

speciesname *Spermophilus citellus* fajnév **közönséges ürge**
 melléklet **II** speciescode **1335**

2.2 Published sources and/or websites

Bihari Z., Heltai M., Csorba G. (szerk) (2007): Magyarország emlőseinek atlasza. Kossuth Kiadó, Budapest (in print)
 Váczi, O. (2006): Abiotikus környezeti tényezők hatása tér- és időbeli aktivitásmintázatára. Doktori disszertáció, ELTE Budapest

Range

2.3.1 Surface range of the species in km2 37950
 2.3.2 Date of range determination 2001-2006
 2.3.3 Quality of data concerning range Moderate e.g. based on partial data with som
 2.3.4 Range trend Stable (=)
 2.3.5 Range trend magnitude in km2 (optional)
 2.3.6 Range trend period 2000-2006
 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) 156
 2.4.1 Population size estimation (maximum) 434
 2.4.1 Population units Number of localities
 2.4.2 Date of population estimation 2001-2006
 2.4.3 Population-methods
 2.4.4 Quality of population data Moderate e.g. based o
 2.4.5 Population trend Stable (=)
 2.4.6 Population trend magnitude (km2)
 2.4.7 Population trend period 2000-2006
 2.4.8 Population-reasons

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

and/or specify

2.4.10 Population-pressures

101 - modification of cultivation practices
141 - abandonment of pastoral systems
243 - trapping, poisoning, poaching
401 - continuous urbanisation
941 - inundation

2.4.11 Population-threats

101 - modification of cultivation practices
141 - abandonment of pastoral systems
243 - trapping, poisoning, poaching
401 - continuous urbanisation
941 - inundation

Habitat

2.5.1 Habitats for the species

speciesname *Spermophilus citellus* fajnév **közönséges ürge**
 melléklet **II** speciescode **1335**

2.5.2 Area estimation (km2)	8834
2.5.3 Date of estimation	1998-2003
2.5.4 Quality of the data	Moderate e.g. based on partial data with s
2.5.5 Trend of the habitat	Decreasing (-)
2.5.6 Trend period	1998-2003
2.5.7 Habitat-reasons	Direct human influence (restoration, deterioration, destruction)
Other (specify)	Indirect anthro(zoo)genic influence
	Natural processes

Reference values

2.6 Future prospects for the species	Poor prospects - species likely to struggle
2.7.1 Favourable reference range (km2)	37950
Qualifier	
2.7.2 Favourable reference population	434
Qualifier	
2.7.3 Suitable habitat for the species	8834
2.7.4 Other relevant information (optional)	

Conclusions

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

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

Ürge (*Spermophilus citellus*)
II., IV. melléklet

