# N. Lachashvili, K. Kereselidze & M. Kikvidze

# The checklist of trees of Georgia (Caucasus) and their provisional regional assessment according to IUCN categories and criteria

#### Abstract

Lachashvili, N., Kereselidze, K. & Kikvidze, M.: The checklist of trees of Georgia (Caucasus) and their provisional regional assessment according to IUCN categories and criteria. — Fl. Medit. 32: 149-189. 2022. — ISSN: 1120-4052 printed, 2240-4538 online.

A checklist of trees distributed in Georgia is presented for the first time. The checklist includes 129 species of vascular plants. They belong to 52 genera and 28 families. Of 129 species 6 are represented by two subspecies and 1 by two varieties. On the whole, the checklist includes 136 taxa. For each taxon (species, subspecies and varieties) a regional, expert based, assessment, according to IUCN criteria, are provided. Regionally (in Georgia) 9 taxa are critically endangered (CR), 4 endangered (EN), 9 vulnerable (VU), and 15 are near threatened (NT). Due to the lack of data, 33 taxa could not be assessed and fell under the category of data definicient. 66 taxa resuleted not endangered so far and have been assigned to the category least concern (LC). References to taxonomy, key synonyms, assessment argumentation and references used in provisional species assessment are given for each taxon.

Key words: conservation, native flora, floristic composition.

#### Introduction

Georgia, despite its small size, is characterized by both floristic and ecosystem diversity. More than 4000 species of vascular plants are distributed here (Davlianidze & al. 2018). In terms of habitat creation, trees occupy a prominent place among them.

In Georgia, trees are distributed in different climate zones from the lowlands to the subalpine belt. They grow on humid, as well as on arid and semi-arid ecotopes, also in wetlands. Accordingly, the trees common in Georgia are represented by species of different bioecology. Due to the above, their floristic composition is rich.

Trees are especially important for maintaining the Earth's ecological balance. In addition, their use is versatile. Therefore, they are under constant anthropogenic pressure (felling, grazing, etc.). Thus, their recording, condition evaluation and assessment, according to the international standarts, are an urgent issue. Despite the above, the composition of trees common in Georgia is still unknown and no checklist exists for them either.

The aim of our research was to compile a checklist of trees of Georgia and to make their regional provisional assessments according to IUCN categories and criteria, which will promote the protection and conservation for this group of plants.

#### Materials and methods

In addition to our own research, the second edition of "Flora of Georgia" (Ketskhoveli 1971-1983; Gagnidze 1985-2011) and the "Nomenclatural checklist of flora of Georgia" (Davlianidze & al. 2018) laid the foundation for the creation of the checklist.

Names and authors of taxa are checked with the international databases: Euro+Med (2006-), The Plant List (2013), GBIF.org (2022), IPNI (2022), POWO (2022), Tropicos.org (2022), WFO (2022). As a result, some of the "narrow" species included in the "Flora of Georgia" (Ketskhoveli 1971-1983; Gagnidze 1985-2011) and the "Nomenclatural checklist of flora of Georgia" (Davlianidze & al. 2018) could not be found in this checklist. These species are given as subspecies or as synonyms.

Provisional taxa assessment and categorization were carried out in accordance with IUCN Red List (2021) criteria. Our assessment of taxa is based on our own research, literary data, results of various concluded and ongoing projects and materials preserved in various herbariums of Georgia (TBI, TGI, BATU). Some taxa are assessed based on the data from the "Red list of the endemic plants of the Caucasus" (Solomon & al. 2013). The verbal information of various researchers is also used.

The calculation of the extent of occurrence (EOO) and the area of occupancy (AOO) of the taxa, the exact distribution coordinates of which we did not have, was carried out on the basis of literature and herbarium data.

# Description of study area

Georgia is located in the central part of Caucasus Ecoregion between latitudes 41°07' and 43°35'N, and longitudes 40°04 'and 46°44' (Fig. 1). Its area is 69,700 km² and hypsometric amplitude ranges from -1 m a.s.l. (Kolkheti lowland) to 5203 m a.s.l. (Mt. Shkhara) (Gobejishvili 2012; Bolashvili & al. 2018).

From a geotectonic point of view, the territory of Georgia belongs to the central part of the Alpine-Himalayan folds (Gobejishvili 2012; Bolashvili & al. 2018).

Georgia is a mountainous country with a diverse and difficult relief. There are three main morphological units: the middle and high mountainous relief of the Caucasus ridge, the intermountain bar and the mountains of southern Georgia (Gobejishvili 2012; Bolashvili & al. 2018).

Georgia is situated on the northern edge of the subtropical climate zone and is under the influence of subtropical, temperate and high-altitude circulatory processes. Despite the small area, almost all types of subtropical climate zones are established on the territory of Georgia, in particular, 23 types of climate are distinguished. Such diversity of climate is due to the location of Georgia and its difficult physical-geographical conditions (Kordzakhia 1961; Gobejishvili 2012; Bolashvili & al. 2018).



Fig. 1. Location of Georgia in the Caucasus Ecoregion.

The territory of Georgia is characterized by diversity of soils. Fourtyeight types of soil are recorded there. Both moist and dry soils are presented. Moist and wet soils of acidic reaction mostly predominate in Western Georgia, while dry alkaline and neutral soils prevail in Eastern Georgia (Urushadze 1999, 2016; Gobejishvili 2012; Bolashvili & al. 2018).

#### Results

129 species of trees, which belong to 52 genera and 28 families of vascular plants, are recorded in Georgia. 6 species are represented by two subspecies and one species by two varieties.

This data does not include non-native trees, which have spread in Georgia for various reasons and in different forms.

It is worth noting that the presented list also includes the species of woody plants, which mainly are shrubs and are rarely found in tree forms. The checklist does not include *Swida armasica* (Sanadze) Gvin., which is not universally taxonomically recognized (Euro+Med 2006-; The Plant List 2013; GBIF.org 2022; IPNI 2022; POWO 2022; Tropicos 2022; WFO 2022).

According to the regional (Georgia) IUCN Red List assessments, 9 taxa are critically endangered (CR), 4 are endangered (EN), 9 are vulnerable (VU), and 15 are close to vulnerable (NT). The endangered taxa are distributed according to IUCN categories as follows:

Critically Endangered (CR) – Arbutus andrachne L., Buxus sempervirens L., Populus euphratica Oliver, Pyrus demetrii Kuth., P. ketzkhovelii Kuth., P. sachokiana Kuth., P. takhtadzhianii Fed., Sorbus caucasica Zinserl., S. hajastana Gabrieljan;

**Endangered (EN)** – *Pinus brutia* Ten. var. *pityusa* (Steven), *Betula megrelica* Sosn., *Pyrus fedorovii* Kuth., *Celtis planchoniana* K.I.Chr.;

**Vulnerable (VU)** – Acer ibericum M. Bieb., A. sosnowskyi Doluch., Betula medwediewii Regel, B. raddeana Trautv., Pistacia atlantica Desf., Quercus pontica K. Koch, Q. robur subsp. imeretina (Steven ex Woronow) Menitsky, Q. robur subsp. pedunculiflora (K. Koch), Zelkova carpinifolia (Pall.) K. Koch;

Near Threatend (NT) – Celtis australis subsp. caucasica (Willd.) C.C. Towns., Crataegus pontica (K. Koch) Menitsky, Juglans regia L., Populus canescens (Aiton) Sm., P. nigra L., Pterocarya pterocarpa (Michx.) Kunth ex I. Iljinsk., Pyrus oxyprion Woronow, Quercus macranthera Fisch. & C.A. Mey. ex Hohen., Salix excelsa S.G. Gmel., S. wilhelmsiana M. Bieb., Sorbus buschiana Zinserl., S. velutina (Albov) Schneid., Ulmus elliptica K. Koch, U. glabra Huds., U. minor Mill.

Due to data deficiency, 33 taxa could not be evaluated and were assigned the category Data Definicient (DD). They are: Abies nordmanniana (Steven) Spach, Acer cappadocicum subsp. divergens (K. Koch ex Pax) A.E. Murray, A. hyrcanum Fisch. & C.A. Mey., A. pseudoplatanus L., A. tataricum L., A. velutinum Boiss., Castanea sativa Mill., Celtis australis L. subsp. australis, Corylus avellana var. pontica (K. Koch) H.J.P.Winkl., C. colurna L., Crataegus caucasica K. Koch, C. pseudoheterophylla Pojark., Cydonia oblonga Mill., Fraxinus angustifolia subsp. oxycarpa (Willd.) Franco & Rocha Afonso, Fraxinus excelsior subsp. coriariifolia (Scheele) A.E.Murray, Laurus nobilis L., Ostrya carpinifolia Scop., Populus alba L., P. hyrcana Grossh., Prunus padus L., Pyrus communis L. subsp. communis (P. balansae Decne.), P. georgica Kuth., Quercus hartwissiana Steven, Salix armeno-rossica A.K. Skvortsov, S. elbursensis Boiss., Sorbus colchica Zinserl., S. fedorovii Zaik., S. turcica Zinserl., Tamarix tetrandra Pall. ex M. Bieb., Taxus baccata L., Tilia cordata Mill., Vitex agnus-castus L., Ziziphus jujuba Mill.

Although most of the trees are under anthropogenic pressure and a significant proportion of them grow in close to extreme environments, most of them (66 taxa) are not endangered and have been assessed as **Least Concern (LC)**.

Below is a checklist of trees distributed in Georgia. Taxa are sorted by families. For each taxon (species and subspecies) the reference to taxonomy, the IUCN Red List category and criteria, the assessment argumentation and the references used in species assessment are given.

## **GYMNOSPERMAE**

**CUPRESSACEAE** 

*Juniperus communis* var. *saxatilis* Pall. (*J. oblonga* M. Bieb.; *J. communis* subsp. *oblonga* (M. Bieb.) Galushko]

References to taxonomy: The Plant List (2013); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Lachashvili (1971); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & al. (2017); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

# Juniperus excelsa M. Bieb. (J. isophyllos K. Koch.)

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Lachashvili & al. (2021); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Lachashvili (1971).

# Juniperus foetidissima Willd.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Ketskhoveli (1960); Lachashvili (1971); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017).

#### **Juniperus oxycedrus** L. (*J. rufescens* Link)

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2021); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Lachashvili (1971); Lachashvili & al. (2004), (2014); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

# Juniperus polycarpos K. Koch [J. excelsa subsp. polycarpos (K. Koch) Takht.]

References to taxonomy: The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Ketskhoveli (1960); Lachashvili (1971); Lachashvili & al. (2004, 2014); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017).

#### *PINACEAE*

# Abies nordmanniana (Steven) Spach

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Ketskhoveli (1960); Lachashvili (1971); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Kvachakidze (1985), (2001); Dolukhanov (2010); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016).

## Picea orientalis (L.) Peterm.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Ketskhoveli (1960); Lachashvili (1971); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Kvachakidze (1985), (2001); Dolukhanov (2010); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016).

*Pinus brutia* var. *pityusa* (Steven) Silba [*P. pityusa* Steven; *P. brutia* subsp. *pityusa* (Steven) Nahal.]

References to taxonomy: The Plant List (2013); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* EN;

Assessment argumentation: the taxon is assessed based on Solomon & al. (2013) [12];

References used in species assessment: Ketskhoveli (1960); Lachashvili (1971); Kvachakidze (2001); Dolukhanov (2010); Solomon & al. (2013).

*Pinus sylvestris* var. *hamata* Steven [*P. kochiana* K. Klotzsch ex K. Koch; *P. sylvestris* subsp. *hamata* (Steven) Fomin; *P. sosnowskyi* Nakai]

References to taxonomy: The Plant List (2013); Lachashvili & al. (2021); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Ketskhoveli (1960); Lachashvili (1971); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Kvachakidze (1985), (2001); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dolukhanov (2010); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Shetekauri (2017).

#### *TAXACEAE*

#### Taxus baccata L.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria*: DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Ketskhoveli (1960); Lachashvili (1971); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Kvachakidze (2001); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Goginashvili & Tvauri (2021).

#### **ANGIOSPERMAE**

DICOTYLEDIONEAE

*ANACARDIACEAE* 

Cotinus coggygria Scop.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Ketskhoveli (1960); Lachashvili 1983a; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili, (1986); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

*Pistacia atlantica* Desf. [*P. mutica* Fisch. & C.A.Mey.; *P. atlantica* subsp. *mutica* (Fisch. & C. A. Mey.) Rech. f.]

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Lachashvili & al. 2020; GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: VU B1 ab (iii);

Assessment argumentation: extent of occurrence - <20000 km², area of occupancy - <2000 km², area – fragmented, number of area fragments – 7, decline in habitat quality caused by cutting and grazing;

References used in species assessment: Ketskhoveli (1960); Lachashvili 1983a; Lachashvili & al. 2020.

## Rhus coriaria L.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Lachashvili 1983a; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

#### *AQUIFOLIACEAE*

# Ilex colchica Pojark.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria*: LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Gagnidze 1983a; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Dmitrieva (1990a); Kvachakidze (2001); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

## **BETULACEAE**

Alnus glutinosa subsp. barbata (C.A. Mey.) Yalt. (A. barbata C.A. Mey.)

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Lachashvili & al. (2021); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Ketskhoveli (1960); Dolokhanov (1975); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Dolukhanov (2010); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

# Alnus incana (L.) Moench

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Dolokhanov (1975); Sakhokia & Khutzishvili (1975); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Shetekauri (2017).

Betula litwinowii Doluch. [B. pubescens var. litwinowii (Doluch.) Ashburner & McAll.] References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected

threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Ketskhoveli (1960); Dolokhanov (1975); Sakhokia & Khutzishvili (1975); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dolukhanov (2010); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017); Shetekauri (2017); I. Akobia's field data (2012-2020) was used to assess the species.

## Betula medwediewii Regel

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: VU Blab (iii);

Assessment argumentation: extent of occurrence - <20000 km², area of occupancy - <2000 km², area – fragmented, decline in habitat quality, caused by cutting and grazing;

References used in species assessment: Dolokhanov (1975); I. Akobia's field data (2012-2020) was used to assess the species.

# Betula megrelica Sosn.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* EN B1ab (iii, v) + 2ab (iii, v);

Assessment argumentation: extent of occurrence - <5000 km², area of occupancy - <500 km², decline in habitat quality, caused by cutting and grazing;

References used in species assessment: Dolokhanov (1975); IUCN (2021);

# Betula pendula Roth

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Ketskhoveli (1960); Dolokhanov (1975); Sakhokia & Khutzishvili (1975); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Lachahsvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017); Shetekauri (2017); I. Akobia's field data (2012-2020) was used to assess the species.

## Betula raddeana Trautv.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* VU B2ab (iii);

Assessment argumentation: extent of occurrence - <20000 km², area of occupancy - <2000 km², area – fragmented, decline in habitat quality, caused by cutting and grazing;

References used in species assessment: Dolokhanov (1975); Sakhokia & Khutzishvili

(1975); Shetekauri (2017); I. Akobia's field data (2012-2020) was used to assess the species.

# **BUXACEAE**

## **Buxus sempervirens** L. (B. colchica Pojark.)

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: CR A2acde;

Assessment argumentation: Population reduction – 95%;

References used in species assessment: Ketskhoveli (1960); Gagnidze (1983b); Dmitrieva (1990a); Matchutadze & al. (2013); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Mitchell & al. (2018); Supatashvili & al. 2019; B. Berdzenishvili's field data (2018)-2020) was used to assess the species.

#### **CELASTRACEAE**

# Euonymus europaeus L.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Gagnidze 1983c; Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017).

## Euonymus latifolius (L.) Mill.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Gagnidze 1983c; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

## Euonymus leiophloeus Steven

References to taxonomy: Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Davlianidze & al. (2018); Lachashvili & al. (2021); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Gagnidze 1983c; Dmitrieva (1990a); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017).

#### **CORNACEAE**

Cornus iberica Woronow [Swida iberica (Woronow) Pojark. ex Grossh.]

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Lachashvili & al. (2021); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Ghviniashvili 1984; Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017).

# Cornus mas L.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Ghviniashvili 1984; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017).

Cornus sanguinea subsp. australis (C. A. Mey.) Jav. [C. australis C. A. Mey.; Swida australis (C.A. Mey.) Pojark. ex Grossh.; S. koenigii (C. K. Schneid.) Pojark. ex Grossh.]

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Lachashvili & al. (2021); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Ghviniashvili 1984; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017).

## **CORYLACEAE**

Carpinus betulus L. (C. caucasica Grossh.)

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Lachashvili & al. (2021); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Ketskhoveli (1960); Kemularia-Natadze (1975)a; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Kvachakidze (2001); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Dolukhanov (2010); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

# Carpinus orientalis Mill.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Ketskhoveli (1960); Kemularia-Natadze (1975)a; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Kvachakidze (2001); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Dolukhanov (2010); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017).

# Corylus avellana L. var. avellana

References to taxonomy: Güner (2012); GBIF.org (2022); POWO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Kemularia-Natadze (1975)a; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Kvachakidze (2001); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

Corylus avellana var. pontica (K. Koch) H.J.P.Winkl. (C. imeretica Kem.-Nath.; C. pontica K. Koch)

References to taxonomy: Güner (2012); The Plant List (2013); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: kemularia-Natadze (1975)a; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985).

Corylus colurna L. (C. iberica Wittm. ex Kem.-Nath.; C. kachetica Kem.-Nath.)

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria*: DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: kemularia-Natadze (1975)a; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

## Ostrva carpinifolia Scop.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: kemularia-Natadze (1975)a; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016).

#### **EBENACEAE**

# Diospyros lotus L.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Kutateladze (1985)a; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986).

# **ELAEAGNACEAE**

## Elaeagnus angustifolia L.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Lachashvili 1984; Lachashvili & al. (2007); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017).

# Hippophae rhamnoides L. [Elaeagnus rhamnoides (L.) A.Nelson]

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected

threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Sakhokia & Khutzishvili (1975); Lachashvili 1984; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

#### *ERICACEAE*

# Arbutus andrachne L.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: CR B2 ab (iii, v);

Assessment argumentation: area – fragmented, number of area fragments – 2, decline in habitat quality, caused by cutting and grazing;

References used in species assessment: Gagnidze (1985)a; Dmitrieva (1990b); Goginashvili & al. (2018); Aliev & al. 2020.

Note: the authors of the article (N. Lachashvili, K. Kereselidze and M. Kikvidze) categorically distances from mentioning the integral part of Georgia - Abkhazia - as an independent state in the certified article (Aliev & al. 2020) and protest against the mentioned scientific journal.

# Vaccinium arctostaphylos L.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Gagnidze (1985)b; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990b); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017).

# *FAGACEAE*

## Castanea sativa Mill.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Ketskhoveli (1960); Gagnidze (1975); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Kvachakidze (2001); Dolukhanov (2010); Tavadze & al. (2013).

# Fagus orientalis Lipsky

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Ketskhoveli (1960); Gagnidze (1975); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Kvachakidze (2001); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Dolukhanov (2010); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

## Ouercus hartwissiana Steven

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Gagnidze (1975); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Dmitrieva (1990a); Dolukhanov (2010); Matchutadze & al. (2013).

## *Quercus macranthera* Fisch. & C.A. Mey. ex Hohen.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* NT;

Assessment argumentation: the species assessment data are approximate to VU category parameters and/or likely to be close to it in the future;

References used in species assessment: Ketskhoveli (1960); Gagnidze (1975); Sakhokia & Khutzishvili (1975); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Kvachakidze (2001); Dolukhanov (2010); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

**Quercus petraea** subsp. **iberica** (Steven ex M.Bieb.) Krassiln. (*Q. iberica* Steven ex M. Bieb.; *Q. dshorochensis* K. Koch)

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); Güner, 2012; The Plant List (2013); Lachashvili & al. (2021); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Ketskhoveli (1960); Gagnidze (1975); Sakhokia & Khutzishvili (1975); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Kvachakidze (2001);

Lachashvili & al. (2007); Dolukhanov (2010); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

## Quercus pontica K. Koch

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: VU B2ab (iii);

Assessment argumentation: extent of occurrence - <20000 km², area of occupancy - <2000 km², the species is assessed based on Solomon & al. (2013);

References used in species assessment: Gagnidze (1975); Dmitrieva (1990a); Solomon & al. (2013).

Quercus robur subsp. imeretina (Woronow) Menitsky (Q. imeretina Woronow)

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: VU B2ab (iii);

Assessment argumentation: extent of occurrence - <20000 km², area of occupancy - <2000 km², the taxon is assessed based on Solomon & al. (2013);

References used in species assessment: Gagnidze (1975); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Dmitrieva (1990a); Dolukhanov (2010); Solomon & al. (2013); Goginashvili & Tvauri (2021).

Quercus robur subsp. pedunculiflora (K. Koch) Menitsky (Q. pedunculiflora K. Koch) References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: VU Blab (I, ii, iii);

Assessment argumentation: extent of occurrence - <20000 km², area of occupancy - <2000 km², area – fragmented, decline in habitat quality, caused by cutting and grazing;

References used in species assessment: Gagnidze (1975); Sakhokia & Khutzishvili (1975); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Dolukhanov (2010); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Goginashvili & Tvauri (2011).

## JUGLANDACEAE

#### Juglans regia L.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: NT;

Assessment argumentation: the species assessment data are approximate to VU category parameters and/or likely to be close to it in the future;

References used in species assessment: Ketskhoveli (1960); kemularia-Natadze (1975)b; Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Lachashvili & al. (2007).

Pterocarya pterocarpa (Michx.) Kunth ex I. Iljinsk. [Juglans pterocarpa Michx.] References to taxonomy: Güner (2012); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* NT;

Assessment argumentation: the species assessment data are approximate to VU category parameters and/or likely to be close to it in the future;

References used in species assessment: Ketskhoveli (1960); Kemularia-Natadze (1975)b; Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Dolukhanov (2010).

## LAMIACEAE

## Vitex agnus-castus L.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Lachashvili (1985).

#### **LAURACEAE**

#### Laurus nobilis L.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: kemularia-Natadze (1973); Dmitrieva (1990a).

#### MALVACEAE (TILIACEAE)

*Tilia begoniifolia* Steven [*T. caucasica* Rupr.; *T. rubra* subsp. *caucasica* (Rupr.) V. Engl.; *Tilia dasystyla* subsp. *caucasica* (V. Engl.) Pigott]

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); Lachashvili & al. (2021); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Cholokashvili 1983; Gagnidze & al. (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

#### Tilia cordata Mill.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria*: DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of

occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Cholokashvili 1983; Shetekauri (2017); Goginashvili & Tvauri (2021).

#### **MORACEAE**

#### Ficus carica L.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Shkhian (1975)a; Lachashvili & al. (2007); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017).

#### **OLEACEAE**

Fraxinus angustifolia subsp. oxycarpa (Willd.) Franco & Rocha Afonso (F. oxycarpa Willd.) References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Lachashvili & al. (2021); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Kutateladze (1985)b; Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017).

Fraxinus excelsior subsp. coriariifolia (Scheele) A.E.Murray (F. coriariifolia Scheele) References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Kutateladze (1985)b; Lachashvili & al. (2007).

# Fraxinus excelsior L. subsp. excelsior

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Ketskhoveli (1960); Sakhokia & Khutzishvili (1975); Kutateladze (1985)b; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Gagnidze & al.

(1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Kvachakidze (2001); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

#### RHAMNACEAE

# Frangula alnus Mill.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Mukbaniani 1983; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze, (1985); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

#### Rhamnus cathartica L.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Mukbaniani 1983; Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

## Ziziphus jujuba Mill.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Mukbaniani 1983.

## ROSACEAE

## Crataegus caucasica K. Koch

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Mukbaniani 1980; Lachashvili & al. (2007); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017).

# Crataegus kyrtostyla Fingerh. (C. monogyna Jacq.)

References to taxonomy: The Plant List (2013); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Davlianidze & al. (2018); Lachashvili & al. (2021); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Sakhokia & Khutzishvili (1975); Mukbaniani 1980; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Lachahsvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

# Crataegus meyeri Pojark.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Mukbaniani 1980; Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017).

## Crataegus orientalis Pall. ex M. Bieb.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Mukbaniani 1980; Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017).

# Crataegus pentagyna Waldst. & Kit. ex Willd.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Sakhokia & Khutzishvili (1975); Mukbaniani 1980; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Lachashvili &

Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017).

# Crataegus pontica K. Koch [C. azarolus var. pontica (K.Koh) K.I.Chr.]

References to taxonomy: Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Davlianidze & al. (2018); Lachashvili & al. (2021); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* NT;

Assessment argumentation: the species assessment data are approximate to VU category parameters and/or likely to be close to it in the future;

References used in species assessment: Mukbaniani 1980; Mardaleishvili & Tskhadadze 2003; Lachashvili & al. (2017); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017).

# Crataegus pseudoheterophylla Pojark.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria*: DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Mukbaniani 1980; Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017).

# Cydonia oblonga Mill.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Kutateladze 1980a; Lachahsvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017).

# *Malus orientalis* Uglitzk. [*M. sylvestris* subsp. *orientalis* (Uglitzk.) Browicz]

References to taxonomy: Plant List (2013); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Davlianidze & al. (2018); Lachashvili & al. (2021); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Sakhokia & Khutzishvili (1975); Kutateladze & 1980b; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Lachahsvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

# Mespilus germanica L. [Crataegus germanica (L.) Kintze]

References to taxonomy: The Plant List (2013); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Davlianidze & al. (2018); Lachashvili & al. (2021); GBIF.org (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Kutateladze 1980c; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Lachahsvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017).

# Prunus avium (L.) L. [Cerasus avium (L.) Moench; C. silvestris Garsault]

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2021); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Sakhokia & Khutzishvili (1975); Ghvinianidze 1980a; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

# Prunus divaricata Ledeb. (P. cerasifera Ehrh.)

References to taxonomy: Güner (2012); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Davlianidze & al. (2018); Lachashvili & al. (2021);

IUCN red list category and criteria: LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Sakhokia & Khutzishvili (1975); Ghvinianidze 1980b; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

# **Prunus laurocerasus** L. (Laurocerasus officinalis M. Roem.)

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Lachashvili & al. (2021); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Ghvinianidze 1980c; Gagnidze & Kemularia-

Natadze (1985); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Lachahsvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017).

# Prunus mahaleb L. subsp. mahaleb [Cerasus mahaleb (L.) Mill.]

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2021); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Ghvinianidze 1980a; Lachashvili & al. (2007); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017).

# Prunus padus L. (Padus avium Mill.)

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant list (2013); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Sakhokia & Khutzishvili (1975); Ghvinianidze 1980d; Gagnidze & al. (1985); Lachahsvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Shetekauri (2017).

# Pyrus communis subsp. caucasica (Fed.) Browicz

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria*: LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Sakhokia & Khutzishvili (1975); Kutateladze 1980d; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

# Pyrus communis L. subsp. communis (Pyrus balansae Decne.)

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Kutateladze 1980d; Dmitrieva (1990a).

## Pvrus demetrii Kuth.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria*: CR D;

Assessment argumentation: extent of occurrence – 309 km², area of occupancy – 28 km², area – fragmented, number of area fragments – 7, decline in habitat quality caused by land use and grazing;

References used in species assessment: Kutateladze 1980d; Goginashvili & Tvauri (2011); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017); K. Kereselidze's field data (2019-2020) was used to assess the species.

# Pyrus fedorovii Kuth.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: EN Blab (iii, v);

Assessment argumentation: extent of occurrence – 529 km², area of occupancy - < 500 km², area – fragmented, number of area fragments – 4, decline in habitat quality caused by land use and grazing;

References used in species assessment: Makashvili 1952; Kutateladze 1980d; Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017).

## Pyrus georgica Kuth.

References to taxonomy: The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Kutateladze 1980d; Lachashvili & al. (2007); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017).

## Pyrus ketzkhovelii Kuth.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria*: CR B2ab (iii);

Assessment argumentation: extent of occurrence – <100 km², area of occupancy - <10 km², number of area fragments – 1, decline in habitat quality, caused by land use and grazing;

References used in species assessment: Kutateladze 1980d; Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017); K. Kereselidze's field data (2019-2020) was used to assess the species.

## **Pyrus oxyprion** Woronow

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: NT;

Assessment argumentation: the species assessment data are approximate to VU category parameters and / or likely to be close to it in the future;

References used in species assessment: Kutateladze 1980d; Lachashvili & al. (2007).

# Pyrus sachokiana Kuth.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* CR D;

Assessment argumentation: extent of occurrence – 6778 km², area of occupancy – 20 km², area – fragmented, number of area fragments – 5, decline in habitat quality caused by land use and grazing; Number of mature individuals – 29;

References used in species assessment: Kutateladze 1980d; Lachashvili & al. (2007); Goginashvili & Tvauri (2011); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); K. Kereselidze's field data (2019-2020) was used to assess the species.

# Pyrus salicifolia Pall.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Kutateladze (1980d); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017).

## Pyrus takhtadzhianii Fed.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria*: CR B1ab (iii) + 2ab (iii);

Assessment argumentation: extent of occurrence - < 100 km², area of occupancy - <10 km², area – fragmented, decline in habitat quality, caused by cutting and grazing; References used in species assessment: Kutateladze 1980d.

Sorbus aucuparia L. (S. boissieri Schneid.; S. caucasigena Kom. ex Gatsch.)

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Kutateladze (1980e); Sakhokia & Khutzishvili (1975); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

#### Sorbus buschiana Zinserl.

References to taxonomy: The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); WFO (2022); IUCN red list category and criteria: NT;

Assessment argumentation: the species assessment data are approximate to VU category parameters and/or likely to be close to it in the future;

References used in species assessment: Sakhokia & Khutzishvili (1975); Kutateladze (1980e); Shetekauri (2017).

#### Sorbus caucasica Zinserl.

References to taxonomy: Güner (2012); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: CR B2 ab (iv);

Assessment argumentation: extent of occurrence - <100 km², area of occupancy - <10 km², number of area fragments – 1; poor regeneration ability, continuing decline in mature individuals; *References used in species assessment:* Kutateladze (1980e); Sakhokia & Khutzishvili (1975); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); K. Kereselidze's field data (2019-2020) was used to assess the species.

# Sorbus colchica Zinserl. [Aira colchica (Zinserl.) Mezhenskyj]

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); Tropicos.org (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Kutateladze (1980e); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Dmitrieva (1990a).

## Sorbus fedorovii Zaik.

References to taxonomy: The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); WFO (2022); IUCN red list category and criteria: DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Kutateladze (1980e); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a).

# Sorbus graeca (Spach) Lodd. ex Schauer [Aira graeca (Spach) M. Roem.]

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); Güner (2012); The Plant List (2013); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Davlianidze & al. (2018); Lachashvili & al. (2021); Tropicos.org (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Kutateladze (1980e); Sakhokia & Khutzishvili (1975); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

# Sorbus hajastana Gabrieljan

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: CR B1ab (iii) + 2ab (iii); CR D;

Assessment argumentation: extent of occurrence - <100 km², area of occupancy - 4 km², number of area fragments – 1, decline in habitat quality, caused by cutting and grazing; *References used in species assessment:* Shetekauri (2017).

# Sorbus subfusca (Ledeb. ex Nordm.) Boiss.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Kutateladze (1980e); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Shetekauri (2017).

# Sorbus torminalis (L.) Crantz. [Torminalis glaberrima (Gand.) Sennikov & Kurtto]

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); Güner (2012); The Plant List (2013); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Davlianidze & al. (2018); Lachashvili & al. (2021); Tropicos.org (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Kutateladze (1980e); Sakhokia & Khutzishvili (1975); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017).

# Sorbus turcica Zinserl. [Aria umbellata (Desf.) Sennikov & Kurtto]

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); Güner (2012); The Plant List (2013); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Davlianidze & al. (2018); Lachashvili & al. (2021); Tropicos.org (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Kutateladze (1980e).

# Sorbus velutina (Albov) C.K. Schneid.

References to taxonomy: The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); WFO (2022); IUCN red list category and criteria: NT;

Assessment argumentation: the species assessment data are approximate to VU category parameters and/or likely to be close to it in the future;

References used in species assessment: Kutateladze (1980e).

# *SALICACEAE*

Populus alba L. [P. nivea (Aiton) Willd.; P. pseudonivea Grossh.]

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Shkhian (1973); Makashvili 1952.

# Populus canescens (Aiton) Sm.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: NT;

Assessment argumentation: the species assessment data are approximate to VU category parameters and/or likely to be close to it in the future;

References used in species assessment: Ketskhoveli (1960); Shkhian (1973); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017).

# Populus euphratica Oliver

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: CR Blab (v) + B2ab (v);

Assessment argumentation: extent of occurrence -  $<100 \text{ km}^2$ , area of occupancy -  $<10 \text{ km}^2$ , number of area fragments -1;

References used in species assessment: Shkhian (1973); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Goginashvili & Tvauri (2011), (2021).

# Populus hyrcana Grossh.

References to taxonomy: Solomon & al. (2013); The Plants list (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Shkhian (1973); Solomon & al. (2013).

## Populus nigra L.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: NT;

Assessment argumentation: the species assessment data are approximate to VU category parameters and/or likely to be close to it in the future;

References used in species assessment: Ketskhoveli (1960); Shkhian (1973); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017).

# Populus tremula L.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Shkhian (1973); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990b); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

## Salix alba L. subsp. alba

References to taxonomy: Güner (2012); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); IUCN red list category and criteria: LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Shkhian (1973); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017).

# Salix alba subsp. micans (Andersson) Rech. f.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Shkhian (1973); Makashvili 1952; Gagnidze & al. (1985); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Dmitrieva (1990b); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017).

## Salix armeno-rossica A.K. Skvortsov

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Shkhian (1973); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016).

# Salix caprea L.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria*: LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Shkhian (1973); Sakhokia & Khutzishvili (1975); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Dmitrieva (1990b); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

#### Salix elbursensis Boiss.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, number of mature individuals, tendency of their decline in numbers, quality of habitat, etc.);

References used in species assessment: Shkhian (1973); Sakhokia & Khutzishvili (1975); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

#### Salix excelsa S.G. Gmel.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: NT;

Assessment argumentation: the species assessment data are approximate to VU category parameters and/or likely to be close to it in the future;

References used in species assessment: Shkhian (1973); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

## *Salix pentandroides* A.K. Skvortsov

References to taxonomy: The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Shkhian (1973); Sakhokia & Khutzishvili (1975); Gagnidze & al. (1985); Shetekauri (2017).

#### Salix triandra L.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Shkhian (1973); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017).

#### Salix wilhelmsiana M. Bieb.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* NT;

Assessment argumentation: the species assessment data are approximate to VU category parameters and/or likely to be close to it in the future;

References used in species assessment: Shkhian (1973); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017).

## SAPINDACEAE (ACERACEAE)

## Acer campestre L.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Lachashvili (1983b); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

# Acer cappadocicum Gled. subsp. cappadocicum (A. laetum C.A. Mey.)

References to taxonomy: Güner (2012); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2021); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: LC

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable.

References used in species assessment: Lachashvili (1983b); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Shetekauri (2017).

*Acer cappadocicum* subsp. *divergens* (K. Koch ex Pax) A.E.Murray (*A. divergens* K. Koch & Pax)

References to taxonomy: Güner (2012); The Plant list (2013); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Lachashvili (1983b).

# Acer hyrcanum Fisch. & C.A. Mey

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (220); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Lachashvili (1983b); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016).

Acer ibericum M. Bieb. [A. monspessulanum subsp. ibericum (M. Bieb. ex Willd.) Yalt.] References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); Davlianidze & al. (2018); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2021);

*IUCN red list category and criteria*: VU B1 ab (iii, v);

Assessment argumentation: extent of occurrence - <20000 km², area of occupancy - <2000 km², area – fragmented, decline in habitat quality caused by cutting and grazing;

References used in species assessment: Lachashvili (1983b); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Goginashvili & Tvauri (2011), (2021); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017).

# Acer platanoides L.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Lachashvili (1983b); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Lachahsvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Shetekauri (2017).

## Acer pseudoplatanus L.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria*: DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of

occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Lachashvili (1983b); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Lachahsvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a).

## Acer sosnowskyi Doluch.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: VU D2;

Assessment argumentation: the species is assessed based on Solomon & al. (2013);

References used in species assessment: Lachashvili (1983b); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Solomon & al. (2013).

#### Acer tataricum L.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria*: DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Lachashvili (1983b); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985).

# Acer trautvetteri Medw. [A. heldreichii subsp. trautvetteri (Medw.) A.E.Murray]

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Davlianidze & al. (2018); Lachashvili & al. (2021);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Ketskhoveli (1960); Lachashvili (1983b); Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Lachahsvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Kvachakidze (2001); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

#### Acer velutinum Boiss.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Lachashvili (1983b); Lachahsvili & Mamukelashvili (1986).

#### STAPHYLEACEAE

# Staphylea colchica Steven

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Gagnidze 1983d; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Dmitrieva (1990a).

# Staphylea pinnata L.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Gagnidze 1983d; Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017).

#### **TAMARICACEAE**

#### Tamarix ramosissima Ledeb.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Khintibidze 1983; Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Lachashvili & al. (2017).

## *Tamarix smyrnensis* Bunge (*T. hohenackeri* Bunge)

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Khintibidze 1983; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017).

#### Tamarix tetrandra Pall. ex M. Bieb.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Khintibidze 1983.

#### *ULMACEAE*

#### Celtis australis L. subsp. australis

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); Güner (2012); The Plant List (2013); GBIF.org (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* DD;

Assessment argumentation: data deficient (unknown extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, continuing decline in quality of habitat etc.);

References used in species assessment: Shkhian (1975)b; Dmitrieva (1990b).

# Celtis australis subsp. caucasica (Willd.) C.C. Towns. (C. caucasica Willd.)

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); Güner (2012); The Plant List (2013); Lachashvili & al. (2021); GBIF.org (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* NT;

Assessment argumentation: the species assessment data are approximate to VU category parameters and/or likely to be close to it in the future;

References used in species assessment: Shkhian (1975)b; Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017).

# Celtis planchoniana K.I.Chr. (C. glabrata Stev. ex Planch.)

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); Güner (2012); The Plant List (2013); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2021); GBIF.org (2022); WFO (2022); IUCN red list category and criteria: EN B1ab (iii);

Assessment argumentation: extent of occurrence - <5000 km², area of occupancy - <5000 km², area – fragmented, decline in habitat quality, caused by cutting and grazing;

References used in species assessment: Shkhian (1975)b; Lachashvili & al. (2007); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017).

## Ulmus elliptica K. Koch

References to taxonomy: The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* NT;

Assessment argumentation: the species assessment data are approximate to VU category parameters and/or likely to be close to it in the future;

References used in species assessment: Shkhian (1975)c; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Dmitrieva (1990b); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

# Ulmus glabra Huds.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* NT;

Assessment argumentation: the species assessment data are approximate to VU category parameters and/or likely to be close to it in the future;

References used in species assessment: Shkhian (1975)c; Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990b); Goginashvili & Tvauri (2011), (2021).

Ulmus minor Mill. (U. foliacea Gilib., U. suberosa Moench, U. georgica Schchian)

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: NT;

Assessment argumentation: the species assessment data are approximate to VU category parameters and/or likely to be close to it in the future;

References used in species assessment: Shkhian (1975)c; Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990b); Lachashvili & al. (2007); Dolukhanov (2010); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Goginashvili & Tvauri (2011).

# Zelkova carpinifolia (Pall.) K. Koch

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria*: VU Blab (iii);

Assessment argumentation: extent of occurrence - 7000 km², area of occupancy - <2000 km², area – fragmented, decline in habitat quality, caused by cutting and grazing;

References used in species assessment: Ketskhoveli (1960); Shkhian (1975)c; Kvachakidze (2021); Lomidze & al. 2020.

#### **VIBURNACEAE**

## Sambucus nigra L.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

IUCN red list category and criteria: LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Kutateladze (2001); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017).

## Viburnum opulus L.

References to taxonomy: Euro+Med (2006-); The Plant List (2013); Davlianidze & al. (2018); GBIF.org (2022); IPNI (2022); POWO (2022); WFO (2022);

*IUCN red list category and criteria:* LC;

Assessment argumentation: at the current stage, neither the existing nor the expected threats to the species (extent of occurrence, area of occupancy, the number of mature individuals and the tendency of their decline in numbers, etc.) are noticeable;

References used in species assessment: Gagnidze & Kemularia-Natadze (1985); Lachashvili & Mamukelashvili (1986); Dmitrieva (1990a); Kutateladze (2001); Shetekauri & Chelidze (2016); Lachashvili & Eradze (2017); Lachashvili & al. (2017); Shetekauri (2017).

#### General conclusion

Trees spread in Georgia are presented by 129 species. They belong to 52 genera and 28 families of vascular plants. Six species are presented by two subspecies and 1 species by two varieties.

According to the regional assessment (Georgia) 9 species are critically endangered (CR), 4 taxa - endangered (EN), 9 - vulnerable (VU), and 15 are near threatened (NT). Due to the lack of data, 33 taxa could not be assessed and fell under the category of data definicient. 66 taxa are not endangered at present and have been assigned the category least concern.

#### Acknowledgements

Taxa assessment and categorization were conducted in the framework of a broader "Georgian Red List Update Project" supported by GIZ Tbilisi Office and coordinated by Ilia State University.

We would like to thank I. Akobia, K. Batsatsashvili, B. Berdzenishvili, N. Eradze, N. Goginashvili, D. Kharazishvili, Z. Manvelidze, N. Memiadze and V. Metreveli for their support and consultation in assessing some of the species.

Special thanks to Ms. Manana Khutsishvili, the Head of the Georgian National Herbarium of Ilia State University and its staff members Ms. Marina Chiboshvili and Ms. Rusudan Iamanidze for their assistance during the data collection.

We would like to thank Mr. Nikoloz Kvaliashvili for providing us with the maps.

## References

Aliev, Kh. U., Tuniyev, B. S., Timukhin, I. N., Taniya, I. V. 2020: Geobotanical and population characteristics of *Arbutus andrachne* L. in Abkhazia. – Bull. of the State Nikita Botan. Gard. **135**: 24-38. https://doi.org/10.36305/0513-1634-2020-135-24-38

Bolashvili, N, Dittmann A., King, L., & Neidze, V. (eds) 2018: National atlas of Georgia. – Stuttgart. Cholokashvili, N. 1983: *Tiliaceae.* – Pp. 279-284 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., 8. – Tbilisi [in Georgian].

Davlianidze, M., Gviniashvili, Ts., Mukbaniani, M., Jinjolia-Imnadze, L. & Jugheli, T. 2018: Nomenclatural checklist of flora of Georgia. – Tbilisi.

Dmitrieva, A. A. 1990a: Opredelitel' rasteniy Adzharii, 2° ed., 1. – Tbilisi [in Russian].

— 1990b: Opredelitel' rasteniy Adzharii, 2° ed., 2. – Tbilisi [in Russian].

Dolokhanov, A. 1983b: Betulaceae. – Pp. 12-27 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora,  $2^{\circ}$  ed., III. – Tbilisi [in Georgian].

— 2010: Lesnaya rastitel'nost' Gruzii. – Tbilisi [in Russian].

- Euro+Med 2006-: Euro+Med PlantBase the information resource for Euro-Mediterranean plant diversity. Published on the Internet http://www2.bgbm.org/EuroPlusMed/ [12/03/2022].
- Gagnidze, R. (ed.) 1985-2011: Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., 10-14. Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 1975: *Fagaceae*. Pp. 40-66 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **3.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 1983a: *Aquifoliaceae*. Pp. 213-219 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **8.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 1983b: *Buxaceae.* Pp. 207-205 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **8.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 1983c: *Celastraceae*. Pp. 220-229 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **8.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 1983d: *Staphyleaceae*. Pp. 230-233 in: Gagnidze, R. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **7.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 1985a: *Arbutus*. Pp. 35-36 in: Gagnidze, R. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **10.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 1985b: *Vaccinaceae*. Pp. 38-42 in: Gagnidze, R. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **10.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- & Kemularia-Natadze, L. M. 1985: Botanical geography and flora of Racha-Lechkhumi (Western Georgia). Tbilisi [in Russian].
- —, Mtskhvetadze, D., Mukbaniani, M. & Chelidze, D. 1985: Svanetis botanikuri geograpia da floris konspekti. Pp. 3-115 in: Nakhutsrishvili, G., Gagnidze, R., Nakhutsrishvili, I., Chanishvili, Sh. & Chikvaidze, J. (eds), Proceedings of N. Ketskhoveli Institute of Botany, 30. Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- GBIF.org 2022: GBIF Home Page. Available from: https://www.gbif.org [Last accessed 12/03/2022].
- Ghvinianidze, Z. 1980a: *Cerasus*. Pp. 301-306 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **6.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 1980b: *Prunus*. Pp. 295-298 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **6.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 1980c: *Laurocerasus*. Pp. 306-308 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **6.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 1980d: *Padus*. Pp. 308-309 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **6.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- Ghviniashvili, Ts. 1984: *Cornaceae*. Pp. 326-333 in: Gagnidze, R. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **9.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- Gobejishvili, R. 2012: National Atlas of Georgia. Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- Goginashvili, N. & Tvauri, I. (2021): Inventory of forest genetic resources in Georgia. Tbilisi.
- & 2011: Tq'is genetikuri resursebis shests'avlisatvis. Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- —, —, Manvelidze, Z., Memiadze, N., Asanidze, Z. & Ghambashidze, G. (2018): Ach'aris tq'is ishviati merkniani sakheobebis inventarizatsiis masalebi. Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- Güner, A. (Ed.-in-Chief) 2012: Türkiye bitkileri listesi. Damarli bitkiler. Istanbul [in Türkish].
- IPNI 2022: International Plant Names Index. Published on the Internet http://www.ipni.org, The Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Harvard University Herbaria & Libraries and Australian National Botanic Gardens. [Last accessed 10/3/2022].
- IUCN 2021: The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version (2021)-3. https://www.iucnredlist.org. [Last accessed 13/3/2022]
- kemularia-Natadze, L. 1973: *Lauraceae*. Pp. 175-176 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **2.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 1975a: *Corylaceae.* Pp. 28-40 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **3.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].

- 1975b: *Juglandaceae*. Pp. 9-12 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **3.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.) 1971-1983: Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., 1-9. Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 1960: Sagartvelos mtsenareuli sapari Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- Khintibidze, L. 1983: *Tamaricaceae*. Pp. 338-348 in: Gagnidze, R. (ed.), Flora of Georgia, 2° ed., 7. Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- Kordzakhia, M. 1961: Sakartvelos hava. Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- Kutateladze, Sh. 1980a: *Cydonia*. Pp. 32-34 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **6**. Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 1980b: *Malus*. Pp. 48-49 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **6.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 1980c: *Mespilus*. Pp. 79-81 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **6.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 1980d: *Pyrus*. Pp. 34-48 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **6.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 1980e: *Surbus*. Pp. 49-74 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **6.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 1985a: *Ebenaceae*. Pp. 105-106 in: Gagnidze, R. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **10.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 1985b: *Oleaceae*. Pp. 106-118 in: Gagnidze, R. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **10.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 2001: *Caprifoliaceae*. Pp. 26-49 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **13.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- Kvachakidze, R. 1985: Svanetis maghalmtis tq'eebi. Pp. 180-202 in: Nakhutsrishvili, G., Gagnidze, R., Nakhutsrishvili, I., Chanishvili, Sh. & Chikvaidze, J. (eds), Proceedings of N. Ketskhoveli Institute of Botani, 30. Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 2001: Forests of Georgia. Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- Lachashvili, J. 1971: *Gymnospermae*. Pp. 115-148 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., 1. Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 1983a: *Anacardiaceae*. Pp. 233-254 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **8.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 1983b: *Aceraceae.* Pp.233-254 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **8.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 1984: *Elaeagnaceae*. Pp. 60-66 in: Gagnidze, R. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **9.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 1985: *Verbenaceae*. Pp. 304-310 in: Gagnidze, R. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **10.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- -, Lachashvili N., Khachidze M. 2007: Conspectus of flora of Kiziki (East Georgia). Tbilisi.
- & Mamukelashvili, G. 1986: Lagodekhis sakhelmts'ipo nakrdzalis floris konspekti. Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- Lachashvili, N. & Eradze, N. 2017: Trees and Shrubs of Tbilisi Environs (East Georgia, South Caucasus). Tbilisi.
- —, & Kereselidze, K. 2021: Systematic structure and florogenetic connections of dendroflora of Tbilisi area (South Caucasus). Fl. Medit. **31:** 135-152. https://doi.org/10.7320/FlMedit31.135
- —, & Khetsuriani, L. D. 2017: Conspectus of trees and shrubs of Tbilisi environs (East Georgia, South Caucasus). J. Ann. Agrar. Sci. **15(1)**: 118-129.
- —, & 2020: Floristic composition of pistachio-woodland (*Pistacieta atlantici*) of Georgia (South Caucasus). Fl. Medit. **30:** 39-53. https://doi.org/10.7320/FlMedit30.039

- Khachidze, M. & Iashaghashvili, K. 2004: Typology of the juniper communitens of Iori plateau.
   Proc. Georg. Acad. Sci. Biol., Ser. B, 2(1-2): 55-64.
- —, —, Khetsuriani, L. D., Eradze, N. V. (2014): Commuties of juniper forest (Junipereta; J. foetidissima, J. polycarpos) in Shida Kartli (East Georgia, South Caucasus). J. Ann. Agrar. Sci. 12(2): 49-65.
- Lomidze, J., Khmaladze, S., Barblishvili, T., Tavartkiladze, K., Berdzenishvili, B., Lomidze, B. 2020: A new population of *Zelkova carpinifolia* (Pall.) K. Koch in environs of Tbilisi characteristics of the species growth, regeneration and soil conditions of the site. J. Ann. Agrar. Sci. **18**(4): 500-506.
- Makashvili, A. 1952: Tbilisis midamoebis flora, 1. Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- Mardaleishvili, T., Tskhadadze, N. 2003: Rare stands of Pontic Hawthorn (*Crataegus pontica* C. Koch) in the environs of Tbilisi. Pp. 88-92 in: Kereselidze, J., Tsitsvidze, A., Chkuaseli, T., Gvritishvili, M., Tugushi, K. & Elbakidze M. (eds), Proceedings of Tbilisi Botanic Garden, 93. Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- Matchutadze, I., Tsinaridze, M., Tsiklauri, Kh. 2013: IUCN globally critically endangered woody plant species of relict forest of Kolkheti lowland. Corpus ID: 134662279.
- Mitchell, R., Chitanava, S., Dbar, R., Kramarets, V., Lehtijarvi, A., Matchutadze I., Mamadashvili, G., Matsiakh, I., Nacambo, S., Papazova-Anakieva, I., Sathyapala, Sh., Tuniyev, B., Veek, G., Zukhbaia, M. & Kenis, M. 2018: Identifying the ecological and societal consequences of a decline in Buxus forests in Europe and the Caucasus. Biol. Inv. **20(12):** 3605-3620. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-018-1799-8
- Mukbaniani, M. 1980: *Crataegus.* Pp. 81-95 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **6.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 1983: *Rhamnaceae*. Pp. 256-274 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **8.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- POWO 2022: Plants of the World Online. http://www.plantsoftheworldonline.org [Last accessed 12/3/2022]
- Sakhokia, M. F. & Khutzishvili, E. J. 1975: Synopsis of the flora of higher plants of Khevi (Kazbegi district of the Georgian SSR). Tbilisi [in Russian].
- Shetekauri, Sh. 2017: Flora of Tusheti, Pshavi and Khevsureti (The east Greater Caucasus). Tbilisi.
- & Chelidze, D. 2016: High mountain flora of Meskheti and Javakheti (Lesser Caucasus). Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- Shkhian, A. 1973: *Salicaceae*. Pp. 177-200 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **2.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 1975a: *Moraceae*. Pp. 77-80 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **3.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 1975b: *Celtidaceae.* Pp. 73-77 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., 3. Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- 1975b: *Ulmaceae*. Pp. 66-73 in: Ketskhoveli, N. (ed.), Sakartvelos flora, 2° ed., **3.** Tbilisi [in Georgian].
- Solomon, J., Shulkina, T. & Schatz, G. E. (eds) 2013: Red list of the endemic plants of the Caucasus: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Iran, Russia and Turkey. Monographs in systematic botany from the Missouri Botanical Garden (MSB) 125. Saint Louis.
- Supatashvili, A., Burjanadze, M., Berdzenishvili, B. 2019: Invasive pest-box tree moth Cydalima perspectalis Walker. (1859)-and main biological aspects in Georgia. J. Ann. Agrar. Sci. 17(1): 121-126.
- Tavadze, B. L., Supatashvili, A. Sh., Rigling, D., Sotirovski, K., Mamukashvili, Ts. I., Chitia S. T. 2013: Pathological status chestnut stands in Georgia. J. Ann. Agrar. Sci. 11(1): 104-107.
- The Plant List 2013: The Plant List Version 1.1. http://www.theplantlist.org [Last accessed

12/10/(2021)].

Tropicos 2021: Tropicos.org – https://tropicos.org [Last accessed 12/10/(2021)].

Urushadze, T. (ed.) 1999: Soil Map of Georgia. - Tbilisi.

— 2016: Soils of Georgia. – Tbilisi.

WFO 2022: World Flora Online. - http://www.worldfloraonline.org. [Last accessed 12/3/2022]

Addresses of the authors:

Nikoloz Lachashvili<sup>1\*</sup>, Konstantine Kereselidze<sup>2</sup> & Mariam Kikvidze<sup>3</sup>,

<sup>1</sup>Institute of Botany, Ilia State University; National Botanical Garden of Georgia; 1, Botanikuri Str., Tbilisi, 0105, Georgia. E-mail adress: lachashvili@gmail.com, nikoloz.lachashvili@iliauni.edu.ge

<sup>2</sup>Ilia State University, Institute of Botany. 1, Botanikuri Str., Tbilisi, 0105, Georgia. E-mail adress: konstantine.kereselidze.1@iliauni.edu.ge; kostabox@gmail.com 

<sup>3</sup>Institute of Ecology, Ilia State University; 3/5, Kakutsa Cholokashvili Str., Tbilisi, 0162, Georgia; National Botanical Garden of Georgia; 1, Botanikuri Str., Tbilisi, 0105, Georgia. E-mail adress: mariam.kikvidze.1@iliauni.edu.ge; mariam\_kikvidze@yahoo.com

\*Corresponding autor.