

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

CODE: 9150

NAME: Medio-European limestone beech forests of the Cephalanthero-Fagion

1. National Level

1.1 Maps

1.1.1 Distribution Map	Yes
1.1.2 Distribution Method	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)
1.1.3 Year or period	2006-2012
1.1.4 Additional map	No
1.1.5 Range Map	Yes

2. Biogeographical Or Marine Level

2.1 Biogeographical Region

2.2 Published

Mediterranean (MED)

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 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 Palearctic Habitat Classification. 6th International Workshop, "European Vegetation Survey", Rome, Italy, 13 -16

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

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 οξιιάς. 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. Landschaftsökol. Westf. Wilhelms-Univ. Münster, 4: 1-171.

Σταμέλλου Σ. 2011. Φυτοκοινωνίες και μοριακή ποικιλότητα της οξιιάς (*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.

2.3 Range of the habitat type in the biogeographical region or marine region

2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km ²)	990
2.3.2 Range method used	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)
2.3.3 Short-term trend period	2001-2012
2.3.4 Short-term trend direction	stable (0)
2.3.5 Short-term trend magnitude	min max
2.3.6 Long-term trend period	
2.3.7 Long-term trend direction	N/A
2.3.8 Long-term trend magnitude	min max
2.3.9 Favourable reference range	area (km ²) operator approximately equal to (≈) unknown No method
2.3.10 Reason for change	Improved knowledge/more accurate data Use of different method

2.4 Area covered by Habitat

2.4.1 Surface area (km ²)	296,4
2.4.2 Year or period	2000-2012
2.4.3 Method used	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)
2.4.4 Short-term trend period	2001-2012
2.4.5 Short-term trend direction	stable (0)
2.4.6 Short-term trend magnitude	min max

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

2.4.7 Short term trend method used Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)

2.4.8 Long-term trend period

2.4.9 Long-term trend direction

N/A

2.4.10 Long-term trend magnitude

min max

2.4.11 Long term trend method used

N/A

2.4.12 Favourable reference area

area (km)
operator approximately equal to (≈)
unknown No
method

2.4.13 Reason for change

Improved knowledge/more accurate data Use of different method

2.5 Main Pressures

Pressure	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
Forest and Plantation management & use (B02)	low importance (L)	N/A
forest exploitation without replanting or natural regrowth (B03)	low importance (L)	N/A
Discharges (E03)	low importance (L)	N/A

2.5.1 Method used – pressures

mainly based on expert judgement and other data (2)

2.6 Main Threats

Threat	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
Forest and Plantation management & use (B02)	low importance (L)	N/A
forest exploitation without replanting or natural regrowth (B03)	low importance (L)	N/A
Discharges (E03)	low importance (L)	N/A

2.6.1 Method used – threats

expert opinion (1)

2.7 Complementary Information

2.7.1 Species

Lathyrus alpestris

Lilium martagon

Melica uniflora

Mercurialis ovata

Mercurialis perennis

Monotropa hypopitys

Neottia nidus-avis

Ostrya carpinifolia

Physospermum cornubiense

Rubus hirtus

Viburnum lantana

Abies borisii-regis

Acer pseudoplatanus

Aremonia agrimonoides

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

Brachypodium pinnatum

Buxus sempervirens

Calamagrostis arundinacea

Campanula rapunculoides

Carex digitata

Carex flacca

Cephalanthera damasonium

Cephalanthera rubra

Epipactis greuteri

Epipactis helleborine

Epipactis microphylla

Euonymus latifolius

Euphorbia amygdaloides

Fagus sylvatica

Fragaria vesca

Fraxinus ornus

Galium rotundifolium

2.7.2 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-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.

2.7.3 Justification of % - thresholds for trends

2.7.4 Structure and functions - methods used

Complete survey/Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate (3)

2.7.5 Other relevant information

2.8 Conclusions (assessment of conservation status at end of reporting period)

2.8.1 Range

assessment Favourable (FV)
qualifiers N/A

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

2.8.2 Area	assessment Favourable (FV) qualifiers N/A
2.8.3 Specific structures and functions (incl Species)	assessment Favourable (FV) qualifiers N/A
2.8.4 Future prospects	assessment Favourable (FV) qualifiers N/A
2.8.5 Overall assessment of Conservation Status	Favourable (FV)
2.8.5 Overall trend in Conservation Status	N/A

3. Natura 2000 coverage conservation measures - Annex I habitat types on biogeographical level

3.1 Area covered by habitat

3.1.1 Surface area (km ²)	min	84,8	max	84,8
3.1.2 Method used	Complete survey/Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate (3)			
3.1.3. Trend of surface area	stable (0)			

3.2 Conversation Measures

3.2.1 Measure	3.2.2 Type	3.2.3 Ranking	3.2.4 Location	3.2.5 Broad Evaluation
Establish protected areas/sites (6.1)	Legal Administrative One-off	medium importance (M)	Inside	Maintain Long term