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	**9150 - Medio-European limestone beech forests of the Cephalanthero-Fagion**

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. Bergmeier E. & Dimopoulos P. 2001. Fagus sylvatica forest vegetation in Greece: Syntaxonomy and gradient analysis. Journal of Vegetation Science 12: 109-126. Bergmeier E. & Dimopoulos P. 1999. Classification of Greek Fagus woodlands: a preliminary survey. Annali di Botanica, Roma, 57: 91-104. Βραχνάκης Μ., Φωτιάδης Γ. & Καζόγλου Ι. 2011. Τύποι Οικοτόπων Εθνικού Πάρκου Πρεσπών – Αναγνώριση-Καταγραφή 2011. Εταιρία Προστασίας Πρεσπών, σελ. 101. Δημόπουλος Π. & Bergmeier E. 1998. Χωρολογία και συνχωρολογία των δασών οξυάς στην Ελλάδα. Πρακτικά 7ου Πανελλήνιου 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 Palaearctic Habitat Classification. 6th International Workshop, "European Vegetation Survey", Rome, Italy, 13 -16 March 1997.
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.
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 2002, ΜΕ, σελ. 18 (σε CD). Ντάφης Σ. 1969. Σταθμολογικαι έρευναι εις δάση οξιάς. Επιστ. Επετ. Γεωπονικής και Δασολογικής Σχολής Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης, 13: 1-49.
Schreiber H.J. 1998. Waldgrenznahe Buchenwälder und Grasländer des Falakron und Pangäon in Nordostgriechenland. Syntaxonomie, Struktur und Dynamik. Arb. Inst. Landscaftsökol. Westf. Wilhelms-Univ. Münster, 4: 1-171.
Σταμέλλου Σ. 2011. Φυτοκοινωνίες και μοριακή ποικιλότητα της οξιάς (Fagus sylvatica) στο όρος Μενοίκιο. Μεταπτυχιακή Διατριβή. ΑΠΘ, σελ. 47. 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., 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., 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.
Tsiripidis I., Karagiannakidou V. & Athanasiadis N. 2005. Ecological and phytogeographical differentiation of beech forests in Greek Rodopi (Northeast Greece). Biologia 60: 57-67.

4. Range

4.1 Surface area	990	
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 (km²)	
	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 km²)	a) Minimum	b) Maximum	c) Best single value	296,4
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 (km²)			
	b) Operator	Approximately equal to (≈)		
	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 (km²)	Minimum	0	Maximum	0
	b) Area in not-good condition (km²)	Minimum	59,28	Maximum	59,28
	c) Area where condition is not known (km²)	Minimum	237,12	Maximum	237,12
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	Increasing (+)				
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: 20% of habitat area is estimated to be in not-good condition.

7. Main pressures and threats

7.1 Characterisation of pressures/threats

Pressure	Ranking
Intensive grazing or overgrazing by livestock (A09)	M
Other forestry activities, excluding those relating to agro-forestry (B29)	M

Threat	Ranking
Intensive grazing or overgrazing by livestock (A09)	M
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?	Yes
	b) Indicate the status of measures	Measures identified, but none yet taken
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		

Adapt mowing, grazing and other equivalent agricultural activities (CA05)

8.6 Additional information

9. Future prospects

9.1 Future prospects of parameters	a) Range	Good
	b) Area	Good
	c) Structure and functions	Poor
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)	Unfavourable - Inadequate (U1)
10.4. Future prospects	Unfavourable - Inadequate (U1)
10.5 Overall assessment of Conservation Status	Unfavourable - Inadequate (U1)
10.6 Overall trend in Conservation Status	Improving (+)
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 The change is mainly due to: Improved knowledge/more accurate data b) Overall trend in conservation status Improved knowledge/more accurate data Use of different method The change is mainly due to: Improved knowledge/more accurate data
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 127,08
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)
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	