

# *Sphagnum balticum* (Baltic Bog-Moss)

Full report outputted on the 01/08/2003 11:23:15

## 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	2	Sites/ Populations	2002	Partial or sample survey	Turner, J. 2002. Baltic bog moss <i>Sphagnum balticum</i> in England and Wales. Plantlife report 201
E	1	Sites/ Populations	2002	Partial or sample survey	See above
NI					
S	1	Sites/ Populations	2002	Partial or sample survey	Species dossier: <i>Sphagnum balticum</i> by Gordon Rothero 2002, unpublished report to SNH
W					

Information originally entered by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Thursday, October 24, 2002

Information last changed by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Monday, December 09, 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	Partial or sample survey	See under status
NI			
S	Not know n	Partial or sample survey	
W			

Information originally entered by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Thursday, October 24, 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.

<b>Status of knowledge:</b>	Know ledge sufficient to make some impact, but more research needed. ▼
<b>Notes:</b>	<input type="text"/>

Information originally entered by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Thursday, October 24, 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 of this species at all extant sites.

**Target start date:**

**Target end date:**

**Target units:**

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Some progress (on schedule) ▼			Partial or sample survey ▼	Under active development ▼
E	Some progress (on schedule) ▼			Partial or sample survey ▼	Under active development ▼
NI	▼			▼	▼
S	Some progress (on schedule) ▼			Partial or sample survey ▼	Under active development ▼
W	▼			▼	▼

**T2: Establish by 2005 ex situ stocks of this species to safeguard extant populations.**

Target start date:

Target end date:

Target units:

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

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

Information originally entered by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Thursday, October 24, 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 Direct afforestation and afforestation in the vicinity of Baltic bog-moss sites with associated effects on the acidity of run-off water and site hydrology.

2.2 Peat cutting and associated effects on site hydrology.

2.3 Drainage of its peatland sites.

2.4 Inappropriate collecting of Sphagnum for horticultural purposes is a potential threat to this species.

## 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	Habitat loss / degradation - extraction/drainage   Drainage (for agriculture)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Habitat loss / degradation - extraction/drainage   Peat extraction
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Habitat loss / degradation - woodlands/forestry   Tree / wood planting
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Pollution - atmospheric   Acid precipitation

Information originally entered by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Thursday, October 24, 2002

Information last changed by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Tuesday, October 29, 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:

Research, survey and information | Species is difficult to find or survey

Country:

UK  E  NI  S  
 W

Solution:

This species is notoriously difficult to survey since it can be tricky to pick out in 'carpets' of superficially similar other sphagnum spp, and bog conditions are not easy going (nor necessarily safe). This problem was overcome at one site (Muckle Moss) by arranging a 'sphagnum search party' of 8 expert bryologists who successfully re-found the species. It is felt that such an approach may yield successes at one or two Scottish sites where it has not been found but may warrant a more detailed search.

Solution type:

Able to resolve:

## Constraint 2:

Constraint keyword:

Country:

UK  E  NI  S  
 W

Solution:

Solution type:

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

Information originally entered by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Monday, December 09, 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.

---

## 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 Bryological Society
<input type="checkbox"/>	Countryside Council for Wales
<input type="checkbox"/>	English Nature
<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural History Museum
<input type="checkbox"/>	Plantlife
<input type="checkbox"/>	Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew
<input type="checkbox"/>	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
<input type="checkbox"/>	Scottish Natural Heritage

Information originally entered by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Thursday, October 24, 2002

Information last changed by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Thursday, October 24, 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 Lead Partner

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 Dr Jenny Duckworth on Thursday, October 24, 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:

'Sphagnum hunt' at English site involving expert bryologists  
refound species and generated local media coverage

Country:

UK  E  NI  S  W

Keyword:

Communication | Raised aw areness / profile among general public

## Success 2:

Description:

Country:

UK  E  NI  S  W

Keyword:

## Success 3:

Description:

Country:

UK  E  NI  S  W

Keyword:

Information originally entered by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Thursday, October 24, 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:**

English Nature

**email:**

ron.porley@er

**Your name:**

Jenny

**Date:**

20.12.02

---