

Damasonium alisma (Starfruit)

Full report outputted on the 31/07/2003 08:30:24

1. Status of the habitat / species

Please give your most accurate assessment of the status of your species or habitat for the UK and for each country. Leave the row blank where the species or habitat does not occur in that country.

	Amount:	Units:	Year:	Accuracy:	Reference for data:
UK	12	Sites/ Populations ▼	2002	Full survey ▼	Plantlife Report (Wheeler 2001)
E	12	Sites/ Populations ▼	2002	Full survey ▼	Plantlife Report (Wheeler 2001)
NI		▼		▼	
S		▼		▼	
W		▼		▼	

Information originally entered by Amanda Miller on Thursday, September 05, 2002
Information last changed by Amanda Miller on Friday, December 20, 2002

2. Trend in Biological Status

Please give your best estimate of the current trend for your species or habitat for the UK, and each appropriate country, using the following categories. Please give an estimate unless there is absolutely no information on which to assess status.

	Trend:	Accuracy:	Reference for data:
UK	Declining (continuing/accelerating) ▼	Full survey ▼	Plantlife reports (Wheeler 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001)
E	Declining (slow ing) ▼	Full survey ▼	Plantlife reports (Wheeler 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001)
NI	▼	▼	
S	▼	▼	
W	▼	▼	

Information originally entered by Amanda Miller on Thursday, September 05, 2002
 Information last changed by Amanda Miller on Friday, December 13, 2002

3. Status of knowledge

To what extent is our scientific knowledge of the habitat / species (e.g research information, autecological knowledge, knowledge for effective re-introduction or habitat restoration/re-creation) sufficient to deliver the plan targets?

Please give an assessment for the UK overall but if there is significant difference in knowledge between different countries this should be noted.

Status of knowledge:	Know ledge sufficient to make some impact, but more research needed. ▼
Notes:	Status very w ell know n, Autecology largely know n, yet site restoration programmes not alw ays successful

Information originally entered by Amanda Miller on Thursday, September 05, 2002

4. Progress on targets

Each of the revised targets from the 2001 Targets Review is listed below.

For each one please give a qualitative assessment of progress for the UK and each country. You can also enter quantitative information on progress by entering data in each of the target boxes and entering the current amount in the amount box. For more information see Help.

T1: Maintain populations at all extant sites

Target start date:

1995

Target end date: 2005

Target units: Sites/ Populations

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Some progress (behind schedule)			Full survey	Yes
E	Some progress (behind schedule)			Full survey	Yes
NI					
S					
W					

T2: Establish a further ten populations by 2004.

Target start date: 1995

Target end date: 2004

Target units: Sites/ Populations

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Some progress (behind schedule) ▼	10	1	Full survey ▼	Yes ▼
E	Some progress (behind schedule) ▼	10	1	Full survey ▼	Yes ▼
NI	▼			▼	▼
S	▼			▼	▼
W	▼			▼	▼

Information originally entered by Amanda Miller on Thursday, September 05, 2002
Information last changed by Amanda Miller on Friday, December 13, 2002

5. Current factors affecting the habitat

When your plan was published the factors (threats) that were thought to be causing loss or decline were listed (in section 2). Re-assessing the current situation may help prioritise actions for your species or habitat. In addition, this enables identification of the main threats to biodiversity across all plans. It is useful to assess whether the importance of different factors is changing and whether there are new issues emerging.

The threat section from the original plan is duplicated below, and a first attempt at categorising the threats has been made. Please confirm that you agree with the categorisation of the original threats identified in the plan (by deleting any wrongly categorised threats and adding the correct category). Please also add to the list any significant threats that have emerged recently, being mindful of environmental issues that have increased in profile or been recognised since plan publication (e.g. climate change). Once you are happy that the list contains all the threats identified in the published plan together with any new ones, please rank them in order of severity (1= highest threat). If the situation has changed and one of the published threats is no longer significant, please leave this in the list but give this rank = 0.

Current factors affecting the habitat from the original publication:

- 2.1 Neglect and mismanagement of ponds on grazed commons or greens, including over-shading by trees and shrubs, with associated collection of leaf litter and the excessive growth of submerged and marginal plants.
- 2.2 Loss of habitat through development, drainage and in-filling of pools and wet hollows.
- 2.3 Introduction of water level controls reducing seasonal fluctuations.
- 2.4 Introduction of invasive, non-native species of water plants.

Keyworded factors:

To add factors click the add button, to delete factors check the delete box and then click the delete button.

Delete:	Rank:	Keyword:
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Habitat loss / degradation - agriculture Inappropriate grazing (due to timing or livestock type)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Habitat loss / degradation - management practice Lack of disturbance
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Habitat loss / degradation - management practice Loss of open areas
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Habitat loss / degradation - management practice Neglect
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Habitat loss / degradation Natural succession
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Invasive/non-native species (directly affecting species) Competition

Information originally entered by Amanda Miller on Friday, December 13, 2002

Information last changed by Amanda Miller on Friday, December 13, 2002

6. Constraints (optional)

Select the three most significant constraints to achieving the targets of the plan, and indicate the order of priority (1-3 with 1 being the most significant constraint). Only include constraints that are acting as a real blockage to delivering the plan targets or leading to a substantial delay in their delivery. For each constraint, please indicate whether you feel that it is within the ability of the lead partner or steering group to resolve the constraint.

Constraint 1:	
Constraint keyword:	Country:
Species and habitat management Species introductions unsuccessful	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> W
Solution:	Solution type:
More research needed on habitat restoration/creation techniques	Research
Able to resolve:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Constraint 2:	
Constraint keyword:	Country:

Partnership Community - lack of involvement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S
	<input type="checkbox"/> W
Solution:	Solution type:
Persuade locals of the value of grazed commons	Communication / publicity
Able to resolve:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Constraint 3:	
Constraint keyword:	Country:
Species and habitat management Grazing regime - causing problems	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S
	<input type="checkbox"/> W
Solution:	Solution type:
More appropriate grazing regimes needed	Management
Able to resolve:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Information originally entered by Amanda Miller on Thursday, September 05, 2002
Information last changed by Amanda Miller on Friday, December 13, 2002

7. Steering Group

Please list all organisations that are represented on the steering group for your species/habitat (include all organisations that have contributed either directly or by correspondence within the last 3 years). Where a steering group does not exist please leave this form blank.

To add organisations click the add button, to delete organisations check the delete box and then click the delete button.

Delete:	Organisation:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buckinghamshire County Council
<input type="checkbox"/>	English Nature
<input type="checkbox"/>	Environment Agency
<input type="checkbox"/>	National Museum of Wales
<input type="checkbox"/>	National Trust
<input type="checkbox"/>	Plantlife
<input type="checkbox"/>	Pond Conservation Trust
<input type="checkbox"/>	Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew

Information originally entered by Amanda Miller on Monday, October 07, 2002
Information last changed by Amanda Miller on Monday, January 06, 2003

8. Other Groups/Organisations

Please list any additional groups/organisations that are actively involved in implementing your action plan. (This is to try to assess which groups are involved where there is no steering group and any additional contributors). If you do not have any other organisations involved, click [here](#).

To add organisations click the add button, to delete organisations check the delete box and then click the delete button.

Delete:	Organisation:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Corporation of London
<input type="checkbox"/>	South Bucks District Council

Information originally entered by Amanda Miller on Friday, December 13, 2002
Information last changed by Amanda Miller on Monday, January 06, 2003

9. Linkages to LBAPs

a) Which of the following most accurately describes your interaction with LBAPs, up to now?

Little or no contact with LBAPs. 

b) If you have been in contact with LBAPs how was it initiated?

By Both 

c) Irrespective of current contact, how important do you consider LBAP co-ordinated action will be in achieving the targets of the plan? Select from category:

d) If you consider LBAP action to be anything other than unimportant, which of the following forms of engagement do you think would be appropriate? (Note, you may tick more than one category.)

- Indirect contact (e.g. posting information on UKBAP website, sharing work programmes, meeting schedules, articles in Biodiversity News, newsletter)
- Provision of generic information on habitat and/or species (e.g. advice and guidance on habitat/species ecology and management)
- Direct provision of advice (e.g. proactive approach to LBAP, response to consultations from LBAPs, advice on LBAP target setting)
- Reciprocal attendance at meetings
- Development of collaborative projects

Other (please specify):

Information originally entered by Amanda Miller on Wednesday, August 21, 2002
Information last changed by Amanda Miller on Friday, December 13, 2002

>

10. Successes (optional)

Have there been key successes in the implementation of your plan that should be drawn to the attention of government, the wider BAP partnership, or the public? Please give a brief description (i.e. 2-3 sentences) of up to three successes and allocate a topic area to each of them:

Success 1:

Description:

Successful reintroduction at Stoke Common. An accurate keyword would be: | number of sites/populations increased through habitat creation and subsequent introduction

Country:

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Species and habitat management | Other

Success 2:

Description:

Bulking up of seed holding for ex-situ conservation in collaboration with MSB & RGB Kew

Country:

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Research, survey and information | Ex-situ / reintroduction techniques - studies completed or underway

Success 3:

Description:	Country:
<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> UK <input type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> W
Keyword:	
<input type="text"/>	

Information originally entered by Amanda Miller on Thursday, September 05, 2002
Information last changed by Amanda Miller on 02 January 2003

Thankyou for answering the questions. You have not yet completed all of the questions. You can go back and answer the additional ones or edit the ones you have already answered whenever you want.

Sign-off:

When you have completed all of the questions that you are able to, you must sign off your reporting.

I agree that the steering group (if present) have agreed the information in this report and that the following contact point has also signed it off:

Contact point:	<input type="text" value="Ron Porley"/>	email:	<input type="text" value="ron.porley@er"/>
Your name:	<input type="text" value="Amanda Miller"/>		
Date:	<input type="text" value="20/12/02"/>		
