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	**6292**
0.2.2 Species name	Knipowitchia goerneri
0.2.3 Alternative species scientific name	N/A
0.2.4 Common name	Kerkyrogovios

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

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

Economidis, P.S. & Chrysopolitou V. (2009). Knipowitschia goerneri. In Red Data Book of threatened Animals of Greeece. Legakis A. & Maragou P. (eds). Hellenic Zoological Society, Athens.

Vanhove M.P.M., Economou A.N., Zogaris S., Larmuseau M.H.D., Giakoumi S., Kalogianni E., Volckaert F.A.M. & Huyse T. (2012). Phylogenetics and biogeography of the Balkan ‘sand gobies’ (Teleostei: Gobiidae): vulnerable species in need of taxonomic revision. Biological Journal of the Linnean Society, Vol. 105: 73–91.

Economidis P.S., Vogiatzis V.P., Bobori D.C. (1996). Freshwater Fishes. In: S. Dafis, E. Papastergiadou, K. Georghiou, D. Babalonas, T. Georgiadis, M. Papageorgiou, Th. Lazaridou, V. Tsiaoussi (Eds), Directive 92/43/EEC, The Greek “Habitat” Project NATURA 2000: An overview, pp. 604-635. Life Contract B4-3200/94/756 Commission of the European Communities DG XI, The Goulandris Natural History Museum - Greek Biotope/Wetland Center.

2.3 Range

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

2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km²)	24
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	decrease (-)
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) 93 operator N/A unkown No method Basic assumption: Favourable Reference Range = Historic Range = value extracted from Additional Reference Range Map
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 24 max 24
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 93 operator N/A unknown No method Basic assumption: Favourable Reference Population = value extracted from Additional Reference Range Map
2.4.15 Reason for change	

2.5 Habitat for the Species

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

2.5.1 Surface area - Habitat (km²)	24
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 expert judgement.
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)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Discharges (E03)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish) (H01)	low importance (L)	N/A
modifying structures of inland water courses (J02.05.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
management of aquatic and bank vegetation for drainage purposes (J02.10)	low importance (L)	N/A
dykes and flooding defence in inland water systems (J02.12.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
surface water abstractions for agriculture (J02.06.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
large scale water deviation (J02.03.01)	high importance (H)	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)
Urbanised areas, human habitation (E01)	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
modifying structures of inland water courses (J02.05.02)	high importance (H)	N/A
reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
management of aquatic and bank vegetation for drainage purposes (J02.10)	high importance (H)	N/A
dykes and flooding defence in inland water systems (J02.12.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
surface water abstractions for agriculture (J02.06.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
large scale water deviation (J02.03.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A

2.7.1 Method used – threats	expert opinion (1)

2.8 Complementary Information

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

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. Endemic to the Korission lagoon area on southern Corfu Island. This tiny goby was originally found in a spring-fed freshwater wetland near the lagoon and in brackish waters within Korission Lagoon. The fringing wetland habitats have been degraded by water abstraction and human land-use change. There are still taxonomic problems in the identification and range distribution data of the Knipowitschia gobies in the Ionian Ecoregion, more work is needed to define lineages, significant population units. Due to it's extremely range restricted distribution and sensive wetland habitat requirements it should be considered one of the rarest and most threatened fishes in Greece. 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). 3. The two Greek Knipowitschia gobies (K. goerneri and K. milleri) are rather recently described and poorly studied species that are related to the Pomatoschistus sand gobies (Vanhove et al. 2012). Due to these relationships Economidis et al. (1996) placed them under the Pomatoschistus canestrini species name and we insist that this was a proper course of action; since so little was known at the time abou species systematics among these poorly studied species.
2.8.3 Trans-boundary assessment	

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

2.9.1 Range	assessment	Bad (U2)
	qualifiers	declining (-)
2.9.2. Population	assessment	Bad (U2)
	qualifiers	declining (-)
2.9.3. Habitat	assessment	Inadequate (U1)
	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

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

3.1 Population

3.1.1 Population Size	Unit	N/A	
	min		max
3.1.2 Method used	N/A		
3.1.3 Trend of population size within	N/A		

3.2 Conversation Measures