

Dear colleagues,

We received some comments and concerns from Poland to the draft red lists of Carpathian forest habitats and of vascular plants, submitted to Parties by Secretariat for consideration and possible finalization. We thank for these comments and here we would like to explain and respond some of them after consultations with leaders of expert groups dealing with the regional assessment of habitats and species within the BioREGIO project (I. Rizman, L. Vaško, P. Turis).

The Red Lists must be considered within the whole picture described in the background document, the publication on draft Carpathian Red List of forest habitats and species (Kadlečík ed. 2014)<sup>1</sup>, which includes methodological approach, more detailed information and explanations and more complete lists.

#### 1. The Draft Red List of Forest Habitats

- Due to different classification systems of habitats in the Carpathian countries, it was agreed in the beginning that common standardised platform is necessary and EUNIS habitat classification will be used in assessment, the same system was used also in the recent assessment of European terrestrial habitats<sup>2</sup> and it was recommended in the Feasibility Study (Rodwell et al. 2013) for this EU28 assessment. It is the scheme integral to policy delivery for the European Commission and already widely used by Member States and NGOs across Europe. Within the limited time and budget of the project it was not possible and advisable to use more detailed units, for some countries such data are not available.
- National situation and trends were taken into account, but overall Carpathian situation and threats were substantial. Polish experts during Carpathian regional assessment unfortunately did not provide required data on forest communities and available were only limited data from previous Carpathian projects. These experts were not present in the final workshop and consultations.
- Some communities have not been assessed as threatened in the highest categories of threat (e.g. Tilio-Acerion forests of slopes, screes and ravines, Abieti-Piceetum) and the published List includes only most threatened forest habitat types (CR, EN, VU) of the Carpathians.

#### 2. The Draft Red List of Vascular Plants

- Each of the participating countries provided data based on their best knowledge about threatened taxa on national level for all-Carpathian assessment. Selection of taxa of genus *Alchemilla* for the Red List was based solely on the selection of Polish participants. The selection of taxa took into account their threat status, and not endemism. The species *Cochlearia tatrae* is included in the Red List, but in the category NT, in the table distributed to Parties by the Secretariat, only “threatened” categories (CR, EN, VU) were selected. *Cochlearia pyrenaica* was omitted in the final list for publication by mistake (it was included in the working versions) and we thank for this notice.

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.bioregio-carpathians.eu/tl\\_files/bioregio/downloads\\_resources/Key%20Outputs%20and%20Publication/RedListofSpecies\\_Habitats\\_AlienSpecies.pdf](http://www.bioregio-carpathians.eu/tl_files/bioregio/downloads_resources/Key%20Outputs%20and%20Publication/RedListofSpecies_Habitats_AlienSpecies.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> European Union, 2016. European Red List of Habitats. Part 2. Terrestrial and Freshwater Habitats. [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/knowledge/pdf/terrestrial\\_EU\\_red\\_list\\_report.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/knowledge/pdf/terrestrial_EU_red_list_report.pdf)

- The methodology of the assessment was agreed in the beginning of the project by all partners and archaeophytical species were included.
- The meaning of RE category is explained in the above mentioned publication (page 46) and it concerns the Carpathian region. We thank for notice on *Camelina alyssum* ssp. *alyssum*, *C. alyssum* ssp. *integerrima* and *Dryopteris villari* – our knowledge about extinction of these species was only about situation in the Carpathians, we had no information about extinction in its whole range and it should be changed accordingly.
- Including of some taxa to the Red List (e.g. *Glyceria declinata*) results from the methodology; currently we do not know an expert with knowledge about the whole Carpathian flora and with ability to assess the trends and threats on this regional level, therefore we decided to use national red lists of the Carpathian part of the countries and threatened taxa included as a basis. For some species there were not sufficient information for assessment and expert opinion was taken into account with consensus between participants.
- *Melilotus altissimus* (not *M. latissimus* mentioned in the Polish comments) was included based of the Slovak proposal. Concerning the term “marginal” – by mistake the explanation of all terms and abbreviations was not included in the Legend at the end of the list (the table).
- *Camelina sativa* ssp. *sativa* – the mistake should be solved. *Ligularia sibirica* is included in the complete list in NT category.
- Using of terminology according to EuroMed in the first column was necessary due to various taxonomic concepts (different names, synonyms) used in the Carpathian countries and also because various taxonomic levels were assessed in the respective countries. The EuroMed names link them and clarify which taxon was assessed on the Carpathian level. For clarification which taxon was assessed on the national level serves the column with national names. According to our opinion this allows better orientation in the taxonomic understanding what is included in the Red List.

Each Red List should be based on relevant scientific data from the field and expert opinion from all participating countries and there is still what to improve in this work, but we think that there is no other comparable updated regional Red List for the Carpathian region and with the support of all Parties it can be accepted.

Dr. Ján Kadlečík  
State Nature Conservancy of the Slovak Republic