



Species and Habitat Action Plan Assessment Form

Please refer to the accompanying guidance for information about how to complete this form and an explanation of terms used

Field 1: Action Plan details

Species/Habitat Action Plan	Lowland Heathland
Lead Partner/Agency	English Nature
Steering Group/Other organisations	<p><i>Steering group in existence? Please state yes or no. Please list the organisations represented.</i></p> <p>Yes, first meeting on 29 April 1997.</p> <p>English Nature (Group Chair/Secretary), CCW, SNH, RSPB, The Wildlife Trusts, Ministry of Defence (Defence Estate Organisation), Forestry Commission, The National Trust, Countryside Agency, FRCA/MAFF, Surrey County Council, Herpetological Conservation Trust, Country Landowners Association, Plantlife.</p> <p>The following are also circulated minutes and information: Department of the Environment (NI).</p>
Work programme in existence?	<p><i>Please state yes or no. If in existence, please use the agreed work programme to update Field 3 and Table B.</i></p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Draft work programme produced for 1998. Second (expanded) work programme (1999/2000) produced in summer 1999, signed off by Steering Group on 1st September 1999.</p>

Field 2: Objectives and targets overview

Please list the targets for the action plan, indicating in which country/region the target is applicable, and additional comments including the rationale for new targets. For each new target please add new sequential paragraph numbers and target text. Please provide information about progress and country disaggregation in Table A for all targets.

Number and text	UK	E	NI	S	W	Comments
4.1. Maintain, and improve by management, all existing lowland heathland (58,000 ha).		X	X	X	X	Maintenance targets per country: E = 32,000 ha W = 7,000 ha S = 23,905 ha <i>*this estimate is subject to review</i> I = 5,385 ha Source: Review of the extent and significance of lowland heathland in the United Kingdom, EN Internal Report.
4.2. Encourage the re-establishment by 2005 of a further 6,000 ha of heathland with the emphasis on the counties of Hampshire, Cornwall, Dorset, Surrey, Devon, Staffordshire, Suffolk and Norfolk in England and Pembrokeshire, Glamorgan and west Gwynedd in Wales, particularly where this links separate heathland areas.		X			X	Re-establishment targets per country: E = 5,400 ha W = 600 ha S = 0 ha NI = 0 ha

Field 3: Proposed actions overview

Please list the proposed actions for the action plan, indicating in which country/region the action is applicable. For each new action please add new sequential paragraph numbers and action text. If the action is regarded as significant (please see guidance) indicate this in the box and provide further details in Table B. For actions not regarded as significant simply state if the action is ongoing or complete. Remember any action which is being dropped from the workplan will be regarded as significant for the first round of reporting.

Number and text	UK	E	NI	S	W	Action significant?	Action complete or ongoing? (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)
5.1.1 Where significant gaps in the SSSI/ASSI coverage of lowland heathland are identified the appropriate SSSI/ASSI procedure should be implemented by 1998.		X	X	X	X	Yes	Started but not complete
5.1.2 Consider expanding Countryside Stewardship, Tir Cymen (now Tir Gofal), ESA and WES to meet the targets for heathland and management and re-creation. Determine the applicability of a new scheme similar to Countryside Stewardship for Scotland.		X	X	X	X	Yes	Ongoing
5.1.3 Take account of the conservation requirements of lowland heathland in developing and adjusting agri-environment schemes.		X	X	X	X	Yes	Ongoing
5.1.4 Simplify the process for submission of applications to the Secretary of State to fence lowland heathland that is common land for grazing, to maintain its wildlife interest.		X			X	Yes	Ongoing
5.1.5 In areas that support lowland heathland there should be a presumption in favour of re-establishing heathland on derelict land or land that has been used for mineral extraction.		X		X	X	Yes	Ongoing (eg. Cornwall & THH)
5.1.6 Encourage Forest Enterprise and the MoD to agree action plans with specific targets for heathland restoration and management for all heathland sites in their ownership with the statutory agencies by the end of 2000		X	X	X	X	Yes	Started but not complete
5.1.7 (New action) Ensure that legislation on public access takes proper account of the nature conservation importance of lowland heathland.		X			X	Yes	Not started
5.2.1 The long term funding of county heathland management projects needs to be addressed. Consideration should be given to establishing county heathland projects in Wales.		X		X	X	Yes	Ongoing (eg. THH)
5.2.2 Relevant local authorities should incorporate heathland Wildlife Site protection policies in development plans by 2000.		X		X	X	Yes	Ongoing
5.3.1 Organisations with experience of		X	X	X	X	Yes	Ongoing

heathland management should continue to provide advice on how to manage and restore lowland heathland.							
5.3.2 Continue existing training courses on heathland management and conservation and target these at land management advisors and officers running countryside management schemes.		X			X	Yes	Ongoing
5.3.3 Produce county lowland heathland re-creation plans identifying areas with high potential for heathland re-establishment by 2000 for all lowland heathland counties.		X		X	X	Yes	Started but not complete
5.3.4 Disseminate lowland heathland inventories for all counties in England by 1997. Seek to complete the Welsh national survey of lowland heathland so that inventories can be published to guide countryside management schemes. Consider the need for a survey and subsequent inventory project in Scotland. Inventories will need periodic updating.		X		X	X	Yes	Completed in England. Started but not complete in Wales. Updating - not started
5.4.1 Continue to develop contacts between international experts in heathland conservation, through mechanisms such as the European Heathland Workshop.		X	X	X	X	No	Ongoing
5.4.2 The European Environment Agency should be encouraged to develop an inventory of lowland heathland to support EU policy development.	X					No	Started but not complete
5.5.1 Develop a rapid monitoring method to be used at a sample of sites to ensure that heathland management schemes are meeting their objectives.		X		X	X	Yes	Started but not complete
5.5.2 Seek to ensure that appropriate studies to evaluate new labour saving technologies for heathland restoration especially for techniques such as turf cutting and rotovation are implemented.		X		X	X	Yes	Ongoing
5.5.3 Establish a baseline survey for monitoring the extent, condition and restoration of lowland heathland in England.		X				Yes	Started but not complete
5.6.1 Undertake a publicity campaign to raise awareness of the importance of lowland heathland by 1998.		X			X	Yes	Complete

NOTE: We indicate that an action is "ongoing" when it is a rolling process that does not have a finite timescale. With "Started but not completed" we mean that the action has a possible deadline for completion.

Field 4: Assessment of status

Please tick the appropriate category to indicate the assessment of status of the species or habitat, for each country/region where appropriate, and provide a statement supporting the category selected.

	Not appropriate	Recovered	Signs of recovery	No change	Declining	Lost	Insufficient information
<i>UK</i>							X
<i>England</i>			X				
<i>Northern Ireland</i>							X
<i>Scotland</i>							X
<i>Wales</i>							X

Brief text description justifying assessment of status: (*~ no more than 100 words for each country/region*)

There are approximately 32,000 ha of lowland heathland in **England**. There are signs of recovery in several regions but despite efforts to maintain the remaining areas, heathlands are still threatened, especially by lack of adequate conservation management. The best documented example is in Dorset where loss to succession was estimated (1996) to be occurring at a rate of 1.7% per year. A survey of lowland heathland SSSIs undertaken in 1997/98 showed that approximately 32.5% of site units were in favourable condition, 33% in unfavourable recovering condition, 15% were in unfavourable, stable condition and 18.8% were in unfavourable declining condition. This shows a slight improvement on a previous survey (1994/95).

The extent of lowland heathland in **Scotland** in 1989 was estimated at 6066 ha (Farrell 1989) from direct field observation by the author and colleagues. It is likely this was an under-estimate as only part of Scotland was covered, and it is difficult to distinguish lowland, transitional and upland heaths especially in the north. Since then, it is believed that there has been little decline in the overall extent, as there have been no major changes in land use. However, recent information suggests that lowland heathland does occur in many more areas but a full survey has not been conducted. There is no systematic information on changes in habitat condition in Scotland.

Wales supports approximately 7,000 ha of lowland heathland. The mechanisms to manage lowland heathland sites in Wales have only recently been initiated (i.e. Tir Gofal, Tomorrows Heathland Heritage). No comprehensive or accurate information for the restoration/re-creation of lowland heathland in Wales will be available for this reporting round. Historically, the decline and fragmentation of lowland heathlands in Wales has been caused by abandonment, afforestation, sheep mono-culture and agricultural intensification (e.g. on the Lleyn Peninsula 51% of dry and 95% of wet lowland heathland have been lost since the 1920's).

No data has been supplied from **Northern Ireland**.

Field 5: Summary statement

Please provide an overview of plan implementation, including new factors affecting the species or habitat which will accelerate or constrain progress towards meeting of the targets. Where a factor results in new action(s) please cross-reference back to the relevant numbers under Field 3 and Table B.

During the last few years a significant number of projects of various sizes have been started with the aim of restoring and when possible, re-creating patches of lowland heathland. English Nature, Local Authorities, Forestry Commission and the Ministry of Defence together with NGOs such as RSPB and the Wildlife Trusts have been involved in this work. English Nature has funded private and public management plans in heathlands through the Wildlife Enhancement Scheme and the Reserves Enhancement Scheme. RES has funded the management of 2286 ha (£91k). The Countryside Stewardship funded the restoration of about 12,000 ha in England. Also the 'Lowland Heathland National Programme' contributed to the management or restoration of 1,559 ha of lowland heathland and the re-creation of additional lowland heathland during the five years (1993-1998) it lasted.

The allocation of £14M by the Heritage Lottery Fund (Tomorrow's Heathland Heritage co-ordinated by English Nature) towards reversing the trend in the loss of lowland heathland will be the major contribution to the delivery of the Lowland Heathland BAP targets. Further £4M will be secured from partners in the projects. Three tranches of projects across England, Northern Ireland and Wales have been approved which should contribute towards the restoration of 14,410 ha (24.4% of BAP targets) and the re-creation of 1,627 ha (27% of BAP targets). A fourth Tranche has been submitted for approval, which will, if achieved, represent 10,994 ha restored (19% of BAP targets) and 252 ha re-created (4.21% of BAP targets). A further Tranche 5, if approved as it stands today, will help with a 10% of BAP targets for restoration and a further 5.2% for re-creation. These projects will make a significant contribution towards the BAP targets, with a total of 53% of the BAP target for restoration and 36% for re-creation. The first payments of THH money have been made in 1999, following the launch of this scheme in October 1997. The main constraint to progressing this very important scheme has been the considerable amount of work and time that the different projects have had to put to gain approval.

In Wales, the main aim of the Lowland & Coastal Heathland Strategy is to outline the requirements necessary to ensure the long-term conservation and expansion of Welsh coastal and other lowland heathland. This was produced as a consultation document in 1999. Tir Gofal will contribute to the delivery of biodiversity targets for a wide range of habitats and species identified in the UK BAP across Wales. Tir Gofal has the potential to restore heathland through enhanced management or to re-creation lowland heathland on acid grassland or improved grassland. Heritage Lottery Funding under the Tomorrow's Heathland Heritage (THH) initiative has been sought to re-create and restore lowland heathland in Pembrokeshire, Gower commons, Lleyn peninsula and Anglesey. It is expected that THH will start to deliver some of the Welsh targets within the next 12 months (e.g. Pembrokeshire, Gower Commons).

Knowledge of the extent and condition of existing lowland heathland and the area of heathland that has been re-created remains incomplete and prevents a proper assessment of progress towards the biological objectives of this plan.

Similarly, incomplete feedback on various actions within the plan makes an assessment of implementation of the plan and the commitment made by different organisations difficult.

Potential changes to access legislation in England and Wales are of relevance to the conservation of lowland heathland. Action 5.1.7. has therefore been added to the plan.

Field 6: Signing off

Please 'sign off' the form below to confirm that steering group members or key contacts have been consulted and agreed the information provided.

Contact details	Lead Partner	Contact Point
Name	Dr Andy King	
Organisation	English Nature	
Assessment date (dd/mm/yy)	4/10/99	

Completed forms should be submitted to NCC

*Biodiversity Information Service
Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Monkstone House
City Road
Peterborough PE1 1JY
Tel: 01733 562626
Fax: 01733 555948
E-mail: lpr99@jncc.gov.uk*

Table A: Action Plan objectives and targets (Copiable table)

For each target please state how, if applicable, it has been disaggregated to the country level. Please insert the paragraph number, UK target and country-specific disaggregated target(s) into the table. Please tick the appropriate category to indicate progress against published and disaggregated targets. For each target please copy the table and detail the (existing or new [new paragraph numbers should run sequentially, under relevant headings in the published volumes]) paragraph number, target text and an assessment of progress.

Objective/target <i>(For new or revised targets please provide the new paragraph number and target text.)</i>			4.1 Maintain, and improve by management, all existing lowland heathland (58,000 ha)		
Country	Not appropriate	Target achieved	Some progress	No progress	Insufficient information
<i>UK</i>					X
<i>England</i>			X		
<i>Northern Ireland</i>					X
<i>Scotland</i>					X
<i>Wales</i>			X		
<p>Text description of target progress (separate for each country/region):</p> <p>Figures for existing extent of lowland heathlands need to be reviewed. There has not been an overall survey of lowland heathlands in the UK before or since BAP targets were established. There have been no large losses of lowland heathland to development since the plan was published, but scrub encroachment due to lack of management is still a significant problem. Current available data (EN, CCW, WT, RSPB, MoD, NT) suggest that more than 41,000 ha of heathlands have been managed and restored in England and Wales. These figures do not include private land owners and they reflect efforts made to manage lowland heathlands more than real outputs since it is an ongoing process. As indicated above (see Field 5), the 'Lowland Heathland National Programme' has contributed to and 'Tomorrow's Heathland Heritage' has the potential to contribute greatly to the management and restoration of lowland heathlands in England and Wales. Approximately 53% of BAP targets for restoration will be achieved by these means.</p> <p>However, information on the condition of lowland heathland is incomplete in England and is not available elsewhere. The latest surveys of the condition of the SSSIs with lowland heathland in England also indicate that, although the situation is improving, heathlands are still in worse condition than the mean of other habitats.</p> <p>In Scotland there is a need to check whether the extent and condition of Scottish lowland heath has changed since 1989, and whether new management practises and agreements have been put in place. SNH will endeavour to do this over the next two years.</p> <p>There is a need to verify whether the condition or extent of Welsh Coastal & Lowland Heathlands has changed significantly since the production of the inventory. Currently 1011 ha of the Welsh SSSI series have management plans for the restoration of coastal and lowland heathland. Whilst Tir Gofal and Tomorrow's Heathland Heritage are expected to significantly increase the area of privately owned lowland heathland entering into management agreements, no comprehensive data is available for the loss or degradation of heathland across Wales.</p> <p>National Trust (NI) bid for HLF funding for lowland heathland restoration (as part of Tomorrow's Heathland Heritage programme) has been successful (ie. South Down Heathland Project). It is planned to manage, restore and re-create 250 ha of lowland heathland. To date, the Business Plan has been approved; currently the management plan is in preparation and the management works are about to start. EHS is also providing grant-aid for the project.</p>					

Objective/target <i>(For new or revised targets please provide the new paragraph number and target text.)</i>		4.2 Encourage the re-establishment by 2005 of a further 6,000 ha of heathland with the emphasis on the counties of Hampshire, Cornwall, Dorset, Surrey, Devon, Staffordshire, Suffolk and Norfolk in England and Pembrokeshire, Glamorgan and west Gwynedd in Wales, particularly where this links separate heathland areas.			
Country	Not appropriate	Target achieved	Some progress	No progress	Insufficient information
<i>UK</i>			X		
<i>England</i>			X		
<i>Northern Ireland</i>					X
<i>Scotland</i>	X				
<i>Wales</i>			X		
<p>Text description of target progress (separate for each country/region):</p> <p>There is no systematic recording of heathland re-creation to common definitions. Currently available estimates suggest that there is around 2,000 ha being re-created in different parts of England and by different organisations against a target of 5400 ha.</p> <p>The first five tranches of THH projects will, if completed fully, achieve 36% of the re-creation target. At present it is not clear how the remaining part of this target will be achieved.</p> <p>Scotland: see above.</p> <p>Wales: see above.</p> <p>NI : see above.</p>					

Table B: Proposed actions (Copiable table)

For each significant action please copy and complete the table below.

<p>Published action/organisation(s) responsible (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</p>	<p>5.1.1 Where significant gaps in the SSSI/ASSI coverage of lowland heathland are identified the appropriate SSSI/ASSI procedure should be implemented by 1998. CCW, DoE(NI), EN, SNH</p>	
<p>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</p>	<p>a. 1998 - Country agencies to provide summaries of SSSI/ASSI coverage and time scales for notification of sites. CCW, DoE(NI), EN, SNH. b. 1999 - Outline extent of resource still due to be notified as SSSI and estimate date that programme of notification is expected to be complete. CCW, DoE(NI), EN, SNH c. 1999 Outline number and extent of SSSI scheduled for notification in this financial year. CCW, EN, SNH.</p>	
<p>Action/workplan undertaken? (Please state yes or no.)</p>	<p>a. 1998 - No b and c. SSSI notification plans (England) in place for 1999 and 2000</p>	
<p>Description of work taken and organisation responsible.</p>	<p><i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken</i> SSSI/ASSI notification procedure in place. Procedure ongoing, but majority of significant lowland heathland sites are expected to be covered by SSSI/ASSI designation by 2000. New sites may be identified by ongoing monitoring process.</p>	
<p>Output and timescale</p>	<p>In England 875 ha to be notified in FY 98/99 - outcome: Three SSSIs notified: - Leiston - Aldeburgh, Suffolk - - Chapel Common, Sussex & Surrey - 80 ha - Woolbeding and Pound Commons, Sussex & Surrey - 70 ha Five pSSSIs will be notified during the FY 1999/2000: - St Leonards Heath, Dorset - Bickerton Hill, West Midlands - 15 ha - Laughton Common, East Midlands - 1 ha - Alcombe & Dunster, Somerset - 270 ha - Tregonetha Downs, Devon & Cornwall - 90 ha In N Ireland three ASSIs have been notified in 1998 that include lowland heathland. Further declarations are planned. - Cashel Loughs - 34.21 ha* (* total area of site, not heathland) - Straghans Lough - 51.6 ha* - Drumcarn - 25.9</p>	<p><i>Action by</i> EN, NI</p>
<p>Constraints to action (Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</p>	<p>Sensitivity over naming sites has meant that reporting has been only in general terms. Funding: Progress on notification has been constrained by lack of funding resources within Statutory Nature Conservation Organisations. In Scotland resources have been concentrated in SPAs and SACs.</p>	
<p>Action complete or ongoing? (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</p>	<p>Started but not complete.</p>	
<p>Next steps</p>	<p><i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i> To complete SSSI/ASSI notification of all lowland heathlands of national significance by 2004. An SSSI review is currently in progress in Scotland; it will ready for 2001.</p>	

Output and timescale	See above	<i>Action by</i> EN,CCW, SNH, NI
Published action/organisation(s) responsible <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.1.2 Consider expanding Countryside Stewardship, Tir Cymen (now Tir Gofal), ESA and WES to meet the targets for heathland and management and re-creation. Determine the applicability of a new scheme similar to Countryside Stewardship for Scotland. CCW, DANI, EN, MAFF, SNH, SE, WOAD	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	<p>a. 1998 Agriculture departments to provide figures to the Steering Group to enable an assessment of uptake and targeting of countryside management schemes on an annual basis. DANI, MAFF, SE, WOAD.</p> <p>b. 1999. Review the effectiveness and coverage of these schemes on a regional basis to determine which areas are insufficiently covered. CCW, EN, MAFF, WOAD</p> <p>c. 1999. Provide figures on uptake and targeting of each scheme up to the end of March 1999. (as far as current data constrains permit). EN, MAFF, WOAD</p> <p>d. 1999. Produce lowland heathland performance indicators for Tir Gofal Scheme and Wildlife Enhancement Schemes. CCW, EN</p>	
Action/workplan undertaken? <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	a-d. Some basic data provided for England (ESA), but more information required across the range of schemes before any worthwhile review or strategic targeting of schemes can be undertaken.	
Description of work taken and organisation responsible.	<p><i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken</i></p> <p>The requirements of lowland heathlands were taken into account in recent (1996-98) quinquennial ESA scheme reviews. One output of this and other reviews was the introduction of the Management Plan concept to the majority of ESAs which enables finer tuning of management to bring about conservation objectives.</p> <p>Following a consultation exercise carried out in early 1999, revised ESA environmental objectives and performance indicators have been developed which now incorporate lowland heathland.</p> <p>CS scheme consultation is carried out at regular intervals to define regional target which in many cases address regional BAP priorities. Reviews of agri-environment scheme payments are carried out on a pre-programmed cycle at which time any environmental factors will be considered.</p>	
Output and timescale	See above	<i>Action by</i> MAFF (FRCA), EN (to collate data)
Constraints to action <i>(Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</i>	<p>Conflicting objectives: Agri-environment schemes have to balance wildlife objectives with others concerning landscape, historic features and access.</p> <p>Funding: Spending is limited by budgetary constraints.</p> <p>Voluntary schemes: they cannot guarantee full coverage of all eligible sites with this habitat.</p> <p>Lack of sufficient data, reliability of data (eg. Overlapping of more than one scheme, leading to double counting). Resolution yet to be determined.</p>	

	New schemes have only recently been introduced, e.g. Tir Gofal.	
Action complete or ongoing? <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	Ongoing	
Next steps	Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible. BAP priority habitats will be taken into consideration in future scheme reviews and regional consultations when these take place. Renewed effort over the next 12 months will attempt to compile reliable and more comprehensive data to undertake review and future action.	
Output and timescale	See above	Action by EN, MAFF

Published action/organisation(s) responsible <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.1.3 Take account of the conservation requirements of lowland heathland in developing and adjusting agri-environment schemes. DANI, MAFF, SERAD, WOAD	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	a. 1999 Produce lowland heathland performance indicators for Countryside Premium Scheme or its successor. SNH, SERAD b. 1999. Review the lowland heathland payments, targets and prescriptions of ESAs as part of ESA review programme. MAFF, EN c. 1999. Statutory conservation agencies will provide advice and help to develop performance indicators for schemes. CCW, EN, SNH d. 1999-2000. SNH to review new agri-schemes with SE.	
Action/workplan undertaken? <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	a. No b. Consultation process under way, also for CS. c. CCW is developing performance indicators for Tir Gofal d. Not started	
Description of work taken and organisation responsible.	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken</i> See Action 5.1.2. <i>Countryside Management Scheme launched by the Department of Agriculture for Northern Ireland takes in all agricultural land in NI outside ESAs. Prescriptions for lowland heathland are included within. DANI and ESA schemes ongoing.</i>	
Output and timescale	See Action 5.1.2.	Action by DANI, MAFF, SERAD, WOAD
Constraints to action <i>(Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which</i>	See Action 5.1.2.	

<i>the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</i>		
Action complete or ongoing? <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	Ongoing	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
	See Action 5.1.2.	
Output and timescale	See Action 5.1.2. SNH to investigate new agri-environmental schemes with SE 2001.	Action by SNH

Published action/organisation(s) responsible <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.1.4 Simplify the process for submission of applications to the Secretary of State to fence lowland heathland that is common land for grazing, to maintain its wildlife interest. DoE (now DETR), WO	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	a. 1999 Contact other habitat steering groups to establish whether this is a shared problem and whether a common approach can be adopted. EN (CA)	
Action/workplan undertaken? <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	No, but started.	
Description of work taken and organisation responsible.	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken</i> Contact established with other BAP habitat & species Steering Groups. Response indicates that the problem seems more or less confined to lowland heathland Group. However, other habitats with similar problems (calcareous grasslands and upland moorlands) have not an Steering Group yet to contact.	
Output and timescale	Contact established with existing habitat groups.	Action by EN
Constraints to action <i>(Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</i>	Open Space Society and issues of retaining open landscape which are in conflict with desirable management prescription for certain areas of heathland. Also the Chobham Common PI decision taken against fencing common has provided precedent to maintain open spaces on common/heathland areas. In considering applications to fence lowland heathland, DETR should be more aware of the wildlife/conservation objectives for the site, and the management this requires.	
Action complete or ongoing? <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	Ongoing	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i> Produce guidelines for fencing common land and promoting the	

	<p>conservation and wildlife benefits of fencing certain areas.</p> <p>Form a sub-group to deal with access to countryside and fencing problems.</p>	
<i>Output and timescale</i>	To be established - propose to start in 1999/2000	<i>Action by</i> DETR/ EN initially

<p>Published action/organisation(s) responsible (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</p>	<p>5.1.5 In areas that support lowland heathland, there should be a presumption in favour of re-establishing heathland on derelict land or land that has been used for mineral extraction. DoE (now DETR), SO, WO</p>	
<p>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</p>	<p>a. Check progress with local teams/LBAPs on action taken to influence/amend regional/mineral plans. EN, LAs</p>	
<p>Action/workplan undertaken? (Please state yes or no.)</p>	<p>A. Yes, started.</p>	
<p>Description of work taken and organisation responsible.</p>	<p>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken</p> <p>Presumption indicated in few Local BAPs.</p> <p>To date focus seems to have shifted away from local teams/LBAPs and attention turned on to ‘flag-ship’ projects within Tomorrow’s Heathland Heritage; eg. Lowland heathland recreation on disused China Clay workings in Cornwall, to raise awareness of potential to recreate heathland on these mineral extraction areas.</p>	
<p>Output and timescale</p>	<p>Ongoing, Cornish project started 1998/99</p>	<p>Action by EN</p>
<p>Constraints to action (Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</p>	<p>Communication: Need a clearer mechanism for contacting Local BAPs and LAs.</p> <p>Staff resources: Staff and time needed to analyse what has been done in Local BAPs.</p>	
<p>Action complete or ongoing? (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	
<p>Next steps</p>	<p>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</p> <p>Review Local Plans to see if this has been done.</p>	
<p>Output and timescale</p>	<p>Timing and organisation to be determined.</p>	<p>Action by</p>

<p>Published action/organisation(s) responsible <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i></p>	<p>5.1.6 Encourage Forest Enterprise and the MoD to agree action plans with specific targets for heathland restoration and management for all heathland sites in their ownership with the statutory nature conservation agencies by the end of 2000. MoD, FE</p>	
<p>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i></p>	<p>a. 1998 The Ministry of Defence to draw up a timetable for the development of an action plan with specific targets for heathland restoration and management for all lowland heathland sites in their ownership. MoD.</p> <p>b. 1999. FE to clarify proportion of Forest Design Plans completed up to end March 1999, what area of i) heathland restoration and ii) heathland re-creation is included in these plans and what the timetable is for the completion of FDP's in heathland areas. FE</p> <p>c. 1999. MoD to produce timetable for the production of a national lowland heathland plan (cf that already produced by FE), outlining national policies and targets. MoD</p> <p>d. 1999. MoD to clarify the proportion of their heathland sites for which conservation plans have been completed up to end March 1999, what area of i) heathland restoration and ii) heathland re-creation is included in these plans and what the timetable is for the completion of these plans in heathland areas. MoD</p>	
<p>Action/workplan undertaken? <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i></p>	<p>a. No b. No (To be reported on by December 1999) c. No (To be reported on by December 1999) d. No (Some plans are ready and other are being drafted)</p>	
<p>Description of work taken and organisation responsible.</p>	<p><i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken</i></p> <p>FE currently manages an area of 16,481 ha of lowland heathland within the following districts: E. Anglia, North York Moors, Sherwood & Lincs, SE England, Dean, W Midlands, New Forest & Dorset, Peninsula. FE reports that has restored and area of 495 ha in New Forest & Dorset and they have re-created an area of 435 ha.</p> <p>MoD owns 18,362 ha of lowland heathland. MoD reports that has restored approximately 1471 ha and re-created 321 ha of lowland heathland from December 1995 to July 1999. In England MoD has 32 lowland heathland sites, 15 of these have management plans and 11 have draft management plans. MoD has 18 lowland heathland sites in Scotland, four have management plans in place and two have draft management plans. The majority of these plans contain targets for future restoration and re-creation of lowland heathland, but the detail of the targets varies.</p>	
<p>Output and timescale</p>	<p>Detailed information available for end 1999</p>	<p>Action by MoD/FE</p>
<p>Constraints to action <i>(Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</i></p>	<p>Other priorities: FE have given priority to Native Woodland HAPs. MoD state that the priority has to be military training.</p> <p>Staff resources and time.</p> <p>Funding: MoD has no separate budget for conservation: funding has to come from the estate management budget.</p>	
<p>Action complete or ongoing? <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i></p>	<p>Started but not complete</p>	
<p>Next steps</p>	<p><i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected</i></p>	

	<i>output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
	- FE: The planned re-creation area over the next 5 years is 1125 ha (further clarification on the extent of planned restoration and re-creation and the coverage of Forest Design Plans to be clarified for the steering group by end December 1999).	
	- MoD: future action will relate to management plan implementation and working towards the targets for restoration and re-creation in those plans. (Timetable for completion of management plans and extent of restoration and re-creation contained in existing plans to be clarified for the steering group by end December 1999).	
Output and timescale	See above	Action by FE & MoD

Published action/organisation(s) responsible <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.1.7 (New action) Ensure that legislation on public access takes proper account of the nature conservation importance of lowland heathland. EN, CA	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	Work programme tasks to be determined.	
Action/workplan undertaken? <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	No	
Description of work taken and organisation responsible.	Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken	
Output and timescale	To be determined.	Action by EN, CA
Constraints to action <i>(Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</i>	Not known	
Action complete or ongoing? <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	Not started	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i> Sub group of steering group to consider access issues before end of 1999.	
Output and timescale	See above	Action by EN, CCW

<p>Published action/organisation(s) responsible (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</p>	<p>5.2.1 The long term funding of county heathland management projects, most of which have full time project officers and which play a key role in heathland management needs to be addressed. Consideration should be given to establishing county heathland projects in Wales. EN, CCW</p>	
<p>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</p>	<p>a. 1998 EN to tabulate the periods for which funding has been secured or is being sought for heathland county management projects. EN b. 1999 Steering Group to provide advice to Tomorrow's Heathland Heritage programme team on priorities and coverage after Tranche 5. Steering Group c. 1999 Consider need for heathland project on Lleyn Peninsula. CCW, Welsh Heathland Forum.</p>	
<p>Action/workplan undertaken? (Please state yes or no.)</p>	<p>a. Yes, ongoing b. Yes, if required and finances from HLF available c. Yes, revised THH bid drafted.</p>	
<p>Description of work taken and organisation responsible.</p>	<p><i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken</i></p> <p>Ongoing, EN in process of considering and prioritising future funding options for range of habitats. Has to be balance between maintaining progress on ground ensuring funds are providing vfm and degree of self-sufficiency where this is realistic. Has to be assessed against THH priorities and national framework.</p>	
<p>Output and timescale</p>	<p>EN currently in process of assessing future commitments towards habitat management 1999/2000</p>	<p>Action by EN</p>
<p>Constraints to action (Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</p>	<p>Funding: Insufficient financial resources to undertake all desirable projects - lower priorities may not receive adequate funding.</p> <p>Continuity of schemes: There was a gap from the end of EN's Lowland Heathland National Programme (mar 98) to the beginning of payments from Tomorrow's Heathland Heritage scheme (first projects only now obtaining finance; funding for most projects will not be on stream until 2000).</p> <p>Long term issue: THH will provide welcome support for successful projects for five years. Longer term issue is finding financial stability and support for heathland management projects.</p>	
<p>Action complete or ongoing? (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</p>	<p>Started but not complete</p>	
<p>Next steps</p>	<p><i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i></p> <p>Steering Group to consider long term funding needs and options.</p>	
<p>Output and timescale</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Action by Steering Group</p>

<p>Published action/organisation(s) responsible (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</p>	<p>5.2.2 Relevant local authorities should incorporate heathland Wildlife Site protection policies in development plans by 2000. LAs</p>	
<p>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</p>	<p>a. 1999. Assess 'best practice' in terms of policies in development plans and disseminate results. RSPB.</p>	
<p>Action/workplan undertaken? (Please state yes or no.)</p>	<p>a. Started but not completed.</p>	
<p>Description of work taken and organisation responsible.</p>	<p><i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken</i></p> <p>Some plans (e.g. Part III of Nottinghamshire Heathland Strategy (Action Plan) completed in 1999 and distributed.</p>	
<p>Output and timescale</p>	<p>a. Initial collation of example policies undertaken but not assessed or disseminated.</p>	<p>Action by RSPB</p>
<p>Constraints to action (Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</p>	<p>Staff resources: staff time within NGOs has been major constraint</p>	
<p>Action complete or ongoing? (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</p>	<p>Started but not completed</p>	
<p>Next steps</p>	<p><i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i></p> <p>Re-assess example policies</p>	
<p>Output and timescale</p>	<p>To disseminate example policies for March 2000</p>	<p>Action by RSPB/LA</p>

<p>Published action/organisation(s) responsible (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</p>	<p>5.3.1 Organisations with experience of heathland management should continue to provide advice on how to manage and restore lowland heathland. CCW, EN, LAs, SNH</p>	
<p>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</p>	<p>a. 1999 Produce and publish new Heathland Management Handbook. RSPB b. 1999 Publish Coastal Heathland Strategy. CCW</p>	
<p>Action/workplan undertaken? (Please state yes or no.)</p>	<p>a. Started but not completed. b. Started but not completed.</p>	
<p>Description of work taken and organisation responsible.</p>	<p><i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken</i></p> <p>a. Funding from BP secured, Steering Group formed (RSPB, BP, ITE, EN), outline of document agreed and potential contributors identified. b. Consultation document circulated (CCW)</p> <p>A lot of work has been going on at local level in different organisations, e.g. Through the different county heathland projects or relevant reserve wardens.</p>	
<p>Output and timescale</p>	<p>a. Ongoing b. July 1999</p>	<p>Action by RSPB, CCW</p>
<p>Constraints to action (Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</p>	<p>a. Staff resources: Limited staff and time within NGO work programme for this work. The inclusive/consultative approach to producing this document has been more time consuming than expected. b. Consultative process slow.</p>	
<p>Action complete or ongoing? (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</p>	<p>Action overall is ongoing. a. Started but not complete. b. Started but not complete.</p>	
<p>Next steps</p>	<p>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</p> <p>a. Finalise authorship. Commission work, edit production, publish and launch handbook. b. Launch final strategy.</p>	
<p>Output and timescale</p>	<p>a. September 2000 b. 2000</p>	<p>Action by RSPB, CCW</p>

<p>Published action/organisation(s) responsible (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</p>	<p>5.3.2 Continue existing training courses on heathland management and conservation and target these at land management advisors and officers running countryside management schemes. RSPB</p>	
<p>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</p>	<p>a. 1999 Confirm programme of training courses for next two years. RSPB</p>	
<p>Action/workplan undertaken? (Please state yes or no.)</p>	<p>a. Yes</p>	
<p>Description of work taken and organisation responsible.</p>	<p><i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken</i></p> <p>RSPB Course describing origins of lowland heathland, characteristic species, appropriate management, restoration, re-creation, planning, funding has been run in most years, sometimes targeted to specific group, e.g. course held in 1998 for FRCA staff.</p> <p>FRCA operates a substantive in-house training programme that includes courses which integrate agricultural and conservation management of various agricultural habitats. Such training is for agri-environment scheme Project Officers and their FRCA Specialist Advisers, who advise landowners and managers in the course of their work.</p> <p>There have been training courses for conservation officers under the Tir Gofal in Wales.</p>	
<p>Output and timescale</p>	<p>RSPB Courses have taken place in 1996, 1998 and 1999.</p>	<p>Action by RSPB</p>
<p>Constraints to action (Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</p>	<p>RSPB - Demand, funding and availability of speakers are main constraints on running these courses.</p>	
<p>Action complete or ongoing? (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	
<p>Next steps</p>	<p><i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i></p> <p>RSPB - Will be based on demand and budget.</p> <p>FRCA - Training needs are reviewed withing the FRCA training strategy every six months.</p>	
<p>Output and timescale</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Action by RSPB/FRCA</p>

<p>Published action/organisation(s) responsible (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</p>	<p>5.3.3 Produce county lowland heathland re-creation plans identifying areas with high potential for heathland re-establishment by 2000 for all lowland heathland counties. EN, CCW, SNH</p>	
<p>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</p>	<p>a. 1999 Identify significant gaps in coverage of these plans. CCW, EN, SNH b. 1999. Review the value of these plans in progressing the Action plan objectives. CCW, EN, SNH</p>	
<p>Action/workplan undertaken? (Please state yes or no.)</p>	<p>No a. Yes, aware of some obvious gaps b. No</p>	
<p>Description of work taken and organisation responsible.</p>	<p><i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken</i></p> <p>Under the National Lowland Heathland Programme, the following plans were produced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A heathland re-creation plan for Breckland - A heathland re-creation plan for Berkshire - A heathland re-creation plan for Dorset - A heathland re-creation plan for Cornwall - Nottinghamshire heathland re-creation; Part III of Notts. Heathland Strategy completed in 1999. - Priorities for the re-creation of lowland heathland in Staffordshire - Coversands Natural Area Heathland re-creation plan - Lowland heathland re-creation plans: Hampshire, Surrey, West Sussex and Isle of Wight 	
<p>Output and timescale</p>	<p>a. Aim to identify gaps by summer 1999. Look at priority counties. b. Assess effectiveness of local plans already produced in terms of 'model examples' to be followed in other counties by summer 2000.</p>	<p><i>Action by</i> EN, CCW, SNH</p>
<p>Constraints to action (Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</p>	<p>Funding and staff resources available locally</p>	
<p>Action complete or ongoing? (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</p>	<p>Started but not complete</p>	
<p>Next steps</p>	<p><i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i></p> <p>Need to check success of the plans.</p>	
<p>Output and timescale</p>	<p>Short contract and report. Financial year 00/01.</p>	<p><i>Action by</i> EN, CCW, SNH</p>

<p>Published action/organisation(s) responsible (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</p>	<p>5.3.4 Seek to disseminate lowland heathland inventories to key organisations involved in heathland management for all counties in England by 1997. Seek to complete the Welsh national survey of lowland heathland so that inventories can be published to guide countryside management schemes. Consider the need for a survey and subsequent inventory project in Scotland. Inventories will need periodic updating. CCW, EN, RSPB, SNH, NI</p>	
<p>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</p>	<p>a. 1999. Welsh heathland inventory in place, but requires digitisation. Further survey of remaining areas to be completed. CCW b. 1999. Consider and agree timetable and means of updating inventories. CCW, EN, RSPB c. 1999. Produce baseline figure for lowland heathland extent in Scotland by area based on best available information. SNH d. 1999. Determine what survey work is required to bring baseline data up to an agreed common standard. SNH e. NI?</p>	
<p>Action/workplan undertaken? (Please state yes or no.)</p>	<p>a. yes b. No, under consideration c. No, SNH to produce by March 2000 d. No, SNH to produce</p>	
<p>Description of work taken and organisation responsible.</p>	<p><i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken</i></p> <p>English inventories completed and disseminated. Aim should be to update via NBN.</p> <p>Welsh inventories need to be completed and digitised.</p> <p>NI - EHS in-house survey and analysis of lowland heathland vegetation communities ongoing. NI Countryside Survey 2000: fieldwork completed and analysis of results under way.</p>	
<p>Output and timescale</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p><i>Action by</i> CCW, SNH (EN)</p>
<p>Constraints to action (Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</p>	<p>Funding and staff resources: Time and funding within the conservation agencies have been very significant constraints.</p> <p>There is no information for Northern Ireland.</p> <p>Funding: Lack of resources for digitising CCW phase II survey.</p>	
<p>Action complete or ongoing? (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</p>	<p>a. Complete. b-d. Started but not complete.</p>	
<p>Next steps</p>	<p><i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i></p> <p>Update English and complete Welsh inventories. <i>See above.</i></p>	
<p>Output and timescale</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p><i>Action by</i></p>

		SNH, CCW, EN
Published action/organisation(s) responsible <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.5.1 Develop a rapid monitoring method to be used at a sample of sites to ensure that heathland management schemes are meeting their objectives. CCW, EN, SNH	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	a. 1999. Complete agreement on and finalise rapid monitoring method developed for THH sites. EN b. 1999. Complete trial monitoring of performance indicators for Tir Gofal. CCW	
Action/workplan undertaken? <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	No a. Started but not completed. b. Started but not completed.	
Description of work taken and organisation responsible.	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken</i> a. EN/THH monitoring methodology currently under review, draft reports now produced and being assessed at national level. b. CCW methodology comparable to EN/THH system	
Output and timescale	a. July 1999 deadline exceeded, EN still propose to produce guidance on monitoring methodology by close of 1999.	<i>Action by</i> EN, CCW
Constraints to action <i>(Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</i>	Staff time: Time and resources within conservation agencies has been main constraint.	
Action complete or ongoing? <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	a-b. Started but not complete	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i> a. Finalise and produce guidance and then undertake field trials by 2000 (on THH and other heathland sites)	
Output and timescale	See above	<i>Action by</i> EN, CCW

<p>Published action/organisation(s) responsible (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</p>	<p>5.5.2 Seek to ensure that appropriate studies to evaluate new labour saving technologies for heathland restoration especially for techniques such as turf cutting and rotovation are implemented. CCW, DoE (now DETR), EN, SNH, SO, WO</p>	
<p>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</p>	<p>a. 1999. Summarise studies carried out so far and what further work is planned. EN</p>	
<p>Action/workplan undertaken? (Please state yes or no.)</p>	<p>a. Ongoing</p>	
<p>Description of work taken and organisation responsible.</p>	<p><i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken</i></p> <p>Information regarding new management techniques published already in a number of outlets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nine articles in the ENACT magazine - Seven articles in Site Lines - Twenty eight notes in The News (EN's Staff newsletter) - One English Nature Research Report - Two Machinery Ring Information Packs - Six issues of the Grazing Animal Project Newsletter. <p>MAFF's Conservation Management Division (CMD) conducts a programme of research within several Assessment Units (AU). The "Lowland Heathland" AU (BD15) has the principle scientific objective of refining ESA and CS prescriptions so that lowland heathland is restored, maintained and re-created in the most environmentally beneficial manner while minimising cost to the farmer and the Exchequer. MAFF's heathland research has focussed on means of successfully establishing heathland rather than developing labour-saving technologies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - R&D Project: "Identification of research requirements for the creation, restoration and management of coastal heath - ITE/ADAS/IGER, end 31/3/99. - R&D Project: "Reversion of intensive arable land to grass heath and <i>Calluna</i> heath" (3 linked projects on soil fertility, vegetation and rabbit grazing aspects), end 31/3/00. 	
<p>Output and timescale</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Action by EN</p>
<p>Constraints to action (Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</p>	<p>None envisaged</p>	
<p>Action complete or ongoing? (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	
<p>Next steps</p>	<p><i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i></p>	

	<p>EN - Continue to publish guidance and offer advice MAFF - The main direction and scope of MAFF's research are addressed at triennial/quadrennial reviews. CMD research is due for review in 2000, which will provide the opportunity to consider research needs raised in those BAPs published since 1995.</p>	
<p><i>Output and timescale</i></p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p><i>Action by</i> EN, MAFF</p>

<p>Published action/organisation(s) responsible (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</p>	<p>5.5.3 Establish a baseline survey for monitoring the extent, condition and restoration of lowland heathland in England. DoE (now DETR)</p>	
<p>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</p>	<p>a. 1999 Agree timetable and common standards for recording baseline of heathland extent and condition monitoring. CCW, EN, SNH</p>	
<p>Action/workplan undertaken? (Please state yes or no.)</p>	<p>Yes, started but not completed.</p>	
<p>Description of work taken and organisation responsible.</p>	<p><i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken</i></p> <p>Steering Group has agreed and promoted definitions of heathland restoration and re-creation as a first step to obtain a common standard. This BAP action is linked closely with 5.3.4 and 5.5.1 and depends upon the production of guidance and its successful trialing.</p> <p>EN has undertaken a sample heathland SSSI condition monitoring survey, but no similar information is currently available for non SSSIs. Some work has been carried out at a local level to define the extent of heathland beyond SSSIs, eg. Nottinghamshire SINC survey 1998/99: production of county Heathland site Register Defensible SINC series, but it has not been done consistently at national level.</p> <p>Phase II surveys have been carried out for Natura 2000 sites in Scotland, for about 5% of sites in England and for about 75-80% of sites in Wales.</p> <p>National Trust (NI) trialing of heathland condition assessment under way (as part of South Down Heathland Project, HLF funded).</p>	
<p>Output and timescale</p>	<p>Ongoing - see above</p>	<p>Action by EN, CCW</p>
<p>Constraints to action (Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</p>	<p>Lack of information: Lack of consistent and reliable data about present extent of lowland heathland across UK. The picture is only partially complete for England and Wales (other BAP actions will contribute towards a more accurate picture), but further work and data is required, particularly from Scotland and NI.</p> <p>Lack of consistent co-ordinated survey across UK, no clear agreement on best way forward.</p> <p>Funding and lack of staff resources.</p>	
<p>Action complete or ongoing? (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</p>	<p>Started but not complete</p>	
<p>Next steps</p>	<p><i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i></p> <p>Statutory Agencies to agree a survey for next year.</p>	
<p>Output and timescale</p>	<p>Baseline survey in 2000.</p>	<p>Action by EN, CCW,</p>

		SNH
--	--	-----

<p>Published action/organisation(s) responsible (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</p>	<p>5.6.1 Undertake a publicity campaign to raise awareness of the importance of lowland heathland by 1998. CCW, EN</p>	
<p>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</p>	<p>a. 1998 Partners to run National Heath Week 11-19 July 1998 and review at next steering group meeting. Steering Group.</p>	
<p>Action/workplan undertaken? (Please state yes or no.)</p>	<p>a. Yes</p>	
<p>Description of work taken and organisation responsible.</p>	<p><i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken</i></p> <p>A Heathland National Week run for three years: 1996, 1997 and 1998.</p> <p>EN supported the week centrally in 1996 through the National Lowland Heathland Programme. It was delivered locally with some 'umbrella' national events and a national launch. The NLHP provided circa £20,000 of support to local projects through grants and contribution to contracts. In 1997/98 there was not the same level of national support as it was agreed that these programmes are best delivered through local programmes. The national approach was not picked up by the national media but local events were well received by local newspapers etc.</p> <p>THH has developed a publicity strategy.</p>	
<p>Output and timescale</p>	<p>In 1996 there were numerous outputs delivered locally, including in excess of 150 local events across the country. A national leaflet (introducing our heathland heritage) was produced, with support from the National Grid company. In 1997/98 there were numerous events but in a less cohesive manner.</p>	<p><i>Action by</i> EN</p>
<p>Constraints to action (Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</p>	<p>The major constraint was lack of staff and financial resources to support heath week outputs. Much could be done to improve output, product and delivery in the future, although the approach of a week of events may not be the best way forward. Currently there are established heathland groups which run heathland events at different times of the year, but it is difficult to select "one" week.</p> <p>Market research suggest that the heath weeks do not seem to have significantly increased awareness.</p>	
<p>Action complete or ongoing? (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</p>	<p>Complete</p>	
<p>Next steps</p>	<p><i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i></p> <p>Following on the 1998 National Heathland Week, a range of local heathland activities and promotions have taken place during 1999. THH will also continue to keep lowland heathland projects in high media profile; Steering group may consider merits of further awareness raising activity. In future there needs to be better linkage between events across the country.</p>	

<i>Output and timescale</i>	See above	<i>Action by</i> SG
-----------------------------	-----------	------------------------