

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	9110 - Luzulo-Fagetum beech forests

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 Tsiropidis 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., Tsiropidis 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.</p> <p>Tsiropidis 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.</p> <p>Dimopoulos P., Tsiropidis 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., Tsiropidis 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.</p> <p>Barbero M. & Quézel P. 1976. Les groupements forestiers de Grece Centro- Meridionale. <i>Ecologia Mediterranea</i> 2: 1-86.</p> <p>Bergmeier E. 1990. Walder und Gebusche des Niederen Olymp (Kato Olimbos, NO-Thessalien). <i>Phytocoenologia</i> 18(2/3): 161-342.</p> <p>Bergmeier E. & Dimopoulos P. 1999. Classification of Greek Fagus woodlands: a preliminary survey. <i>Annali di Botanica</i>, Roma, 57: 91-104.</p> <p>Bergmeier E. & Dimopoulos P. 2001. Fagus sylvatica forest vegetation in Greece: Syntaxonomy and gradient analysis. <i>Journal of Vegetation Science</i> 12: 109-126.</p> <p>Βραχνάκης Μ., Φωτιάδης Γ. & Καζόγλου Ι. 2011. Τύποι Οικοτόπων Εθνικού Πάρκου Πρεσπών – Αναγνώριση-Καταγραφή 2011. Εταιρία Προστασίας Πρεσπών, σελ. 101.</p> <p>Δημόπουλος Π. & Bergmeier E. 1998. Χωρολογία και</p>

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

- συνχωρολογία των δασών οξυάς στην Ελλάδα. Πρακτικά 7ου Πανελληνίου Επιστημονικού Συνεδρίου της Ελληνικής Βοτανικής Εταιρίας, Αλεξανδρούπολη, 1-4 Οκτωβρίου 1998: 96-101.
- Dierschke H. 1998 (1997). Syntaxonomical survey of European beech forests: some general conclusions. *Ann. Bot. (Roma)* 55: 17–26.
- Dimopoulos P. & Bergmeier E. 1997. The Beech forests of Greece: Diversity, Syntaxonomy and relationships with the Palaeartic Habitat Classification. 6th International Workshop, "European Vegetation Survey", Rome, Italy, 13 -16 March 1997.
- 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.
- Gamisans J. & Hebrard J.-P. 1980. A propos de la vegetation des forets en Grece du Nord-est (Macedoine orientale et Thrace occidentale). *Documents phytosociologiques* 5: 243-276.
- Κοράκης Γ.Χ. 2003. Οι μονάδες βλάστησης του όρους Πάικου και η αξιολόγησή τους από αναδασωτική σκοπιά. Διδακτορική Διατριβή. ΑΠΘ, σελ. 264 + Παράρτημα.
- Κωνσταντινίδης Π. & Τσιουρλής Γ. 2001. Οι βλαστητικές μονάδες (τύποι οικοτόπων) της Επαρχίας Λαγκαδά (Λεκάνη Μυγδονίας): Μέρος Ι: Περιγραφή, ανάλυση και χαρτογράφηση. *Επιστ. Επετ. Τμημ. Δασολογίας & Φυσικού Περιβάλλοντος ΜΔ*: 627-654.
- Κωνσταντινίδης Π. & Τσιουρλής Γ. 2001. Οι τύποι οικοτόπων της Επαρχίας Λαγκαδά (Λεκάνης Μυγδονίας): Μέρος ΙΙ. Οικολογική κατάσταση και δυναμική. *Επιστ. Επετ. Τμημ. Δασολογίας & Φυσικού Περιβάλλοντος ΜΔ*: 655-680.
- Πουλής Γ. 2011. Οι φυτοκοινωνίες των δασών οξιάς του όρους Οξυά (Κ. Ελλάδα). Μεταπτυχιακή Διπλωματική Εργασία. Θεσσαλονίκη, 50 σελ.
- Raus Th. 1980. Die vegetation Osthessaliens (Griechenland), III. Quercu-Fagetea und azonale Gehölzgesellschaften. *Bot. Jahrb. Syst.* 101(3): 313-361.
- Reif A. & Löblich-Ille K. 1999. Sind die Rotbuchenwälder im Pieria-Gebirge (Nordgriechenland) hohenzonal oder extrazonal? Eine Studie zum Übergang zwischen temperaten und submediterranen Wäldern in Nordgriechenland. *Phytocoenologia* 29(1): 87-146.
- Schreiber H.J. 1998. Waldgrenznahe Buchenwälder und Grasländer des Falakron und Pangäon in Nordostgriechenland. *Syntaxonomie, Struktur und Dynamik. Arb. Inst. Landschaftsökol. Westf. Wilhelms-Univ. Münster* 4: 1-171.
- Τσιριπίδης Ι. 2001. Οι φυτοκοινωνίες δασών οξιάς της Ροδόπης και εκτίμηση περιβαλλόντων τους για αναδάσωση. Διδακτορική Διατριβή. ΑΠΘ, σελ. 359 + Παραρτήματα.
- Tsiripidis I., Fotiadis G., Karagiannakidou V. & Babalonas D. 2005. Classification problems of forest vegetation in Greece: Transition from beech to deciduous oak zone. *Bot. Chron.* 18(1): 253-268.
- Tsiripidis I., Bergmeier E. & Dimopoulos P. 2007. Geographical and ecological differentiation in Greek *Fagus* forest vegetation. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 18: 743-750.
- Tsiripidis I., Karagiannakidou V. & Athanasiadis N. 2005. Ecological and phytogeographical differentiation of beech forests in Greek Rodopi (Northeast Greece). *Biologia* 60: 57-67.
- Tsiripidis I., Karagiannakidou V., Alifragis D. & Athanasiadis N. 2007. Classification and gradient analysis of the beech forest vegetation of the southern Rodopi (Northeast Greece). *Folia Geobotanica*, 42: 249–270.
- Φωτιάδης Γ. 2004. Καθορισμός των δασικών φυτοκοινωνιολογικών μονάδων του Ελληνικού τμήματος του όρους Μπέλες και της οροσειράς των Κρουσίων.

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

Διδακτορική Διατριβή, ΑΠΘ, σελ. 273 + Παράρτημα. Φωτιάδης Γ., Παναγιωτίδης Σ. & Γερασιμίδης Α. 2005. Φυτοκοινωνιολογικές μονάδες των δασών οξιάς του τόξου Βέρνο-Άσκιο (ΒΔ Ελλάδα). Πρακτικά 10ου Πανελληνίου Επιστημονικού Συνεδρίου της Ελληνικής Βοτανικής Εταιρείας, Ιωάννινα, 5-8 Μαΐου 2005, σελ. 9 (σε CD).

Χοχλίουρος Π.Σ. 2005. Χλωριδική και Φυτοκοινωνιολογική Έρευνα του Όρους Βερμίου - Οικολογική προσέγγιση. Διδακτορική Διατριβή. Πανεπιστήμιο Πατρών. 352 σελ. + 3 Παραρτήματα.

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

4. Range

4.1 Surface area	1971
4.2 Short-term trend Period	2007-2018
4.3 Short-term trend Direction	Stable (0)
4.4 Short-term trend Magnitude	a) Minimum b) Maximum
4.5 Short-term trend Method used	Based mainly on extrapolation from a limited amount of data
4.6 Long-term trend Period	
4.7 Long-term trend Direction	
4.8 Long-term trend Magnitude	a) Minimum b) Maximum
4.9 Long-term trend Method used	Based mainly on extrapolation from a limited amount of data
4.10 Favourable reference range	a) Area (km ²) b) Operator Approximately equal to (≈) c) Unknown Yes d) Method
4.11 Change and reason for change in surface area of range	No change The change is mainly due to:
4.12 Additional information	

5. Area covered by habitat

5.1 Year or period	2015-015-
5.2 Surface area (in km ²)	a) Minimum b) Maximum c) Best single value 1342,3
5.3 Type of estimate	Best estimate
5.4 Surface area Method used	Based mainly on extrapolation from a limited amount of data
5.5 Short-term trend Period	2007-2018
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 ²)

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

	b) Operator	Approximately equal to (\approx)
	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

6. Structure and functions

6.1 Condition of habitat	a) Area in good condition (km ²)	Minimum 1208,07	Maximum 1208,07
	b) Area in not-good condition (km ²)	Minimum 0	Maximum 0
	c) Area where condition is not known (km ²)	Minimum 134,23	Maximum 134,23

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-Dukát, 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
Other forestry activities, excluding those relating to agro-forestry (B29)	M

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

Threat	Ranking
Other forestry activities, excluding those relating to agro-forestry (B29)	M

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? 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

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

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 ² in biogeographical/marine region)	a) Minimum b) Maximum c) Best single value	597,96
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