

Lowland calcareous grassland

Full report outputted on the 30/07/2003 15:58:21

1. Status of the habitat / species

Please give your most accurate assessment of the status of your species or habitat for the UK and for each country. Leave the row blank where the species or habitat does not occur in that country.

	Amount:	Units:	Year:	Accuracy:	Reference for data:
UK	39500	<input type="text"/>	2002	Partial or sample survey	published plan & Agency data
E	38450	<input type="text"/>	2001	Full survey	published plan & EN data
NI	0	<input type="text"/>	1995	Partial or sample survey	published plan
S	100	<input type="text"/>	2002	Partial or sample survey	From J MacKintosh & M Smith, SNH, 2002, pers. comm.
W	1000	<input type="text"/>	1999	Full survey	Phase I survey, CCW, 1979-1999

Information originally entered by Richard Jefferson on Tuesday, October 15, 2002

Information last changed by Richard Jefferson on Friday, December 06, 2002

2. Trend in Biological Status

Please give your best estimate of the current trend for your species or habitat for the UK, and each appropriate country, using the following categories. Please give an estimate unless there is absolutely no information on which to assess status.


	Trend:	Accuracy:	Reference for data:
UK	Stable	Informed guess	JNCC
E	Stable	Informed guess	EN data, also Burke & Critchley 2001. Review of UK agri-environment schemes and other initiatives in maintaining, restoring and re-creating semi-natural low land grassland. ADAS report for CCW & JNCC.
NI	Not applicable (does not occur in this country)		EHS
S	Declining (slow ing)	Informed guess	SNH
W	Declining (slow ing)	Informed guess	CCW

Information originally entered by Richard Jefferson on Wednesday, October 16, 2002
 Information last changed by Richard Jefferson on Friday, December 06, 2002

3. Status of knowledge

To what extent is our scientific knowledge of the habitat / species (e.g research information, autecological knowledge, knowledge for effective re-introduction or habitat restoration/re-creation) sufficient to deliver the plan targets?

Please give an assessment for the UK overall but if there is significant difference in knowledge between different countries this should be noted.

Status of knowledge:	Know ledge sufficient to effectively deliver the plan targets. 
Notes:	<div style="border: 1px solid gray; padding: 5px;"><p>Ecological specialists have extensive know ledge of the needs of these habitats and their species. How ever some work is needed to synthesise this know ledge to provide constructive advice for site managers. Further research is needed into the detail of re-creation methods and evaluating their success.</p></div>

Information originally entered by Richard Jefferson on Tuesday, October 15, 2002
Information last changed by Richard Jefferson on Friday, December 06, 2002

4. Progress on targets

Each of the revised targets from the 2001 Targets Review is listed below.

For each one please give a qualitative assessment of progress for the UK and each country. You can also enter quantitative information on progress by entering data in each of the target boxes and entering the current amount in the amount box. For more information see Help.

T5: For stands outside SSSIs, secure favourable condition over as near to 100% as is practicable by 2015.

Target start date: 1998

Target end date: 2015

Target units:

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	<input type="text" value="Unknown"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="No"/>
E	<input type="text" value="Unknown"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="Yes"/>
NI	<input type="text" value="Not applicable"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
S	<input type="text" value="Some progress (ahead of schedule)"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="Informed guess"/>	<input type="text" value="Yes"/>
W	<input type="text" value="Some progress (behind schedule)"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="Best guess"/>	<input type="text" value="No"/>

T6: Attempt to re-establish 1000 ha of lowland calcareous grassland of wildlife value at carefully targeted sites by 2010.

Target start date: 1998

Target end date: 2010

Target units:

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Target exceeded (plan progress) ▼	1000		Partial or sample survey ▼	Under active development ▼
E	Target exceeded (plan progress) ▼	970	8400	Partial or sample survey ▼	Under active development ▼
NI	Not applicable ▼				
S	Not applicable ▼				
W	Some progress (behind schedule) ▼	30		Informed guess ▼	Under active development ▼

T1: Arrest the depletion of lowland calcareous grassland throughout the UK.

Target start date:

1998

Target end date:

ongoing

Target units:

Progress

Target

Current

Accuracy

Monitoring

UK	Some progress (behind schedule) ▼	39500		Informed guess ▼	No ▼
E	Some progress (on schedule) ▼	38450		Informed guess ▼	Yes ▼
NI	Not applicable ▼				
S	Some progress (behind schedule) ▼	27		Informed guess ▼	Yes ▼
W	Some progress (behind schedule) ▼	1000		Informed guess ▼	Under consideration ▼

T2: Within SSSIs, initiate rehabilitation management for all significant stands of lowland calcareous grassland in unfavourable condition by 2005.

Target start date:

Target end date:

Target units:

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Some progress (behind schedule) ▼	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	Informed guess ▼	Under active development ▼
E	Some progress (on schedule) ▼	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	Informed guess ▼	Yes ▼

NI	Not applicable				
S	Some progress (behind schedule)			Informed guess	Yes
W	Some progress (behind schedule)			Best guess	Under active development

T3: Achieve favourable status for all significant stands of lowland calcareous grassland within SSSIs by 2010.

Target start date: 1998

Target end date: 2010

Target units:

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Some progress (behind schedule)			Informed guess	Under active development
E	Some progress (on schedule)	569	431	Partial or sample survey	Yes
NI	Not applicable				
S	Some progress (on schedule)			Informed guess	Yes

W	Some progress (behind schedule) ▼			Best guess ▼	Under active development ▼
----------	-----------------------------------	--	--	--------------	----------------------------

T4: For stands outside SSSIs, secure favourable condition over 30% of the resource by 2005.

Target start date:	1998
Target end date:	2005
Target units:	▼

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Unknown ▼			▼	No ▼
E	Unknown ▼			▼	Yes ▼
NI	Not applicable ▼			▼	▼
S	Some progress (on schedule) ▼			Informed guess ▼	Yes ▼
W	Some progress (behind schedule) ▼			Best guess ▼	No ▼

Information originally entered by Richard Jefferson on Tuesday, October 15, 2002
 Information last changed by Richard Jefferson on Friday, November 29, 2002

5. Current factors affecting the habitat

When your plan was published the factors (threats) that were thought to be causing loss or decline were listed (in section 2). Re-assessing the current situation may help prioritise actions for your species or habitat. In addition, this enables identification of the main threats to biodiversity across all plans. It is useful to assess whether the importance of different factors is changing and whether there are new issues emerging.

The threat section from the original plan is duplicated below, and a first attempt at categorising the threats has been made. Please confirm that you agree with the categorisation of the original threats identified in the plan (by deleting any wrongly categorised threats and adding the correct category). Please also add to the list any significant threats that have emerged recently, being mindful of environmental issues that have increased in profile or been recognised since plan publication (e.g. climate change). Once you are happy that the list contains all the threats identified in the published plan together with any new ones, please rank them in order of severity (1= highest threat). If the situation has changed and one of the published threats is no longer significant, please leave this in the list but give this rank = 0.

Current factors affecting the habitat from the original publication:

- 2.1 The factors currently affecting calcareous grassland reduce the quality and quantity of the habitat, and its fragmentation brings increased risk of species extinctions in the small remnant areas. For example a survey of the Lincolnshire Wolds found that 66% of sites were less than 1 ha in size and none was more than 10 ha in size. The factors include:
 - 2.1.1 Agricultural intensification by use of fertilisers, herbicides and other pesticides, re-seeding or ploughing for arable crops.
 - 2.1.2 Farm specialisation towards arable cropping has reduced the availability of livestock in many lowland areas. The result is the increasing dominance of coarse grasses such as tor grass *Brachypodium pinnatum* and false oat grass *Arrhenatherum elatius* and invasion by scrub and woodland, leading to losses of calcareous grassland flora and fauna.
 - 2.1.3 Over-grazing is a less widespread problem, and is sometimes associated with supplementary feeding, which can also can cause localised sward damage, due to trampling and long-term nutrient enrichment.
 - 2.1.4 Development activities such as mineral and rock extraction, road building, housing and landfill.
 - 2.1.5 Localised afforestation with hardwoods and softwoods.
 - 2.1.6 Recreational pressure bringing about floristic changes associated with soil compaction at some key sites.

2.1.7 Invasion by non-native plants, including bird-sown Cotoneaster species, causes problems by smothering calcareous grassland communities at some sites.

2.1.8 Atmospheric pollution and climate change, the influence of which is not fully assessed.

Keyworded factors:

To add factors click the add button, to delete factors check the delete box and then click the delete button.

Delete:	Rank:	Keyword:
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Habitat loss / degradation - agriculture Abandonment of marginal land
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Habitat loss / degradation - agriculture Inappropriate grazing (due to timing or livestock type)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Habitat loss / degradation - agriculture Intensive crop regimes
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Habitat loss / degradation - agriculture Loss of mixed farming
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Habitat loss / degradation - agriculture Overgrazing
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Habitat loss / degradation - agriculture Ploughing
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Habitat loss / degradation - agriculture Re-seeding of pastures / grassland
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Habitat loss / degradation - agriculture Trampling by livestock

<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Habitat loss / degradation - agriculture Undergrazing
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Habitat loss / degradation - extraction/drainage Aggregate extraction - land
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Habitat loss / degradation - infrastructure development Housing infrastructure
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Habitat loss / degradation - woodlands/forestry Tree / wood planting
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Human disturbance Trampling (physical damage)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Invasive/non-native species (directly affecting species) Competition
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Pollution - atmospheric Acid precipitation
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Pollution - atmospheric Global warming / sea-level rise
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Pollution - land Agricultural (nutrient enrichment)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Pollution - land Agricultural (other agro-chemicals)

Information originally entered by Richard Jefferson on Wednesday, October 16, 2002
Information last changed by Richard Jefferson on Friday, December 20, 2002

6. Constraints (optional)

Select the three most significant constraints to achieving the targets of the plan, and indicate the order of priority (1-3 with 1 being the most significant constraint). Only include constraints that are acting as a real blockage to delivering the plan targets or leading to a substantial delay in their delivery. For each constraint, please indicate whether you feel that it is within the ability of the lead partner or steering group to resolve the constraint.

Constraint 1:	
Constraint keyword:	Country:
Species and habitat management Farming practice - causing problems	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> W
Solution:	Solution type:
Encourage land managers to apply for appropriate agri-environment scheme funding; seek to tailor schemes to minimise nutrient in-puts.	Management
Able to resolve:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Constraint 2:	
Constraint keyword:	Country:
Species and habitat management Grazing regime - causing problems	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> W

Solution:	Solution type:
<p>Encourage local and national initiatives to graze sites and networks of sites. Support the work of the Grazing Animals Project & encourage the development of a favourable agricultural policy context for low-intensity grazing.</p>	<p>Funding and incentive schemes</p>
Able to resolve:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Constraint 3:	
Constraint keyword:	Country:
<p>Communication Best practice guidance - lack of</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> W</p>
Solution:	Solution type:
<p>Provide guidance to help site managers integrate the needs of species (especially invertebrates) as well as habitats into site management plans.</p>	<p>Communication / publicity</p>
Able to resolve:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Information originally entered by Richard Jefferson on Wednesday, October 16, 2002
Information last changed by Richard Jefferson on Friday, December 13, 2002

7. Steering Group

Please list all organisations that are represented on the steering group for your species/habitat (include all organisations that have contributed either directly or by correspondence within the last 3 years). Where a steering group does not exist please leave this form blank.

To add organisations click the add button, to delete organisations check the delete box and then click the delete button.

Delete:	Organisation:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Butterfly Conservation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Countryside Council for Wales
<input type="checkbox"/>	Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
<input type="checkbox"/>	English Nature
<input type="checkbox"/>	Environment and Heritage Service
<input type="checkbox"/>	Joint Nature Conservation Committee
<input type="checkbox"/>	Ministry of Defence
<input type="checkbox"/>	National Assembly for Wales

- National Trust
- Plantlife
- Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
- Scottish Natural Heritage
- Soil Association
- The Grassland Trust
- Wildlife Trusts

Information originally entered by Andrew Cottam on Monday, October 07, 2002
Information last changed by Richard Jefferson on Friday, December 13, 2002

8. Other Groups/Organisations

Please list any additional groups/organisations that are actively involved in implementing your action plan. (This is to try to assess which groups are involved where there is no steering group and any additional contributors). If you do not have any other organisations involved, [click here](#).

To add organisations click the add button, to delete organisations check the delete box and then click the delete button.

9. Linkages to LBAPs

a) Which of the following most accurately describes your interaction with LBAPs, up to now?

Good contact with LBAPs, information exchanged.

b) If you have been in contact with LBAPs how was it initiated?

By Both

c) Irrespective of current contact, how important do you consider LBAP co-ordinated action will be in achieving the targets of the plan? Select from category:

Critical

d) If you consider LBAP action to be anything other than unimportant, which of the following forms of engagement do you think would be appropriate? (Note, you may tick more than one category.)

<input type="checkbox"/>	Indirect contact (e.g. posting information on UKBAP website, sharing work programmes, meeting schedules, articles in Biodiversity News, newsletter)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Provision of generic information on habitat and/or species (e.g. advice and guidance on habitat/species ecology and management)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Direct provision of advice (e.g. proactive approach to LBAP, response to consultations from LBAPs, advice on LBAP target setting)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reciprocal attendance at meetings
<input type="checkbox"/>	Development of collaborative projects

Other (please specify):

consultation/outreach to LBAPs to identify their needs which may be relevant to UK HAP, & to support the development of local strategies, especially for habitat re-creation.

Information originally entered by Richard Jefferson on Wednesday, October 16, 2002
Information last changed by Richard Jefferson on Friday, December 06, 2002

>

10. Successes (optional)

Have there been key successes in the implementation of your plan that should be drawn to the attention of government, the wider BAP partnership, or the public? Please give a brief description (i.e. 2-3 sentences) of up to three successes and allocate a topic area to each of them:

Success 1:

Description:	Country:
<p>The area of land being managed with the intention of re-creating calcareous grassland far exceeds the target (Burke & Critchley, 2001)</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> W
Keyword:	

Species and habitat management | Habitat creation / restoration - achieved

Success 2:

Description:

Populations of silver-spotted skipper in chalk grassland downland have increased on sites covered by agri-environment schemes (Butterfly Conservation website)

Country:

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Funding and incentives | Agricultural schemes - delivering wildlife gains

Success 3:

Description:

There are a number of initiatives under way or under development, including applications for Lottery funding. Examples of projects which have started to achieve targets include the Salisbury Plain LIFE project, the Dorset Grassland SNCI project and the South Downs chalk grassland restoration project.

Country:

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Funding and incentives | Other



Information originally entered by Richard Jefferson on Wednesday, October 16, 2002

Information last changed by Richard Jefferson on Friday, December 06, 2002

Thankyou for answering the questions. You have not yet completed all of the questions. You can go back and answer the additional ones or edit the ones you have already answered whenever you want.

Sign-off:

When you have completed all of the questions that you are able to, you must sign off your reporting.

I agree that the steering group (if present) have agreed the information in this report and that the following contact point has also signed it off:

Contact point:

Tim Blackstock

email:

T.Blackstock@

Your name:

Richard

Date:

20 December
