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

Supporting documentation for the 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:

S1390 - Western rustwort (*Marsupella profunda*)

IMPORTANT NOTE – PLEASE READ

- The country-level reporting information contained in this document is a contribution to the Article 17 UK report for the habitat/species concerned.
- It has been provided by **Natural England** and refers only to the state of the habitat/species in **England** - it does not constitute an assessment for the whole of the UK.
- The Article 17 UK Approach document provides details on how this information has been used and, combined with information supplied by other Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies
- The format of the document is closely aligned to that set out by the European Commission for Member State reporting – as a result, some of the fields are not applicable at a country-level and have deliberately been left blank – in addition, the content of most fields is constrained by the EC reporting categories.

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

Field name	*Brief explanations*	
0.2 Species	**0.2.1 Species code**	**S1390**
	0.2.2 Species scientific name	***Marsupella profunda***
	0.2.3 Alternative species scientific name Optional	
	0.2.4 Common name Optional	**Western Rustwort**

1.1 Maps			
1.1.1 Distribution map		**Sensitive**	**False**

1.1.2 Method used - map	**Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling**
1.1.3 Year or period	**2006-2011**
1.1.4 Additional distribution map	**False**
1.1.5 Range map	

2.1 Biogeographical region & marine regions	**ATL**
2.2 Published sources	**"Rare and scarce bryophytes in southwest England, Callaghan (2011). 108 pages. Source: Natural England. Web address: not available. Data supplied by the British Bryological Society on the NBN Gateway."**

2.3 Range		
2.3.1 Surface area Range	**360**	
2.3.2 Method used Surface area of Range	**Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling**	
	I think that range area becomes fairly meaningless when there are two population clusters separated by about 45 miles.	
2.3.3 Short-term trend Period	**2006-2012**	
2.3.4 Short term trend Trend direction	**decrease 1% or less/year**	
2.3.5 Short-term trend Magnitude	**a) Minimum**	**1**
	b) Maximum	**10**
2.3.6 Long-term trend Period	**1998-2012**	
2.3.7 Long-term trend Trend direction	**decrease 1% or less/year**	
2.3.8 Long-term trend Magnitude Optional	**a) Minimum**	**1**
	b) Maximum	**10**

2.3.9 Favourable reference range	**a) Value in km²**	
	b) Operator for FRR	
	c) FRR is unknown (indicated by "true")	**True**
	d) Method used to set FRR	**This is not a meaningful measure for this species.**
2.3.10 Reason for change Is the difference between the reported value in 2.3.1 and the previous reporting round mainly due to…	**a) Genuine change?**	**False**
	b) Improved knowledge/more accurate data?	**False**
	c) Use of different method (e.g. "Range tool")?	**True**

2.4 Population		
2.4.1 Population size estimation (using individuals or agreed exceptions where possible)	**a) Unit**	
	b) Minimum	
	c) Maximum	
2.4.2 Population size estimation (using population unit other than individuals) Optional *(if 2.4.1 filled in)*	**a) Unit**	**number of localities**
	b) Minimum	**8**
	c) Maximum	**10**
2.4.3 Additional	**a) Definition of**	**Boundary of SSSI, china clay works or**

information on population estimates / conversion Optional	**"locality"**	**other geographical feature.**
	b) Method to convert data	
	c) Problems encountered to provide population size estimation	**A site may have numerous colonies or just one but counts as the same thing.**
2.4.4 Year or period	**1998-2012**	
2.4.5 Method used Population size	**Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling**	
2.4.6 Short-term trend Period	**2006-2012**	
2.4.7 Short-term trend Trend direction	**decrease 1% or less/year**	
2.4.8 Short-term trend Magnitude	**a) Minimum**	**1**
	b) Maximum	**1**
	c) Confidence interval	**95**
2.4.9 Short-term trend Method used	**Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling**	
2.4.10 Long-term trend – Period	**1998-2012**	
2.4.11 Long-term trend Trend direction	**decrease 1% or less/year**	
2.4.12 Long-term trend Magnitude Optional	**a) Minimum**	**1**

	b) Maximum	**1**
	c) Confidence interval	**95**
2.4.13 Long term trend Method used	**2**	
2.4.14 Favourable reference population	**a) Number of individuals/agreed exceptions/other units**	**8**
	b) Operator	**approximately equal to**
	c) FRP is unknown indicated by "true"	**False**
	d) Method used to set FRP	**The previous FRP was for at least 10 sites but 2 sites are now known not to hold Marsupella profunda. There are now 8 known sites with records post 2006 (still 10 post 1999 - but it is not known if 2 of these have been re-surveyed).**
2.4.15 Reason for change Is the difference between the value reported at 2.4.1 or 2.4.2 and the previous reporting round mainly due to:	**a) Genuine change?**	**True**
	b) Improved knowledge/more accurate data?	**False**
	c) Use of different method (e.g. "Range tool")?	**False**

2.5 Habitat for the species		
2.5.1 Area estimation	**6**	
2.5.2 Year or period	**2005-**	
2.5.3 Method used Habitat for the species	**Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling**	
2.5.4 Quality of the habitat	**a) Habitat quality**	**Moderate**
	b) Assessment method	**Estimate of potentially suitable bare ground from 2005 air photos.**
2.5.5 Short-term trend Period	**2006-2012**	
2.5.6 Short-term trend Trend direction	**decrease**	
2.5.7 Long-term trend Period	**1998-2012**	
2.5.8 Long-term trend Trend direction	**decrease**	
2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat for the species	**a) Value in km²**	**0**
	b) Absence of data indicated as '0'	
2.5.10 Reason for change Is the difference between the value reported at 2.5.1 and the previous reporting round mainly due to	**a) Genuine change?**	**False**
	b) Improved knowledge/more accurate data?	**False**
	c) Use of different method (e.g. "Range tool")?	**True**

2.6 Main pressures		
a) Pressure	**b) Ranking**	**c) Pollution qualifier**
	H = high importance	

	M = medium importance L = low importance	
K02: Biocenotic evolution, succession	H	
G01: Outdoor sports and leisure activities, recreational activities	M	
K01: abiotic (slow) natural processes	M	

2.6.1 Method used – Pressures	**based exclusively or to a larger extent on real data from sites/occurrences or other data sources**

2.7 Threats		
a) Threat	**b) Ranking**	**c) Pollution qualifier**
	H = high importance M = medium importance L = low importance	
K02: Biocenotic evolution, succession	H	
G01: Outdoor sports and leisure activities, recreational activities	M	
K01: abiotic (slow) natural processes	M	

Off-road vehicle use could destroy existing colonies. Shading and loss of bare ground due to vegetation succession is a significant problem. A reduction of the heavy metal content of mine spoil due to leaching reduces substrate suitability and increases the rate of succession.	
2.7.1 Method used – Threats	**expert opinion**

2.8 Complementary information	
2.8.1 Justification of % thresholds for trends	
2.8.2 Other relevant information	
2.8.3 Trans-boundary assessment	

2.9 Conclusions *(assessment of conservation status at end of reporting period)*
Please refer to the United Kingdom assessment for this species.

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

3.1 Population		
3.1.1 Population size Estimation of population size included in the SAC network	**a) Unit**	**number of localities**
	b) Minimum	**8**
	c) Maximum	**8**
3.1.2 Method used	**Complete survey/Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate**	
3.1.3 Trend of population size within the network (short-term trend)	**decrease**	

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

	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
1.2: Measures needed, but not implemented				Y		M	Y			Y	Y	Y			
2.1: Maintaining grasslands and other open habitats				Y		H	Y			Y	Y	Y			

There needs to be an additional option here of Measures needed and implementation in progress or planned.
For this species it is important to maintain areas of bare, unshaded china clay spoil.