

DRAFT**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	Stone-curlew
Lead Partner/Agency	RSPB (Contact point - MAFF)
Steering Group/Other organisations	<p><i>Steering group in existence? Please state yes or no. Please list the organisations represented.</i></p> <p>Yes, RSPB, MAFF, EN, MoD, Norfolk Wildlife Trust, FRCA, CLA, NFU, plus several individual farmers/landowners.</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, but under revision, Dated 3 October 1997</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
4.2 Increase the breeding population in the present UK range to 200 pairs by the year 2000, and 300 pairs by 2010.		X				4.1 is explanatory background to targets and not a target/objective in itself.
4.3 Encourage re-colonisation of the past breeding range in the UK		X				
4.4 Increase the population breeding on semi-natural grassland to 120 pairs by the year 2000.		X				

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 Consider the requirements of the stone curlew when establishing and reviewing agri-environmental schemes.		X				Yes	Ongoing
5.1.2 Seek to ensure that the Breckland and South Wessex Downs ESAs, and Countryside Stewardship, take into account the requirements of the species, in particular grazing, heath and downland prescriptions, to reverse fragmentation.		X				Yes	Ongoing
5.1.3 Encourage the uptake of schemes supporting the reversion of arable to heathland in ESA and Countryside Stewardship schemes within the set aside to benefit stone curlew.		X				Yes	Ongoing
5.1.4 Persuade the European Commission and Council of Europe to ban or discourage hunting of this species in any European country where it is traditionally shot.	X					No	Not started
5.2.1 Encourage favourable management plans on all land in the former and current range of the species, including land currently held by the MoD and FE.		X				Yes	Ongoing
5.2.2 Consider designating a SPA within Breckland.		X				No	Started but not completed
5.3.1 Seek to protect nests and chicks on arable land.		X				Yes	Ongoing
5.3.2 Monitor the effects of fox predation on nesting and control if necessary.		X				Yes	Ongoing
5.3.3 Discourage illegal egg collecting and seek to ensure offenders are prosecuted.		X				No	Ongoing
5.4.1 Provide training in stone curlew conservation for relevant conservation advisors, including ADAS, ESA, Countryside Stewardship and FWAG staff.		X				Yes	Ongoing
5.4.2 Ensure landowners and managers are aware of the presence, legal status and conservation requirements of this species, and appropriate methods of habitats management.		X				Yes	Ongoing
5.5.1 Investigate survival data on birds on arable sites compared with semi-natural sites.		X				No	Started but not completed
5.5.2 Monitor the UK stone curlew breeding population regularly to assess whether the action plan is attaining its objectives.		X				No	Ongoing
5.5.3 Pass information gathered during survey and monitoring of this species to JNCC or BRC so that it can be incorporated in national databases	X					No	Ongoing
5.5.4 Provide information annually to BirdLife International on the UK status of the species to contribute to maintenance of an up-to-date global red list.	X					No	Ongoing
5.5.5 (New action) Investigate the causes of stone-curlew nest failure on semi-natural habitats		X				Yes	Started but not complete
5.5.6 (New Action) Investigate the effects of disturbance from road traffic on stone-curlew demography.		X				Yes	Started but not complete

5.6.1 Encourage birdwatchers to visit the Norfolk Wildlife Trust Reserve at Weeting Heath in Breckland to view stone curlews to highlight the decline and importance of the species and minimise the disturbance elsewhere.		X				No	Ongoing
---	--	---	--	--	--	----	---------

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
UK			X				
England			X				
Northern Ireland	X						
Scotland	X						
Wales	X						

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

Some significant progress has been made in terms of the overall population objective. The stone-curlew population decline from the 1930s to the 1980s has been halted and the population has increased in each of the last six years. However, the population is still small and vulnerable. It is still largely concentrated in two areas, none of the former range has been re-colonised and it is largely dependent on farmland. For sustainable population recovery it is desirable to increase the number of pairs nesting on semi-natural habitats. The current and historical UK range of this species is confined to England.

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.

Some positive progress has been made on implementation since the plan was published in 1995. This species is subject to an RSPB/EN species recovery project which is a key to delivering some of this plan. The introduction by MAFF of a stone-curlew special project option for Countryside Stewardship in Wessex and the positive use of set-aside derogations have been of particular importance. Encouraging the uptake of voluntary set-aside (5.1.3) and the extension and further targeting of the CS special project (5.1.1) are likely to be key for this species on arable land. Budgetary limitations on Countryside Stewardship may constrain the success of the stone-curlew special project. The Breckland ESA has helped to encourage management of existing Breckland heaths. Securing appropriate management on all existing semi-natural habitats (5.2.1) and increasing the extent of these habitats are likely constraints on achieving targets. Monitoring and biological knowledge of this species is good. Factors affecting breeding success should be clarified by planned new research (5.5.5).

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	Robin Wynde	Andrew Kuyk

Organisation	RSPB	MAFF
Assessment date (dd/mm/yy)	28.10.99	28.10.99

Completed forms should be submitted to JNCC

*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 (For new or revised targets please provide the new paragraph number and target text.)	4.2 Increase the breeding population in the present UK range to 200 pairs by the year 2000, and 300 pairs by 2010.				
Country	Not appropriate	Target achieved	Some progress	No progress	Insufficient information
UK	X				
England		X			
Northern Ireland	X				
Scotland	X				
Wales	X				
Text description of target progress (separate for each country/region):					
<p>The first part of the target was achieved in 1998 when 215 pairs were confirmed breeding and further progress was made in 1999. The numbers of proved breeding pairs from annual monitoring during the period of the plan to date are as follows: 1995 - 166 pairs, 1996, - 174 pairs, 1997 - 192 pairs, 1998 - 215 pairs and 1999 - 233 pairs. This represents a 40% increase over the last 5 years.</p> <p>This information is derived from annual monitoring of the entire stone-curlew breeding population co-ordinated by RSPB fieldworkers. These figures represent minimum populations as they include only pairs proved breeding. It is estimated that ca. 10% of the breeding population may not be located in any one year.</p>					

Objective/target (For new or revised targets please provide the new paragraph number and target text.)	4.3 Encourage re-colonisation of the past breeding range in the UK				
Country	Not appropriate	Target achieved	Some progress	No progress	Insufficient information
UK	X				
England				X	
Northern Ireland	X				
Scotland	X				
Wales	X				
Text description of target progress (separate for each country/region):					
<p>Over 95% of the population is still concentrated in the two core areas of Breckland and Wessex, two small peripheral populations have been maintained in recent years but one other has declined and its future is extremely precarious. No new former areas of population have been re-established since the plan was published.</p>					

Objective/target (For new or revised targets please provide the new paragraph number and target text.)	4.4 Increase the population breeding on semi-natural grassland to 120 pairs by the year 2000.				
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				
Text description of target progress (separate for each country/region):					
<p>This target has not been achieved. The number of stone-curlew pairs which had their first nesting attempt on semi-natural habitats in 1999 was 86 compared to 90 pairs in 1998 and 76 pairs in 1997. It is apparent that this target is very unlikely to be met.</p> <p>The reasons that this target have not been met are because some areas of semi-natural habitat are not being managed favourably, weather conditions in 1999 were unfavourable and there has been limited progress in increasing the extent of heathland and downland in the key areas for this species in the last five years (there has been some arable reversion, e.g. to downland in the South Wessex Downs ESA, but this has yet to be colonised by stone-curlews). .</p>					

Table B: Proposed actions (Copiable table)

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

Published action/organisation(s) responsible (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)	5.1.1 Consider the requirements of the stone curlew when establishing and reviewing agri-environmental schemes. (MAFF)	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)	Introduce a special project within the Countryside Stewardship scheme for the provision of stone-curlew nesting plots within the potential range of the stone-curlew. In time for introduction for the 1998 breeding season.(MAFF)	
Action/workplan undertaken? (Please state yes or no.)	Yes	
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>	
Output and timescale	<p>Scheme up and running by 1998, 15 applications made in spring 1998 and 10 were approved, further application winter 98 and plots on ground for 1999 breeding season. Option presently confined to Wessex (Hants,Wilts, Dorset, Berks &Oxon) and one site in Cambridgeshire where a special project has been set up which aims to encourage extension of the range for stone-curlew..</p> <p>In addition the requirements of BAP priority species were taken into account in recent (1996–98) quinquennial ESA scheme reviews and some tier options were modified accordingly.</p> <p>Following a consultation exercise carried out in early 1999, revised ESA environmental objectives and performance indicators have been developed which now incorporate key BAP habitats.</p>	<p><i>Action by</i> MAFF/ RSPB, MAFF/EN</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>Funding: High success rate for the stone-curlew special project compared to other CS applications but overall funding for CS is a constraint to the success of this scheme.</p> <p>Conflicting priorities: Agri-environment schemes have to balance wildlife objectives with others concerning landscape, historic features and access.</p> <p>Coverage: As voluntary schemes, they cannot guarantee full coverage of all eligible sites with this habitat. In addition the CS special project is mainly confined to Wessex, although there is a single stone-curlew special project agreement in Cambridgeshire.</p>	
Action complete or ongoing? (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)	Ongoing	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
Output and timescale	<p>Further work to encourage CS special project and target to relevant farmers during and 99/2000 winters.</p> <p>BAP priority habitats will be taken into consideration in future scheme reviews and regional consultations when these take place</p>	<p><i>Action by</i> RSPB/ MAFF</p>

Published action/organisation(s) responsible (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)	5.1.2 Seek to ensure that the Breckland and South Wessex Downs ESAs, and Countryside Stewardship, take into account the requirements of the species, in particular grazing, heath and downland prescriptions, to reverse fragmentation. (CC, EN, MAFF)	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)	Consider adjustments to ESA schemes and the targeting of countryside Stewardship to strengthen their contributions to effective stone-curlew conservation and the achievement of targets for this species. 1997 (MAFF)	
Action/workplan undertaken? (Please state yes or no.)	Yes	
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	<p>Stone-curlews can currently be catered for in the South Wessex Downs ESA by means of specific management plans and derogations to existing management practices. However at present this ESA incorporates very few nesting territories of this species.</p> <p>The Breckland ESA provides important incentives for the grazing of heathland sites that are very important for this species.</p> <p>There is a very successful Countryside Stewardship Stone Curlew special project underway at present (see 5.1.1). (<i>which is also available within the ESA where appropriate</i>)</p> <p>FRCA Project Officers are assisting with the targeting of Countryside Stewardship for stone curlews.</p>	Action by MAFF
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>Funding: Consideration may be given to implement the CS special project in other areas, but will need to be considered in the light of budgetary constraints.</p> <p>Coverage: Most of the Wessex stone-curlew population nests outside the existing South Wessex Downs ESA boundary.</p>	
Action complete or ongoing? (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)	Ongoing	
Next steps	Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.	
Output and timescale	To be determined	Action by MAFF

Published action/organisation(s) responsible (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)	5.1.3 Encourage the uptake of schemes supporting the reversion of arable to heathland in ESA and Countryside Stewardship schemes within the set aside to benefit stone curlew. (MAFF)	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)	<p>The Action as worded does not make sense. Work programme included:</p> <p>Investigate the introduction of long term derogations for specific stone-curlew management on set-aside land. In time for introduction for the 1998 breeding season. (MAFF)</p> <p>No specific work programme task has been identified to encourage further reversion of arable to heathland in the Breckland ESA.</p>	

Action/workplan undertaken? (Please state yes or no.)	Yes	
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>	
Output and timescale	<p>Long term derogation procedures agreed and implemented by MAFF. To date these have only been required in a few cases. In 1998, 28 derogations were issued to farmers who requested them (all with the support of RSPB) for set-aside land to allow specific management to attract breeding stone curlew.</p> <p>The Breckland ESA has a target for the creation of 1000 hectares of heathland with a further 300 hectares to be created following the 1998 ESA payment review, uptake to date has been moderate. Incentives are provided by current ESA provisions, strengthened by clearly stated objectives and performance indicators.</p>	Action by MAFF/RSPB
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>No significant constraints on set-aside derogations.</p> <p>Funding: The main constraint on increasing the amount of arable reversion to heathland within the Breckland ESA is likely to be the attractiveness of payments.</p>	
Action complete or ongoing? (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)	<p>Set-aside derogations task complete.</p> <p>Encouraging arable reversion to heathland, ongoing.</p>	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
Output and timescale	to be determined	Action by MAFF/steering group

Published action/organisation(s) responsible (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)	5.2.1 Encourage favourable management plans on all land in the former and current range of the species, including land currently held by the MoD and FE. (EN, MoD)	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)	Draw up a timetable for the development of specific management plans for MoD and FE sites for stone-curlews. By October 1998. (EN, FE, MoD)	
Action/workplan undertaken? (Please state yes or no.)	No MoD timetable produced October 1999.	
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>	

Output and timescale	Some progress on developing Salisbury Plain Integrated Land Management Plan, this is due to be published November 1999. Work on ILMP for Stanta in the Brecks is underway with a projected completion date of March 2000 and a plan for Porton Down is due to be produced by July 2000.	Action by MoD/EN/RSPB
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><u>Conflicting priorities:</u> MoD originally declined to agree to work programme, as they were not certain of when site management plans would be completed. A timetable was supplied in response to this reporting process but is still subject to resources (see below). MoD have stated that their first priority is to military training. EN and RSPB have also had difficulty in agreeing specific targets for stone-curlews with MoD for MoD land (Targets have been agreed for Salisbury Plain - May 99, targets for Stanta are subject to continuing discussion).</p> <p><u>Funding:</u> Progress on the MoD management plans is subject to sufficient resources being available. MoD have no specific conservation budget, work has to be paid for out of the estate management budget. These issues have yet to be addressed or resolved by the steering group.</p>	
Action complete or ongoing? (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)	action not complete	
Next steps	Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.	
Output and timescale	To be determined	Action by MoD, Steering group

Published action/organisation(s) responsible (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)	5.3.1 Seek to protect nests and chicks on arable land. (EN)	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)	Continue to deploy fieldworkers in Wessex and Breckland to carry out species protection and monitoring work. 1998, 1999 and 2000 field seasons (EN and RSPB)	
Action/workplan undertaken? (Please state yes or no.)	Yes	
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	Fieldworkers continue to successfully carry out nest and chick protection work as part of their work programme. For example in Wessex in 1999 fieldworkers provided direct help or advice to farmers in relation to 27 breeding attempts and the pairs involved went on to fledge 23 chicks.	Action by RSPB (EN)
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.)	None at present. As the population increases so the potential involvement of fieldworkers grows, <u>Staff resources</u> may therefore become a constraint in the future.	
Action complete or ongoing? (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)	Ongoing	
Next steps	Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.	

Output and timescale	Fieldworkers to continue nest and chick protection work as part of their work programme.	Action by RSPB (EN)
-----------------------------	--	---------------------

Published action/organisation(s) responsible <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.3.2 Monitor the effects of fox predation on nesting and control if necessary. (EN)	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	-	
Action/workplan undertaken? <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	No	
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>	
Output and timescale	There is currently no means of monitoring the effects of fox predation on overall productivity. An attempt has been made to collate information on past and present predatory control work and to try to correlate any changes in this with productivity. However, to date it has not been possible to collect sufficient information.	Action by RSPB
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>	<u>Lack of information:</u> Systematic information on the scale of predatory control for the relevant areas is not available.	
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>	
Output and timescale	Further consideration will be given to the collation of the appropriate information on predator control in the future. The research project 5.5.5 may provide some indication of the level of predation in specific areas.	Action by RSPB, Steering Group

Published action/organisation(s) responsible <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.4.1 Provide training in stone curlew conservation for relevant conservation advisors, including ADAS, ESA, Countryside Stewardship and FWAG staff. (EN, MAFF)	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	Draw up a plan on the provision of land management advice to help achieve conservation targets for stone-curlew, 1998. (FRCA and RSPB)	
Action/workplan undertaken? <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	No	
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>	

Output and timescale	No formal plan has been drawn up but training courses involving statutory and NGO experts have been run for FRCA agri-environment scheme Project Officers.	Action by EN, RSPB
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>	None	
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>	
Output and timescale	Training needs are reviewed within the FRCA training strategy every six months	Action by FRCA

Published action/organisation(s) responsible <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.4.2 Ensure landowners and managers are aware of the presence, legal status and conservation requirements of this species, and appropriate methods of habitats management. (EN)	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	-	
Action/workplan undertaken? <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	Yes	
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>	
Output and timescale	This is carried out by the stone-curlew fieldworkers and relevant EN and FRCA staff during the course of their work.	Action by RSPB, EN, FRCA
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>		
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>	
Output and timescale	Continue as part of existing work programmes.	Action by RSPB, FRCA, EN

Published action/organisation(s) responsible <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.5.5 (New Action) Investigate the causes of stone-curlew nest failure on semi-natural habitats. (RSPB)	
---	--	--

Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	1999 - Trial research project to test methods. 2000 - full research project to determine timing and causes of breeding failure on military training land (depending on pilot and approval)	
Action/workplan undertaken? <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	Yes	
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>	
Output and timescale	Initial project outline produced and discussed with EN and MoD. Trial research carried out on MoD land in 1999 to test methodology and practicalities in the field. This involved the use of temperature sensitive data loggers to determine nest cup temperatures and ascertain the timing of nesting failure.	<i>Action by</i> RSPB
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>	None to date	
Action complete or ongoing? <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	Started not yet completed	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
Output and timescale	Results pilot project will be used to determine whether full research project can be undertaken.	<i>Action by</i> RSPB

Published action/organisation(s) responsible <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.5.6 (New Action) Investigate the effects of disturbance from road traffic on stone-curlew demography. (RSPB)	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	1999 - Completion and publication of research showing that stone-curlews are markedly less abundant in suitable habitat close to major roads. 2000 - beginning of research studentship at Dept of Zoology, University of Cambridge to investigate causes of effect of roads and mitigation measures. (subject to confirmation of funding by RSPB).	
Action/workplan undertaken? <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	Yes	
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>	

Output and timescale	Initial research complete and in press (RSPB). PhD project designed to be completed in 2003. Further work on practical mitigation measures likely to be required, possibly beginning in 2002.	<i>Action by</i> RSPB
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>	None to date	
Action complete or ongoing? <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	Started not yet completed	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
Output and timescale	Results available in 2002-2003 will be used to determine whether mitigation is practical.	<i>Action by</i> RSPB