



Species and Habitat Action Plan Assessment Form

Please refer to the accompanying guidance for information about how to complete this form and an explanation of terms used

Field 1: Action Plan details

Species/Habitat Action Plan	<i>Dolomedes plantarius</i> - Fen raft spider
Lead Partner/Agency	English Nature (Contact Point - EN)
Steering Group/Other organisations	Yes, for the Suffolk population only.
Work programme in existence?	Provisional plan drafted but not agreed. It has been used in this report to clarify actions that have been undertaken.

Field 2: Objectives and targets overview

Please list the targets for the action plan, indicating in which country/region the target is applicable, and additional comments including the rationale for new targets. For each new target please add new sequential paragraph numbers and target text. Please provide information about progress and country disaggregation in Table A for all targets.

Number and text	UK	E	NI	S	W	Comments
4.1 Achieve a ten-fold increase in the range of the population at Redgrave and Lopham Fen.		✓				
4.2 Increase the population density throughout much of the range of Redgrave and Lopham Fen to a mean maximum of c15 individuals per pool (the maximum level supported since monitoring began in 1991).		✓				
4.3 Maintain the density and range of the fen raft spider on the Pevensy Levels.		✓				
4.4 Introduce populations to two suitable new sites by 2010.		✓				

Field 3: Proposed actions overview

Please list the proposed actions for the action plan, indicating in which country/region the action is applicable. For each new action please add new sequential paragraph numbers and action text. If the action is regarded as significant (please see guidance) indicate this in the box and provide further details in Table B. For actions not regarded as significant simply state if the action is ongoing or complete. Remember any action which is being dropped from the workplan will be regarded as significant for the first round of reporting.

Number and text	UK	E	NI	S	W	Action significant?	Action complete or ongoing? <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>
5.1.1 Where appropriate, include the requirements of the species when revising prescriptions for relevant agri-environment schemes.		✓				no	ongoing
5.1.2 Address the requirements of this species in the LEAP process and in relevant WLMPs.		✓				yes	ongoing
5.1.3 Take account of the requirements of the species in response to applications for water abstraction licences.		✓				yes	ongoing
5.2.1 Where possible, ensure that occupied and potential habitat is appropriately managed including management of water quality and water levels by 2005.		✓				yes	ongoing
5.2.2 Ensure that the species is included in site management documents for all relevant SSSIs.		✓				Yes	Ongoing
5.3.1 Translocate spiders within existing sites where physical isolation prevents recolonisation of suitable habitat.		✓				no	not started
5.3.2 Introduce to a series of new sites in East Anglian and southern England to establish a new viable population in each region..		✓				no	not started
5.4.1 Advise landowners and managers of the presence of the fen raft spider and the importance of beneficial management for its conservation.		✓				yes	ongoing
5.5.1 Continue regular monitoring at Redgrave and Lopham Fen, and establish a regular monitoring programme for the species at Pevensey Levels and for newly established populations.		✓				yes	ongoing
5.5.2 Conduct targeted autecological research to inform habitat management.		✓				yes	ongoing
5.5.3 Encourage research on the ecology and conservation of this species on an international level, and use the experience gained towards its conservation.		✓				no	not started
5.6.1 Promote opportunities for the appreciation of this species and the conservation issues associated with its habitat. This		✓				no	ongoing

should be achieved through articles within appropriate journals, and by a publicity leaflet, as well as by increasing opportunities for public viewing.							
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Field 4: Assessment of status

Please tick the appropriate category to indicate the assessment of status of the species or habitat, for each country/region where appropriate, and provide a statement supporting the category selected.

	Not appropriate	Recovered	Signs of recovery	No change	Declining	Lost	Insufficient information
<i>UK</i>							
<i>England</i>				✓			
<i>Northern Ireland</i>	X						
<i>Scotland</i>	X						
<i>Wales</i>	X						

Brief text description justifying assessment of status: (~ no more than 100 words for each country/region)

Monitoring at the Suffolk site over eight years has shown no trend up or down, but the population remains in a precarious condition close to extinction in just two small colonies restricted to a few pools that have received artificial irrigation since August 1991.

At the Sussex site, a full survey undertaken in 1994 was repeated in 1999. The 1994 survey indicated a n extensive and, in places, a dense population. Preliminary results from 1999 indicated no marked change in density of spiders. No measure of change in the extent of the population has been made.

Field 5: Summary statement

Please provide an overview of plan implementation, including new factors affecting the species or habitat which will accelerate or constrain progress towards meeting of the targets. Where a factor results in new action(s) please cross-reference back to the relevant numbers under Field 3 and Table B.

English Nature and the Suffolk Wildlife Trust started a Species Recovery Programme in 1991 at Redgrave & Lopahm Fen. Actions include obtaining irrigation water from the local water company to maintain water in a few pools, without which the species will have gone extinct here, and almost annual management of surrounding vegetation. New pools have been dug and are occupied in one part of the fen. Monitoring of spider numbers has been undertaken since 1991 and water levels since 1992. Suffolk Trust obtained EU Life funds to restore the fen, and to help in the cost of moving a borehole which has been abstracting water adjacent to the fen for about 30 years. Water levels in the aquifer are rising; it is anticipated that this will increase the available habitat for spiders once recharge is complete. Future work will be to translocate spiders to recently dug pool s on a part of the fen distant from the present two colonies, if they do not colonise naturally when water levels rise. Annual mMonitoring will continue in the foreseeable future.

Action at Pevensey will be undertaken mostly as part of restoration and enhancement of the grazing marsh habitat as a whole, since the greatest density of spiders is found on the most synpathetically managed parts of the site.

Field 6: Signing off

Please 'sign off' the form below to confirm that steering group members or key contacts have been consulted and agreed the information provided.

Contact details	Lead Partner	Contact Point
Name	Martin Drake	Dave Stone (species co-ordinator)
Organisation	English Nature	English Nature

Assessment date (dd/mm/yy)	16/9/1999
----------------------------	-----------

Completed forms should be submitted to JNCC

*Biodiversity Information Service
Joint Nature Conservation Committee*

Monkstone House

City Road

Peterborough PE1 1JY

Tel: 01733 562626

Fax: 01733 555948

E-mail: lpr99@jncc.gov.uk

Table A: Action Plan objectives and targets (Copiable table)

For each target please state how, if applicable, it has been disaggregated to the country level. Please insert the paragraph number, UK target and country-specific disaggregated target(s) into the table. Please tick the appropriate category to indicate progress against published and disaggregated targets. For each target please copy the table and detail the (existing or new [new paragraph numbers should run sequentially, under relevant headings in the published volumes]) paragraph number, target text and an assessment of progress.

Objective/target <i>(For new or revised targets please provide the new paragraph number and target text.)</i>			4.1 Achieve a ten-fold increase in the range of the population at Redgrave and Lopham Fen.		
Country	Not appropriate	Target achieved	Some progress	No progress	Insufficient information
<i>UK</i>					
<i>England</i>				✓	
<i>Northern Ireland</i>	X				
<i>Scotland</i>	X				
<i>Wales</i>	X				
Text description of target progress (separate for each country/region): Until water levels in the aquifer are fully restored, the amount of useable habitat will remain tiny. New pools dug in 1997 have not increased numbers significantly.					

Objective/target <i>(For new or revised targets please provide the new paragraph number and target text.)</i>			4.2 Increase the population density throughout much of the range of Redgrave and Lopham Fen to a mean maximum of c15 individuals per pool (the maximum level supported since monitoring began in 1991).		
Country	Not appropriate	Target achieved	Some progress	No progress	Insufficient information
<i>UK</i>					
<i>England</i>				✓	
<i>Northern Ireland</i>	X				
<i>Scotland</i>	X				
<i>Wales</i>	X				
Text description of target progress (separate for each country/region): Until water levels in the aquifer are fully restored, the amount of useable habitat will remain tiny. New pools dug in 1997 have not increased numbers significantly. Constant (unsustainable) management of marginal vegetation remains necessary to keep existing pools in suitable conditions.					

Objective/target <i>(For new or revised targets please provide the new paragraph number and target text.)</i>			4.3 Maintain the density and range of the fen raft spider on the Pevensey Levels.		
Country	Not appropriate	Target achieved	Some progress	No progress	Insufficient information
<i>UK</i>					
<i>England</i>			✓		
<i>Northern Ireland</i>	X				
<i>Scotland</i>	X				
<i>Wales</i>	X				
Text description of target progress (separate for each country/region): There is no evidence that the density of spiders is less than it was in 1991 in the core area which is managed by English Nature (NNR) and Sussex Wildlife Trust. There is no information on change in the spider's range on the site. It is probably a reasonable assumption that the target is being met.					

Objective/target <i>(For new or revised targets please provide the new paragraph number and target text.)</i>			4.4 Introduce populations to two suitable new sites by 2010.		
Country	Not appropriate	Target achieved	Some progress	No progress	Insufficient information
<i>UK</i>					
<i>England</i>				✓	
<i>Northern Ireland</i>	X				
<i>Scotland</i>	X				
<i>Wales</i>	X				
Text description of target progress (separate for each country/region): This action cannot be undertaken until the population at Redgrave & Lopham Fen could withstand the removal of individuals. Preparatory research will be on the habitat requirements (still not well understood), methods for translocation, and on location of suitable sites.					

Table B: Proposed actions (Copiable table)

For each significant action please copy and complete the table below.

Published action/organisation(s) responsible	5.1.2 Address the requirements of this species in the LEAP process and in relevant WLMPs.	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible	EA	
Action/workplan undertaken?	Yes	
Description of work taken and organisation responsible.	Dolomedes is mentioned in both the LEAP and WLMP for Pevensey.	
Output and timescale		<i>Action by</i>
Constraints to action		
Action complete or ongoing?	Ongoing	
Next steps	<p>A Pevensey Levels Project Officer has been appointed to oversee implementation of the WLMP.</p> <p>The EA will will shortly include Dolomedes in the Broadland Rivers LEAP that covers Redgrave & Lopham Fen.</p>	
Output and timescale	Three year post at Pevensey.	<i>Action by</i>

Published action/organisation(s) responsible	5.1.3 Take account of the requirements of the species in response to applications for water abstraction licences.	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible		
Action/workplan undertaken?	Yes	
Description of work taken and organisation responsible.	<p>The borehole that abstracted water from beside Redgrave & Lopham Fen has been moved to a new location.</p> <p>There is a general presumption against further abstraction on Pevensey.</p>	
Output and timescale		<i>Action by</i>
Constraints to action	Cost of compensation if licences are revoked or limited.	
Action complete or ongoing?	Ongoing	
Next steps	<p>Ensure that the water company remains aware of its responsibility to not reduce the level of ground water under the Redgrave & Lopham Fen.</p> <p>EN will respond to consultation on abstraction licences on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>At Pevensey, the EA plan to investigate the impact of abstraction, as part of AMP3 (Asset Management Plan), due to be complete by 2003.</p>	
Output and timescale		<i>Action by</i>

Published action/organisation(s)	5.2.1 Where possible, ensure that occupied and nearby potential
---	--

responsible	habitat is appropriately managed including management of water quality and water levels by 2005.	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible	Suffolk Wildlife Trust, Sussex Wildlife Trust, English Nature, Environment Agency	
Action/workplan undertaken?	Yes	
Description of work taken and organisation responsible.	<p>Suffolk Wildlife Trust have managed the fen and pools at Redgrave & Lopham Fen using advice from a specialist contracted to English Nature. This has helped to retain the open character of the pools. Essex & Suffolk Water Company have supplied irrigation water to two small areas of the fen with pools; this has (for most of each summer) maintained sufficient water to allow survival and breeding of a small number of animals. EU Life funding contributed to this action for three years.</p> <p>The Fen Restoration Project is currently investigating nutrient issues in preparation for possibly diverting nutrient-rich water from the fen.</p> <p>At Pevensey Levels, English Nature, Sussex Wildlife Trust, Environment Agency and landowners through WES have maintained a proportion of ditches in condition suitable for survival and breeding.</p>	
Output and timescale	ongoing - there is no end-date to maintenance.	<i>Action by</i> WT/EN/EA/water companies
Constraints to action	<p>Funding at Redgrave & Lopham Fen, now that EU funding has ceased.</p> <p>Hydrological control of nutrient-rich water at Redgrave & Lopham Fen.</p> <p>Recharge of aquifer not being affected by the new borehole sited a short distance away.</p>	
Action complete or ongoing?	ongoing - there is no end-date to maintenance	
Next steps	<p>Suffolk Trust to pursue ways of diverting eutrophic water entering Lopham Fen.</p> <p>Suffolk Trust and EN Suffolk Team to ensure water company continues to supply adequate irrigation water until ground-water returns.</p>	
Output and timescale		<i>Action by</i> EN/WTs

Published action/organisation(s) responsible	5.2.2 Ensure that the species is included in site management documents for all relevant SSSIs.	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible	EN, Suffolk Wildlife Trust, Sussex Wildlife Trust	
Action/workplan undertaken?	Yes	
Description of work taken and organisation responsible.	The need to take the spider's conservation into account is included in management plans by EN and Sussex Wildlife Trust for Pevensey Levels, and by Suffolk Wildlife Trust for Redgrave & Lopham Fen.	
Output and timescale		<i>Action by</i>
Constraints to action		

Action complete or ongoing?	Complete	
Next steps		
Output and timescale		<i>Action by</i>

Published action/organisation(s) responsible	5.4.1 Advise landowners and managers of the presence of the fen raft spider and the importance of beneficial management for its conservation.	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible	EN, Suffolk Wildlife Trust, Sussex Wildlife Trust	
Action/workplan undertaken?	Yes	
Description of work taken and organisation responsible.	The spider has had considerable publicity, especially on Redgrave & Lopham Fen where the population is wholly within the remit of the Suffolk Wildlife Trust. It is included as a high-profile species in leaflets for both sites.	
Output and timescale		<i>Action by</i>
Constraints to action		
Action complete or ongoing?	Ongoing.	
Next steps	Continue to inform owners on Pevensey Levels through publicity and free availability of reports on its status there.	
Output and timescale		<i>Action by</i>

Published action/organisation(s) responsible	5.5.1 Continue regular monitoring at Redgrave and Lopham Fen, and establish a regular monitoring programme for the species at Pevensey Levels and for newly established populations (EN).	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible	Suffolk Wildlife Trust, Sussex Wildlife Trust, English Nature,	
Action/workplan undertaken?	Yes	
Description of work taken and organisation responsible.	English Nature & Suffolk Wildlife Trust have monitored spiders and water levels. English Nature has commissioned a protocol for monitoring the spider at Pevensey; implementation will start at the time interval recommended by the report.	
Output and timescale	Yearly reports in ENRR series detailing results.	<i>Action by</i> EN/WTs
Constraints to action	None	
Action complete or ongoing?	ongoing	
Next steps	Implement simpler system at R & L Fen and new system at Pevensey	
Output and timescale		<i>Action by</i> EN

Published action/organisation(s)	5.5.2 Conduct targeted autecological research to inform habitat	
---	--	--

responsible	management.	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible	English Nature	
Action/workplan undertaken?	Yes	
Description of work taken and organisation responsible.	No work has been undertaken specifically on the autecology but several years of monitoring have resulted in a better understanding of some aspects of the biology, especially breeding behaviour and requirements of adults during the summer months.	
Output and timescale		<i>Action by</i> EN
Constraints to action		
Action complete or ongoing?	Ongoing	
Next steps	Investigate possibility of PhD or MSc research project.	
Output and timescale		<i>Action by</i> EN