CODE: 9370

NAME: Palm groves of Phoenix

#### 1. National Level

#### **1.1 Maps**

1.1.1 Distribution Map

1.1.2 Distribution Method

1.1.3 Year or period

1.1.4 Additional map

1.1.5 Range Map

Yes

Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)

2006-2012

No

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.

Barrow S.C. 1998. A Monograph of Phoenix L. (Palmae: Coryphoideae). Kew bulletin 53: 513-575.

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

2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km²) 36

2.3.2 Range method used Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)

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

2.3.3 Short-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 (km²)

operator approximately equal to  $(\approx)$ 

unkown 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 (km²) 1,28

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

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 more than (>)

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)
Sport and leisure structures (G02)	low importance (L)	N/A
fire and fire suppression (J01)	low importance (L)	N/A
human induced changes in hydraulic conditions (J02)	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)
Sport and leisure structures (G02)	low importance (L)	N/A
Interspecific faunal relations (K03)	medium importance (M)	N/A
fire and fire suppression (J01)	low importance (L)	N/A
human induced changes in hydraulic conditions (J02)	low importance (L)	N/A

2.6.1 Method used – threats	expert opinion (1)
2.7 Complementary Information	
2.7.1 Species	
Arisarum vulgare	
Aristolochia cretica	
Arum concinnatum	
Asparagus aphyllus	
Ballota pseudodictamnus	
Carex hispida	
Ceratonia siliqua	
Dracunculus vulgaris	
Equisetum hyemale	
Juncus acutus	
Juncus conglomeratus	
Juncus heldreichianus	
Narcissus tazetta	
Nerium oleander	
Ononis spinosa	
Phlomis lanata	
Phoenix theophrasti	
Piptatherum miliaceum	
Pistacia lentiscus	
Prasium majus	
Schoenus nigricans	
Scirpoides holoschoenus	
Smilax aspera	
Tamus communis	

#### 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-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., latrou, 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

2.7.5 Other relevant information

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

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

2.8.1 Range assessment Favourable (FV)

qualifiers N/A

assessment Inadequate (U1)

qualifiers stable (=)

assessment Favourable (FV)

qualifiers N/A

assessment Inadequate (U1)

qualifiers stable (=)

Inadequate (U1)

2.8.5 Overall assessment of Conservation Status

2.8.3 Specific structures

2.8.4 Future prospects

and functions (incl Species)

2.8.5 Overall trend in Conservation Status

2.8.2 Area

stable (=)

### 3. Natura 2000 coverage \_conservation measures - Annex I habitat types on biogeographical level

#### 3.1 Area covered by habitat

3.1.1 Surface area (km²) min 0,7 max 0,7

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
Legal protection of habitat and species (6.3)	s Legal	high importance (H)	Both	Enhance Long term
Restoring/improving fores habitats (3.1)	t Recurrent	medium importance (M)	Both	Enhance Long term