

# Annex B - Bird Species' status and trends report (Article 12)

## 1. Species information

1.1 Member State	Hungary
1.2 Species code	A214
1.3 EURING code	7390
1.4 Species scientific name	Otus scops
1.5 Subspecific population	
1.6 Alternative species scientific name	
1.7 Common name	füleskuvik
1.8 Season	Breeding (B)

## 2. Population size

2.1 Year or period	2014-2018
2.2 Population size	a) Unit number of pairs (p) b) Minimum 800 c) Maximum 2400 d) Best single value
2.3 Type of estimate	Best estimate
2.4 Population size Method used	Based mainly on extrapolation from a limited amount of data
2.5 Sources	Demeter Iván, Horváth Márton & Prommer Mátyás (Heliaca 2017): Az MME Ragadozómadár-védelmi Szakosztálya (RMvSz) által monitorozott fajok 2017-es költsési eredményeinek összefoglalása, 75. o. Hámori Dániel, Csörgő Tibor (szerk, 2017): Magyarországon előforduló bagolyfajok határozása és gyakorlati természetvédelme, Herman Ottó Intézet, 46. o. Consultation with national experts. National park directorates' databases <a href="http://map.mme.hu/maps/map2">http://map.mme.hu/maps/map2</a> New method: Under the KEHOP-4.3.0-15-2016-00001 project in 2017-2018, 530 2.5x2.5 km <sup>2</sup> grids were surveyed for a given set of breeding bird species, covering 3.6% of the country. 84 pairs of Otus scops were estimated for the 530 grids. The habitat distribution in the 530 grids is considered to be representative of the country, so the national population may be estimated at 2359 pairs. This figure was used here as a maximum figure, considering that other, published estimates were lower (300-600 pairs).
2.6 Change and reason for change (since previous report)	Improved knowledge/more accurate data Use of different method  The change is mainly due to: Use of different method
2.7 Additional information	It is now considered that the population size was strongly underestimated in the previous reporting period. Since 2012, experts have been applying different monitoring methods focusing on sample areas, resulting in more accurate data.

## 3. Population trend

## Annex B - Bird Species' status and trends report (Article 12)

### 3.1 Short-term trend (last 12 years)

3.1.1 Short-term trend Period	2007-2018
3.1.2 Short-term trend Direction	Increasing (+)
3.1.3 Short-term trend Magnitude	a) Minimum 5 b) Maximum 20 c) Best single value
3.1.4 Short-term trend Method used	Based mainly on expert opinion with very limited data
3.1.5 Sources	Consultation with national experts. National park directorates' databases

### 3.2 Long-term trend (since c. 1980)

3.2.1 Long-term trend Period	1980-2018
3.2.2 Long-term trend Direction	Increasing (+)
3.2.3 Long-term trend Magnitude	a) Minimum 10 b) Maximum 30 c) Best single value
3.2.4 Long-term Trend Method used	Based mainly on expert opinion with very limited data
3.2.5 Sources	Hámori Dániel, Csörgő Tibor (szerk, 2017): Magyarországon előforduló bagolyfajok határozása és gyakorlati természetvédelme, Herman Ottó Intézet, 46. o. Consultation with national experts. National park directorates' databases <a href="http://map.mme.hu/maps/map2">http://map.mme.hu/maps/map2</a>

### 3.3 Additional information

## 4. Breeding distribution map and size

4.1 Sensitive species	No
4.2 Year or period	2014-2018
4.3 Breeding distribution map	Yes
4.4 Breeding distribution surface area	20285
4.5 Breeding distribution Method used	Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate
4.6 Additional maps	No
4.7 Sources	National park directorates' databases <a href="http://map.mme.hu/maps/map2">http://map.mme.hu/maps/map2</a>
4.8 Additional information	The distribution map was made by using breeding probability data in all categories (possible, likely and certain).

## 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

## Annex B - Bird Species' status and trends report (Article 12)

### 5.1.4 Short-term trend Method used

c) Best single value

Based mainly on extrapolation from a limited amount of data

### 5.1.5 Sources

Consultation with national experts.

National park directorates' databases

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

MME Nomenclator Bizottság (2008): Magyarország madarainak névjegyzéke.

Nomenclator avium Hungariae. Magyar Madártani és Természetvédelmi

Egyesület, Budapest. 189-190 p.

## 5.2 Long-term trend (since c. 1980)

### 5.2.1 Long-term trend Period

1980-2018

### 5.2.2 Long-term trend Direction

Unknown (X)

### 5.2.3 Long-term trend Magnitude

a) Minimum

b) Maximum

c) Best single value

### 5.2.4 Long-term trend Method used

Insufficient or no data available

### 5.2.5 Sources

Haraszthy L. (szerk.) (1984): Magyarország fészkelő madarai. Natura, Budapest. 246 p.

Haraszthy, L. (szerk.) (1998): Magyarország madarai. Mezőgazda Kiadó, Budapest. 441 p.

Magyar G., Hadarics T., Waliczky Z., Schmidt A., Nagy T. & Bankovics A. (1998): Magyarország madarainak névjegyzéke. Madártani Intézet, Budapest, 110 p.

MME Nomenclator Bizottság (2008): Magyarország madarainak névjegyzéke.

Nomenclator avium Hungariae. Magyar Madártani és Természetvédelmi Egyesület, Budapest. 189-190 p.

National park directorates' databases

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

### 5.3 Additional information

As there is no data available from the 1980s and valuable data are accessible only from the 2010s, it is impossible to estimate the direction of long-term breeding distribution trend.

## 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?

No

6.1 Type of international plan

No plan (NA)

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

No

6.3 If 'NO', describe any measures and initiatives taken related to the international SAP/MP/BMS

6.4 Assessment of the effectiveness of SAPs for globally threatened species (Art. 12, Species Action Plans)

()

## Annex B - Bird Species' status and trends report (Article 12)

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

( )

6.6 Sources of further Information

### 7. Main pressures and threats

a) Pressure	b) Ranking	c) location
Removal of old trees (excluding dead or dying trees) (B08)	H	inside the Member State (inMS)
Conversion from other land uses to housing, settlement or recreational areas (excluding drainage and modification of coastline, estuary and coastal conditions) (F01)	H	inside the Member State (inMS)
Conversion from other land uses to commercial / industrial areas (excluding drainage and modification of coastline, estuary and coastal conditions) (F03)	H	inside the Member State (inMS)
Conversion from mixed farming and agroforestry systems to specialised (e.g. single crop) production (A03)	H	inside the Member State (inMS)
Abandonment of grassland management (e.g. cessation of grazing or mowing) (A06)	H	inside the Member State (inMS)
Roads, paths, railroads and related infrastructure (e.g. bridges, viaducts, tunnels) (E01)	M	inside the Member State (inMS)
Transmission of electricity and communications (cables) (D06)	M	inside the Member State (inMS)
Problematic native species (I04)	M	inside the Member State (inMS)
Illegal shooting/killing (G10)	M	outside EU (outEU)
a) Threat	d) Ranking	e) location
Removal of old trees (excluding dead or dying trees) (B08)	H	inside the Member State (inMS)
Conversion from other land uses to housing, settlement or recreational areas (excluding drainage and modification of coastline, estuary and coastal conditions) (F01)	H	inside the Member State (inMS)
Conversion from other land uses to commercial / industrial areas (excluding drainage and modification of coastline, estuary and coastal conditions) (F03)	H	inside the Member State (inMS)
Conversion from mixed farming and agroforestry systems to specialised (e.g. single crop) production (A03)	H	inside the Member State (inMS)
Abandonment of grassland management (e.g. cessation of grazing or mowing) (A06)	H	inside the Member State (inMS)
Roads, paths, railroads and related infrastructure (e.g. bridges, viaducts, tunnels) (E01)	M	inside the Member State (inMS)
Transmission of electricity and communications (cables) (D06)	M	inside the Member State (inMS)
Problematic native species (I04)	M	inside the Member State (inMS)

## Annex B - Bird Species' status and trends report (Article 12)

Illegal shooting/killing (G10)

M

outside EU (outEU)

### 7.2 Sources of information

Hámori Dániel, Csörgő Tibor (szerk, 2017): Magyarországon előforduló bagolyfajok határozása és gyakorlati természetvédelme, Herman Ottó Intézet, 46-47. o.

Consultation with national experts.

National park directorates' databases

### 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

Maintain the current distribution, population and/or habitat for the species

### 8.3 Location of the measures

Both inside and outside Natura 2000

### 8.4 Response to the measures

Short-term results (within the current reporting period, 2013-2018)

### 8.5 List of main conservation measures

CA04 - Reinstate appropriate agricultural practices to address abandonment, including mowing, grazing, burning or equivalent measures

CB05 - Adapt/change forest management and exploitation practices

CC06 - Reduce impact of service corridors and networks

CS03 - Improvement of habitat of species from the directives

### 8.6 Additional information

## 9. Natura 2000 (SPAs) coverage

### 9.1 Population size inside the Natura 2000 (SPA) network

a) Unit	number of pairs (p)
b) Minimum	200
c) Maximum	250
d) Best single value	

### 9.2 Type of estimate

Best estimate

### 9.3 Population size inside the network Method used

Based mainly on expert opinion with very limited data

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

Increasing (+)

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

Based mainly on expert opinion with very limited data

### 9.6 Additional information

From the KEHOP-4.3.0-15-2016-00001 project in 2017-2018, 230 pairs can be estimated to breed in SPAs (calculating from the number of pairs in the sample grids covered more than 50% by SPAs). This was used here as the basis of estimation.

## **Annex B - Bird Species' status and trends report (Article 12)**

# A madárvédelmi irányelv 12. cikke alapján készített országjelentés 2019.

**Füleskuvik (*Otus scops*)**  
jelölő faj (egyéb)

