

Mentha pulegium (Pennyroyal)

Full report outputted on the 31/07/2003 11:05:14

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	17	Sites/ Populations	2002	Informed guess	New Atlas of the British & Irish Flora. 2002. OUP.
NI	1	Sites/ Populations	2002	Full survey	
S					
W	1	Sites/ Populations	2002	Full survey	

Information originally entered by Ron Porley on Friday, November 22, 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) ▼	▼	
E	Declining (continuing/accelerating) ▼	Partial or sample survey ▼	see status section
NI	Stable ▼	Full survey ▼	
S	▼	▼	
W	Stable ▼	Full survey ▼	

Information originally entered by Ron Porley on Friday, November 22, 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>Protection of sites is crucial since species has declined markedly and is occupies a specialist niche. Autecology poorly understood in particular role of seed bank/recruitment from seed. Recent molecular work by Kew highlighted exceptional genetic variation with recommendation that all native pops should be protected.</p></div>

Information originally entered by Ron Porley on Friday, November 22, 2002
Information last changed by Ron Porley on 06 January 2003

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 geographical range of pennyroyal in the UK.	
Target start date:	<input type="text" value="1998"/>
Target end date:	<input type="text" value="ongoing"/>

Target units:

Sites/ Populations

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Some progress (behind schedule)				Under consideration
E	Some progress (behind schedule)			Partial or sample survey	Under consideration
NI	Target achieved			Full survey	Yes
S					
W	Target achieved			Full survey	Yes

T2: Maintain viable populations at all extant sites in the UK.

Target start date:

1998

Target end date:

ongoing

Target units:

Sites/ Populations

Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
----------	--------	---------	----------	------------

UK	Some progress (on schedule)				
E	Some progress (behind schedule)				
NI	Target achieved				
S					
W	Target achieved				

T3: Regenerate pennyroyal from the seed-bank on at least five suitable historic sites by 2003.

Target start date:

Target end date:

Target units:

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Some progress (behind schedule)				
E					

NI	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
S	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
W	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

T4: Establish an ex-situ programme to protect genetic diversity, create a reserve population and provide experimental material.

Target start date:

1998

Target end date:

ongoing

Target units:

Sites/ Populations

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	<input type="text" value="Some progress (on schedule)"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
E	<input type="text" value="Some progress (behind schedule)"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
NI	<input type="text" value="No progress"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
S	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

W	No progress				
----------	-------------	--	--	--	--

Information originally entered by Ron Porley on Friday, November 22, 2002
Information last changed by Ron Porley on Monday, November 25, 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 loss of seasonally wet habitats, either through drainage or excavation to create permanently wet conditions.
- 2.2 Abandonment or infilling of disturbed habitats favoured by pennyroyal, such as unmade tracks and gateways.
- 2.3 Cessation of traditional grazing management and subsequent successional changes.
- 2.4 Habitat destruction by agricultural intensification (such as fertilising or ploughing) and by development.

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"/>	5	Habitat loss / degradation - agriculture Ploughing
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Habitat loss / degradation - agriculture Undergrazing
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Habitat loss / degradation - extraction/drainage Drainage (for agriculture)
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Habitat loss / degradation - infrastructure development Housing infrastructure
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Habitat loss / degradation - management practice Lack of disturbance
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Pollution - land Agricultural (nutrient enrichment)

Information originally entered by Ron Porley on Monday, November 25, 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:

Policy, legislation and designation | Insufficient protection through UK designated sites (SSSI, NNR, MNR)

Country:

- UK E NI S
 W

Solution:

Native populations need to be identified (largely done) and SSSI protection seriously considered (an action supported by Kew and Cornwall Biodiversity Group).

Solution type:

Legislation and policies

Able to resolve:**Constraint 2:****Constraint keyword:**

Policy, legislation and designation | Poor legal protection for species

Country:

- UK E NI S
 W

Solution:

Despite being Schedule 8 populations are still being damaged/lost therefore need to use legislation if need be.

Solution type:

Legislation and policies

Able to resolve:

Constraint 3:

Constraint keyword:

Species and habitat management | Habitat quality declining (including due to poor management)

Country:

UK E NI S
 W

Solution:

Places where this plant grows (disturbed seasonally flooded grassy-heath and common land/village greens) are frequently either tidied up or 'improved' or neglected so disturbance lacking.

Solution type:

Management

Able to resolve:

Information originally entered by Ron Porley on Monday, November 25, 2002
Information last changed by Ron Porley on 06 January 2003

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.

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"/>	Aberdeen Countryside Project
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cornwall Biodiversity Group
<input type="checkbox"/>	Countryside Council for Wales
<input type="checkbox"/>	English Nature
<input type="checkbox"/>	Kew Royal Botanic Gardens
<input type="checkbox"/>	National Trust
<input type="checkbox"/>	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
<input type="checkbox"/>	Scottish Natural Heritage
<input type="checkbox"/>	Teignbridge District Council

Information originally entered by Ron Porley on Monday, November 25, 2002

Information last changed by Ron Porley on 06 January 2003

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 LBAP

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 Ron Porley on Monday, November 25, 2002
Information last changed by Ron Porley on 06 January 2003

>

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:

UK

E

NI

S

W

Keyword:

Success 2:

Description:	Country:
<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> UK <input type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> W
Keyword:	
<input type="text"/>	

Success 3:

Description:	Country:
<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> UK <input type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> W
Keyword:	
<input type="text"/>	

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:	<input type="text" value="Ron Porley"/>	email:	<input type="text" value="ron.porley@er"/>
-----------------------	---	---------------	--

Your name:

Ron Porley

Date:

6 January 200
