

# Report on the main results of the surveillance under article 17 for annex I habitat types (Annex D)

CODE: 7230

NAME: Alkaline fens

## 1. National Level

### 1.1 Maps

1.1.1 Distribution Map	Yes
1.1.2 Distribution Method	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)
1.1.3 Year or period	2007-2012
1.1.4 Additional map	No
1.1.5 Range Map	Yes

## 2. Biogeographical Or Marine Level

### 2.1 Biogeographical Region

#### Pannonian (PAN)

### 2.2 Published

Bölöni J., Molnár Zs. & Kun A (2011): Magyarország Élőhelyei Vegetációtípusok leírása és határozója ÁNÉR 2011: MTA Ökológiai és Botanikai Kutatóintézete, Vácrátót.

Molnár, Zs., M. Biró, J. Bölöni & F. Horváth (2008): Distribution of the (semi-)natural habitats in Hungary I.: Marshes and grasslands, Acta Botanica Hungarica 50 (Suppl): 59-105.

A Nemzeti Biodiverzitás-monitorozó Rendszer keretében 2007-2012 között végzett felmérések kutatási jelentése

### 2.3 Range of the habitat type in the biogeographical region or marine region

2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km <sup>2</sup> )	27436
2.3.2 Range method used	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)
2.3.3 Short-term trend period	2001-2012
2.3.4 Short-term trend direction	stable (0)
2.3.5 Short-term trend magnitude	min max
2.3.6 Long-term trend period	
2.3.7 Long-term trend direction	N/A
2.3.8 Long-term trend magnitude	min max
2.3.9 Favourable reference range	area (km <sup>2</sup> ) operator approximately equal to (≈) unkown No method
2.3.10 Reason for change	Improved knowledge/more accurate data Use of different method

### 2.4 Area covered by Habitat

2.4.1 Surface area (km <sup>2</sup> )	25
2.4.2 Year or period	2007-2012
2.4.3 Method used	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)
2.4.4 Short-term trend period	2001-2012
2.4.5 Short-term trend direction	stable (0)
2.4.6 Short-term trend magnitude	min max

# Report on the main results of the surveillance under article 17 for annex I habitat types (Annex D)

2.4.7 Short term trend method used	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)
2.4.8 Long-term trend period	
2.4.9 Long-term trend direction	N/A
2.4.10 Long-term trend magnitude	min max
2.4.11 Long term trend method used	N/A
2.4.12 Favourable reference area	area (km) operator more than (>) unknown No method
2.4.13 Reason for change	Improved knowledge/more accurate data Use of different method

## 2.5 Main Pressures

Pressure	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
damage caused by game (excess population density) (F03.01.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
problematic native species (I02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
intensive mowing or intensification (A03.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
abandonment / lack of mowing (A03.03)	medium importance (M)	N/A
abandonment of pastoral systems, lack of grazing (A04.03)	medium importance (M)	N/A
competition (flora) (K04.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Peat extraction (C01.03)	low importance (L)	N/A
burning down (J01.01)	low importance (L)	N/A
forest planting on open ground (B01)	low importance (L)	N/A
invasive non-native species (I01)	high importance (H)	N/A
Landfill, land reclamation and drying out, general (J02.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
Canalisation & water deviation (J02.03)	high importance (H)	N/A
species composition change (succession) (K02.01)	high importance (H)	N/A

2.5.1 Method used – pressures based exclusively or to a larger extent on real data from sites/occurrences or other

## 2.6 Main Threats

Threat	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
invasive non-native species (I01)	high importance (H)	N/A
Landfill, land reclamation and drying out, general (J02.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
Canalisation & water deviation (J02.03)	high importance (H)	N/A
species composition change (succession) (K02.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
damage caused by game (excess population density) (F03.01.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
problematic native species (I02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
intensive mowing or intensification (A03.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
abandonment / lack of mowing (A03.03)	medium importance (M)	N/A
abandonment of pastoral systems, lack of grazing (A04.03)	medium importance (M)	N/A
competition (flora) (K04.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Peat extraction (C01.03)	low importance (L)	N/A

# Report on the main results of the surveillance under article 17 for annex I habitat types (Annex D)

burning down (J01.01)	low importance (L)	N/A
forest planting on open ground (B01)	low importance (L)	N/A

2.6.1 Method used – threats expert opinion (1)

## 2.7 Complementary Information

### 2.7.1 Species

Carex davalliana

Carex flava

Carex lepidocarpa

Carex panicea

Eriophorum spp.

Lathyrus pannonicus

Parnassia palustris

Polygala amarella

Scorzonera humilis

Juncus subnodulosus

Schoenus nigricans

Dactylorhiza majalis

Dactylorhiza incarnata

Epipactis palustris

Carex elata

Peucedanum palustre

Thelypteris palustris

Lysimachia vulgaris

Eupatorium cannabinum

Urtica dioica

Phragmites australis

Carex acutiformis

Aster adv. spp.

Echinocystis lobata

Solidago adv. spp.

### 2.7.2 Species method used

NBmR 5x5 km-es kvadrátok és N2000 területek élőhelytérképezése, az NBmR monitorozásra kiválasztott társulásainak cönológiai felvételezése, valamint a közösségi jelentőségű élőhelytípusok monitorozása eredményeinek összegzése és értékelése alapján.

### 2.7.3 Justification of % - thresholds for trends

### 2.7.4 Structure and functions - methods used

Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)

### 2.7.5 Other relevant information

A struktúra-funkció megítélése 5 komponensű (fajkészlet, fragmentáltság, inváziós fertőzöttség, termőhelyi sérülékenység, kezelések sikeressége) szempontrendszer alapján történt.

# Report on the main results of the surveillance under article 17 for annex I habitat types (Annex D)

## 2.8 Conclusions (assessment of conservation status at end of reporting period)

2.8.1 Range	assessment Favourable (FV) qualifiers N/A
2.8.2 Area	assessment Inadequate (U1) qualifiers stable (=)
2.8.3 Specific structures and functions (incl Species)	assessment Bad (U2) qualifiers declining (-)
2.8.4 Future prospects	assessment Inadequate (U1) qualifiers declining (-)
2.8.5 Overall assessment of Conservation Status	Bad (U2)
2.8.5 Overall trend in Conservation Status	declining (-)

## 3. Natura 2000 coverage conservation measures - Annex I habitat types on biogeographical level

### 3.1 Area covered by habitat

3.1.1 Surface area (km <sup>2</sup> )	min	20	max	22
3.1.2 Method used	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)			
3.1.3. Trend of surface area	N/A			

### 3.2 Conversation Measures

3.2.1 Measure	3.2.2 Type	3.2.3 Ranking	3.2.4 Location	3.2.5 Broad Evaluation
Other agriculture-related measures (2.0)	Legal Administrative Contractual Recurrent	high importance (H)	Both	Maintain Enhance Long term
Maintaining grasslands and other open habitats (2.1)	Administrative Contractual Recurrent	high importance (H)	Both	Maintain Enhance
Restoring/improving the hydrological regime (4.2)	Contractual Recurrent	high importance (H)	Both	Maintain Enhance Long term

