Report on the main results of the surveillance under article 11 for annex II, IV and V species (Annex B)

0.1 Member State	**GR**
0.2.1 Species code	**5089**
0.2.2 Species name	**Barbus euboicus**
0.2.3 Alternative species scientific name	N/A
0.2.4 Common name	Evoiki Briana

1. National Level

1.1 Maps

1.1.1 Distribution Map	Yes
1.1.1a Sensitive species	No
1.1.2 Method used - map	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)
1.1.3 Year or period	2007-2012
1.1.4 Additional map	Yes
1.1.5 Range map	Yes

2. Biogeographical Or Marine Level

2.1 Biogeographical Region	**Mediterranean (MED)**
2.2 Published sources	Geiger M.F., Herder F., Monaghan M.T., Almada V., Barbieri R., Bariche M., Berrebi P., Bohlen J., Casal-Lopez M., Delmastro G.B., Denys G.P.J., Dettai A., Doadrio I., Kalogianni E., Kärst H., Kottelat M., Kovačić M., Laporte M., Lorenzoni M., Marčić M., Özuluğ M., Perdices A., Perea S., Persat H., Porcelotti S., Puzzi C., Robalo J., Šanda R., Schneider M., Šlechtová V., Stoumboudi M., Walter S. & Freyhof J. (2014). Spatial heterogeneity in the Mediterranean Biodiversity Hotspot affects barcoding accuracy of its freshwater fishes. Molecular Ecology Resources 2014.

2.3 Range

2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km²)	25	
2.3.2 Method - Range surface area	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)	
2.3.3 Short-term trend period	2001-2012	
2.3.4 Short-term trend direction	unknown (x)	
2.3.5 Short-term trend magnitude	min	max
2.3.6 Long-term trend period		
2.3.7 Long-term trend direction	N/A	
2.3.8 Long-term trend magnitude	min	max
2.3.9 Favourable reference range	area (km²)	
	operator	N/A
	unkown	Yes
	method	
2.3.10 Reason for change		

2.4 Population

2.4.1 Population size (individuals or agreed exception)	Unit	N/A		
	min		max	
2.4.2 Population size (other than individuals)	Unit	number of map 1x1 km grid cells (grids1x1)		
	min	25	max	25
2.4.3 Additional information	Definition of locality			

Report on the main results of the surveillance under article 11 for annex II, IV and V species (Annex B)

	Conversion method	
	Problems	Most data are described as semi-quantitative or qualitative. Few quantitative data. Too much variability between existing samples, especially between different river basins, making it difficult to extrapolate individuals or classes for reporting population unit.
2.4.4 Year or period	2006-2012	
2.4.5 Method – population size	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)	
2.4.6 Short-term trend period	2001-2012	
2.4.7 Short term trend direction	unknown (x)	
2.4.8 Short-term trend magnitude	min	max confidence interval
2.4.9 Short-term trend method	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)	
2.4.10 Long-term trend period		
2.4.11 Long term trend direction	N/A	
2.4.12 Long-term trend magnitude	min	max confidence interval
2.4.13 Long-term trend method	N/A	
2.4.14 Favourable reference population	number	
	operator	N/A
	unknown	Yes
	method	
2.4.15 Reason for change		

2.5 Habitat for the Species

2.5.1 Surface area - Habitat (km²)	25
2.5.2 Year or period	2006-2012
2.5.3 Method used - habitat	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)
2.5.4 a) Quality of habitat	Bad
2.5.4 b) Quality of habitat - method	Based on partial data with some extrapolation and expert judgment.
2.5.5 Short term trend period	2001-2012
2.5.6 Short term trend direction	decrease (-)
2.5.7 Long-term trend period	
2.5.8 Long term trend direction	N/A
2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat (km²)	0
2.5.10 Reason for change	

2.6 Main Pressures

Pressure	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
Urbanised areas, human habitation (E01)	low importance (L)	N/A
reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Discharges (E03)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
large scale water deviation (J02.03.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
modifying structures of inland water courses (J02.05.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
surface water abstractions for agriculture (J02.06.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
dykes and flooding defence in inland water systems (J02.12.02)	high importance (H)	N/A

Report on the main results of the surveillance under article 11 for annex II, IV and V species (Annex B)

2.6.1 Method used – pressures	mainly based on expert judgement and other data (2)

2.7 Main Threats

Threat	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
Urbanised areas, human habitation (E01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
Discharges (E03)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
large scale water deviation (J02.03.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
modifying structures of inland water courses (J02.05.02)	high importance (H)	N/A
surface water abstractions for agriculture (J02.06.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
dykes and flooding defence in inland water systems (J02.12.02)	high importance (H)	N/A

2.7.1 Method used – threats	expert opinion (1)

2.8 Complementary Information

2.8.1 Justification of % thresholds for trends	The % threshold could not be used for the assessment since: a) a different method for assessing range was employed, compared to the 2nd Reporting
2.8.2 Other relevant Information	1. The distribution of this species is now restricted to Manikiotiko stream in Central-eastern Evia Island. It is unknown if the species inhabited neighbouring basins in the past (it was not found in these basins in recent surveys). This small rheophilic barbel is critically endangered since, during some summers, the stream's sections of the Manikiotiko dry up almost completely and the population is confined to a few remaining pools. Water abstraction and barriers to movement are pressures and they seriously threaten the species survival. A new protected area must be enacted in the Manikiotiko stream for this species conservation. 2. Basic Assumptions: i) "Surface Area Range" (field 2.3.1) = value extracted from "Range Map" (field 1.1.5). ii) "Favourable Reference Range" (field 2.3.9a) = a) "Surface Area Range" (field 2.3.1) OR b) value extracted from "Additional Reference Range Map" (provided). Depends on whether the Favourable range is equal or larger than actual species range. iii) "Population Size" (field 2.4.2) = value extracted from "Distribution Map" (field 1.1.1) or "Additional Distribution Map" (field 1.1.4) (when provided). iv) "Favourable Reference Population" (field 2.4.14) = a) "Population Size" (field 2.4.2) OR b) value extracted from "Additional Reference Range Map" (provided). Depends on whether the Favourable population is equal or larger than actual species population. v) Habitat "Area Estimation" (field 2.5.1) = "Distribution Map" (field 1.1.1) or "Additional Distribution Map" (field 1.1.4) (when provided).
2.8.3 Trans-boundary assessment	

2.9 Conclusions (assessment of conservation status at end of reporting period)

2.9.1 Range	assessment Unknown (XX) qualifiers N/A
2.9.2. Population	assessment Unknown (XX) qualifiers N/A

Report on the main results of the surveillance under article 11 for annex II, IV and V species (Annex B)

2.9.3. Habitat	assessment	Bad (U2)
	qualifiers	declining (-)
2.9.4. Future prospects	assessment	Bad (U2)
	qualifiers	declining (-)
2.9.5 Overall assessment of Conservation Status	Bad (U2)	
2.9.5 Overall trend in Conservation Status	declining (-)	

3. Natura 2000 coverage and conservation measures - Annex II species

3.1 Population

3.1.1 Population Size	Unit	number of map 1x1 km grid cells (grids1x1)		
	min	0	max	0
3.1.2 Method used	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)			
3.1.3 Trend of population size within	unknown (x)			

3.2 Conversation Measures

3.2.1 Measure	3.2.2 Type	3.2.3 Ranking	3.2.4 Location	3.2.5 Broad Evaluation
Legal protection of habitats and species (6.3)	Legal	high importance (H)	Outside	Enhance