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

## NATIONAL LEVEL

## 1. General information

| | |
|---|---|
| 1.1 Member State | **GR** |
| 1.2 Species code | **6999** |
| 1.3 Species scientific name | **Clinopodium taygeteum** |
| 1.4 Alternative species scientific name | Micromeria taygetea |
| 1.5 Common name (in national language) | |

## 2. Maps

| | |
|---|---|
| 2.1 Sensitive species | No |
| 2.2 Year or period | 2015 |
| 2.3 Distribution map | Yes |
| 2.4 Distribution map Method used | Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate |
| 2.5 Additional maps | Yes |

## 3. Information related to Annex V Species (Art. 14)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3.1 Is the species taken in the wild/exploited? | No | |
| 3.2 Which of the measures in Art. 14 have been taken? | a) regulations regarding access to property | No |
| | b) temporary or local prohibition of the taking of specimens in the wild and exploitation | No |
| | c) regulation of the periods and/or methods of taking specimens | No |
| | d) application of hunting and fishing rules which take account of the conservation of such populations | No |
| | e) establishment of a system of licences for taking specimens or of quotas | No |
| | f) regulation of the purchase, sale, offering for sale, keeping for sale or transport for sale of specimens | No |
| | g) breeding in captivity of animal species as well as artificial propagation of plant species | No |
| | h) other measures | No |

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

3.3 Hunting bag or quantity taken in the wild for Mammals and Acipenseridae (Fish)

a) Unit

| b) Statistics/ quantity taken | Provide statistics/quantity per hunting season or per year (where season is not used) over the reporting period | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Season/ year 1 | Season/ year 2 | Season/ year 3 | Season/ year 4 | Season/ year 5 | Season/ year 6 |
| Min. (raw, ie. not rounded) | | | | | | |
| Max. (raw, ie. not rounded) | | | | | | |
| Unknown | No | No | No | No | No | No |

3.4. Hunting bag or quantity taken in the wild Method used

3.5. Additional information

## BIOGEOGRAPHICAL LEVEL

## 4. Biogeographical and marine regions

4.1 Biogeographical or marine region where the species occurs

**Mediterranean (MED)**

4.2 Sources of information

Tan K. & Iatrou G. 2001: Endemic Plants of Greece. The Peloponnese. – Gad Publishers Ltd., Copenhagen.

Kyriakopoulos, C. & Kamari, G. 2009. Micromeria taygetea P.H. Davis In: The Red Data Book of rare and threatened plants of Greece, Vol 2 (E-Z), Phitos D., Constantinidis T., Kamari G. (eds), pp. 184-185, Hellenic Botanical Society, Patras, Greece (in Greek).

Kyriakopoulos, C. & Kamari, G. 2013. Micromeria taygetea. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2014.3. <www.iucnredlist.org>.

## 5. Range

5.1 Surface area: 12

5.2 Short-term trend Period: 2007-2018

5.3 Short-term trend Direction: Unknown (x)

5.4 Short-term trend Magnitude: a) Minimum b) Maximum

5.5 Short-term trend Method used: Insufficient or no data available

5.6 Long-term trend Period

5.7 Long-term trend Direction

5.8 Long-term trend Magnitude: a) Minimum b) Maximum

5.9 Long-term trend Method used

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

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 5.10 Favourable reference range | a) Area (km²) | |
| | b) Operator | Approximately equal to (≈) |
| | c) Unknown | |
| | d) Method | Favourable reference range was based on the sum of historic and current distribution of the species. |
| 5.11 Change and reason for change in surface area of range | No change | |
| | The change is mainly due to: | |
| 5.12 Additional information | | |

## 6. Population

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 6.1 Year or period | 2015 | |
| 6.2 Population size (in reporting unit) | a) Unit | number of individuals (i) |
| | b) Minimum | 760 |
| | c) Maximum | 2000 |
| | d) Best single value | |
| 6.3 Type of estimate | Best estimate | |
| 6.4 Additional population size (using population unit other than reporting unit) | a) Unit | |
| | b) Minimum | |
| | c) Maximum | |
| | d) Best single value | |
| 6.5 Type of estimate | | |
| 6.6 Population size Method used | Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate | |
| 6.7 Short-term trend Period | 2007-2018 | |
| 6.8 Short-term trend Direction | Increasing (+) | |
| 6.9 Short-term trend Magnitude | a) Minimum | |
| | b) Maximum | |
| | c) Confidence interval | |
| 6.10 Short-term trend Method used | Based mainly on expert opinion with very limited data | |
| 6.11 Long-term trend Period | | |
| 6.12 Long-term trend Direction | | |
| 6.13 Long-term trend Magnitude | a) Minimum | |
| | b) Maximum | |
| | c) Confidence interval | |
| 6.14 Long-term trend Method used | | |
| 6.15 Favourable reference population (using the unit in 6.2 or 6.4) | a) Population size | 800 with unit number of individuals (i) |
| | b) Operator | |
| | c) Unknown | |
| | d) Method | The favourable reference population is defined as approximately the minimum number of individuals |

counted in 2014 (rounded to the upper number of individuals).

| | |
|---|---|
| 6.16 Change and reason for change in population size | No change<br>The change is mainly due to: |
| 6.17 Additional information | |

## 7. Habitat for the species

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 7.1 Sufficiency of area and quality of occupied habitat | a) Are area and quality of occupied habitat sufficient (for long-term survival)? | Yes |
| | b) Is there a sufficiently large area of unoccupied habitat of suitable quality (for long-term survival)? | |
| 7.2 Sufficiency of area and quality of occupied habitat Method used | Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate | |
| 7.3 Short-term trend Period | 2007-2018 | |
| 7.4 Short-term trend Direction | Stable (0) | |
| 7.5 Short-term trend Method used | Based mainly on extrapolation from a limited amount of data | |
| 7.6 Long-term trend Period | | |
| 7.7 Long-term trend Direction | | |
| 7.8 Long-term trend Method used | | |
| 7.9 Additional information | The surface area of the habitat is estimated at 0.06 km2 and its quality is good. Clinopodium taygeteum grows on hard or eroded limestone rocks and cliffs. There are several rock or cliff systems in the distribution range of the species, some of them partially or entirely inaccessible. This habitat is of good quality regarding species composition (typical species) and because it is not significantly influenced by grazing or other forms of pressure. | |

## 8. Main pressures and threats

8.1 Characterisation of pressures/threats

| Pressure | Ranking |
|---|---|
| No pressures (Xxp) | |

| Threat | Ranking |
|---|---|
| No threats (Xxt) | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 8.2 Sources of information | |
| 8.3 Additional information | In fact, only LOW ranking pressures and threats act on the specific species and this is the reason why they are not included in 8.1, above. |

## 9. Conservation measures

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 9.1 Status of measures | a) Are measures needed? | No |
| | b) Indicate the status of measures | |

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

9.2 Main purpose of the measures taken

9.3 Location of the measures taken

9.4 Response to the measures

9.5 List of main conservation measures

9.6 Additional information

## 10. Future prospects

10.1 Future prospects of parameters

| | |
|---|---|
| a) Range | Good |
| b) Population | Good |
| c) Habitat of the species | Good |

10.2 Additional information

## 11. Conclusions

| | |
|---|---|
| 11.1. Range | Favourable (FV) |
| 11.2. Population | Favourable (FV) |
| 11.3. Habitat for the species | Favourable (FV) |
| 11.4. Future prospects | Favourable (FV) |
| 11.5 Overall assessment of Conservation Status | Favourable (FV) |
| 11.6 Overall trend in Conservation Status | Stable (=) |

11.7 Change and reasons for change in conservation status and conservation status trend

a) Overall assessment of conservation status

No change

The change is mainly due to:

b) Overall trend in conservation status

Use of different method

The change is mainly due to: Use of different method

11.8 Additional information

## 12. Natura 2000 (pSCIs, SCIs and SACs) coverage for Annex II species

12.1 Population size inside the pSCIs, SCIs and SACs network (on the biogeographical/marine level including all sites where the species is present)

| | |
|---|---|
| a) Unit | number of individuals (i) |
| b) Minimum | 80 |
| c) Maximum | 100 |
| d) Best single value | |

12.2 Type of estimate

Minimum

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 12.3 Population size inside the network Method used | Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate |
| 12.4 Short-term trend of population size within the network Direction | Unknown (x) |
| 12.5 Short-term trend of population size within the network Method used | Insufficient or no data available |
| 12.6 Additional information | Species for which either new Natura sites have been designated or former ones have been expanded to cover a bigger part of their populations.<br>The population size in 12.1 is reported as minimum due to the recent update of the Greek Natura 2000 Database (extended areas of current Natura 2000 sites and newly proposed SCIs). No relevant data exist for the extensions or the new Natura 2000 sites. |

## 13. Complementary information

| | |
|---|---|
| 13.1 Justification of % thresholds for trends | |
| 13.2 Trans-boundary assessment | |
| 13.3 Other relevant Information | Note on 6.4. Population size was estimated in 2014 and c. 760 individuals were counted. This value is reported as minimum population size. The species often grows at inaccessible rocks and it is certain that the population size is larger. Since the species was observed to have an uneven occurrence pattern in its distribution area, it is difficult to predict the maximum number of individuals. Taking into consideration the habitat of the species, not rare on the mountain, a prediction of c. 2.000 mature individuals can serve as a maximum population size.<br>Note on 6.16. According to new data, the population size of Clinopodium taygeteum is larger than the size reported in 2006. This difference is purely due to a better estimation of population size in the field (several localities visited, more time allocated to estimations in situ) and should not be attributed to a genuine increase in the number of individuals. The total population is presumably stable over a long time.<br>Note on surface area of the habitat: Habitat area estimation is the sum of the area actually covered by the population of the species.The presence of the species in GR2520005, GR2520006 is not reported in the literature or by any other source. Possible discrepancies with the SDF will be corrected in the next submission of revised SDF forms. |