

Lutra lutra (Otter)

Full report outputted on the 31/07/2003 10:52:04

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					
E	22	Sites/ Populations	1994	Partial or sample survey	OSE 1991-94, % sites +ve (but see next entry)
NI	85	Sites/ Populations	1981	Full survey	OSNI 1980-81, % sites +ve (but see next entry)
S	88	Sites/ Populations	1994	Full survey	OSS 1991-94, % sites +ve
W	53	Sites/ Populations	1991	Full survey	OSW 1991, % sites +ve (but see next entry)

Information originally entered by Graham Scholey on Thursday, December 05, 2002

Information last changed by Graham Scholey on Friday, December 20, 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	Increasing		See below
E	Increasing	Partial or sample survey	OSE 2000-02 (unpublished) plus local survey info.
NI	Fluctuating / No clear trend	Full survey	OSNI 2001 (unpublished)
S	Stable	Informed guess	Local information and reports
W	Increasing	Full survey	OSW 2002 (unpublished)

Information originally entered by Graham Scholey on Thursday, December 05, 2002

Information last changed by Graham Scholey on Wednesday, December 11, 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 make some impact, but more research needed. ▼
Notes:	Essentially sufficient know ledge exists on otter ecological requirements and habitat needs to enable the broad targets to be achieved. How ever, further targeted research is required in ord to better inform management decisions, to enable effective reduction of threats, and to resolve areas of conflict.

Information originally entered by Graham Scholey on Thursday, December 05, 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 existing otter populations.

Target start date: 1995

Target end date: Ongoing

Target units: Sites/ Populations

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Target achieved				
E	Target achieved	22		Partial or sample survey	Yes
NI	Target achieved	85		Full survey	Yes
S	Target achieved	88		Informed guess	Under active development
W	Target achieved	53		Full survey	Yes

T2: Expand existing otter populations.

Target start date: 1995

Target end date: 2010

Target units: Sites/ Populations

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Unknown				
E	Some progress (behind schedule)	65		Partial or sample survey	Yes
NI	Some progress (behind schedule)	95		Full survey	Yes
S	Unknown	95		Unknown	Under active development
W	Some progress (ahead of schedule)	70		Full survey	Yes

T3: By 2010, restore breeding otters to all catchments and coastal areas where they have been recorded since 1960.

Target start date: 1995

Target end date: 2010

Target units: Sites/ Populations

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Unknown				
E	Some progress (behind schedule)	95		Partial or sample survey	Yes
NI	Some progress (behind schedule)	100		Full survey	Yes
S	Unknown	100		Unknown	Under active development
W	Some progress (ahead of schedule)	95		Full survey	Yes

Information originally entered by Graham Scholey on Thursday, December 05, 2002
Information last changed by JNCC on 03 April 2003

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 Pollution of watercourses, especially by PCBs.
- 2.2 Insufficient prey associated with poor water quality.
- 2.3 Impoverished bankside habitat features needed for breeding and resting.
- 2.4 Incidental mortality, primarily by road deaths and drowning in eel traps.

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"/>	1	Accidental mortality Road kills
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Habitat loss / degradation - management practice Inappropriate water channel / river bank management
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Pollution - freshwater Industrial / commercial

Information originally entered by Graham Scholey on Thursday, December 05, 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 Habitat fragmentation increasing or too great	<input type="checkbox"/> UK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> W
Solution:	Solution type:
Address threats to successful recolonisation resulting from accidental mortality within transport corridors; restore high quality riverine and floodplain habitats to provide continuity and connectivity, and to enhance sustainability of degraded riverine fisheries.	Management
Able to resolve:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Constraint 2:	
Constraint keyword:	Country:
Policy, legislation and designation Local / regional policies and legislation - general or other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> W

Solution:	Solution type:
<p>Adoption of best practice policies to minimise roadkills; adoption of sustainable catchment management policies and practices to ensure the quality of food supply and habitat can support optimum carrying capacity for viable population throughout range.</p>	<p>Legislation and policies</p>
Able to resolve:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Constraint 3:	
Constraint keyword:	Country:
<p></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> UK <input type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> W</p>
Solution:	Solution type:
<p></p>	<p></p>
Able to resolve:	<input type="checkbox"/>

Information originally entered by Graham Scholey on Wednesday, December 11, 2002
Information last changed by Graham Scholey on Friday, December 20, 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"/>	Czech Otter Foundation
<input type="checkbox"/>	English Nature
<input type="checkbox"/>	Environment Agency
<input type="checkbox"/>	Environment and Heritage Service
<input type="checkbox"/>	Joint Nature Conservation Committee
<input type="checkbox"/>	Otters and Rivers Project
<input type="checkbox"/>	Scottish Environment Protection Agency
<input type="checkbox"/>	Scottish Natural Heritage

- The Otter Trust
- Vincent Wildlife Trust
- Water UK
- Wildlife Trusts

Information originally entered by Graham Scholey on Thursday, December 05, 2002
Information last changed by Graham Scholey on Friday, December 20, 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.

- | Delete: | Organisation: |
|--------------------------|---------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | British Canoe Union |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Cardiff University |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Carp Society |

- Centre for Ecology and Hydrology
- Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
- Farming and Wildlife Advisory Group
- Forestry Commission
- Highways Agency
- International Otter Survival Fund
- Local Authorities
- Mammal Society
- National Assembly for Wales
- PTES
- Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
- Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
- Scottish Agricultural College

- Scottish Executive
- Sparsholt College
- Specialist Angler's Alliance
- Water Companies
- WildCRU

Information originally entered by Graham Scholey on Thursday, December 05, 2002
Information last changed by Graham Scholey on Friday, December 20, 2002

9. Linkages to LBAPs

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

Good contact with LBAPs, developing local projects that are contributing to UK Targets.

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:

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.)

<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Development of collaborative projects

Other (please specify):

Information originally entered by Graham Scholey 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:

National Surveys have been completed for England (2000-2002), Wales (2002) and Northern Ireland (2001) and a sampling strategy for a survey of Scotland has been devised for implementation in 2003/4. None of the surveys have been fully reported yet and it has therefore not been possible to fully reflect the results of these surveys in this 2002 report.

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Research, survey and information | Monitoring surveys underway

Success 2:

Description:

Country:

Significant strides have been made in addressing the issue of accidental killing. Working Groups, with a broad representation in England (co-ordinated by the Highways Agency) and Wales (co-ordinated by the National Assembly for Wales) are assessing the level of risk to otters of roadkill on the trunk road network and identifying priorities for action. Many schemes to mitigate against roadkills have been implemented and more are planned. The Highways Agency has published its Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, which includes measures to minimise risks for otters, and the results of research into reducing the risk of otter roadkill has been subject to a separate publication by the Highways Agency with Oxford University's Wildlife Conservation Research Unit. The Scottish Executive (Transport and Planning Group) has produced an inventory of wildlife mitigation works, held workshops with stakeholders and produced draft guidelines for 'Otters and Scottish Trunk Roads'. In England and Wales a National Byelaw has been passed requiring the use of otter guards on eel fyke nets.

- UK
- E
- NI
- S
- W

Keyword:

Communication | Best practice guidance

Success 3:

Description:

Country:

A strong partnership between the Environment Agency, Wildlife Trusts and other key partners has helped to deliver a considerable body of work which contributes to the objectives of the national otter BAP. The Environment Agency, The Wildlife Trusts' Otters and Rivers Project, Water UK and English Nature provided considerable resources for the National Survey of England, and the EA, The Wildlife Trusts, Welsh Water and The Countryside Council for Wales similarly so for the National Survey of Wales. The Wildlife Trusts, EA, SNH, SEPA, International Otter Survival Fund and others helped in the provision of otter corpses for otter post-mortem and ecotoxicological research, and The Wildlife Trusts/EA and others with the collection of spraint for DNA research. Collaboration between The WTs and EA also took place in the provision of advice on the impacts of otter predation on stillwater fisheries, with valuable input to this issue from other statutory bodies and several angling societies. A partnership approach has underwritten much of the progress on the BAP.

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Partnership | Other

Information originally entered by Graham Scholey on Friday, December 06, 2002

Information last changed by Graham Scholey on Friday, December 20, 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:	Allison Crofts	email:	<input type="text"/>
Your name:	Graham		
Date:	20/12/02		
