

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	4043
0.2.2 Species name	<i>Pseudophilotes bavius</i>
0.2.3 Alternative species scientific name	N/A
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	Estimate based on expert opinion with no or minimal sampling (1)
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	Combination of sampling data (2014) with data reported in Pamperis (2009). Pamperis LN. 2009. The Butterflies of Greece. Athens: Pamperis Editions.766 p.

2.3 Range

2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km ²)	4379
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 ²) operator approximately equal to (≈) unkown No method No extinction is officially reported for the species at 10km grid scale. Therefore the FVR is considered to be similar with the current range
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 N/A min max
2.4.2 Population size (other than individuals)	Unit number of adults (adults) min 100 max 500
2.4.3 Additional information	Definition of locality Conversion method Problems Sampling localities were visited only once in 2014. In absence of time series data, we considered (a) expert

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

opinion of known population localities since 2007, (b) population localities from the Greek butterfly atlas, (c) the proportion % of species presence in the localities visited in 2014, in order to provide an estimation of minimum and maximum population size in terms of population classes

2.4.4 Year or period	2007-2012
2.4.5 Method – population size	Estimate based on expert opinion with no or minimal sampling (1)
2.4.6 Short-term trend period	2001-2012
2.4.7 Short term trend direction	stable (0)
2.4.8 Short-term trend magnitude	min max confidence interval
2.4.9 Short-term trend method	Estimate based on expert opinion with no or minimal sampling (1)
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 more than (>) unknown No method We compared the minimum population size estimated with the assessed population from historic localities, on the basis of the Greek butterfly atlas, to conclude that the reference population is greater than actual size.
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 (km ²)	
2.5.2 Year or period	
2.5.3 Method used - habitat	Absent data (0)
2.5.4 a) Quality of habitat	Unknown
2.5.4 b) Quality of habitat - method	Absent data
2.5.5 Short term trend period	2001-2012
2.5.6 Short term trend direction	unknown (x)
2.5.7 Long-term trend period	
2.5.8 Long term trend direction	N/A
2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat (km ²)	0
2.5.10 Reason for change	

2.6 Main Pressures

Pressure	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
Taking and removal of animals (terrestrial) (F03.02)	low importance (L)	N/A
mowing / cutting of grassland (A03)	low importance (L)	N/A
use of biocides, hormones and chemicals (A07)	low importance (L)	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)
Taking and removal of animals (terrestrial) (F03.02)	low importance (L)	N/A

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

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

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 stable (=)

2.9.3. Habitat assessment Unknown (XX)
qualifiers N/A

2.9.4. Future prospects assessment Favourable (FV)
qualifiers N/A

2.9.5 Overall assessment of Conservation Status Inadequate (U1)

2.9.5 Overall trend in Conservation Status stable (=)

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

3.1 Population

3.1.1 Population Size Unit number of adults (adults)
min 50 max 100

3.1.2 Method used Estimate based on expert opinion with no or minimal sampling (1)

3.1.3 Trend of population size within N/A

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 One-off	medium importance (M)	Inside	Enhance Long term
Legal protection of habitats and species (6.3)	Legal	high importance (H)	Both	Enhance