



Strasbourg, 2 April 2024



T-PVS/PA(2024)04

CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE
AND NATURAL HABITATS

Group of Experts on Protected Areas and Ecological Networks

14th meeting

17 – 18 April 2024, Vaduz, Liechtenstein
Venue: Rathaussaal

Discussion paper assessing the opportunity for a revision of the Emerald Network Standard Data Form (SDF)

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

Discussion paper assessing the opportunity for a revision of the Emerald Network Standard Data Form (SDF)*Marc Roekaerts and Laura-Patricia Gavilán Iglesias***Introduction**

The last revision of the appendix to Resolution No. 5 (1998) dates back to 2013 when the Standing Committee adopted a new version aligning the Emerald Network Standard Data Form with the revision of the Natura 2000 Standard Data Form¹. Since then, countries have been using this version of the SDF and the dataflow from national to international merged datasets was guaranteed by the IT-tools as developed by the European Environment Agency (EEA) under the Memorandum of Collaboration between both international organisations.

Meanwhile, the Vision of the Bern Convention for the period to 2030 was adopted by the Standing Committee on 3rd December 2021, which affirms that the Contracting Parties expect to see that “By 2030, declines in biodiversity are halted, leading to recovery of wildlife and habitats, improving the lives of people and contributing to the health of the planet”. Moreover, the Standing Committee adopted on 1st December 2023 a Strategic Plan for the period the 2030 providing a guiding framework for the programmes and activities that are needed to achieve the Vision; considering that the EU adopted a Biodiversity Strategy for 2030² and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF).

Dataflow principles, data standards and IT-tools are also constantly under development. The EEA is presently moving towards a completely renewed data platform called ReportNet3. Keeping compatibility with this renewed frame will ensure maintaining the harmonisation of European data as much as possible to be able to make them public and display and analyse European environmental data at pan-European scale.

The purpose of this document is to propose a revision of the current Standard Data Form considering the monitoring of the redefined goals and targets of the Emerald Network for the period to 2030 on one hand and on the other hand, the challenges to keep the data standards up to date to be able to guarantee the use of the renewed dataflow principles using ReportNet3.

In this context, this paper aims to discuss the suitability of an update of the Emerald Network Standard Data Form to better respond to the challenges set in the Strategic Plan of the Bern Convention and better inform the indicators set in the post-2020 Emerald Network Work plan and in the Strategic Plan, while streamlining with the reporting on the conservation status set by Resolution No. 8 (2012).

In this way, the Emerald Network could also better respond to forthcoming biodiversity commitments and goals endorsed by Contracting Parties in the framework of diverse international Conventions or treaties.

¹ [Implementing decision - 2023/2806 - EN - EUR-Lex \(europa.eu\)](#)

² [Biodiversity strategy for 2030 - European Commission \(europa.eu\)](#)

Better inform the indicators under the Emerald Network

Contracting Parties have committed to a new level of ambition for the period to 2030 with the adoption of the Strategic Plan. With the objective of evaluating this commitment and monitoring the achievement of individual targets, sixteen indicators of progress were developed³.

Hereafter, the summary table proposed in the Strategic Plan is complemented with an assessment of the extent to which possible contribution of the revised Emerald Network Standard Data Form could contribute informing the targets and indicators. It should be noticed that due to the nature of the SDF, which responds to the documentation of the special features of a protected site, this update will mostly benefit to Goal 1 and Goal 2. Some indicators will be not impacted by this revision, namely those included in Goals 3 and 4. The SDF will contribute to improve data related to the Emerald Network itself.

The numbering of the fields included in the column *SDF update* corresponds to the revised SDF (see the Annex).

Table 1. Possible contribution of the proposed revised Emerald Network SDF by indicator and target.

Target	Indicator(s)	SDF update
<i>GOAL 1: The area, connectivity, integrity and resilience of natural and semi-natural ecosystems is increased including through protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures covering at least 30% of the land and of the sea areas.</i>		
1.1 Natural and semi-natural 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 the Convention and in Resolution No. 4 (1996).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1.a Trends in extent and condition of selected habitat and ecosystem types. 1.1.b Extent of degraded ecosystems under restoration (by ecosystem type). 	<p>Principal sources for proposed indicator 1.1.a include reporting on conservation status under Bern Convention Resolution No. 8 (2012).</p> <p>Indicator 1.1.b: the present SDF does not contain standardised information on restoration needs. Amendment of the following fields will contribute to provide information for this indicator:</p> <p>3.1.3 Non-presence 3.1.12 Degree of conservation 3.1.13 Conservation objectives 5.3 Conservation measures</p>
1.2 Coverage of natural habitats by the Emerald Network meets the sufficiency targets set for 2030 in the post-2020 Work Plan for the Network.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.2 Emerald Network Sufficiency Index. 	<p>No direct contribution on the sufficiency index. However, the revised SDF will improve the data quality and consequently, sufficiency will be based on a set of data of higher quality.</p>

³ [1680ada084 \(coe.int\)](https://www.coe.int/t/t09/Convention/Convention+on+the+Protection+of+Natural+and+Semi-natural+Areas/Convention+on+the+Protection+of+Natural+and+Semi-natural+Areas+English+version.pdf)

<p>1.3 All sites included in the Emerald Network are effectively managed and subject to formal protection and other effective area-based conservation measures.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.3. a Extent to which protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) cover Emerald Network sites. • 1.3. b Proportion of adopted Emerald Network sites with implemented management plans. 	<p>1.3.a In the present SDF, the protection status is given in section 5 of the SDF. Because of possible duplicated efforts for collecting the data, in the new SDF this section is deleted. Other dataflows managed by the EEA are better informing on the protection status in a wider context. For biodiversity, the EEA hosts the indicator set developed under the Streamlining European Biodiversity Indicators (SEBI) process. Within this context, the indicator SEBI 007 indicates the status of the nationally designated protected areas and SEBI 008 indicates the status of sites designated under the EU Habitats and Birds Directives and the Emerald Network Sites⁴.</p> <p>1.3.b In the present SDF, this information is contained in the fields 6.2 Management Plans and 6.3 Conservation Measures (which is a text field and optional). No systematic information on management effectiveness.</p> <p>In order to better inform on the indicator 1.3.b., the amendment of the following fields will provide relevant information for these indicators:</p> <p>5.3 Conservation measures 5.4 Management effectiveness</p>
<p>1.4 The habitats that the Emerald Network aims to conserve are being maintained at, or progressing towards, a satisfactory conservation status.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.4 Contribution of the Emerald Network to the conservation status of habitats. 	<p>The information that feeds this indicator is essentially found in the reporting under Bern Convention Resolution No. 8 (2012). Nevertheless, the new information included in habitat's condition will provide extra information at site level:</p> <p>3.1.12 Degree of conservation</p>

⁴ [An introduction to Europe's Protected Areas \(europa.eu\)](https://european-council.europa.eu/media/e300042f-323d-4761-9957-3f3f10274d8c/attachment_data/data/e300042f-323d-4761-9957-3f3f10274d8c.pdf)

<p>1.5 Specific recommendations arising from individual Case Files are followed up and acted upon; and cases are resolved and closed within a reasonable timeframe, taking account of any advice provided by the Standing Committee.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.5.a [Indicator based on statistics concerning Case File recommendations (e.g. proportion implemented, partially implemented, not yet implemented)]. • 1.5.b [Indicator based on statistics concerning numbers of Case Files (e.g. numbers per country; number of years each case has been on Standing Committee agendas)]. 	<p>No contribution of the SDF</p>
<p>GOAL 2: The conservation status of threatened species is improved, the abundance of native species has increased, and human-induced extinctions have been halted.</p>		
<p>2.1 The species listed in the Appendices to the Bern Convention and in Appendix 1 to Resolution No. 6 (1998) are at or are recovering towards a satisfactory conservation status.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1 Conservation status of species, as reported under Resolution No. 8 (2012). 	<p>Principal source of information for this indicator is the reporting under Resolution No. 8 (2012) for the species listed in the Resolution No. 6 (1998).</p> <p>However, the updated information on the quality of the species's habitats will contribute to inform on the conservation status of species listed in Resolution No. 6 (1998) in Emerald Network sites:</p> <p>3.2.15 Degree of conservation</p>
<p>2.2 Anthropogenic causes of actual or potential negative effects on the conservation status of species of wild flora and fauna⁵ 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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>Principal source of information for this indicator is the reporting under Resolution No. 8 (2012) for the species listed in the Resolution No. 6 (1998).</p> <p>The amendment of the list of pressures and the use of a common list for the Emerald Network and the reporting under Resolution No. 8 (2012) will improve this information at site level.</p> <p>4.3 Pressures on the site.</p>
<p>GOAL 3: The contributions of wild flora and fauna and their natural habitats to a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment are valued, maintained and enhanced.</p>		

⁵ Including in particular (though not limited only to) habitat loss and degradation, including loss of connectivity; illegal killing, taking and trade; unsustainable use; toxins and pollution, including micropollutants; barriers to migration, disturbance, light pollution, invasive alien species; and climate change.

3.1 The natural environment thrives, thereby benefiting people's livelihoods, food and water security, community resilience, well-being and quality of life.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1.a Nature-based quality of life assessment (qualitative summary overview). 3.1.b Trends in air quality. 3.1.c Trends in water quality. 	No direct contribution of the potential update of the SDF on these indicators.
3.2 Conservation and sustainable use of nature contributes positively to measures relating to human rights, democracy, landscape management, cultural heritage and physical and mental health, and to the prevention and mitigation of major hazards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.2 Single review assessment of the contribution made by the conservation and sustainable use of nature under the Bern Convention to other fields of action under the Council of Europe. 	No direct contribution of the potential update of the SDF on these indicators.
3.3 Nature-based solutions and ecosystem-based approaches implemented by Bern Convention Parties contribute to the mitigation of climate change and the adaptation to its effects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.3 Number of initiatives involving nature-based solutions or ecosystem-based approaches as reported in Nationally Determined Contributions under the UNFCCC, with ecosystem extent data where available. 	No direct contribution of the potential update of the SDF on these indicators.
GOAL 4: Sufficient resources are available and are used efficiently to achieve all goals and targets in this Plan.		
4.1 Sufficient resources and capacity, including scientific and technical cooperation, are available to achieve all the goals and targets in the Strategic Plan for the Bern Convention.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.1 Resources and capacity available at international level for implementing the Strategic Plan, as assessed for each financial planning 	No direct contribution of the potential update of the SDF on these indicators.

In relation with the post 2020 Emerald Network Workplan and the Monitoring Framework⁶, the update of the SDF will mainly contribute to better assess Phase III of the Emerald Network constitution process, providing better data on the proportion of the Emerald Network sites with management plans, but also providing new essential information on conservation objectives and measures in place.

Appropriate site management is essential to reach the ultimate goal of the Emerald Network: the favourable conservation status for all habitat types and species included in Resolution No. 4 (1996) and Resolution No. 6 (1998). The existence and implementation of management plans is an indicator to measure the site management. However, the evaluation of the effectiveness has not yet been properly considered and the fact that a site has a management plan does not obligatory responds to positive conservation results, because the conservation objectives can be unclear or not concrete or simply because there are no measures in place. The revised SDF contains a new section 5.3 on

⁶ T-PVS/PA(2020)2

conservation measures from which new indicators could be developed, such as the percentage of sites where conservation measures have been fully established and/or the percentage of sites where the conservation measures are achieving the proposed conservation objectives⁷.

The proposed revised SDF considers the timeframe of validity of management plans since these documents are temporary documents and require regular reviews. Authorities are not always able to obtain up-to-date information on the status of the habitats and species and to update the conservation objectives. The fact of dating the inclusion of up-to-date information in the SDF, will clearly contribute on data quality and assist experts to value the quality of the figures.

Overview of the most important changes proposed in the Standard Data Form

The recently adopted new Natura 2000 Standard Data Form⁸ is used as the basis for the update of the current fields of the Emerald Network Standard Data Form.

The changes proposed aim to (1) better inform the indicators proposed in the Strategic Plan, (2) improve data quality, (3) clarify concepts usually misinterpreted by countries, (4) streamline with the reporting on the conservation status under the Resolution No. 8 (2012), (5) maintain the alignment with the Natura 2000 data, (6) report new information as requested for new environmental engagements and (7) guarantee a format compatible with the new ReportNet 3 dataflow.

The updated form includes four possibilities:

- 1) Addition of a new field (in light orange in the annex below),
- 2) Deletion of old fields (are not shown in the annex below),
- 3) Update of an existing field (in green in the annex below), and
- 4) Fields not applicable for the Emerald Network (in orange in the annex below), where the sentence “Not applicable for the Emerald Network” is included.

For instance, the proposal includes a new field called “Emerald Network site status” to distinguish between proposed, candidate and adopted sites, informing on the legal protection of the Emerald Network sites; and on the contrary, it proposes the deletion of fields such as: “Site Length” or “Ownership”.

Most changes have been made in the sections regarding *Ecological Information* and *Site Management* since these two sections contain the most demanded information to fulfil the requirements of the Strategic Plan of the Bern Convention, the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030⁹ and other international commitments; as a result, more accurate information is requested. The dates of surveys and the methods used for estimating the coverage of a habitat type or the population of a species are now requested to allow specialists and experts to judge the ecological information provided and thus contribute to the continuous improvement of data.

An example of clarification of usually misinterpreted concepts, the definition of evaluation criteria is explained in detail to better interpret non-significant habitat types or species.

The section on conservation (now “Degree of Conservation”) has been developed further to embrace categories, determine occupied areas in good or not good conditions, explain the method used to find out the degree of conservation and to express in a clearer way the conservation objectives for the features within the Emerald Network site.

Eventually, information on management plans is extended and the existing section “Conservation

⁷ T-PVS/PA(2024)05

⁸ [Implementing decision - 2023/2806 - EN - EUR-Lex \(europa.eu\)](#)

⁹ [Biodiversity strategy for 2030 - European Commission \(europa.eu\)](#)

Measures” becomes compulsory to enable the evaluation of the effectiveness of the management of the site and the tracking of the status of implementation of the measures.

The former section “5. Site Protections Status” has been completely deleted as the data can be derived from other data sources such as the inventory of nationally designated areas as a priority dataset of the EEA. It is suggested to also delete it from the Emerald Network SDF. At the same time, it should be highlighted that some of the Contracting Parties are not EIONET countries and it should be investigated how other sources could be used to find the necessary data such as the “Protected Planet” database of UNEP.

The former section “7. Map of the Site” was replaced by the new section “6. Geospatial representation”. As a consequence, the data fields in this section have been indicated with background color green.

For more detailed information see the proposed revised Emerald Standard Data Form included in the Annex. More background information of the proposed changes can also be found in the guidelines of the revised Natura 2000 SDF¹⁰.

¹⁰ [Implementing decision - 2023/2806 - EN - EUR-Lex \(europa.eu\)](#)

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	
1.1 Site type	Pre-defined options: <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	Extra field not to be filled by the countries. It will be automatically included during the creation of a new Emerald Network Release <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed <input type="checkbox"/> Candidate <input type="checkbox"/> Adopted

Commented [GU1]: All data fields have been rephrased according to the Emerald Network terminology and dating principles

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)	

Commented [GU2]: The pre-defined options clarify better the reason(s) for the area difference

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

Commented [GU3]: as indicated in the reference portal: The list corresponds to the Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics of Europe (NUTS), which is maintained by EUROSTAT. For the SDF field 2.5 the NUTS level 2 is used. In case, for a particular country no official NUTS codes exist, an agreed similar coding system is used

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	Pre-defined options: <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. 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 the section 3.1 should be left blank.
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	Pre-defined options: <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	Indicate if habitat type occurrence is non-significant; For significant occurrences all fields of the 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.
3.1.9 Representativity	Pre-defined options: <input type="checkbox"/> A: excellent representativity <input type="checkbox"/> B: good representativity <input type="checkbox"/> C: significant representativity

3.1.10 Relative surface	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: $2\% \geq p > 0\%$
3.1.11 Relative surface explanations (optional)	Free text and language tag
3.1.12 Degree of conservation	
3.1.12.1 Degree of conservation – categorised	Pre-defined options: <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	Give the area in hectares for each of the categories: <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	<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	Pre-defined options: <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	
3.2.15.1 Degree of conservation - categorised	Pre-defined options: <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)

3.2.15.2 Degree of conservation – occupied area (op-tional)	<div>Give the area of the habitat occupied by the species in percentages for each of the categories:</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient quality: ...%</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Non-sufficient quality: ...%</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Unknown habitat quality: ...%</div>
---	--

3.2.15.3 Degree of conservation – occupied percentage classes	<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>
3.2.16 Conservation objectives	<p>Pre-defined options:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Prevent deterioration</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Maintain the extent and good quality of the habitat of the species and the population size</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Enlarge area of the habitat of the species</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Re-establish habitat for the species</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Improve the quality of the habitat of the species (considering also disturbance and mortality factors)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Increase the population size</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Reduce pressure on the population (e.g. reduce mortality or disturbance)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Re-establish the population at the site</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other</p>
3.2.17 Conservation objectives - explanations	Free text and language tag
3.2.18 Isolation	<p>Pre-defined options:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A: population (almost) isolated,</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> B: population not isolated, but on margins of area of distribution,</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> C: population not isolated within extended distribution range</p>
3.2.19 Global	<p>Pre-defined options:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A: excellent value</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> B: good value</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> C: significant value</p>
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	Pre-defined options: <input type="checkbox"/> Common <input type="checkbox"/> Rare <input type="checkbox"/> Very rare <input type="checkbox"/> Present
3.3.8 Motivation	Pre-defined options: <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 Union concern as referred to in the EU Regulation 1143/2014 on invasive alien species (IAS) <input type="checkbox"/> Other reasons

Commented [GU4]: referring to the discussions in the Ad Hoc Working Group for Reporting of the Bern Convention, the question on the opportunities to develop a Pan-European List of IAS is under consideration.

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	Pre-defined options: <input type="checkbox"/> High importance <input type="checkbox"/> Medium importance <input type="checkbox"/> Low importance
4.3.3 Location inside/outside	Pre-defined options: <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)	Pre-defined options: <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	Pre-defined options: <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): — Title and link (URI) and/or — Further explanations on detailed conservation measures (free text and language tag)
5.3.2 Status of conservation measures	Two questions with pre-defined options: 1. Are the necessary measures established? <input type="checkbox"/> fully established <input type="checkbox"/> partly established <input type="checkbox"/> not established For fully or partly established measures only: 2. Are the established measures implemented? <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	Two questions with pre-defined options: — 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

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

Commented [GU5]: This section is replacing the former section 7. Map of the site

