

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

## NATIONAL LEVEL

### 1. General information

1.1 Member State	GR
1.2 Habitat code	3240 - Alpine rivers and their ligneous vegetation with <i>Salix elaeagnos</i>

### 2. Maps

2.1 Year or period	2015
2.3 Distribution map	Yes
2.3 Distribution map Method used	Based mainly on extrapolation from a limited amount of data
2.4 Additional maps	Yes

## BIOGEOGRAPHICAL LEVEL

### 3. Biogeographical and marine regions

3.1 Biogeographical or marine region where the habitat occurs

**Mediterranean (MED)**

3.2 Sources of information

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. Βλάχος Α. 2006. Χλωρίδα Βλάστηση και Οικολογία του ορεινού συγκροτήματος των Βαρδουσίων. Διδακτορική Διατριβή. Πανεπιστήμιο Πατρών, σελ. 396.

Δημόπουλος Δ. Π. 1993. Χλωριδική και Φυτοκοινωνιολογική έρευνα του όρους Κυλλήνη - Οικολογική Προσέγγιση. Διδακτορική Διατριβή. Πανεπιστήμιο Πατρών, σελ. 370.

Θεοδωρόπουλος Κ., Ξυστράκης Φ., Ελευθεριάδου Ε. & Σαμαράς Δ. 2011. Ζώνες βλάστησης και τύποι οικοτόπων της περιοχής του φορέα διαχείρισης Εθνικού Δρυμού Ολύμπου. Επιστ. Επετ. Σχολής Δασολογίας και Φυσικού Περιβάλλοντος, ΑΠΘ, ΜΕ: σελ. 18 (σε CD).

### 4. Range



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

b) Area in not-good condition (km <sup>2</sup> )	Minimum 0	Maximum 0
c) Area where condition is not known (km <sup>2</sup> )	Minimum 0,13	Maximum 0,13

## 6.2 Condition of habitat Method used

Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate

## 6.3 Short-term trend of habitat area in good condition Period

20072018

## 6.4 Short-term trend of habitat area in good condition Direction

Stable (0)

## 6.5 Short-term trend of habitat area in good condition Method used

Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate

## 6.6 Typical species

Has the list of typical species changed in comparison to the previous reporting period? No

## 6.7 Typical 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 t, 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 for the determination of differential taxa. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 20: 233-240.

## 6.8 Additional information

Assumption: 90% of habitat area is estimated to be in good condition.

## 7. Main pressures and threats

### 7.1 Characterisation of pressures/threats

Pressure	Ranking
Natural succession resulting in species composition change (other than by direct changes of agricultural or forestry practices) (L02)	H
Threat	Ranking
Natural succession resulting in species composition change (other than by direct changes of agricultural or forestry practices) (L02)	H

### 7.2 Sources of information

PRESSURES: Based mainly on expert judgement and other data.  
THREATS: Based on expert opinion.

### 7.3 Additional information

## 8. Conservation measures

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

8.1 Status of measures a) Are measures needed? No

b) Indicate the status of measures

8.2 Main purpose of the measures taken

8.3 Location of the measures taken

8.4 Response to the measures

8.5 List of main conservation measures

()

8.6 Additional information

## 9. Future prospects

9.1 Future prospects of parameters a) Range Good

b) Area Good

c) Structure and functions Good

9.2 Additional information

## 10. Conclusions

10.1. Range Favourable (FV)

10.2. Area Favourable (FV)

10.3. Specific structure and functions (incl. typical species) Favourable (FV)

10.4. Future prospects Favourable (FV)

10.5 Overall assessment of Conservation Status Favourable (FV)

10.6 Overall trend in Conservation Status Stable (=)

10.7 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

No change

The change is mainly due to:

10.8 Additional information

## 11. Natura 2000 (pSCIs, SCIs, SACs) coverage for Annex I habitat types

11.1 Surface area of the habitat type inside the pSCIs, SCIs and SACs network (in km<sup>2</sup> in biogeographical/marine region) a) Minimum  
b) Maximum  
c) Best single value 1,34

11.2 Type of estimate Minimum

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

11.3 Surface area of the habitat type inside the network Method used

Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate

11.4 Short-term trend of habitat area in good condition within the network Direction

Stable (0)

11.5 Short-term trend of habitat area in good condition within network Method used

Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate

11.6 Additional information

The change in 11.1 (in comparison to the previous report) is due to the updated mapping datasets on terrestrial habitat types within the Natura 2000 network (pSCIs, SCIs and SACs), based on the most recent national project (results became available in 2018). As this project did not include the extended areas of the Natura 2000 sites, nor the newly proposed SCIs, the surface area reported is the minimum.

## 12. Complementary information

12.1 Justification of % thresholds for trends

12.2 Other relevant information