1. Species information

1.1 Member State Hungary A080 1.2 Species code 1.3 EURING code 2560

1.4 Species scientific name Circaetus gallicus

1.5 Subspecific population

1.6 Alternative species scientific name

1.7 Common name kígyászölyv 1.8 Season Breeding (B)

2. Population size

2.1 Year or period 2015-2017

2.2 Population size a) Unit number of pairs (p)

> b) Minimum 41 45 c) Maximum

d) Best single value

Best estimate 2.3 Type of estimate

2.4 Population size Method used Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate

2.5 Sources National park directorates' databases (Annual survey of colonially breeding

and strictly protected bird species) http://map.mme.hu/maps/map2

2.6 Change and reason for change Improved knowledge/more accurate data (since previous report)

The change is mainly due to: Improved knowledge/more accurate data

2.7 Additional information

3. Population trend

3.1 Short-term trend (last 12 years)

3.1.1 Short-term trend Period 2007-2018

3.1.2 Short-term trend Direction Stable (0)

3.1.3 Short-term trend Magnitude a) Minimum b) Maximum

c) Best single value

3.1.4 Short-term trend Method used Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate

3.1.5 Sources

Haraszthy L. (szerk.) (2014): Natura 2000 fajok és élőhelyek Magyarországon.

Pro Vértes Közalapítvány, Csákvár. p. 548-551.

National park directorates' databases (Annual survey of colonially breeding

and strictly protected bird species) http://map.mme.hu/maps/map2

3.2 Long-term trend (since c. 1980)

3.2.1 Long-tern trend Period 1985-2018 3.2.2 Long-term trend Direction Decreasing (-)

2020. május 21. Page 1 of 5

3.2.3 Long-term trend Magnitude	a) Minimum	55		
	b) Maximum	59		
	c) Best single value			
3.2.4 Long-term Trend Method used	Based mainly on expe	ert opinion with very limited data		
3.2.5 Sources	Haraszthy L. (szerk.) (2014): Natura 2000 fajok és élőhelyek Magyarországon			
	Pro Vértes Közalapítv	ány, Csákvár. p. 548-551.		
	National park directo	rates' databases (Annual survey of colonially breeding		
	and strictly protected	bird species)		
	http://map.mme.hu/	maps/map2		

3.3 Additional information

Haraszthy (2014) estimates that the population in the mid-1980s may have been even above 100 pairs, so this value (100 pairs) was used as the basis of the long-term trend.

4. Breeding distribution map and size

4.1 Sensitive species	No
4.2 Year or period	2014-2018
4.3 Breading distribution map	Yes
4.4 Breading distribution surface area	2861
4.5 Breading distribution Method used	Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate
4.6 Additional maps	No
4.7 Sources	National park directorates' databases (Annual survey of colonially breeding
	and strictly protected bird species)
4.8 Additional information	http://map.mme.hu/maps/map2

5. Breeding range trend

5.1 Short-term trend (last 12 years)

5.1.1 Short-term trend Period	2007-2018
5.1.2 Short-term trend Direction	Stable (0)
5.1.3 Short-term trend Magnitude	a) Minimum
	b) Maximum
	c) Best single value
5.1.4 Short-term trend Method used	Complete survey or

5.1.4 Short-term trend Method used5.1.5 Sources

Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate

Haraszthy L. (szerk.) (2014): Natura 2000 fajok és élőhelyek Magyarországon. Pro Vértes Közalapítvány, Csákvár. p. 548-551.

National park directorates' databases (Annual survey of colonially breeding

and strictly protected bird species) http://map.mme.hu/maps/map2

5.2 Long-term trend (since c. 1980)

5.2.1 Long-term trend Period5.2.2 Long-term trend Direction	1980-2018 Decreasing (-)	
5.2.3 Long-term trend Magnitude	a) Minimum	10
	b) Maximum	30

2020. május 21. Page 2 of 5

5.2.4 Long-term trend Method used 5.2.5 Sources

c) Best single value

30 Based mainly on expert opinion with very limited data

Haraszthy L. (szerk.) (2014): Natura 2000 fajok és élőhelyek Magyarországon. Pro Vértes Közalapítvány, Csákvár. p. 548-551.

National park directorates' databases (Annual survey of colonially breeding and strictly protected bird species)

http://map.mme.hu/maps/map2

5.3 Additional information

The short-term trend of the distribution is considered stable, as is the population, the apparent decline when the map is compared with the map in the 2013 report is because the latter was based on a much longer period (2000-2012).

In the 2013 Article 12 report, the long-term population decline was estimated at 10-30%, while the long-term breeding range decline at 10-20%. Here, the the long-term population decline is estimated at 55-59%, so the long-term breeding range decline is also put at a possibly higher rate, 10-30% (not exactly the same as the population decline, as the population density was probably higher at that time, concentrating on the best habitats).

6. Progress in work related to international Species Action Plans (SAPs), Management Plans (MPs) and Brief Management Statements (BMSs)

6.0 Is/Will the information related to international SAPs, MPs and BMSs (section 6) be provided for the other season for this species?

6.1 Type of international plan 6.2 Has a national plan linked to the intarnational SAP/MP/BMS been adopted?

6.3 If 'NO', describe any measures and initiatives taken related to the international SAP/MP/BMS 6.4 Assessment of the effectivess of SAPs for globally threatened species (Art. 12, Species Action Plans)

6.5 Assessment of the effectivess of MPs for huntable species in non-Secure status (Articles 3 and 7, Management Plans)

6.6 Sources of further Information

Nο

No plan (NA) No

()

()

7. Main pressures and threats

2020. május 21. Page 3 of 5

a) Pressure	b) Ranking	c) location
Conversion from one type of agricultural land use to another (excluding drainage and burning) (A02)	Н	inside the Member State (inMS)
Abandonment of grassland management (e.g. cessation of grazing or mowing) (A06)	Н	inside the Member State (inMS)
Clear-cutting, removal of all trees (B09)	Н	inside the Member State (inMS)
Transmission of electricity and communications (cables) (D06)	M	inside the Member State (inMS)
Sports, tourism and leisure activities (F07)	Н	inside the Member State (inMS)
Illegal shooting/killing (G10)	Н	both inside and outside EU (inOutEU)
a) Threat	d) Ranking	e) location
Conversion from one type of agricultural land use to another (excluding drainage and burning) (A02)	Н	inside the Member State (inMS)
Abandonment of grassland management (e.g. cessation of grazing or mowing) (A06)	Н	inside the Member State (inMS)
Clear-cutting, removal of all trees (B09)	Н	inside the Member State (inMS)
Transmission of electricity and communications (cables) (D06)	М	inside the Member State (inMS)
Coarte tourism and laisure activities (FO7)	Н	inside the Member State (inMS)
Sports, tourism and leisure activities (F07)		

7.2 Sources of information

Haraszthy L. (szerk.) (2014): Natura 2000 fajok és élőhelyek Magyarországon. Pro Vértes Közalapítvány, Csákvár. p. 548-551.

7.3 Additional information

8. Main Conservation Measures

8.1 Status of measures Measures identified and taken	
8.2 Main purpose of the measures taken Increase the population size and/or improve population (improve reproduction success, reduce mortality, improstructure)	•
8.3 Location of the measures Both inside and outside Natura 2000	
8.4 Response to the measures Medium-term results (within the next two reporting per 2030)	periods, 2019-

8.5 List of main conservation measures

- CA01 Prevent conversion of natural and semi-natural habitats, and habitats of species into agricultural land
- CA03 Maintain existing extensive agricultural practices and agricultural landscape features
- CA04 Reinstate appropriate agricultural practices to address abandonment, including mowing, grazing, burning or equivalent measures
- CB02 Maintain existing traditional forest management and exploitation practices
- CB05 Adapt/change forest management and exploitation practices

2020. május 21. Page 4 of 5

CB06 - Stop forest management and exploitation practices

CC06 - Reduce impact of service corridors and networks

CF03 - Reduce impact of outdoor sports, leisure and recreational activities

CS03 - Improvement of habitat of species from the directives

8.6 Additional information

Haraszthy L. (szerk.) (2014): Natura 2000 fajok és élőhelyek Magyarországon. Pro Vértes Közalapítvány, Csákvár. p. 548-551.

9. Natura 2000 (SPAs) coverage

9.1 Population size inside the Natura 2000 (SPA) network

a) Unit number of pairs (p)

b) Minimum 30 c) Maximum 37

d) Best single value

Best estimate

9.2 Type of estimate

9.3 Population size inside the network Method used

9.4 Short-term trend of population size within the network Direction

9.5 Short-term trend of population size within the network Method used

9.6 Additional information

Based mainly on extrapolation from a limited amount of data

Stable (0)

Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate

Based on the number of 2.5x2.5 km2 grids (39) with likely or certain breeding of the species and on the subset of these overlapping more than 50% with SPAs (29) or any degree with SPAs (32), assuming an even density within occupied grids.

2020. május 21. Page 5 of 5