

<u>Έργο</u>:

ΠΑΡΟΧΗ ΥΠΗΡΕΣΙΩΝ

ΓΙΑ ΤΗΝ ΠΑΡΑΚΟΛΟΥΘΗΣΗ 11 ΕΙΔΩΝ ΠΑΝΙΔΑΣ ΣΥΜΦΩΝΑ ΜΕ ΤΗΝ ΟΔΗΓΙΑ 92/43/ΕΟΚ ΓΙΑ ΤΗΝ ΕΤΟΙΜΑΣΙΑ ΤΗΣ 6ΕΤΟΥΣ ΕΚΘΕΣΗΣ ΜΕΡΟΣ Γ: ΕΡΠΕΤΑ - ΣΑΥΡΕΣ

α/α	Είδος	Παράρτημα Οδηγίας 92/43/ΕΟΚ
1	Ophisops elegans, Αλιζαύρα	IV
2	Ablepharus kitaibelii, Βυζάστρα, Βυζαστρούα	IV
3	Chalcides ocellatus, Γλυάστρα	IV
4	Cyrtodactylus kotschyi (Cyrtopodion), Μισιαρός	IV
5	Chamaeleo chamaeleon, Χαμαιλέοντας,	
	Χαμουλιός	IV

Παραδοτέο 3:

Έκθεση αξιολόγησης της κατάστασης διατήρησης των ειδών Ophisops elegans, Ablepharus kitaibelii, Chalcides ocellatus, Cyrtodactylus kotschyi (Cyrtopodion) και Chamaeleo chamaeleon, κατά την περίοδο 2007-2012

Αναθέτουσα Αρχή: Τμήμα Περιβάλλοντος

<u>Αρ. Διαγωνισμού</u>: **ΤΠ 7/2011** Προϋπολογισμός: **€ 23.600,00**

Διάρκεια: 2 Ιανουαρίου 2012 – 2 Απριλίου 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 Γ: ΕΡΠΕΤΑ - ΣΑΥΡΕΣ». 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 C: Reptiles – Sauria" 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 σαυρών κοινοτικού ενδιαφέροντος Ophisops elegans, Ablepharus kitaibelii, Chalcides ocellatus, Cyrtodactylus kotschyi (Cyrtopodion) και Chamaeleo chamaeleon, 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). 2012. DOE 7/2011. Evaluation of the conservation status of the lizards species of Community interest *Ophisops elegans, Ablepharus kitaibelii, Chalcides ocellatus, Cyrtodactylus kotschyi* (*Cyrtopodion*) και *Chamaeleo chamaeleon*. Reporting period: 2007-2012. Greek Biotope-Wetland Centre –Department of Environment. Thermi..

Field name	Brief explanations		
0.1 Member State	CY		
	0.2.1 Species code	1276	
	0.2.2 Species scientific	Ablepharus kitaibelii	
	name	Abiepharus Kitalbelli	
	0.2.3 Alternative species		
0.2 Species	scientific name	Ablepharus budaki	
	Optional		
	0.2.4 Common name		
	Optional	Vyzastra, Vyzastroua	

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'			
1.1.2 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 & Mediterranean (MED) marine regions			

 $^{^{\}scriptsize 1}$ See the definition of a sensitive species in section 1.1.1 of the Guidelines

Διαχειριστικού Σχεδίου για το Δάσος Πάφου". Φεβρουάριος Τμήμα Δασών, Λευκωσία. Σελ. 188.			
περιβαλλοντικών επιπτώσεων από ενδεχόμενη κατεδάφιση ι	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.		
Διαχείρισης της περιοχής CY3000008 «Λίμνη Παραλιμνίου».	Διαχείρισης της περιοχής CY3000008 «Λίμνη Παραλιμνίου». Ελληνικό Κέντρο Βιοτόπων- Υγροτόπων – Τμήμα Περιβάλλοντος. Θέρμη. 170		
	6ιαχείρισης της περιοχής CY4000002 "Χα-Ποτάμι". Ελληνικό Κέντρο Βιοτόπων- Υγροτόπων – Υπηρεσία Περιβάλλοντος. Θέρμη. 170 σελ.		
έκδοσης). 2007. Σχέδιο Διαχείρισης της περιοχής «CY60000 Λύμπια Αγία Άννα». Ελληνικό Κέντρο Βιοτόπων- Υγροτόπων	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 of Cyprus. Edition Chimaira. Pages 364.	Baier, F., Sparrow, D.J.& Wiedl, H.J. 2009. The Amphibians and Reptiles of Cyprus. Edition Chimaira. Pages 364.		
management of the lizard community in a Mediterranean re	Michaelides, G. & Kati, V. 2009. Diversity patterns and conservation management of the lizard community in a Mediterranean reserve (Cyprus). Journal of Biological Research –Thessaloniki 12: 211-220.		
2.3 Range Range within the biogeographical region concerned	Range within the biogeographical region concerned		
2.3.1 Surface area 5743 km ² .			
	2 = Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling		
2.3.3 Short-term trend 2001-2012 Period	2001-2012		
2.3.4 Short term trend 0 = stable Trend direction			
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 x = unknown Trend direction			
Optional			

0.001			
2.3.8 Long-term trend Magnitude	a) Minimum		
	a) William Carr		
Optional	b) Maximum		
2.3.9 Favourable reference	5640 km ²		
range	≈		
	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	a) genuine change?	NO	
Is the difference between the reported value in 2.3.1. and the previous reporting round mainly due to	b) improved knowledge/more accurate data? YES		
	c) use of different m	ethod (e.g. "R	ange tool")? YES
2.4 Population			
2.4.1 Population size	a) Unit		individual (class)
estimation	b) Minimum		1.000.000 (class 11)
(using individuals or agreed exceptions where possible)	c) Maximum		5.000.000 (class 11)
2.4.2 Population size estimation (using population	a) Unit ²		
unit other than individuals) Optional (if 2.4.1 filled in)	b) Minimum		
	c) Maximum		
2.4.3 Additional information on population	a) Definition of "lo	ocality"	
estimates / conversion Optional	b) Method to conv	ert data	The mean from a number (N=16) of population density measurements was extrapolated to the total area of distribution.
	c) Problems encou provide population estimation		The statistical power of the approach used was low for a widely distributed species. Also there can be significant fluctuations in population density depending on the season. 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 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.

Trend direction 2.4.8 Short-term trend Magnitude Optional a)			
Optional a,	\ Mimimo		
) Minimum		
b)) Maximum		
) Confidence nterval		
2.4.9 Short-term trend 1 Method used	= 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			
•) Minimum		
Optional			
b)) Maximum		
The state of the s) Confidence nterval		
2.4.13 Long term trend Method used			
Optional Po	lonulation class 11 /1 /	000 000 E 000 000)	
reference population	Population class 11 (1.000.000-5.000.000)		
nc		s estimations of population. However there are ts of significant population decline.	
	a) genuine change? YES/NO		
Is the difference between the value reported at 2.4.1 or 2.4.2 and the previous	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 31	195 km²		
	2012		
	2 = Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or		
Habitat for the species mo	modelling		
2.5.4 Quality of the go	good		

habitat	A widely distributed species using a wide range of habitats, with favourable population and range parameters.		
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			
2.5.8 Long-term trend Trend direction Optional			
2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat for the species	5350 km ²		
2.5.10 Reason for change	a) genuine change? YES/NO		
Is the difference between the value reported at 2.5.1 and the previous reporting round mainly	b) improved knowledge/more accurate data? YES/NO		
due to	c) use of different method (e.g. "Range tool")? YES/NO		
2.6 Main pressures			
a) Pressure	b) Ranking c) Pollution qualifier		
A01 Cultivation A07 use of biocides, hormones and chemicals	- L - L	optional	
2.6.1 Method used – Pressures	1 = based only on expert judgements		
2.7 Threats			
a) Threat	b) Ranking	c) Pollution qualifier	
A01 Cultivation A07 use of biocides, hormones and chemicals	- L - L	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.
2.8.3. Trans-boundary assessment	Suitable habitat has been estimated by modelling.

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	Favourable (FV)
Conservation Status	1 avodrable (1 v)
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	a) Unit	Use same unit as in 2.4		
Estimation of population size included in the network (of the	b) Minimum			
same biogeographical region).	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	3.2.2	3.2.3	3.2.4	3.2.5
Measure	Туре	Ranking	Location	Broad evaluation of the
				measure
	Tick the relevant		Tick the relevant	
	case(s)		case concerning where the	Tick the relevant case
			measure is	
			PRIMARILY	
			applied	

	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									

General evaluation matrix (per biogeographical region within a MS)

Parameter		Conse	rvation 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

Field name	Brief explanations		
0.1 Member State	CY		
	0.2.1 Species code	5598	
	0.2.2 Species scientific	Chamaeleo chamaeleon recticrista	
	name	Chamaeleo Chamaeleon rectionsta	
	0.2.3 Alternative species		
0.2 Species	scientific name	Chamaeleo chamaeleon	
	Optional		
	0.2.4 Common name		
	Optional	Chamaeleontas	

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' Indicate if species is considered to be 'sensitive'			
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 ea	ch biogeographical region or marine region concerned		
2.1 Biogeographical region & marine regions	Mediterranean (MED)		
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.		
	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		

 $^{^{\}scriptsize 1}$ See the definition of a sensitive species in section 1.1.1 of the Guidelines

_

2.3.1 Surface area	5743 km².			
Range	37 13 1011 1			
2.3.2 Method used	2 = Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or			
Surface area of Range	modelling			
2.3.3 Short-term trend Period	2001-2012			
2.3.4 Short term trend	0 = stable			
Trend direction				
2.3.5 Short-term trend	-> B#ii			
Magnitude Optional	a) Minimum			
Optional	b) Maximum			
	·			
2.3.6 Long-term trend Period				
Optional				
·	y – unknown			
2.3.7 Long-term trend Trend direction	x = unknown			
Optional				
2.3.8 Long-term trend Magnitude	a) Minimum			
	a) William Car			
Optional	b) Maximum			
2.3.9 Favourable reference range	5640 km²			
90	≈			
		-		
	small area on the mou		area of the country excluding only a	
2.3.10 Reason for change	a) genuine change? A	<u> </u>	S SCEN SCE US FRAN	
Is the difference between the		- -		
reported value in 2.3.1. and the previous reporting round	b) improved knowledge/more accurate data? YES			
mainly due to	c) use of different method (e.g. "Range tool")? YES			
	c) use of different file	etilod (e.g. 10	ange tool j: 123	
2.4 Population				
2.4.1 Population size	a) Unit		individual (class)	
estimation (using individuals or agreed	b) Minimum		500.000 (class 11)	
exceptions where possible)	c) Maximum		1.000.000 (class 11)	
2.4.2 Population size	a) Unit ²			

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.

estimation (using population unit other than individuals)	b) Minimum		
Optional (if 2.4.1 filled in)	c) Maximum		
2.4.3 Additional	a) Definition of "locality"		
information on population estimates / conversion Optional	b) Method to convert	data	The mean from a number (N=17) of population density measurements was extrapolated to the total area of distribution.
	c) Problems encountered to provide population size estimation		The statistical power of the approach used was low for a widely distributed species. Also there can be significant fluctuations in population density depending on the season. 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 p modelling	artial data	with some extrapolation and/or
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 e	expert opin	ion 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	Population class 10 (500	.000-1.000	0.000)
	<u> </u>		

2.6.1 Method used – Pressures	2 = mainly based on expert judgemen	nt and other data		
animals(insects, reptiles, amphibians,) D01.02 roads, motorways L09 fire (natural)	- L - L - H			
copses or scrub J01.01 burning down F03.02.01 collection of	- M - M			
A07 use of biocides, hormones and chemicals A10.01 removal of hedges and	- L - L	optional		
a) Pressure A01 Cultivation	b) Ranking	c) Pollution qualifier		
2.6 Main pressures				
due to	c) use of different method (e.g. "Rang	ge tool")? <i>YES/NO</i>		
value reported at 2.5.1 and the previous reporting round mainly	b) improved knowledge/more accurate data? YES/NO			
2.5.10 Reason for change Is the difference between the	a) genuine change? YES/NO			
Optional 2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat for the species	5304 km²			
2.5.8 Long-term trend Trend direction				
2.5.7 Long-term trend Period Optional				
2.5.6 Short-term trend Trend direction	0 = stable			
2.5.5 Short-term trend Period	2001-2012			
habitat	A widely distributed species using a wide range of habitats, with favourable population and range parameters.			
2.5.4 Quality of the	good			
2.5.3 Method used Habitat for the species	2 = Estimate based on partial data wi modelling	th some extrapolation and/or		
2.5.2 Year or period	2012			
2.5.1 Area estimation	4805 km ²			
2.5 Habitat for the species	-, 255 5. S S. S (e.g. 101)	g = 350. j _5 0,110		
2.4.2 and the previous reporting round mainly due to:	b) improved knowledge/more accura c) use of different method (e.g. "Ran	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Is the difference between the value reported at 2.4.1 or	a) genuine change? YES/NO	to data? VES/NO		
2.4.15 Reason for change	no indications or reports of significant population decline.			
	There were no previous estimations of			
reference population				

2.7 Threats		
a) Threat	b) Ranking	c) Pollution qualifier
A01 Cultivation A07 use of biocides, hormones and chemicals A10.01 removal of hedges and copses or scrub J01.01 burning down F03.02.01 collection of animals(insects, reptiles, amphibians,) D01.02 roads, motorways	- L - M - L - L	optional
L09 fire (natural)	- H	
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)					
(assessment)	or 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	Favourable (FV)				
Conservation Status					
2.9.6 Overall trend in					
Conservation Status					

3.1 Population						
3.1.1 Population size	a) Unit	Use same unit as in 2.4				
Estimation of population size included in the network (of the	b) Minimum					
same biogeographical region).	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	Tick to case where meas	tion the relectoncering the the ure is ARILY		mea			case	the				
	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									

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

Field name	Brief explanations			
0.1 Member State	CY			
	0.2.1 Species code	1274		
	0.2.2 Species scientific	Chalcides ocellatus		
	name	Charcines Ocellatus		
	0.2.3 Alternative species			
0.2 Species	scientific name			
	Optional			
	0.2.4 Common name			
	Optional	Glyastra		

1 National Level					
1.1 Maps	Distribution and range within the MS concerned				
1.1.1 Distribution map 1.1.2 Method used - map	Attached shapefiles (grid 10x10) Indicate if species is considered to be 'sensitive' 2 = Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or				
1.1.2 Wethod used map	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 & Mediterranean (MED					
marine regions					

 $^{^{\}scriptsize 1}$ 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.			
	Χατζηχαραλάμπους, Ε. (συντονίστρια έκδοσης). 2011. Σχέδιο Διαχείρισης της περιοχής CY3000008 «Λίμνη Παραλιμνίου». Ελληνικό Κέντρο Βιοτόπων- Υγροτόπων – Τμήμα Περιβάλλοντος. Θέρμη. 170 σελ. + Παράρτημα + 14 Χάρτες.			
	Baier, F., Sparrow, D.J.& Wiedl, H.J. 2009. The Amphibians and Reptiles of Cyprus. Edition Chimaira. Pages 364.			
	Michaelides, G. & Kati, V. 2009. Diversity patterns and conservation management of the lizard community in a Mediterranean reserve (Cyprus). Journal of Biological Research –Thessaloniki 12: 211-220.			
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	x = unknown			
Optional 2.3.8 Long-term trend Magnitude	a) Minimum			
Optional	b) Maximum			
2.3.9 Favourable reference	3960 km²			

range	≈			
	A wide ranging species restricted to lower elevation areas. Areas above 500m. altitude have been excluded from FRR.			
2.3.10 Reason for change	a) genuine change? NO			
Is the difference between the	-, gename ananga			
reported value in 2.3.1. and the previous reporting round mainly due to	b) improved knowledge/	more accur	rate data? YES	
,	c) use of different method	od (e.g. "Ra	ange tool")? <i>YES</i>	
2.4 Population				
2.4.1 Population size	a) Unit		individual (class)	
estimation	b) Minimum		1.000.000 (class 11)	
(using individuals or agreed exceptions where possible)	c) Maximum		5.000.000 (class 11)	
2.4.2 Population size estimation (using population	a) Unit ²			
unit other than individuals) Optional (if 2.4.1 filled in)	b) Minimum			
	c) Maximum			
2.4.3 Additional information on population	a) Definition of "local	ity"		
estimates / conversion Optional	b) Method to convert	data	The mean from a number (N=4) of population density measurements was extrapolated to the total area of distribution.	
	c) Problems encounted		The statistical power of the	
	provide population sizestimation	ze	approach used was low for a widely distributed species. Also there can be significant fluctuations in population density depending on the season. 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 p modelling	partial data	with some extrapolation and/or	
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	a) Minimum			

_

 $^{^2}$ 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.

Optional					
	b) Maximum				
	c) Confidence interval				
2.4.9 Short-term trend Method used	1 = Estimate based or	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	Population class 11 (1.	.000.000-5.000.000)			
reference population					
	There were no previous estimations of population. However there are no indications or reports of significant population decline.				
2.4.15 Reason for change	a) genuine change? Y	ES/NO			
Is the difference between the value reported at 2.4.1 or 2.4.2 and the previous	b) improved knowledge/more accurate data? YES/NO				
reporting round mainly due to:	c) use of different method (e.g. "Range tool")? YES/NO				
2.5 Habitat for the species					
2.5.1 Area estimation	3088 km²				
2.5.2 Year or period	2012	partial data with some autramolation and for			
2.5.3 Method used Habitat for the species	modelling	partial data with some extrapolation and/or			
2.5.4 Quality of the	good				
habitat	A widely distributed species using a wide range of habitats, with favourable population and range parameters.				
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	4265 km ²			
for the species				
2.5.10 Reason for change	a) genuine change? YES/NO			
Is the difference between the value reported at 2.5.1 and the	b) improved knowledge/more accurate data? YES/NO c) use of different method (e.g. "Range tool")? YES/NO			
previous reporting round mainly due to				
2.6 Main pressures				
a) Pressure	b) Ranking	c) Pollution qualifier		
A01 Cultivation	- L			
A07 use of biocides, hormones	- L	optional		
and chemicals				
2.6.1 Method used –	1 = based only on expert judgements	3		
Pressures				
2.7 Threats				
a) Threat	b) Ranking	c) Pollution qualifier		
A01 Cultivation	- L	<i>optiona</i> l		
A07 use of biocides, hormones	- L	ориона		
and chemicals				
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	a) Unit	Use same unit as in 2.4		
Estimation of population size included in the network (of the	b) Minimum			
same biogeographical region).	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	3.2.2	3.2.3	3.2.4	3.2.5
3.∠. I	3.2.2		~	3.2.3
Measure	Type	Ranking	Location	Broad evaluation of the
				measure
	Tick the relevant		Tick the relevant	
	case(s)		case concerning	Tick the relevant case
			where the	
			measure is	
			PRIMARILY	
			applied	

	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									

General evaluation matrix (per biogeographical region within a MS)

Parameter		Conse	rvation 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 <u>AND</u> 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		Conse	rvation 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

Field name	Brief explanations			
0.1 Member State	CY			
	0.2.1 Species code	6154		
	0.2.2 Species scientific	Cyrtodactylus kotschyi		
	name	Cyrtodactyrus Kotscriyi		
	0.2.3 Alternative species			
0.2 Species	scientific name	Cyrtopodion kotschyi		
	Optional			
	0.2.4 Common name			
	Optional	Misharos		

1 National Level				
1.1 Maps	Distribution and range within the MS concerned			
1.1.1 Distribution map 1.1.2 Method used - map	Attached shapefiles (grid 10x10) Indicate if species is considered to be 'sensitive' 2 = Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling			
	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)			

 $^{^{\}scriptsize 1}$ 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.			
	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 6ιαχείρισης 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.			
	Τσιαούση Β., Χατζηχαραλάμπους, Ε. & Ιωαννίδης Ι. (συντονιστές έκδοσης). 2007. Σχέδιο Διαχείρισης της περιοχής CY2000003 «Μιτσερό». Ελληνικό Κέντρο Βιοτόπων- Υγροτόπων – Υπηρεσία Περιβάλλοντος. Θέρμη. 146 σελ. + ii Παραρτήματα + 14 Χάρτες.			
	Baier, F., Sparrow, D.J.& Wiedl, H.J. 2009. The Amphibians and Reptile of Cyprus. Edition Chimaira. Pages 364.			
	Michaelides, G. & Kati, V. 2009. Diversity patterns and conservation management of the lizard community in a Mediterranean reserve (Cyprus). Journal of Biological Research –Thessaloniki 12: 211-220.			
2.3 Range	Range within the biogeographical region concerned			
2.3.1 Surface area Range	5762 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	a) Minimum			
Optional	b) Maximum			
2.3.6 Long-term trend Period Optional				
2.3.7 Long-term trend Trend direction	x = unknown			
Optional				

2.3.8 Long-term trend					
Magnitude	a) Minimum				
Optional	b) Maximum				
	·				
2.3.9 Favourable reference range	5640 km ²				
	~				
	A wide ranging speci small area on the mo		area of the country excluding only a as been set as FRR.		
2.3.10 Reason for change	a) genuine change?	NO			
Is the difference between the					
reported value in 2.3.1. and the previous reporting round mainly due to	b) improved knowled	lge/more accu	irate data? <i>YES</i>		
	c) use of different m	ethod (e.g. "R	ange tool")? <i>YES</i>		
2.4 Population					
2.4.1 Population size	a) Unit		individual (class)		
estimation	b) Minimum		500.000 (class 10)		
(using individuals or agreed exceptions where possible)	c) Maximum		1.000.000 (class 10)		
2.4.2 Population size estimation (using population	a) Unit ²				
unit other than individuals) Optional (if 2.4.1 filled in)	b) Minimum				
	c) Maximum				
2.4.3 Additional information on population	a) Definition of "lo	cality"			
estimates / conversion Optional	b) Method to conv	ert data	The mean from a number (N=15) of population density measurements was extrapolated to the total area of distribution.		
	c) Problems encou		The statistical power of the		
	provide population estimation	n size	approach used was low for a widely		
	estimation		distributed species. Also there can be significant fluctuations in		
			population density depending on		
			the season. Expressing the results		
2.4.4. Voor on maria d	2012		as a class was a safer option.		
2.4.4 Year or period 2.4.5 Method used	2012 2 – Estimate based (on nartial data	with some extrapolation and/or		
Population size	2 = Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling				
2.4.6 Short-term trend	2001-2012				
Period					

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.

2.4.7 Short-term trend	0 = stable			
Trend direction				
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 10 (50	00.000-1.000.000)		
		s estimations of population. However, there are ts of significant population decline.		
2.4.15 Reason for change	a) genuine change? Y	-		
Is the difference between the value reported at 2.4.1 or 2.4.2 and the previous	b) improved knowledg	e/more accurate data? YES/NO		
reporting round mainly due to:	c) use of different met	hod (e.g. "Range tool")? YES/NO		
2.5 Habitat for the species				
2.5.1 Area estimation	3176 km ²			
2.5.2 Year or period	2012	control data with an analysis of the second		
2.5.3 Method used Habitat for the species	2 = Estimate based on modelling	partial data with some extrapolation and/or		
2.5.4 Quality of the	good			
habitat	A widely distributed species using a wide range of habitats, with favourable population and range parameters. The preferred microhabitat (rocks or human structures) is widely available throughout the country.			

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	4360 km ²				
for the species					
2.5.10 Reason for change	a) genuine change? YES/NO				
Is the difference between the value reported at 2.5.1 and the	b) improved knowledge/more accurate data? YES/NO				
previous reporting round mainly due to	c) use of different method (e.g. "Range tool")? YES/NO				
due to	c) use of different method (e.g. Kang	ge tool j: 123/140			
2.6 Main pressures					
a) Pressure	b) Ranking	c) Pollution qualifier			
A01 Cultivation	- L				
A07 use of biocides, hormones and chemicals	- L	optional			
A10.02 removal of stone walls	- L				
and embankments	L				
2.6.1 Method used –	1 = based only on expert judgements				
Pressures					
2.7 Threats					
a) Threat	b) Ranking	c) Pollution qualifier			
A01 Cultivation	- L	<i>optiona</i> l			
A07 use of biocides, hormones	- L	<i>οριοπα</i> ι			
and chemicals					
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	Favourable (FV)
Conservation Status	Tavourable (1 v)
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	a) Unit	Use same unit as in 2.4				
Estimation of population size included in the network (of the	b) Minimum					
same biogeographical region).	c) Maximum					
3.1.2 Method used	3 = Complete survey or a statistically 2 = Estimate based on partial data w modelling 1 = Estimate based on expert opinio 0 = Absent data	vith some extrapolation and/or				
3.1.3 Trend of population size within the network (short-term trend) Optional	0 = stable + = increase - = decrease					

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

	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									

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 <u>AND</u> 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	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	range 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

Field name	Brief explanations				
0.1 Member State	CY				
	0.2.1 Species code	1268			
	0.2.2 Species scientific	Ophisops elegans			
	name				
	0.2.3 Alternative species				
0.2 Species	scientific name	Ophisops elegans schlueteri			
	Optional				
	0.2.4 Common name				
	Optional	Alizavra			

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'	-					
1.1.2 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 ea	Complete for each biogeographical region or marine region concerned					
2.1 Biogeographical region &	Mediterranean (MED)					
marine regions						

 $^{^{\}scriptsize 1}$ 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 – Υπροεσία Περιβάλλοντος. Θέσμη. 170 σελ					
	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. Τσιαούση Β., Χατζηχαραλάμπους, Ε. & Ιωαννίδης Ι. (συντονιστές					
	έκδοσης). 2007. Σχέδιο Διαχείρισης της περιοχής CY2000003 «Μιτσερό». Ελληνικό Κέντρο Βιοτόπων- Υγροτόπων – Υπηρεσία Περιβάλλοντος. Θέρμη. 146 σελ. + ii Παραρτήματα + 14 Χάρτες. Baier, F., Sparrow, D.J.& Wiedl, H.J. 2009. The Amphibians and Reptiles					
	of Cyprus. Edition Chimaira. Pages 364. Michaelides, G. & Kati, V. 2009. Diversity patterns and conservation management of the lizard community in a Mediterranean reserve (Cyprus). Journal of Biological Research –Thessaloniki 12: 211-220.					
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					
·	x = unknown				
2.3.7 Long-term trend Trend direction	x = unknown				
Optional					
2.3.8 Long-term trend					
Magnitude	a) Minimum				
Optional	b) Maximum				
2.3.9 Favourable reference range	5640 km²				
Tungo	~				
	A wide ranging speci small area on the mo		area of the country excluding only a s been set as FRR.		
2.3.10 Reason for change	a) genuine change? NO				
Is the difference between the					
reported value in 2.3.1. and the previous reporting round mainly due to	b) improved knowledge/more accurate data? YES				
, 535 5	c) use of different method (e.g. "Range tool")? YES				
2.4 Population					
2.4.1 Population size	a) Unit		individual (class)		
estimation	b) Minimum		5.000.000 (class 12)		
(using individuals or agreed exceptions where possible)	c) Maximum		10.000.000 (class 12)		
2.4.2 Population size estimation (using population	a) Unit ²				
unit other than individuals) Optional (if 2.4.1 filled in)	b) Minimum				
	c) Maximum				
2.4.3 Additional information on population	a) Definition of "lo	ocality"			
estimates / conversion Optional	b) Method to conv	ert data	The mean from a number (N=53) of population density measurements was extrapolated to the total area of 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 encoun provide population sestimation		The statistical power of the approach used was low for a widely distributed species. Also, there can be significant fluctuations in population density depending on the season. 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 modelling	partial data	with some extrapolation and/or				
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 12 (5.	000.000-10.	000.000)				
	There were no previou no indications or repor		s of population. However there are ant population decline.				
2.4.15 Reason for change	a) genuine change? YES/NO						
Is the difference between the value reported at 2.4.1 or	b) improved knowledge/more accurate data? YES/NO						

2.4.2 and the previous reporting round mainly due to:	c) use of different method (e.g. "Ran	ge tool")? YES/NO						
2.5 Habitat for the species								
2.5.1 Area estimation	4711 km ²							
2.5.2 Year or period	2012							
2.5.3 Method used	2 = Estimate based on partial data wi	th some extrapolation and/or						
Habitat for the species	modelling							
2.5.4 Quality of the habitat	good							
Habitat	A widely distributed species using a w favourable population and range para							
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	5560 km ²							
for the species								
2.5.10 Reason for change	a) genuine change? YES/NO							
Is the difference between the value reported at 2.5.1 and the previous reporting round mainly	b) improved knowledge/more accurat	e data? YES/NO						
due to	c) use of different method (e.g. "Rang	ge tool")? YES/NO						
2.6 Main pressures								
a) Pressure	b) Ranking	c) Pollution qualifier						
A01 Cultivation	- L							
A07 use of biocides, hormones and chemicals	- L	optional						
2.6.1 Method used – Pressures	1 = based only on expert judgements							
2.7 Threats								
a) Threat	b) Ranking	c) Pollution qualifier						
A01 Cultivation A07 use of biocides, hormones and chemicals	- L - L 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	a) Unit	Use same unit as in 2.4
Estimation of population size included in the network (of the	b) Minimum	
same biogeographical region).	c) Maximum	
3.1.2 Method used	3 = Complete survey or a statistically 2 = Estimate based on partial data w modelling 1 = Estimate based on expert opinio 0 = Absent data	vith some extrapolation and/or
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									

General evaluation matrix (per biogeographical region within a MS)

Parameter	meter 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