

UK BAP Targets Review

Country Group consultation

Cover note

For our BAP priority habitats and species, the targets define what we aim to achieve, guide conservation action, and provide the milestones against which we assess progress. To ensure that they remain relevant and fit for this purpose a review of the targets for the 436 UK Habitat and Species Action Plans began in September 2004. The review process is being coordinated by the Biodiversity Reporting and Information Group (BRIG) on behalf of the UK Standing Committee.

This information note summarises the outcomes of the review so far and presents its findings to the biodiversity groups of the four countries of the UK. The outcomes of the Review are based on the submission of Lead Agencies, Lead Partners and steering groups comprising government and non-government representatives. BRIG considers that the targets that have been set are based on the based available information and represent a challenging yet pragmatic recommendation, taking into account what is reasonable in terms of the biology, space and resources.

In assessing the proposed revised BAP targets, **Country Groups are asked to:**

- (i) Consider the type and magnitude of the targets that have been proposed for each habitat and species and **query or correct** those that are inappropriate. The format for feedback on targets that the Country Group requires changing is attached (see Feedback Form).
- (ii) **Note** that assessing progress towards many of the targets will require changes to existing monitoring schemes or new monitoring programmes. If any of these changes are unlikely, Country Groups are further asked to consider the value of accepting the targets concerned because assessing progress will not be possible.
- (iii) **Support** the proposal in section 9 to continue the review without marine habitats and species at this time.
- (iv) **Consult**, as appropriate, local and/or regional biodiversity partnerships to achieve a wide ownership of the targets (see section 10).
- (v) **Provide** the Targets Review group with a contact point who can act on behalf of the Country Group should further changes or issues arise as a result of the consultation or late submissions from Lead Partners.

UK BAP Targets Review

Country Group consultation

1. Introduction

- 1.1 A review of the targets for the 436 UK Habitat and Species Action Plans was launched in September 2004. The review process is being coordinated by the Biodiversity Reporting and Information Group (BRIG) on behalf of the UK Standing Committee. This is the first full-scale review of BAP targets and has so far involved an extended consultation with the Lead Partners and Steering Groups of HAPs and SAPs, who have proposed new targets following the guidance agreed by the UK Standing Committee¹. The review will establish the country contributions to the overall UK targets and most of the mechanisms for achieving the targets are now devolved. Consequently, Country Biodiversity Groups² have an important role to play in assessing and approving the target proposals on behalf of the administrations of each country.
- 1.2 Consultation with Country Groups was initially planned for autumn 2005. Unfortunately, this was delayed due to late responses from several Lead Partners (many of whom were also heavily involved in the BAP list review). Previously, Country Groups have advised that this consultation should focus on the proposed targets for habitats and have also requested information on targets for widespread species targets. It is therefore these two categories of target that are covered by this paper. The proposed targets follow a new SMART structure with additional fields for quantitative data and supporting information (see below). For this paper, the data in these fields have been summarised to aid the consultation process and re-formatted so that they can be more easily printed. Much of the relevant information is presented; however, the definitive set of targets (including those for more restricted-range species) is in spreadsheet format and is available on the UK BAP website¹. Country Groups are requested to make careful reference to the spreadsheets before completing their assessment of the targets.

2. Aims of the review

- 2.1 The UK Standing Committee agreed the following aims for the Targets Review:
- to update targets in light of new information and progress;
 - to remove or re-set time limited targets that have expired;
 - to standardise targets so that they adhere to a new SMART structure; and
 - to establish the different country contributions for each UK target (in many instances this involved making the targets quantitative for the first time).
- 2.2 The SMART structure was adopted to ensure, as far as possible, that BAP targets are Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound. This

¹ For further information on the terms of the Targets Review and the timetable see the Targets Review Guidance Note, available at www.ukbap.org.uk/GenPageText.aspx?id=98. The full set of revised targets in spreadsheet format is also available from this page.

² Throughout this note, the terms “Country Groups” and “Country Biodiversity Groups” refer to the biodiversity decision-making mechanisms in each country.

was to facilitate integration between national and local levels and improve our ability to report on progress. This approach included the following new features:

- targets are categorised into standard types to achieve a common approach to the use of terms (e.g. restoration and expansion for habitats);
- a new “monitoring” field is included with each target to explain how progress will be assessed; and
- a new “description” field accompanies the targets that includes additional information relevant to conservation practitioners who may be involved in delivering the target. For example, in some description fields priority areas for delivery are listed.

3. Overview of proposals for revised habitat targets

- 3.1 Target proposals were received for 34 HAPs which included all terrestrial, freshwater and coastal habitats and two marine habitats. No proposals were submitted for the remaining eleven marine habitats.
- 3.2 A short overview of the proposals for each habitat is provided ([Table I](#)). This identifies gaps, highlights any significant issues and gives an indication of the magnitude and direction of any quantitative change in the revised target compared to the original. With respect to the latter, there are substantial difficulties in making a direct comparison with the existing targets due to changes in target dates and the type of targets being proposed. However, the existing quantitative targets for habitats (with indicative country breakdowns provided by Lead Partner in 2001) are given in [Annex E](#) for reference.
- 3.3 An overview of the quantitative data for the proposed country habitat targets is given in [Annexes A-D](#). Each of these annexes contains the habitat targets for a single country. In the tables in each of these annexes, the habitats are grouped and summarised by sector. In each annex, table 1 contains the targets for 2015 for each habitat and the percentage increase that the achieve condition, restoration and expansion targets represent compared to the current extent of the resource. [Tables 2 and 3](#) give the restoration and expansion targets for each of the years 2010, 2015 and 2020, summarised for each sector. Since restoration and expansion represent increasing the extent of habitat that qualifies as BAP habitat, these two target types represent an estimate of the amount of additional BAP resource that will be delivered by meeting the combined targets.
- 3.4 An important objective for all priority habitats is to prevent further decline in extent of the resource and this is represented by the maintenance target. In some cases, loss events are inevitable (for example, on the coast) and so the maintenance target equates to no **net** loss and these types of targets can be met provided any losses are off-set by habitat expansion elsewhere. For other habitats, maintenance targets may equate to no actual losses. As part of the review, Lead Partners were asked whether their proposed maintenance target represented “no loss” or “no net loss” and these results are summarised in [Table II](#) (for full details refer to [Annex F](#)).

Table I – overview of proposed habitat targets

Habitat name	Issues for consideration	Quantitative changes
The agriculture sector		
Ancient and/or species-rich hedgerows = Hedgerows	Targets have been set for all hedgerows, not just ancient/species-rich. The proposal to extend the priority habitat definition to all hedgerows has been put forward to BRIG for approval, although country groups could consider setting targets for the whole hedgerow resource without re-defining the priority habitats.	The proposed targets represent a substantial increase because targets are being set for the whole hedgerow resource. A new expansion target has also been set at 800 km / year for UK.
Blanket bog, Upland heathland, Upland calcareous grassland	Targets have been set for maintenance, achieving condition inside A/SSSIs & achieving condition outwith A/SSSIs and restoration. Upland HAP Group had considerable difficulty in meeting the requirements of the Targets Review Group Guidance for the target revision. This is mainly due to the large areas covered by these priority habitats, the lack of relevant baseline information and problems in finding suitable, cost efficient monitoring methods for reporting. For blanket bog and upland heathland - need to establish whether the Countryside Survey (CS) field sample surveys can provide information on condition. If CS is unable to provide this information there will be the need for undertaking sample surveys at a less rigorous level to determine a measurable increase / decrease / no change, rather than setting a qualitative target. For Upland Calcareous Grassland - cannot be identified through Countryside Survey due to its smaller extent and distribution. Sample surveys would need to undertaken to monitor for condition.	Revised target values set for maintenance (all upland HAPs). No new target values yet available for achieving condition and restoration. Achieving condition within A/SSSIs - do not yet have baselines for the area in condition. This should be possible once the Common Standards Monitoring has been completed (country differences).
Cereal field margins = Arable field margins	Targets have been set for all arable field margins, not just cereal field margins. The targets set are largely based on agri-environment prescriptions which differ between countries. The proposal to extend the priority habitat definition to all arable field margins has been put forward to BRIG for approval.	Formerly, there was only a target for achieving condition of cereal field margins. New targets for achieving condition and expansion have been proposed for the whole arable field margin resource. Overall, these changes have led to a substantial increase in the values of the targets, although they are not directly comparable because the former target was only a subset of the proposed targets.
Limestone pavements	Limestone HAP Group did not propose new targets - original targets retained for now.	Target values remain unchanged.

Habitat name	Issues for consideration	Quantitative changes
Lowland calcareous grassland Lowland dry acid grassland Lowland meadows Purple moor grass and rush pastures Upland hay meadows	There is no coherent programme of UK BAP priority grassland habitat monitoring in place. At present, reporting for these HAPs (especially outside A/SSSIs) will only be possible for lowland grasslands in England, where a non-statutory surveillance project has been developed alongside the SSSI Common Standards Monitoring programme. The Grassland HAP Group have proposed two New Type of targets for each HAP to (1) reduce grassland fragmentation and (2) increase grassland patch size.	Current expansion targets for lowland calcareous grassland and lowland meadows have been exceeded since plan publication. For each HAP, new restoration and expansion targets target have been proposed to substantially increase the resource by 2020.
Lowland heathland	In addition to standard target types, the Lowland Heathland HAP Group has proposed a New Type of target to "Increase the percentage by area of the heathland resource within patches greater than xx ha in size to xx% by 20xx".	Maintenance figures have substantially increased since the HAP was written following completion of inventory development and new country surveys. The new target proposes an expansion rate of ~700 ha per year until 2020; this is an increase in the current rate of expansion. This could be considered ambitious since the current expansion target has not been met (6,000 ha by 2005 - latest estimate is that 2200 ha has been created).
The coasts and seas		
Coastal saltmarsh Mudflats	There are strong links between saltmarsh and mudflat and there are significant difficulties in distinguishing between the two, in terms of establishing extent as well as habitat creation targets. Consideration is being given to the relationship between intertidal mud/sand flat targets and saltmarsh targets and whether they should be integrated into a single target. A final decision is still to be made by the HAP group.	Combined targets set for maintenance, achieving condition and expansion (intertidal sediment ecosystems). Targets values are broken down to vegetated and unvegetated parts. Expansion targets set for England and Wales only.
Coastal sand dunes	Modified targets for achieve condition that covers all aspects of dune condition (these represent a combination of original targets). No expansion target set - expansion of the dune resource is not regarded as an appropriate target for this habitat; where it occurs it will do so naturally and not (usually) in response to management.	Restoration target values remain unchanged but the Lead Partner proposes reviewing these as a result of inventory development in the future. The Scottish maintenance figures have substantially increased since the HAP was written following completion of the national Scottish inventory survey (Dargie 2000).
Coastal vegetated shingle	Vegetated shingle usually exists within dynamic coastal habitats and is vulnerable to human activities. To ensure delivery of the targets there may need to be fundamental changes in the	Modified targets set for maintenance, achieving condition and restoration. Target values need to be set for achieving condition and restoration.

Habitat name	Issues for consideration	Quantitative changes
	management of the coastal flood plain, coastal flood defence and adjacent habitats.	
Littoral and sublittoral chalk	No response to the targets review	-
Lophelia pertusa reefs	No response to the targets review	-
Machair	No revised targets set for Machair HAP. The Lead Partner has said that two significant problems effectively make a revision of targets impossible: (1) achieving favourable condition vs conflicts with current management (SCM has identified major failures in achieving favourable condition in machair arable, also strongly suggesting as yet unconfirmed failures in condition of machair fallow), (2) The storm of 11 January 2005 had an immense impact on machair in the Uists/Tiree. This has changed the priorities of the 'drivers' for machair, and these are likely to change and develop further as the perceived causes, effects, and the political situation evolve.	-
Maerl beds	No response to the targets review	-
Maritime cliff and slopes	Currently no national vegetation survey of maritime cliffs in the UK. Effective conservation targets will be hampered without development of a Maritime Cliff inventory to determine the extent and quality of the maritime cliff and slope resource in the UK. A new target has been proposed to "increase the extent of MC unaffected by coastal engineering/coast protection" - applies to England Only.	Target values remain unchanged and are to be reviewed as a result of inventory development.
Modiolus modiolus beds	No response to the targets review	-
Mud habitats in deep water	No response to the targets review	-
Sabellaria alveolata reefs	No response to the targets review	-
Sabellaria spinulosa reefs	No response to the targets review	-
Saline lagoons	Saline lagoons usually exist within dynamic coastal habitats and	Modified targets set for maintenance, achieving condition, and

Habitat name	Issues for consideration	Quantitative changes
	are vulnerable to human activities. The Lead Partner has commented that to ensure delivery of the targets there may need to be fundamental changes in the management of the coastal flood plain, coastal flood defence and adjacent habitats.	expansion. Maintenance targets set for area (ha) and number of sites. Target values remain unchanged.
Seagrass beds	No response to the targets review	-
Serpulid reefs	No response to the targets review	-
Sheltered muddy gravels	No response to the targets review	-
Sublittoral sands and gravels	No response to the targets review	-
Tidal rapids	No response to the targets review	-
Water and wetlands		
Aquifer fed naturally fluctuating water bodies	Targets have been set based on numbers of sites, not hectares. Target set for achieve condition only.	No significant changes.
Chalk rivers	Need to establish baseline extent for chalk rivers. Current targets only set for SSSIs.	Quantitative targets set for achieve condition and restoration of whole chalk river resource.
Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh	The Wetland HAP Group have proposed a New Type of target for "Establishing 8 new landscape scale wetland complexes by 2020". This cross-refers to targets in the uplands, lowland raised bog, wet woodlands, fens and reedbed HAPs. (N.B. THIS COMMENT APPLIES TO ALL WETLAND TYPES)	New quantitative targets set up to 2020 for achieving condition, restoration and expansion as current targets now expired (year 2000).
Eutrophic standing waters	Targets have been set based on numbers of sites, not hectares. Targets set for achieve condition and restoration.	Country target values assigned to different tiered categories.
Fens	Proposed change in fen habitat definition. The proposal to re-define the priority habitat definition has been put forward to BRIG for approval.	Proposed target values set for maintenance, achieving condition and restoration for the whole fen resource. This represents an increase because the current targets only set for fens within A/SSSIs.
Lowland raised bog	The Wetland HAP Group have proposed 2 New Types of target - 1. "Achieve by 2010, 90% of the total market requirement of soil improver and growing media to be peat free in the UK, so as to help reverse the unfavourable condition of LRB." 2. "By 2020, ensure that the carbon footprint of major enregy users (e.g. public bodies, large industries) in bog-rich administrative areas and	Modified targets set for maintenance, achieving condition and restoration. Maintenance target values have been revised to include both primary and secondary lowland raised bogs.

Habitat name	Issues for consideration	Quantitative changes
	elsewhere to be linked with the maintenance, restoration and creation of peat-forming wetlands (mainly LRB)."	
Mesotrophic lakes	Targets have been set based on numbers of sites, not hectares. Targets set for achieve condition and restoration.	Country target values assigned to different tiered categories.
Reedbeds = Wet reedbeds	Proposed change in reedbed habitat definition. The proposal to re-define the priority habitat definition from all reedbed types to wet reedbed has been put forward to BRIG for approval. Reedbeds are swamps and are often associated with Fens and it would be appropriate for reedbed to be covered by the Fen HAP. However, for the purposes of this HAP, it is considered important to distinguish wet reedbed from reed dominated fen due to its association with the bittern <i>Botaurus stellaris</i> , a priority species that relies almost solely on this type of habitat. The wet reedbed HAP has therefore been developed to compliment the Species Action Plan for bittern.	The proposed targets represent a substantial increase from existing targets. The target for reedbed expansion is 1,700 ha by 2010 and 2,300 ha by 2020. This equates to an annual increase of habitat of 100 ha.
Woodland and forestry		
Lowland wood-pasture and parkland = Wood-pasture and parkland	Proposed change in habitat definition to include wood-pasture and parklands in the upland zone, not just lowland. The proposal to extend the priority habitat definition to include upland types has been put forward to BRIG for approval. A consequence is that the revised targets proposed now include Scotland and Northern Ireland.	Targets have been set based on numbers of sites, not hectares. Restoration target - on a country breakdown this would be equivalent to about 200 sites for action in England by 2010 or about 5 per county. The remaining balance: 30 sites Wales, 15 sites Scotland and 5 sites Northern Ireland. The proposed 2010 target would equal the current target, and probably exceed it.
Lowland beech and yew woodland Native pine woodlands Upland mixed ashwoods Upland oakwood Wet woodland	A single set of targets have been set which encompass all native woodlands (including the two new priority woodland types: upland birchwood and lowland mixed deciduous). Wales: The Targets Review Group does not consider that some of the targets proposed by Wales Woodland HAP Group meet the Targets Review guidance. In particular, the group proposed targets based on values for "planned work" which do not meet the SMART requirement that the targets represent biological gain. Target values presented may be under-estimation of actual restoration/expansion. Target values will need to be re-looked at again. Scotland: FCS and the Native Woodland Partnership for Scotland are undertaking a parallel review of policies, programmes	Quantitative native woodland targets have been set for each country.

Habitat name	Issues for consideration	Quantitative changes
	<p>and targets which will feed into the revision of the Scottish Forestry Strategy (SFS) over the 2005/06 period as well as producing revised targets for native woodlands HAPs. They intend to finalise revisions to the targets for native woodland HAPs in Scotland by summer of 2006. Scottish Woodland HAP Group have set provisional targets for all native woodland and individual woodland priority HAP targets (sub-set). Northern Ireland: N.I. Biodiversity Group published native woodland action plans in March 2005 and have produced a draft guidance note on "Northern Ireland Native Woodland Definitions."</p>	

Table II

Lead Partner assessment of whether habitat maintenance targets represent “no loss” or “no net loss”. (See [Annex F](#) for details)

Habitat Sector	Habitat Group	No loss / No net loss
Coast & Seas	Coastal	No net loss - (all HAPs)
Agriculture	Grassland (lowland/upland)	No loss (low calcareous, low dry acid grassland, low meadows, purple moor-grass and rush pastures, upland hay meadows), No net loss (upland calcareous)
Agriculture	Lowland Heathland	No net loss
Agriculture	Upland Heathland & Blanket bog	No net loss – (all HAPs)
Agriculture	Limestone Pavement	No loss
Agriculture	Hedgerows & Arable margins	No net loss – (all HAPs)
Woodland & Forestry	Woodland	No loss (ancient semi-natural Woodland), No net loss (other native woodland) - (all HAPs)
Woodland & Forestry	Wood-pasture & parkland	No loss
Water & Wetlands	Wetland	No loss (fens, raised bog), No net loss (reedbeds, coastal & flood plain grazing marsh)
Water & Wetlands	Freshwater	No loss – (all HAPs)

4. Monitoring and description fields for habitat targets

- 4.1 Reporting on BAP progress to date has been difficult due to the lack of suitable monitoring schemes, particularly outside of designated sites. The monitoring proposals for the revised targets are summarised in [Annex G](#). This demonstrates that there are still significant issues for monitoring BAP targets, especially outside of designated sites. Many lead partners have stated that future monitoring of progress towards these targets will only be possible if there are changes in country or UK-wide monitoring schemes, notably Countryside Survey.
- 4.2 Lead Partners were asked to use the “description” field to provide a brief commentary to help focus action by giving details of, for example, which geographical areas are the priorities for delivery, and what the emphasis of work should be. Conservation professionals, in particular LBAPs, are seen as the main audience that will find the information in this field useful and it has been included in this paper to aid further consultation (see section 10).
- 4.3 In terms of future presentation and updates, the target monitoring and description information will be available in the Biodiversity Action Reporting System (BARS) and Lead Partners will be able to amend and improve the advice when they wish.

5. Overview of proposals for revised species targets

- 5.1 Submissions for the Targets Review were received for 315 species action plans (see [Table III](#)). These include 34 species plans for which the Lead Partner proposed that no targets be set because they recommend the species be dropped

from the BAP priority list ([Annex H](#)). This list of species has been passed to the BRIG Priority Species and Habitats Review Working Group for assessment.

Table III - Summary of target submissions by species group

Species group	Response received (no. of plans)	No response to targets review (no. of plans)
Birds	23	3
Mammals	12	-
Fish	3	2
Herpetiles	4	-
Marine species	11	8
Aculeates (bees/ants/wasps)	25	-
Lepidoptera (butterflies/moths)	47	-
Beetles	23	24
Flies	14	4
Molluscs	11	1
Other invertebrates	8	5
Flowering plants	47	15
Lower plants	80	13
Stoneworts	7	1
Total =	315	76

6.2 For many plans, the proposed targets are the first SMART, quantitative targets to be set for the species. This reflects the substantial increase in knowledge that we now have of the distribution, status and conservation requirements of many BAP species. Targets submitted for widespread species (those whose range exceeds 100 occupied 10km squares) are included in [Annex I](#), sorted by sector. Comparisons of these proposed targets with the published targets (where possible) demonstrate that Lead Partners and steering groups have taken a pragmatic approach to proposing targets. Many original targets were set without sufficient understanding of the rates of decline and recovery. As a result, it would be biologically impossible to achieve them. In setting new targets, Lead Partners have used the latest data to set achievable but challenging targets, in line with the Targets Review guidance note.

7. Long-term viability

7.1 Lead Partners were asked to give their best assessment of whether meeting all the proposed BAP targets (up to the latest target date) would be likely to equate to the status of the habitat or species being viable in the long-term or whether they still only represent milestones towards this goal.

7.2 Lead Partners considered that meeting all the revised BAP targets would equate to long-term viability for 123 species and three habitats (eutrophic and mesotrophic lakes and lowland heathland). For full details (together with any caveats made by the Lead Partners) refer to the Targets Review spreadsheets on the UK BAP website, column labelled “*Do the BAP targets equate to long-term viability?*”

8. New target types

- 8.1 The Targets Review is an opportunity to set new types of targets that will help to improve biodiversity conservation in the long-term. There were no limits on the type of target that Lead Partners could propose, but they were encouraged to consider four categories:
- (i) Qualitative targets for improving the connectivity or resilience of habitats and species populations. These targets will support improvements in the long-term viability of habitats and species populations, for example by creating ecologically functional landscapes or helping species respond to climate change.
 - (ii) Targets using indicators. It is proving impractical to monitor some species and habitats individually, especially in the marine environment; in these circumstances indicator-based targets may be the only pragmatic approach.
 - (iii) Targets that encompass more than one plan. These “cross-plan” targets should help improve the integration of plans.
 - (iv) Targets for improving the population structure or maintaining / enhancing the genetic diversity of species populations.
- 8.2 New target types were proposed for 17 HAPs and 41 SAPs. Examples of the types of target proposed are given in [Table IV](#). For several habitats, “cross-plan” targets were proposed which encompass more than one priority habitat. For other habitats, and for many species, targets were proposed which aim to improve habitat connectivity and species population resilience. Lead Partners for several species proposed targets for habitat quality or extent, which has implications for the later stages of the priority habitat and species review (see paragraph 11).

Table IV – Examples of “New Types” of targets

Plan name	Target set
Wetland habitat plans	Establish 8 new landscape-scale wetland complexes by 2020, including at least 1 in each country.
Lowland raised bog	Achieve by 2010, 90% of the total market requirement of soil improver and growing media to be peat free in the UK, so as to help reverse the unfavourable condition of lowland raised bog
Lowland raised bog	By 2020, ensure that efforts to reduce the carbon footprint of major energy users (e.g. carbon sequestration initiatives by public bodies and large industries) in bog-rich administrative areas and elsewhere are linked with the maintenance, restoration and creation of peat-forming wetlands (mainly Lowland Raised Bog).
Lowland beech and yew woodland Native pine woodlands Upland mixed ashwoods Upland oakwood Wet woodland	A single set of targets have been set which encompass all native woodlands (including the two new priority woodland types: upland birchwood and lowland mixed deciduous). Each country has set separate targets for maintenance, achieve condition, restoration and expansion for native woodland.
Lowland calcareous grassland	50% (ha to be confirmed) of new re-established area to contribute to resultant habitat patches of 2 ha or more of Lowland Calcareous Grassland by 2010.
Lowland dry acid grassland	75% (ha to be confirmed) of re-established area to be adjacent to existing Lowland Dry Acid Grassland or

	other semi-natural habitat by 2010.
<i>Mellicta athalia</i> (butterfly)	Increase area of suitable interconnected habitat (active coppice & open areas) in Kent to 1980 levels by 2010 and then maintain.
<i>Melampyrum sylvaticum</i> (flowering plant)	Produce 5 new populations of greater genetic diversity that might be able to adapt to the effects produced by climate change by introducing seeds from a number of different sites to the same location in order to encourage cross-pollination.
<i>Potamogeton compressus</i> (flowering plant)	Establish connectivity between two existing, healthy populations by 2015.
<i>Coincya wrightii</i> (flowering plant)	All sea cliffs on the east coast of Lundy to be cleared of <i>Rhododendron ponticum</i> by 2015.
<i>Gnorimus nobilis</i> (Beetle)	Increase the number of traditionally managed orchards in favourable condition in the core areas of the known range of the beetle by 20% by 2020.

9. Marine habitats and species

9.1 Proposals for revised targets have only been received for 2 out of 11 marine habitats and 11 out of 19 marine species plans. Lead Partners for these plans initially found it difficult to work within the terms of the review because the lack of information about many marine habitats and species makes it hard to set SMART targets. They were, however, encouraged to set “new” types of target as described in section 8, including targets based on indicators, ecosystem objectives, or on managing threats. To date, they have not done so but they have expressed a willingness to build on ongoing work to establish Marine Ecosystem Objectives.

9.2 The Targets Review Group proposes that, rather than delay the whole review process, targets for marine habitats and species be left unchanged at this stage. There appear to be two options for developing marine targets. First, once the Marine Ecosystem Objectives work has developed to a stage where targets can be set based on these objectives, BRIG could then be tasked with working with the Lead Partners to develop marine BAP targets. This is likely to be after the work on the Marine Bill has been completed. The second option is to go out to contract to develop marine targets in a shorter timescale, and to build these targets into the implementation mechanisms to be proposed on completion of the priority habitats and species review.

10. Consultation with local (and regional) biodiversity partnerships

10.1 LBAPs and other conservation professionals are seen as the main audience for the data in the description field, and they are also likely to find the monitoring field information useful. Comments are invited regarding the clarity, specificity and usefulness of the information in the description field in particular. Please submit any comments on the separate form provided. The comments will be provided to Lead Partners who may amend the information in these fields.

10.2 County or regional breakdowns of the quantitative targets have not been provided by Lead Partners as part of the review. LBAPs may nonetheless be

able to indicate whether the targets are of a similar order to their own by referring to the percentage data in the relevant tables in Annexes A-D. For each habitat, the percentage that the achieving condition, restoration and expansion targets represent as a proportion of the current resource (the maintenance target) is given, allowing comparisons at different geographical scales to be made. In addition, for rare species that only occur in one or few counties, the targets will be relevant to specific LBAPs.

- 10.3 The Targets Group has been consulted by several LBAPs during the course of the Review process who have asked about the implications of the Review for them. In particular, they have been concerned that there would be some expectation or requirement to revise their own targets in the light of the outcomes of the Review. Our advice has so far been that, unless they hear otherwise from their Country LBAP representative, there is no requirement for them to change their own review timetables. However when, in due course, they do review their targets, the revised UK and Country targets should be seen as an information source to be used when considering the types and magnitude of targets they set. For example, some of the “New target types” may serve as useful models for LBAPs to set their own cross-plan targets, or targets that aid species resilience. Countries are requested to consider this when carrying out any consultation with LBAPs and to advise them of how they should use the Target Review outputs, if at all.

11. Links to the priority habitats and species review

- 11.1 Over the past year, BRIG has also been coordinating a parallel review of the priority species and habitat lists. The first stage of this review involves using the latest scientific evidence to assess habitats and species against the BAP priority listing criteria. This stage will report in the near future and will be followed by a further stage to determine delivery mechanisms for these habitats and species. The aim is to develop implementation mechanisms that are better integrated into existing plans, strategies and policies so that we achieve more for biodiversity without a proliferation in the bureaucracy associated with BAP. The appropriate implementation mechanism may differ between countries and so Country Groups will be heavily involved in determining the final outcome of the priority habitats and species review.
- 11.2 Whatever implementation mechanisms are finally selected by Country Groups, it is important that they are underpinned by SMART targets wherever possible. BRIG considers that the work done for the Targets Review will, in many cases, provide these targets. This is true, both for those targets set for single species or habitats (which may underpin either single-species/habitat plans, or act as success measures and indicators for mechanisms delivering multiple species/habitats) and for cross-plan targets (see section 8, above). In addition, some of the “New target types” will provide a useful basis for setting targets that achieve better integration of habitat and species objectives.

12. Next steps

- 12.1 BRIG proposes that this Country Group consultation will run until the end of May 2006. There will then be a two month period during which any late issues with Lead Partners are resolved before publishing the revised targets in August 2006 (see table V).
- 12.2 The publication of revised targets will only include those species and habitats for which proposed targets have been submitted. As discussed earlier, this will therefore not include revised targets for most marine species and habitats. BRIG suggests that the task of updating targets for marine plans and filling the other remaining gaps in the Targets Review awaits the completion of the Priority Species and Habitats Review. At this stage, further thought will need to be given to the targets that will underpin the new delivery mechanisms developed as part of this review and this will be an appropriate time to consider what specific targets, if any, need to be developed for additional species and habitats.

Table V - Proposed timetable for completing the Targets Review

Timetable	Targets Review	Stage in Process
March to end May 2006	Country Group & Regional Biodiversity Partnership consultation	Any feedback and suggested amendments from this consultation will be taken up with the Lead Partners/ Agencies concerned.
June to July 2006	Final target sign-off by BRIG and Country Groups	Feed back to Lead Partners. Resolution of any late issues.
August 2006	New targets finalised and posted on UK BAP website and uploaded into BARS	The complete set of revised targets will come into effect from summer 2006 .

13. Responding to the Targets Review

- 13.1 Country Groups are requested to provide a single, collated response to the Targets Review using the form which accompanies this guidance note. Please also provide a single point of contact with whom the Targets Review group can discuss any further matters arising.
- 13.2 Please send submissions (preferably by email) by 31 May 2006 to:

Gavin Measures
 UK BAP Targets Review
 English Nature
 Terrestrial Wildlife Team
 Peterborough
 PE1 1UA

Email: gavin.measures@english-nature.org.uk
 Tel: 01733 455265

ANNEXES

Understanding the annexes to the Targets Review

The Targets Review has generated a great deal of data. The aim of the annexes is to present these data in a summarised form to aid the Country Group consultation phase of the review. Country Groups may choose to assemble an “information pack” of relevant annexes for their country comprising the relevant country habitat target (A, B, C or D) and one of each of the subsequent annexes.

Annexes A-D

The first four annexes present overviews of the habitat targets for one country.

Annex A – England habitat targets

Annex B – Northern Ireland habitat targets

Annex C – Scotland habitat targets

Annex D – Wales habitat targets

Each of these contains the tables referred to in section 3.3. The notation followed is of the form “Table A1”, where ‘A’ is the number of the annex and ‘1’ is the number of the table.

Annexes E-I

Annex E – Original quantitative habitat targets

Annex F – Habitat maintenance targets: No net loss / No loss targets

Annex G – Monitoring methodology and determining baselines

Annex H – Species recommended for removal from the BAP list (no targets set) or referred back to Species List Review Group

Annex I – Targets submitted for widespread species (those occupying whose range exceeds 100 occupied 10km squares)

A guide to files available for download from UK BAP website

The full set of revised targets is available for download from the UK BAP website at: www.ukbap.org.uk/GenPageText.aspx?id=98

Habitat targets 1 – spreadsheet (quantitative targets)

Habitat targets 2 – spreadsheet (summary details - target text, description and monitoring fields)

Species targets 1 – spreadsheet (quantitative targets)

Annex A – England habitat targets

Table A1
Overview of quantitative targets set for 2015

Habitat	Target unit	Maintenance	Achieve condition by 2015	Condition %	Restoration by 2015	Restoration %	Expansion by 2015	Expansion %
Agriculture								
Arable margins	Hectares - ha	Not appropriate	37,134		-		69378	
Blanket bog	Hectares - ha	239,737	tbc		tbc		-	
Hedgerows	Kilometres - km	558,150	279,075	50.0%	-		6400	1.1%
Limestone pavement	Hectares - ha	2,340	tbc		-		-	
Lowland calcareous grassland	Hectares - ha	38,687	32,036	82.8%	726	1.9%	8426	21.8%
Lowland dry acid grassland	Hectares - ha	20,142	17,295	85.9%	285	1.4%	276	1.4%
Lowland heathland	Hectares - ha	58,000	43,200	74.5%	-		6000	10.3%
Lowland meadows	Hectares - ha	7,282	6,078	83.5%	481	6.6%	256	3.5%
Purple moor-grass and rush pastures	Hectares - ha	21,544	19,195	89.1%	128	0.6%	151	0.7%
Upland calcareous grassland	Hectares - ha	10,000	tbc		tbc		-	
Upland hay meadows	Hectares - ha	870	830	95.4%	48	5.5%	72	8.3%
Upland heathland	Hectares - ha	213,334	tbc		tbc		-	
Coasts and Seas								
Coastal saltmarsh/Mudflat (intertidal)	Hectares - ha	32,500 (SM), 206,900 (intertidal)	tbc		-		3420	1.7%
Coastal sand dunes	Hectares - ha	11,900	tbc		210	1.8%	-	
Coastal vegetated shingle	Hectares - ha	5,343	tbc		tbc		-	
Maritime cliff and slope	Kilometres - km	1,164	700	60.1%	-		200 ha	
Saline lagoons	Hectares - ha	1,205	1,145 (2010 target)	95.0%	-		100	8.3%
Water and Wetlands								
Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh	Hectares - ha	170,000	76,500	45.0%	7500	4.4%	1250	0.7%
Fens	Hectares - ha	8,000	7,200	90.0%	1500	18.8%	-	
Lowland raised bogs	Hectares - ha	11,200	7,466	66.7%	1000	8.9%	-	

BAP Targets Review Consultation

Habitat	Target unit	Maintenance	Achieve condition by 2015	Condition %	Restoration by 2015	Restoration %	Expansion by 2015	Expansion %
Wet reedbeds	Hectares - ha	5,200	4,680	90.0%	-		1715	33.0%
Chalk rivers	Kilometres - km	4,000	tbc		300	7.5%	-	
Aquifer-fed fluctuating water bodies	Site(s)	5	5	100.0%	-		-	
Eutrophic standing waters	Site(s)	3,917	tbc		-		-	
Mesotrophic lakes	Site(s)	644	tbc		-		-	
Woodland and Forestry								
Native woodland - All	Hectares - ha	535,000	375,000	70.1%	-		53000	9.9%
Native woodland - Ancient	Hectares - ha	251,000	-		36000	14.3%	-	
Wood-pasture and parkland	Site(s)	6,000	4,200	70.0%	400	6.7%	120	2.0%

Table A2
Summary of habitat restoration targets for England - all values in hectare(s)

Habitat Sector	Habitat Group	2010	2015	2020
Coast & Seas	Coastal ****	210.00	-	-
Agriculture	Grassland (lowland/upland)	884.00	1,668.00	2,650.00
Agriculture	Hedgerows & Arable margins	No restoration targets		
Agriculture	Lowland Heathland *	No restoration targets		
Agriculture	Upland Heathland & Blanket bog	Target values to be set		
Agriculture	Limestone Pavement	Target values to be set		
Woodland & Forestry	Woodland **	19,000.00	36,000.00	67,000.00
Water & Wetlands	Wetland	5,000.00	10,000.00	18,750.00
Water & Wetlands	Freshwater ***	No restoration targets		
	Total =	25,094.00	47,668.00	88,400.00
Woodland & Forestry	Wood-pasture and parkland (sites)	200.00	400.00	800.00

* - no restoration target for lowland heathland (targets are for achieving condition rather than restoration)

** - excludes targets for wood pasture & parkland. These are expressed as number of sites.

*** - no restoration targets for freshwater habitats (targets are for achieving condition rather than restoration)

**** - coastal - only includes targets for sand dunes

Table A3
Summary of habitat expansion targets for England - all values in hectare(s)

Habitat Sector	Habitat Group	2010	2015	2020
Coast & Seas	Coastal	2,316.00	3,540.00	-
Agriculture	Grassland (lowland/upland)	9,051.00	9,181.00	9,421.00
Agriculture	Hedgerows & Arable margins *	65,178.00	69,378.00	-
Agriculture	Lowland Heathland	3,000.00	6,000.00	9,000.00
Agriculture	Upland Heathland & Blanket bog ****	No expansion targets		
Agriculture	Limestone Pavement	No expansion targets		
Woodland & Forestry	Woodland **	26,000.00	53,000.00	80,000.00
Water & Wetlands	Wetland ***	1,915.00	2,965.00	4,560.00
Water & Wetlands	Freshwater	No expansion targets		
	Total =	107,460.00	144,064.00	102,981.00
Agriculture	Hedgerows (Kilometres)	3,200.00	6,400.00	-
Woodland & Forestry	Wood-pasture & parkland (sites)	40.00	120.00	240.00

* - excludes targets for hedgerows. These are expressed in kilometres

** - excludes targets for wood pasture & parkland. These are expressed as number of sites

*** - only includes expansion target for reedbeds & CFP&GM, other wetland HAP targets set for restoration

**** - for upland heath and blanket bog targets set for restoration

Annex B – Northern Ireland habitat targets

Table B1
Overview of quantitative targets set for 2015

Habitat type	Target unit	Maintenance	Achieve condition by 2015	Condition %	Restoration by 2015	Restoration %	Expansion by 2015	Expansion %
Agriculture								
Arable margins	Hectares - ha	Not appropriate	317		-		1368	
Blanket bog	Hectares - ha	140,000	tbc		tbc		-	
Hedgerows	Kilometres - km	118,619	No figures supplied		-		-	
Limestone pavement	Hectares - ha	220	tbc		-		-	
Lowland dry acid grassland	Hectares - ha	674	No figures supplied		No figures supplied		5	0.74%
Lowland heathland	Hectares - ha	5,400	1,810	33.5%	-		-	
Lowland meadows	Hectares - ha	937	728	77.7%	No figures supplied		10	1.1%
Purple moor-grass and rush pastures	Hectares - ha	18,919	14,750	78.0%	No figures supplied		-	
Upland calcareous grassland	Hectares - ha	1000	tbc		tbc		-	
Upland heathland	Hectares - ha	60,300	tbc		tbc		-	
Coasts and Seas								
Coastal saltmarsh/Mudflat	Hectares - ha	215 (SM) 10,985 (intertidal)	tbc		-		-	
Coastal sand dunes	Hectares - ha	1,571	1,450	92.3%	28	1.8%	-	
Coastal vegetated shingle	Hectares - ha	50	50	100.0%	tbc		-	
Maritime cliff and slope	Kilometres - km	500	475	95.0%	-		50 ha	
Saline lagoons	Hectares - ha	42	tbc		-		2	4.8%
Water and Wetlands								
Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh	Hectares - ha	4,782	2,152	45.0%	No figures supplied		50	1.0%
Fens	Hectares - ha	3,000	2,700	90.0%	50	1.7%	-	
Lowland raised bogs	Hectares - ha	2,300	1,533	66.7%	6	0.3%	-	
Wet reedbeds	Hectares - ha	3,200	2,880	90.0%	-		280	8.8%

Habitat type	Target unit	Maintenance	Achieve condition by 2015	Condition %	Restoration by 2015	Restoration %	Expansion by 2015	Expansion %
Aquifer-fed fluctuating water bodies	Site(s)	3	3	100.0%	-		-	
Eutrophic standing waters	Site(s)	1,670	tbc		-		-	
Mesotrophic lakes	Site(s)		tbc		-		-	
Woodland and Forestry								
Native woodland - All	Hectares - ha	8,380	5,350	63.8%	420	5.0%	840	10.0%
Wood-pasture and parkland	Site(s)	500	350	70.0%	10	2.0%	3	0.6%

Table B2**Summary of habitat restoration targets for Northern Ireland - all values in hectare(s)**

Habitat sector	Habitat group	2010	2015	2020
Coast and Seas	Coastal ****	28.00	-	-
Agriculture	Grassland (lowland/upland)	tbc	-	-
Agriculture	Hedgerows & Arable margins	No restoration targets		
Agriculture	Lowland Heathland *	No restoration targets		
Agriculture	Upland Heathland & Blanket bog	Target values to be set		
Agriculture	Limestone Pavement	Target values to be set		
Woodland & Forestry	Woodland **	180.00	420.00	-
Water & Wetlands	Wetland	28.00	56.00	110.00
Water & Wetlands	Freshwater ***	No restoration targets		
	Total =	236.00	476.00	110.00
Woodland & Forestry	Wood-pasture and parkland (sites)	5.00	10.00	20.00

* - no restoration target for lowland heathland (targets are for achieving condition rather than restoration)

** - excludes targets for wood pasture & parkland. These are expressed as number of sites.

*** - no restoration targets for freshwater habitats (targets are for achieving condition rather than restoration)

**** - coastal - only includes targets for sand dunes

Table B3
Summary of habitat expansion targets for Northern Ireland - all values in hectare(s)

Sector	Habitat Group	2010	2015	2020
Coast & Seas	Coastal	21.00	52.00	-
Agriculture	Grassland (lowland/upland)	15.00	-	-
Agriculture	Hedgerows & Arable margins *	1,368.00	1,368.00	-
Agriculture	Lowland Heathland	130.00	-	-
Agriculture	Upland Heathland & Blanket bog ****	No expansion targets		
Agriculture	Limestone Pavement	No expansion targets		
Woodland & Forestry	Woodland **	400.00	840.00	-
Water & Wetlands	Wetland ***	225.00	330.00	450.00
Water & Wetlands	Freshwater	No expansion targets		
	Total =	2,159.00	2,590.00	450.00

Agriculture	Hedgerows (kilometres)	No expansion targets		
Woodland & Forestry	Wood-pasture & parkland (sites)	1.00	3.00	6.00

* - excludes targets for hedgerows. These are expressed in kilometres

** - excludes targets for wood pasture & parkland. These are expressed as number of sites

*** - only includes expansion target for reedbeds & CFP&GM, other wetland HAP targets set for restoration

**** - for upland heath and blanket bog targets set for restoration

Annex C – Scotland habitat targets

Table C1
Overview of quantitative targets set for 2015

Habitat type	Target unit	Maintenance	Achieve condition by 2015	Condition %	Restoration by 2015	Restoration %	Expansion by 2015	Expansion %
Agriculture								
Arable margins	Hectares - ha	Not appropriate	3,375		-		6,500	
Blanket bog	Hectares - ha	175,9000	tbc		tbc		-	
Hedgerows	Kilometres - km	48,680	24,340	50.0%	-		560	1.1%
Limestone pavement	Hectares - ha	300	tbc		-		-	
Lowland calcareous grassland	Hectares - ha	761	415	54.5%	46	6.0%	4	0.5%
Lowland dry acid grassland	Hectares - ha	4,357	1,766	40.5%	258	5.9%	119	2.73%
Lowland heathland	Hectares - ha	18,888	3,590	19.0%	-		104	0.6%
Lowland meadows	Hectares - ha	980	492	50.2%	175	17.9%	93	9.5%
Purple moor-grass and rush pastures	Hectares - ha	6,768	3,100	45.8%	353	5.2%	151	2.2%
Upland calcareous grassland	Hectares - ha	5,000	tbc		tbc		-	
Upland hay meadows	Hectares - ha	27	18	66.7%	3	11.1%	5	18.5%
Upland heathland	Hectares - ha	623,000	tbc		tbc		-	
Coasts and Seas								
Coastal saltmarsh/Mudflat	Hectares - ha	6,685 (SM), 45,500 (intertidal)	tbc		-		-	
Coastal sand dunes	Hectares - ha	35,000	tbc		619	1.8%	-	
Coastal vegetated shingle	Hectares - ha	700	tbc		-		-	
Maritime cliff and slope	Kilometres - km	2,373	1424	60.0%	-		200 ha	
Machair	Hectares - ha	15,000	No figures supplied		No figures supplied		No figures supplied	
Saline lagoons	Hectares - ha	3,900	3,705	95.0%	-		16	0.4%
Water and Wetlands								
Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh	Hectares - ha	1,500	675	45.0%	250		250	16.7%

Habitat type	Target unit	Maintenance	Achieve condition by 2015	Condition %	Restoration by 2015	Restoration %	Expansion by 2015	Expansion %
Fens	Hectares - ha	850	600	70.6%	250	29.4%	-	
Lowland raised bogs	Hectares - ha	13,000	8,666	66.7%	70	0.5%	-	
Wet reedbeds	Hectares - ha	500	150	30.0%	-		280	56.0%
Eutrophic standing waters	Site(s)	1,012	tbc		-		-	
Mesotrophic lakes	Site(s)	1,749	tbc		-		-	
Woodland and Forestry								
Native woodland - All	Hectares - ha	391,000	121,000	30.9%	7662	2.0%	81,576	20.9%
Wood-pasture and parkland	Site(s)	2,000	1,400	70.0%	30	1.5%	9	0.5%

Table C2
Summary of habitat restoration targets for Scotland - all values in hectare(s)

Habitat sector	Habitat group	2010	2015	2020
Coast & Seas	Coastal ****	619.00	-	-
Agriculture	Grassland (lowland/upland)	417.00	835.00	1,251.00
Agriculture	Hedgerows & Arable margins	No restoration targets		
Agriculture	Lowland Heathland *	No restoration targets		
Agriculture	Upland Heathland & Blanket bog	Target values to be set		
Agriculture	Limestone Pavement	Target values to be set		
Woodland & Forestry	Woodland **	5,866.00	7,662.00	8,782.00
Water & Wetlands	Wetland	285.00	570.00	975.00
Water & Wetlands	Freshwater ***	No restoration targets		
	Total =	7,187.00	9,067.00	11,008.00
Woodland & Forestry	Wood-pasture and parkland (sites)	15.00	30.00	60.00

* - no restoration target for lowland heathland (targets are for achieving condition rather than restoration)

** - excludes targets for wood pasture & parkland. These are expressed as number of sites.

*** - no restoration targets for freshwater habitats (targets are for achieving condition rather than restoration)

**** - coastal - only includes targets for sand dunes

Table C3
Summary of habitat expansion targets for Scotland - all values in hectare(s)

Sector	Habitat Group	2010	2015	2020
Coast & Seas	Coastal	92.00	216.00	-
Agriculture	Grassland (lowland/upland)	311.00	372.00	430.00
Agriculture	Hedgerows & Arable margins *	5,000.00	6,500.00	-
Agriculture	Lowland Heathland	104.00	-	-
Agriculture	Upland Heathland & Blanket bog ****	No expansion targets		
Agriculture	Limestone Pavement	No expansion targets		
Woodland & Forestry	Woodland **	53,378.00	81,576.00	102,040.00
Water & Wetlands	Wetland ***	325.00	530.00	850.00
Water & Wetlands	Freshwater	No expansion targets		
	Total =	59,210.00	89,194.00	103,320.00
Agriculture	Hedgerows (kilometres)	280.00	560.00	-
Woodland & Forestry	Wood-pasture & parkland (sites)	3.00	9.00	18.00

* - excludes targets for hedgerows. These are expressed in kilometres

** - excludes targets for wood pasture & parkland. These are expressed as number of sites

*** - only includes expansion target for reedbeds & CFP&GM, other wetland HAP targets set for restoration

**** - for upland heath and blanket bog targets set for restoration

Annex D – Wales habitat targets

Table D1
Overview of quantitative targets set for 2015

Habitat type	Target unit	Maintenance	Achieve condition by 2015	Condition %	Restoration by 2015	Restoration %	Expansion by 2015	Expansion %
Agriculture								
Arable margins	Hectares - ha	Not appropriate	3,795		-		5,810	
Blanket bog	Hectares - ha	56,200	tbc		tbc		-	
Hedgerows	Kilometres - km	88,710	44,355	50.0%	-		1,040	1.2%
Limestone pavement	Hectares - ha	70	tbc		-		-	
Lowland calcareous grassland	Hectares - ha	1,146	782	68.2%	17	1.5%	48	4.2%
Lowland dry acid grassland	Hectares - ha	36,473	15,159	41.6%	54	0.1%	16	0.04%
Lowland heathland	Hectares - ha	12,500	5,030	40.2%	-		1,000	8.0%
Lowland meadows	Hectares - ha	1,322	777	58.8%	1554	117.5%	50	3.8%
Purple moor-grass and rush pastures	Hectares - ha	32,161	15,650	48.7%	445	1.4%	40	0.1%
Upland calcareous grassland	Hectares - ha	700	tbc		tbc		-	
Upland heathland	Hectares - ha	80,000	tbc		tbc		-	
Coasts and Seas								
Coastal saltmarsh/Mudflat	Hectares - ha	6,100 (SM), 22,165 (intertidal)	tbc		-		360	1.6%
Coastal sand dunes	Hectares - ha	8,100	tbc		143	1.8%	-	
Coastal vegetated shingle	Hectares - ha	110	tbc		-		-	
Maritime cliff and slope	Kilometres - km	522	315	60.3%	-		50 ha	
Saline lagoons	Hectares - ha	38	35	92.1%	-		2	5.3%
Water and Wetlands								
Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh	Hectares - ha	39,858	17,936	45.0%	No figures supplied		No figures supplied	
Fens	Hectares - ha	6,200	5,580	90.0%	500	8.1%	-	
Lowland raised bogs	Hectares - ha	2,000	1,333	66.7%	3	0.2%	-	
Wet reedbeds	Hectares - ha	460	414	90.0%	-		25	5.4%
Aquifer-fed fluctuating water bodies	Site(s)	1	1	100.0%	-		-	

BAP Targets Review Consultation

Habitat type	Target unit	Maintenance	Achieve condition by 2015	Condition %	Restoration by 2015	Restoration %	Expansion by 2015	Expansion %
Eutrophic standing waters	Site(s)	281	tbc		-		-	
Mesotrophic lakes	Site(s)	76	tbc		-		-	
Woodland and Forestry								
Native woodland - All	Hectares - ha	128,927	35,526	27.6%	4907	3.8%	4,263	3.3%
Wood-pasture and parkland	Site(s)	1,500	1,050	70.0%	60	4.0%	18	1.2%

Table D2
Summary of habitat restoration targets for Wales - all values in hectare(s)

Habitat sector	Habitat group	2010	2015	2020
Coast & Seas	Coastal ****	143.00	-	-
Agriculture	Grassland (lowland/upland)	1,814.00	2,070.00	2,324.00
Agriculture	Hedgerows & Arable margins	No restoration targets		
Agriculture	Lowland Heathland *	No restoration targets		
Agriculture	Upland Heathland & Blanket bog	Target values to be set		
Agriculture	Limestone Pavement	Target values to be set		
Woodland & Forestry	Woodland **	3,680.76	4,907.69	6,134.61
Water & Wetlands	Wetland	253.00	505.00	760.00
Water & Wetlands	Freshwater ***	No restoration targets		
	Total =	5,890.76	7,482.69	9,218.61
Woodland & Forestry	Wood-pasture and parkland (sites)	30.00	60.00	120.00

* - no restoration target for lowland heathland (targets are for achieving condition rather than restoration)

** - excludes targets for wood pasture & parkland. These are expressed as number of sites.

*** - no restoration targets for freshwater habitats (targets are for achieving condition rather than restoration)

**** - coastal - only includes targets for sand dunes

Native woodland - Wales:

The Targets Review Group does not consider that some of the targets proposed by Wales Woodland HAP Group meet the Targets Review guidance. In particular, the group proposed targets based on values for "planned work" which do not meet the SMART requirement that the targets represent biological gain. Target values presented may be under-estimation of actual restoration. Target values will need to be re-looked at again.

Table D3
Summary of habitat expansion targets for Wales - all values in hectare(s)

Sector	Habitat Group	2010	2015	2020
Coast & Seas	Coastal	261.00	412.00	-
Agriculture	Grassland (lowland/upland)	77.00	154.00	229.00
Agriculture	Hedgerows & Arable margins *	4,660.00	5,810.00	-
Agriculture	Lowland Heathland	500.00	1,000.00	1,500.00
Agriculture	Upland Heathland & Blanket bog ****	No expansion targets		
Agriculture	Limestone Pavement	No expansion targets		
Woodland & Forestry	Woodland **	3,197.00	4,263.12	5,328.90
Water & Wetlands	Wetland ***	10.00	25.00	40.00
Water & Wetlands	Freshwater	No expansion targets		
	Total =	8,705.00	11,664.12	7,097.90
Agriculture	Hedgerows (kilometres)	520	1,040	-
Woodland & Forestry	Wood-pasture & parkland (sites)	6.00	18.00	36.00

* - excludes targets for hedgerows. These are expressed in kilometres

** - excludes targets for wood pasture & parkland. These are expressed as number of sites

*** - only includes expansion target for reedbeds & CFP&GM, other wetland HAP targets set for restoration

**** - for upland heath and blanket bog targets set for restoration

Native woodland - Wales:

The Targets Review Group does not consider that some of the targets proposed by Wales Woodland HAP Group meet the Targets Review guidance. In particular, the group proposed targets based on values for "planned work" which do not meet the SMART requirement that the targets represent biological gain. Target values presented may be under-estimation of actual expansion. Target values will need to be re-looked at again.

UK BAP Targets Review - Country Group consultation

ANNEXES E - I

Five annexes below present overviews of the habitat and species targets.

Annex E – Original quantitative habitat targets

Annex F – Habitat maintenance targets: No net loss / No loss targets

Annex G – Monitoring methodology and determining baselines

Annex H – Species recommended for removal from the BAP list (no targets set) or referred back to Species List Review Group

Annex I – Targets submitted for widespread species (those occupying whose range exceeds 100 occupied 10km squares)

ANNEX E**Original quantitative habitat targets**

N.B. Only quantitative targets are shown. A full set of all the original targets is available at www.ukbap.org.uk/GenPageText.aspx?id=98.

Habitat	Target	Target value	Target units	Target end date	England	Northern Ireland	Scotland	Wales
The agriculture sector								
Ancient and/or species-rich hedgerows	T1 Halt the net loss of species-rich hedgerows through neglect and removal by the year 2000.	190000	km	2000	138000	41000	13900	20600
Ancient and/or species-rich hedgerows	T2 Halt all loss of hedgerows which are both ancient and species-rich by 2005.	190000	km	2005	138000	41000	13900	20600
Ancient and/or species-rich hedgerows	T3 Achieve favourable condition for 25% (c.47,500 km) of species-rich and ancient hedges by 2000.	47500	km	2000	Target relevant	Target relevant	Target relevant	Target relevant
Ancient and/or species-rich hedgerows	T4 Achieve favourable condition for 50% (c.95,000 km) of species-rich and ancient hedges by 2005.	95000	km	2005	Target relevant	Target relevant	Target relevant	Target relevant
Blanket bog	T1 Maintain the current extent and overall distribution of blanket mire currently in favourable condition.	1500000	ha		215000	140000	1060000	52300
Blanket bog	T2 Improve the condition of those areas of blanket mire which are degraded but readily restored, so that the total area in, or approaching, favourable condition by 2005 is 340,000 ha (ie around 30% of the total extent of restorable blanket mire).	340000	ha	2005	48120	31410	238600	21870
Blanket bog	T3 Introduce management regimes to improve to, and subsequently maintain in, favourable condition a further 280,000 ha of degraded blanket mire by 2010.	280000	ha	2010	40500	26500	200	13000
Blanket bog	T4 Introduce management regimes to improve the condition of a further 225,000 ha of degraded blanket mire by 2015, resulting in a total of 845,000 ha (ie around 75% of the total extent of restorable blanket mire) in, or approaching, favourable condition.	225000	ha	2015	32500	21500	160000	10500
Cereal field margins	T1 Maintain, improve and restore by management the biodiversity of some 15,000 ha of cereal field margins on appropriate soil types in the UK by 2010.	15000	ha	2010	12725		2025	250
Limestone pavements	T1 Ensure that there is no further loss to the extent of limestone pavement areas.	3000	ha		2326	220	300	70
Lowland calcareous grassland	T1 Arrest the depletion of lowland calcareous grassland throughout the UK.	39500	ha		38450		27	1000
Lowland calcareous grassland	T6 Attempt to re-establish 1000 ha of lowland calcareous grassland of wildlife value at carefully targeted sites by 2010.	1000	ha	2010	970			30
Lowland dry acid grassland	T1 Arrest the depletion of lowland acid grassland throughout	65500	ha		20500	1100	3900	40000

Habitat	Target	Target value	Target units	Target end date	England	Northern Ireland	Scotland	Wales
	the UK.							
Lowland dry acid grassland	T6 Attempt to re-establish 500 ha of lowland acid grassland of wildlife value at carefully targeted sites by 2010.	500	ha	2010	250	50	100	100
Lowland heathland	T1 Maintain the extent of all existing lowland heathland (58,000 ha).	58000	ha	2005	32000	5385	23905	6900
Lowland heathland	T2 Improve by management all existing lowland heathland currently in unfavourable condition.	58000	ha	2005	32000	5385	23905	6900
Lowland heathland	T3 Encourage the re-establishment by 2005 of a further 6,000 ha of heathland with the emphasis on the counties of Hampshire, Cornwall, Dorset, Surrey, Devon, Staffordshire, Suffolk and Norfolk in England and Pembrokeshire, Glamorgan and west Gwynedd in Wales, particularly where this links separate heathland areas.	6000	ha	2005	5400			600
Lowland meadows	T1 Arrest the depletion of unimproved lowland meadow throughout the UK.	18400	ha		8400	5300	3000	1700
Lowland meadows	T6 Attempt to re-establish 500 ha of lowland meadow of wildlife value at carefully targeted sites by 2010.	500	ha	2010	230	145	85	40
Purple moor grass and rush pastures	T1 Arrest the depletion of purple moor grass and rush pasture throughout the UK.	66800	ha		10500	16800	4500	35000
Upland calcareous grassland	T1 Maintain the current distribution and extent (ca 22,000-25,000 ha) of upland calcareous grassland in the UK.	25000	ha		10000	1100	13140	760
Upland calcareous grassland	T2 Achieve favourable condition for at least 75% of upland calcareous grassland (7,000 ha in England, 7,000-9,750 ha in Scotland, 500 ha in Wales and 500 ha in Northern Ireland) through sympathetic management by 2005 or as soon as biologically practical thereafter.	17750	ha	2005	7000	500	9750	500
Upland calcareous grassland	T3 Initiate pilot attempts to re-create at least 200 ha of upland calcareous grassland by 2005, with a particular emphasis on reducing fragmentation through linking small, vulnerable and discontinuous sites.	200	ha	2005	100	10	80	10
Upland hay meadows	T1 Arrest the depletion of unimproved upland hay meadow throughout its UK distribution.	1100	ha		1000		100	
Upland hay meadows	T6 Attempt to re-establish 50 ha of upland hay meadow of wildlife value at carefully targeted sites by 2010.	50	ha	2010	45			5
Upland heathland	T1 Maintain the current extent and overall distribution of the upland heathland which is currently in favourable condition.	3000000	ha		270000	69500	1700000 - 2500000	69000
Upland heathland	T4 Seek to increase dwarf shrubs to at least 25% cover where they have been reduced or eliminated due to inappropriate management. A target for such restoration of	100000	ha	2010	30000			2500

Habitat	Target	Target value	Target units	Target end date	England	Northern Ireland	Scotland	Wales
	between 50,000 and 100,000 ha by 2010 is proposed.							
Upland heathland	T5 Initiate management to re-create 5,000 ha of upland heath by 2005 where heathland has been lost due to agricultural improvement or afforestation, with a particular emphasis on reducing fragmentation of existing heathland.	5000	ha	2005	2500			200
The coasts and seas								
Coastal saltmarsh	T1 There should be no further net loss (currently estimated at 100 ha/year) of coastal saltmarsh. This will involve the creation of 100 ha/year during the period of this plan.	1500	ha	2015	1350	Target relevant	Target relevant	150
Coastal saltmarsh	T2 Create a further 40 ha of saltmarsh in each year of the plan to replace the 600 ha lost between 1992 and 1998, based on current estimates.	600	ha	2015	540	Target relevant	Target relevant	60
Coastal saltmarsh	T3 Maintain the quality of the existing resource in terms of community and species diversity.	45500	ha		32500	215	6685	6100
Coastal sand dunes	T1 Protect the existing sand dune resource of about 54,500 ha from further losses to anthropogenic factors, whether caused directly or indirectly (eg by sea defence schemes affecting coastal processes).	56000	ha		11900	3000	33000	8100
Coastal sand dunes	T2 Offset the expected net losses due to natural causes of about 2% of the dune habitat resource over 20 years by encouraging new dunes to accrete and where possible by allowing mobile dune systems to move inland.	1120	ha	2020	Target relevant	Target relevant	Target relevant	Target relevant
Coastal sand dunes	T3 Seek opportunities for restoration of sand dune habitat lost to forestry, agriculture or other human uses. A target figure of up to 1000 ha to be reinstated by 2010 (to be reviewed as a result of the inventory proposed in 5.5.1) is suggested.	1000	ha	2010	210	50	590	140
Coastal vegetated shingle	T1 Prevent further net loss of existing vegetated shingle structures totalling about 5800 ha. (However local gains and losses due to storm events occur sporadically and should be accepted provided that the national and regional resources are maintained overall.)	5800	ha		5343		700	110
Mudflats	T1 Maintain at least the present extent and regional distribution of the UK's mudflats. This target will require compensating predicted losses to development by the restoration of mudflats. Whilst this may not be possible in the same location, it should be within the same littoral sediment cell.	285500	ha		206900	10985	45500	22165
Sabellaria alveolata reefs	T3 Within 15 years, attempt to re-establish S. alveolata reefs in five areas where they were formerly present.	5	site(s)	2015	Target relevant	Target relevant	Target relevant	Target relevant
Saline lagoons	T1 Maintain the current area (c.5200 ha) of coastal saline	5200	ha		1200	42	3900	38

Habitat	Target	Target value	Target units	Target end date	England	Northern Ireland	Scotland	Wales
	lagoons.							
Saline lagoons	T2 Maintain the current number and distribution of coastal saline lagoons.	358	Number of sites		177	30	139	12
Saline lagoons	T4 Create, by the year 2015, 120 ha of saline lagoon.	120	ha	2015	100	2	16	2
Water and wetlands								
Aquifer fed naturally fluctuating water bodies	T1 Conserve the characteristic hydrological regimes, plant and animal communities of all known aquifer fed naturally fluctuating water bodies in the UK.	31	ha		20	10	0	1
Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh	T1 Maintain the existing habitat extent (300,000ha).	300000	ha		200000	Resource poorly known - nominal target 23000	Resource poorly known - nominal target 23000	54000
Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh	T2 Maintain the quality of existing habitat (300,000ha).	300000	ha		200000	Target relevant	Target relevant	54000
Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh	T3 Rehabilitate 10,000 ha of grazing marsh habitat which has become too dry, or is intensively managed, by the year 2000. This would comprise 5,000 ha already targeted in ESAs, with an additional 5,000 ha.	10000	ha	2000	7500	325	525	1800
Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh	T4 Begin creating 2,500 ha of grazing marsh from arable land in targeted areas, in addition to that which will be achieved by existing ESA schemes, with the aim of completing as much as possible by the year 2000.	2500	ha	2000	2200	60	230	230
Lowland raised bog	T1 Maintain the current distribution and extent (c6,000 ha) of primary near-natural lowland raised peat bog in the UK.	6000	ha		500	2000	2500	975
Lowland raised bog	T2 Ensure that the condition of the current resource is maintained where favourable or enhanced where unfavourable through appropriate management.	6000	ha		500	2000	2500	975
Lowland raised bog	T3 Establish by 2005 appropriate hydrological and management regimes at those areas which have been damaged but still retain nature conservation interest (ie primary degraded and drained; c7,000 ha).	7000	ha	2005	1400	Target relevant	Target relevant	820
Lowland raised bog	T4 Aim to achieve favourable condition of those areas which have been damaged but still retain nature conservation interest (ie primary degraded and drained; c7,000 ha) by 2015.	7000	ha	2015	1400	Target relevant	Target relevant	820
Reedbeds	T1 Rehabilitate by the year 2000 the priority areas of existing reedbed (targeting those of 2ha or more).	6900	ha	2000	5200	NI target awaited	1138	550
Reedbeds	T2 Maintain priority areas of existing reedbed by active	6900	ha		5200	NI target awaited	1138	550

Habitat	Target	Target value	Target units	Target end date	England	Northern Ireland	Scotland	Wales
	management.							
Reedbeds	T3 Create 1,200 ha of new reedbed on land of low nature conservation interest by 2010.	1200	ha	2010	1000	NI target awaited	80	120
Woodland and forestry								
Lowland beech and yew woodland	T1 Maintain the total current extent (c. 30,000 ha) of lowland beech and yew woodland.	30000	ha		27000	0	0	3000
Lowland beech and yew woodland	T10 Establish by colonisation or planting a further 1,500ha of lowland beech and yew woodland on unwooded sites or by conversion of non-native plantations by 2015	1500	ha	2015	1350			150
Lowland beech and yew woodland	T7 Restore to site-native species at least 750 ha of former lowland beech woodland which has been converted to non-native plantations on ancient woodland sites, by 2010.	750	ha	2010	675			75
Lowland beech and yew woodland	T8 Restore to site-native species at least a further 750 ha of former lowland beech woodland which has been converted to non-native plantations on ancient woodland sites, by 2015.	1125	ha	2015	675			75
Lowland beech and yew woodland	T9 Establish by colonisation or planting 1,500 ha of lowland beech and yew woodland on unwooded sites or by conversion of non-native plantations by 2010.	1500	ha	2010	1350			150
Lowland wood-pasture and parkland	T1 Maintain the current extent and distribution of the total resource of wood-pasture and parkland	To be resolved	ha		22,000	100	To be resolved	7000
Lowland wood-pasture and parkland	T3 Initiate in areas where examples of derelict wood-pasture and parkland occur a programme to restore 2,500ha to favourable ecological condition by 2010.	2500	ha	2010	1250	25	625	600
Lowland wood-pasture and parkland	T4 By 2002 initiate the expansion of 500 ha of wood-pasture or parkland, in appropriate areas, to help reverse fragmentation and reduce the generation gap between veteran trees	500	ha	2002	250	5	125	120
Native pine woodlands	T1 Maintain the current wooded area in the 'core areas' of the pinewoods listed in the CPI	17882	ha	ongoing	N/A	N/A	17882	N/A
Native pine woodlands	T2 Improve the condition of the 'core areas' of the pinewoods listed in the CPI	17882	ha	ongoing	N/A	N/A	17882	N/A
Native pine woodlands	T3 By 2005, expand the wooded areas of the pinewoods by establishing 5600 hectares predominantly by natural regeneration. This will be mainly in the 'regeneration zones', but some will also occur in the 'core areas'.	5600	ha	2005	N/A	N/A	5600	N/A
Native pine woodlands	T4 By 2005, create the conditions for a further 5600 ha to be naturally regenerated over the next 20 years	5600	ha	2005	N/A	N/A	5600	N/A
Native pine woodlands	T5 By 2005, establish 25000 ha of new native pinewoods on suitable sites within the natural range of native pinewoods.	25000	ha	2005	N/A	N/A	25000	N/A

Habitat	Target	Target value	Target units	Target end date	England	Northern Ireland	Scotland	Wales
	[This expansion target is additional to target T3]							
Upland mixed ashwoods	T1 Maintain the total extent (approx. 67,000 ha) and distribution of upland mixed ashwood.	67000	ha	2010	37000	725	22275	7500
Upland mixed ashwoods	T2 Maintain the current extent (40,000-50,000 ha) and distribution of ancient semi-natural upland mixed ashwood.	50000	ha	2010	27500	500	16500	5500
Upland mixed ashwoods	T4 Initiate by 2004 measures intended to achieve favourable condition in 80% of the total resource of upland mixed ashwoods	54000	ha	2004	29700	540	17820	5940
Upland mixed ashwoods	T7 Complete restoration to site-native species of 1,200 ha of former upland mixed ashwood which has been converted to non-native plantation on Ancient Woodland Sites by 2010.	1200	ha	2010	750	25	400	125
Upland mixed ashwoods	T8 Complete restoration to site-native species over a further 1,200 ha of former upland mixed ashwood which has been converted to non-native plantation on Ancient Woodland Sites by 2015.	1200	ha	2015	750	25	200	62
Upland mixed ashwoods	T9 Complete the establishment of 3,000 ha of upland mixed ashwood on unwooded sites, or by conversion of non-native plantations, by 2010.	3000	ha	2010	1250	25	1000	325
Upland mixed ashwoods	T10 Complete the establishment of a further 3,000 ha of upland mixed ashwood on unwooded sites, or by conversion of non-native plantations, by 2015.	3000	ha	2015	1650	25	1000	325
Upland oakwood	T1 Maintain the current extent (70,000 to 100,000 ha) and distribution of the upland oakwood system.	85000	ha	2010	21250	1700	35600	26450
Upland oakwood	T3 Avoiding other habitats of high nature conservation value, expand the area of upland oakwood by 7000 - 10000 ha (about 10%) by planting or natural regeneration on currently open ground, and by conversion from non-native plantations, by 2005.	7000	ha	2005	1750	100	2950	2200
Upland oakwood	T4 Complete the restoration to site-native species of 7000 - 10000 ha (10% of the total resource) of former upland oakwood that has been converted to non-native plantation on Ancient Woodland Sites by 2010.	7000	ha	2005	1750	100	2950	2200
Wet woodland	T1 Maintain the total extent (50,000-70,000 ha) and distribution of wet woodlands.	60000	ha		19800	600	30000	9600
Wet woodland	T2 Maintain the current area (currently estimated at 24,000-30,000 ha) of ancient semi-natural wet woodlands.	30000	ha		9900	300	15000	4800
Wet woodland	T4 Initiate measures intended to achieve favourable condition in 80% of wet woodlands of the total resource by 2004.	48000	ha	2004	15820	500	24000	7680
Wet woodland	T5 Achieve favourable condition over 50% of the total	25-		2010	9900	300	15000	4800

Habitat	Target	Target value	Target units	Target end date	England	Northern Ireland	Scotland	Wales
	resource of wet woodlands by 2010.	35000						
Wet woodland	T7 Complete restoration to site-native species of 1,600 ha of former native wet woodland that has been converted to non-native plantations on ancient woodland sites by 2010.	1600	ha	2010	525	25	500	250
Wet woodland	T8 Complete restoration to site-native species of a further 1,600 ha of former native wet woodland that has been converted to non-native plantations on ancient woodland sites by 2015.	1600	ha	2015	525	25	500	250
Wet woodland	T9 Complete establishment of 3,375 ha of wet woodland on unwooded sites or by conversion of plantations by 2010.	2700	ha	2010	1125	25	1100	550
Wet woodland	T10 Complete establishment of a further 3,375 ha of wet woodland on unwooded sites or by conversion of plantations by 2015	2700	ha	2015	1125	25	1100	550

ANNEX F**Habitat maintenance targets: No net loss / No loss targets**

Habitat name	Target text	Category	Comments
Arable field margins	-	No net loss	No maintaining extent target set - achieving condition/restoration targets only.
Hedgerows	T1 – Maintain the net extent of hedgerows across the UK.	No net loss	The target refers to maintaining net extent in relation to complete removal and relates to all hedgerows consisting predominately of at least one native species. Losses of hedgerows will be minimised by the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 (in England & Wales) and by cross-compliance rules and by encouraging good management so as to reduce losses through neglect. New planting to replace lost hedgerows will be encouraged primarily through grants under agri-environment schemes.
Coastal saltmarsh/mudflats	T1 - There should be no further net loss of extent of intertidal sediment ecosystems, currently estimated at 600ha per year. This breaks down to: the vegetated part of the intertidal sediment ecosystems, currently estimated at 100ha per year. The un-vegetated part of the intertidal sediment ecosystems, currently estimated at 500ha per year.	No net loss	Areas of SM/MF will continue to be lost due to both natural processes and coastal squeeze against flood defence structures. Loss from some parts of the coast will to an extent be offset by gains through natural processes in other areas. However, it is likely that the losses will continue to exceed the gains and consequently, maintaining extent will require the creation of SM/MF habitat
Coastal sand dunes	T1 - There should be no further net loss of the existing UK sand dune resource, its distribution and range of habitat types of about 56,500 ha (71,600 ha with Scottish Machair) from further losses to anthropogenic factors, whether caused directly or indirectly (e.g. by sea defence schemes affecting coastal processes).	No net loss	This is a 'no net loss' target to take account of the dynamic nature of sand dunes.
Coastal vegetated shingle	T1 - Maintain total extent of coastal vegetated shingle habitat throughout the UK, and the structures, sediment and coastal processes that support them, approximately 5800ha.	No net loss	This is a 'no net loss' target to take account of the dynamic nature of shingle. This includes the maintenance of transitions to other habitats landward and seaward.

Machair	T1 - Maintain the existing extent of machair habitat throughout its natural range (15,100 ha).	No net loss	This is a "no net loss" target to take account of dynamic nature of machair.
Maritime cliff and slope	T1 - Maintain the existing free-functioning maritime cliff & slope resource (including of cliff-top and slope habitat), estimated to be have a length of about 4000 km. T2 - No overall net loss of cliff and slope functionality as a result of coast protection or engineering works.	No net loss	This is essentially a 'no net loss' target that should take account of the balance between the extent of coast protection works and free-functioning cliff systems.
Saline lagoons	T1 - There should be no further net loss in extent of saline lagoons, subject to natural change. Any loss due to anthropogenic pressures should be offset with habitat enhancement / creation.	No net loss	Areas of SL will continue to be lost especially in SE England, due to both natural processes and coastal squeeze against flood defence structures. Loss from some parts of the coast will to an extent be offset by gains through natural processes in other areas. However, it is likely that the losses will continue to exceed the gains and consequently, maintaining extent will require the creation of new SL habitat
Lowland calcareous grassland	T1 - Maintain the current extent of Lowland Calcareous Grassland in the UK. (Target represents no loss of BAP habitat).	No loss	
Lowland dry acid grassland	T1 - Maintain the current extent of Lowland Dry Acid Grassland in the UK. (Target represents no loss of BAP habitat).	No loss	
Lowland meadows	T1 - Maintain the current extent of Lowland Meadows in the UK.	No loss	Target represents no loss of BAP habitat.
Purple moor-grass and rush pastures	T1 - Maintain the current extent of Purple Moor-grass and Rush Pastures in the UK.	No loss	Target represents no loss of BAP habitat.
Upland hay meadows	T1 - Maintain the current extent of Upland Hay Meadows in the UK.	No loss	Target represents no loss of BAP habitat.
Upland calcareous grassland	T1 - Maintain at least 17,700 ha of upland calcareous grassland in the UK by 2010.	No net loss	There should be no overall loss of the upland calcareous grassland habitat resource. However, 'losses' to other 'priority habitats' (e.g. upland ash woodland) may be acceptable to the UK Upland HAP SG.
Blanket bog	T1 - Maintain at least 2,325,000 ha of blanket mire in the UK by 2010.	No net loss	There should be no overall loss of the blanket bog habitat resource.

Upland heathland	T1 - Maintain at least 2,110,000 ha of upland heathland in the UK by 2010.	No net loss	There should be no overall loss of the upland heathland habitat resource. However, 'losses' to other 'priority habitats' (e.g. native pine woodland) may be acceptable to the UK Upland HAP SG.
Lowland heathland	T1 - Maintain the current extent of all existing lowland heathland. This target represents no net loss of habitat.	No net loss	
Limestone pavement	T1 - Ensure that there is no loss to the extent of limestone pavement.	No loss	
Chalk rivers	-	No loss	No maintaining extent target set - achieving condition/restoration targets only.
Aquifer-fed fluctuating water bodies	-	No loss	No loss category (loss = site being destroyed). Emphasis on achieving condition
Eutrophic standing waters	-	No loss	No loss category (loss = site being destroyed). Emphasis on achieving condition
Mesotrophic lakes	-	No loss	No loss category (loss = site being destroyed). Emphasis on achieving condition
Fens	T1 - Maintain the current extent of the UK fen resource and diversity of fen types (see fen types 1-8).	No loss	This target represents a "no loss" of habitat"(some loss of fen to woodland or bog as a result of natural succession is desirable).
Lowland raised bog	T1 - Maintain the extent of the existing UK resource of BAP habitat (i.e. primary and secondary raised bog resource) with no loss.	No loss	
Wet reedbed	T1 - Maintain the extent of the existing resource of BAP habitat by active management and with no net loss, 80% of which is in blocks of greater than 2ha.	No net loss	

Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh	T1 - Maintain the extent of the existing resource of C&FPGM habitat with no net loss.	No net loss	In particular, ensure that grazing marsh of similar quality is created to landward of flood defences that have been abandoned or breached as sea level rises, by mapping where compensatory habitat will be created in Shoreline Management Plans and other plans set out by statutory agencies.
Wood-pasture and parkland	T1 - No loss of or significant damage to the extent of known wood-pasture and parkland sites.	No loss	Aim is no overall reduction, based on estimate in the published plan, or current estimates, whichever greater. This target would apply across all the time periods being considered.
Native woodland - England	T1 - Maintain the existing area of ancient broadleaved woodland, which qualifies as native woodland; i.e. no change in the existing area of 251 kha.	No loss	
Native woodland - England	T2 - No net loss of native woodland; i.e. the area of non-ancient broadleaved woodland totals at least 284 kha.	No net loss	Although the basic target for non-ancient woodland only requires gains to exceed losses, it will be necessary to monitor the following aspects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the level of flux and rate of change in native woodland area; • the change to other priority habitats rather than to other land use (e.g. set a target of 'no net loss of semi-natural habitat'; • likely considerable interchange between native woodland and wood pasture HAP; • the area of woodland as patches or dynamic areas within other habitats.
Native woodland - Scotland	T1 - Maintain the current extent and distribution of ancient semi-natural woodland, which qualifies as native woodland; i.e. no change in the existing area of 118,382 ha.	No loss	
Native woodland - Scotland	T2 - Maintain the total extent and distribution of native woodland (no net loss of 391,000 ha).	No net loss	
Native woodland - Wales	T3 - Maintain the net extent of native broadleaved woodland, especially the extent of ancient semi-natural woodland.	No loss (ASNW), No net loss (other native woodland)	Target refers to all native woodland i.e. $\geq 50\%$ native tree species in the canopy. No loss of ASNW, no net loss of other native woodlands.

ANNEX G

Monitoring methodology and determining baselines

There is at present no systematic method, across all the UK countries, for estimating both the extent and condition of BAP habitats. This is due to the extensive area of the habitats, and lack of resources to undertake surveys outside A/SSSIs. HAP groups are actively exploring the potential of Countryside Survey (CS) (both for the future CS2007, and retrospectively from CS2000) and other surveys, at a Country level, to determine baselines and future monitoring methods. It is also likely that the countries will use different methods and will have different resources available to undertake these assessments.

Habitat	Proposed target monitoring	Comments and issues
Hedgerows	Countryside Survey (CS2007) Uptake & monitoring statistics for agri-environment options (in each country)	
Arable field margins	Countryside Survey (CS2007) Uptake & monitoring statistics for agri-environment options (in each country)	CS2007 scoping study (reporting in late 2006) will investigate ability of CS to record favourable condition in arable field margins. Additionally a working group has been set up to set standards for favourable condition.
Lowland heathland	Common Standards Monitoring (in statutory and non-statutory sites) Aerial photographs Heathland Sample Survey (HSS) project in England	
Blanket bog	Countryside Survey (CS2007) * Common Standard Monitoring (CSM) Country surveys Local loss & projects should also be reported through LBAP reporting	* Discussions are underway with ADAS and CEH on improving the CS data to fulfil this role. If CS is not suitable, other sampling methods will be considered, but this will have considerable financial requirements and it is possible that the different countries will use different methods.
Upland calcareous grassland	Common Standard Monitoring (CSM) Country surveys Local loss & projects should also be reported through LBAP reporting	For upland calcareous grassland most of the habitat resource lies within A/SSSIs (the resource outside is fragmented, and further survey is required to identify its presence). Remote monitoring is not feasible for this habitat. Extent and condition monitoring can be undertaken through CSM, but for the resource out with A/SSSIs there is no means of assessment.
Upland heathland	Countryside Survey (CS2007) *	* Discussions are underway with ADAS and CEH on improving

	Common Standard Monitoring (CSM) – designated sites Country surveys Local loss & projects should also be reported through LBAP reporting	the CS data to fulfil this role. If CS is not suitable, other sampling methods will be considered, but this will have considerable financial requirements and it is possible that the different countries will use different methods.
Limestone pavement	Countryside Survey (CS2007) Common Standard Monitoring (CSM) Country surveys	A GIS-based limestone pavement inventory and condition assessment record for the UK is under development by the Limestone Pavement HAP Steering Group.
Wood-pasture and parkland	Common Standard Monitoring (CSM) Local loss & projects should also be reported through LBAP reporting Wood-pasture and Parkland Inventory System (WAPIS)	Do not currently have an inventory of sites. This is being addressed through programmes of survey and the development of two data-bases: the Wood-pasture and Parkland Inventory System (WAPIS) run by JNCC/English Nature and the Ancient Tree Forum's Ancient Tree Hunt database. As the data-bases and inventories become more complete more systematic reviews of loss/damage will become possible.
Lowland meadows	Countryside Survey (CS2007)	There is no coherent programme of UK BAP priority habitat monitoring in place. This now requires urgent development as part of the JNCC sampling framework, and fully integrating with Countryside Survey, SSSI and agri-environment monitoring programmes. At present, reporting will only be possible for lowland grasslands in England, where a non-statutory surveillance project has been developed alongside the SSSI Common Standards Monitoring programme. To enable sufficient time for adequate data sets to accumulate, we recommend that reporting should be on a longer time interval than the current three years.
Upland hay meadows	Common Standard Monitoring (CSM)	
Lowland calcareous grassland	Uptake & monitoring statistics for agri-environment options (in each country)	
Lowland dry acid grassland	Non-statutory grassland surveillance project (England)	
Purple moor-grass and rush pastures		
Maritime cliff and slope	Common Standard Monitoring (CSM) and N2K monitoring Remote sensing and site assessment Maritime-cliff inventory (England) Uptake & monitoring statistics for agri-environment options (in each country)	SSSI and Natura 2000 site monitoring will inform the monitoring. There is a need to establish a formalised programme for non-SSSI areas e.g. using remote sensing and appropriate sampling of sites. Without the benefit of a national vegetation survey of maritime cliffs in the UK we will remain severely hampered in our efforts to develop effective conservation targets. The Maritime Cliff and Slope inventory being compiled for England will provide a useful starting point for both monitoring and targeting and the approach could be

		extended to the whole of the UK. Monitoring of agri-environment schemes will provide information on success outside of SSSIs.
Coastal sand dunes	Common Standard Monitoring (CSM) and N2K monitoring Remote sensing and site assessment Sand dune inventory and country surveys Uptake & monitoring statistics for agri-environment options (in each country)	SSSI and Natura 2000 site monitoring will inform the monitoring. There is a need to establish a formalised programme for non-SSSI areas using remote sensing. The Sand Dune survey of Great Britain will provide a useful baseline. Monitoring of agri-environment schemes will provide information on success outside of SSSIs.
Coastal vegetated shingle	Common Standard Monitoring (CSM) and N2K monitoring Remote sensing and site assessment Uptake & monitoring statistics for agri-environment options (in each country)	SSSI and Natura 2000 site monitoring will inform the monitoring. There is a need to establish a formalised programme for non-SSSI areas e.g. using remote sensing and appropriate sampling of sites.
Coastal saltmarsh	Common Standard Monitoring (CSM) and N2K monitoring Remote sensing and site assessment	SSSI and Natura 2000 site monitoring will inform the monitoring. There is a need to establish a formalised programme for non-SSSI areas e.g. using remote sensing and appropriate sampling of sites.
Mudflats	Common Standard Monitoring (CSM) and N2K monitoring Remote sensing and site assessment	SSSI and Natura 2000 site monitoring will inform the monitoring. There is a need to establish a formalised programme for non-SSSI areas e.g. using remote sensing and appropriate sampling of sites.
Saline lagoons	Common Standard Monitoring (CSM) and N2K monitoring	Monitoring programme needs to be established to assess lagoons outside of designated sites. Contextual information can also be used to inform monitoring.
Chalk river	Existing monitoring incl. Water Quality and Biological General Quality Assessment (GQA) River Habitat Survey (RHS) and flow gauging and groundwater monitoring. Characteristic species monitoring incl. BAP species (incl. macro-invertebrates, otter, water vole, S. damselfly), adhoc macrophyte surveys National Fisheries Database (NFPD), Salmon	Monitoring and reporting framework to be established as part of process of characterising Favourable Condition. Integrated with requirements for reporting PSA target and Water Framework Directive. Need length of designated chalk rivers to be established.
Eutrophic standing waters	Monitoring of water chemistry (including total phosphorus and chlorophyll) - 4 times a year.	Many lakes currently have no or minimal data available on their conservation value, impact status or reference condition.

Mesotrophic lakes	Common Standard Monitoring (CSM) GB Lakes Inventory Maintain a database of lakes studied and data collected. Data to assess all relevant potential pressures should be collected.	Information on these aspects is vital for prioritising lakes and determining actions needed to achieve favourable status. NI Lakes data are not presently collated into formats that would support classification and prioritization using the GB Lakes Inventory. Under the auspices of the EC Water Framework Directive, this will be achieved, during 2006, for all lakes recognised for their conservation significance (possibly 200+) and during 2008 for all lakes >1 ha (716).
Aquifer-fed fluctuating water bodies	Common Standards Monitoring (CSM)	
Native woodlands - Wales	National Inventory of Woodland and Trees (NIWT) Common Standard Monitoring (CSM) Aerial photographs GLADE grant system	NIWT 2 (proposed for 2005/6) should measure the extent of native woodlands, but estimates will not be available for each native woodland type in Wales due to sample size. Frequency: 5-10 years. In Assembly woodlands, use the FC GIS, Forest Design Plan objectives, and evidence of management plans. For non-Assembly woodlands, use evidence of management plans through the new GLADE grant system, plus evidence of a GLADE PAWS assessment (for PAWS sites which fall within the 'native' category (>50% native cover)). Frequency: annual
Native woodlands - England	National Inventory of Woodland and Trees (NIWT) Common Standard Monitoring (CSM) Aerial photographs EWGS and FE databases	Using the digital map from the FC's 1998 National Inventory of Woodland and Trees (NIWT) as the baseline map of the resource, and using subsequent aerial photography to report against the targets. Using the SSSI condition assessment methodology as a basis for assessing condition (although 'thresholds' for the key attributes have not yet been agreed). NIWT sample squares will probably be the principal source of data for this target.
Native woodlands - Scotland	National Inventory of Woodland and Trees (NIWT) Common Standard Monitoring (CSM) Aerial photographs Scottish Native Woodland Survey FC forestry grants	The Scottish Native Woodland Survey will assess progress by 2012. Interim progress will be provided by Forestry Commission recording systems for forestry grants and for the National Forest Estate. Progress towards condition of designated sites is provided by a rolling programme of site condition monitoring by SNH.

ANNEX H**Species recommended for removal from the BAP list (No targets set) or referred back to Species List review Group**

Species name	Lead Partner comments
<i>Acrobolbus wilsonii</i>	Since <i>Acrobolbus</i> is not considered to be threatened, as it has more than 15 hectads and no evidence of decline, it is thought likely that the species will be dropped from the BAP priority species list at the next review. Watching brief only.
<i>Amara famelica</i>	No target has been set because this species is likely to be removed from the BAP priority list. Work towards the conservation of this species has been severely hampered by poor results from extensive surveys. In reality, no population is sufficiently well 'known' for the Action Plan to be progressed. The only post-1980 record is from Sutton Park, West Midlands, and this 'population' is only known from the discovery of a single individual. Extensive surveys at all post-war sites have failed to find this beetle (see species dossier - Feb 2004).
<i>Anaergates atratulus</i>	Targets not set. Recommending that this species be removed from the BAP list. A parasitic species which depends upon a suitable level of host nests. Parasitism by this species is terminal for the host nest. Records are all serendipitous. Direct searching for parasitised nest not proven practicable and is not ecologically sustainable. Could form part of a future heathland ant assemblage target, but would not be directly monitorable.
<i>Andrena gravida</i>	Targets not set. Recommending that this species be removed from the BAP list. Appears to be an occasional colonist in SE England. Widespread and frequent to south in Continental Europe. No specific habitat association.
<i>Andrena lathyri</i>	Targets not set. Recommending that this species be removed from the BAP list. No record during period from 1998 to 2004, despite intensive searches of last known areas. Presumed extinct in UK. Widespread and frequent to south in Continental Europe.
<i>Battarraea phalloides</i>	Preliminary molecular research at the University of Kent (Jeffries & McLain ENRR 625) suggested that <i>B. phalloides</i> and <i>B. stevenii</i> are not significantly different and retention of two taxa is not justified. Refer back to habitat & species review group.
<i>Bembidion argenteolum</i>	Targets not set. Species now extinct (lost pre-BAP). Survey of Lough Neagh failed to find species - Anderson, R. (1995) Report Environment and Heritage Service. Recommending that this species be removed from the BAP list. Suggest monitoring brief only.
<i>Boletus regius</i>	Current opinion is that there is only one post 1960 UK site for this and not seen since 1987. Disputed by some and ID depends on interpretation of <i>regius</i> and <i>pseudoregius</i> and experience of recorder. These species' distributions are insufficiently clarified. A field/lab project to apply DNA seq analysis to confirm or refute the pair's distribution should be a priority. The key actions for <i>regius</i> should be to re-find it in UK and to use molecular approach to investigate taxonomy and try to re-evaluate any fresh and stored dried material which is available. Once this has been achieved, the target can be re-evaluated.
<i>Bombylius discolor</i>	Concerns over this species being on the BAP list. It is currently doing very well; a situation brought about probably by changes in climate rather than any action undertaken via the UK BAP. This species is not confined to any particular habitat and is not very choosy. It has been found on the edges of arable fields, roadside verges, grassland, farmland etc and seems to be very widely spread. We could still include it but I feel it is telling us little. Can it not be removed as a success? or just left in the background with a tick next to it? Suggest monitoring brief only.

Species name	Lead Partner comments
<i>Brachythecium appleyardiae</i>	Recent taxonomic studies (unpublished) have shown this species to be synonymous with a widespread taxon (<i>Scleropodium tourettii</i>). It is proposed to delete this species from UKBAP.
<i>Bryum mamillatum</i>	Species is no longer a valid taxa (see reference 1 below). Even if it were a valid taxa, it appears to have been extinct in the UK before the Action Plan was published. It has not been refound at its sites in eastern England, despite intensive searching, and the Merseyside record has been discounted (see reference 2 below). We therefore recommend that an Action Plan is no longer valid for <i>B. mamillatum</i> 1) Holyoak, D.T. 2004. Taxonomic notes on some European species of <i>Bryum</i> (Bryopsida: Bryaceae). <i>Journal of Bryology</i> , 26, 247-265 2) Holyoak, D.T. 2002. Coastal mosses of the genus <i>Bryum</i> . <i>Plantlife report</i> 206
<i>Callicera spinolae</i>	Targets not set. Recommending that this species be removed from the BAP list. Despite being rare and associated with mature trees (an interesting habitat for many insects) it seems very likely that any action we take WILL NOT effect it. This species is seemingly colonising westwards but NOT leaving any old colonies in its wake. Even when suitable habitat and artificial rot holes are present at sites the species does not seem to react favourably and still moves on. It should be removed as we have no control over it. Suggest monitoring brief only.
<i>Cathormiocerus britannicus</i>	Taxonomic work has shown that this species is not separate from <i>Cathormiocerus myrmecophilus</i> and therefore does not warrant BAP status.
<i>Didymon mamillosus</i>	Drop - molecular studies show synonymous with <i>D. rigidulus</i> . (Rumsey & Russell, 2003)
<i>Dorycera graminum</i>	Targets not set. Recommending that this species be removed from the BAP list. Like <i>Doros</i> , we know nothing about its ecology despite two contracts to find out more. We know nothing about its larval requirements; it seems to turn up in a number of sites often with disparate habitat types present. To go any further with this species will require a lot of funding directed towards its autecology. Suggest monitoring brief only.
<i>Ephemerum stellatum</i>	Research has been carried out on the taxonomic status of this species, which appears to be extinct in the UK in any case (prior to plan publication), which demonstrates that it is not a valid species. Target implementation can only occur once taxonomic status has been confirmed. We therefore propose that <i>E. stellatum</i> is no longer suitable for an action plan. Reference: Holyoak, D.T. 2001. Starry Earth Moss <i>Ephemerum stellatum</i> . <i>Plantlife report</i> 180
<i>Fissidens exiguus</i>	Research has been carried out both in the UK and in the USA which suggests that <i>F. exiguus</i> is not a valid species in its own right but rather a form of <i>F. bryoides</i> . We therefore propose that this is no longer suitable for an action plan and that all targets are dropped. References: Holyoak D.T. 2001. Tiny fern moss <i>Fissidens exiguus</i> . <i>Plantlife report</i> 181 Pursell, R.A. 1976. On the typification of certain taxa and structural variation within the <i>Fissidens bryoides</i> complex in Eastern North America. <i>Bryologist</i> 79: 35-41
<i>Formica pratensis</i>	Extinct?
<i>Fumaria occidentalis</i>	Target not set. Recommending that this species be removed from the BAP list. Species has just been removed from the Red List since - despite having considerable interest as a rare English endemic - its population is now known to be stable (possibly increasing), and it does not appear to be under any current threat. Suggest monitoring brief only.

Species name	Lead Partner comments
<i>Gyalideopsis scotica</i>	Drop all targets - agreed at BLS Cons Comm, by BJ Coppins. Requires no special management and is not under threat - other than climatic perhaps.
<i>Halecania rhypodiza</i>	Species is unlikely to qualify as a BAP priority.
<i>Hamatocaulis vernicosus</i>	Recommend species should be removed from the UKBAP list (it is widespread and abundant in Wales) and it is hard to see what targets might be appropriate.
<i>Hydrelia sylvata</i>	Recommend downgrade to Species of Conservation Concern. Known from 76 10km squares in the last 5 years as opposed to 72 10km squares from 1980 to c1999 (a total of approx. 120 10km squares from 1980 onwards. Almost certainly under-recorded in south-east England during the last 5 years. Records indicate an approx. 38% of all squares recorded for this species do not have a post 1980 record.
<i>Hypena rostralis</i>	Recommend downgrade to Species of Conservation Concern. Known from 169 10km squares in the last 5 years as opposed to 65 10km squares from 1980 to 1998. Larval survey effort over last 5 years has shown this species to be formerly under-recorded
<i>Limonium binervosum</i> agg.	At the last UK SAP Steering Group meeting (17/12/05) members* discussed the conservation status of Limonium and in light of the genetic work and reanalysis of the morphological data, the group would like to propose the removal of Limonium from the UK BAP Priority List and the abandonment of the UK SAP with any future conservation work being delivered through other means, including LBAPs. See attached paper on the removal of rock sea lavender.
<i>Lycaena dispar</i>	Extinct?
<i>Myotis myotis</i>	Targets not set. Recommending that this species be removed from the BAP list. Species extinct. No proposals for reintroduction in Action Plan. We will respond to natural recolonisation. Suggest monitoring brief only.
<i>Mythimna turca</i>	Recommend downgrade to Species of Conservation Concern. Known from 73 10km squares in last 5 years as opposed to 58 10km squares from 1980 to 1996. Recorded from c.100 10km squares from 1980 onwards. Records indicate an approx. 42% of all squares recorded for this species do not have a post 1980 record.
<i>Nomada errans</i>	Targets not set. Recommending that this species be removed from the BAP list. No record during period from 1998 to 2004, despite intensive searches of last known areas. Presumed extinct in UK. Very localised and uncommon in Continental Europe.
<i>Opegrapha paraxanthodes</i>	Proposal to drop the lichen <i>Opegrapha paraxanthodes</i> from the BAP list. This lichen is categorized by Woods and Coppins 2003 as near threatened though being nationally rare. It is known from 3 sites in Scotland, 3 in Wales and 1 in England. It is a little understood species of vertical, shaded calcareous rock outcrops. It was presumably originally included as a BAP species as it was considered to be endemic. This latter status is doubtful. It is separated with difficulty from the widespread <i>O. varia</i> -a lichen of tree bark- on account of slight differences in spore septation. There has also been confusion with <i>O. mougeotii</i> and <i>O. paraxanthodes</i> may only be a variant of this latter species. The continental lichenologists do not apparently recognise this minor difference as being sufficiently great to warrant any taxonomic status or have recognised it as forming part of the diversity of <i>O. variaeformis</i> . The natural habitats of <i>O. paraxanthodes</i> do not appear to be under any particular threat and the limestone quarrying industry is creating fresh habitat on a scale that conservation action could never emulate. All

Species name	Lead Partner comments
	attempts to secure funds for a research programme to examine its relationship to <i>O. varia</i> etc. have been unsuccessful since with no threat to sites it is a rather academic exercise. In consequence it is proposed that no further action is proposed with respect to this species.
<i>Pachytychius haematocephalus</i>	Gilkicker Weevil should no longer be a Priority species, largely due to lack of evidence of continuing decline.
<i>Stenus palposus</i>	Targets not set. Resurvey of key sites on the 16th and 22nd May 2004 and on the 12th June 2004 failed to produce evidence of the occurrence of <i>Stenus palposus</i> . In the light of its probable extinction in NI, <i>Stenus palposus</i> should be removed from the BAP priority list. (See attached word documents for details).
<i>Trichomanes speciosum</i>	It is the recommendation of the Steering Group that this species be removed from BAP listing. As we stated in the JNCC 2003 Assessment actions had already been accomplished or had been made unnecessary in the light of research and monitoring work carried out under the BAP. The species was discovered to be much more abundant than believed, was showing signs of sporophytic recruitment in several sites, had not actually been totally lost from any site and appeared to be under little threat and unlikely to benefit from actions beyond that of ensuring protection of sites. Restoration was unnecessary given that the species was still present in sites as the gametophyte and there was reasonable expectation that these would ultimately recruit new sporophytes. In any case material of known provenance existed from only one site
<i>Xestia rhomboidea</i>	Recommend downgrade to Species of Conservation Concern. Recorded from 76 10km squares from 1999 onwards as opposed to 71 from 1980 to c.1999. Not recorded from approx. 48% of all 10km squares this species has been recorded historically from 1980 onwards. Probably under-recorded.

ANNEX I**Targets submitted for widespread species (those occupying whose range exceeds 100 occupied 10km squares)**

Species name (taxon)	Revised target text	Target units	2005 baseline					2010 target				
			UK	E	NI	S	W	UK	E	NI	S	W
The agriculture sector												
Alauda arvensis (Birds)	T1 - Ensure the BBS index is at 100% of the 2003 level by 2010. (Target applicable to UK and all four countries)	BBS Index	tbc	tbc	tbc	tbc	tbc	100	100	100	100	100
Alauda arvensis (Birds)	T2 - Maintain the percentage of occupied BBS squares at the 2003 levels. (Target applicable to UK and all four countries)	% Occupied BBS Squares	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Carduelis cannabina (Birds)	T1 - Increase the BBS index to 115% of the 2003 level by 2010. (Target applicable to UK, England, Scotland and Wales)	BBS Index	tbc	tbc	0	tbc	tbc	115	115	0	115	115
Carduelis cannabina (Birds)	T3 - Ensure population is at 115% of 2010 baseline level by 2015 and 130% of 2010 baseline level by 2020. (Target applicable to Northern Ireland)	% 2010 Baseline	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	tbc	0	0

Species name (taxon)	Revised target text	Target units	2005 baseline					2010 target				
			UK	E	NI	S	W	UK	E	NI	S	W
Carduelis cannabina (Birds)	T4 - Maintain the percentage of occupied BBS squares at the 2003 level. (Targets applicable to UK and all four countries)	% Occupied BBS Squares	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Emberiza schoeniclus (Birds)	T1 - Increase the BBS index to 115% of the 2003 level by 2010. (Target applicable to UK England and Scotland)	BBS Index	tbc	tbc	0	tbc	0	115	115	0	115	0
Emberiza schoeniclus (Birds)	T3 - Ensure population is at 115% of 2010 baseline level by 2015 and 130% of 2010 baseline level by 2020. (Target applicable to Wales and Northern Ireland)	% 2010 Baseline	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	tbc	0	tbc
Emberiza schoeniclus (Birds)	T4 - Increase the percentage of occupied BBS squares to 110% of the 2003 level by 2010. (Target applicable to UK, England, Scotland and Northern Ireland)	% Occupied BBS Squares	tbc	tbc	tbc	tbc	0	110	110	110	110	0

Species name (taxon)	Revised target text	Target units	2005 baseline					2010 target				
			UK	E	NI	S	W	UK	E	NI	S	W
Emberiza schoeniclus (Birds)	T6 - Increase number of 1km squares occupied to 110% 2010 level by 2015 and to 120% 2010 level by 2020. (Target applicable to Wales)	% Occupied 1 km squares	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	tbc
Miliaria calandra (Birds)	T1 - Convert the current (2003) negative BBS population trend into a stable or positive population trend by 2010. (Target applicable to UK and England)	BBS Index	tbc	tbc	0	0	0	Trend 0/+ve	Trend 0/+ve	0	0	0
Miliaria calandra (Birds)	T2 - Ensure the BBS index is at 100% of the 2003 level by 2015 and increase to 150% of the 2003 level by 2020. (Target applicable to UK and England)	BBS Index	tbc	tbc	0	0	0	Trend 0/+ve	Trend 0/+ve	0	0	0
Miliaria calandra (Birds)	T4 - Ensure population is at 100% of 2010 baseline level by 2015 and 150% of 2010 baseline by 2020. (Target applicable to Scotland)	% 2010 Baseline	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Species name (taxon)	Revised target text	Target units	2005 baseline					2010 target				
			UK	E	NI	S	W	UK	E	NI	S	W
Miliaria calandra (Birds)	T5 - Establish viable breeding population of >30 singing males by 2020. (Target applicable to Wales)	Displaying males	0	0	0	0	tbc	0	0	0	0	tbc
Miliaria calandra (Birds)	T6 - Ensure the percentage of occupied BBS squares is at 100% of the 2003 level by 2010. (Target applicable to UK and England)	% Occupied BBS Squares	tbc	tbc	0	0	0	100	100	0	0	0
Miliaria calandra (Birds)	T8 - Increase number of 1km squares occupied to 110% 2010 level by 2015 and to 120% 2010 level by 2020.	% Occupied 1 km squares	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	tbc	0
Passer montanus (Birds)	T1 - Increase the BBS index to 150% of the 2003 level by 2010. (Targets applicable to UK and England)	BBS Index	tbc	tbc	0	0	0	150	150	0	0	0
Passer montanus (Birds)	T3 - Ensure population is at 150% of 2010 baseline level by 2015 and 220% of 2010 baseline level by 2020. (Target applicable to Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland)	% 2010 Baseline	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	tbc	tbc	tbc

Species name (taxon)	Revised target text	Target units	2005 baseline					2010 target				
			UK	E	NI	S	W	UK	E	NI	S	W
Passer montanus (Birds)	T4 - Increase the percentage of occupied BBS squares to 110% of the 2003 level by 2010. (Target applicable to UK and England)	% Occupied BBS Squares	tbc	tbc	0	0	0	110	110	0	0	0
Passer montanus (Birds)	T6 - Increase number of 1km squares occupied to 110% 2010 level by 2015 and to 120% 2010 level by 2020. (Target applicable to Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland)	% Occupied 1 km squares	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	tbc	tbc	tbc
Perdix perdix (Birds)	T1 - Ensure the UK population of grey partridge is above 90,000 breeding pairs by 2010.	Breeding pairs	65000	55000	0	9000	1000	90000	76000	0	12500	1500
Perdix perdix (Birds)	T2 - Achieve an increase in the range of grey partridge from current 1,450 occupied 10 km squares, to 1,530 occupied 10 km squares by 2015	Occupied 10 km squares	1450	1100	0	300	50	1450	1100	0	300	50
Streptopelia turtur (Birds)	T1 - Convert the current (2003) negative BBS population trend into a stable or positive	BBS Index	tbc	tbc	0	0	0	Trend 0/ +ve	Trend 0/ +ve	0	0	0

Species name (taxon)	Revised target text	Target units	2005 baseline					2010 target					
			UK	E	NI	S	W	UK	E	NI	S	W	
	population trend by 2010. (Target applicable to UK and England)												
Streptopelia turtur (Birds)	T2 - Ensure the BBS index is at 100% of the 2003 level by 2015 and increase to 115% of the 2003 level by 2020. (Target applicable to UK and England)	BBS Index	tbc	tbc	0	0	0	Trend 0/+ve	Trend 0/+ve	0	0	0	0
Streptopelia turtur (Birds)	T3 - Establish viable breeding population of >30 singing males by 2020. (Target applicable to Wales)	Displaying males	0	0	0	0	tbc	0	0	0	0	0	tbc
Streptopelia turtur (Birds)	T4 - Ensure a stable or positive trend in the percentage of occupied BBS squares by 2010. (Target applicable to UK and England)	% Occupied BBS Squares	tbc	tbc	0	0	0	Trend 0/+ve	Trend 0/+ve	0	0	0	0
Tetrao tetrix (Birds)	T1 - Increase the population of black grouse to 6800 lekking males by 2010.	Displaying males	4388	895	0	3250	243	4550	1000	0	3250	300	
Tetrao tetrix (Birds)	T2 - Restore the range of black grouse to 325 occupied 10km	Occupied 10 km squares	296	43	0	230	23	305	48	0	230	27	

Species name (taxon)	Revised target text	Target units	2005 baseline					2010 target				
			UK	E	NI	S	W	UK	E	NI	S	W
	squares by 2010.											
Turdus philomelos (Birds)	T1 - Increase the BBS index to 115% of the 2003 level by 2010. (Target applicable to UK and all four countries)	BBS Index	tbc	tbc	tbc	tbc	tbc	115	115	115	115	115
Turdus philomelos (Birds)	T2 - Maintain the percentage of occupied BBS squares at the 2003 levels. (Target applicable to UK and all four countries)	% Occupied BBS Squares	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Euphydryas aurinia (Butterflies)	T1 - Maintain the core range of the species.	Occupied 10 km squares	199	91	16	35	57	199	91	16	35	57
Euphydryas aurinia (Butterflies)	T2 - Maintain viable networks (metapopulations) within 25 core regions.	Occupied 1 km squares	315	171	?	97	47	373	205	?	107	61
Lysandra bellargus (Butterflies)	T1 - Maintain the current range of the species.	Occupied 10 km squares	95	95	0	0	0	95	95	0	0	0
Lysandra bellargus (Butterflies)	T2 - Restore populations to the 1970-82 distribution by 2010.	Occupied 10 km squares	55	55	0	0	0	79	79	0	0	0

Species name (taxon)	Revised target text	Target units	2005 baseline					2010 target				
			UK	E	NI	S	W	UK	E	NI	S	W
Lepus europaeus (Mammals)	T1 - Maintain current range of brown hare in the UK.	Occupied 10 km squares	1604	1022	0	412	170	1604	1022	0	412	170
Lepus europaeus (Mammals)	T2 - Double existing numbers of brown hare by 2010.	Individuals	866300	702600	0	124000	39700	1732500	1405100	0	248100	79300
Lepus europaeus (Mammals)	T2 - Ensure brown hare population is at X% of 2005 baseline level by 2010. (Targets applicable England, Scotland and Wales)	Population index	100	100	0	100	100	120	120	0	120	120
The coasts and seas												
Melanitta nigra (Birds)	T1 - Increase the population of common scoter to at least 100 breeding pairs by 2010.	Breeding pairs	95	0	0	95	0	100	0	0	100	0
Melanitta nigra (Birds)	T2 - Maintain at least the existing breeding range of common scoter in Scotland (23 Occupied 10 km squares).	Occupied 10 km squares	23	0	0	23	0	23	0	0	23	0
Melanitta nigra (Birds)	T3 - Regain common scoter as a breeding species in Northern Ireland by 2015.	Site(s) / Population(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Species name (taxon)	Revised target text	Target units	2005 baseline					2010 target				
			UK	E	NI	S	W	UK	E	NI	S	W
Melanitta nigra (Birds)	T4 - Maintain the current range of moulting common scoters in the UK.	Site(s) / Population(s)	14	4	1	6	3	14	4	1	6	3
Melanitta nigra (Birds)	T5 - Maintain the current population of moulting common scoters in the UK.	Individuals	n/avl	n/av/	n/av/	n/av/	n/av/	0	tbc	tbc	tbc	tbc
Melanitta nigra (Birds)	T6 - Maintain the current range of wintering common scoters in the UK.	Site(s) / Population(s)	14	4	1	6	3	14	4	1	6	3
Melanitta nigra (Birds)	T7 - Maintain the current population of wintering common scoters in the UK.	Individuals	58000	9000	3000	13000	33000	58000	9000	3000	13000	33000
Water and wetlands												
Austropotamobius pallipes (Crustacean)	T1 - Maintain current range of white-clawed crayfish in the UK.	Occupied 10 km squares	241	194	23	2	22	241	194	23	2	22
Austropotamobius pallipes (Crustacean)	T2 - Achieve an increase in range of white-clawed crayfish in the UK by 59 10 km squares to 300 by 2030.	Occupied 10 km squares	241	194	23	2	22	253	204	24	2	23
Austropotamobius pallipes (Crustacean)	T3 - Maintain key populations of white-clawed crayfish in the UK.	Site(s) / Population(s)	19	14	4	0	1	19	14	4	0	1

Species name (taxon)	Revised target text	Target units	2005 baseline					2010 target				
			UK	E	NI	S	W	UK	E	NI	S	W
Triturus cristatus (Herpetiles)	T1 - Achieve an increase of occupied 1km ² from X - Y by date.	Occupied 1 km squares	0		0			0		0		
Triturus cristatus (Herpetiles)	T2 - Achieve an increase in the range from current X occupied km ² 's, to Y occupied km ² 's.	Occupied 1 km squares	0		0			0		0		
Triturus cristatus (Herpetiles)	T3 - Maintain the range of the species in all current vice counties.	Occupied vice counties	80	56	0	15	9	80	56	0	15	9
Triturus cristatus (Herpetiles)	T4 - Ensure that X occupied GCN ponds have at least 1/2* other suitable ponds present within 500m by date (to be decided).	Site(s) / Population(s)	0		0			0		0		
Arvicola terrestris (Mammals)	T1 - Maintain the current range (730 occupied 10km squares) of water vole in UK.	Occupied 10km squares	730	582	0	79	69	730	582	0	79	69
Arvicola terrestris (Mammals)	T2 - Achieve an increase in range by 50 new occupied 10km squares in the UK by 2010.	Occupied 10km squares	730	582	0	79	69	780	605	0	95	80
Lutra lutra (Mammals)	T1 - Maintain the current distribution of the otter throughout	Occupied 10 km squares	2219	878	148	988	205	2219	878	148	988	205

Species name (taxon)	Revised target text	Target units	2005 baseline					2010 target				
			UK	E	NI	S	W	UK	E	NI	S	W
	the UK.											
Lutra lutra (Mammals)	T2 - Expand the distribution of otters to achieve 85% occupancy of 10km squares by 2015.	% Occupied 10 km squares	2219	878	148	988	205	2377	997	156	1003	221
Woodland and forestry management												
Caprimulgus europaeus (Birds)	T1 - Maintain a population of 4079 churring males.	Displaying males	4079	3821	0	24	234	4079	3821	0	24	234
Caprimulgus europaeus (Birds)	T2 - Increase the population to 4800 churring males by 2016 (an 18% population increase in 12 years).	Displaying males	4079	3821	0	24	234	0				
Caprimulgus europaeus (Birds)	T3 - Maintain a range of 269 occupied ten km squares.	Occupied 10 km squares	269	225	0	6	38	269	225	0	6	38
Caprimulgus europaeus (Birds)	T4 - Increase the range to 305 occupied ten km squares by 2016 (a 13% range increase in 12 years).	Occupied 10 km squares	269	225	0	6	38	0				
Lullula arborea (Birds)	T1 - Maintain a population of 1500 breeding pairs.	Breeding pairs	1500	1500	0	0	0	1500	1500	0	0	0

Species name (taxon)	Revised target text	Target units	2005 baseline					2010 target					
			UK	E	NI	S	W	UK	E	NI	S	W	
Lullula arborea (Birds)	T2 - Increase the population to 2150 breeding pairs by 2018 (a 43% population increase in 12 years).	Breeding pairs	1500	1500	0	0	0	0					
Lullula arborea (Birds)	T3 - Maintain a range of 90 occupied ten km squares.	Occupied 10 km squares	90	90	0	0	0	90	90	0	0	0	0
Lullula arborea (Birds)	T4 - Increase the range to 125 occupied ten km squares by 2018 (a 39% range increase in 12 years).	Occupied 10 km squares	90	90	0	0	0	0					
Muscicapa striata (Birds)	T1 - Convert the current (2003) negative BBS population trend into a stable or positive population trend by 2010. (Target applicable to UK and England)	BBS Index	tbc	tbc	0	0	0	Trend 0/ +ve	Trend 0/ +ve	0	0	0	0
Muscicapa striata (Birds)	T2 - Ensure the BBS index is at 100% of the 2003 level by 2015 and increase to 115% of the 2003 level by 2020. (Target applicable to UK and England)	BBS Index	tbc	tbc	tbc	0	0	Trend 0/ +ve	Trend 0/ +ve	0	0	0	0

Species name (taxon)	Revised target text	Target units	2005 baseline					2010 target				
			UK	E	NI	S	W	UK	E	NI	S	W
Muscicapa striata (Birds)	T4 - Ensure population is at 100% of 2010 baseline level by 2015 and 115% of 2010 baseline level by 2020. (Target applicable to Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland)	% 2010 Baseline	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	tbc	tbc	tbc
Muscicapa striata (Birds)	T5 - Maintain the percentage of occupied BBS squares at the 2003 level. (Target applicable to UK, England and Wales)	% Occupied BBS Squares	100	100	0	0	100	100	100	0	0	100
Muscicapa striata (Birds)	T7 - Maintain number of 1km squares occupied at 2010 level by 2015. (Target applicable to Scotland and Northern Ireland)	% Occupied 1 km squares	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	tbc	tbc	0
Pyrrhula pyrrhula (Birds)	T1 - Convert the current (2003) negative BBS population trend into a stable or positive population trend by 2010. (Target applicable to UK, England and Wales)	BBS Index	tbc	tbc	0	0	tbc	Trend 0/ +ve	Trend 0/ +ve	0	0	Trend 0/ +ve

Species name (taxon)	Revised target text	Target units	2005 baseline					2010 target				
			UK	E	NI	S	W	UK	E	NI	S	W
Pyrrhula pyrrhula (Birds)	T2 - Ensure the BBS index is at 100% of the 2003 level by 2015 and increase to 115% of the 2003 level by 2020. (Target applicable to UK, England and Wales)	BBS Index	tbc	tbc	0	0	tbc	Trend 0/+ve	Trend 0/+ve	0	0	Trend 0/+ve
Pyrrhula pyrrhula (Birds)	T4 - Ensure population is at 100% of 2010 baseline level by 2015 and 115% of 2010 baseline level by 2020. (Target applicable to Scotland and Northern Ireland)	% 2010 Baseline	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	tbc	tbc	0
Pyrrhula pyrrhula (Birds)	T5 - Maintain the percentage of occupied BBS squares at the 2003 level. (Target applicable to UK and all four countries)	% Occupied BBS Squares	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Boloria euphrosyne (Butterflies)	T1 - Maintain the core range of the species in the UK.	Occupied 10 km squares	194	101	0	79	14	194	101	0	79	14
Boloria euphrosyne (Butterflies)	T2 - Maintain viable networks (metapopulations) within 23 core regions.	Site(s) / Population(s)	52	47	0	tbc	5	52	47	0	tbc	5

Species name (taxon)	Revised target text	Target units	2005 baseline					2010 target				
			UK	E	NI	S	W	UK	E	NI	S	W
Boloria euphrosyne (Butterflies)	T3 - Increase the number of occupied sites within each network.	Site(s) / Population(s)	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	0	tbc	2
Muscardinus avellanarius (Mammals)	T1 - Maintain the current range (376 occupied 10km squares) of dormouse in UK. (This will involve maintaining dormouse populations in existing occupied 10km squares).	Occupied 10 km squares	376	327	0	0	62	376	327	0	0	62
Muscardinus avellanarius (Mammals)	T2 - Re-establish self-sustaining dormouse populations at X sites, in counties where they have been lost, by 2010.	Site(s) / Population(s)	11	11	0	0	0	16	16	0	0	0
Muscardinus avellanarius (Mammals)	T3 - Ensure the dormouse population index is at 100% of the 1991 level by 2015 and increase to 115% of the 1991 level by 2020.	Population index	tbc	tbc	0	0	tbc	Trend 0/+ve	Trend 0/+ve	0	0	Trend 0/+ve
Pipistrellus pipistrellus (Mammals)	T1 - Maintain P. pipistrellus population above 2005 baseline level (baseline available only at UK level at this time).	NBMP Index	100					100				

Species name (taxon)	Revised target text	Target units	2005 baseline					2010 target					
			UK	E	NI	S	W	UK	E	NI	S	W	
Pipistrellus pipistrellus (Mammals)	T2 - Increase P. pipistrellus population index by 35% of the 2005 baseline level by 2020.	NBMP Index	100					110					
Pipistrellus pygmaeus (Mammals)	T1 - Maintain P. pygmaeus population above 2005 baseline level (baseline available only at UK level at this time).	NBMP Index	100					100					
Pipistrellus pygmaeus (Mammals)	T2 - Increase P. pygmaeus population index by 35% of the 2005 baseline level by 2020.	NBMP Index	100					110					
Rhinolophus ferrumequinum (Mammals)	T3 - Ensure GH bat population is at X% of 2005 baseline level by 2010.	Population index	100	100	0	0	100	tbc	tbc	0	0	t	
Rhinolophus hipposideros (Mammals)	T1 - Achieve an increase the range of lesser horseshoe bats in the UK by 86 10 km squares to 394 by 2030.	Occupied 10 km squares	308	225	0	0	83	308	225	0	0	83	
Rhinolophus hipposideros (Mammals)	T2 - Increase R. hipposideros population index by 25% of the 2005 baseline level by 2020.	NBMP Index	100					108					

Species name (taxon)	Revised target text	Target units	2005 baseline					2010 target				
			UK	E	NI	S	W	UK	E	NI	S	W
Sciurus vulgaris (Mammals)	T1 - Maintain populations of red squirrels across their current range in the UK.	Occupied 10 km squares	603	172	111	300	20	603	172	111	300	20