



UK priority species pages – Version 2

To find out more about the JNCC priority species pages visit <http://www.jncc.gov.uk/page-5161>

To find out more about JNCC visit <http://www.jncc.gov.uk/page-1729>

SPECIES PAGES FOR 2007 UK BAP PRIORITY SPECIES

(see endnotes for an explanation of the various components of this compilation).

Shargacucullia lychnitis Rambur, 1833

Striped Lychnis

1 General information

| | |
|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Level 1 | Terrestrial invertebrates |
| Level 2 | moth |
| On 1997 UK BAP list | Species Action Plan |

2 UK BAP criteriaⁱ

| 1. International threat | 2. International responsibility (2a) + moderate decline in UK (2b) | 3. Marked decline in the UK | 4. Other important factor(s) |
|-------------------------|--|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| False | False | False | True |

3 Evidence for Criteriaⁱⁱ

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Criterion 1 | |
| Criterion 2a | |
| Criterion 2b | |
| Criterion 3 | |
| Criterion 4 | An existing `old` priority species, the factors which caused its past range contraction have not been identified and, although there has been a modest range expansion to the south-east in recent years, the majority of the territory lost prior to 1980 has not been reclaimed. There appears to have been a range contraction in the north-west of its range. It remains vulnerable to mismanagement of roadside verges where many colonies occur and to over grazing of chalk grassland. This would be an important flagship species for roadside verges. |

4 Distribution by Country

| England | Scotland | Wales | Northern Ireland | International Waters |
|---------|----------|-------|------------------|----------------------|
| Y | | N | | |

5 Distribution Information

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Distribution data source | Mark Parsons Butterfly Conservation March 2007 - input June 2007 |
| Distribution data notes | |

| | |
|--|--|
| number of sites (where less than or equal to 10) | |
| Units used for number of sites | |

6 Actions identified by expertsⁱⁱⁱ

| Action number | Action text | Reporting category |
|---------------|---|--|
| 1 | need to encourage survey to gain a better understanding of distribution. Need to identify key sites and monitor these | Species-specific monitoring/survey |
| 2 | Associated with Dark Mullein and generally occurring in sites of disturbance and early successional habitats, such as roadsides | Prescriptive habitat action |
| 3 | Although comparatively widely distributed, single site advice may be needed to ensure a continuity of suitable habitat | Species-specific prescriptive habitat action |

8 Additional information from specialists^{iv}

| Attribute | Value |
|--------------------------------|--|
| NBN current scientific name | Shargacucullia lychnitis |
| NBN common name | Striped Lychnis |
| classification level 1 | Terrestrial invertebrates |
| classification level 2 | moth |
| Crit 1 Global threat | Not known. |
| Crit 1 European threat | Reported to be declining in Denmark, elsewhere stable or increasing. |
| Crit 1 Supporting info | Occurs from central Spain west to the Urals and southern Ukraine, north to southern Denmark and the Baltic states. Also in eastern North Africa and the Middle East to Iran. |
| Crit 2 % of global pop | Not known |
| Crit 2 % of European popn | Not known |
| Crit 4 other important factors | An existing priority species, the factors which caused its past range contraction have not been identified and, although there has been a modest range expansion to the south-east in recent years, the majority of the territory lost prior to 1980 has not been reclaimed. There appears to have been a range contraction in the north-west of its range. It remains vulnerable to mismanagement of roadside verges where many colonies occur and to over grazing of chalk grassland. This would be an important flagship species for roadside verges. |
| Sources | Ronkay, G. & Ronkay, L. (1986). Noctuidae Europaeae Volume 6: Cuccullinae I. |

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| | Entomological Press.National Scarce Moth Recording Scheme.Parsons, M.S., (2001). The European status of the UK Biodiversity Action Plan Moths. Ent. Rec. J. Var. 113: 49-62. |
| Quality | Information on existing and past UK status reliable. Understanding of ecology good. |
| Criterion(existing bap species) | 0 |

10 Species designations^v

| Abbreviation | Reporting Category | Designation | Designation description | Year | Source | Comment |
|-------------------|--|-------------------|--|------|---|---|
| England NERC S.41 | Biodiversity Lists - England | England NERC S.41 | Species “of principal importance for the purpose of conserving biodiversity” covered under section 41 (England) of the NERC Act (2006) and therefore need to be taken into consideration by a public body when performing any of its functions with a view to conserving biodiversity. | 2008 | Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 - Species of Principal Importance in England (section 41) and Wales (section 42) | Geographic constraint=Listing is for England only |
| BAP:2007 | Biodiversity Action Plan UK list of priority species | Priority Species | The UK List of Priority Species and Habitats contains 1150 species and 65 habitats that have been listed as priorities for conservation action under the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UK BAP). | 2007 | UK list of Priority Habitats and Species | status on former BAP list: Species Action Plan |

UK BAP 2008 reporting^{vi}

(nb this only applies to species on the original 1997 UK BAP priority species list)

11 General status

| Country | Attribute | Value |
|---------|-------------------------------|---|
| England | | |
| | Date | 2008 |
| | Status unknown | No |
| | Value | 34 |
| | Units | Occupied 10 km squares |
| | Accuracy | Partial survey |
| | Adequate data | No and not likely by 2011 |
| | Data on NBN | No |
| | Refer to LBAP data | No |
| | Data source / comments | Source: Butterfly Conservation's "Action for Threatened Moths Project". The above assessment is based on records from the period 2000 to 2008, the majority being records of the larval stage. There are an additional 3 10km squares from this period with records of single adults, these may or may not represent breeding populations, further survey being required to ascertain this. |
| | Edits made by reporting group | |
| UK | | |
| | Date | 2008 |
| | Status unknown | No |
| | Value | 34 |
| | Units | Occupied 10 km squares |
| | Accuracy | Partial survey |
| | Adequate data | No and not likely by 2011 |
| | Data on NBN | No |

| | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---|
| | Refer to LBAP data | No |
| | Data source / comments | Source: Butterfly Conservation's "Action for Threatened Moths Project". The above assessment is based on records from the period 2000 to 2008, the majority being records of the larval stage. There are an additional 3 10km squares from this period with records of single adults, these may or may not represent breeding populations, further survey being required to ascertain this. |
| | Edits made by reporting group | |

7 Trends

| Country | Attribute | Value |
|---------|-------------------------------|---|
| England | | |
| | Date | 2008 |
| | Status unknown | No |
| | Trend | Fluctuating - probably stable |
| | Accuracy | Partial survey |
| | Adequate data | No and not likely by 2011 |
| | Data on NBN | No |
| | Refer to LBAP data | No |
| | Data source / comments | Source: Butterfly Conservation's "Action for Threatened Moths Project". |
| | Edits made by reporting group | |
| UK | | |
| | Date | 2008 |
| | Status unknown | No |
| | Trend | Fluctuating - probably stable |
| | Accuracy | Partial survey |
| | Adequate data | No and not likely by 2011 |
| | Data on NBN | No |

| | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---|
| | Refer to LBAP data | No |
| | Data source / comments | Source: Butterfly Conservation's "Action for Threatened Moths Project". |
| | Edits made by reporting group | |

8 Successes

| Success text | Success category 1 | Success category 2 | England | NI | Scotland | Wales | Edits by reporting group |
|---|----------------------------------|---|---------|----|----------|-------|--------------------------|
| A Moths Count training event, part-funded by the Heritage Lottery Fund, has been held on this species. | Research, survey and information | Successful skills transfer/training | Yes | No | No | No | |
| The factsheet is now available on the Butterfly Conservation and BARS websites | Communication | Leaflet published | Yes | No | No | No | |
| On at least one site, a railway station, factsheets have been displayed to highlight the species to the general public. | Communication | Raised awareness / profile among general public | Yes | No | No | No | |
| Survey/surveillance has been undertaken over much of this species range in recent years. | Research, survey and information | Baseline survey - achieved or started | Yes | No | No | No | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---|-----|----|----|----|--|
| There has been significant volunteer survey/surveillance within at least part of this species' range. | Partnership | Voluntary / charitable body involvement | Yes | No | No | No | |
|---|-------------|---|-----|----|----|----|--|

9 Threats

| Threat category 1 | Threat category 2 | England | NI | Scotland | Wales | Edits made by reporting group |
|---|-------------------------------|---------|----|----------|-------|-------------------------------|
| Changes in native species dynamics | Decline in food source / prey | Yes | No | No | No | |
| Habitat loss / degradation - management practice | Scrub encroachment | Yes | No | No | No | |
| Habitat loss / degradation - management practice | Lack of disturbance | Yes | No | No | No | |
| Habitat loss / degradation - agriculture | Loss of field margins | Yes | No | No | No | |
| Habitat loss / degradation - infrastructure development | Transport infrastructure | Yes | No | No | No | |

15 Constraints

| Rank | Constraint category 1 | Constraint category 2 | Constraint summary | England | NI | Scotland | Wales | Solution category | Solution summary |
|------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|--|---------|----|----------|-------|--|--|
| 2 | Funding and incentives | General lack of resources | There continue to be insufficient resources to undertake effective liaison with a range of organisations, to undertake thorough survey and to ensure mangement occurs where it is needed.. | Yes | No | No | No | Funding, resources and incentive schemes | Increased resourcing is required to ensure aspects of the effort on this species are carried forward. |
| 2 | Species and habitat management | Conflict with other uses | Inappropriate roadside management, e.g. timing of roadside cutting can be an issue within at least part of this species' range. | Yes | No | No | No | Management | Ensure roadsides are appropriately managed. However, this is likely to need increased resources, both for liaison and management and could conflict with health and safety issues. |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|----------------------------|--|-----|----|----|----|-------------------|--|
| 2 | Species and habitat management | Other | Some of the roadside colonies appear to have been lost, although others have been discovered. This may be down to a lack of appropriate management, for example inappropriate cutting regimes. Natural succession may be a problem on other sites. | Yes | No | No | No | Management | Improved management, including scarification, may be needed on roadside sites to ensure a continuity of availability of the hostplant. Disturbance to ensure continuity of foodplant may be needed at other sites. Additional funding and resource may be required to ensure appropriate management takes place. |
| 2 | Research, survey and information | Baseline survey - required | Although considerable survey effort has been undertaken, not all potential areas have been surveyed adequately and it is probable that colonies lie undetected. | Yes | No | No | No | Survey/monitoring | Further survey is required, although this may need additional resourcing. |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---------------------------------------|--|-----|----|----|----|--|---|
| 2 | Partnership | Local authority - lack of involvement | Despite approaches there has been limited input to conserve this species within parts of its range, although in other areas the county council is involved in work on this moth. | Yes | No | No | No | Funding, resources and incentive schemes | Further resources are needed to encourage engagement from some County Councils. |
|---|-------------|---------------------------------------|--|-----|----|----|----|--|---|

10 State of Knowledge

| State of knowledge category | Notes | Edits made by reporting group |
|--|---|-------------------------------|
| Knowledge sufficient to make some impact, but more research needed | New sites for the species continue to be discovered, although some former sites appear to have been lost, at least in the short term. The species is one that moves around as habitat becomes available, although not all potential sites are colonised, but disappears as the foodplant, Dark Mullein, dies out through habitat succession or change. In parts of its range, the species is associated with roadsides and further effort is needed to enhance the roadside potential for this species, this may require the engagement of the Highway Agency or the Local County Council in some areas.. The work on this species has been co-ordinated by Butterfly Conservation's "Action for Threatened Moths Project" with part funding from Natural England.. | |

ENDNOTES

ⁱ An explanation of these criteria is included at Annex 3 of UK Biodiversity Action Plan: Report on the Species and Habitat Review. BRIG (ed. Ant Maddock) 2007. This review was organised in two stages. Stage 1 looked at the scientific evidence for selecting the UK List of Priority Species and Habitats while stage 2 considered the conservation action needed for these species and habitats and provided signposts to the means of implementing action.

ⁱⁱ The information on evidence and the species distribution is as presented on the UK BAP website. Users can download a spreadsheet of the [Stage 1 species evidence](#) from the home page of the UK BAP website.

ⁱⁱⁱ Actions were assigned to each and every priority species by expert groups convened at Stage 2 of the Review process. These were subsequently categorised into “signpost categories”. This information is as shown on the UK BAP website See the link for [categorisation \(signposting\) of UK priority species](#).

^{iv} This information has been derived from Stage 1 of the priority species review, and is presented in the “marine”, “terrestrial invertebrates” and “other terrestrial species” sheets within the spreadsheet of the [Stage 1 species evidence](#). The information presented here varies according to the taxonomic group. Please note that some of these data have been written for other Expert Group members and may not be of great value to a wider audience.

^v Information on conservation designations has been extracted from JNCC’s collation of information on [species designations](#). The designations shown in version 2 of these pages are as at December 2010.

^{vi} As part of the 2008 UK BAP reporting round lead partners of national plans were asked to answer a number of specific questions. The data will be analysed and used for the UK and country level reports. All of the responses provided through BARS as part of the 2008 reporting exercise are available to [download](#). Note that in the December 2010 version of these pages (version 2) includes corrections to previously truncated text fields.