functional mailbox email address	Functional mailbox email address, not personal
5.1.5	Website with contact information	Website containing the official contact information of the organisation
5.2	Management plans	
5.2.1	Existence of management plans(s)	<p>Pre-defined options:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (if yes fill in 5.2.2) <input type="checkbox"/> No, site only partially covered (fill in 5.2.2) <input type="checkbox"/> No, but in preparation <input type="checkbox"/> No, because a management plan is not necessary (fill in 5.2.3) <input type="checkbox"/> No, other reason (fill in 5.2.3)
5.2.2	Reference and validity of the management plan(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Name of the plan and <input type="checkbox"/> Link to the plan (URI) and <input type="checkbox"/> Validity: start date (year and month) and duration: number of months / or not defined
5.2.3	Further explanations	Free text and language tag; To be filled if management plan does not exist and is also not in preparation
5.3	Conservation measures	

5.3.1 Detailed information on measures	<p>Pre-defined options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Necessary conservation measures are included in the management plan(s) to which the link is provided in section 5.2.2 (yes/no) <input type="checkbox"/> Necessary conservation measures are described in the following document(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Title and link (URI) and/or — Further explanations on detailed conservation measures (free text and language tag)
5.3.2 Status of conservation measures	<p>Two questions with pre-defined options:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are the necessary measures established? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> fully established <input type="checkbox"/> partly established <input type="checkbox"/> not established <p>For fully or partly established measures only:</p> 2. Are the established measures implemented? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> all implemented and/or all on-going <input type="checkbox"/> only partly implemented and/or partly on-going <input type="checkbox"/> one-off measures not implemented and/or no re current measures on-going
5.4 Management effectiveness	<p>Two questions with pre-defined options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Is the effectiveness of the conservation measures periodically assessed? [yes/no] — Are the conservation measures delivering the set conservation objectives? [yes/no/not yet/ unknown because not assessed]

6. Geospatial representation of the site (optional)

6.1 INSPIRE identifier	INSPIRE identifier of the spatial object (see Natura 2000 reference portal)
6.1.1 Namespace	The namespace as defined by the national INSPIRE implementation
6.1.2 Local identifier	The local identifier must be unique within the namespace
6.1.3 Version identifier (optional)	The identifier of the particular version of the spatial object