



### 4<sup>th</sup> Natura 2000 Mediterranean Seminar Larnaca, Cyprus

Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

# Conservation status improvement targets for habitat types and species

Rafael Hidalgo & Francisco Guil

Subdirección General de Biodiversidad Terrestre y Marina Ministerio para la Transición Ecológica y el Reto Demográfico







### Some basic figures

#### Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process



### 30% target for improving status

Terrestrial Habitat types

• Total\*: 247

• U1/U2: **181** 

\*assessments

Terrestrial **Species** (no birds)

• Total\*: 621

• U1/U2: **415** 

\*assessments

Terrestrial Species: **Birds** 

• Total: 329

• CR/EN/VU: **56** 

**TOTAL U1/U2** (+ *CR/EN/VU*): **652 30**% = **196** 





# SELECTION PROCESS Habitat types of community interest

#### Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

0) The priority of action for the selection of Habitat types of Community interest (HCIs) that would contribute to meeting the 30% improvement target should fall on **all 'Unfavorable-bad' assessments**, because these HCIs are the ones that present the greatest risk, and in the shortest term, of destruction or irreversible degradation.

Unfeasible by 2030 → An alternative (albeit robust) approach is needed





# SELECTION PROCESS Habitat types of community interest

### Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

- 1) <u>First selection criterion</u>: Prioritize those unfavorable assessments (both U2 and U1) whose eventual **improvement depends exclusively on improving the status of a single parameter of the General Evaluation Matrix**, regardless of the total number of parameters that show an unfavorable status.
  - → 103 assessments. Of these, 19 are assessments whose improvement depends only on the 'Future Prospects' parameter, 57 on the 'Structure and Specific Functions', 23 on the 'Occupied Area', and 4 on the 'Range'.





# SELECTION PROCESS Habitat types of community interest

#### Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

2) The selection of HCIs that could be included in the 30% target should be made on a case-by-case basis from those 103 assessments. Not feasible: severe time and resource constraints.

Alternative approach: it can be assumed that the parameter on which presumably the most effective action can be taken to improve the CS is that of 'Future Prospects'

<u>Second selection criterion</u>: Priority should be given to those unfavorable evaluations whose eventual **improvement depends on improving the parameters 'Future prospects' or, secondarily, 'Structure and specific functions'**.

 $\rightarrow$  (103  $\rightarrow$ ) **76 assessments** (19 'Future Prospects' + 57 'Structure and functions')





### **SELECTION PROCESS**

### **Habitat types of community interest**

#### Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

3) Third and last selection criterion: priority is given to those assessments for which the area occupied in Spain by the corresponding HCI is equal to or greater than 50% of the total area occupied by that HCI in the EU.

 $\rightarrow$  (57  $\rightarrow$ ) 32 assessments

Final selection: **51** assessments:

1150 ATL	U1
1320 MED	U2
2190 ATL	U1
2250 MED	U2
2270 MED	U2
3160 MED	U2
3170 MED	U2
3220 MED	U1
3240 ATL	U2
3260 ALP	U1
4020 ATL	U1
4030 ATL	U1
4030 MED	U1
4090 ATL	U1
5120 MED	U2
5120 ATL	U2
5130 ALP	U1

U1
U1
U2
U1
U1
U1
U2
U1
U2
U2
U1
U1

8220 MED	U1
8230 ATL	U1
8230 MED	U1
8310 ALP	U1
8320 MAC	U1
9160 ALP	U2
91E0 MED	U2
9240 ATL	U1
92A0 MED	U1
92D0 MAC	U1
9320 MAC	U1
9340 ALP	U2
9340 MED	U1
9370 MAC	U1
9380 ATL	U1
9550 MAC	U1
9570 MED	U1





# SELECTION PROCESS Species of community interest: Flora

#### Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

### 1) Atributtes:

- Species with Management Plan in the Biogeographical Region
- Species with stable or increasing trends
- Pressures and threats affecting the species
- Species present in Natura 2000 sites
- Degree of responsibility of Spain





# SELECTION PROCESS Species of community interest: Flora

#### Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

### 2) <u>Criteria for initial selection</u>:

- Species with stable or increasing trends and Management Plan → 21 assessments
- Species with stable or increasing trends (not included in the previous set) <u>and</u> favourable 'Future Prospects' → 12 assessments
- Other taxa on a case-by-case basis → 9 assessments



Initial selection: 42 assessments





# SELECTION PROCESS Species of community interest: Flora

#### Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

- 3) Discussion and agreement by Ministry & Regional Governments:
  - √ 10 new assessments added
  - √ 1 assessment deleted



<u>Final selection</u>: **51 assessments** (34% of the total number of unfavorable assessments)

39 out of these 51 assessments are of endemic species, representing 76.5% of the total number of assessments selected





# SELECTION PROCESS Species of community interest: Fauna

#### Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

1) Pressures and threats for each species have been evaluated, considering that this is the variable most closely related to the real possibility of making a realistic prediction of the possible evolution of their conservation status.

An **index** has been calculated, quantitatively assigning a value of 1 for a 'Medium' threat ranking and a value of 2 for a 'High' threat ranking:

Pressures & Threats value for species  $X = (Sum \ of \ Threats * ranking \ of \ each \ one) / total \ of \ threats$ 





# SELECTION PROCESS Species of community interest: Fauna

#### Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

### 2) General criteria for prioritization:

- Assessments with lower values of the above index (< 1,30)</li>
- Species for which there are conservation programs at the national level
- (Some exceptions to the two previous criteria have been made at the suggestion of wildlife conservation managers —eg. exclusion of game species, or inclusion of species with an increasing and alarming risk of extinction)



3) Final selection: 87 assessments (34% of the total number of unfavorable assessments)





# SELECTION PROCESS **Birds**

#### Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

1) Pressures and threats for each species have been evaluated, considering that this is the variable most closely related to the real possibility of making a realistic prediction of the possible evolution of their conservation status.

An **index** has been calculated, quantitatively assigning a value of 1 for a 'Medium' threat ranking and a value of 2 for a 'High' threat ranking:

Pressures & Threats value for species  $X = (Sum \ of \ Threats * ranking \ of \ each \ one) / total \ of \ threats$ 





# SELECTION PROCESS **Birds**

#### Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

### 2) General **criteria for prioritization**:

- Species with lower values of the above index (< 1,33)</li>
- Species for which there are conservation programs at the national level
- (Some exceptions to the two previous criteria have been made at the suggestion of wildlife conservation managers —eg. exclusion of game species, or inclusion of species with an increasing and alarming risk of extinction)



3) <u>Final selection</u>: **17 species** (30% of the total number of species CR/EN/VU)





### **Results**

#### Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

### Terrestrial Habitat types

• Total\*: 247

• U1/U2: 181

• Selected: 51

\*assessments

### Terrestrial **Species** (no birds)

• Total\*: 621

• U1/U2: 415

• Selected: 138

\*assessments

Terrestrial Species: **Birds** 

• Total: 329

• CR/EN/VU: 56

• Selected: 17

**TOTAL: 206 (31,6%)** 

### THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION