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	**6194**
0.2.2 Species name	**Iberis runemarkii**
0.2.3 Alternative species scientific name	Iberis arbuscula Runemark
0.2.4 Common name	N/A

1. National Level

1.1 Maps

1.1.1 Distribution Map	Yes
1.1.1a Sensitive species	Yes
1.1.2 Method used - map	Complete survey/Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate (3)
1.1.3 Year or period	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	Runemark H. 1963. Studies in the Aegean Flora. V. Iberis arbuscula sp. nov. Bot. Notiser 116:323-325 Snogerup S. 1995. Iberis runemarkii. In: Phitos D., Strid A., Snogerup S. & Greuter W. (eds). The Red Data Book of rare and threatened plants of Greece. World Wide Fund for Nature, Athens pp. 322-323

2.3 Range

2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km²)	2	
2.3.2 Method - Range surface area	Complete survey/Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate (3)	
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	approximately equal to (≈)
	unkown	No
	method	FRR was defined as the sum of the historical and current distribution of the species.
2.3.10 Reason for change	Improved knowledge/more accurate dataUse of different method	

2.4 Population

2.4.1 Population size (individuals or agreed exception)	Unit	number of individuals (i)		
	min	4	max	4
2.4.2 Population size (other than individuals)	Unit	N/A		
	min		max	
2.4.3 Additional information	Definition of locality			
	Conversion method			
	Problems	The population grows at cliffs which are inaccessible at		

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

	their greater part. Telescopic lens were used for population size estimation, however, it is possible that few individuals in the form of rosettes may have been missed (flowering individuals would have been readily observed).
2.4.4 Year or period	2012
2.4.5 Method – population size	Complete survey/Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate (3)
2.4.6 Short-term trend period	
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	Absent data (0)
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 250 operator N/A unknown No method Favourable reference population was set as larger than the theoretically estimated Minimum Viable Population for a perennial subshrub at a stageless habitat with medium environmental stability and unknown fertility, pollination system, production of reproductive units and survival. The estimation was not conservative taking into account the fact that this is an isolated, stenoendemic species.
2.4.15 Reason for change	Improved knowledge/more accurate data Use of different method

2.5 Habitat for the Species

2.5.1 Surface area - Habitat (km²)	0,01
2.5.2 Year or period	2012
2.5.3 Method used - habitat	Complete survey/Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate (3)
2.5.4 a) Quality of habitat	Good
2.5.4 b) Quality of habitat - method	The species is a chasmophyte, occuring on steep limestone rocks. This habitat is abundant and actually undisturbed (except from grazing) at the distribution area of the species. The typical species of the habitat are abundant at this area.
2.5.5 Short term trend period	2000-2012
2.5.6 Short term trend direction	stable (0)
2.5.7 Long-term trend period	
2.5.8 Long term trend direction	N/A
2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat (km²)	0,05
2.5.10 Reason for change	Improved knowledge/more accurate data Use of different method

2.6 Main Pressures

Pressure	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
non intensive grazing (A04.02)	high importance (H)	N/A
hand collection (F04.02.02)	low importance (L)	N/A

2.6.1 Method used – pressures	based exclusively or to a larger extent on real data from sites/occurrences or othe

2.7 Main Threats

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

Threat	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
non intensive grazing (A04.02)	high importance (H)	N/A
hand collection (F04.02.02)	low importance (L)	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	Iberis runemarkii is a stenoendemic species which had been seen and collected (botanical specimen) only twice (in 1958 and 1960), before field work in June 2014, except from an unconfirmed occurence in 2008. In 1958 and 1960 there were only few individuals. There is too little known regarding the biology and autecology of the species. Field work in 2014 resulted in the finding of 4 rosettes (immature individuals), despite the thorough search of the accessible parts of the cliff system and of part of the inaccessible parts with the use of telescopic lenses. It is possible that more individuals occur at totally inaccessible parts, but they cannot be many. The species is vulnerable to grazing which is heavy at its distribution area. Although the goats may consume the only flowering parts leaving the vegetative reproduction organs intact, the lack of sexual reproduction may lead (or has already led) to degradation of the population of the species.
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	Bad (U2)
	qualifiers	unknown (x)
2.9.3. Habitat	assessment	Favourable (FV)
	qualifiers	N/A
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 individuals (i)		
	min	4	max	4
3.1.2 Method used	Complete survey/Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate (3)			
3.1.3 Trend of population size within	unknown (x)			

3.2 Conversation Measures

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

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)	Inside	Long term
Regulation/ Management of hunting and taking (7.1)	Legal	high importance (H)	Inside	Long term