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## $3^{\text {rd }}$ global biodiv. hotspot for plants



## « how many are threatened? "
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## Towards a Mediterranean Red List of

 threatened plants

## A eight-year project (2012-2018)

3 workshops (2015-2017), >50 experts, 4 managers :


## which taxonomic reference to follow

3 x or 4 x more names than accepted taxa (synonyms... or not ?)
CONSERVATOIRE
ETS JARDIN BOTANIQUES
VILLE DE GENEVE

CJB > Base de données > Africa > Recherche
$A^{\text {pd }}$ Base de données des plantes d'Afrique

## Fluctuant taxonomy : how and why ?

- $1^{\text {st }}$ property :

A taxon have to be identifiable in the field


## $2^{\text {nd }}: A$ taxon have to respond to homogenous conservation issues

## The case of Allium ampeloprasum L. :

sensu latissimo (WCSP, E+M...)
sensu stricto (Jauzein \& Tison 2005)
rasum


| $t$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |



## Ex. : the genus Ophrys (Orchidaceae)


very lumper position $\rightarrow$ our compromise $\leftarrow$ splitter orchidologists

## Data heterogeneity or deficiency

## 1) lack of quantitative data (population, nb 'locations'... )



## Data heterogeneity or deficiency

## 2) lack of historical data (trends, decline ratio... )

SUMMARY OF THE FIVE CRITERIA (A-E) USED TO EVALUATE IF A TAXON BELONGS IN AN IUCN RED LIST THREATENED CATEGORY (CRITICALLY ENDANGERED, ENDANGEDED

| y | Endangered | Vulnerable |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A1 $\quad \geq 90 \%$ | 270\% | $250 \%$ |
| A2, A3 \& A4 $\quad \geq 80 \%$ | $250 \%$ | $230 \%$ |
| A1 Population reduction observed, estimated, inferred, or suspi the past where the causes of the reduction are clearly reversible AN understood AND have ceased. | (a) dir | abundance ot the taxon |
| A2 Population reduction observed, estimated, inferred, or suspected in the past where the causes of reduction may not have ceased OR may not be understood OR may not be reversible. | (c) a decline in area of occupancy <br> based on (AOO), extent of occurrence (EOO) and/or habitat quality |  |
| A3 Population reduction projected, inferred or suspected to be met in the future (up to a maximum of 100 years) ((a) cannot be used for A3]. | following: (d) actual or potential levels of exploitation |  |
| A4 An observed, estimated, inferred, projected or suspected population reduction where the time period must include both the past and the future (up to a max. of 100 years in future), and where the causes of reduction may not have ceased OR may not be understood OR may not be reversible. |  | introduced taxa, pathogens, competitors or |

B. Geographic range in the form of either B1 (extent of occurrence) AND/OR B2 (area of occupancy)

|  | Citically Endangered | Endangered | Vulnerable |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B1. Extent of occurrence (EOO) | $<100 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ | $<5,000 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ | $<20,000 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ |
| B2. Area of occupancy (AOO) | $<10 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ | $<500 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ | $<2,000 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ |

AND at least 2 of the following 3 conditions:
(a)

Smunluf OR Number of locations
(b) Continuing decline observa estimated, inferred or projected in any of: (i) extent of occurrence; (ii) area of occupancy; (iii) area, extent and/or quality of habita, (iv) number of locations or subpopulations; (v) number of mature individuals
(c) Extreme fluctuations in any of: (i) xtent of occurrence; (ii) area of occupancy; (iii) number of locations or subpopulations; (iv) number of mature individuals

## Data heterogeneity or deficiency

## 3) lack of field knowledge (distribution, threats...)

SUMMARY OF THE FIVE CRITERIA (A-E) USED TO EVALUATE IF A TAXON BELONGS IN AN IUCN RED LIST THREATENED CATEGORY (CRITICALLY ENDANGERED, ENDANGERED OR VULNERABLE).'


## Data heterogeneity or deficiency

## 4) lack of biological data (generat ${ }^{\circ}$ length, fragmentat ${ }^{\circ}$...)



## Functional biology and the resilience capacities

- "severe" vs natural fragmentation ?

«Severely » fragmented ?
If « yes» $\rightarrow$ EN: B2ab(iii,v)

If «no » $\rightarrow$ VU: C2a(i)

## Functional biology and the resilience capacities

- Positive grazing vs negative "over"grazing ?

(photo by V. Papanastasis)

(Office du Tourisme, Salon-de-Provence)


## Functional biology and the resilience

 capacities- forest fires : a dramatic collapse or an endogenous disturbance ?



## Functional biology and the resilience

 capacities- climatic change : what do we know about the climatic vs other needs of each species?


Feedback from reassessing Dicots :

## Convolvulus durandoi



11 February 2009
SCOPE OF ASSESSMENT
Global, Mediterranean, Pan-Africa

Assessment in detail
$\rightarrow$ Rainy forests on clay soils... 2017 field : not rare, overlooked 2019 redlist $\rightarrow$ NT category!



