

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

## 1. Species information

1.1 Member State	Hungary
1.2 Species code	A220
1.3 EURING code	7650
1.4 Species scientific name	Strix uralensis
1.5 Subspecific population	
1.6 Alternative species scientific name	
1.7 Common name	uráli bagoly
1.8 Season	Breeding (B)

## 2. Population size

2.1 Year or period	2013-2018
2.2 Population size	a) Unit number of pairs (p) b) Minimum 120 c) Maximum 280 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	National park directorates' databases (Annual survey of colonially breeding and strictly protected bird species) <a href="http://map.mme.hu/maps/map2">http://map.mme.hu/maps/map2</a> Demeter, I., Horváth, M. & Prommer, M. (2019): Az MME Ragadozómadár-védelmi Szakosztálya (RMvSZ) által monitorozott fajok 2017-es költési eredményeinek összefoglalása. Heliaca: 15: 74-75.
2.6 Change and reason for change (since previous report)	Genuine change The change is mainly due to: Genuine change

### 2.7 Additional information

Demeter et al. (2019) estimated 120 pairs for 2017. This is considered here as a minimum figure (and it is probably an underestimate, so it was not used for trend calculations). The species has low detectability and annual fluctuations also complicate the picture. But because it has been proved to spread within Hungary and also increased in new localities, it is likely that the national population has slightly increased in the short-term trend period. So the maximum figure was raised compared to the 2013 report.

## 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	Fluctuating (F)
3.1.3 Short-term trend Magnitude	a) Minimum b) Maximum c) Best single value

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

### 3.1.4 Short-term trend Method used

Based mainly on expert opinion with very limited data

### 3.1.5 Sources

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-term trend Period

1980-2018

### 3.2.2 Long-term trend Direction

Increasing (+)

### 3.2.3 Long-term trend Magnitude

a) Minimum  
b) Maximum  
c) Best single value 1300

### 3.2.4 Long-term Trend Method used

Based mainly on expert opinion with very limited data

### 3.2.5 Sources

Haraszthy L. (szerk.) (1984): Magyarország fészkelő madarai. Natura, Budapest. 247 p.  
National park directorates' databases (Annual survey of colonially breeding and strictly protected bird species)  
<http://map.mme.hu/maps/map2>

### 3.3 Additional information

The species has low detectability but because it has been proved to spread within Hungary and also increased in new localities even in the short-term trend period, it is likely that the national population has slightly increased, too. Haraszthy (1984) estimated the population at 10-20 pairs in the early 1980s, and the maximum figure was the basis for the long-term trend (compared to the maximum figure of the present report).

## 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

4653

### 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 (Annual survey of colonially breeding and strictly protected bird species)  
<http://map.mme.hu/maps/map2>

### 4.8 Additional information

## 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

Increasing (+)

#### 5.1.3 Short-term trend Magnitude

a) Minimum  
b) Maximum  
c) Best single value 24

#### 5.1.4 Short-term trend Method used

Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate

#### 5.1.5 Sources

National park directorates' databases (Annual survey of colonially breeding

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

and strictly protected bird species)  
<http://map.mme.hu/maps/map2>  
[http://www.termeszetvedelem.hu/\\_user/browser/File/Natura2000/BD\\_12\\_jelentes\\_2013\\_anyagai/Strix\\_uralensis.pdf](http://www.termeszetvedelem.hu/_user/browser/File/Natura2000/BD_12_jelentes_2013_anyagai/Strix_uralensis.pdf)

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

5.2.1 Long-term trend Period	1980-2018
5.2.2 Long-term trend Direction	Increasing (+)
5.2.3 Long-term trend Magnitude	a) Minimum b) Maximum c) Best single value
5.2.4 Long-term trend Method used	Based mainly on extrapolation from a limited amount of data
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. <a href="http://map.mme.hu/maps/map2">Http://map.mme.hu/maps/map2</a>

### 5.3 Additional information

In the early 1980s, the species was only known to breed in the Zemplén Hill Range. In this report it is assumed that most of the range was occupied already then (this is probably an overestimation, but due to the low detectability of the species, detection of its occurrence in various localities was probably behind the actual spread of the species). The Zemplén Hills are covered roughly by 11 ETRS grids. So this figure (1100 km<sup>2</sup>) was compared with the range in the present report.

## 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)
Clear-cutting, removal of all trees (B09)	H	inside the Member State (inMS)
Transmission of electricity and communications (cables) (D06)	H	inside the Member State (inMS)

a) Threat	d) Ranking	e) location
Removal of old trees (excluding dead or dying trees) (B08)	H	inside the Member State (inMS)
Clear-cutting, removal of all trees (B09)	H	inside the Member State (inMS)
Transmission of electricity and communications (cables) (D06)	H	inside the Member State (inMS)

#### 7.2 Sources of information

Haraszthy L. (szerk.) (2014): Natura 2000 fajok és élőhelyek Magyarországon. Pro Vértes Közalapítvány, Csákvár. p. 627-628.

#### 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

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

Haraszthy L. (szerk.) (2014): Natura 2000 fajok és élőhelyek Magyarországon. Pro Vértes Közalapítvány, Csákvár. p. 627-628.

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

### 9. Natura 2000 (SPAs) coverage

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

a) Unit	number of pairs (p)
b) Minimum	100
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 extrapolation from a limited amount of 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 extrapolation from a limited amount of data

#### 9.6 Additional information

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

Uráli bagoly (*Strix uralensis*)  
jelölő faj (I. melléklet)

