

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	5310 - <i>Laurus nobilis</i> thickets

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	<p>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.</p> <p>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. Κοράκης Γ. & Αραβίδης Η. 2004. Καταγραφή, ταξινόμηση και αξιολόγηση των φυσικών ενδιαιτημάτων του Λακωνικού Ταυγέτου σύμφωνα με την οδηγία 92/43/ΕΟΚ. Πρακτικά 1ου Πανελληνίου Περιβαλλοντικού Συνεδρίου, Νέα Ορεστιάδα, 7-9 Μαΐου 2004: 891-900. Μαρούλης Γ. 2003. Χλωρίδα και βλάστηση των οικοσυστημάτων του όρους Ερύμανθος (ΒΔ Πελοπόννησος). Διδακτορική Διατριβή. Πανεπιστήμιο Πατρών, σελ. 450 + 1 Παράρτημα + 1 Χάρτης. Πανίτσα Μ., Ζώτος Α., Αγναντίτης Ν., Ζήκος Α., Bergmeier E. & Δημόπουλος Π. 2006. Οικοτοπική διαφοροποίηση και εδαφικές συνθήκες στην προστατευόμενη περιοχή των Τζουμέρκων. Πρακτικά του 3ου Επιστημονικού Συνεδρίου της Ελληνικής Οικολογικής Εταιρείας και της Ελληνικής Ζωολογικής Εταιρείας, Ιωάννινα, 16-19 Νοεμβρίου 2006: 254-262.</p>

4. Range

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

	c) Area where condition is not known (km ²)	Minimum 15,64	Maximum 15,64
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	<p>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).ReferencesChytrý, M., Tichý, L., Holt, J. & Botta-Dukat, 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.</p>		
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
No pressures (Xxp)	
Threat	Ranking
No threats (Xxt)	

7.2 Sources of information

7.3 Additional information

In fact, only LOW ranking pressures and threats act on the specific habitat and this is the reason why they are not included in 7.1, above.

8. Conservation measures

8.1 Status of measures	a) Are measures needed? No
	b) Indicate the status of measures

8.2 Main purpose of the measures taken

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

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 km² in biogeographical/marine region)

a) Minimum
b) Maximum
c) Best single value 0,08

11.2 Type of estimate

Minimum

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)

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

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