

Report on the main results of the surveillance under article 17 for annex I habitat types (Annex D)

CODE: 91CA

NAME: Rhodopide and Balkan Range Scots pine forests

1. National Level

1.1 Maps

1.1.1 Distribution Map	Yes
1.1.2 Distribution Method	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)
1.1.3 Year or period	2006-2012
1.1.4 Additional map	No
1.1.5 Range Map	Yes

2. Biogeographical Or Marine Level

2.1 Biogeographical Region

2.2 Published

Mediterranean (MED)

Dimopoulos P., Xystrakis F. and Tsiripidis I. 2014. Deliverable A1. Final Catalogue of Habitat Types – 1st edition. Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change, OIKOM Ltd - E. Alexandropoulou - A. Glavas, Athens, pages 54.

Dimopoulos P., Fotiadis G., Tsiripidis I., Panitsa M. and Karadimou E. 2014. Deliverable A2. Report and Literature Database on Habitat Types of Greece – 1st edition. Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change, OIKOM Ltd - E. Alexandropoulou - A. Glavas, Athens, pages 210.

Tsiripidis I., Xystrakis F., Kasampalis D., Mastrogianni A., Strid A. and Dimopoulos P., 2014. Deliverable A4. Potential Distribution Maps of Habitat Types – 1st edition. Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change, OIKOM Ltd - E. Alexandropoulou - A. Glavas, Athens, Athens, pages 176.

Dimopoulos P., Tsiripidis I., Xystrakis F., Panitsa M., Fotiadis G., Kallimanis A.S. and Kazoglou I. 2014. Deliverable A6. Explanatory Implementation Manual for the Conservation Degree Assessment of Habitat Types – 1st edition. Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change, OIKOM Ltd - E. Alexandropoulou - A. Glavas, Athens, pages 35. (with Annexes: I. Habitat types protocols, pages 600; II. Explanatory notes on the habitat types protocols selection, pages 4; III. Correspondence of Habitat types protocols with the clusters of vegetation relevés (excel file).

Dimopoulos P., Tsiripidis I., Xystrakis F., Kallimanis A.S and Panitsa M. 2014. Deliverable A7. Preliminary Analysis of the Field Data for the Habitat Types – 1st edition. Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change, OIKOM Ltd - E. Alexandropoulou - A. Glavas, Athens, pages 16.

Γερασιμίδης Α. 1985. Σταθμολογικές Συνθήκες και Μεταπαγετώδης Εξέλιξη της Βλάστησης στα Δάση Λαϊλιά Σερρών και Καταφυγίου Πιερίων. Διδακτορική διατριβή. Επιστ. Επετ. Τμ. Δασολογίας και Φυσικού Περιβάλλοντος 26 (7), σελ. 133.

Ελευθεριάδου Ε., Τσιριπίδης Ι., Θεοδωρόπουλος Κ. & Ξυστράκης Φ. 2007. Τύποι οικοτόπων της περιοχής "Ροδόπη (Σημάδα)" του Δικτύου "Φύση 2000". Πρακτικά 13ου Πανελληνίου Δασολογικού Συνεδρίου της Ελληνικής Δασολογικής Εταιρείας, Χλόη Καστοριάς, 7-10 Οκτωβρίου 2007 (τόμος Ι): 91-99.

Eleftheriadou E., Tsiripidis I., Theodoropoulos K. & Karagiannakidou V. 2006. Plant communities of Pinus sylvestris forests in West Rhodopes, NE Macedonia, Greece. In: Ivanova, D. (ed.), Plant, fungal, and habitat diversity investigation and conservation. Proceedings of IV Balkan Botanical Congress, Sofia, 20-26 June 2006. Institute of Botany, Sofia, pg. 296-302.

Zoller H., Geissler P. & Athanasiadis N. 1977. Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Wälder, Moos- und Flechtenassoziationen in den Gebirgen Nordgriechenlands. Bauhinia 6/1: 215-255.

Report on the main results of the surveillance under article 17 for annex I habitat types (Annex D)

2.3 Range of the habitat type in the biogeographical region or marine region

2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km ²)	722
2.3.2 Range method used	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
2.3.10 Reason for change	Improved knowledge/more accurate data Use of different method

2.4 Area covered by Habitat

2.4.1 Surface area (km ²)	182,8
2.4.2 Year or period	2000-2012
2.4.3 Method used	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)
2.4.4 Short-term trend period	2001-2012
2.4.5 Short-term trend direction	stable (0)
2.4.6 Short-term trend magnitude	min max
2.4.7 Short term trend method used	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)
2.4.8 Long-term trend period	
2.4.9 Long-term trend direction	N/A
2.4.10 Long-term trend magnitude	min max
2.4.11 Long term trend method used	N/A
2.4.12 Favourable reference area	area (km) operator approximately equal to (≈) unknown No method
2.4.13 Reason for change	Improved knowledge/more accurate data Use of different method

2.5 Main Pressures

Pressure	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
Forest and Plantation management & use (B02)	low importance (L)	N/A
forest exploitation without replanting or natural regrowth (B03)	low importance (L)	N/A
fire (natural) (L09)	low importance (L)	N/A

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

2.6 Main Threats

Threat	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
Forest and Plantation management & use (B02)	low importance (L)	N/A
forest exploitation without replanting or natural regrowth (B03)	low importance (L)	N/A
fire (natural) (L09)	low importance (L)	N/A

Report on the main results of the surveillance under article 17 for annex I habitat types (Annex D)

Changes in biotic conditions (M02)

low importance (L)

N/A

2.6.1 Method used – threats expert opinion (1)

2.7 Complementary Information

2.7.1 Species

Calamagrostis arundinacea

Corylus avellana

Avenella flexuosa (syn: *Deschampsia flexuosa*)

Digitalis viridiflora

Epilobium angustifolium

Fagus sylvatica

Galium mollugo agg.

Genista carinalis

Hieracium transiens subsp. *erythrocarpum* (syn: *Hieracium erythrocarpum*)

Hieracium olympicum

Hieracium sparsum

Juniperus communis

Luzula luzuloides

Orthilia secunda

Picea abies

Pinus sylvestris

Pyrola chlorantha

Quercus petraea

Rubus idaeus

Trifolium alpestre

Veronica officinalis

2.7.2 Species method used

Typical species were determined on the basis of a vegetation database, comprised of about 22000 sampling plots. First, a list of possible typical species was determined per habitat type, selecting the ones presenting a high fidelity value to the habitat types according the algorithm of Tsiripidis et al. (2009) and the phi coefficient value (Chytrý et al. 2002). Then typical species per habitat type were selected from the above-mentioned lists by expert judgment and using as criteria species niche breadth, their ability to comprise indicators of habitat types' conservation status and their function as keystone species. The nomenclature of the typical species follows Dimopoulos et al. (2013).

References

Chytrý, M., Tichý, L., Holt, J. & Botta-Duká, J. 2002. Determination of diagnostic species with statistical fidelity measures. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 13: 79–90.

Dimopoulos, P., Raus, Th., Bergmeier, E., Constantinidis, Th., Iatrou, G., Kokkini, S., Strid, A. & Tzanoudakis, D. 2013: *Vascular plants of Greece: an annotated checklist*. – Berlin: Botanischer Garten und Botanisches Museum Berlin-Dahlem, Freie Universität Berlin; Athens: Hellenic Botanical Society. *Englera* 31: 1-367.

Tsiripidis, I., Bergmeier, E., Fotiadis, G. & Dimopoulos, P. 2009. A new algorithm

Report on the main results of the surveillance under article 17 for annex I habitat types (Annex D)

for the determination of differential taxa. Journal of Vegetation Science 20: 233-240.

2.7.3 Justification of % - thresholds for trends

2.7.4 Structure and functions - methods used

2.7.5 Other relevant information

Complete survey/Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate (3)

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

2.8.1 Range

assessment Favourable (FV)
qualifiers N/A

2.8.2 Area

assessment Favourable (FV)
qualifiers N/A

2.8.3 Specific structures and functions (incl Species)

assessment Favourable (FV)
qualifiers N/A

2.8.4 Future prospects

assessment Favourable (FV)
qualifiers N/A

2.8.5 Overall assessment of Conservation Status

Favourable (FV)

2.8.5 Overall trend in Conservation Status

N/A

3. Natura 2000 coverage conservation measures - Annex I habitat types on biogeographical level

3.1 Area covered by habitat

3.1.1 Surface area (km²)

min 104,1 max 104,1

3.1.2 Method used

Complete survey/Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate (3)

3.1.3. Trend of surface area

stable (0)

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

medium
importance (M)

Inside

Maintain
Long term