

# 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	7140 - Transition mires and quaking bogs

### 2. Maps

2.1 Year or period	2015
2.3 Distribution map	Yes
2.3 Distribution map Method used	Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate
2.4 Additional maps	Yes

## BIOGEOGRAPHICAL LEVEL

### 3. Biogeographical and marine regions

3.1 Biogeographical or marine region where the habitat occurs	<b>Mediterranean (MED)</b>
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).</p> <p>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. Αθανασιάδης Ν. 1977. Sphagnum contortum Schultz, Sph. subsecundum Nees, Sph. palustre L. και Sph. squarrosum Pers. (Cr.) τέσσερα νέα είδη της Ελληνικής χλωρίδας. Επιστ. Επετ. Γεωπονικής και Δασολογικής Σχολής, ΑΠΘ, τόμος 20: 263-282.</p> <p>Αθανασιάδης Ν., Γερασιμίδης Α. 1978. Drosera rotundifolia L., Drosera intermedia Hayne, δύο νέα είδη της Ελληνικής χλωρίδας. Επιστ. Επετ. Γεωπονικής και Δασολογικής Σχολής, ΑΠΘ, τόμος 21: 65-82.</p> <p>Αθανασιάδης Ν., Γερασιμίδης Α. 1986. Μεταπαγετώδης εξέλιξη της βλάστησης στο Βόρα Αλμωπίας. Επιστ. Επετ. Τμήματος Δασολογίας και Φυσικού Περιβάλλοντος, ΑΠΘ, τόμος ΚΘ/4: 211-249. Αθανασιάδης Ν., Γερασιμίδης Α., Ελευθεριάδου Ε., Θεοδωρόπουλος Κ. 1991: Μεταπαγετώδης εξέλιξη της βλάστησης στη Ροδόπη (Ελατιά Δράμας). Επιστ. Επετ. Τμήματος Δασολογίας και Φυσικού Περιβάλλοντος, ΑΠΘ, τόμος ΛΔ/1: 209-245.</p>



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

5.6 Short-term trend Direction	Stable (0)		
5.7 Short-term trend Magnitude	a) Minimum	b) Maximum	c) Confidence interval
5.8 Short-term trend Method used	Based mainly on extrapolation from a limited amount of data		
5.9 Long-term trend Period			
5.10 Long-term trend Direction			
5.11 Long-term trend Magnitude	a) Minimum	b) Maximum	c) Confidence interval
5.12 Long-term trend Method used			
5.13 Favourable reference area	a) Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	Approximately equal to (≈)	
	b) Operator	Yes	
	c) Unknown	Yes	
	d) Method		
5.14 Change and reason for change in surface area of range	No change The change is mainly due to:		
5.15 Additional information	The surface area of the habitat (5.2) is equal to the area of the habitat within the Natura 2000 network (pSCIs, SCIs and SACs) (11.1), as reported for the previous reporting period (2007-2013).		

## 6. Structure and functions

6.1 Condition of habitat	a) Area in good condition (km <sup>2</sup> )	Minimum 0,009	Maximum 0,009
	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 0,001	Maximum 0,001
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	Analysis of phytosociological relevés.		
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
Roads, paths, railroads and related infrastructure (e.g. bridges, viaducts, tunnels) (E01)	H
Abstraction from groundwater, surface water or mixed water (K01)	H
Intensive grazing or overgrazing by livestock (A09)	M

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

Abandonment of grassland management (e.g. cessation of grazing or mowing) (A06) M

Threat Ranking

Roads, paths, railroads and related infrastructure (e.g. bridges, viaducts, tunnels) (E01) H

Abstraction from groundwater, surface water or mixed water (K01) 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

### 8.1 Status of measures

a) Are measures needed? Yes  
b) Indicate the status of measures Measures needed but cannot be identified

### 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  
Improved knowledge/more accurate data  
Use of different method

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

The change is mainly due to: Improved knowledge/more accurate data

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 0,01

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)

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

The change to the conservation status [from U1(=) to FV] is based on more field data (collected assessment protocols) available.