

speciesname *Crambe tataria* fajnév **tátorján**  
 melléklet **II** speciescode **4091**

**2.2 Published sources and/or websites**

Horváth András: A tátorján fajmegőrzési terve, 2005.  
 Horváth A. 1991: A tátorján (*Crambe tataria* Sebeók) magyarországi védelmének cönológiai és ökológiai alapjai. – Természetvédelmi Közlemények 1: 23-38.

**Range**

2.3.1 Surface range of the species in km2 478  
 2.3.2 Date of range determination 2006  
 2.3.3 Quality of data concerning range Good e.g based on extensive surveys  
 2.3.4 Range trend Decreasing (-)  
 2.3.5 Range trend magnitude in km2 (optional)  
 2.3.6 Range trend period 1960-2006

2.3.7 range-reasons

Direct human influence (restoration, deterioration, destruction)
Indirect anthropo(zoo)genic influence
Natural processes

and/or specify

**Population**

2.4.1 Population size estimation (minimum) 2500  
 2.4.1 Population size estimation (maximum) 3000  
 2.4.1 Population units Number of individuals  
 2.4.2 Date of population estimation 2006  
 2.4.3 Population-methods From comprehensive inventory  
 2.4.4 Quality of population data Good e.g based on ext  
 2.4.5 Population trend Decreasing (-)  
 2.4.6 Population trend magnitude (km2) 50  
 2.4.7 Population trend period 1960-2006

2.4.8 Population-reasons

Direct human influence (restoration, deterioration, destruction)
Improved knowledge/more accurate data
Indirect anthropo(zoo)genic influence
Natural processes

and/or specify

2.4.10 Population-pressures

100 Cultivation
101 - modification of cultivation practices
140 Grazing
141 - abandonment of pastoral systems
180 Burning
950 Biocenotic evolution
954 - invasion by a species

2.4.11 Population-threats

141 - abandonment of pastoral systems
950 Biocenotic evolution
954 - invasion by a species

**Habitat**

2.5.1 Habitats for the species 40A0, 6210, 6250

speciesname	<i>Crambe tataria</i>	fajnév	tátorján
melléklet	II	speciescode	4091

---

2.5.2 Area estimation (km2)	0,4			
2.5.3 Date of estimation	2006			
2.5.4 Quality of the data	Good e.g based on extensive surveys			
2.5.5 Trend of the habitat	Decreasing (-)			
2.5.6 Trend period	1960-2006			
2.5.7 Habitat-reasons	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Direct human influence (restoration, deterioration, destruction)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indirect anthro(zoo)genic influence</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Natural processes</td> </tr> </table>	Direct human influence (restoration, deterioration, destruction)	Indirect anthro(zoo)genic influence	Natural processes
Direct human influence (restoration, deterioration, destruction)				
Indirect anthro(zoo)genic influence				
Natural processes				
Other (specify)				

### Reference values

2.6 Future prospects for the species	Poor prospects - species likely to struggle
2.7.1 Favourable reference range (km2)	478
Qualifier	
2.7.2 Favourable reference population	3000
Qualifier	
2.7.3 Suitable habitat for the species	0,5
2.7.4 Other relevant information (optional)	


### Conclusions

Conclusions: (2.3) Range	Inadequate (U1)
Conclusions: (2.4) Population	Inadequate (U1)
Conclusions: (2.5) Habitat for the species	Inadequate (U1)
Conclusions: (2.6) Future prospects	Inadequate (U1)
Conclusions: Overall assessment	Inadequate (U1)



Térképmelléklet az élőhelyvédelmi irányelv 17. cikke alapján készített országjelentéshez  
2007.

Tátorján (*Crambe tataria*)

II., IV. melléklet



Jelmagyarázat

-  Elterjedés (range)
-  Kiterjedés (distribution)

