

AIN 17954 R

WR
99
WCMC Reports 99

**Comparison of site-related data requirements for
European Directive and Ramsar Convention
reporting with information gathered through
Common Standards monitoring**

Prepared for the
Joint Nature Conservation Committee

by

**Javier Beltrán and Jeremy Harrison
World Conservation Monitoring Centre**



**WORLD CONSERVATION
MONITORING CENTRE**

**Final Report
April 1999**

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
UNEP-WCMC, Cambridge

<http://www.archive.org/details/comparisonofsite99belt>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
	1.1 Mandate	1
	1.2 Aims and objectives	1
	1.3 Working documents	2
2.	WORKING METHOD.....	3
3.	COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS.....	5
	3.1 Comparison between <i>Natura 2000</i> and Ramsar data forms	5
	3.2 Comparison of formats used for common standards reporting by country agencies ...	6
	3.3 Comparison of country agency Common Standards reporting formats with international reporting requirements.....	7
	3.4 Analysis of data gaps.....	7
	3.5 Other issues of concern.....	8
4.	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	9

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Mandate

The Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) has agreed standards for monitoring the condition of “interest features” on designated sites (Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Areas of Special Scientific Interest, Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation and Ramsar sites). These standards require the country agencies to gather and report information on condition, land purpose and legality categories to JNCC on a 6-year cycle, with interim reports on a 3-year cycle.

The JNCC, through its International Site Designations Project team also acts as a reference point for the collation and supply of site-related information, through the Department of Environment Transport and the Regions, to the European Commission (*Natura 2000* network) and Ramsar Convention Bureau. The JNCC wishes to satisfy itself that the majority of site-related reporting required under the EC Habitats and Birds Directives and the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance can be met by information gathered and maintained by the country agencies and JNCC. In particular JNCC needs to establish that required information on the ecological status of sites and the factors affecting this would be gathered and maintained through the Common Standards Monitoring Programme.

The work undertaken through this contract by the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) is the first step in fulfilling an agreed corporate target within the support unit's work for 1998/9 “*undertake a detailed comparison of the information supplied in Natura 2000 and Ramsar data sheets with that gathered through common standards monitoring*”. Using the material compiled in implementation of this contract and provided in this report, JNCC may develop a position on future site-data and information supply for use at appropriate EC and international fora.

1.2 Aims and objectives

The overall aim of this work is to initiate a process, which leads to development of more effective mechanisms to be used by JNCC for reporting on sites to the European Commission DG XI and Ramsar Convention Bureau.

The specific objectives of this project are to:

- compare site-related data requirements for the EC Habitats and Birds Directives and the Ramsar Convention reporting with information gathered through the Common Standards Monitoring Programme by English Nature, Scottish Natural Heritage, Countryside Council for Wales and the Environment and Heritage Service (Northern Ireland); and

- make recommendations based on this comparison that will facilitate the development of site-based reporting in the future.

1.3 Working documents

JNCC made the following documents available to WCMC, and it is on these and WCMC's familiarity with *Natura 2000* and the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance that this report is based.

- Copy of Ramsar Information Sheet, with examples of completed sheets for Dornoch Firth and Loch Fleet, and Cors Caron
- Ramsar Convention: Data Entry Form Guidance
- Copy of *Natura 2000* Standard Data Form, with examples of completed sheets for The New Forest, The Broads, and Afon Teifi
- *Natura 2000* Network Standard Data Form EUR 15 Version (EC DGXI, 1995)
- The ENSIS Business Manual (English Nature)
- Monitoring SSSIs – Guidance (Countryside Council for Wales, 1996)
- ISIS Monitoring (Countryside Council for Wales)
- Guidance on Site Condition Monitoring (Scottish Natural Heritage, 1998)
- Habitat condition assessment in the uplands, and Field guide to upland habitat condition assessment (Countryside Council for Wales)
- A minimum format guide for the production of management plans for SSSIs (Countryside Council for Wales, 1996)

The Environment and Heritage Service is developing data forms and standards for Northern Ireland and hence Northern Ireland was not considered in the present analysis.

2. WORKING METHOD

The present project comprises a comparative review of the forms currently in use for collecting data on *Natura 2000* sites (Special Protection Areas established under the EC Birds Directive and Special Areas of Conservation established under the EC Habitats Directive) and Wetlands of International Importance (otherwise known as Ramsar sites), and the SSSI/ASSIs designated at the country level throughout the United Kingdom.

The review was primarily focused on the following aspects:

- i. The general structure of each form and whether existing structural differences could be overcome in order to simplify the process of site-related data compilation for monitoring purposes at both national and European levels.

Special attention was paid to the way in which fields requiring the same data types are organised in each form and how this would eventually facilitate or impair the aggregation of data and their exchange or sharing of data between forms.

- ii. The data types required for each field and whether common standards developed by country agencies/JNCC are being applied consistently across the United Kingdom and are valid for the collection and analysis of data on sites designated at the European level.
- iii. The periodicity with which site-related data should be updated. Three categories of periodicity were defined and assigned to each data field as follows: (1) data required only the first time of reporting and unlikely to change; (2) data more likely to change requiring periodic update or review; and (3) data for which there is an obligation to report change whenever it occurs.
- iv. The existence of data field gaps. Such gaps were identified after considering a full list of questions which, if they were answered, would cover all the information required at the regional (*Natura 2000* and Ramsar sites) and national (country agency) levels. This analysis also involved the identification of alternative sources of data that could be targeted in order to fulfil site-reporting requirements at all levels.

The *Natura 2000* Standard Data Form (both obligatory and non-obligatory data fields) and the Ramsar Data Entry Form were compared first, and a table with notes explaining areas of overlap and significant differences between them was prepared (**Table 1**). For convenience in referring back to the original documents, the headings and summary explanatory notes for *Natura 2000* sites are also set out in **Table 2** and for Ramsar sites in **Table 3**.

Although the focus of the EC Directives differs from that of the Convention on Wetlands in that they cover a wider range of habitats and species, it was anticipated that differences in data requirements (point ii) of their respective forms would not be significant. It was also

foreseen that the pre-defined lists of interest features and indicators of Favourable Conservation Status already developed for the *Natura 2000* network, could easily be used as a common reference to compile data on Ramsar sites (point iii). It was therefore considered appropriate to analyse the forms used in the Common Standards Monitoring Programme with the view to propose a unique, common field name against which these forms could be compared (**Table 4**). These proposed common field names are derived from those used in the *Natura 2000* and Ramsar data forms and their adoption by JNCC could greatly facilitate international reporting. The *Natura 2000* and Ramsar data fields used were chosen after careful consideration of how much data a comprehensive form should have as a minimum in order to fulfil site-related reporting requirements at the European level.

The next stage in the process of review involved a comparative assessment of data gathered through the Common Standards Monitoring Programme (and maintained by the agencies in their respective information systems) against this series of common field names (**Table 5**). The basic assumption made during this analysis was that the forms used in gathering data on SSSIs, which are also SPA/SACs and/or Ramsar sites, should include these fields in their structure or at least clearly indicate alternative sources from which to extract the necessary information.

Finally, all forms were analysed in the light of a series of questions that must be answered in order to fulfil the information required at European and national levels (**Table 6**). This final table indicates the existence of major data gaps in each form, and includes a column that describes alternative sources of data to be compiled in order to fill in these gaps.

3. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

3.1 Comparison between *Natura 2000* and Ramsar data forms

Table 1 shows the result of comparing the *Natura 2000* Standard Data Form and the Ramsar Data Entry Form. The most salient points to be made from this comparison are as follows:

- a) As expected, their structures differ very little with respect to the type of data required, although they are organised in significantly distinct ways.
- b) The *Natura 2000* Standard Data Form presents a data field sequence separated in headings (e.g. site identification, site location, ecological information, site protection and management), which facilitates the process of data collection and analysis. The Ramsar Data Entry Form lacks such a clear sequence of sections, which may make the data compilation process more difficult to follow.
- c) Equivalent data fields are not always simple to identify and match with each other. Often, they have distinctly different titles and/or occupy totally different positions in the form. However, these structural differences are not great enough to significantly hinder the exchange and sharing of data between the two processes of data compilation.
- d) The data fields defined in the *Natura 2000* Standard Data Form are generally more specific and less descriptive than equivalent fields in the Ramsar Data Entry Form. In this sense, it is clear that great effort has been made to facilitate simple analysis by the ETC/NC providing a range of categorical options to select from, in order to avoid the process of data compilation being too dependent on compiler subjectivity. Nevertheless, subjectivity is still an issue for *Natura 2000* because guidance for filling in the Standard Data Form is still low for some fields, particularly where the data categories are fairly broad.
- e) The Ramsar Data Entry Form clearly indicates the criteria under which the site has been designated for inclusion in the List of Wetlands of International Importance. The *Natura 2000* Standard Data Form is structured in a way that it is not immediately apparent for which interest features the site has been selected. However, this information is held on the SPA citations or candidate SAC reasons for Recommendation documents maintained at JNCC.
- f) Reference lists of interest features (e.g. species and habitats) or other important aspects and facts about the site (such as human activities and impacts, site designations and management activities) are annexed to the *Natura 2000* Standard Data Form. Their use is intended to standardise the information that is gathered and managed, and facilitate analysis. These lists could also be used for compiling data about Ramsar sites, therefore ensuring that the data collection process at the country level for international reporting is as straightforward as possible.

- g) Although the Ramsar Data Entry Form has recently been modified to place greater emphasis on changes in the ecological character of sites, this is not as evident as it should be. In this respect, the *Natura 2000* Standard Data Form is better designed to report such changes.

3.2 Comparison of formats used for common standards reporting by country agencies

Table 5 depicts the results from comparing the data gathered through the Common Standards Monitoring Programme by Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH), English Nature (EN) and Countryside Council for Wales (CCW). As mentioned earlier, the Environment and Heritage Service is developing data forms and standards for Northern Ireland and hence these elements were not considered in the present analysis.

Major similarities and differences between the forms developed by country agencies are as follows:

- a) Albeit very similar in their data requirements, significant differences exist between the way in which country agencies have organised the forms for gathering site-related data through the Common Standards Monitoring Programme.
- b) In general, structural dissimilarities between the EN Site Unit Record form and the CCW Site Visit & Feature Condition form and Activity/Event recording form are less significant than those existing between these and the SNH Condition Monitoring Form and Damage Reporting Form.
- c) Features of interest are basically the same for all monitoring programmes but pre-defined lists have been organised differently by each agency. For instance, SNH has adopted a system of reporting categories which assemble groups of features, whereas EN follows a two-tier classification system. CCW has prepared simple lists of habitat types and species. Both SNH and EN have proceeded to 'unitise' those interest features that are too large or complex to be considered in their entirety.
- d) Some fields are not included on the data forms, presumably because they do not need periodic updating. For example, except for EN, it is unclear whether certain specific data about sites (for example location, area, physical features, and so on) are available and where they can be found. This is perhaps not important for site monitoring, but certainly is when considering international reporting requirements.
- e) Even though all monitoring programmes allow for the integration of data collected by third parties, only SNH provides for the distinction between data sources to be clearly made. JNCC may want to follow up on this issue, which is outside the scope of the current contract.
- f) The issue of data validation has only been specifically addressed by EN. CCW indicates in the SSSI species features list when an expert is needed for the collection of data (this list also suggests when the recommended field period is for gathering data on each feature).
- g) The role of tenants in monitoring condition of interest features is considered differently by each agency. EN allows for data to be collected directly by landowners or occupiers, whereas CCW indicates if they are responsible for management actions and whether

these have been complied or not. SNH implies a less active role for tenants within the entire monitoring process.

- h) The distinction between human activities and their effect on the condition of interest features is clearly addressed by SNH. Such a distinction is not so evident in the CCW data form, whereas all human activities are considered as potentially damaging by EN, regardless of their extent and type.

3.3 Comparison of country agency Common Standards reporting formats with international reporting requirements

With regards to similarities and dissimilarities that exist between forms and standards at country agency level and the requirements for reporting on sites to the European Commission and the Ramsar Convention Bureau, the most relevant are the following:

- a) Form structure and data requirements for site reporting at the European level (*Natura 2000* and Convention on Wetlands of International Importance) are significantly different from those used for monitoring by the country agencies. In general, site-related data gathering instruments developed by country agencies appear to be more compatible with those developed for *Natura 2000*, whereas differences with the Ramsar Data Entry Form seem more difficult to harmonise.
- b) Data requirements at country level are concentrated on aspects of monitoring changes in condition of interest features as a result of human activities and management actions. In this respect, Common Standards Monitoring data forms lack most of the fields for collecting general geographic/ecological information on the site, and details on its protection status, relation with other sites, etc, which exist in the *Natura 2000* and Ramsar data forms (**Tables 1, 4 and 6**). It is assumed that these data can be found elsewhere, such as in the original designations, management plans, site objectives statements, and site attributes tables within databases. These types of data tend not to change significantly over time.
- c) For the purposes of country-level reporting, all interest features for which the site was designated by country agencies are assigned to broad categories, and attributes are defined to structure an assessment of the condition of each feature. Neither categories nor attributes are directly comparable to the fields used in the *Natura 2000* and Ramsar data forms.
- (d) The condition of notified features existing in designated sites is assessed against defined “desired states” or targets for each attribute. The use of these targets facilitates the periodic evaluation of the status of every feature over the entire site network. It is assumed that the “desired states” defined for each site take account of the reason for which the site was designated a Ramsar site or SPA/SAC (*Natura 2000*). In that sense, it is particularly relevant that the Common Standards Monitoring Programme ensure that all interest features for which *Natura 2000* and Ramsar sites were selected are periodically and properly assessed.

3.4 Analysis of data gaps

Table 6 provides a list of questions which, if they were answered, would provide all of the information required by the European Commission for *Natura 2000* sites and the Ramsar Convention Bureau for Ramsar sites. The table also includes a list of potential alternative

information sources that might be used to fill in existing information gaps. The principle findings from this analysis are the following:

- a) Numerous gaps of data fields were identified as a result from comparing the respective forms. As already indicated in Section 3.3.b), most of these gaps are concentrated on the forms used for gathering data through the Common Standards Monitoring Programme, and relate to geographic/ecological information on the site and details on its protection status, relation with other sites, etc. Nevertheless, these gaps can be regarded as relatively simple to bridge, since it is expected that the information is readily accessible from other information sources (e.g. SOS and management plans in country agency).
- b) It is unclear whether the *Natura 2000* Standard Data Form or the Ramsar Data Entry Form can adequately capture the highly detailed information on some issues (e.g. human activities and impacts), which is to be collected through the Common Standards Monitoring Programme. In that sense, it is needed that clear rules of aggregation data on SSSIs/ASSIs to report on international designations at the European level are defined and agreed by JNCC and national agencies.

3.5 Other issues of concern

In all of the discussion so far, it is assumed that the sites that the Common Standards Monitoring Programme is reporting on have the same boundaries as associated Ramsar sites or *Natura 2000* sites. However this is not necessarily the case. For example:

- a) The Broads has been proposed for *Natura 2000* with an area of 5282 hectares, while the Broadland Ramsar site covers 3350 hectares. Both contain multiple SSSIs.
- b) The Alt Estuary Ramsar site of 1160 hectares lies *within* the Altcar Sand Dune and Foreshore SSSI which covers 1472 hectares (there are numerous minor differences in size between designated Ramsar sites and the SSSIs that they are based on).
- c) The Chichester and Langstone Harbours Ramsar site of 5749 hectares comprises two separate SSSIs, which are presumably subject to two separate monitoring programmes.

Processes need to be in place to ensure that appropriate information is available for the designated Ramsar sites and *Natura 2000* sites, where these are not single SSSIs.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

As the information required for reporting on both *Natura 2000* sites and Ramsar sites is essentially similar, it seems superfluous for JNCC to require country agencies to complete two separate forms.

Recommendation 1

Create a common *international sites reporting form* from which the necessary information for reporting to both the European Commission (on *Natura 2000* sites) and the Ramsar Convention Bureau (on Ramsar sites) can be readily, and preferably automatically, derived. This *form* should be developed with the view to facilitate access to and exchange of data between the International Designations Database at JNCC and country agency corporate systems (MIDAS, ENSIS and ISIS).

It is clear from the review of information required for international reporting on sites and of information currently being compiled through the Common Standards Monitoring Programme, that: not all of the required information is compiled through Common Standards reporting; the information compiled through Common Standards reporting is generally information relevant to situations where the UK is obliged to report change (update frequency (3) Data for which there is an obligation to report change whenever it happens, in Table 1), and to a lesser extent information in the other two categories; and the missing information is readily available from other sources.

The process of creating a common form should include a previous clarification on how data gathered through the Common Standards Monitoring programme could be aggregated on *Natura 2000* and Ramsar sites.

Recommendation 2

Split the proposed common reporting form into two components, a *descriptive* component where information is compiled once on designation and then only change needs to be reported, and a *review and monitoring* component which is completed on a regular basis, and can be based directly on common standards monitoring procedures.

As the issues faced by the United Kingdom on reporting on international sites are likely to be similar to those faced by other European Union countries, JNCC should consider developing an approach that has applications elsewhere. It would therefore be appropriate for JNCC to develop a unique data form for site-related reporting in co-operation with the European Commission and the Ramsar Convention Bureau in the context of *harmonisation of international agreements*. Note that this will also have some relevance beyond European Union countries with the future implementation of the Emerald Network under the auspices of the Bern Convention.

The *review and monitoring* component of the common reporting form (as outlined in **Table 4**) is dependent on a clear set of aggregation rules for each country to take account of their different recording forms and data management in MIDAS, ENSIS or ISIS.

For two reasons, this common form should probably follow the general format and coding systems adopted within the *Natura 2000* context. Firstly completion of least part of this form is a requirement on European Union countries, and secondly it is the more detailed of the two forms and therefore lends itself to generating the Ramsar information by generalisation and summarisation.

Recommendation 3

Develop the proposed common reporting form in collaboration with both the European Commission and the Ramsar Convention Bureau in the context of *harmonisation of international agreements*, and base it on the *Natura 2000* form.

Differences between the classification systems adopted by each country agency, particularly for habitats, make the task of data aggregation and exchange of information difficult, and complicate the task of site-related reporting at the European level. This seems rather unnecessary in what is a relatively small country well endowed with natural scientists.

Recommendation 4

An attempt should be made to agree an UK-wide classification system of interest features, particularly habitats. Failing this, or as an interim step, means should be developed to clearly define aggregation rules in order to harmonise information from the different country agencies and to convert it into a format that is useful for international reporting.

At present JNCC is not able to compile information on internationally designated sites within the UK from information provided through common standards monitoring, and is therefore using information from other sources. However, it is important to point out that 1998/99 was the first year of Common Standards Monitoring.

Recommendation 5

Country agencies should clearly indicate where it is possible to find specific information on sites about which they are reporting, in order to facilitate the compilation and reporting process carried out by JNCC on their behalf.

The condition of notified features within designated sites is assessed against defined “desired states”, but it is not clear from the information available whether the desired states defined for each site take account of the reason for which the site was designated a Ramsar site or SPA/SAC (*Natura 2000*).

Recommendation 6

JNCC should ensure that country agencies are taking full account of the reasons for which sites have been designated as Ramsar sites or SPA/SACs when setting “desired states” for notified features.

It is clear that there is not necessarily a direct one-to-one relationship between nationally designated sites and either Ramsar sites or *Natura 2000* sites. In circumstances where this is the case, it is not clear how information from common standards monitoring is used to report on the internationally designated sites.

Recommendation 7

A review should be carried out to assess the relationship between nationally designated sites and internationally designated sites, to assess differences in the area covered and the manner in which this affects reporting.

TABLE 1: Comparison between Natura 2000 Standard Data Form and Ramsar Convention Data Entry Form

NATURA 2000 Standard Data Form	Comments	Ramsar Convention Data Entry Form	Comments	Comparison	Update frequency	Origin
1.1 Type	Obligatory. Code identifying which Directive, and relationship to other Directive sites. Obligatory. Unique code, including code for country.	<i>Not relevant</i>	<i>Not relevant</i>	<i>Not required for Ramsar</i>	1	European Commission
1.2 Site Code ⁷		0. Site reference number	Unique code, including code for country.	SDF site code comprises two characters and consists of two components: 1) the first two codes are the country code; and 2) the remaining 7 characters are alphanumeric and are to be given by the responsible national authority. DEF site consists of six characters arranged in two components.	1	National agencies
1.3 Form compilation date	Obligatory. Date when information was compiled.	1. Date	Date when information was compiled	SDF compilation date consists of a six digits data field, which takes the form of the year (four digits) followed by the month in numeric form (two digits). DEF compilation date consists of a free-text field, and as only date can be provided it is not clear whether a DEF has previously been submitted.	1	Compiler
1.4 Update	Obligatory. Date when information reported for site was last changed.					
1.5 Relation to other Natura 2000 sites	Obligatory if relation exists, entering the Natura 2000 site code of each related site.	<i>Not relevant</i>	<i>Not relevant</i>	<i>Not required for Ramsar</i>	1	European Commission
1.6 Respondent(s)	Obligatory. Name and address.	11. Compiler	Name and address	Similar free-text format. DEF includes a separate field for tel/fax.	1	Compiler
1.7 Site name	Obligatory	3. Name of wetland		No specific requirements or restrictions	1	Compiler
1.8 Site indication and designation dates	Obligatory. Dates when SCI proposed and confirmed, and when SCI or SPA designated.	Not part of the form, but maintained by Ramsar Convention Bureau	Date when site was effectively added to the List of Wetlands of International Importance	In SDF, four different field with the same format as for Form compilation date. Not required for DEF.	1	Secretary/ European Commission
2.1 Site centre location	Obligatory. Latitude and longitude of central point.	4. Geographical co-ordinates	Latitude and longitude of central point.	Similar format	1	Compiler
2.2 Area (ha)	Obligatory. Most recent area, where known or relevant.	6. Area (ha)	Area calculated from map, if available	Similar format	1	Compiler
2.3 Site length (km)	Obligatory when area measurements are not relevant (e.g. caves, cliffs).	<i>Not requested</i>	<i>Not requested</i>	<i>Not required for Ramsar</i>	1	Compiler
2.4 Altitude (m)	Optional - minimum, maximum and mean.	5. Altitude (m)	Minimum and maximum	In SDF, three separate four-character fields. In DEF, one field including minimum-maximum altitudes separated by a dash.	1	Compiler

*1: Only required first time & if changed

*2: Periodic update/revision

*3: Obligation to report change whenever it occurs

TABLE 1: Comparison between Natura 2000 Standard Data Form and Ramsar Convention Data Entry Form

NATURA 2000 Standard Data Form	Comments	Ramsar Convention Data Entry Form	Comments	Comparison	Update frequency	Origin
2.5 Administrative region	Obligatory. NUTS region, and percentage of site within each region or within marine areas not covered by NUTS regions.	13. General site location	A general statement in free text, followed by the name of administrative region in full. No information on the proportion of the area within each region is requested.	Ramsar requires a more general description of location, as well as information on the administrative region. NUTS level three is equivalent to the counties in England, Scotland and Wales (though not Northern Ireland).	1	Compiler
2.6 Biogeographic region	Obligatory. Check boxes, with reference to the biogeographic region map (Doc. Hab. 94/2)	2. Country	One separate free-text field	Required for Ramsar, taken as implicit by <i>Natura 2000</i> from other information provided.	1	Compiler
3.1.i) Habitat types present on the site	Obligatory. Habitats present (from a pre-defined list) followed by % of site area covered by each of them.	<i>Not requested</i>	<i>Not requested</i>	<i>Not required for Ramsar</i>	1	Compiler
3.1.ii) Representativity, relative surface, conservation status and global assessment of habitat types present on the site	Obligatory. Degree of representativity gives a measure of how typical a habitat type is; relative surface is the area covered by each habitat type compared with national coverage; conservation status is the degree of conservation of the structure and functions of the natural habitat type, and restoration possibilities; and global assessment is the value of the site for conservation of the habitat type concerned.	8. Wetland type	Wetland habitats present (from a pre-defined list) with an indication of area covered by each of them.	Four-character numeric code system in SDF; one-character code system in DEF. Level of detail is significantly greater for <i>Natura 2000</i> .	2	Compiler
3.2.a.i) to 3.2.f.i) Species of fauna covered by Directives	Obligatory. Species present (from pre-defined lists), and details of population levels.	18. Noteworthy fauna	List of species of national or international importance with details on population level at site, the degree of threat, the conservation status and the degree of rarity.	Four-character numeric code system in SDF followed by the species name and details on population numbers on site; full scientific name in DEF followed by conservation status at regional/local levels.	2	Compiler
3.2.a.ii) to 3.2.f.ii) Assessment of site for species the conservation of species of fauna	Obligatory. Population of each species in comparison to national population; conservation status and degree of isolation, and global importance of the site for the species concerned.			A series of discrete options to select from in SDF. Categories are assigned to three/four-letter codes. Conservation status at regional/national levels in DEF.	2	Compiler

*1: Only required first time & if changed

*2: Periodic update/revision

*3: Obligation to report change whenever it occurs

TABLE 1: Comparison between *Natura 2000* Standard Data Form and Ramsar Convention Data Entry Form

<i>NATURA 2000</i> Standard Data Form	Comments	Ramsar Convention Data Entry Form	Comments	Comparison	Update frequency	Origin
3.2.g.i.) Species of plants covered by Directives	Obligatory. Species present (from pre-defined lists), and details of population levels.	17. Noteworthy flora	List of species of national or international importance, the degree of threat, the conservation status and the degree of rarity.	Four-character numeric code system in SDF followed by the species name and details on population numbers on site; full scientific name in DEF followed by conservation status at regional/local levels.	2	Compiler
3.2.g.ii) Assessment of site for species the conservation of species of flora	Obligatory. Population of each species in comparison to national population; conservation status and degree of isolation, and global importance of the site for the species concerned.			A series of discrete options to select from in SDF. Categories are assigned to three/four-letter codes. Conservation status at regional/national levels in DEF.	2	Compiler
3.3 Other important species of flora and fauna	Optional. List of other important species present and the reasons for listing them (national red lists, endemics, international conventions, etc)	<i>Not requested</i>	<i>Not requested</i>	<i>Not required for Ramsar</i>	2	Compiler
4.1 General site Character	Obligatory. Description of the character of the site covering habitats, and the main geological, geomorphological and landscape features of importance	7. Overview	A brief, general summary including: physical and ecological features, most significant values & benefits provided	SDF includes a checklist to indicate % cover of habitat classes from a pre-defined list. It also includes extra space for a free-text description. DEF includes a free-text box for describing main characteristics of site in bullet-point format.	2	Compiler
<i>Not requested</i>	<i>Not requested</i>	14. Physical features	Summary checklist of key physical characteristics, including geology, geomorphology, nutrient status, pH, salinity, soil, water permanence, and mean annual rainfall and temperature range.	<i>Not required for Natura 2000</i>	2	Compiler
<i>Not requested</i>	<i>Not requested</i>	15. Hydrological features	Summary checklist of hydrological values	<i>Not required for Natura 2000</i>	2	Compiler
<i>Not requested</i>	<i>Not requested</i>	16. Ecological features	Summary description of main habitats and vegetation types, including dominant plant communities and species.	<i>Not required for Natura 2000</i>	2	Compiler
4.2 Quality and importance	Obligatory. Description of the quality and importance of the site, in view of the conservation objectives of the directives (particularly with reference to species listed in the annexes)	9. Ramsar criteria	Which of the identified criteria does the site meet.	A review of the site against the defined criteria (DEF) and habitats/species present (SDF).	2	Compiler
4.3 Vulnerability	Obligatory. Description of the nature and extent of pressures, where not already adequately covered by section 6.1.	12. Justification of Ramsar Criteria	Justification of the above			
		23(b). Site vulnerability statement	Based on responses to sections 22 and 23(a)	Similar free-text format	3	Compiler

*1:Only required first time & if changed

*2:Periodic update/revision

*3:Obligation to report change whenever it occurs

TABLE 1: Comparison between Natura 2000 Standard Data Form and Ramsar Convention Data Entry Form

NATURA 2000 Standard Data Form	Comments	Ramsar Convention Data Entry Form	Comments	Comparison	Update frequency	Origin
<i>Not requested</i>	<i>Not requested</i>	19. Social & cultural values	Check boxes	<i>Not required for Natura 2000</i>	1	Compiler
4.4 Site designation	Optional. Description of any aspect of the site designation not adequately covered by section 5	<i>Not requested</i>	<i>Not requested</i>	<i>Not required for Ramsar</i>	2	Compiler
4.5 Ownership	Optional. Description of the site ownership (category and proportion of area).	20. Land tenure/ownership	Check boxes for the site itself and in the immediate catchment	DEF separates ownership at the site and in the immediate catchment area.	2	Compiler
4.6 Documentation	Optional. List of relevant publications and/or scientific data concerning the site.	30. Bibliography	Bibliography relevant to the site	Similar free-text format	2	Compiler
4.7 History	To be filled in by the European Commission. EC maintained record of changes to the data provided.	<i>Not requested</i>	<i>Not requested</i>	<i>Not required for Ramsar</i>	1	European Commission
5.1 Protection status at national and regional level	Obligatory. National or regional designations, and the proportion of the site covered by those designations.	23(a). Conservation measures taken	National designations within the site and/or the immediate catchment.	Four-character code, which is different for each country in the European Community in SDF followed by % cover. Free-text box detailing full designation (actual or proposed) of each individual site in DEF.	2	Compiler
5.2 Relationship with other sites	Optional. Lists and identifies relationships between different designated areas which are part of or adjacent to the Natura 2000 site.	24. Conservation measures proposed but not yet taken	National designations within the site and/or the immediate catchment.	Type code and site name of sites to which it is related in SDF. This data are followed by a single-character code depicting type of overlap and % of cover. General description of relationships in DEF.	1	Compiler
5.3 Relationship with Corine biotope sites	Optional. Lists and records the relationship to any CORINE biotope sites.	23(a). Conservation measures taken	National designations within the site and/or the immediate catchment.	<i>Not required for Ramsar</i>	1	Compiler
6.1 General impacts	Optional. Lists of human activities that influence the site (from a pre-defined list), the intensity of the influence, the proportion of the site affected, and whether the influence is positive, negative or neutral.	<i>Not relevant</i>	<i>Not relevant</i>	<i>Not required for Ramsar</i>	3	Compiler
<i>Not requested</i>	<i>Not requested</i>	21. Current land use & human activities	Check boxes for the site itself and for the immediate catchment.	Three-character numeric code describing impacts and activities in SDF. Three degree of intensities (A, B, C) according to influence on site. Check-list of human activities and impacts at the site and in the immediate catchment, classified in low-medium-high degrees in DEF.	2	Compiler
<i>Not requested</i>	<i>Not requested</i>	25. Current scientific research/survey/monitoring & facilities	Brief list in bullet-point format	<i>Not required for Natura 2000</i>		
<i>Not requested</i>	<i>Not requested</i>	26. Current conservation education	Brief list in bullet-point format	<i>Not required for Natura 2000</i>	2	Compiler
<i>Not requested</i>	<i>Not requested</i>	27. Current recreation & tourism activities	Brief list in bullet-point format, cross-referenced to 'Site Vulnerability & Management Statement'.	<i>Not required for Natura 2000</i>	2	Compiler

*1: Only required first time & if changed

*2: Periodic update/revision

*3: Obligation to report change whenever it occurs

TABLE 1: Comparison between *Natura 2000* Standard Data Form and Ramsar Convention Data Entry Form

<i>NATURA 2000</i> Standard Data Form	Comments	Ramsar Convention Data Entry Form	Comments	Comparison	Update frequency	Origin
6.2.a. Site management	Optional. Contact details including name, address, phone/fax of the responsible authority.	28. Functional jurisdiction 29. Management authority	Ultimate responsibility Agency responsible for management	Similar free-text format	2	Computer
6.2.b. Site management	Optional. Description of management plans undertaken or in preparation.	<i>Not requested</i>	<i>Not requested</i>	<i>Not required for Ramsar</i>	2	Computer
7. Map of the site	Obligatory. Details of basemap used, including national map number, scale, projection and whether the maps are available digitally. Availability and detail of aerial photographs.	10. Outline map of site	No specification of either quality or format.	Digital file or reference to the source paper map for both instruments	1	Computer
8. Slides	Optional. List of slides and other photographic material	<i>Not requested</i>	<i>Not requested</i>	<i>Not required for Ramsar</i>	2	Computer

*1: Only required first time & if changed

*2: Periodic update/revision

*3: Obligation to report change whenever it occurs

TABLE 2: Data fields on the *Natura 2000* Standard Data Form

NATURA 2000 Standard Data Form	Comments
1.1 Type	Obligatory. Code identifying which Directive, and relationship to other Directive sites.
1.2 Site Code	Obligatory. Unique code, including code for country.
1.3 Form compilation date	Obligatory. Date when information was compiled.
1.4 Update	Obligatory. Date when information reported for site was last changed.
1.5 Relation to other Natura 2000 sites	Obligatory if relation exists, entering the Natura 2000 site code of each related site.
1.6 Respondent(s)	Obligatory. Name and address.
1.7 Site name	Obligatory
1.8 Site indication and designation dates	Obligatory. Dates when SCI proposed and confirmed, and when SCI or SPA designated.
2.1 Site centre location	Obligatory. Latitude and longitude of central point.
2.2 Area (ha)	Obligatory. Most recent area, where known or relevant.
2.3 Site length (km)	Obligatory when area measurements are not relevant (e.g. caves, cliffs).
2.4 Altitude (m)	Optional - minimum, maximum and mean.
2.5 Administrative region	Obligatory. NUTS region, and percentage of site within each region or within marine areas not covered by NUTS regions.
2.6 Biogeographic region	Obligatory. Check boxes, with reference to the biogeographic region map (Doc. Hab. 94/2)
3.1.i) Habitat types present on the site	Obligatory. Habitats present (from a pre-defined list) followed by % of site area covered by each of them.
3.1.ii) Representativity, relative surface, conservation status and global assessment of habitat types present on the site	Obligatory. Degree of representativity gives a measure of how typical a habitat type is; relative surface is the area covered by each habitat type compared with national coverage; conservation status is the degree of conservation of the structure and functions of the natural habitat type, and restoration possibilities; and global assessment is the value of the site for conservation of the habitat type concerned.
3.2.a.i) to 3.2.f.i) Species of fauna covered by Directives	Obligatory. Species present (from pre-defined lists), and details of population levels.
3.2.a.ii) to 3.2.f.ii) Assessment of site for species the conservation of species of fauna	Obligatory. Population of each species in comparison to national population; conservation status and degree of isolation, and global importance of the site for the species concerned.
3.2.g.i.) Species of plants covered by Directives	Obligatory. Species present (from pre-defined lists), and details of population levels.
3.2.g.ii) Assessment of site for species the conservation of species of flora	Obligatory. Population of each species in comparison to national population; conservation status and degree of isolation, and global importance of the site for the species concerned.
3.3 Other important species of flora and fauna	Optional. List of other important species present and the reasons for listing them (national red lists, endemics, international conventions, etc)
4.1 General site Character	Obligatory. Description of the character of the site covering habitats, and the main geological, geomorphological and landscape features of importance.
4.2 Quality and importance	Obligatory. Description of the quality and importance of the site, in view of the conservation objectives of the directives (particularly with reference to species listed in the annexes).
4.3 Vulnerability	Obligatory. Description of the nature and extent of pressures, where not already adequately covered by section 6.1.
4.4 Site designation	Optional. Description of any aspect of the site designation not adequately covered by section 5
4.5 Ownership	Optional. Description of the site ownership (category and proportion of area).
4.6 Documentation	Optional. List of relevant publications and/or scientific data concerning the site.
4.7 History	To be filled in by the European Commission. EC maintained record of changes to the data provided.
5.1 Protection status at national and regional level	Obligatory. National or regional designations, and the proportion of the site covered by those designations.
5.2 Relationship with other sites	Optional. Lists and identifies relationships between different designated areas which are part of or adjacent to the Natura 2000 site.
5.3 Relationship with Corine biotope sites	Optional. Lists and records the relationship to any CORINE biotope sites.
6.1 General impacts	Optional. Lists of human activities that influence the site (from a pre-defined list), the intensity of the influence, the proportion of the site affected, and whether the influence is positive, negative or neutral.
6.2.a. Site management	Optional. Contact details including name, address, phone/fax of the responsible authority.
6.2.b. Site management	Optional. Description of management plans undertaken or in preparation.
7. Map of the site	Obligatory. Details of basemap used, including national map number, scale, projection and whether the maps are available digitally. Availability and detail of aerial photographs.
8. Slides	Optional. List of slides and other photographic material

TABLE 3: Data fields on the Ramsar Convention Data Entry Form

Ramsar Convention Data Entry Form	Comments
0. Site reference number	Unique code, including code for country
1. Date	Date when information was compiled
2. Country	One separate free-text field
3. Name of wetland	
4. Geographical co-ordinates	Latitude and longitude of central point.
5. Altitude (m)	Minimum and maximum
6. Area (ha)	Area calculated from map, if available
7. Overview	A brief, general summary including: physical and ecological features, most significant values & benefits provided
8. Wetland type	Wetland habitats present (from a pre-defined list) with an indication of area covered by each of them.
9. Ramsar criteria	Which of the identified criteria does the site meet.
10. Outline map of site	No specification of either quality or format.
11. Compiler	Name and address
12. Justification of Ramsar Criteria	Justification of Criteria given in field 9
13. General site location	A general statement in free text, followed by the name of administrative region in full. No information on the proportion of the area within each region is requested.
14. Physical features	Summary checklist of key physical characteristics, including geology, geomorphology, nutrient status, pH, salinity, soil, water permanence, and mean annual rainfall and temperature range.
15. Hydrological features	Summary checklist of hydrological values
16. Ecological features	Summary description of main habitats and vegetation types, including dominant plant communities and species.
17. Noteworthy flora	List of species of national or international importance, the degree of threat, the conservation status and the degree of rarity.
18. Noteworthy fauna	List of species of national or international importance with details on population level at site, the degree of threat, the conservation status and the degree of rarity.
19. Social & cultural values	Check boxes
20. Land tenure/ownership	Check boxes for the site itself and in the immediate catchment
21. Current land use & human activities	Check boxes for the site itself and for the immediate catchment.
22. Significant factors affecting the ecological character of the site	Check boxes for the site itself and for the immediate catchment.
23(a). Conservation measures taken	National designations within the site and/or the immediate catchment.
23(b). Site vulnerability statement	Based on responses to sections 22 and 23(a)
24. Conservation measures proposed but not yet taken	National designations within the site and/or the immediate catchment.
25. Current scientific research/survey/monitoring & facilities	Brief list in bullet-point format
26. Current conservation education	Brief list in bullet-point format
27. Current recreation & tourism activities	Brief list in bullet point format, cross-referenced to 'Site Vulnerability & Management Statement'.
28. Functional jurisdiction	Ultimate responsibility
29. Management authority	Agency responsible for management
30. Bibliography	Bibliography relevant to the site

TABLE 4: Data fields proposed to be used when collecting information through Common Standards Monitoring Programme

Proposed Common Field Name	Information source/notes	Natura 2000 SDF Field	Ramsar DEF Field	Update frequency
Site name	Country Agencies	1.7	3	1
Designation type	JNCC/Convention Secretariats	Yes	No	1
Relation to other designated sites	JNCC/Convention Secretariats	1.5, 5.2 and 5.3	23	1
Site code	JNCC/Convention Secretariats	1.2	SRF	1
Protection status	JNCC and Country Agencies	5.1	23 & 24	2
Respondent	JNCC and Country Agencies	1.6	Yes	3
Validation	JNCC and Country Agencies	No	No	3
Visit Date	Country Agencies	No	No	3
Type of visit	Country Agencies	No	No	3
Site ownership	Country Agencies	4.5	20	2
Site ID	Country Agency (Geographic Information Units)	2.1; 2.2; 2.3 and 2.4	4; 5 & 6	1
Site description	Country Agencies	4.1	7; 14; 15 & 16	1
Criteria for selection	Pre-defined lists	Derived from 3.1.i) and 3.2.i)	9 & 12	2
Habitat types present	Pre-defined lists	3.1.i)	8	3
Species present	Pre-defined lists	3.2.i) and 3.3	17 & 18	3
Interest features condition assessment	Pre-defined lists of condition targets	3.1.ii)	17 & 18	3
General human impacts (land use and activities) and natural events	Pre-defined lists	6.1	21 & 22	3
Site management	Site Objective Statement (SOS)/Site Management Statements (SMS) and Management Plans	6.2	28	3
Damage	Pre-defined lists	None specific	None specific	3
Origin of damage	Pre-defined lists	None specific	None specific	3
Nature and extent of damage	Compiler	None specific	None specific	3
Legal aspects	Pre-defined lists	No	No	2
Remedial actions	Country Agencies	No	No	3
Map	Country Agencies (Geographic Information Units)	7 Map	10 Outline map of site	1
Photographs	Compiler			1
Notes	Compiler	No	No	2

(1) Data required only first time

(2) Data requiring periodic update or review

(3) Data for which there is an obligation to report change whenever it occurs

TABLE 5: Comparison between data gathered through Common Standards Monitoring Programmes

Proposed Common Field Name	Scottish Natural Heritage CMF & DRF	Countryside Council for Wales SVF/AERF	English Nature SUR	Commentary
Site name	Yes	Yes	Yes	No specific requirements or restrictions
Designation type	No	No	No	Relevant to indicate if a SSSI/ASSI is also a Wetland of International Importance and/or a SPA/SAC
Relation to other designated sites	No	No	No	Relevant if individual SSSI/ASSI overlaps or otherwise interacts with other site/s designated at country/regional levels
Site code	MIDAS Site Code	No	No	MIDAS Site Code assigned by JNCC based on EC format and Ramsar Bureau format-sequential. A similar approach should be followed with SSSIs/ASSIs in Wales and England.
Protection status	No	No	No	Relevant to indicate status of SSSI/ASSI at national level
Respondent	Name	Recorder details (name, position and previous history of visits)	Name and status (owner, occupier, agent or manager) of recorder	Similar format
Validation	No	Pre-defined list of interest features indicating when an expert is required and period to monitor	Assessed by	Relevant, particularly in cases when 'difficult' data are gathered by non-expert compilers
Visit Date	Date (CMF); 1. Date of damage (DRF)	Date of current and last visits	Date of visit	Similar format
Type of visit	CMF. Single (1.A.); part of a survey (1.B.); summary of several visits/surveys (1.C.)	No	No	Only SNH form provides for the distinction between types of monitoring
Site ownership	CMF. 1.A. Persons contacted (Owner/Occupier/Other)	List of persons (owners, occupiers, contacts) contacted during visit	Brief mention of owner/occupier, if he/she is responsible for monitoring the site	General statement about ownership at regional/international level. The role of tenants is highlighted at country level; however, there are significant differences between the format adopted by each country agency.
Site ID	No	Area and proportion of area seen during visit	Brief, in Site Objectives Management (SOS)	Not requested at country level. However, it is assumed that these data are available from other sources (e.g. Geographic Information Units, SOS).
Site description	No	No	Brief, in Site Objectives Management (SOS)	See above
Criteria for selection	Based on interest features present	Based on interest features present	Based on interest features present	Classification of a SSSI/ASSI as a SPA/SAC is based on interest features present on site; classification of a SSSI as a Wetland of International Importance is based on interest features complying with Ramsar Selection Criteria.

TABLE 5: Comparison between data gathered through Common Standards Monitoring Programmes

Proposed Common Field Name	Scottish Natural Heritage CMF & DRF	Countryside Council for Wales SVF/AERF	English Nature SUR	Commentary
Habitat types present	2. CMF. Description of condition: list of interest features classified by Reporting Categories, with a description of current condition according to management targets. Habitats can be grouped in monitoring units; 7. New features	Numbered list of interest features with indications on whether their presence was confirmed or not during the visit, the need of management for maintenance or recovery, and whether there is any cause for concern	Two-tier classification system: Level 1, is where groups of features are defined at a management/monitoring level, using Phase 1 Code to define communities, habitat supporting species, or GCR Theme Codes; Level 2 remains the focus for quantitative validation or monitoring. Site 'unitisation' should be achieved, if necessary.	Although pre-defined lists of habitats are basically the same, there are significant differences between the degree of detail of the classification systems adopted at the country level. CCW's list is the less detailed, whereas EN's list is the most detailed. SNH is the only one adopting a reporting categories system and its list follows the <i>Natura 2000</i> format more closely. Particular attention should be put on estimating the extent or percentage cover of Annex I habitats and wetland types, as this key to develop a real picture of their condition on designated sites.
Species present	See above	See above	See above	No major differences between formats. CCW lists of species includes a suggestion of when an expert is needed and which is the best monitoring period of the year for each species.
Interest features condition assessment	3. CMF. Assessment of condition according to SAT or previous visits	Assessment of condition according to previous visits	Assessment of condition according to SOS or previous visits	Similar format at country level as that adopted by <i>Natura 2000</i>
General human impacts (land use and activities) and natural events	4. CMF. Activity/event affecting each feature, with an indication of whether the effect is positive (+), negative (-) or neutral (0).	Four fields located in different sections: 1) a box indicating the occurrence of any activity/event on site; 2) a check-box describing them and indicating % of site covered/affected; 3) a check-box showing the date of occurrence; and 4) a check-box including the main reason why an activity was achieved	See Damage below	The distinction between human activities and their effects on the condition of interest features is less evident in EN's SUR. The way in which the form is organised creates some confusion in CCW and EN, where fields for collecting data on human activities are separated between each other.
Site management	5. CMF. Assessment of the management to which each feature is subjected, if any, with an indication of whether or not is appropriate to review management.	Three fields located in different sections: 1) details of management agreements accepted by owners/occupiers, and their compliance; 2) appropriateness of activity and intensity/timing for objective; and 3) security of activities in the future	Brief description of management regime(s) currently in place for each unit	Not required at regional/international level. Quite different approaches at country level.
Damage	2. DRF. Description of damage or decline (according to Table 3 of <i>Guidance Notes</i>)	Four fields located in different sections: 1) a check-box indicating activities/events that are linked to changes in condition of interest features; 2) a check-box describing them and indicating % of site covered/affected; 3) a check-box showing the date of occurrence; and 4) a check-box including the main reason why an activity was achieved	Four separate fields: 1) a check-box showing the code of PDOs and whether there has been neglect and/or pollution; 2) a check-box indicating threat prognosis; and 3) a check-box for assessing the loss and damage resulting from human activities or natural events. In the case of natural catastrophes, there is a box to briefly describe them and indicate the affected units within site	See comment on human activities and impacts

TABLE 5: Comparison between data gathered through Common Standards Monitoring Programmes

Proposed Common Field Name	Scottish Natural Heritage CMF & DRF	Countryside Council for Wales SVF/AERF	English Nature SUR	Commentary
Origin of damage	3. DRF. Location of source of damage; temporal aspects; person(s) responsible; and causal agent.	Four distinct fields located in different sections: 1) a check-box indicating the person or organisation responsible for the activity; 2) the likelihood of negative effect of this activity on interest features; 3) the source; and 4) the rate of repetition/continuation	Loss and damage assessment. This box includes a check-list depicting the purpose of damaging activity and causal agent.	Similar basic format at country level
Nature and extent of damage	4. DRF. Assessment of damage suffered by interest features which have not achieved condition targets, with an indication of likelihood of recovery.	Three fields located in different sections: 1) likelihood and conditions of recovery of those features classed as unfavourable; 2) check-box listing activities/events with an indication of proportion of site covered/affected; and 3) list of features affected by each activity with an indication of extent of actual and potential damage	Loss and damage assessment. This box includes the approximate date of damage and the area of feature destroyed or damaged. The box also contains check-lists for identifying temporal aspects and source of damage. It also allows for a brief description of damage to be written.	Similar basic format at country level
Legal aspects	5. DRF. Table indicating legal status of site in relation to S28 & S29.	Legality: check-box indicating status of site in relation to several legal aspects	Loss and damage assessment. This box includes a check-list indicating status of site in relation to several legal aspects.	Similar basic format at country level
Remedial actions	6. DRF. List of legal actions taken, by order of severity	Actions taken during the visit and any further action required for features classed as unfavourable, destroyed or concerned	Free-text field for comments on management issues and remedial actions	Similar basic format at country level
Map	Obligatory	Obligatory	Obligatory	
Photographs	7. Details of photograph taken (DRF)	List of photographs taken	Not requested	
Notes	Free-text box (6 in CMF; 7 in DRF)	Continuation sheets to be appended	Free-text field and continuation sheet	

TABLE 6: Comparison of *Natura 2000* and Ramsar site

Required information	Ramsar	<i>Natura 2000</i>	SNH	CCW	EN	Alternative information sources
Whether site is a SCI or SPA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Whether site is a Ramsar site	Y	Y	N	N	N	Ramsar Bureau/Ramsar Forum
Whether site has any other international designation	Y	Y	N	N	N	Common European database
Whether site is protected at national level	Y	Y	N	N	N	Country Agencies/Common European Database
How site relates to other international/national sites is detailed	Y	Y	N	N	N	Geographic Info Units
Criteria under which the site is designated are fully detailed	Y	Y	N	N	N	List of interest features present
A site code has been assigned	Y	Y	Y	?	?	JNCC
Full contact details of compiler are provided	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Country Agencies
Full details of site location (coordinates, extension, altitude, biogeographic region, etc.) are given	Y	Y	N	N	N	Site Objective Statement Management Plans
Full details of physical features and ecological values of site are provided	Y	Y	N	N	N	The same as above
A reference list of habitat types is available	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Country Agencies/JNCC
Full list of habitat types included within site is included	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
A quantitative measure of habitat condition, representativity and importance for conservation is given	Y	Y	N	N	N	Site Objective Statement Management Plans
There are provisions to report habitat extent information	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
A reference list of species is available	?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Country Agencies/JNCC
A full account of species present in site is provided	Y	Y	N	N	N	Site Objective Statement Management Plans
Species of particular conservation interest are highlighted	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Country Agencies/JNCC
Data on size, conservation status, degree of isolation and seasonal distribution of species populations are required	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Site Objective Statement Management Plans
A reference list of human activities and impacts is available	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Description of human activities and impacts in and around the site is solicited	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
A reference table of condition targets to monitor is available	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Site Objective Statement Management Plans
A measure of how condition of site has changed through time is possible	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Previous visits reports
Indication of management actions implemented to improve condition of site is given	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	The same as above
Details of budget and manpower needed to implement site management are included	N	N	Y	N	N	Country Agencies
Details of land tenure regime on site are solicited	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Details of legal aspects which were contravened are required	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Formal institutions