

**European Community Directive  
on the Conservation of Natural Habitats  
and of Wild Fauna and Flora  
(92/43/EEC)**

**Third Report by the United Kingdom under  
Article 17**

on the implementation of the Directive  
from January 2007 to December 2012  
Conservation status assessment for

Species:

S1207 - Pool frog (*Rana lessonae*)

## Reporting format on the 'main results of the surveillance under Article 11' for Annex II, IV & V species

<i>Field name</i>	<i>Brief explanations</i>	
<b>0.2 Species</b>	<b>0.2.1 Species code</b>	<b>S1207</b>
	<b>0.2.2 Species scientific name</b>	<b><i>Rana lessonae</i></b>
	<b>0.2.3 Alternative species scientific name</b> Optional	
	<b>0.2.4 Common name</b> Optional	

<b>1.1 Maps</b>			
<b>1.1.1 Distribution map</b>	<b>True</b>	<b>Sensitive</b>	<b>False</b>
	The distribution map is based on species records which are considered to be representative of the range within the current reporting period. For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document.		



<b>1.1.2 Method used - map</b>	<b>Complete survey/Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate</b>
	For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document and relevant country-level reporting information.
<b>1.1.3 Year or period</b>	<b>2006-2012</b>
	The distribution map is based on species records which are considered to be representative of the range within the current reporting period. For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document.

<b>1.1.4 Additional distribution map</b> Optional	<b>False</b>
<b>1.1.5 Range map</b>	<b>True</b> The range map was produced by applying the UK range mapping tool to the distribution map presented in 1.1.4. The alpha value for this species was 35km. For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document.



<b>2.1 Biogeographical region &amp; marine regions</b>	<b>ATL</b>
<b>2.2 Published sources</b>	<p><b>BEEBEE, T.J.C. &amp; GRIFFITHS, R.A. 2000. Amphibians and Reptiles: A Natural History of the British Herpetofauna. The New Naturalist series. HarperCollins, London.</b></p> <p><b>BEEBEE, T.J.C., BUCKLEY, J., EVANS, I., FOSTER, J.P., GENT, A.H., GLEED-OWEN, C.P., KELLY, G., ROWE, G., SNELL, C., WYCHERLEY, J. &amp; ZEISSET, I. 2005. Neglected native or undesirable alien? Resolution of a conservation dilemma concerning the pool frog <i>Rana lessonae</i>. Biodiversity and Conservation 14: 1607-1626.</b></p> <p><b>BUCKLEY, J. &amp; FOSTER, J. 2005. Re-introduction strategy for the pool frog <i>Rana lessonae</i> in England. English Nature Research Report no 642. English Nature, Peterborough.</b></p> <p><b>EUROPEAN HABITATS FORUM. 2006. Towards European Biodiversity Monitoring. Assessment, monitoring and reporting of conservation status of European habitats and species. Wien, Cambridge, Bruxelles.</b></p>

	<p><b>FOSTER, J. &amp; BUCKLEY, J. 2006. Report on the second release in the reintroduction of the pool frog <i>Rana lessonae</i> to England, May-June 2006. Unpublished Report to Natural England Wildlife Licensing Unit. October 2006.</b></p> <p><b>KUZMIN, S., BEEBEE, T., ANDREONE, F., NYSTRÖM, P., ANTHONY, B., SCHMIDT, B., OGRODOWCZYK, A., OGIELSKA, M., COGALNICEANU, D., KOVÁCS, T., KISS, I., PUKY, M. &amp; VÖRÖS, J. 2004. <i>Rana lessonae</i>. In: IUCN 2006. 2006 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species.</b>  <a href="http://www.iucnredlist.org/search/details.php/58643/all">www.iucnredlist.org/search/details.php/58643/all</a></p> <p><b>The Amphibian &amp; Reptile Conservation Trust: Rare Species Database and Reptile and Amphibian Dataset (provided via the NBN Gateway)</b>  <b>UK distribution map data sources</b></p> <p><b>J. Foster (pers. comm), NE</b></p> <p>UK Distribution Map data sources</p> <p>J. Foster (pers. comm), NE</p>
--	--

<b>2.3 Range</b>			
<b>2.3.1 Surface area Range</b>	<p><b>100</b></p> <p>The surface area of the range was calculated from the map presented in 1.1.5. For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document.</p>		
<b>2.3.2 Method used Surface area of Range</b>	<p><b>Complete survey/Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate</b></p> <p>For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document and relevant country-level reporting information.</p>		
<b>2.3.3 Short-term trend Period</b>	<p><b>2001-2012</b></p> <p>For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document and relevant country-level reporting information.</p>		
<b>2.3.4 Short term trend Trend direction</b>	<p><b>increase</b></p> <p>The short term trend direction was derived by comparing the range map in 1.1.5 with the range map produced in the 2007 report, by considering the range trend in the 2007 report, and by considering any further information provided by the UK country conservation agencies. For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document and relevant country-level reporting information.</p>		
<b>2.3.5 Short-term trend Magnitude</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;"><b>a) Minimum</b></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p style="text-align: right;">Optional</p>	<b>a) Minimum</b>	
<b>a) Minimum</b>			

	<b>b) Maximum</b>	
<b>2.3.6 Long-term trend Period</b> Optional		
<b>2.3.7 Long-term trend Trend direction</b> Optional		
<b>2.3.8 Long-term trend Magnitude</b> Optional	<b>a) Minimum</b>	
	<b>b) Maximum</b>	
<b>2.3.9 Favourable reference range</b>	<b>a) Value in km<sup>2</sup></b>	
	<b>b) Operator for FRR</b>	<b>much more than</b>
	<b>c) FRR is unknown (indicated by "true")</b>	<b>False</b>
	It is unknown how large the range would have to be in order to support a viable population, although it is presumed that the FRR is much greater than current and further introductions are planned.	
	<b>d) Method used to set FRR</b>	
<b>2.3.10 Reason for change</b> Is the difference between the reported value in 2.3.1 and the previous reporting round mainly due to...	<b>a) Genuine change?</b>	<b>False</b>
	The surface area of the range is the same as was reported in 2007.	
	<b>b) Improved knowledge/more accurate data?</b>	<b>False</b>
	The surface area of the range is the same as was reported in 2007.	
	<b>c) Use of different method (e.g. "Range tool")?</b>	<b>False</b>
	The surface area of the range is the same as was reported in 2007.	

<b>2.4 Population</b>		
<b>2.4.1 Population size estimation</b> (using individuals or agreed exceptions where possible)	<b>a) Unit</b>	<b>number of individuals</b>
	<b>b) Minimum</b>	<b>50</b>
	For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document and relevant country-level reporting information.	
	<b>c) Maximum</b>	<b>60</b>
For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document and relevant country-level reporting information.		
<b>2.4.2 Population size estimation</b> (using population unit other than individuals) Optional ( <i>if 2.4.1 filled in</i> )	<b>a) Unit</b>	
	<b>b) Minimum</b>	
	<b>c) Maximum</b>	
<b>2.4.3 Additional information on population estimates / conversion</b> Optional	<b>a) Definition of "locality"</b>	
	<b>b) Method to convert data</b>	
	<b>c) Problems encountered to provide population size estimation</b>	
<b>2.4.4 Year or period</b>	<b>2012</b>	
For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document and relevant country-level reporting information.		
<b>2.4.5 Method used Population size</b>	<b>Complete survey/Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate</b>	
For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document and relevant country-level reporting information.		
<b>2.4.6 Short-term trend Period</b>	<b>2001-2012</b>	
For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document and relevant country-level reporting information.		
<b>2.4.7 Short-term trend Trend direction</b>	<b>increase</b>	
For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document and relevant country-level reporting information.		
<b>2.4.8 Short-term trend Magnitude</b> Optional	<b>a) Minimum</b>	<b>30</b>
	For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document and relevant country-level reporting information.	

	<b>b) Maximum</b>	<b>35</b>
	For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document and relevant country-level reporting information.	
	<b>c) Confidence interval</b>	
<b>2.4.9 Short-term trend Method used</b>	<b>Complete survey/Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate</b>	
	For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document and relevant country-level reporting information.	
<b>2.4.10 Long-term trend – Period</b> Optional		
<b>2.4.11 Long-term trend Trend direction</b> Optional		
<b>2.4.12 Long-term trend Magnitude</b> Optional	<b>a) Minimum</b>	
	<b>b) Maximum</b>	
	<b>c) Confidence interval</b>	
<b>2.4.13 Long term trend Method used</b> Optional		
<b>2.4.14 Favourable reference population</b>	<b>a) Number of individuals/agreed exceptions/other units</b>	<b>10000</b>
	The FRP has been set at 10000 individuals. This size is thought to be large enough for the population to be viable in the long term.	
	<b>b) Operator</b>	
	<b>c) FRP is unknown (indicated by "true")</b>	<b>False</b>

	<b>d) Method used to set FRP</b>	<b>The FRP has been set at 10000 individuals. This size is thought to be large enough for the population to be viable in the long term. For further details please see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document and relevant country-level reporting information.</b>
	The FRP has been set at 10000 individuals. This size is thought to be large enough for the population to be viable in the long term. For further details please see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document and relevant country-level reporting information.	
<b>2.4.15 Reason for change</b> Is the difference between the value reported at 2.4.1 or 2.4.2 and the previous reporting round mainly due to:	<b>a) Genuine change?</b>	<b>False</b>
	The population estimate is now reporting using the unit 'individuals' rather than 'populations', so comparison of the reported number is not applicable. However, there has been a genuine increase in individuals from 40 in 2007 to 50-60 in 2012.	
	<b>b) Improved knowledge/more accurate data?</b>	<b>False</b>
	The population estimate is now reporting using the unit 'individuals' rather than 'populations', so comparison of the reported number is not applicable. However, there has been a genuine increase in individuals from 40 in 2007 to 50-60 in 2012.	
	<b>c) Use of different method (e.g. "Range tool")?</b>	<b>False</b>
		The population estimate is now reporting using the unit 'individuals' rather than 'populations', so comparison of the reported number is not applicable. However, there has been a genuine increase in individuals from 40 in 2007 to 50-60 in 2012.

<b>2.5 Habitat for the species</b>	
<b>2.5.1 Area estimation</b>	<b>0.125</b> This species is being re-introduced; while it currently occupies a small area, there is thought to be sufficient habitat available in England to support a viable population if correctly managed. For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document and relevant country-level reporting information.  There is thought to be a sufficient amount of habitat in the UK to support a viable population of the species.
<b>2.5.2 Year or period</b>	<b>2007-2012</b> For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document and relevant country-level reporting information.
<b>2.5.3 Method used Habitat for the species</b>	<b>Complete survey/Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate</b>



	For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document and relevant country-level reporting information.	
<b>2.5.4 Quality of the habitat</b>	<b>a) Habitat quality</b>	<b>Moderate</b>
	For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document and relevant country-level reporting information.	
	<b>b) Assessment method</b>	<b>Detailed annual surveys and habitat assessments.</b>
	For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document and relevant country-level reporting information.	
<b>2.5.5 Short-term trend Period</b>	<b>2007-2012</b>	
	For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document and relevant country-level reporting information.	
<b>2.5.6 Short-term trend Trend direction</b>	<b>stable</b>	
	For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document and relevant country-level reporting information.	
<b>2.5.7 Long-term trend Period</b> Optional		
<b>2.5.8 Long-term trend Trend direction</b> Optional		
<b>2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat for the species</b>	<b>a) Value in km<sup>2</sup></b>	
	<b>b) Absence of data indicated as '0'</b>	
<b>2.5.10 Reason for change</b> Is the difference between the value reported at 2.5.1 and the previous reporting round mainly due to	<b>a) Genuine change?</b>	<b>False</b>
	The surface area of habitat is the same as was reported in 2007.	
	<b>b) Improved knowledge/more accurate data?</b>	<b>False</b>
	The surface area of habitat is the same as was reported in 2007.	
	<b>c) Use of different method (e.g. "Range tool")?</b>	<b>False</b>
	The surface area of habitat is the same as was reported in 2007.	

<b>2.6 Main pressures</b>		
<b>a) Pressure</b>	<b>b) Ranking</b>	<b>c) Pollution qualifier</b>
	H = high importance (max 5 entries) M = medium importance L = low importance	

I02: problematic native species	H	O
K02: Biocenotic evolution, succession	H	T
K05: reduced fecundity/ genetic depression	H	X
F03: Hunting and collection of wild animals (terrestrial)	M	A
G05: Other human intrusions and disturbances	M	N
K01: abiotic (slow) natural processes	M	P

For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document and relevant country-level reporting information.

**2.6.1 Method used – Pressures**

**mainly based on expert judgement and other data**

For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document and relevant country-level reporting information.

<b>2.7 Threats</b>		
<b>a) Threat</b>	<b>b) Ranking</b>	<b>c) Pollution qualifier</b>
	H = high importance (max 5 entries) M = medium importance L = low importance	
H01: Pollution to surface waters (limnic & terrestrial, marine & brackish)	H	ANOPTX
I01: invasive non-native species	H	T
J02: human induced changes in hydraulic conditions	H	A
K02: Biocenotic evolution, succession	H	T
K05: reduced fecundity/ genetic depression	H	O
A02: modification of cultivation practices	M	A
B02: Forest and Plantation management & use	M	T
F03: Hunting and collection of wild animals (terrestrial)	M	X
G05: Other human intrusions and disturbances	M	A

H02: Pollution to groundwater (point sources and diffuse sources)	M	OTX
H04: Air pollution, air-borne pollutants	M	ANPX
J03: Other ecosystem modifications	M	X
K01: abiotic (slow) natural processes	M	O
M01: Changes in abiotic conditions	M	T
M02: Changes in biotic conditions	M	X
A07: use of biocides, hormones and chemicals	L	OTX
A08: Fertilisation	L	NOPX
I02: problematic native species	L	X
K03: Interspecific faunal relations	L	X

For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document and relevant country-level reporting information.

**2.7.1 Method used – Threats**

**expert opinion**

For further details see the 2013 Article 17 UK Approach document and relevant country-level reporting information.

**2.8 Complementary information**

**2.8.1 Justification of % thresholds for trends**

**2.8.2 Other relevant information**

**At the beginning of the 19th Century this species was known at two sites in the UK. By the mid-1800s, one of these sites had been lost, and by 1995 pool frogs were presumed extinct in the wild. However, a population has since been re-established in the UK in 2006. The population at this site is doing well, and further reintroductions are planned.**

**2.8.3 Trans-boundary assessment**

<b>2.9 Conclusions (assessment of conservation status at end of reporting period)</b>	
<b>2.9.1 Range</b>	<b>a) Conclusion</b> <b>Bad</b>
	Range has been assessed as Bad because the FRV is much greater than the current surface area of range, although the short term trend is increasing.
	<b>b) Qualifier</b> <b>improving</b>
	The short term trend is increasing.
<b>2.9.2 Population</b>	<b>a) Conclusion</b> <b>Bad</b>
	Population has been assessed as Bad because the FRV is much greater than the current population, although the short term trend is increasing.
	<b>b) Qualifier</b> <b>improving</b>
	The short term trend is increasing.
<b>2.9.3 Habitat for the species</b>	<b>a) Conclusion</b> <b>Favourable</b>
	Habitat for species has been assessed as Favourable because, there is thought to be sufficient habitat to support a viable population, the habitat quality is moderate and the short term trend is stable.
	It is thought that there is sufficient habitat available for re-introductions, with appropriate habitat management to support a viable population.
	<b>b) Qualifier</b>
<b>2.9.4 Future prospects</b>	<b>a) Conclusion</b> <b>Unknown</b>
	Future prospects is assessed as Unknown on the basis of assessments of the future prospects of the three parameters, range, population and habitat for species:  Range future prospects: Unknown Population future prospects: Unknown Habitat future prospects: Good Overall future prospects: Unknown
	Although conservation measures are in place for this species, much potential habitat is within already protected sites, and further re-introductions are planned, it is too early to predict their long term success.
	<b>b) Qualifier</b>
<b>2.9.5 Overall assessment of Conservation Status</b>	<b>Bad</b>

	The overall assessment is Unfavourable Bad because range and population parameters have been assessed as bad.
<b>2.9.6 Overall trend in Conservation Status</b>	<b>improving</b>
	On balance, the overall trend is increasing.

**3 Natura 2000 coverage & conservation measures - Annex II species**  
(only applies to species listed under Annex II of the Directive)

<b>3.1 Population</b>		
<b>3.1.1 Population size</b>  Estimation of population size included in the SAC network	<b>a) Unit</b>	
	<b>b) Minimum</b>	
	<b>c) Maximum</b>	
<b>3.1.2 Method used</b>		
<b>3.1.3 Trend of population size within the network</b> (short-term trend)  Optional		

<b>3.2 Conservation measures</b>				
Conservation measures taken (i.e. already being implemented) within the reporting period and provided information about their importance, location and evaluation.				
<b>3.2.1 Measure</b>	<b>3.2.2 Type</b>	<b>3.2.3 Ranking</b>	<b>3.2.4 Location</b>	<b>3.2.5 Broad evaluation of the measure</b>
		H = high importance	where the measure is PRIMARILY applied	

	a) Legal/statutory	b) Administrative	c) Contractual	d) Recurrent	e) One-off	M = medium importance L = low importance	a) Inside	b) Outside	c) Both inside & outside	a) Maintain	b) Enhance	c) Long term	d) No effect	e) Unknown	f) Not evaluated

--