

# 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	5350
0.2.2 Species name	<i>Salmo farioides</i>
0.2.3 Alternative species scientific name	N/A
0.2.4 Common name	Ioniki Pestropha

## 1. National Level

### 1.1 Maps

1.1.1 Distribution Map	Yes
1.1.1a Sensitive species	Yes
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	No
1.1.5 Range map	Yes

## 2. Biogeographical Or Marine Level

### 2.1 Biogeographical Region

#### Mediterranean (MED)

### 2.2 Published sources

Kottelat M. & Freyhof J. (2007). Handbook of European freshwater fishes. Publications Kottelat, Cornol, Switzerland.

Economou A.N., Giakoumi S., Vardakas L., Barbieri R., Stoumboudi M. & Zogaris S. (2007). The freshwater ichthyofauna of Greece - an update based on a hydrographic basin survey. Mediterranean Marine Science, Vol. 8(1): 91-166.

Zogaris, S. & Economou, A.E. (2009). *Salmo farioides*. In Red Data Book of threatened Animals of Greece. Legakis A. & Maragou P. (eds), p 141-142. Hellenic Zoological Society, Athens.

### 2.3 Range

2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km <sup>2</sup> )	17300
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	stable (0)
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 (km <sup>2</sup> ) operator approximately equal to (≈) unkown No method Basic assumption: Favourable Reference Range = Surface Area Range (current range)
2.3.10 Reason for change	

### 2.4 Population

2.4.1 Population size (individuals or agreed exception)	Unit N/A min max
---	---------------------

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

2.4.2 Population size (other than individuals)	Unit	number of map 10x10 km grid cells (grids10x10)		
	min	173	max	173
2.4.3 Additional information	Definition of locality			
	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		decrease (-)		
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	approximately equal to (≈)		
	unknown	No		
	method	Basic assumption: Favourable Reference Population = value extracted from Range Map		

## 2.4.15 Reason for change

## 2.5 Habitat for the Species

2.5.1 Surface area - Habitat (km <sup>2</sup> )	17300
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	Moderate
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 (km <sup>2</sup> )	0
2.5.10 Reason for change	

## 2.6 Main Pressures

Pressure	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
intensive mixed animal grazing (A04.01.05)	low importance (L)	N/A
forest exploitation without replanting or natural regrowth (B03)	medium importance (M)	N/A
sand and gravel quarries (C01.01.01)	low importance (L)	N/A
Fishing and harvesting aquatic resources (F02)	high importance (H)	N/A
Illegal taking/ removal of marine fauna (F05)	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)

Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)	low importance (L)	N/A
invasive non-native species (I01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
large scale water deviation (J02.03.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
reduction in migration/ migration barriers (J03.02.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
modifying structures of inland water courses (J02.05.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
surface water abstractions for agriculture (J02.06.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A

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

## 2.7 Main Threats

Threat	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
intensive mixed animal grazing (A04.01.05)	low importance (L)	N/A
forest exploitation without replanting or natural regrowth (B03)	medium importance (M)	N/A
sand and gravel quarries (C01.01.01)	low importance (L)	N/A
Fishing and harvesting aquatic resources (F02)	high importance (H)	N/A
Illegal taking/ removal of marine fauna (F05)	low importance (L)	N/A
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)	low importance (L)	N/A
invasive non-native species (I01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
large scale water deviation (J02.03.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
reduction in migration/ migration barriers (J03.02.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)	medium importance (M)	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

2.7.1 Method used – threats      expert opinion (1)

## 2.8 Complementary Information

2.8.1 Justification of % thresholds for trends

2.8.2 Other relevant Information

The % threshold could not be used for the assessment since: a) a different method for assessing range was employed, compared to the 2nd Reporting

1. Western Balkan endemic species, found in Greece in rivers Aaos, Kalamas, Arachthos, Acheloos, Evinos, Mornos and Alfios. Some isolated populations that have dramatically declined, such as in tributaries of river Alphios, and should be considered endangered population units in need of immediate conservation/restoration measures. Native populations are threatened by illegal overfishing; genetic introgression through irresponsible stocking is also an important threat. Changes in flow regime and barriers (dams etc) are important pressures and threats to this highly migratory species.

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

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

"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).

3. Population assessment took into account, besides Favourable Reference Population (grid), population structure and reproduction trends. In several samplings (more than 20) around species range area, only few large (more than 20cm) adults were sampled and fry seem to be declining.

## 2.8.3 Trans-boundary assessment

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

2.9.1 Range	assessment Favourable (FV) qualifiers N/A
2.9.2. Population	assessment Inadequate (U1) qualifiers declining (-)
2.9.3. Habitat	assessment Inadequate (U1) qualifiers declining (-)
2.9.4. Future prospects	assessment Inadequate (U1) qualifiers declining (-)
2.9.5 Overall assessment of Conservation Status	Inadequate (U1)
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 10x10 km grid cells (grids10x10) min 83 max 83
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
Establish protected areas/sites (6.1)	Legal Administrative One-off	low importance (L)	Inside	Enhance Long term
Regulation/ Management of fishery in limnic systems (7.2)	Legal Administrative Recurrent	high importance (H)	Both	Enhance Long term