

Additional guidance on the use of conservation measures

The conservation measures in the checklist are at general level. The list is developed for the reporting purposes to help the Commission to assess the Natura 2000 contribution to the conservation status of species and habitats and all Member States should use the same list. This is why the checklist is short and one measure can cover various measures. E.g. under 2.1. 'Maintaining grasslands and other open habitats' cover measures like 'mowing, burning, grazing, removal/control of shrubs and other woody plants'. This means that when you complete the fields 3.2.2. – 3.2.5, you have to make a decision on the most relevant cases to be ticked (try to estimate the proportion of the habitat area targeted by the measure and importance of the measure for restoring/maintaining the conservation status). You can tick more than one under field 3.2.2. – e.g. if this includes mowing, grazing and control of shrubs under measure 2.1. you need to decide which one is/ones are the most relevant.

The reporting guidelines do not provide guidance on how to evaluate 'type', 'location' or 'evaluation for measures' in case Member States are aggregating own more detailed measures to report measures from the checklist of conservation measures as the thinking for the reporting purposes is to use those ones which are given in the list.

Reported 'type', 'location' or 'evaluation' should correspond with the measures in the checklist and the evaluation should be given for each measure from the biogeographical perspective. It is impossible to aggregate mechanically 'type', 'location' or 'evaluation' attributed to potential detailed partial measures, without re-evaluating them from the biogeographical perspective.

Some additional guidance:

For 3.2.2. 'Type' the reporting format allows reporting several 'types' for one conservation measure. So if one partial detailed measure is 'administrative' and another 'legal' and the relative importance of both measures for conservation status is not very different, both 'legal' and 'administrative' can be reported.

3.2.4 'Location' reflects case where the measures from the checklist were applied with reference to proportion of the habitat area/species population. So the evaluation in this section should answer the question whether the set of implemented partial detailed measures is mainly implemented inside or outside the Natura 2000. Here the aggregation is not possible.

For 3.2.5 'Evaluation' only most relevant case (or exceptionally relevant cases) should be ticked. In this case again the evaluation should reflect the impact of the entire set of implemented partial detailed measures.

If needed you can use the field 'other relevant information' to explain more details.