



Strasbourg, 10 November 2024

T-PVS/PA(2024)20

CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE AND NATURAL HABITATS

Standing Committee

44th meeting Strasbourg, 2 - 6 December 2024

Informative paper on the implications of a revision of the Emerald Network Standard Data Form (SDF)

Document prepared by 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.

A discussion paper assessing the opportunity for a revision of the Emerald Standard Data Form (SDF) was presented to Contracting Parties at the 14th meeting of the Group of Experts on Protected Areas and Ecological Networks, held in Vaduz (Liechtenstein). After discussion, Contracting Parties were positive about this update and asked the Bern Convention Secretariat to explore further the implication of such a revision and to suggest a timeline.

The purpose of this document is to respond to this request for information, exploring the potential implications of the revision of the current Standard Data Form and proposing a future planning of implementation. The implications of each new and updated field are explained in this document, and field changes have been categorised as low, medium and high implications. It should be noted that the validation rules as well as the optional or compulsory nature of the new fields can be discussed next year.

Since the European Environment Agency (EEA) is implementing a new data platform, called Reportnet 3, the adoption of the new Emerald Network SDF will ensure compatibility with this new reporting tool and the harmonisation of European datasets.

¹ Implementing decision - 2023/2806 - EN - EUR-Lex (europa.eu)

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

The recently adopted new Natura 2000 Standard Data Form² 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) inform the progress in achievement of the targets of the post-2020 Emerald Network strategic workplan, (3) improve data quality, (4) clarify concepts usually misinterpreted by countries, (5) streamline with the reporting on the conservation status under the Resolution No. 8 (2012), (6) maintain the alignment with the Natura 2000 data, (7) report new information as requested for new environmental engagements and (8) 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 2030³ 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 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/WCMC.

² Implementing decision - 2023/2806 - EN - EUR-Lex (europa.eu)

³ Biodiversity strategy for 2030 - European Commission (europa.eu)

The former section "7. Map of the Site" was replaced by the new section "6. Geospatial representation". Consequently, 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 SDF⁴.

Implications of the proposed changes of the new Standard Data Form for the Contracting Parties

The most significant implication of not migrating to the new SDF will be the impossibility to deliver Emerald Network databases. Indeed, the EEA will not maintain the current Reportnet 2 platform once the new Reportnet 3 is completely operational. Reportnet 3 is framed to collect information on the established schemas of the new SDF, as a result, Emerald Network information contained in the old SDF will not be collected anymore.

EEA's Central Data Repository (CDR) will remain accessible until 2029, but it will however not be possible to upload new files once the dataflow is opened in Reportnet 3 and the Emerald Network SDF manager will no longer be maintained once the new Emerald Network SDF will enter into force.

The implication on the workload is explained below for each of the fields added, deleted or updated:

Addition of new fields

- 1.3.1 Site name non-Latin alphabet (optional): no 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 Areas of Special Conservation Interest (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.
- 3.1.6 Method used for cover: provide information on the reliability of data cover (3.1.4). No significant implication for Contracting Parties since habitat type coverage was already requested in the previous SDF. Parties only need to choose one of the three pre-defined options.
- 3.1.7 Period of last data collection: this field provides further information on when data was collected to improve data quality. It has medium implication because Parties need to fill in the date of the last survey; nevertheless, reporting this date as "unknown" is also possible.
- 3.1.8 Significance: no significant impact since the concept was already included in the past. D occurrences for species and habitats used to be considered as non-significant. Now the country will indicate it in this new field.
- 3.1.11 Relative surface explanations (optional): additional information on relative surface. No significant implication since it is an optional field.
- 3.1.12.1 Degree of conservation categorised: no significant impact for this new field since this information was already covered by the previous field "Conservation".
- 3.1.12.2 Degree of conservation area: this new field requires information which was previously not reported. As a result, it has significant implication since the area in good condition and not-good condition is requested in ha. This information streamlines with the reporting under Resolution No. 8 (2012), helping to report the conservation status of habitats included in the Emerald Network.
- 3.1.12.3 Degree of conservation method used: this new field requires information previously not reported. This information streamlines with the reporting under Resolution No. 8 (2012), helping to report the conservation status of habitats included in the Emerald Network.
- 3.1.13 Conservation objectives: this new field requires information previously not reported as such. Nevertheless, it has a medium implication because conservation objectives were usually considered by site managers.

⁴ Implementing decision - 2023/2806 - EN - EUR-Lex (europa.eu)

- 3.1.14 Conservation objectives explanations: additional information on conservation objectives. It has a medium implication (see above).
- 3.1.16 Update date: this field is needed to clarify when the information on habitats has been updated. It has not got a significant implication.
- 3.2.9 Method used for population size: provide information on the reliability of data on population size (3.2.7.1). No significant implication for Parties since species population was already requested by the previous SDF, they only need to choose one of the three pre-defined options.
- 3.2.10 Period of last data collection: this field provides further information on when data was collected to improve data quality. It has medium implication because Parties need to fill in the date of the last survey; nevertheless, reporting this date as "unknown" is also possible.
- 3.2.11 Significance: no significant impact since the concept was already included in the past. D occurrences for species and habitats used to be considered as non-significant. Now the country will indicate it in this new field.
- 3.2.14 Population explanations (optional): additional information on population size. No significant implication since it is an optional field.
- 3.2.15.1 Degree of conservation categorised: no significant impact for this new field since this information was already covered by the previous field "Conservation" of the species.
- 3.2.15.2 Degree of conservation occupied area (optional): no significant impact for this new field since this information is optional. Nevertheless, it is recommended to fill in this field because it provides useful information for the quality of the area occupied by the species within the Emerald Network, thus contributing to the reporting under Resolution No. 8 (2012).
- 3.2.15.3 Degree of conservation occupied percentage classes: this new field requires information previously not reported. It requests information of the quality of the area occupied by species listed in Resolution No. 6 (1998). This information streamlines with the reporting under Resolution No. 8 (2012) reporting, helping to report the conservation status of species. included in the Emerald Network.
- 3.2.16 Conservation objectives: this new field requires information previously not reported as such. Nevertheless, it has a medium implication because conservation objectives were usually considered by site managers.
- 3.2.17 Conservation objectives explanations: additional information on conservation objectives for the species listed in Resolution No. 6 (1998). It has a medium implication.
- 4.3.2 Rank: it provides information on the impact of pressures: high, medium, low. No significant implications since the concept was already included in the past.
- $4.\overline{3}.3$ Location inside/outside: No significant implications since the concept was already included in the past.
- 4.3.4 Pressure further detailed: additional information on threats. Medium implications for Contracting Parties, depending on the level of detail they want to report.
- 4.3.5 Update date: when the site description was last updated. No significant implication on adding this date.
- 4.4.2 Update date: when the documentation has been updated.

No significant implication on adding this date.

- 5.2.3 Further explanations on management plans: Medium implications for Contracting Parties, depending on the level of detail they want to report.
- 5.3.1 Detailed information on measures: Medium implications for Contracting Parties because this field contains pre-defined options: conservation measures are included in management plans: yes or no and in which documents.
- 5.3.2 Status of conservation measures: Medium implications for Contracting Parties because this field contains pre-defined options.
- 5.4 Management effectiveness: Medium implications for Contracting Parties because this field contains pre-defined options (yes/no/unknown answers).

Deletion of old fields

- $2.1\ Site$ centre location: no longer needed. Low implications.
- 2.4 Site length (optional): no longer needed. Low implications.
- 3.1 Habitat type data quality: indicated in the new field 3.1.6 Method used for cover. No implications.
- 3.2 Species data quality: included in the new field 3.2.9 Method used for Population size. No

implications.

- 4.4 Ownership (optional): no longer needed. Low implications.
- 5. Site protection status (optional): this section has been completely removed from the new SDF as the data can be obtained from other data sources such as the inventory of nationally designated areas for EIONET countries. The impact is medium since other sources of information should be investigated for non-EIONET countries. Nevertheless, this section was optional.

Update of existing fields

- 3.1.3 Non-presence: This field was interpreted directly by countries. The new pre-defined options help clarify if the habitat type was never present in the site or is no longer present. The update of this field has positive implications on data quality.
- 3.1.10 Relative surface: The A relative surface has been split because in the past it was rather large. The A1, A2, A3 and A4 help 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.
- 3.2.5 Non-presence: This field was interpreted directly by countries. The new pre-defined options help clarify if the habitat type was never present in the site or is no longer present. The update of this field has positive implications on data quality.
- 3.2.13 Population: The A population has been split into A1, A2, A3 and A4 because the interval used to be rather large. The A1, A2, A3 and A4 help 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 predefined options. Low implication since this section is optional.
- 5.2.1 Existence of management plans(s): more options beyond "no / yes" were 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 requested, including the validity dates of the management plan. This updated field has medium implication for countries because they are asked to provide more information.
- 6.1 INSPIRE identifier: the section "Geospatial representation of the site" will replace the old section "Map of the site". It needs to be clarified if it should be automatically provided by the EEA.
- 6.1.1 Namespace: the section "Geospatial representation of the site" will replace the old section "Map of the site". The implication of this new field is foreseen as low.
- 6.1.2 Local identifier: the section "Geospatial representation of the site" will replace the old section "Map of the site". The implication of this new field needs to be discussed. For the time being, it can be considered as medium.
- 6.1.3 Version identifier (optional): the section "Geospatial representation of the site" will replace the old section "Map of the site". Since it is an optional field, the implication for countries is considered as low.

The table below summarizes the impact of the above assessed fields:

LOW IMPLICATION	MEDIUM	HIGH IMPLICATION
	IMPLICATION	
1.3.1 Site name non-	3.1.7 Period of last data	3.1.12.2Degree of
Latin alphabet	collection	conservation – area
1.5.7 Emerald Site Status	3.1.13 Conservation	3.1.12.3Degree of
	objectives	conservation - method
		used
3.1.6 Method used for	3.1.14 Conservation	3.2.15.3Degree of
cover	objectives – explanations	conservation - occupied
		percentage classes
3.1.11 Relative surface	3.2.10 Period of last data	3.1.10 Relative surface
explanations	collection	
3.1.12.1Degree of	3.2.16 Conservation	3.2.13 Population
conservation –	objectives	
categorised		

3.1.16 Update date	3.2.17 Conservation
	objectives – explanations
3.2.9 Method used for	4.3.4 Pressure further
population size	detailed
3.2.11 Significance	5.2.3 Further
	explanations on
	management plans
3.2.14 Population –	5.3.1 Detailed
explanations	information on measures
3.2.15.1Degree of	5.3.2 Status of
conservation –	conservation measures
categorised	
3.2.15.2 Degree of	5.4 Management
conservation - occupied	effectiveness
area	
4.3.2 Rank	5.2.2 Reference and
	validity of the management
	plan(s)
4.3.3 Location	6.1.2 Local identifier
inside/outside	
4.3.5 Update date	Deletion of 5. Site
	protection status
4.4.2 Update date	
3.1.3 Non-presence	
3.2.5 Non-presence	
3.3.8 Motivation	
5.2.1 Existence of	
management plans(s)	
6.1 INSPIRE identifier	
6.1.1 Namespace	
6.1.3 Version identifier	
Deletion of 2.1 Site centre	
location	
Deletion of 2.4 Site length	
Deletion of 3.1 Habitat	
type data quality	
Deletion of 3.2 Species	
data quality	
Deletion of 4.4 Ownership	

Proposed planning

The proposed planning is indicative since the new Natura 2000 dataflow in Reportnet 3 is still in development

Discussion on optional/compulsory fields, schemas and validation rules; Final draft of the new Emerald Network SDF.

Creation of the new Emerald Network SDF on Reportnet 3.

Workshop for countries on reporting on the new SDF on Reportnet 3; Testing phase for Parties;

Implementation of results from the testing phase.

During the period 2026-2029 Parties use the new SDF, but compulsory new fields can be left empty. It will not be possible to upload new files to the CDR when the Emerald Network dataflow is working on Reportnet 3.

<u>2029:</u>

The new SDF is used by Contracting Parties and the validation rules apply.

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

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	
2.	Site area and location	To be filled for each site
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	
5.	Site management	To be filled for each site
6.	Geospatial representation	

DATA FIELDS OF THE PROPOSED EMERALD STANDARD DATA FORM

	1. Site Identification		
1.1	Site type	Pre-defined options: ☐ A: site only important for Birds ☐ B: site important for habitats and non-avian species ☐ 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

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 Proposed Candidate Adopted

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: □ Cliff or steep area □ Cave □ Projection to ETRS89 □ 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 [GU1]: All data fields have been rephrased according to the Emerald Network terminology and dating principles

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

${\bf 3.} \ \textbf{Ecological information}$

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: ☐ the habitat is no longer present in the site ☐ 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: □ complete survey or a statistically robust estimate; □ based mainly on extrapolation from a limited amount of data; □ 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: ☐ A: excellent representativity ☐ B: good representativity ☐ C: significant representativity

3.1.10 Relative surface	Pre-defined options: □ A1: $100\% \ge p > 75\%$ □ A2: $75\% \ge p > 50\%$ □ A3: $50\% \ge p > 25\%$ □ A4: $25\% \ge p > 15\%$ □ B: $15\% \ge p > 2\%$ □ C: $2\% \ge p > 0\%$
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: ☐ A: excellent degree of conservation (nearly all of the habitat area in good condition) ☐ B: good degree of conservation (most of the habitat area in good condition) ☐ C: reduced degree of conservation (most of the habitat area in not good condition) ☐ X: unknown degree of conservation (most or all of the habitat area in unknown condition)
3.1.12.2 Degree of conservation – area	Give the area in hectares for each of the categories: Good condition:[ha] Not-good condition:[ha] Unknown condition:[ha]
3.1.12.3 Degree of conservation – method used	 □ Complete survey or statistically robust estimate in hectares (for example taken from mapping in management plans) □ Based mainly on extrapolation from a limited amount of data (expert judgement) □ Based mainly on expert opinion with very limited data (based on partial mapping data) □ Insufficient or no data available
3.1.13 Conservation objectives	Pre-defined options: □ Prevent deterioration □ Maintain the habitat type's surface area and its good condition □ Enlarge the area of the habitat type □ Improve the habitat type condition □ Re-establish the habitat type □ Other
3.1.14 Conservation objectives - explanations	Free text and language tag

3.1.15 Global	Pre-defined options: ☐ A: excellent value ☐ B: good value ☐ 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: ☐ the species is no longer present in the site ☐ 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: ☐ Permanent ☐ Reproducing ☐ Concentration ☐ 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)

1-PVS/PA(2024)04	T-PVS/PA(2024)04	
------------------	------------------	--

- 16 -

3.2.9 Method used for population size 3.2.10 Period of last data collection	Pre-defined options: Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate Based mainly on expert opinion with very limited data Based mainly on extrapolation from a limited amount of data Insufficient or no data available 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	Indicate if the bird species met the ornithological criteria used to justify SPA classification.
Not applicable for the Emerald Network	
3.2.13 Population	Pre-defined options: □ A1: $100\% \ge p > 75\%$ □ A2: $75\% \ge p > 50\%$ □ A3: $50\% \ge p > 25\%$ □ A4: $25\% \ge p > 15\%$ □ B: $15\% \ge p > 2\%$ □ C: $2\% \ge p > 0\%$
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: ☐ A: excellent degree of conservation (nearly all of the habitat occupied by the species has sufficient quality) ☐ B: good degree of conservation (most of the habitat occupied by the species has sufficient quality) ☐ C: reduced degree of conservation (most of the habitat occupied by the species has non-sufficient quality) ☐ 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)

Give the area of the habitat occupied by the species in percentages for each of the categories:

□ Sufficient quality: ...%
□ Non-sufficient quality: ...%

- ☐ Unknown habitat quality: ...%

3.2.15.3 Degree of conservation – occupied percentage classes	Estimated area of the habitat occupied by the species with sufficient quality □ 0-25 % □ 26-50% □ 51-75% □76-100% Estimated area of the habitat occupied by the species with non-sufficient quality □ 0-25 % □ 26-50% □ 51-75% □ 76-100% Estimated area of the habitat occupied by the species for which the quality is unknown □ 0-25 % □ 26-50% □ 51-75% □ 76-100%
3.2.16 Conservation objectives	Pre-defined options: □ Prevent deterioration □ Maintain the extent and good quality of the habitat of the species and the population size □ Enlarge area of the habitat of the species □ Re-establish habitat for the species □ Improve the quality of the habitat of the species (considering also disturbance and mortality factors) □ Increase the population size □ Reduce pressure on the population (e.g. reduce mortal-ity or disturbance) □ Re-establish the population at the site □ Other
3.2.17 Conservation objectives - explanations	Free text and language tag
3.2.18 Isolation	Pre-defined options: ☐ A: population (almost) isolated, ☐ B: population not isolated, but on margins of area of distribution, ☐ C: population not isolated within extended distribution range
3.2.19 Global	Pre-defined options: A: excellent value B: good value C: significant value
3.2.20 Update date	Year and month
3.3 Other important spe	ecies 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: □ Common □ Rare □ Very rare □ Present
3.3.8 Motivation	Pre-defined options: □ Appendix I species □ Appendix III species □ Appendix III species □ Species listed in National Red Lists □ Species listed in Global Red Lists □ Endemic species □ 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) □ Typical species of Resolution No. 4 (1996) habitat types □ Crop Wild Relatives (CWR) / Forest Genetic Resources (FGR) □ Invasive alien species of Union concern as referred to in the EU Regulation 1143/2014 on invasive alien species (IAS) □ Other reasons

Commented [GU2]: 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	
	Т
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: High importance Medium importance Low importance
4.3.3 Location inside/outside	Pre-defined options: ☐ Inside Emerald Network site ☐ Outside Emerald Network site ☐ 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: ☐ Yes (if yes fill in 5.2.2) ☐ No, site only partially covered (fill in 5.2.2) ☐ No, but in preparation ☐ No, because a management plan is not necessary (fill in 5.2.3) ☐ No, other reason (fill in 5.2.3)

5.2.2 Reference and validity of the management plan(s)	 □ Name of the plan and □ Link to the plan (URI) and □ 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: □ Necessary conservation measures are included in the management plan(s) to which the link is provided in section 5.2.2 (yes/no) □ 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? fully established partly established not established For fully or partly established measures only: 2. Are the established measures implemented? all implemented and/or all on-going only partly implemented and/or partly ongoing 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

