

Hirudo medicinalis (Medicinal Leech)

Full report outputted on the 31/07/2003 09:21:06

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	87	Sites/ Populations	2002	Partial or sample survey	See separate references below for different countries

E	76	Sites/ Populations	2002	Partial or sample survey	<p>Marshall, H. 1999. Medicinal leech (<i>Hirudo medicinalis</i>) survey of Cumbria 1998-99. RSPB/EN unpublished report. Young, M. 2000. Medicinal leech (<i>Hirudo medicinalis</i>) survey of Cumbria 2000. RSPB/EN unpublished report. Nixon, A. 1999. A survey of the Medicinal Leech (<i>Hirudo medicinalis</i>) in the Romney Marsh Natural Area, 1998/99. Romney Marsh Countryside Project unpublished report. McConnell, H. 2000. A study of medicinal leech populations in the Romney Marsh Natural Area 2000. Romney Marsh Countryside Project unpublished report. Reeves, R. 1999. Survey of medicinal leech (<i>Hirudo medicinalis</i>) in the New Forest, 1998 & 1999. Hampshire Wildlife Trust unpublished report.</p>
NI					
S	2	Sites/ Populations	2002	Partial or sample survey	<p>Maitland, P.S. 1996. Recovery of the medicinal leech <i>Hirudo medicinalis</i> in Scotland. Phase 1. Unpublished report to SNH. Contract No. RASD/072/96 IBB SRP. Maitland, P.S. 1997. Recovery of the medicinal leech <i>Hirudo medicinalis</i> in Scotland. Phase 2. Unpublished report to SNH. Contract No: RASD/031/97 SRF</p>

W	9	Sites/ Populations ▼	2002	Partial or sample survey ▼	Lloyd, D. 1998. The Medicinal Leech <i>Hirudo medicinalis</i> in Wales. North Wales Wildlife Trust unpublished report. Jones, A.C.L. & Kettle, B.S. 1999. Medicinal leech survey of Anglesey (Ynys Mon) 1999. North Wales Wildlife Trust unpublished report.

Information originally entered by Malcolm Ausden on Tuesday, December 10, 2002
 Information last changed by Malcolm Ausden on Tuesday, December 10, 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	Not know n ▼	▼	
E	Not know n ▼	▼	
NI	Not applicable (does not occur in this country) ▼	▼	
S	Not know n ▼	▼	

W	Not known		
----------	-----------	--	--

Information originally entered by Malcolm Ausden on Tuesday, December 10, 2002
Information last changed by Malcolm Ausden on Tuesday, December 10, 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:	

Information originally entered by Malcolm Ausden on Tuesday, December 10, 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.

T1: Maintain populations at not less than 87 sites

Target start date: 2000

Target end date: ongoing

Target units: Sites/ Populations

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Target achieved	87	87	Partial or sample survey	Yes
E	Target achieved	76	76	Partial or sample survey	Yes
NI	Not applicable				
S	Target achieved	2	2	Partial or sample survey	Yes
W	Target achieved	9	9	Partial or sample survey	Yes

T2: Maintain the current geographical range

Target start date: 2000

Target end date:		ongoing			
Target units:		Occupied 10 km sq.			
Progress		Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Target achieved	20	20	Partial or sample survey	Under consideration
E	Target achieved	15	15	Partial or sample survey	Under consideration
NI	Not applicable				
S	Target achieved	2	2	Partial or sample survey	Under consideration
W	Target achieved	7	7	Partial or sample survey	Under consideration

Information originally entered by Malcolm Ausden on Tuesday, December 10, 2002
 Information last changed by Malcolm Ausden on Wednesday, December 18, 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 Loss of ponds through water abstraction, natural vegetational succession and infilling.

2.2 Loss of stock-grazed ponds.

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"/>	2	Habitat loss / degradation - extraction/drainage Water abstraction (from water bodies)
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Habitat loss / degradation - management practice Inappropriate water channel / river bank management
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Habitat loss / degradation Invasive alien species (directly impacting habitat)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Habitat loss / degradation Natural succession
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Pollution - atmospheric Global warming / sea-level rise

Information originally entered by Malcolm Ausden on Tuesday, December 10, 2002

Information last changed by Malcolm Ausden on Tuesday, December 10, 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:
<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> UK <input type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> W
Solution:	Solution type:
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Able to resolve:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Constraint 2:	
Constraint keyword:	Country:

<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> UK <input type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> W
Solution:	Solution type:
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Able to resolve:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Constraint 3:	
Constraint keyword:	Country:
<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> UK <input type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> W
Solution:	Solution type:
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Able to resolve:	<input type="checkbox"/>

Information originally entered by Malcolm Ausden on Tuesday, December 10, 2002

Information last changed by Malcolm Ausden on Tuesday, December 10, 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"/>	Countryside Council for Wales
<input type="checkbox"/>	English Nature
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
<input type="checkbox"/>	North Wales Wildlife Trust
<input type="checkbox"/>	Romney Marsh Countryside Project
<input type="checkbox"/>	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
<input type="checkbox"/>	Scottish Natural Heritage

Information originally entered by Malcolm Ausden on Tuesday, December 10, 2002

Information last changed by Malcolm Ausden on Tuesday, December 10, 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?

Generic advice to LBAPs on species/habitat needs or appropriate local actions produced/distributed.

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:

Slightly important

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.)

Indirect contact (e.g. posting information on UKBAP website, sharing work programmes, meeting schedules, articles in Biodiversity News, newsletter)

- Provision of generic information on habitat and/or species (e.g. advice and guidance on habitat/species ecology and management)
- Direct provision of advice (e.g. proactive approach to LBAP, response to consultations from LBAPs, advice on LBAP target setting)
- Reciprocal attendance at meetings
- Development of collaborative projects

Other (please specify):

Information originally entered by Malcolm Ausden on Tuesday, December 10, 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:

Securing funding for a UK-wide survey of medicinal leeches. This involved surveying 41 of the 57 sites at which medicinal leeches have previously been recorded (the remainder had either been recently surveyed or were impossible to locate or gain access to), together with 608 waterbodies and lengths of ditch in the vicinity of these.

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Funding and incentives | Species / habitat champion appointed

Success 2:

Description:

Country:

During the above surveys we found medicinal leeches at 23 of the 41 previously known sites surveyed, but also discovered 5 previously unknown populations. The surveys also vastly increased the number of interconnected ditches in which they have been recorded in the Romney Marsh Natural Area (from 2 to 51).

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Research, survey and information | Baseline survey - achieved or started

Success 3:

Description:

Following identification of extent sites (see above), we have been able to inform relevant landowners and statutory organisations of the presence and requirements of medicinal leeches at all known UK sites.

Country:

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Communication | Advice to land managers / owners

Information originally entered by Malcolm Ausden on Tuesday, December 10, 2002
Information last changed by Malcolm Ausden on Wednesday, December 18, 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:	David Phillips	email:	malcolm.ausden@...
Your name:	Malcolm		

Date:

18/12/2002
