ΜΟΥΣΕΙΟ ΓΟΥΛΑΝΔΡΗ ΦΥΣΙΚΗΣ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑΣ
ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟ ΚΕΝΤΡΟ ΒΙΟΤΟΠΩΝ - ΥΓΡΟΤΟΠΩΝ

Έργο:

ΠΑΡΟΧΗ ΥΠΗΡΕΣΙΩΝ

ΓΙΑ ΤΗΝ ΠΑΡΑΚΟΛΟΥΘΗΣΗ 11 ΕΙΔΩΝ ΠΑΝΙΔΑΣ ΣΥΜΦΩΝΑ ΜΕ ΤΗΝ ΟΔΗΓΙΑ 92/43/ΕΟΚ ΓΙΑ ΤΗΝ ΕΤΟΙΜΑΣΙΑ ΤΗΣ 6ΕΤΟΥΣ ΕΚΘΕΣΗΣ

ΜΕΡΟΣ Α: ΑΜΦΙΒΙΑ

α/α	**Είδος**	**Παρ/μα Οδηγίας 92/43/ΕΟΚ**
1	Δενδροβάτραχος *Hyla savignyi* (*Hyla arborea*)	IV
2	Πράσινος Φρύνος (*Pseudepidalea viridis*) *Bufo viridis*	IV
3	Λιμνοβάτραχος *Pelophylax bedriagae* (*Rana bedriagae*) *(ridibunda)*	V

Παραδοτέο 3:

Έκθεση αξιολόγησης της κατάστασης διατήρησης των ειδών *Hyla savignyi (Hyla arborea), Bufo viridis (Pseudepidalea viridis) και Pelophylax bedriagae (Rana bedriagae, R. ridibunda*), κατά την περίοδο 2007-2012

Αναθέτουσα Αρχή: **Τμήμα Περιβάλλοντος**

Αρ. Διαγωνισμού: **ΤΠ 7/2011**

Προϋπολογισμός: **€ 23.600,00**

Διάρκεια: **2 Ιανουαρίου 2012 – 2 Απριλίου 2013**

ΤΜΗΜΑ ΠΕΡΙΒΑΛΛΟΝΤΟΣ

ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗ
ΑΠΡΙΛΙΟΣ 2013

Το παρόν εκπονήθηκε από το ΕΚΒΥ στο πλαίσιο του έργου «*Παροχή Υπηρεσιών για την παρακολούθηση 11 ειδών πανίδας σύμφωνα με την Οδηγία 92/43/ΕΟΚ για την ετοιμασία της εξαετούς έκθεσης. ΜΕΡΟΣ Α: ΑΜΦΙΒΙΑ*». Το έργο χρηματοδοτήθηκε από εθνικούς πόρους. Αναθέτουσα Αρχή ήταν το Τμήμα Περιβάλλοντος του Υπουργείου Γεωργίας, Φυσικών Πόρων και Περιβάλλοντος της Κύπρου.

The present study has been prepared by the Greek Biotope-Wetland Centre (EKBY) in the framework of the project "Rendering of services for the monitoring of 11 fauna species under the Directive 92/43/EEC for the elaboration of the National Report. Part A: Amphibians" which has been funded by national funds. Contracting Authority was the Environment Department of the Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment of the Republic of Cyprus.

Η πλήρης αναφορά στο παρόν είναι:

Ιωαννίδης Ι., Μαρία Δημάκη, Λένα Χατζηιορδάνου και Έλενα Χατζηχαραλάμπους, (συντονισμός έκδοσης). 2013. Τ.Π. 7/2011. Έκθεση αξιολόγησης της κατάστασης διατήρησης των ειδών αμφιβίων κοινοτικού ενδιαφέροντος *Hyla savignyi (Hyla arborea), Bufo viridis (Pseudepidalea viridis) και Pelophylax bedriagae (Rana bedriagae) (ridibunda)* κατά την περίοδο 2007-1012. Ελληνικό Κέντρο Βιοτόπων-Υγροτόπων – Τμήμα Περιβάλλοντος. Θέρμη.

This document may be cited as follows:

Ioannidis I., Maria Dimaki, Lena Hatziiordanou and Helena Hadjicharalambous, (editors). 2013. DOE 7/2011. Evaluation of the conservation status of the amphibian species of Community interest *Hyla savignyi (Hyla arborea), Bufo viridis (Pseudepidalea viridis) και Pelophylax bedriagae (Rana bedriagae) (ridibunda)*. Reporting period: 2007-2012. Greek Biotope-Wetland Centre –Department of Environment. Thermi..

Annex B - Reporting format on the 'main results of the surveillance under Article 11' for Annex II, IV & V species

Field name	*Brief explanations*	
0.1 Member State	CY	
0.2 Species	**0.2.1 Species code**	1201
	0.2.2 Species scientific name	Bufo viridis
	0.2.3 Alternative species scientific name Optional	Pseudepidalea viridis
	0.2.4 Common name Optional	Prasinos Frynos

1 National Level		
1.1 Maps	Distribution and range within the MS concerned	
1.1.1 Distribution map	Attached shapefiles (grid 10x10)	Indicate if species is considered to be 'sensitive'[1]
1.1.2 Method used - map	2 = Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling	
1.1.3 Year or period	2007-2012	
1.1.4 Additional distribution map Optional	Attached shapefiles (grid 1x1)	
1.1.5 Range map	Attached shapefiles (grid 10x10)	

2 Biogeographical level Complete for each biogeographical region or marine region concerned	
2.1 Biogeographical region & marine regions	Mediterranean (MED)

[1] See the definition of a sensitive species in section 1.1.1 of the Guidelines

2.2 Published sources	Γκατζογιάννης, Σ., Παλάσκας, Δ., Τσιάρας, Δ., Κωνσταντινίδης, Π., Τσιουρλής, Γ., Κασιούμης, Κ., Θεοφάνους, Σ., Σφουγγάρης, Α., Γεωργιακάκης, Π., Ποϊραζίδης, Κ,, Ζόγκαρης, Σ., Λουμπουρδής, Ν. και Καλαπανίδα, Μ. 2010. Διαχειριστικό Σχέδιο Δάσους Πάφου – Μέρος Α΄. Αυτοτελής έκδοση του Έργου "Ετοιμασία Ολοκληρωμένου Διαχειριστικού Σχεδίου για το Δάσος Πάφου". Φεβρουάριος 2010. Τμήμα Δασών, Λευκωσία. Σελ. 188. Παπαδήμος, Δ., Χατζηχαραλάμπους, Ε. & Δημάκη, Μ. 2010. Έκθεση περιβαλλοντικών επιπτώσεων από ενδεχόμενη κατεδάφιση ιδιωτικού φράγματος στο Χα-Ποτάμι. Ελληνικό Κέντρο Βιοτόπων-Υγροτόπων. Θέρμη. 46 σελ. + Παράρτημα. Χατζηχαραλάμπους, Ε. (συντονίστρια έκδοσης). 2011. Σχέδιο Διαχείρισης της περιοχής CY3000008 «Λίμνη Παραλιμνίου». Ελληνικό Κέντρο Βιοτόπων- Υγροτόπων – Τμήμα Περιβάλλοντος. Θέρμη. 170 σελ. + Παράρτημα + 14 Χάρτες. Χατζηχαραλάμπους, Ε. (συντονίστρια έκδοσης). 2009. Σχέδιο διαχείρισης της περιοχής CY4000002 "Χα-Ποτάμι". Ελληνικό Κέντρο Βιοτόπων- Υγροτόπων – Υπηρεσία Περιβάλλοντος. Θέρμη. 170 σελ. + Παράρτημα + 14 Χάρτες. Χατζηχαραλάμπους, Ε., Τσιαούση, Β. & Ιωανίδης, Γ. 2007 (συντονιστές έκδοσης). 2007. Σχέδιο Διαχείρισης της περιοχής «CY6000003 Λύμπια Αγία Άννα». Ελληνικό Κέντρο Βιοτόπων- Υγροτόπων – Υπηρεσία Περιβάλλοντος. Θέρμη. 134 σελ. + ii Παραρτήματα + 14 Χάρτες Baier, F., Sparrow, D.J.& Wiedl, H.J. 2009. The Amphibians and Reptiles of Cyprus. Edition Chimaira. Pages 364.	
2.3 Range	Range within the biogeographical region concerned	
2.3.1 Surface area Range	5761 km²	
2.3.2 Method used Surface area of Range	2 = Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling	
2.3.3 Short-term trend Period	2001-2012	
2.3.4 Short term trend Trend direction	0 = stable	
2.3.5 Short-term trend Magnitude Optional	**a) Minimum**	
	b) Maximum	
2.3.6 Long-term trend Period Optional		
2.3.7 Long-term trend Trend direction Optional	x = unknown	
2.3.8 Long-term trend	**a) Minimum**	

Magnitude Optional	**b) Maximum**	
2.3.9 Favourable reference range	5640 km²	
	≈	
	A wide ranging species. The entire area of the country excluding only a small area on the mountaintops has been set as FRR.	
2.3.10 Reason for change Is the difference between the reported value in 2.3.1. and the previous reporting round mainly due to…	a) genuine change? *NO*	
	b) improved knowledge/more accurate data? *YES*	
	c) use of different method (e.g. "Range tool")? *YES*	
2.4 Population		
2.4.1 Population size estimation (using individuals or agreed exceptions where possible)	**a) Unit**	individual (class)
	b) Minimum	50.000 (class 8)
	c) Maximum	100.000 (class 9)
2.4.2 Population size estimation (using population unit other than individuals) Optional *(if 2.4.1 filled in)*	**a) Unit**[2]	
	b) Minimum	
	c) Maximum	
2.4.3 Additional information on population estimates / conversion Optional	**a) Definition of "locality"**	
	b) Method to convert data	The mean from a number (N=19) of population measurements during the breeding season was extrapolated to the total area of available wetlands within the species distribution.
	c) Problems encountered to provide population size estimation	The statistical power of the approach used was low. There can be significant fluctuations in population measurements between years. During the dry years prior to 2012 population estimations and the estimated distribution were significant lower. However this changed dramatically during the wet year 2012. Expressing the results as a class was a safer option.
2.4.4 Year or period	2012	

[2] If a population unit is used other than individuals or the unit of the list of exceptions this data is recommended to be converted to individuals. The converted data should be reported in the field 2.4.1.

2.4.5 Method used Population size	2 = Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling	
2.4.6 Short-term trend Period	2001-2012	
2.4.7 Short-term trend Trend direction	x = unknown	
2.4.8 Short-term trend Magnitude Optional	**a) Minimum**	
	b) Maximum	
	c) Confidence interval	
2.4.9 Short-term trend Method used	1 = Estimate based on expert opinion with no or minimal sampling	
2.4.10 Long-term trend – Period Optional		
2.4.11 Long-term trend Trend direction Optional		
2.4.12 Long-term trend Magnitude Optional	**a) Minimum**	
	b) Maximum	
	c) Confidence interval	
2.4.13 Long term trend Method used Optional		
2.4.14 Favourable reference population	Population class 8 (50.000-100.000)	
	There were no previous estimations of population. Although there are no indications or reports of significant population decline, there is a reported case of local extinction.	
2.4.15 Reason for change Is the difference between the value reported at 2.4.1 or 2.4.2 and the previous reporting round mainly due to:	a) genuine change? *YES/NO*	
	b) improved knowledge/more accurate data? *YES/NO*	
	c) use of different method (e.g. "Range tool")? *YES/NO*	
2.5 Habitat for the species		
2.5.1 Area estimation	3830 km²	
2.5.2 Year or period	2012	

2.5.3 Method used Habitat for the species	2 = Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling
2.5.4 Quality of the habitat	good
	A widely distributed species using a wide range of habitats in its land phase, with favourable population and range parameters. However, the reproductive habitat could be a limiting factor. During the dry years there is possibly a decrease of available surface water along the lower parts of the rivers and stream due to the existence of many dumps. However, those dumps provide a safe alternative for reproduction during the dry years.
2.5.5 Short-term trend Period	2001-2012
2.5.6 Short-term trend Trend direction	0 = stable
2.5.7 Long-term trend Period Optional	
2.5.8 Long-term trend Trend direction Optional	
2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat for the species	4207 km²
2.5.10 Reason for change Is the difference between the value reported at 2.5.1 and the previous reporting round mainly due to	a) genuine change? *YES/NO*
	b) improved knowledge/more accurate data? *YES/NO*
	c) use of different method (e.g. "Range tool")? *YES/NO*

2.6 Main pressures

a) Pressure	b) Ranking	c) Pollution qualifier
A07 use of biocides, hormones and chemicals	- L	*optional*
D01.02 roads, motorways	- L	
H01 Pollution to surface waters	- L	
J02 human induced changes in hydraulic conditions	- M	
J02.10 management of aquatic and bank vegetation for drainage purposes	- L	
K01.03 Drying out	- H	
K03.05 antagonism arising from introduction of species	- M	

2.6.1 Method used – Pressures	2 = mainly based on expert judgement and other data

2.7 Threats

a) Threat	b) Ranking	c) Pollution qualifier

A07 use of biocides, hormones and chemicals D01.02 roads, motorways H01 Pollution to surface waters J02 human induced changes in hydraulic conditions J02.10 management of aquatic and bank vegetation for drainage purposes K01.03 Drying out K03.05 antagonism arising from introduction of species	- L - L - L - M - L - H - M	
2.7.1. Method used – Threats	1 = expert opinion	

2.8 Complementary information	
2.8.1. Justification of % thresholds for trends	
2.8.2. Other relevant information	The "Range Tool" has been used for estimation of the Range. The area of habitat has been considered equal to the distribution. Suitable habitat has been estimated by modelling.
2.8.3. Trans-boundary assessment	

2.9 Conclusions ***(assessment of conservation status at end of reporting period)***	
2.9.1. Range	Favourable (FV)
2.9.2. Population	Favourable (FV)
2.9.3 Habitat for the species	Favourable (FV)
2.9.4 Future prospects	Favourable (FV)
2.9.5 Overall assessment of Conservation Status	Favourable (FV)
2.9.6 Overall trend in Conservation Status	

3 Natura 2000 coverage & conservation measures - Annex II species *on biogeographical level*

3.1 Population		
3.1.1 Population size Estimation of population size included <u>in the network</u> (of the same biogeographical region).	**a) Unit**	Use same unit as in 2.4
	b) Minimum	
	c) Maximum	
3.1.2 Method used	3 = Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate 2 = Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling 1 = Estimate based on expert opinion with no or minimal sampling 0 = Absent data	
3.1.3 Trend of population size within the network (short-term trend) Optional	0 = stable + = increase - = decrease x = unknown	

3.2 Conservation measures														
List up to 20 conservation measures taken (i.e. already being implemented) within the reporting period and provided information about their importance, location and evaluation. Fields 3.2.2-3.2.5 to be filled in for each reported measure.														
3.2.1 Measure	**3.2.2 Type** Tick the relevant case(s)					**3.2.3 Ranking**	**3.2.4 Location** Tick the relevant case concerning where the measure is PRIMARILY applied			**3.2.5 Broad evaluation of the measure** Tick the relevant case				
	a) Legal/statutory	**b) Administrative**	**c) Contractual**	**d) Recurrent**	**e) One-off**		**a) Inside**	**b) Outside**	**c) Both inside & outside**	**a) Maintain**	**b) Enhance**	**c) Long term**	**d) No effect**	**e) Unknown**	**f) Not evaluated**
Use codes from the checklist on conservation measures						*Highlight – using a capital 'H' – up to 5 of the most important measures*									

Annex C - Assessing conservation status of a SPECIES

General evaluation matrix *(per biogeographical region within a MS)*

Parameter	Conservation Status			
	Favourable ('green')	**Unfavourable - Inadequate ('amber')**	**Unfavourable - Bad ('red')**	***Unknown (insufficient information to make an assessment)***
Range[3]	Stable (loss and expansion in balance) or increasing AND not smaller than the 'favourable reference range'	Any other combination	Large decline: Equivalent to a loss of more than 1% per year within period specified by MS **OR** more than 10% below favourable reference range	*No or insufficient reliable information available*
Population	Population(s) not lower than 'favourable reference population' AND reproduction, mortality and age structure not deviating from normal (if data available)	Any other combination	Large decline: Equivalent to a loss of more than 1% per year (indicative value MS may deviate from if duly justified) within period specified by MS AND below 'favourable reference population' OR More than 25% below favourable reference population OR Reproduction, mortality and age structure strongly deviating from normal (if data available)	*No or insufficient reliable information available*
Habitat for the species	Area of habitat is sufficiently large (and stable or increasing) AND habitat quality is suitable for the long term survival of the species	Any other combination	Area of habitat is clearly not sufficiently large to ensure the long term survival of the species OR Habitat quality is bad, clearly not allowing long term survival of the species	*No or insufficient reliable information available*
Future prospects (as regards to population, range and habitat availability)	Main pressures and threats to the species not significant; species will remain viable on the long-term	Any other combination	Severe influence of pressures and threats to the species; very bad prospects for its future, long-term viability at risk.	*No or insufficient reliable information available*

[3] Range within the biogeographical region concerned

Parameter	Conservation Status			
	Favourable ('green')	**Unfavourable - Inadequate ('amber')**	**Unfavourable - Bad ('red')**	***Unknown (insufficient information to make an assessment)***
Overall assessment of CS[4]	All 'green' OR three 'green' and one 'unknown'	One or more 'amber' but no 'red'	One or more 'red'	Two or more 'unknown' combined with green or all "unknown"

[4] A specific symbol (qualifier +/-/=/x) is to be used in the unfavourable categories to indicate an overall trend in conservation status

Annex B - Reporting format on the 'main results of the surveillance under Article 11' for Annex II, IV & V species

Field name	*Brief explanations*	
0.1 Member State	CY	
0.2 Species	**0.2.1 Species code**	2362
	0.2.2 Species scientific name	Hyla savignyi
	0.2.3 Alternative species scientific name Optional	Hyla arborea
	0.2.4 Common name Optional	Dendrovatrachos

1 National Level		
1.1 Maps	Distribution and range within the MS concerned	
1.1.1 Distribution map	Attached shapefiles (grid 10x10)	Indicate if species is considered to be 'sensitive'[1]
1.1.2 Method used - map	2 = Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling	
1.1.3 Year or period	2007-2012	
1.1.4 Additional distribution map Optional	Attached shapefiles (grid 1x1)	
1.1.5 Range map	Attached shapefiles (grid 10x10)	

2 Biogeographical level Complete for each biogeographical region or marine region concerned	
2.1 Biogeographical region & marine regions	Mediterranean (MED)

[1] See the definition of a sensitive species in section 1.1.1 of the Guidelines

2.2 Published sources	Γκατζογιάννης, Σ., Παλάσκας, Δ., Τσιάρας, Δ., Κωνσταντινίδης, Π., Τσιουρλής, Γ., Κασιούμης, Κ., Θεοφάνους, Σ., Σφουγγάρης, Α., Γεωργιακάκης, Π., Ποϊραζίδης, Κ,, Ζόγκαρης, Σ., Λουμπουρδής, Ν. και Καλαπανίδα, Μ. 2010. Διαχειριστικό Σχέδιο Δάσους Πάφου – Μέρος Α΄. Αυτοτελής έκδοση του Έργου "Ετοιμασία Ολοκληρωμένου Διαχειριστικού Σχεδίου για το Δάσος Πάφου". Φεβρουάριος 2010. Τμήμα Δασών, Λευκωσία. Σελ. 188. Παπαδήμος, Δ., Χατζηχαραλάμπους, Ε. & Δημάκη, Μ. 2010. Έκθεση περιβαλλοντικών επιπτώσεων από ενδεχόμενη κατεδάφιση ιδιωτικού φράγματος στο Χα-Ποτάμι. Ελληνικό Κέντρο Βιοτόπων-Υγροτόπων. Θέρμη. 46 σελ. + Παράρτημα. Χατζηχαραλάμπους, Ε. (συντονίστρια έκδοσης). 2011. Σχέδιο Διαχείρισης της περιοχής CY3000008 «Λίμνη Παραλιμνίου». Ελληνικό Κέντρο Βιοτόπων- Υγροτόπων – Τμήμα Περιβάλλοντος. Θέρμη. 170 σελ. + Παράρτημα + 14 Χάρτες. Χατζηχαραλάμπους, Ε. (συντονίστρια έκδοσης). 2009. Σχέδιο διαχείρισης της περιοχής CY4000002 "Χα-Ποτάμι". Ελληνικό Κέντρο Βιοτόπων- Υγροτόπων – Υπηρεσία Περιβάλλοντος. Θέρμη. 170 σελ. + Παράρτημα + 14 Χάρτες. Χατζηχαραλάμπους, Ε., Τσιαούση, Β. & Ιωανίδης, Γ. 2007 (συντονιστές έκδοσης). 2007. Σχέδιο Διαχείρισης της περιοχής «CY6000003 Λύμπια Αγία Άννα». Ελληνικό Κέντρο Βιοτόπων- Υγροτόπων – Υπηρεσία Περιβάλλοντος. Θέρμη. 134 σελ. + ii Παραρτήματα + 14 Χάρτες Baier, F., Sparrow, D.J.& Wiedl, H.J. 2009. The Amphibians and Reptiles of Cyprus. Edition Chimaira. Pages 364. Stöck, M., Dubey, S., Klütsch, C., Litvinchuk, S.N., Scheidt, U. and Perrin, N. 2008. Mitochondrial and nuclear phylogeny of circum-Mediterranean tree frogs from the *Hyla arborea* group. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 49: 1019–1024.	
2.3 Range	Range within the biogeographical region concerned	
2.3.1 Surface area Range	5761 km²	
2.3.2 Method used Surface area of Range	2 = Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling	
2.3.3 Short-term trend Period	2001-2012	
2.3.4 Short term trend Trend direction	x = unknown	
2.3.5 Short-term trend Magnitude Optional	**a) Minimum**	
	b) Maximum	
2.3.6 Long-term trend Period Optional		

2.3.7 Long-term trend Trend direction Optional	x = unknown	
2.3.8 Long-term trend Magnitude Optional	**a) Minimum**	
	b) Maximum	
2.3.9 Favourable reference range	5640 km²	
	≈	
	A wide ranging species. The entire area of the country excluding only a small area on the mountaintops has been set as FRR.	
2.3.10 Reason for change Is the difference between the reported value in 2.3.1. and the previous reporting round mainly due to…	a) genuine change? *YES/NO*	
	b) improved knowledge/more accurate data? *YES/NO*	
	c) use of different method (e.g. "Range tool")? *YES/NO*	
2.4 Population		
2.4.1 Population size estimation (using individuals or agreed exceptions where possible)	**a) Unit**	individual (class)
	b) Minimum	100.000 (class 9)
	c) Maximum	500.000 (class 9)
2.4.2 Population size estimation (using population unit other than individuals) Optional *(if 2.4.1 filled in)*	**a) Unit**[2]	
	b) Minimum	
	c) Maximum	
2.4.3 Additional information on population estimates / conversion Optional	**a) Definition of "locality"**	
	b) Method to convert data	The mean from a number (N=22) of population measurements during the breeding season was extrapolated to the total area of available wetlands within the species distribution.

[2] If a population unit is used other than individuals or the unit of the list of exceptions this data is recommended to be converted to individuals. The converted data should be reported in the field 2.4.1.

	c) Problems encountered to provide population size estimation		The statistical power of the approach used was low. There can be significant fluctuations in population measurements between years. During the dry years prior to 2012 population estimations and the estimated distribution were significant lower. However this changed dramatically during the wet year 2012. Expressing the results as a class was a safer option.
2.4.4 Year or period	2012		
2.4.5 Method used Population size	2 = Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling		
2.4.6 Short-term trend Period	2001-2012		
2.4.7 Short-term trend Trend direction	0 = stable		
2.4.8 Short-term trend Magnitude Optional	**a) Minimum**		
	b) Maximum		
	c) Confidence interval		
2.4.9 Short-term trend Method used	1 = Estimate based on expert opinion with no or minimal sampling		
2.4.10 Long-term trend – Period Optional			
2.4.11 Long-term trend Trend direction Optional			
2.4.12 Long-term trend Magnitude Optional	**a) Minimum**		
	b) Maximum		
	c) Confidence interval		
2.4.13 Long term trend Method used Optional			
2.4.14 Favourable reference population	Population class 9 (100.000-500.000)		
	There were no previous estimations of population. However, there are no indications or reports of significant population decline.		

2.4.15 Reason for change Is the difference between the value reported at 2.4.1 or 2.4.2 and the previous reporting round mainly due to:	a) genuine change? *YES/NO*
	b) improved knowledge/more accurate data? *YES/NO*
	c) use of different method (e.g. "Range tool")? *YES/NO*
2.5 Habitat for the species	
2.5.1 Area estimation	4673 km²
2.5.2 Year or period	2012
2.5.3 Method used Habitat for the species	2 = Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling
2.5.4 Quality of the habitat	good a) To be indicated as good / moderate / bad / unknown
	A widely distributed species using a wide range of habitats in its land phase, with favourable population and range parameters. However the reproductive habitat could be a limiting factor. During the dry years there is possibly a decrease of available surface water along the lower parts of the rivers and stream due to the existence of many dumps. However those dumps provide a safe alternative for reproduction during the dry years.
2.5.5 Short-term trend Period	2001-2012
2.5.6 Short-term trend Trend direction	0 = stable
2.5.7 Long-term trend Period Optional	
2.5.8 Long-term trend Trend direction Optional	
2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat for the species	5421 km²
2.5.10 Reason for change Is the difference between the value reported at 2.5.1 and the previous reporting round mainly due to	a) genuine change? *YES/NO*
	b) improved knowledge/more accurate data? *YES/NO*
	c) use of different method (e.g. "Range tool")? *YES/NO*

2.6 Main pressures

a) Pressure	b) Ranking	c) Pollution qualifier
A07 use of biocides, hormones and chemicals	- L	*optional*
H01 Pollution to surface waters	- L	
J02 human induced changes in hydraulic conditions	- M	
J02.10 management of aquatic and bank vegetation for drainage purposes	- M	
K01.03 Drying out	- H	
K03.05 antagonism arising from introduction of species	- M	

2.6.1 Method used – Pressures	2 = mainly based on expert judgement and other data

2.7 Threats		
a) Threat	**b) Ranking**	**c) Pollution qualifier**
A07 use of biocides, hormones and chemicals	- L	*optional*
H01 Pollution to surface waters	- L	
J02 human induced changes in hydraulic conditions	- M	
J02.10 management of aquatic and bank vegetation for drainage purposes	- M	
K01.03 Drying out	- H	
K03.05 antagonism arising from introduction of species	- M	
2.7.1. Method used – Threats	1 = expert opinion	

2.8 Complementary information	
2.8.1. Justification of % thresholds for trends	
2.8.2. Other relevant information	The "Range Tool" has been used for estimation of the Range. The area of habitat has been considered equal to the distribution. Suitable habitat has been estimated by modelling.
2.8.3. Trans-boundary assessment	

2.9 Conclusions ***(assessment of conservation status at end of reporting period)***	
2.9.1. Range	Favourable (FV)
2.9.2. Population	Favourable (FV)
2.9.3 Habitat for the species	Favourable (FV)
2.9.4 Future prospects	Favourable (FV)
2.9.5 Overall assessment of Conservation Status	Favourable (FV)
2.9.6 Overall trend in Conservation Status	

3 Natura 2000 coverage & conservation measures - Annex II species
on biogeographical level

3.1 Population		
3.1.1 Population size Estimation of population size included in the network (of the same biogeographical region).	**a) Unit**	Use same unit as in 2.4
	b) Minimum	
	c) Maximum	
3.1.2 Method used	3 = Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate 2 = Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling 1 = Estimate based on expert opinion with no or minimal sampling 0 = Absent data	
3.1.3 Trend of population size within the network (short-term trend) Optional	0 = stable + = increase - = decrease x = unknown	

3.2 Conservation measures

List up to 20 conservation measures taken (i.e. already being implemented) within the reporting period and provided information about their importance, location and evaluation.

Fields 3.2.2-3.2.5 to be filled in for each reported measure.

3.2.1 Measure	**3.2.2 Type** Tick the relevant case(s)					**3.2.3 Ranking**	**3.2.4 Location** Tick the relevant case concerning where the measure is PRIMARILY applied			**3.2.5 Broad evaluation of the measure** Tick the relevant case					
	a) Legal/statutory	**b) Administrative**	**c) Contractual**	**d) Recurrent**	**e) One-off**		**a) Inside**	**b) Outside**	**c) Both inside & outside**	**a) Maintain**	**b) Enhance**	**c) Long term**	**d) No effect**	**e) Unknown**	**f) Not evaluated**
Use codes from the checklist on conservation measures						*Highlight – using a capital 'H' – up to 5 of the most important measures*									

Annex C - Assessing conservation status of a SPECIES

General evaluation matrix *(per biogeographical region within a MS)*

Parameter	Conservation Status			
	Favourable ('green')	**Unfavourable - Inadequate ('amber')**	**Unfavourable - Bad ('red')**	***Unknown (insufficient information to make an assessment)***
Range[3]	Stable (loss and expansion in balance) or increasing AND not smaller than the 'favourable reference range'	Any other combination	Large decline: Equivalent to a loss of more than 1% per year within period specified by MS **OR** more than 10% below favourable reference range	*No or insufficient reliable information available*
Population	Population(s) not lower than 'favourable reference population' AND reproduction, mortality and age structure not deviating from normal (if data available)	Any other combination	Large decline: Equivalent to a loss of more than 1% per year (indicative value MS may deviate from if duly justified) within period specified by MS AND below 'favourable reference population' OR More than 25% below favourable reference population OR Reproduction, mortality and age structure strongly deviating from normal (if data available)	*No or insufficient reliable information available*
Habitat for the species	Area of habitat is sufficiently large (and stable or increasing) AND habitat quality is suitable for the long term survival of the species	Any other combination	Area of habitat is clearly not sufficiently large to ensure the long term survival of the species OR Habitat quality is bad, clearly not allowing long term survival of the species	*No or insufficient reliable information available*
Future prospects (as regards to population, range and habitat availability)	Main pressures and threats to the species not significant; species will remain viable on the long-term	Any other combination	Severe influence of pressures and threats to the species; very bad prospects for its future, long-term viability at risk.	*No or insufficient reliable information available*

[3] Range within the biogeographical region concerned

Parameter	Conservation Status			
	Favourable ('green')	**Unfavourable - Inadequate ('amber')**	**Unfavourable - Bad ('red')**	***Unknown (insufficient information to make an assessment)***
Overall assessment of CS[4]	All 'green' OR three 'green' and one 'unknown'	One or more 'amber' but no 'red'	One or more 'red'	Two or more 'unknown' combined with green or all "unknown"

[4] A specific symbol (qualifier +/-/=/x) is to be used in the unfavourable categories to indicate an overall trend in conservation status

Annex B - Reporting format on the 'main results of the surveillance under Article 11' for Annex II, IV & V species

Field name	*Brief explanations*	
0.1 Member State	CY	
0.2 Species	**0.2.1 Species code**	5360
	0.2.2 Species scientific name	Rana bedriagae
	0.2.3 Alternative species scientific name Optional	Rana ridibunda
	0.2.4 Common name Optional	Limnovatrachos

1 National Level		
1.1 Maps	Distribution and range within the MS concerned	
1.1.1 Distribution map	Attached shapefiles (grid 10x10)	Indicate if species is considered to be 'sensitive'[1]
1.1.2 Method used - map	2 = Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling	
1.1.3 Year or period	2007-2012 (Year or period when distribution data was collected)	
1.1.4 Additional distribution map Optional	Attached shapefiles (grid 1x1)	
1.1.5 Range map	Attached shapefiles (grid 10x10)	

2 Biogeographical level Complete for each biogeographical region or marine region concerned	
2.1 Biogeographical region & marine regions	Mediterranean (MED)

[1] See the definition of a sensitive species in section 1.1.1 of the Guidelines

2.2 Published sources	Γκατζογιάννης, Σ., Παλάσκας, Δ., Τσιάρας, Δ., Κωνσταντινίδης, Π., Τσιουρλής, Γ., Κασιούμης, Κ., Θεοφάνους, Σ., Σφουγγάρης, Α., Γεωργιακάκης, Π., Ποϊραζίδης, Κ,, Ζόγκαρης, Σ., Λουμπουρδής, Ν. και Καλαπανίδα, Μ. 2010. Διαχειριστικό Σχέδιο Δάσους Πάφου – Μέρος Α΄. Αυτοτελής έκδοση του Έργου "Ετοιμασία Ολοκληρωμένου Διαχειριστικού Σχεδίου για το Δάσος Πάφου". Φεβρουάριος 2010. Τμήμα Δασών, Λευκωσία. Σελ. 188. Παπαδήμος, Δ., Χατζηχαραλάμπους, Ε. & Δημάκη, Μ. 2010. Έκθεση περιβαλλοντικών επιπτώσεων από ενδεχόμενη κατεδάφιση ιδιωτικού φράγματος στο Χα-Ποτάμι. Ελληνικό Κέντρο Βιοτόπων-Υγροτόπων. Θέρμη. 46 σελ. + Παράρτημα. Χατζηχαραλάμπους, Ε. (συντονίστρια έκδοσης). 2011. Σχέδιο Διαχείρισης της περιοχής CY3000008 «Λίμνη Παραλιμνίου». Ελληνικό Κέντρο Βιοτόπων- Υγροτόπων – Τμήμα Περιβάλλοντος. Θέρμη. 170 σελ. + Παράρτημα + 14 Χάρτες. Χατζηχαραλάμπους, Ε. (συντονίστρια έκδοσης). 2009. Σχέδιο διαχείρισης της περιοχής CY4000002 "Χα-Ποτάμι". Ελληνικό Κέντρο Βιοτόπων- Υγροτόπων – Υπηρεσία Περιβάλλοντος. Θέρμη. 170 σελ. + Παράρτημα + 14 Χάρτες. Χατζηχαραλάμπους, Ε., Τσιαούση, Β. & Ιωανίδης, Γ. 2007 (συντονιστές έκδοσης). 2007. Σχέδιο Διαχείρισης της περιοχής «CY6000003 Λύμπια Αγία Άννα». Ελληνικό Κέντρο Βιοτόπων- Υγροτόπων – Υπηρεσία Περιβάλλοντος. Θέρμη. 134 σελ. + ii Παραρτήματα + 14 Χάρτες Baier, F., Sparrow, D.J.& Wiedl, H.J. 2009. The Amphibians and Reptiles of Cyprus. Edition Chimaira. Pages 364. Blosat, B. 2008. Population status, threats and protection of the Grass Snake Natrix natrix cypriaca (Hecht, 1930) on Cyprus. Mertensiella 17: 246-271 Lymberakis, P., Poulakakis, N., Manthalou, G., Tsigenopoulos, C.S., Magoulas, A. and Mylonas, M. 2007. Mitochondrial phylogeography of Rana (Pelophylax) populations in the Eastern Mediterranean region. Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution, 44 (1): 115-125. Plötner, J., Uzzell, Th., Beerli, P., Akın, Ç., Bilgin, C.C., Haefeli, C., Ohst, T., Köhler, F., Schreiber, R., Guex, G.D., Litvinchuk, S.N., Westaway, R., Reyer, H.U., Pruvost, N & Hotz H. 2010. Genetic Divergence and Evolution of Reproductive Isolation in Eastern Mediterranean Water Frogs. M. Glaubrecht (ed.), Evolution in Action, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 373 – 403.	
2.3 Range	Range within the biogeographical region concerned	
2.3.1 Surface area Range	5743 km²	
2.3.2 Method used Surface area of Range	2 = Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling	
2.3.3 Short-term trend Period	2001-2012	
2.3.4 Short term trend Trend direction	x = unknown	
2.3.5 Short-term trend Magnitude	**a) Minimum**	

Optional	**b) Maximum**	
2.3.6 Long-term trend Period Optional		
2.3.7 Long-term trend Trend direction Optional	x = unknown	
2.3.8 Long-term trend Magnitude Optional	**a) Minimum**	
	b) Maximum	
2.3.9 Favourable reference range	5640 km²	
	≈	
	A wide ranging species. The entire area of the country excluding only a small area on the mountaintops has been set as FRR.	
2.3.10 Reason for change Is the difference between the reported value in 2.3.1. and the previous reporting round mainly due to…	a) genuine change? *YES/NO*	
	b) improved knowledge/more accurate data? *YES/NO*	
	c) use of different method (e.g. "Range tool")? *YES/NO*	
2.4 Population		
2.4.1 Population size estimation (using individuals or agreed exceptions where possible)	**a) Unit**	individual (class)
	b) Minimum	100.000 (class 9)
	c) Maximum	500.000 (class 9)
2.4.2 Population size estimation (using population unit other than individuals) Optional *(if 2.4.1 filled in)*	**a) Unit**[2]	
	b) Minimum	
	c) Maximum	
2.4.3 Additional information on population estimates / conversion Optional	**a) Definition of "locality"**	
	b) Method to convert data	The mean from a number (N=41) of population measurements during the breeding season was extrapolated to the total area of available wetlands within the species distribution.

[2] If a population unit is used other than individuals or the unit of the list of exceptions this data is recommended to be converted to individuals. The converted data should be reported in the field 2.4.1.

	c) Problems encountered to provide population size estimation		The statistical power of the approach used was low. There can be significant fluctuations in population measurements between years. During the dry years prior to 2012 population estimations and the estimated distribution were significant lower. However this changed dramatically during the wet year 2012. Expressing the results as a class was a safer option.
2.4.4 Year or period	2012		
2.4.5 Method used Population size	2 = Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling		
2.4.6 Short-term trend Period	2001-2012		
2.4.7 Short-term trend Trend direction	0 = stable		
2.4.8 Short-term trend Magnitude Optional	**a) Minimum**		
	b) Maximum		
	c) Confidence interval		
2.4.9 Short-term trend Method used	1 = Estimate based on expert opinion with no or minimal sampling		
2.4.10 Long-term trend – Period Optional			
2.4.11 Long-term trend Trend direction Optional			
2.4.12 Long-term trend Magnitude Optional	**a) Minimum**		
	b) Maximum		
	c) Confidence interval		
2.4.13 Long term trend Method used Optional			
2.4.14 Favourable reference population	Population class 9 (100.000-500.000)		
	There were no previous estimations of population. However there are no indications or reports of significant population decline.		

2.4.15 Reason for change Is the difference between the value reported at 2.4.1 or 2.4.2 and the previous reporting round mainly due to:	a) genuine change? *YES/NO*	
	b) improved knowledge/more accurate data? *YES/NO*	
	c) use of different method (e.g. "Range tool")? *YES/NO*	
2.5 Habitat for the species		
2.5.1 Area estimation	3718 km²	
2.5.2 Year or period	2012	
2.5.3 Method used Habitat for the species	2 = Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling	
2.5.4 Quality of the habitat	good	
	A widely distributed species using a wide range of habitats in its land phase, with favourable population and range parameters. However the reproductive habitat could be a limiting factor. During the dry years there is possibly a decrease of available surface water along the lower parts of the rivers and stream due to the existence of many dumps. However those dumps provide a safe alternative for reproduction during the dry years.	
2.5.5 Short-term trend Period	2001-2012	
2.5.6 Short-term trend Trend direction	0 = stable	
2.5.7 Long-term trend Period Optional		
2.5.8 Long-term trend Trend direction Optional		
2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat for the species	5208 km²	
2.5.10 Reason for change Is the difference between the value reported at 2.5.1 and the previous reporting round mainly due to	a) genuine change? *YES/NO*	
	b) improved knowledge/more accurate data? *YES/NO*	
	c) use of different method (e.g. "Range tool")? *YES/NO*	
2.6 Main pressures		
a) Pressure	**b) Ranking**	**c) Pollution qualifier**

A07 use of biocides, hormones and chemicals H01 Pollution to surface waters J02 human induced changes in hydraulic conditions J02.10 management of aquatic and bank vegetation for drainage purposes K01.03 Drying out K03.05 antagonism arising from introduction of species	- L - L - M - M - H - M	*optional*
2.6.1 Method used – Pressures	2 = mainly based on expert judgement and other data	

2.7 Threats		
a) Threat	**b) Ranking**	**c) Pollution qualifier**
A07 use of biocides, hormones and chemicals H01 Pollution to surface waters J02 human induced changes in hydraulic conditions J02.10 management of aquatic and bank vegetation for drainage purposes K01.03 Drying out K03.05 antagonism arising from introduction of species	- L - L - M - M - H - M	*optional*
2.7.1. Method used – Threats	1 = expert opinion	

2.8 Complementary information	
2.8.1. Justification of % thresholds for trends	
2.8.2. Other relevant information	The "Range Tool" has been used for estimation of the Range. The area of habitat has been considered equal to the distribution. Suitable habitat has been estimated by modelling.
2.8.3. Trans-boundary assessment	

2.9 Conclusions ***(assessment of conservation status at end of reporting period)***	
2.9.1. Range	Favourable (FV)
2.9.2. Population	Favourable (FV)

2.9.3 Habitat for the species	Favourable (FV)
2.9.4 Future prospects	Favourable (FV)
2.9.5 Overall assessment of Conservation Status	Favourable (FV)
2.9.6 Overall trend in Conservation Status	

3 Natura 2000 coverage & conservation measures - Annex II species
on biogeographical level

3.1 Population		
3.1.1 Population size Estimation of population size included <u>in the network</u> (of the same biogeographical region).	**a) Unit**	Use same unit as in 2.4
	b) Minimum	
	c) Maximum	
3.1.2 Method used	3 = Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate 2 = Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling 1 = Estimate based on expert opinion with no or minimal sampling 0 = Absent data	
3.1.3 Trend of population size within the network (short-term trend) Optional	0 = stable + = increase - = decrease x = unknown	

3.2 Conservation measures

List up to 20 conservation measures taken (i.e. already being implemented) within the reporting period and provided information about their importance, location and evaluation.

Fields 3.2.2-3.2.5 to be filled in for each reported measure.

3.2.1 Measure	**3.2.2 Type** Tick the relevant case(s)	**3.2.3 Ranking**	**3.2.4 Location** Tick the relevant case concerning where the measure is PRIMARILY applied	**3.2.5 Broad evaluation of the measure** Tick the relevant case

	a) Legal/statutory	b) Administrative	c) Contractual	d) Recurrent	e) One-off		a) Inside	b) Outside	c) Both inside & outside	a) Maintain	b) Enhance	c) Long term	d) No effect	e) Unknown	f) Not evaluated
Use codes from the checklist on conservation measures						*Highlight – using a capital 'H' – up to 5 of the most important measures*									

Annex C - Assessing conservation status of a SPECIES

General evaluation matrix *(per biogeographical region within a MS)*

Parameter	Conservation Status			
	Favourable ('green')	**Unfavourable - Inadequate ('amber')**	**Unfavourable - Bad ('red')**	***Unknown (insufficient information to make an assessment)***
Range[3]	Stable (loss and expansion in balance) or increasing AND not smaller than the 'favourable reference range'	Any other combination	Large decline: Equivalent to a loss of more than 1% per year within period specified by MS **OR** more than 10% below favourable reference range	*No or insufficient reliable information available*
Population	Population(s) not lower than 'favourable reference population' AND reproduction, mortality and age structure not deviating from normal (if data available)	Any other combination	Large decline: Equivalent to a loss of more than 1% per year (indicative value MS may deviate from if duly justified) within period specified by MS AND below 'favourable reference population' OR More than 25% below favourable reference population OR Reproduction, mortality and age structure strongly deviating from normal (if data available)	*No or insufficient reliable information available*
Habitat for the species	Area of habitat is sufficiently large (and stable or increasing) AND habitat quality is suitable for the long term survival of the species	Any other combination	Area of habitat is clearly not sufficiently large to ensure the long term survival of the species OR Habitat quality is bad, clearly not allowing long term survival of the species	*No or insufficient reliable information available*
Future prospects (as regards to population, range and habitat availability)	Main pressures and threats to the species not significant; species will remain viable on the long-term	Any other combination	Severe influence of pressures and threats to the species; very bad prospects for its future, long-term viability at risk.	*No or insufficient reliable information available*

[3] Range within the biogeographical region concerned

Parameter	Conservation Status			
	Favourable ('green')	**Unfavourable - Inadequate ('amber')**	**Unfavourable - Bad ('red')**	***Unknown (insufficient information to make an assessment)***
Overall assessment of CS[4]	All 'green' OR three 'green' and one 'unknown'	One or more 'amber' but no 'red'	One or more 'red'	Two or more 'unknown' combined with green or all "unknown"

[4] A specific symbol (qualifier +/-/=/x) is to be used in the unfavourable categories to indicate an overall trend in conservation status