

# REPORT ON THE 'MAIN RESULTS OF THE SURVEILLANCE UNDER ARTICLE 17' FOR ANNEX II, IV AND V SPECIES OF DIRECTIVE 92/43/EEC

## NATIONAL LEVEL

### 1. GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 Member State	HU
1.2 Species code	5345
1.3 Species scientific name	<i>Rutilus virgo</i>
1.4 Alternative species scientific name (Optional)	<i>Rutilus pigus virgo</i>
1.5 Common name (Optional)	leánykancér

### 2. MAPS

*Distribution of the species within the Member State concerned.*

2.1 Sensitive species	No
2.2 Year or period	2019–2024
2.3 Distribution map	Yes
2.4 Distribution map Method used	Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate
2.5 Additional maps (Optional)	–
2.6 Additional information (Optional)	–

### 3. INFORMATION RELATED TO ANNEX V SPECIES (ART. 14 OF DIRECTIVE 92/43/EEC)

3.1 Is the species taken in the wild/exploited?	No	
3.2 Are measures needed for the species (only for species in favourable conservation status)?	No	
3.3 Which of the measures in Art. 14 have been taken?	a) regulations regarding access to property	–
	b) temporary or local prohibition of the taking of specimens in the wild and exploitation	–
	c) regulation of the periods and/or methods of taking specimens	–

	d) application of hunting and fishing rules which take account of the conservation of such populations	–					
	e) establishment of a system of licences for taking specimens or of quotas	–					
	f) regulation of the purchase, sale, offering for sale, keeping for sale or transport for sale of specimens	–					
	g) breeding in captivity of animal species as well as artificial propagation of plant species	–					
	h) other measures, if yes, describe	–					
3.4 Hunting bag or quantity taken in the wild regardless of conservation status - for Mammals and Acipenseridae (Fish)	a) Unit	–					
	b) Statistics/ quantity taken	<i>Provide statistics/quantity taken per hunting season or per year (where season is not used) over the reporting period</i>					
		Season/ year 1	Season/ year 2	Season/ year 3	Season/ year 4	Season/ year 5	Season/ year 6
	Min. (raw, i.e. not rounded)						
	Max. (raw, i.e. not rounded)						
	Unknown	–	–	–	–	–	–
3.5 Hunting bag or quantity taken in the wild Method used	–						
3.6 Additional information (Optional)	–						

## BIOGEOGRAPHICAL LEVEL

*Complete for each biogeographical region or marine region concerned.*

### 4. BIOGEOGRAPHICAL AND MARINE REGIONS

4.1 Biogeographical or marine region where the species occurs	<b>Pannonian</b>
4.2 First time reporting	No
4.3 Additional information	–

#### 4.4 Sources of information

Nemzeti Biodiverzitás-monitorozó Rendszer 2019-2024 közt végzett felméréseinek jelentései, ANPI, BFNPI, DDNPI, DINPI, HNPI, KNPI adatbázis, a BioAqua Pro, DE, BLKI, HUN-REN ÖK Közcélú Monitoring projektje, FB, VGT 2019 adatbázisa, Halasi-Kovács Béla, Sallai Márton és Sallai Zoltán, Weiperth András saját adatai és szakirodalmi adatok: HARKA Á. 2018: Terjed a Tiszában a leánykancér (*Rutilus virgo*). Halászat 111/4: 122. HARKA Á. 2024: Leánykancér (*Rutilus virgo*) a Kiskunságban. Halászat 117/1: 20. HARKA Á., JUHÁSZ M. & PAPP G. 2021: Leánykancér (*Rutilus virgo*) a Tisza-tóból. Halászat 114/4: 141. JUHÁSZ M. 2024: Leánykancér (*Rutilus virgo*) a Tisza folyó Tisza-tavi szakaszán. Halászat 117/2: 19. OLAJOS P., KISS B., POLYÁK L. & SALLAI Z. 2022: Research on fish communities of watercourses in Hungary using benthic trawl net: faunistical data. – Fol. Hist.-nat. Mus. Matr. 46: 135–152. POLYÁK L., OLAJOS P., KOVÁCS Z., FARKAS GY. B. & MÜLLER Z. 2023: Újabb adatok a leánykancér (*Rutilus virgo*) magyarországi elterjedéséhez. Halászat 116/2: 13. SALLAI Z. & ORCSIK T. 2022: Leánykancérok (*Rutilus virgo*) a Rábából. Halászat 115/4: 19. SALLAI Z. & SALLAI M. 2016: Leánykancér (*Rutilus virgo*) a Principális-csatornából. Halászat 109/2: 13. SALLAI Z. 2017: Leánykancér (*Rutilus virgo*) a Közép-Tiszán. Halászat 110/4: 17. SALLAI Z. 2020: Leánykancér (*Rutilus virgo*) a Pécsi-vízből. Halászat 113/4: 124. SALLAI Z. 2024: Leánykancér (*Rutilus virgo*) a Közép-Tisza alsó szakaszáról. Halászat 117/1: 19. SALLAI Z. & JUHÁSZ P. 2019: Elektromos kece alkalmazása a haltani kutatásoknál a Tisza bal parti vízgyűjtőjén és a Zagyván. XLIII. Halászati Tudományos Tanácskozás, Szarvas, 2019. május 29–30. p. 11–15. SALLAI Z. & JUHÁSZ P. 2021: A Túr magyarországi vízrendszerének halfaunisztikai vizsgálata. Pisces Hungarici 15: 39–54. SALLAI Z. & SALLAI M. 2021: A Duna halközösségének monitorozása a mohácsi Szabadság-sziget melletti fő- és mellékágban (2018–2020). Pisces Hungarici 15: 7–21. UDVARI ZS. & GYÖRE K. 2020: A Ráckevei (Soroksári)-Duna halfajkészlete (1902–2020). Pisces Hungarici 14: 151–162.

## 5. RANGE

*Range within the biogeographical/marine region concerned.*

5.1 Surface area (km <sup>2</sup> )	8295	
5.2 Change and reason for change in surface area of range and main reason	Is there a change between reporting periods? yes, due to improved knowledge/more accurate data	
	The change is mainly due to: improved knowledge or more accurate data	
5.3 Short-term trend Period	2013–2024	
5.4 Short-term trend Direction	stable	
5.5 Short-term trend Magnitude (Optional)	a) Estimated Minimum	–
	b) Estimated Maximum	–

	c) Pre-defined range	–
	d) Unknown	–
5.6. Short-term trend Magnitude Type of estimate (Optional)	–	
5.7 Short-term trend Method used	Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate	
5.8 Long-term trend Period (Optional)	–	
5.9 Long-term trend Direction (Optional)	–	
5.10 Long-term trend Magnitude (Optional)	a) Minimum	–
	b) Maximum	–
5.11 Long-term trend Method used (Optional)	–	
5.12 Favourable reference range	a) –	
	b) <i>if a precise favourable reference range is unknown indicate if the range is:</i> approximately equal to the favourable reference range (less than 2% smaller)	
	c) –	
	d) <i>Indicate method used to set reference value (multiple methods can be chosen)</i>	<i>Indicate the quality of information available:</i>
	Expert opinion	
5.13 Range when Directive came into force (Optional)	–	
5.14 Additional information (Optional)	–	

## 6. POPULATION

*Population within the biogeographical/marine region concerned.*

6.1 Year or period	2019–2024	
6.2 Population size (in reporting unit)	a) Unit	–
	b) Minimum	–
	c) Maximum	–
	d) Best single value	–
	e) Class	
6.3 Type of estimate	minimum	
6.4 Quality of extrapolation to reporting unit (Optional)	–	
6.5 Additional population size	a) Unit	number of map 1x1 km grid cells

(using population unit other than reporting unit) (Optional)	b) Minimum	–
	c) Maximum	–
	d) Best single value	271
6.6 Type of estimate (Optional)	minimum	
6.7 Population size Method used	Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate	
6.8 Change and reason for change in population size and main reason	Is there a change between reporting periods? yes, due to improved knowledge/more accurate data yes, due to the use of different method	
	The change is mainly due to: improved knowledge or more accurate data	
6.9 Short-term trend Period	2013–2024	
6.10 Short-term trend Direction	stable	
6.11 Short-term trend Magnitude	a) Estimated Minimum	–
	b) Estimated Maximum	–
	c) Pre-defined range	–
	d) Unknown	–
6.12 Short-term trend Magnitude Type of estimate	Best estimate	
6.13 Short-term trend Method used	Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate	
6.14 Long-term trend Period (Optional)	–	
6.15 Long-term trend Direction (Optional)	–	
6.16 Long-term trend Magnitude (Optional)	a) Minimum	–
	b) Maximum	–
	c) Confidence interval	–
6.17 Long-term trend Method used (Optional)	–	
6.18 Favourable reference population	<i>a) Population size (with unit):</i>	

	<p><i>b) if a precise favourable reference population is unknown indicate if the population is:</i> approximately equal to the favourable reference population (less than 5% smaller)</p>	
	<p><i>c) Indicate if favourable reference population is unknown:</i> –</p>	
	<p><i>d) Indicate method used to set reference value (multiple methods can be chosen)</i></p>	<p><i>Indicate the quality of information available:</i></p>
	<p>Expert opinion</p>	
6.19 Population size when Directive came into force (Optional)	<p>–</p>	
6.20 Additional Information (Optional)	<p>Monitoring methods implemented in Hungary do not make it possible to provide population estimates in individuals for this species. Nor is it scientifically justifiably possible to convert monitoring results into national population estimates in individuals, due to the large variation in abundance, both spatially and temporally, of the various subpopulations.</p>	

## 7. HABITAT FOR THE SPECIES

7.1 Sufficiency of area and quality of occupied habitat	<p>a) Is area of occupied habitat sufficient (for long-term survival)? Yes</p> <p>b) Is quality of occupied habitat sufficient (for long-term survival)? Yes</p> <p>c) If NO to a) is there a sufficiently large area of unoccupied habitat of suitable quality (for long-term survival)? –</p>	
7.2 Sufficiency of area and quality of occupied habitat Method used	<p>Area of habitat: Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate</p>	<p>Quality of habitat: Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate</p>
7.3 Short-term trend Period	<p>2013–2024</p>	
7.4 Short-term trend Direction	<p>stable</p>	
7.5 Short-term trend Method used	<p>Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate</p>	
7.6 Long-term trend Period (Optional)	<p>–</p>	
7.7 Long-term trend Direction (Optional)	<p>–</p>	
7.8 Long-term trend Method used (Optional)	<p>–</p>	

7.9 Additional information (Optional)	—
---------------------------------------	---

## 8. MAIN PRESSURES AND THREATS

### 8.1 Characterisation of pressures

Pressure	Timing	Scope (proportion of population affected)	Influence (on population or habitat of the species)	Invasive alien species of Union concern	Other invasive alien species
<b>PE02</b> Transport - Shipping lanes and ferry lanes transport operations	ongoing and likely to be in the future	minority <50%	Medium influence		
<b>PG13</b> Species exploitation - Bycatch and incidental killing (due to fishing and hunting)	ongoing and likely to be in the future	majority 50 – 90%	Medium influence		
8.2 Methods used (Optional)	—				
8.3 Sources of information (Optional)	—				
8.4 Additional information (Optional)	—				

## 9. CONSERVATION MEASURES

9.1 Status of measures	<p>Are measures needed?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Status of measures:</p> <p>Measures identified, but none yet taken</p>
9.2 Scope of measures taken	—
9.3 Main purpose of the measures taken	—
9.4 Location of the measures taken	—
9.5 Response to the measures <i>(when the measures start to neutralize the pressure(s) and produce positive effects)</i>	—

9.6 List of main conservation measures	<p>MC04 – Reduce impact of hydropower operation and infrastructure (incl. the restoration of freshwater habitats)</p> <p>MC08 – Manage/reduce/eliminate point or diffuse source pollution to surface or ground waters from resource exploitation and energy production</p> <p>ME01 – Reduce impact of transport operation and infrastructure</p> <p>MF04 – Reduce/eliminate pollution to surface or ground waters from commercial, residential and recreational areas and activities, and from industrial activities and structures</p> <p>MG13 – Other measures related to exploitation of species</p> <p>MK01 – Reduce impact of mixed source pollution</p> <p>MK02 – Reduce impact of multi-purpose hydrological changes</p> <p>MK04 – Other measures related to mixed source pollution.</p> <p>MX01 – Support conservation measures in another EU Member State</p>
9.7 Additional information (Optional)	–

## 10. FUTURE PROSPECTS

10.1 Future prospects of parameters	a) Range	Good
	b) Population	Unknown
	c) Habitat of the species	Unknown
10.2 Additional information (Optional)	–	

## 11. CONCLUSIONS

### *Assessment of conservation status at end of reporting period*

11.1 Range	Favourable (FV)	
11.2 Population	Favourable (FV)	
11.3 Habitat for the species	Favourable (FV)	
11.4 Future prospects	Unknown (XX)	
11.5 Overall assessment of Conservation Status	Favourable (FV)	
11.6 Overall trend in Conservation Status	stable	
11.7 Change and reasons for change in conservation status and conservation status trend	Overall assessment of conservation status (11.5)	
	<i>Indicate whether there is a change from the previous reporting round and (if yes) the nature of that change.</i>	no, there is no difference
	<i>The change is mainly due to:</i>	
	Overall trend in conservation status (11.6)	

	<i>Indicate whether there is a change from the previous reporting round and (if yes) the nature of that change.</i>	no, there is no difference
	<i>The change is mainly due to:</i>	
11.8 Additional information (Optional)	–	

## 12. NATURA 2000 (PROPOSED SITES OF COMMUNITY IMPORTANCE (PSCIs), SITES OF COMMUNITY IMPORTANCE (SCIs) AND SPECIAL AREAS OF CONSERVATION (SACs) COVERAGE FOR ANNEX II SPECIES OF DIRECTIVE 92/43/EEC

12.1 Population size inside the pSCIs, SCIs and SACs network (on the biogeographical/marine level including all sites where the species is present)	a) Unit	–
	b) Minimum	–
	c) Maximum	–
	d) Best single value	–
12.2 Type of estimate	–	
12.3 Additional population size (using population unit other than reporting unit in field 6.2) (Optional)	a) Unit	number of map 1x1 km grid cells
	b) Minimum	–
	c) Maximum	–
	d) Best single value	256
12.4 Type of estimate (Optional)	minimum	
12.5 Population size inside the network Method used	Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate	
12.6 Short-term trend of population size within the network Direction	stable	
12.7 Short-term trend of population size within the network Method used	Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate	

12.8 Short-term trend of habitat for the species within the network Direction	stable
12.9 Short-term trend of habitat for the species within the network Method used	Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate
12.10 Additional information (Optional)	–

### 13. COMPLEMENTARY INFORMATION


13.1 Justification of % thresholds for trends	–
13.2 Trans-boundary assessment	–
13.3 Other relevant information	–

# Az élőhelyvédelmi irányelv 17. cikke szerinti országjelentés, 2025

**Leánykoncér**

*(Rutilus virgo)*

II. és IV. melléklet



Forrás: Agrárminisztérium,  
Természetmegőrzési Főosztály

**Jelmagyarázat**

