Ramsar Information Sheet

Published on 20 June 2025
Update version, previously published on : 10 March 2017

Hungary

Lakes by Tata

Designation date	17 March 1989
Site number	419
Coordinates	47°40'55"N 18°17'36"E
Area	1 897,00 ha

Color codes

Fields back-shaded in light blue relate to data and information required only for RIS updates.

Note that some fields concerning aspects of Part 3, the Ecological Character Description of the RIS (tinted in purple), are not expected to be completed as part of a standard RIS, but are included for completeness so as to provide the requested consistency between the RIS and the format of a 'full' Ecological Character Description, as adopted in Resolution X.15 (2008). If a Contracting Party does have information available that is relevant to these fields (for example from a national format Ecological Character Description) it may, if it wishes to, include information in these additional fields.

1 - Summary

Summary

The Old Lake is the largest lake of Komárom-Esztergom county situated in the inner city of Tata. It is an artificial storage lake formed in the Middle Ages with swelling up a steam called Által-ér. It is a unique incident in all over the world that migrating birds rest at an inner city lake. Sometimes 25-35 thousands of waterfowls spend the night there.

Regarding the land use, in the area of the delta of Által-ér a mosaic of habitats is formed (meadows, pastures, spring bogs, remainings of fen and bog areas, reedbeds, ploughlands, fishponds, streams). This area is wedged between urbanized and industrial regions from the North and South as well as clearly bordered by the town of Almásfüzitő and the agglomeration area of Tata town.

2 - Data & location

2.1 - Formal data

2.1.1 - Name and address of the compiler of this RIS

Responsible compiler

Institution/agency	Duna-Ipoly National Park Directorate
Postal address	1525 Budapest, Pf.: 86.

National Ramsar Administrative Authority

Institution/agency	Department for Nature Conservation, Ministry of Agriculture
Postal address	Kossuth Lajos tér 11.

2.1.2 - Period of collection of data and information used to compile the RIS

From year	2006
To year	2025

2.1.3 - Name of the Ramsar Site

Official name (in English, French or Spanish)	Lakes by Tata

2.1.4 - Changes to the boundaries and area of the Site since its designation or earlier update

(Update) A. Changes to Site boundary	Yes ○ No ◉
(Update) B. Changes to Site area	No change to area
(Update) For secretariat only: This update is an extension	☐

2.1.5 - Changes to the ecological character of the Site

(Update) 6b i. Has the ecological character of the Ramsar Site (including applicable Criteria) changed since the previous RIS?	No

2.2 - Site location

2.2.1 - Defining the Site boundaries

b) Digital map/image
<1 file(s) uploaded>

Former maps	0

Boundaries description

There are two areas. 1. Follows the boundary of the Tatai Old Lake. 2. North border: Szőny-Füzítő canal. East border: Freeway 1., West border: Tata-Naszály-Almásfüzítő road. South border: The border of Tata city

2.2.2 - General location

a) In which large administrative region does the site lie?	Komárom-Esztergom county
b) What is the nearest town or population centre?	Tata

2.2.3 - For wetlands on national boundaries only

a) Does the wetland extend onto the territory of one or more other countries?	Yes ○ No ◉
b) Is the site adjacent to another designated Ramsar Site on the territory of another Contracting Party?	Yes ○ No ◉

2.2.4 - Area of the Site

Official area, in hectares (ha): 1897

Area, in hectares (ha) as calculated from GIS boundaries: 1897.43

2.2.5 - Biogeography

Biogeographic regions

Regionalisation scheme(s)	Biogeographic region
EU biogeographic regionalization	Pannonic

Other biogeographic regionalisation scheme

European Commission DG Environment webpage
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/sites_hab/biogeog_regions/index_en.htm
The biogeographic regionalisation scheme applied is the same used by the European Union (according to the Habitats Directive)

3 - Why is the Site important?

3.1 - Ramsar Criteria and their justification

<no data available>

☑ Criterion 2 : Rare species and threatened ecological communities

☑ Criterion 3 : Biological diversity

Justification: This wetland gives complex support to the survival of endangered and vulnerable animal and plant species. The Old Lake has a special value in maintaining ecological diversity of this region, this role is outstandingly unique in an inner city. This wetland has an important role for maintaining the biological diversity of the biogeographic region. There are numerous bird species with large populations.

Variable habitats can be found in the relatively small area, that results in high biodiversity especially in bird species. Population is given in pairs in the case of breeding populations and in specimens in the case of migrant populations.

☑ Criterion 4 : Support during critical life cycle stage or in adverse conditions

☑ Criterion 5 : >20,000 waterbirds

Overall waterbird numbers: 60000 individuals

☑ Criterion 6 : >1% waterbird population

Optional text box to provide further information: Based on the Waterbird Population Estimates, the 1% threshold is 1900 ind. for the Pannonic nonbreeding population of Anser albifrons (2014-2018). The population regularly occurring in the site is above this threshold.
Based on the Waterbird Population Estimates, the 1% threshold is 1300 ind. for the C European nonbreeding population of Anser anser (2013-2018). The population regularly occurring in the site is at or above this threshold.

3.2 - Plant species whose presence relates to the international importance of the site

Phylum	Scientific name	Criterion 2	Criterion 3	Criterion 4	IUCN Red List	CITES Appendix I	Other status	Justification
Plantae								
TRACHEOPHYTA / LILIOPSIDA	*Allium suaveolens*	☐	☑	☐	LC	☐	Considered as LC	biogeografically important or rare species
TRACHEOPHYTA / LILIOPSIDA	*Cyperus longus*	☐	☑	☐	LC	☐	Considered as LC	biogeografically important or rare species
TRACHEOPHYTA / LILIOPSIDA	*Gymnadenia conopsea*	☐	☑	☐		☐	Considered as LC	biogeografically important or rare species
TRACHEOPHYTA / MAGNOLIOPSIDA	*Ludwigia palustris*	☐	☑	☐	LC	☐	Considered as LC	biogeografically important or rare species
TRACHEOPHYTA / LILIOPSIDA	*Ophrys sphegodes*	☐	☑	☐	NT	☐	Considered as NT	biogeografically important or rare species

3.3 - Animal species whose presence relates to the international importance of the site

Phylum	Scientific name	Species qualifies under criterion				Species contributes under criterion				Pop. Size	Period of pop. Est.	% occurrence 1)	IUCN Red List	CITES Appendix I	CMS Appendix I	Other Status	Justification
		2	4	6	9	3	5	7	8								
Birds																	
CHORDATA / AVES	*Acrocephalus melanopogon*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	2	2020		LC	☐	☐		Breeding population: 0-4 pairs. Criterion 3: the wetland supports a small, but reionally important population of the species.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Alcedo atthis*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	8	2020		LC	☐	☐		Breeding population: 3-6 pairs. Criterion 3: the wetland supports a small, but reionally important population of the species.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Anas crecca*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	600	2020		LC	☐	☐		Migrant population at the site: 600-1600 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Anas platyrhynchos*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☐	☐	3500	2020		LC	☐	☐		Breeding population: 30-40 pairs Migrant population at the site: 3500-9000 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Anas strepera*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	200	2020			☐	☐		Breeding population: 1-3 pairs Migrant population at the site: 200-350 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Anser albifrons*	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐	☐	45000	2020	20	LC	☐	☐		Migrant population at the site: 20000-50000 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Anser anser*	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐	☐	1300	2020	1	LC	☐	☐		Breeding population: 30-40 pairs Migrant population at the site: 1300-5000 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Anser erythropus*	☑	☑	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	5	2020	1	VU	☐	☑	Considered as critically endangered	Population of maximum 5 individuals. Criterion 4: This species is an occasional visitor in very small numbers, but even those few specimens are of international significance, as the entire breeding population in Europe is below 100 pairs. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Anser fabalis*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	200	2020		LC	☐	☐		Migrant population at the site: 200-2000 specimens (Anser serrirostris). Criterion 3: The wetland is important for migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Aquila heliaca*	☑	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	4	2020		VU	☑	☑		Migrant population at the site: max. 4 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for migrant waterbirds and raptors, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Ardea alba*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	350	2020		LC	☐	☐		Migrant population at the site: 350 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Ardea purpurea*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	8	2020		LC	☐	☐		Breeding population: 5-10 pairs. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Aythya ferina*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	400	2020		VU	☐	☐		Breeding population: 5-10 pairs Migrant population at the site: 400-800 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.

Phylum	Scientific name	Species qualifies under criterion				Species contributes under criterion				Pop. Size	Period of pop. Est.	% occurrence 1)	IUCN Red List	CITES Appendix I	CMS Appendix I	Other Status	Justification
		2	4	6	9	3	5	7	8								
CHORDATA / AVES	*Aythya fuligula*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	200	2020		LC	☐	☐		Breeding population: 1-5 pairs Migrant population at the site: 200-500 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Aythya nyroca*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	4	2020		NT	☐	☑		Breeding population: 0-4 pairs. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Botaurus stellaris*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	5	2020		LC	☐	☐		Breeding population: 4-6 pairs. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Branta ruficollis*	☑	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	5	2020		VU	☐	☑	Considered as critically endangered	Migrant population of 5-51 individuals. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Chlidonias hybrida*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	20	2020		LC	☐	☐		Migrant population at the site: 20-50 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Chlidonias leucopterus*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	56			LC	☐	☐		Migrant population at the site: 56 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Chlidonias niger*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	250	2020		LC	☐	☐		Migrant population at the site: 250-650 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Chroicocephalus ridibundus*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☐	☐	12000	2020			☐	☐		Migrant population at the site: Maximum 12000 individuals. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Ciconia ciconia*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	150	2020		LC	☐	☐		Breeding population: pairs Migrant population at the site: 50-150 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Ciconia nigra*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	50	2020		LC	☐	☐		Migrant population at the site: 50-135 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Circaetus gallicus*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	4			LC	☐	☐		Migrant population at the site: max. 4 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds and raptors, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Circus aeruginosus*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	6	2020		LC	☐	☐		Breeding population: 3-6 pairs. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds and raptors, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Cygnus olor*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	470			LC	☐	☐		Breeding population: 3-6 pairs Migrant population at the site: 470 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Egretta garzetta*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	50	2020		LC	☐	☐		Migrant population at the site: 50-90 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.

Phylum	Scientific name	Species qualifies under criterion				Species contributes under criterion				Pop. Size	Period of pop. Est.	% occurrence 1)	IUCN Red List	CITES Appendix I	CMS Appendix I	Other Status	Justification
		2	4	6	9	3	5	7	8								
CHORDATA / AVES	*Fulica atra*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	2600			LC	☐	☐		Breeding population: 35-40 pairs Migrant population at the site: 2600 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Gallinago gallinago*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	310			LC	☐	☐		Migrant population at the site: 310 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Gallinula chloropus*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	10			LC	☐	☐		Breeding population: 8-12 pairs. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Haliaeetus albicilla*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	5	2020		LC	☑	☑		Migrant population at the site: max. 5-12 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds and raptors, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Himantopus himantopus*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	10	2020		LC	☐	☐		Breeding population: 0-6 pairs Migrating population at the site: 10-52 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Ixobrychus minutus*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	18	2020		LC	☐	☐		Breeding population: 15-20 pairs. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Larus cachinnans*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	7200			LC	☐	☐		Migrant population at the site: Maximum 7200 individuals. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Larus canus*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	4500			LC	☐	☐		Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Limosa limosa*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	10			NT	☐	☐		Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Luscinia svecica*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	6	2020		LC	☐	☐		Breeding population: 2-6 pairs. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant birds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Mergellus albellus*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	5			LC	☐	☐		Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Microcarbo pygmeus*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	150	2020			☐	☐		Breeding population: 5-10 pairs Migrant population at the site: 150-410 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Netta rufina*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	87			LC	☐	☐		Breeding population: 2-7 pairs Migrant population at the site: 87 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Numenius arquata*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	52			NT	☐	☐		Migrant population at the site: 52 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.

Phylum	Scientific name	Species qualifies under criterion				Species contributes under criterion				Pop. Size	Period of pop. Est.	% occurrence 1)	IUCN Red List	CITES Appendix I	CMS Appendix I	Other Status	Justification
		2	4	6	9	3	5	7	8								
CHORDATA / AVES	*Nycticorax nycticorax*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	100	2020		LC	☐	☐		Migrant population at the site: 100-260 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Philomachus pugnax*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	500	2020			☐	☐		Migrant population at the site: 500-2200 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Platalea leucorodia*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	12	2020		LC	☐	☐		Migrant population at the site: 12-65 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Porzana parva*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	8				☐	☐		Breeding population: 5-10 pairs. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Porzana porzana*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	6	2020		LC	☐	☐		Breeding population: 2-5 pairs. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Rallus aquaticus*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	10			LC	☐	☐		Breeding population: 8-12 pairs. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Recurvirostra avosetta*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	108	2020		LC	☐	☐		Breeding population: 0-7 pairs Migrant population at the site: max. 108 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Sterna hirundo*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	235	2020		LC	☐	☐		Breeding population: 0-100 pairs Migrant population at the site: 235 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Tringa erythropus*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	320			LC	☐	☐		Migrant population at the site: 320 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Tringa glareola*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	300	2020		LC	☐	☐		Migrant population at the site: 300-1200 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Tringa nebularia*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	265			LC	☐	☐		Migrant population at the site: 265 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Tringa totanus*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	415			LC	☐	☐		Breeding population: 0-2 pairs Migrant population at the site: 415 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.
CHORDATA / AVES	*Vanellus vanellus*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	650			NT	☐	☐		Breeding population: 0-8 pairs Migrant population at the site: 650 specimens. Criterion 3: The wetland is important for breeding and migrant waterbirds, as the most important shallow wetland in the county.

1) Percentage of the total biogeographic population at the site

Criterion 4: Waterfowl hunting is banned on the site so it provides a refuge to waterfowl where they can roost and feed safely.

Criterion 5: Water birds individual number can reach 80.000. 48.000 geese stayed in the area for 3 weeks.

For Biological components: animal species, see taxonomic list.

3.4 - Ecological communities whose presence relates to the international importance of the site

<no data available>

4 - What is the Site like? (Ecological character description)

4.1 - Ecological character

Által-ér is a stream which flows through Tata, and it gains up the water coming down from the surrounding mountains. It is the water-collector of several creeks and sources so that it creates a large habitat-system for communities associated with water.

There is a very valuable bog area (namely: Tófarok) which is mostly wet throughout the whole year. Dominant plant communities are swamp forests, (e.g. Alnus glutinosa, Salix alba, Salix fragilis, Salix cinerea). In a small spot there is a reedbed as well. This part of the area is quite a diverse habitat of the site.

“Által-ér” is a little stream which had been dammed up in the 15th century in order to create a water stocking pond. It was also used for extensive fish breeding. The stream has remained the basic supplier of the “Old-lake” even for today. The size of the lake is 219 hectares. On the shore the dominant plant communities are pine-trees and different species of ferns (For example: Dryopteris filix- mas and Dryopteris assimilis).

The hydrology has improved since the mining activity in the surrounding region has declined and springs have returned.

4.2 - What wetland type(s) are in the site?

Inland wetlands

Wetland types (code and name)	Local name	Ranking of extent (1: greatest - 4: least)	Area (ha) of wetland type	Justification of Criterion 1
Fresh water > Flowing water >> M: Permanent rivers/ streams/ creeks		2		
Fresh water > Lakes and pools >> O: Permanent freshwater lakes		1		
Fresh water > Lakes and pools >> Tp: Permanent freshwater marshes/ pools		4		
Fresh water > Marshes on inorganic soils >> Ts: Seasonal/ intermittent freshwater marshes/ pools on inorganic soils		3		
Fresh water > Marshes on inorganic soils >> Xf: Freshwater, tree-dominated wetlands				
Fresh water > Flowing water >> Y: Permanent Freshwater springs; oases				

Human-made wetlands

Wetland types (code and name)	Local name	Ranking of extent (1: greatest - 4: least)	Area (ha) of wetland type
1: Aquaculture ponds		1	
Zk(c): Man-made subterranean hydrological systems		0	

4.3 - Biological components

4.3.1 - Plant species

Other noteworthy plant species

Phylum	Scientific name	Position in range / endemism / other
TRACHEOPHYTA/LILIOPSIDA	*Allium angulosum*	Endangered, biogeografically important or rare species.
TRACHEOPHYTA/LILIOPSIDA	*Anacamptis coriophora*	Endangered, biogeografically important or rare species. 1000 flowering specimens.
TRACHEOPHYTA/LILIOPSIDA	*Anacamptis palustris*	Endangered, biogeografically important or rare species. 50-100 specimens.
TRACHEOPHYTA/LILIOPSIDA	*Anacamptis palustris elegans*	Endangered, biogeografically important or rare species. 50 specimens.
TRACHEOPHYTA/MAGNOLIOPSIDA	*Anthyllis vulneraria*	Endangered, biogeografically important or rare species.
TRACHEOPHYTA/POLYPODIOPSIDA	*Azolla caroliniana*	Endangered, biogeografically important or rare species.
TRACHEOPHYTA/MAGNOLIOPSIDA	*Centaurea scabiosa sadleriana*	Endangered, biogeografically important or rare species.
TRACHEOPHYTA/LILIOPSIDA	*Dactylorhiza sambucina*	Endangered, biogeografically important or rare species. 1-5 specimens.
TRACHEOPHYTA/MAGNOLIOPSIDA	*Erucastrum nasturtiifolium*	Endangered, biogeografically important or rare species.
TRACHEOPHYTA/LILIOPSIDA	*Hydrocharis morsus-ranae*	Endangered, biogeografically important or rare species.
TRACHEOPHYTA/LILIOPSIDA	*Leucojum vernum*	Endangered, biogeografically important or rare species.
TRACHEOPHYTA/MAGNOLIOPSIDA	*Nymphaea alba*	Endangered, biogeografically important or rare species.
TRACHEOPHYTA/LILIOPSIDA	*Orchis mascula*	Endangered, biogeografically important or rare species. 4-5 specimens.
TRACHEOPHYTA/LILIOPSIDA	*Orchis militaris*	Endangered, biogeografically important or rare species. 300-350 specimens.
TRACHEOPHYTA/MAGNOLIOPSIDA	*Plantago maritima*	Endangered, biogeografically important or rare species.
TRACHEOPHYTA/MAGNOLIOPSIDA	*Ribes rubrum*	Endangered, biogeografically important or rare species.
TRACHEOPHYTA/MAGNOLIOPSIDA	*Salix rosmarinifolia*	Endangered, biogeografically important or rare species.
TRACHEOPHYTA/MAGNOLIOPSIDA	*Senecio umbrosus*	Endangered, biogeografically important or rare species. Population of 2200 - 3500 specimens.
TRACHEOPHYTA/LILIOPSIDA	*Stipa pennata pennata*	Endangered, biogeografically important or rare species.
TRACHEOPHYTA/LILIOPSIDA	*Stratiotes aloides*	Endangered, biogeografically important or rare species.
TRACHEOPHYTA/LILIOPSIDA	*Veratrum album*	Endangered, biogeografically important or rare species.
TRACHEOPHYTA/MAGNOLIOPSIDA	*Vincetoxicum hirundinaria*	Endangered, biogeografically important or rare species.

4.3.2 - Animal species

Other noteworthy animal species

Phylum	Scientific name	Pop. size	Period of pop. est.	% occurrence	Position in range /endemism/other
CHORDATA/MAMMALIA	*Castor fiber*				

Invasive alien animal species

Phylum	Scientific name	Impacts	Changes at RIS update
CHORDATA/MAMMALIA	*Myocastor coypus*	Actual (minor impacts)	No change

4.4 - Physical components

4.4.1 - Climate

Climatic region	Subregion
C: Moist Mid-Latitude climate with mild winters	Cfb: Marine west coast (Mild with no dry season, warm summer)

4.4.2 - Geomorphic setting

a) Minimum elevation above sea level (in metres): 130

a) Maximum elevation above sea level (in metres): 130

Entire river basin ☐

Upper part of river basin ☐

Middle part of river basin ☑

Lower part of river basin ☐

More than one river basin ☐

Not in river basin ☐

Coastal ☐

Please name the river basin or basins. If the site lies in a sub-basin, please also name the larger river basin. For a coastal/marine site, please name the sea or ocean.

The main stream of the region is Által-ér. It springs from the Kopasz-hegy between the settlements of Pusztavám and Császár from more springs and flows into the Duna by Szelíd-dombok near Dunaalmás.

4.4.3 - Soil

Mineral ☑

(Update) Changes at RIS update: No change ◉ Increase ○ Decrease ○ Unknown ○

No available information ☐

Are soil types subject to change as a result of changing hydrological conditions (e.g., increased salinity or acidification)? Yes ○ No ◉

Please provide further information on the soil (optional)

See Physical features of the site in additional material for further information.

4.4.4 - Water regime

Water permanence

Presence?	Changes at RIS update
Usually permanent water present	
Usually seasonal, ephemeral or intermittent water present	

Source of water that maintains character of the site

Presence?	Predominant water source	Changes at RIS update
Water inputs from precipitation	☐	No change
Water inputs from surface water	☑	No change

Water destination

Presence?	Changes at RIS update
Feeds groundwater	No change
To downstream catchment	increase

Stability of water regime

Presence?	Changes at RIS update
Water levels largely stable	increase

Please add any comments on the water regime and its determinants (if relevant). Use this box to explain sites with complex hydrology:

See Hydrological values of the site in additional material for further information.

4.4.5 - Sediment regime

Sediment regime unknown ☐

<no data available>

4.4.6 - Water pH

Unknown ☑

4.4.7 - Water salinity

Fresh (<0.5 g/l) ☑

(Update) Changes at RIS update: No change ◉ Increase ○ Decrease ○ Unknown ○

Unknown ☐

4.4.8 - Dissolved or suspended nutrients in water

Eutrophic ☑

(Update) Changes at RIS update: No change ◉ Increase ○ Decrease ○ Unknown ○

Unknown ☐

4.4.9 - Features of the surrounding area which may affect the Site

Please describe whether, and if so how, the landscape and ecological characteristics in the area surrounding the Ramsar Site differ from the site itself: i) broadly similar ○ ii) significantly different ◉

Surrounding area has greater urbanisation or development ☐

Surrounding area has higher human population density ☐

Surrounding area has more intensive agricultural use ☐

Surrounding area has significantly different land cover or habitat types ☐

4.5 - Ecosystem services

4.5.1 - Ecosystem services/benefits

Provisioning Services

Ecosystem service	Examples	Importance/Extent/Significance
Wetland non-food products	Other	Medium

Regulating Services

Ecosystem service	Examples	Importance/Extent/Significance
Maintenance of hydrological regimes	Groundwater recharge and discharge	Medium
Hazard reduction	Flood control, flood storage	Medium

Cultural Services

Ecosystem service	Examples	Importance/Extent/Significance
Recreation and tourism	Nature observation and nature-based tourism	Medium
Recreation and tourism	Picnics, outings, touring	Medium
Recreation and tourism	Recreational hunting and fishing	Medium
Spiritual and inspirational	Cultural heritage (historical and archaeological)	Medium
Scientific and educational	Educational activities and opportunities	Medium
Scientific and educational	Long-term monitoring site	Medium

Other ecosystem service(s) not included above:

The dominant land use types are ploughlands and fishponds. In the case of ploughlands monocultures, while in fishponds intensive fishery are characteristic, in the case of withdrawn land use built-in area is important. The extension of the marshes, ditches and roads is considerably large, conserving values. The proportion of the grasslands, forests and reedbed is less but with great conservational significance. The reedbed is situated at the edge of the land use area. The area of the grasslands is to be extended by ploughland-grassland conversion. The tree stands are made up of non-indigenious species. It is unfortunate respecting the aims of conservation but these are still to be maintained using nature-friendly methods.

Bird fauna monitoring by DINPD and Birdlife Hungary

See additional material for further information on ecosystem services.

Have studies or assessments been made of the economic valuation of ecosystem services provided by this Ramsar Site? Yes ○ No ○ Unknown ◉

4.5.2 - Social and cultural values

i) the site provides a model of wetland wise use, demonstrating the application of traditional knowledge and methods of management and use that maintain the ecological character of the wetland ☐

ii) the site has exceptional cultural traditions or records of former civilizations that have influenced the ecological character of the wetland ☐

iii) the ecological character of the wetland depends on its interaction with local communities or indigenous peoples ☐

iv) relevant non-material values such as sacred sites are present and their existence is strongly linked with the maintenance of the ecological character of the wetland ☐

<no data available>

4.6 - Ecological processes

<no data available>

5 - How is the Site managed? (Conservation and management)

5.1 - Land tenure and responsibilities (Managers)

5.1.1 - Land tenure/ownership

Public ownership

Category	Within the Ramsar Site	In the surrounding area
National/Federal government	☑	☐
Local authority, municipality, (sub)district, etc.	☑	☑
Other public ownership	☑	☑

Private ownership

Category	Within the Ramsar Site	In the surrounding area
Cooperative/collective (e.g., farmers cooperative)	☑	☑
Other types of private/individual owner(s)	☑	☑

Provide further information on the land tenure / ownership regime (optional):

within the Ramsar site:
The Old lake is mostly owned by the State.
In the northern part of the surrounding area there are built-in sites and public areas. Some of them are owned by individuals and authorities.
From the conservation point of view, this status is favorable as the majority of land items are owned by the local government, state or agricultural cooperative so it is easier to make the approaches of conservation accepted. The state ownership of the reed-beds and fish ponds are to be supported together with the withdrawn land use of the Fényes-források.

in the surrounding area:
Partly privately owned area, and partly owned by the local government.

5.1.2 - Management authority

Please list the local office / offices of any agency or organization responsible for managing the site: Duna-Ipoly National Park Directorate

Provide the name and/or title of the person or people with responsibility for the wetland: Balázs Tóth PhD

Postal address: 1525 Budapest, Pf. 86.

E-mail address: DINPI@DINPI.HU

5.2 - Ecological character threats and responses (Management)

5.2.1 - Factors (actual or likely) adversely affecting the Site's ecological character

Human settlements (non agricultural)

Factors adversely affecting site	Actual threat	Potential threat	Within the site	Changes	In the surrounding area	Changes
Housing and urban areas	Medium impact	Medium impact	☐	No change	☑	No change

Water regulation

Factors adversely affecting site	Actual threat	Potential threat	Within the site	Changes	In the surrounding area	Changes
Drainage	Medium impact	Medium impact	☑	No change	☑	No change
Water abstraction	Medium impact	Medium impact	☐	No change	☑	No change
Canalisation and river regulation	Medium impact	Medium impact	☐	No change	☑	No change

Agriculture and aquaculture

Factors adversely affecting site	Actual threat	Potential threat	Within the site	Changes	In the surrounding area	Changes
Marine and freshwater aquaculture	Medium impact	Medium impact	☑	No change	☐	No change

Human intrusions and disturbance

Factors adversely affecting site	Actual threat	Potential threat	Within the site	Changes	In the surrounding area	Changes
Recreational and tourism activities	Medium impact	Medium impact	☑	No change	☑	No change

Natural system modifications

Factors adversely affecting site	Actual threat	Potential threat	Within the site	Changes	In the surrounding area	Changes
Dams and water management/use	Medium impact	Medium impact	☐	No change	☑	No change

Invasive and other problematic species and genes

Factors adversely affecting site	Actual threat	Potential threat	Within the site	Changes	In the surrounding area	Changes
Invasive non-native/ alien species	High impact	High impact	☑	No change	☑	No change

Pollution

Factors adversely affecting site	Actual threat	Potential threat	Within the site	Changes	In the surrounding area	Changes
Household sewage, urban waste water	Medium impact	Medium impact	☑	No change	☑	No change
Industrial and military effluents	Medium impact	Medium impact	☑	No change	☑	No change
Agricultural and forestry effluents	Medium impact	Medium impact	☐	No change	☑	No change
Garbage and solid waste	Medium impact	Medium impact	☑	No change	☑	No change
Unspecified	Medium impact	Medium impact	☑	No change	☑	No change

Climate change and severe weather

Factors adversely affecting site	Actual threat	Potential threat	Within the site	Changes	In the surrounding area	Changes
Droughts	High impact	High impact	☑	No change	☑	No change

Please describe any other threats (optional):

a) within the Ramsar site:

The former fen areas remained only in small patches, and in the lower holes and former drainage ditches water is still present. In the neighbouring area, Réti fish ponds were created in the 1890s, Ferencmajori fish ponds were developed in 1962. The implementation of fish ponds were the first, but not deliberate step towards the rehabilitation of the former wetlands.

Permanent organic and oil pollution of streams and creeks that flow into the Old lake. Organic pollution comes from householding, oil comes from roads.

b) in the surrounding area:

The main threat to natural conditions is the expanding land ownership of individuals who use their sites for recreation purposes. The more sites are given into public property, the more pollution (chemicals, noise, moving) threats the wildlife. One of the main tasks of nature conservation and the public interests is to find the balance between assuring nature's harmony and giving recreation opportunities to visitors.

The area of the delta of Által-ér was a formerly extensive, vivid marsh region. With the occupation of agricultural land, the increase of the inhabited area and the effect of mining to the water basis resulted in present use and conservation values connected to this. The most important running water sources became very unstable. 250 million liter water used to flow down the Által-ér delta per day until 1960s, when the implementation of Sámuel Mikoviny's drainage plan completely altered the area.

As for our present knowledge, an overall infrastructural development is not planned in this region, but the areas by Fényes-forrás and Réti-halastavak are potential subjects for building-in. The maintenance of the streams can lead to conservation problems. The communal waste water and illegal waste deposits have significant effects. In certain years, the drought causes also devastating ecological effects because of the reduced water output of the streams flowing into. In these cases, the water level of fish ponds is lower, which can be critical in the breeding period.

In the field of conservation of the natural habitats, the presence of aggressive non-indigenous plant species threaten the natural vegetation.

5.2.2 - Legal conservation status

Regional (international) legal designations

Designation type	Name of area	Online information url	Overlap with Ramsar Site
EU Natura 2000	Tatai Öregtó		partly

National legal designations

Designation type	Name of area	Online information url	Overlap with Ramsar Site
Municipal Nature Conservation Area	Old lake		partly

5.2.3 - IUCN protected areas categories (2008)

Ia Strict Nature Reserve ☐

Ib Wilderness Area: protected area managed mainly for wilderness protection ☐

II National Park: protected area managed mainly for ecosystem protection and recreation ☐

III Natural Monument: protected area managed mainly for conservation of specific natural features ☐

IV Habitat/Species Management Area: protected area managed mainly for conservation through management intervention ☐

V Protected Landscape/Seascape: protected area managed mainly for landscape/seascape conservation and recreation ☑

VI Managed Resource Protected Area: protected area managed mainly for the sustainable use of natural ecosystems ☐

5.2.4 - Key conservation measures

Habitat

Measures	Status
Habitat manipulation/enhancement	Proposed
Hydrology management/restoration	Proposed
Soil management	Proposed
Land conversion controls	Proposed

Other:

Habitat restoration has been planned and implemented already. (Creating islands, dredging, restoration of littoral region, enlarging marsh area.).

5.2.5 - Management planning

Is there a site-specific management plan for the site? Yes

Has a management effectiveness assessment been undertaken for the site? Yes ○ No ◉

If the site is a formal transboundary site as indicated in section Data and location > Site location, are there shared management planning processes with another Contracting Party? Yes ○ No ◉

Please indicate if a Ramsar centre, other educational or visitor facility, or an educational or visitor programme is associated with the site:

In the eastern part of the lake there is an information desk, which introduces the ecological values of the Old Lake. Local schools and bird-watchers visit the area. The Hungarian Ornithological Association organizes several excursions around the lake every year. Birdwatching is helped by the birdwatching-tower standing on the eastern side of the lake.
Every year, the municipality launches a competition for educational institutions, NGOs and residential communities to promote water conservation, nature protection and awareness-raising.
Tata is also one of the main sponsors and host of the annual Tata Wild Goose Festival, the largest nature conservation event in Hungary, organised by NGOs since 2001.
In 2023, it has established rainwater harvesting rain gardens in a street of the town and plans to develop others, with the active involvement of the communities concerned, to keep storm water in place.
In 2019, the town built a 300-metre-long educational trail at the Kismosó spring.

5.2.6 - Planning for restoration

Is there a site-specific restoration plan? No, but a plan is being prepared

Further information

1/3 part of the enlargement site is a protected site of local significance. Ferencmajori fish ponds I. and IV. are parts of a special hunting area, so on these ponds hunting is prohibited the whole year. In other parts of the area, management plans are not implemented but local restrictions help to preserve natural values.

Old marshland (8 hectares) has been restored, and sluices were built. Mud was removed, littoral region was developed.

5.2.7 - Monitoring implemented or proposed

Monitoring	Status
Birds	Implemented

Bird fauna monitoring by DINPD and Birdlife Hungary

6 - Additional material

6.1 - Additional reports and documents

6.1.1 - Bibliographical references

Musicz László Norbert (2023): A Tatai Öreg-tó Ramsari-terület vadlúd állományának komplex vizsgálata. doktori értekezés, Soproni Egyetem, Sopron

6.1.2 - Additional reports and documents

i. taxonomic lists of plant and animal species occurring in the site (see section 4.3)
<1 file(s) uploaded>

ii. a detailed Ecological Character Description (ECD) (in a national format)
<no file available>

iii. a description of the site in a national or regional wetland inventory
<no file available>

iv. relevant Article 3.2 reports
<no file available>

v. site management plan
<no file available>

vi. other published literature
<2 file(s) uploaded>

6.1.3 - Photograph(s) of the Site

Please provide at least one photograph of the site:

Tens of thousands of geese and thousands of ducks roost on Lake Öreg, in front of the baroque style Castle of Tata during the migration period (*Csonka Péter ; Duna-Ipoly National Park Directorate, 20-12-2010*)

Waterbirds with the view of the city in the background. (*Csonka Péter ; Duna-Ipoly National Park Directorate, 16-11-2024*)

Flocks of geese over Lake Öreg. (*Csonka Péter ; Duna-Ipoly National Park Directorate, 16-11-2024*)

Red-breasted Geese at Lake Öreg. (*Csonka Péter ; Duna-Ipoly National Park Directorate, 16-11-2024*)

6.1.4 - Designation letter and related data

Designation letter
<1 file(s) uploaded>

Date of Designation: 1989-03-17