

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


**Second Report by the United Kingdom under  
Article 17  
on the implementation of the Directive  
from January 2001 to December 2006**


**Conservation status assessment for  
Species:  
S1903 - *Liparis loeselii* - Fen orchid**

The information in this assessment corresponds to the "species fact sheet" submitted by the UK to the European Union in February 2008 (second and final submission). Please note that this is a section of the UK's report. For the complete report visit <http://www.jncc.gov.uk/article17>

Please cite as: Joint Nature Conservation Committee. 2007. *Second Report by the UK under Article 17 on the implementation of the Habitats Directive from January 2001 to December 2006*. Peterborough: JNCC. Available from: [www.jncc.gov.uk/article17](http://www.jncc.gov.uk/article17)

**Species Name: *Liparis loeselii***

<b>1. National level</b>	
Species Code	S1903
Member State	United Kingdom
Biogeographic regions concerned within the Member state	ATL
1.1 Range map	

1.2 Distribution map	
<b>2. Biogeographic level</b>	
2.1 Biogeographic region	ATL
2.2 Published sources and/or websites	<p>WIGGINTON, M.J. 1999. British Red Data Books 1 Vascular Plants. 3rd Edition. Peterborough: Joint Nature Conservation Committee</p> <p>Map Data Sources</p> <p>Andy Jones, CCW (pers. comm.).</p> <p>Vascular Plants Database, Botanical Society of the British Isles, via the Biological Records Centre.</p>
<b>2.3 Range of species in the biogeographic region or marine region</b>	
2.3.1 Surface range of the species (sq km)	409
2.3.2 Date of range determination	2005-2006

2.3.3 Quality of data concerning range	Good		
2.3.4 Range trend	Decreasing (-)		
2.3.5 Range trend magnitude (%)	41		
2.3.6 Range trend period	1994-2006		
2.3.7 Reasons for reported trend	3 - Direct human influence; 4 - Indirect anthropo or zoogenic influence;		
<b>2.4 Population</b>			
2.4.1 Population size estimation	Minimum	5	Maximum
	Units	Localities	
2.4.2 Date of population estimation	2005-2006		
2.4.3 Method used for population estimation	3 - From comprehensive inventory		
2.4.4 Quality of population data	Good		
2.4.5 Population trend	Decreasing (-)		
2.4.6 Population trend magnitude (%)	29		
2.4.7 Population trend period	1994-2006		
2.4.8 Reasons for reported trend	3 - Direct human influence; 4 - Indirect anthropo or zoogenic influence; 5 - Natural processes;		
2.4.9 Justification of % thresholds for trends (optional)	Not applicable		
2.4.10 Main pressures	140 - Grazing; 160 - General Forestry management; 871 - sea defense or coast protection works; 950 - Biocenotic evolution;		
2.4.11 Threats	140 - Grazing; 160 - General Forestry management; 871 - sea defense or coast protection works; 950 - Biocenotic evolution;		
<b>2.5 Habitat for the species in the biogeographic region or marine region</b>			
2.5 Habitats for the species	<p><i>L. loeselii</i> is a small green-flowered orchid of fens and dune systems. Two morphologically distinct forms occur: the type form of the East Anglian fens has acute oblong-elliptical leaves, while the form occurring in the dune slacks of south Wales and formerly north Devon (var. <i>ovata</i>) is shorter, generally fewer-flowered and bears blunt, broadly elliptical leaves. In the UK the two forms are mutually exclusive with respect to their distribution between habitats.</p> <p>In all fenland sites in the Norfolk Broads, this species is confined to tall-herb fens that have experienced disturbance through peat-cutting. In dune slacks <i>L. loeselii</i> occurs across quite a wide range of vegetation types, though principally in younger dune slack communities where some open soil remains. A high summer water table appears to be essential for the survival of this drought-sensitive species. In common with many other orchids, <i>L. loeselii</i> appears to rely on regular disturbance for its long-term survival at any one site, and dune system over-stabilisation has been a major causal element in its decline.</p> <p>Water quality and water quantity issues are limiting, and habitat management is currently very artificial and possibly unsustainable (R. Land, pers. comm.)</p>		

2.5.2 Area estimation (sq km)	Unknown
2.5.3 Date of estimation	05/2007
2.5.4 Quality of data	Poor
2.5.5 Trend of the habitat	Unknown (X)
2.5.6 Trend period	1994-2006
2.5.7 Reasons for reported trend	3 - Direct human influence; 4 - Indirect anthropo or zoogenic influence; 5 - Natural processes;
<b>2.6 Future prospects</b>	
2.6 Future prospects for the species	Poor prospects_Species likely to struggle unless conditions change
<b>2.7 Complementary information</b>	
2.7.1 Favourable reference range (sq km)	790
2.7.2 Favourable reference population	8
2.7.3 Suitable Habitat for the species	Unknown
2.7.4 Other relevant information	
<b>2.8 Conclusions</b> <i>(assessment of conservation status at end of reporting period)</i>	
(2.3) Range	(U2-) - Bad and deteriorating
(2.4) Population	(U2-) - Bad and deteriorating
(2.5) Habitat for the species	(U2) - Bad
(2.6) Future prospects	(U2) - Bad
Overall assessment	(U2-) - Bad and deteriorating