

Margaritifera margaritifera (Freshwater Pearl Mussel)

Full report outputted on the 31/07/2003 10:57:29

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	<input type="text"/>	Sites/ Populations ▼	2002	Partial or sample survey ▼	<input type="text"/>
E	<input type="text"/>	Sites/ Populations ▼	2002	Partial or sample survey ▼	<input type="text"/>
NI	3	Sites/ Populations ▼	2002	Full survey ▼	(Note: no of pons w ith juveniles given, but some of these have low nos of juvs and viability may be low)
S	57	Sites/ Populations ▼	2002	Partial or sample survey ▼	((Note: no of pons w ith juveniles given, but some of these have low nos of juvs and viability may be low) Cosgrove and Young 1998, Cosgrove and Hastie 2000

W	<input type="text"/>	Sites/ Populations ▼	2002	Partial or sample survey ▼	<input type="text"/>
----------	----------------------	----------------------	------	----------------------------	----------------------

Information originally entered by Anne Lewis on Friday, October 18, 2002
 Information last changed by Martin Gaywood on Thursday, December 19, 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	Declining (continuing/accelerating) ▼	Partial or sample survey ▼	<input type="text"/>
E	Declining (continuing/accelerating) ▼	Partial or sample survey ▼	<input type="text"/>
NI	Declining (continuing/accelerating) ▼	Informed guess ▼	<input type="text"/>
S	Not know n ▼	Informed guess ▼	<input type="text"/>
W	Declining (continuing/accelerating) ▼	Partial or sample survey ▼	<input type="text"/>

Information originally entered by Anne Lewis on Friday, October 18, 2002
 Information last changed by Martin Gaywood on Thursday, December 19, 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:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"><p>SNH-funded PhD at University of Aberdeen on fpm ecology (Hastie 2001) completed, results published in SNH report, peer-reviewed journals etc.</p><p>NERC-funded postdoctoral research underway at Univ of Aberdeen on effects of fpm on invertebrate communities</p><p>EC LIFE-funded work underway at Univ Aberdeen on captive rearing techniques</p><p>SNIFFER project, involving Queens University Belfast, which has examined the sediment type requirements of fpm, and the biological requirements of juvenile fpm (e.g. host infection rates, glochidial survival). A proposal to continue with the next stage of this work is currently being assessed.</p><p>SNH-funded review of possible effects of pollutants on fw pm to commence shortly.</p></div>

Information originally entered by Martin Gaywood on Thursday, November 07, 2002
Information last changed by Martin Gaywood on Thursday, December 19, 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 the size of all viable populations.

Target start date: 1999

Target end date: ongoing

Target units: Sites/ Populations

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Unknown			Informed guess	
E	No progress			Informed guess	
NI	Target achieved	3	3	Full survey	Under active development
S	Target achieved	47	57	Informed guess	Under active development
W	No progress			Informed guess	

T2: Increase the size of all viable populations.

Target start date: 1999

Target end date: ongoing

Target units: Sites/ Populations

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Unknown			Informed guess	
E	No progress			Informed guess	
NI	Unknown				
S	Unknown				
W	No progress			Informed guess	

T3: Encourage re-colonisation of this species into at least 10 suitable former areas by 2005.

Target start date: 1995

Target end date: 2005

Target units: Sites/ Populations

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Some progress (behind schedule) ▼	10			
E	Not applicable ▼				
NI	Some progress (behind schedule) ▼				
S	Some progress (behind schedule) ▼				
W	Not applicable ▼				

Information originally entered by Martin Gaywood on Thursday, November 07, 2002
Information last changed by Martin Gaywood on Thursday, December 19, 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 Poor water quality, including nutrient enrichment (which also affects the numbers of host fish).
- 2.2 Habitat removal and alteration through development, drainage schemes, flow regulation and fisheries management.
- 2.3 A decline in populations of host fish.
- 2.4 Conifer planting, exacerbating the effects of river acidification.
- 2.5 Amateur pearl fishing, aided by improved accessibility.
- 2.6 Poor land management in the catchment (e.g. overgrazing leading to sedimentation from soil erosion).

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	Changes in native species dynamics Decline in food source / prey
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Habitat loss / degradation - extraction/drainage Drainage (for agriculture)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Harvesting Overfishing
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Pollution - atmospheric Acid precipitation
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Pollution - freshwater Agricultural (nutrient enrichment)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Pollution - freshwater Sediment
--------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------------

Information originally entered by Martin Gaywood on Thursday, November 07, 2002
Information last changed by Martin Gaywood on Thursday, December 19, 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:
Funding and incentives Staff resources - insufficient	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UK <input type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> W
Solution:	Solution type:
Sufficient resources e.g. Champion funding	Funding and incentive schemes
Able to resolve:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Constraint 2:	

Constraint keyword:	Country:
Species and habitat management Water quality decline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UK <input type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S
	<input type="checkbox"/> W
Solution:	Solution type:
Extensive reversal of land-use practises in affected catchments	Site protection / designation
Able to resolve:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Constraint 3:	
Constraint keyword:	Country:
Communication Lack of awareness / poor profile among general public	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UK <input type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S
	<input type="checkbox"/> W
Solution:	Solution type:
Post holder dedicated to fw pm UKSAP could help coordination of SAP, improve communication regarding a range of managment issues	Communication / publicity
Able to resolve:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Information originally entered by Martin Gaywood on Thursday, November 07, 2002

Information last changed by Anne Lewis on Monday, December 16, 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"/>	Environment Agency
<input type="checkbox"/>	Environment and Heritage Service
<input type="checkbox"/>	Joint Nature Conservation Committee
<input type="checkbox"/>	National Museum of Wales
<input type="checkbox"/>	Scottish Environment Protection Agency

- Scottish Natural Heritage
- University of Aberdeen

Information originally entered by Martin Gaywood on Thursday, November 07, 2002
Information last changed by Martin Gaywood on Thursday, December 19, 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"/>	Dee District Salmon Fishery Board
<input type="checkbox"/>	Police authorities
<input type="checkbox"/>	Queens University Belfast
<input type="checkbox"/>	Rivers Agency within DARG
<input type="checkbox"/>	Spey District Salmon Fishery Board

Water Companies

Information originally entered by Martin Gaywood on Thursday, December 19, 2002

Information last changed by Martin Gaywood on Thursday, December 19, 2002

9. Linkages to LBAPs

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

Little or no contact with LBAPs.

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.)

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 Anne Lewis on Friday, October 18, 2002

Information last changed by Martin Gaywood on Thursday, November 07, 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:

Following the SAC moderation process, there are now 19 cSACs for fpm in Scotland (update needed for rest of UK)

Country:

UK

E

NI

S

W

Keyword:

Policy, legislation and designation | Improved protection through site designation - international (SPA, SAC, RAMSAR)

Success 2:

Description:

As a result of a number of research projects, the ecology of the fpm is now better understood.

Country:

- UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Research, survey and information | Autecology - improved knowledge

Success 3:

Description:

Full legal protection of the fpm in England, Scotland and Wales appears to have reduced (although not eliminated) the extent of destructive pearl fishing. However the pearl mussel is still not fully protected in Northern Ireland and this needs to be rectified.

Country:

- UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Policy, legislation and designation | Improved legal protection status of species



Information originally entered by Martin Gaywood on Thursday, November 07, 2002

Information last changed by Martin Gaywood on Thursday, December 19, 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:

Martin

email:

anne.lewis@e

Your name:

Anne Lewis

Date:

24.12.02
