

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	<i>Damasonium alisma</i>
Lead Partner/Agency	Plantlife
Steering Group/Other organisations	Bucks and Surrey County Councils; Elmbridge Borough Council, English Nature; ITE Monkswood; Lower Mole Countryside Management Project, National Museum and Galleries of Wales; National Trust; Plantlife; Pond Action.
Work programme in existence?	Yes.

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. Safeguard populations at all known sites, including considering SSSI notification.		x				
4.2. Establish suitable conditions and restore to a minimum of ten former sites by 2004.		x				It has been agreed by Steering Group that if suitable known historic sites cannot be found, efforts should be concentrated on appropriate sites within the historic range of the species.
4.3. Organise long-term management of the restored ponds to ensure the plant's future survival.		x				Target has been revised by SG to include long-term management of extant as well as restored sites.

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 that 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.)
5.2.1. Promote measures to maintain water quality at all extant sites (LAs, NRA).		x				x	Started
5.2.2. Control marginal and submerged vegetation in the area around any starfruit populations and ensure that bare substrate is provided for germination (EN, LAs).		x				x	Ongoing
5.2.3. Prepare and promote an appropriate water level management plan for sites containing this species (EN, NRA, LAs).		x				x	Not started
5.2.4. Restore appropriate management at former sites with a view to regeneration from seed bank or reintroduction (EN).		x				x	Started
5.2.5. Consider the need to notify sites as SSSIs (EN).		x				x	Started

5.3.1. Collect and deposit seed from all sites in the National Seed Bank (EN).		x					Ongoing
5.3.2. Continue programme of restoration and, following analysis of previous attempts, aim to restore ten populations to suitable sites by 2004. Where reintroduction is attempted, ensure the use of seed of local provenance (EN).		x				x	Started
5.4.1. Ensure landowners, managers and local authorities are aware of the presence, legal status and importance of conserving this species and appropriate methods of habitat management (EN).		x				x	Yes
5.5.1. Survey former sites with a view to regeneration of the seed bank or identification of suitable sites for reintroduction ((EN).		x				x	Yes
5.5.2. Monitor population size, water quality and water levels at all sites regularly (EN).		x					Started
5.5.3. Work closely with other European countries to establish the status, ecology and conservation requirements of this species and use information and expertise towards its conservation in the UK (EN, JNCC).		x				x	Started
5.5.4. Pass information gathered during the survey and monitoring of this species to the JNCC or BRC so that it can be incorporated in national databases (EN).		x					
5.5.5. Provide information annually to the World Conservation Monitoring Centre on the UK status of the species to contribute to the maintenance of an up-to-date global Red Data List (JNCC).		x					
5.5.6 Additional action: Undertake a research project to examine the autecology and genetics of this species in order to inform conservation management. (EA, EN, ITE, Plantlife)		x				x	Started
5.6.1. Ensure local communities are made aware of the presence and importance of this species and the reason for carrying out conservation management (EN).		x				x	Started

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							
England				x			
Northern Ireland							
Scotland							
Wales							
Brief text description justifying assessment of status: (~ no more than 100 words for each country/region)							
Species continues to occur on between 1 and 4 sites in England out of a total of 10 sites from which it has been recorded since 1990.							

Field 5: Summary statement

Produced by JNCC's Biodiversity Information Service, 31/07/03

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 action has been undertaken since plan publication, including:

- Management action at extant ponds which has maintained small populations at up to 4 sites in Buckinghamshire and Surrey.
- Review of possible restoration sites and initiation of pond creation project at one site.
- Initiation of research project, including collection of data on habitat and water quality, establishment of ex-situ experiments at ITE

However, fundamental problems remain which hinder progress and mean that targets are unlikely to be met:

- No further SSSI designation of extant sites threatened by artificial management of water-levels and inappropriate leisure uses.
- Inadequate mechanisms for ensuring appropriate management on SSSIs
- Neglect and mismanagement of common land, compounded by difficulties in securing agreement for fencing (requirement for review of legislation)
- Inadequate ecological understanding of species, compounded by lack of resources for basic research
- Difficulty in securing funding through agri-environment schemes (application for funding for management at one site refused twice).

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
	Ruth Davis	
Organisation	Plantlife	
Assessment date (dd/mm/yy)		

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.)	4.1. Safeguard populations at all known sites, including considering SSSI notification.				
Country	Not appropriate	Target achieved	Some progress	No progress	Insufficient information
<i>UK</i>					
<i>England</i>				x	
<i>Northern Ireland</i>					
<i>Scotland</i>					
<i>Wales</i>					
Text description of target progress (separate for each country/region):					
No further measures for legal site safeguard have been implemented since publication of plan in 1995. A request to EN for notification of additional sites was refused. However, agreements with some landowners (for example Gerrards Cross Parish Council) are providing some measure of informal protection to some sites.					

Objective/target (For new or revised targets please provide the new paragraph number and target text.)	4.2. Establish suitable conditions and restore to a minimum of ten former sites by 2004.				
Country	Not appropriate	Target achieved	Some progress	No progress	Insufficient information
<i>UK</i>			x		
<i>England</i>					
<i>Northern Ireland</i>					
<i>Scotland</i>					
<i>Wales</i>					
Text description of target progress (separate for each country/region):					
<p>Since plan publication in 1995, populations have been recorded at three sites where they were not recorded in 1994, 1995:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site in Bucks where no plants had been recorded for c. 30 years (following work undertaken 1992/2) • Site in Surrey where a reintroduced population was not seen between 1993 – 1996 • Site in Surrey (possibly reintroduced) where plants had not been recorded for several years <p>However, two sites in Bucks which supported plants in 1994 have been searched without success since.</p> <p>It was decided that further efforts at restoration should concentrate on sites which already appeared suitable and had some guarantee of long-term management, preferably extensive grazing. Assessment of former sites revealed none which met these conditions. In the light of this it has been agreed that suitable sites within the former range of the species will be considered. However, prior to introducing populations into these areas the following work needs to be completed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of genetic composition of UK populations, planning of populations with suitable genetic composition • Further characterisation of appropriate habitat and assessment of proposed sites <p>If all goes according to plan, an additional 2 populations may have been established by 2004, making a total of 5 'restored' population; the target of 10 is inappropriate to the current circumstances and is unlikely to be met.</p>					

Objective/target (For new or revised targets please provide the new paragraph number and target text.)	4.3. Organise long-term management of the restored ponds to ensure the plant's future survival.				
Country	Not appropriate	Target achieved	Some progress	No progress	Insufficient information
<i>UK</i>					
<i>England</i>			x		
<i>Northern Ireland</i>					
<i>Scotland</i>					
<i>Wales</i>					
Text description of target progress (separate for each country/region):					
Steering Group took this as applying to all ponds.					
Management at the majority of extant ponds is still dependent on manual/mechanical intervention by conservation organisations and land owners/managers. At some ponds there is no alternative to this situation and sufficient resources and encouragement need to be made available to ensure management continues (Latchmoor Pond, New Pond, West End Common, Heath House Pond, Littleworth Common).					
At other extant sites, there is scope for restoration of extensive grazing. However, in each case resources and some public resistance to the removal of secondary woodland from old heaths and commons are impeding implementation. The creation of some sites where there are a network of reproductively interacting populations ('metapopulations') is vital to the long-term future of the plant. Commitment to positive management of SSSIs for priority species such as this is necessary to deliver this outcome.					
Selection of further sites for restoration will depend in future on existing commitments to long-term management on the selected sites. Continued adequate funding of heathland restoration projects and attendant agri-environment schemes will be necessary to ensure the success of this policy.					

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.)	5.2.1. Measures to maintain water quality at sites.
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)	1. Undertake a programme of water sampling and water-level monitoring at extant starfruit ponds and provide the data collected to Plantlife/ITE. (EA) 2. Include assessment of the water quality and water level requirements of this species in the research project proposed below, with a view to determining acceptable parameters for both on habitat for this species. (EA/ITE/EA) 3. Encourage a greater understanding of the possible impact of wild fowl populations on starfruit sites by informing the public and land owners of the potential associated risks and supporting efforts to limit duck feeding by Parish Councils etc. (Plantlife/Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust/Pond Action/Bucks C.C.)
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>Programme of water quality sampling begun by Environment Agency, data not yet supplied to Plantlife/ITE. (Action 1998.)</p> <p>Research project initiated, awaiting input of water quality data (Action 1998)</p> <p>Information regularly provided to Parish Councils, Gerrard's Cross Parish Council taken measures to control duck populations on one pond.</p>	<p>Action by County Councils , EA, EN, ITE, Parish Councils, Plantlife.</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 that the steering group is unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</i>	<p>Data not yet supplied for use in research project.</p> <p>Sites where duck problem is worst have no legal status, so no legal obligation to manage areas appropriately (including measures to control ducks)</p> <p>Public pressure by some individuals to manage ponds as duck and fish ponds.</p>	
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	<p>Complete actions 1 and 2 in work programme by 2000.</p> <p>Continue to pursue action 3.</p>	<p>Action by County Councils , EA, EN, ITE, Parish Councils, Plantlife.</p>

Published action/organisation(s) responsible <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.2.2. Control marginal and submerged vegetation in the area around any starfruit populations and ensure that bare substrate is provided for germination (EN, LAs).	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	Individual work programme for each sites (1999 – 2001) listed in work programme.	
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	<p>Management work will be undertaken on a cycle on all extant sites for the species during 1999 - 2001</p>	<p>Action by EN, Buckinghamshire County Council Elmbridge Borough Council, Lower Mole Countryside Management Project, Plantlife, National Trust</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 that the steering group is unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</i>	<p>Urgent need for survey and Water Level Management Plans on some sites before further positive action can be taken; funding not available for these at present (see below).</p> <p>Inadequate resources to undertake management works on scale required, compounded by failure of senior staff to recognise the importance of the work to be undertaken.</p>	
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	Delivery of current actions in work programme by 2001 Development of a further management programme for 2002 - 2005	<i>Action by</i> EN, Buckinghamshire County Council Elmbridge Borough Council, Lower Mole Countryside Management Project, Plantlife, National Trust
Published action/organisation(s) responsible <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.2.3. Prepare and promote an appropriate water level management plan for sites containing this species (EN, NRA, LAs).	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	1. Make funds available to ensure appropriate ecological assessment of ponds where management is planned, preferably using Pond Action's assessment of Latchmoor as a model. Ensure that these assessments are conducted wherever possible during Summer 1999. These should be considered the equivalent of the water-level management plans suggested in the published action plan The following ponds should be considered priorities for action during 1999: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Littleworth Common Pond • Daisy and Naphill Common Ponds • West End Common Ponds • New Pond (EA/EN/Parish Councils and other Local Authorities). 2. Ensure the incorporation of starfruit plan objectives and actions into all relevant Local Environment Agency Plans (LEAPs) (EA)	
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	The equivalent of WLMPs have been prepared for 2 ponds in Buckinghamshire, funded by Gerrard's Cross Parish Council (Action 1996, 1999). However, despite the efforts of individuals within EA, no funding has been made available to take this forward on the priority list of ponds given above. Actions have been incorporated into at least one relevant LEAP and starfruit is mentioned in one other (Action 1996 – 1998). However, has not produced necessary funding.	<i>Action by:</i> EA, EN, Local Authorities, Pond Action
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 that the steering group is unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</i>	Funding constraints, which are partly the result of EA funding being concentrated on species for which they are Contact Point, leading to difficulties for other species where they are not CP but are responsible for key actions in the plan.	
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 to seek funding through EA, EN, Local Authority and Plantlife sources to implement actions as outlined in plan (1999 – 2000) Ensure that specific actions are incorporated into all LEAPs when review make this possible	<i>Action by</i> EA, EN, Local Authorities, Plantlife, Pond Action

Published action/organisation(s) responsible (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)	5.2.4. Restore appropriate management at former sites with a view to regeneration from seed bank or reintroduction (EN).	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)	1. Following a review of data on historical sites for this species, select four sites to attempt restoration. Should no appropriate sites be found, consider the creation of new ponds in appropriate habitat or the introduction of the species into ponds which are within its historic range and provide suitable habitat. Actions for four sites are suggested below; these will be subject to the agreement of the UK group and are provisional only (UK Steering Group)	
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	Following completed assessment of historic sites, 4 areas have been selected for work, including incorporation of more ponds into the grazing compartment surrounding one existing sites, possible introductions at two sites within the species historic range and the creation of ponds at a further site within the species historic range. In addition, restoration work will continue at a number of ponds within SSSIs where the species has not been seen for several years, but which are considered 'extant' (Daisy and Naphill Commons, Littleworth).	Action by UK SG, EN, Local Authorities, National Trust
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.)	Limited numbers of suitable and available sites, linked to problems with fencing to ensure conservation grazing on common land. Difficulty in characterising suitable habitat (needs to be supported by further research). Limited resources to ensure appropriate management.	
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	Pursue action at 4 sites according to timetable outlined in work programme (1999 – 2001).	Action by UK SG, EN, Local Authorities, National Trust, Pond Action.

Published action/organisation(s) responsible (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)	5.2.5. Consider the need to notify sites as SSSIs (EN).	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)	1. Re-consider the notification of Gerrard's Cross Common, on the basis that New Pond has supported the most regularly occurring populations of this species in Buckinghamshire in recent years. (EN)	
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	The matter was referred to relevant EN team and notification refused.	<i>Action by</i> 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>	Unwillingness of EN to designate the site despite the suggestion that this should be given serious consideration in the action plan and despite meeting the biological criteria for selection. (Any site with above 200 'points' should qualify; listing on Schedule 8 = 200 points, listing on RDB = 200 points, Nationally scarce 50; the site supports not only starfruit (Schedule 8), but also 5 nationally scarce invertebrate species). EN believe that notification of the site is unlikely to achieve any greater protection or significant changes to management as changes would be impossible to enforce.	
Action complete or ongoing? <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	Ongoing, as Lead Partner will continue to request re-consideration of this issue.	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
Output and timescale	Designation refused 1998, will request reconsideration 1999 – 2000.	<i>Action by</i> EN, Plantlife.

Published action/organisation(s) responsible <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.3.2. Continue programme of restoration and, following analysis of previous attempts, aim to restore ten populations to suitable sites by 2004. Where reintroduction is attempted, ensure the use of seed of local provenance (EN).	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	Undertake management actions as outlined in 5.2.4 above. Undertake a programme to determine the genetic relationships between different starfruit populations. This information should then be used to inform any planned introductions, and material from suitable sites taken into cultivation with a view to bulking up seed. Aim to make this work part of a larger programme of research looking into the genetics and autecology of species of ponds with fluctuating water levels. (Cambridge University Botanic Gardens/EA/EN/ITE/Plantlife)	
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	See 5.2.4 for details of work on population restoration; action to be undertaken 1999 – 2001 under the current work programme. Proposals for research project being developed by Cambridge University Botanic Garden, ITE, Plantlife.	<i>Action by</i> UK SG, EN, ITE, Local Authorities, National Trust, Pond Action
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>	See 5.2.4 for constraints relating to management action. Lack of resources to pay for suitable research is holding up investigations into genetics and ecology and thus hindering plan implementation. (The recommendation to use material of local provenance in this instance may be inappropriate – see for example SNH guidance on genetic compositions of re-introductions which favours use of mixed populations to maximise fitness. This issue requires investigation before positive action is taken).	
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	Implement programme of restoration management/pond creation etc as outlined in 5.2.4, according to work programme timetable (1999 – 2001). Continue to develop research project and seek suitable funding during 1999.	<i>Action by</i> UK SG, EN, ITE, Local Authorities, National Trust, Pond Action
-----------------------------	---	--

Published action/organisation(s) responsible <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.4.1. Ensure landowners, managers and local authorities are aware of the presence, legal status and importance of conserving this species and appropriate methods of habitat management (EN).	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	1. All landowners/managers are currently aware, liaison is maintained with EN and Plantlife where necessary; members of the group should ensure that they are available to offer advice on management and protection when and where a need arises (Bucks C. C./EA/EN/Parish Councils/Plantlife) 2. Offer advice and information on the proposed re-introduction and introduction programme for this species and report on the success of project as this becomes clear.	
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	All landowners/managers made aware prior to publication of action plan (1991 – 1995) Local Authority Countryside Management Projects in Surrey and Bucks providing support where appropriate within their local areas. Project Officer employed by Plantlife to provide advice on request to any individual/organisation for whom it is relevant (ongoing)	<i>Action by</i> EN, Local Authorities, Plantlife.
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>	Continued funding for Countryside Management Projects by local authorities, which provide one of the most effective means of maintaining liaison over a long-period with private owners, Parish Councils etc.	
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 to employ Plantlife Project Officer for period of work programme to provide advice and support where necessary (1999 – 2001) Continue to provide financial support to Countryside Management Projects (ongoing)	<i>Action by</i> EN, Local Authorities, Plantlife.

Published action/organisation(s) responsible <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.5.1. Survey former sites with a view to regeneration of the seed bank or identification of suitable sites for reintroduction (EN).	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	1. Complete review of historical records for this species, including assessment of any sites suitable for restoration/introduction. (Plantlife/BSBI)	
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	Completed 1998	Action by EN, Plantlife.
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>	Complete	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
Output and timescale		Action by

Published action/organisation(s) responsible <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.5.3. Work closely with other European countries to establish the status, ecology and conservation requirements of this species and use information and expertise towards its conservation in the UK (EN, JNCC).	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	1 Support the collection of data from European sites for starfruit and make this data available to inform research project (Plantlife) 2. Undertake an examination of the taxonomy of the species, and its current distribution in Europe. (National Museums and Galleries of Wales)	
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	1 Data collected from starfruit sites in France as part of research into a number of species of similar habitats. 2 Information collated on the European status of starfruit and its relatives. 3 Seek if possible to gain access to European material of the species in order to compare genetic composition with UK populations and determine what, if any, level of genetic erosion may be affecting native populations (Cambridge University Botanic Garden, EN/ITE/Plantlife)	Action by EN, National Museums and Galleries of Wales, Plantlife.
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>	Ideally, this work should be part of a wider review of the conservation status, ecology and conservation of BAP species in continental Europe; actions occur in many species action plans to this effect, generally attributed to JNCC as responsible agency. This should in turn lead to a review of British species' representation on the EU Habitats Directive. No JNCC funding appears to be available for this work; nor is it being managed in a concerted way. This means that we are missing out on the opportunity to make it more cost effective by addressing a number of species at once and that the case for increased international protection for declining species such as this is harder to make.	
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 to identify and utilise opportunities to gather data on the distribution, ecology and conservation of this species in continental Europe and to access material for genetic comparisons (1999 – 2001, review at end of current work programme period)	<i>Action by</i> EN, JNCC, National Museums and Galleries of Wales, Plantlife.
-----------------------------	--	---

Published action/organisation(s) responsible <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.5.6 Additional action: Undertake a research project to examine the autecology and genetics of this species in order to inform conservation management. (EA, EN, ITE, Plantlife, University of Cambridge Botanic Gardens)	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	Undertake a research project to examine the autecology and genetics of this species, factors in the aquatic environment affecting its survival and the factors to consider when planning further restoration/introduction attempts. This project should aim to produce initial results by end 2000, with a view to beginning introductions in 2001. (EA/EN/ITE/Plantlife) Seek to make this project part of a larger investigation into the autecology of species of ephemeral ponds. (Cambridge University Botanic Gardens/EA/EN/ITE/Plantlife)	
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	ITE has begun work on examining the significance on individual environmental variables on starfruit growth and survival. Proposals being developed to more broad-reaching research project.	<i>Action by:</i> Cambridge University Botanic Garden, EA, EN, ITE.
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>	Funding available for biodiversity research to underpin actions specified in plan.	
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 with actions as outlined in work programme 1999 - 2001	<i>Action by</i> Cambridge University Botanic Garden, EA, EN, ITE.

Published action/organisation(s) responsible <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.6.1. Ensure local communities are made aware of the presence and importance of this species and the reason for carrying out conservation management (EN).	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	1. Organise a visit to starfruit sites at Headley Heath and consider inviting 'key' starfruit contact within local area to attend. (National Trust/Plantlife) 2. If the above is successful, organise a further starfruit day, possibly to Black Park or New Pond? To publicise and encourage the conservation of this species (Bucks C. C./EN/Plantlife)	
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	Action 1 completed 1999.	Action by EN, Plantlife, National Trust.
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>	Difficulty in convincing people locally of the importance of the species and the making its conservation compatible with other uses on ponds.	
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	Complete actions as outlined in work programme (1999) Review success and devise further actions for 2000, 2001	Action by UK SG, EN, Local Authorities, Plantlife, National Trust