

## 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

<b>Species/Habitat Action Plan</b>	Sand lizard <i>Lacerta agilis</i>
<b>Lead Partner/Agency</b>	The Herpetological Conservation Trust / English Nature
<b>Steering Group/Other organisations</b>	No. Meeting held between Lead Partners and documentation circulated to interested parties
<b>Work programme in existence?</b>	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
<b>4.0a&amp;b</b> Achieve favourable status in Britain by 2015 and a monitoring programme to measure progress to this goal should be established by 2002.	X	X		X	X	New objective has been included to allow clearer aim for Plan and to link to EC objectives for the species. This sets a UK objective and guides the future development and expansion of the plan.
Re-establishment of 10 populations seems to be both achievable and feasible. The current Species Recovery Programme, now in its second year, achieved four translocations in the first year and one further site was included in 1995. Eleven sites have been identified for further consideration (although it is unlikely that all will be suitable). A target of 10 is achievable, and hopefully could be exceeded by the year 2000. A longer target would be unwise. [See note at 4.2]		X			X	

<p>Re-establish 10 populations to restore the range and distribution in suitable habitat within its former range by the year 2000.</p>		X			X	<p><i>Note: re-establishment should be considered as having occurred only after a number of years of successful breeding on-site. However for the purpose of reporting we shall record all sites where breeding has been confirmed after a translocation and where there is no reason to believe that the population has been lost (e.g. due to habitat loss or damage). Note: this target includes the Species Recovery Programme project period started in 1994; the SRP achieved (completed or initiated) 11 re-introductions, all of which can be included in the target. A revised target should therefore now be set, looking more ambitiously at re-establishing a wider range. Excluding the completion of the SRP translocations the target should be set at 3 translocations initiated by 2005 and a further 3 initiated by 2010</i></p>
<p>Maintain all breeding populations at current levels and enhance where possible. <i>This objective relates only to sites that were extant at the time of publishing the Action Plan (December 1995). This needs to be monitored via an assessment of habitat quality/damage, records of management and/or an assessment of population status.</i></p> <p><i>Management to sustain population levels should be in place on the majority of relevant sites by 2005 and all sites by 2010.</i></p>		X		X	X	<p>The Scottish population is not considered a conservation priority.</p> <p>A time-tabled target has been added to that given in the published plan.</p>
<p>Reverse the fragmentation of sites by habitat re-creation and management. <i>This is important to make individual sites larger and more robust and to link adjoining populations/ sites. It will include actions within sites (mostly via habitat restoration) and between sites via re-creation; e.g. through heathland and dune re-creation projects.</i></p>		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.)
<b>5.1 Policy and legislation</b>							
<b>5.1.1</b> Encourage the development and uptake of management schemes and incentive payments for heathland management and restoration in southern England and ensure that these include provision to assist sand lizard conservation (Action: MAFF and EN). While these schemes are predominantly in southern England such mechanisms may also be appropriate elsewhere. Prepare specific provisions for sand lizard conservation for inclusion in such schemes (Action: HCT and EN)		X				Yes	On-going: Though heathland management schemes have been implemented, there is currently little attempt to include species specific provisions required for this species in some schemes. Other schemes such as RES do allow for species specific management where this is considered a priority by land managers.
<b>5.1.2</b> Consider the removal of limited areas of woodland on former heathland to allow linkages of fragmented heathland populations and expand populations within forests. (Action: FA, FE)		X				Yes	On-going: Habitat restoration programmes are in place involving removal of woodland. However specific links to this SAP need to be developed.
Seek to ensure that dune management policies are consistent with sand lizard needs in occupied areas (Action: LAs, EN, NT, MoD, HCT)		X			X	Yes	On-going: local progress e.g. in Merseyside (green-beach) and at Studland (fencing).
Review Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 and Habitats Regulations 1994 to ensure they provide adequate protection for and means of conserving sand lizards and provision for enforcement to allow these to be effective (Action: DETR, police/PAW, JNCC)	X					Yes	On-going: but little sign of progress. Need to: comply fully with EC Directive include powers of access ensure positive management increase police powers allow survey over whole range of species Need to control release of non-native, invasive plant species (e.g. Gaultheria)
Review and amend planning guidance (e.g. PPG 9 in England), practice and policies to reflect the importance of the planning process in achieving BAP targets and fully implement the EC Habitats Directive (Action: DETR, LAs, EN, ALGE, HCT/Froglife/HGBI to advise)		X			X	Yes	On-going: but little sign of progress. Important to ensure that development pressure is reduced. Needs to be included within a review of the planning process and how it addresses protected and BAP species.

<b>5.2 Site safeguard and management</b>							
<b>5.2.1</b> Review SSSI coverage of sand lizard sites in Wales <i>and England</i> and seek to ensure all significant populations are designated (Action: CCW <i>and EN</i> )		X			X	Yes	On-going: there has been little in the way of formal appraisal of the whole series of sites and the occurrence of the species has yet to be mapped against SSSI boundaries. However (despite having not included EN in the published plan for action) a number of priority sites have been notified for the species since the SAP was published; though still an outstanding need in NW
Identify all sites with sand lizards to LAs for identification in Development Plans (Action: CCW, EN, LAs <i>and HCT/ARGs and WTs</i> ) <i>Address need to provide SINC protection for sand lizard populations. (Action: HCT/WTs/Froglife/ARGs and EN)</i>		X			X	Yes	Started: some sites have been identified by LAs . A formal process has yet to be developed across England and Wales. SINC's have tended to be based on habitat/botanic characters, need to include reptile criteria. need better links between recorders / record holders and LAs and need closer working between specialist NGOs and WTs.
<b>5.2.2.a</b> <i>Develop standard guidance and protocols to ensure consistent high quality advice and clear working practices in reptile casework (to inform developers, consultants and LAs) (Action: EN, CCW, SNH, HCT and Froglife/HGBI, IEEM, Consultants, ALGE)</i>		X				Yes	Started: Guidelines have been produced by HGBI (for the widespread species). Draft texts exist for protocols (EN) and an advisory leaflet for developers. (EN/HCT/Froglife) for reptile species.
<b>5.2.3</b> Consider habitat re-creation on suitable heathland and dune vegetation to consolidate and expand the current range (Action: CCW, EN, FA, FE, LAs, MAFF, MoD, <i>other land owners, HCT and WTs</i> )		X				Yes	Started: but this has focussed on heath habitat re-creation with relatively little species specific design. (see also 5.1.2)

<b>5.3 Species management and protection</b>							
<b>5.3.1</b> Ensure sand lizard needs are catered for in programmes of cutting, burning or grazing management on sites supporting populations or likely to do so (Action: CCW, EN, SNH, NT, RSPB, LAs, HCT)		X				Yes	Not started.
<b>5.3.1a</b> Develop local / Regional plans / SAPs/ BAPs to set sand lizard conservation in a local context in all areas currently with the species and those where reintroduction would be appropriate (Action: LAs, EN, CCW, HCT, ARGs, WTs)		X			X	Yes	On-going: local BAPs have been produced that address sand lizards in SW Region, Cornwall, Surrey, Hampshire and Merseyside. More specific actions need to be identified in Dorset and in areas in which the species should be re-introduced.
<b>5.3.1b</b> Prepare site management objectives for sand lizards and ensure that specific conservation measures for the species are included in all plans and management schemes for all designated sites (statutory and 'second tier' designations) and nature reserves with this species. These should consider the relevance of the site relative to adjacent populations, etc. (Action: EN, CCW, HCT, WTs, LAs)		X			X	Yes (very)	On-going; there is a draft text that includes sand lizard habitat requirements in Favourable Condition assessments for specific sites.  draft management plans/briefs, etc, should be prepared for appropriate sites where these help achieve or clarify SAP objectives
<b>5.3.2</b> Maintain all breeding populations at current levels and enhance where possible (Action: CCW, EN and SNH and HCT to advise in advisory and funding role: action for all land owners and managers)		X		X	X	Yes (very)	On-going: continuing programme of habitat management though limited amounts of specific management necessary for th species.
Where feasible, and following identification of suitable sites, consider 10 translocations to re-establish the former range and distribution of the species in suitable habitats (for example coastal sand dunes) (Action: CCW, EN, HCT). This target includes Species Recovery Programme targets (already achieved). Excluding these, revised targets should be: Identify a re-introduction rationale and list of proposed sites and areas by 2000. Initiate 3 translocations by 2005 and a further 3 initiated by 2010. (Action: HCT with CCW, EN, ARGs/WTs, LAs and landowners)		X			X	Yes	Completed: the target of ten sites was exceeded through the Species Recovery Programme. A more ambitious programme of translocations is needed to restore former distribution.

<b>5.3.4</b> Further develop and refine captive breeding programme following a review of its role and function (Action: HCT, Zoos, EN, CCW)		X				Yes	On-going. The action needed is significant for Merseyside and Weald; lower significance for Dorset stock where captive breeding has been most successful.
<b>5.4 Advisory</b>							
<b>5.4.1</b> Ensure that relevant LAs and landowners and managers of sites containing sand lizard are aware of its needs, legal status and importance of conserving the species and that advice on its management is available (Action: CCW, EN, FA, SNH, LAs, HCT/ARGs)		X			X	Yes	On-going; though not comprehensive (cross ref. 5.2.2)
<b>5.4.2</b> Provide detailed information about the conservation and management needs of sand lizards through written advice and training, etc, so that the necessary management can be taken forward (Action: EN, CCW with HCT/WWF)		X			X	Yes	Started. This will require the circulation of the Conservation Handbook and development of new initiatives to pass on information about best practice, etc. This is a major requirement for achieving the action in 5.4.1
<b>5.4.3</b> Produce a simple leaflet identifying conservation needs and aims of the SAP for general circulation (Action: HCT with EN)		X				Medium	Started
<b>5.5 Research</b>							
<b>5.5.1</b> Investigate and refine methods for permanently controlling and redressing habitat degradation by bracken and <i>Gaultheria shallon</i> . (Action: CCW, EN, JNCC, MAFF and HCT: link to Heathland HAP project)		X				Yes	Started through SRP. There is also a need to look a legislative means of controllin the sale/ spread of invasive plabt species such as <i>Gaultheria</i>
Evaluate the genetic difference between the Merseyside, Weald and Dorset populations (Action: EN, JNCC, Sussex University and HCT)		X				Medium	Started
<b>5.5.3</b> Encourage the regular monitoring of known populations, devise monitoring objectives and devise a meaningful and repeatable method for assessing the status of these populations (Action: CCW, EN, JNCC, ARGs: co-ordinated by HCT)		X			X	Yes	Started.

<b>5.5.4</b> Pass information gathered during survey and monitoring of this species to JNCC or BRC in order that it can be incorporated in a national database and contribute to the maintenance of an up-to-date Red list (Action: CCW, EN, SNH, JNCC, HCT, ARGs, BRC and LRCs) Develop, and populate with data, rare reptile database(s) and develop protocols and agreements for exchange and use of data. Link this action to 5.2.1 and 5.2.2. (Action: JNCC, HCT, ARGs, Sefton MBC, LRCs)		X			X	Medium	Started. Need to speed up progress with HCT database to provide information to organisations that need it.
<b>5.5.5</b> Evaluate the impact of grazing management on sand lizards and identify appropriate protocols, if necessary (Action: EN/Heath HAP SG, HCT)		X				Yes	Started
<b>5.5.6</b> Determine means of lessening impact of cats (domestic and feral) on sand lizard populations (Action: EN/RSPCA/HCT)		X				Medium	Not started. This is especially a problem / issue for urban sites.
<b>5.6 Communications and publicity</b>							
<b>5.6.1</b> Publicise the importance, rarity and conservation needs of sand lizard through the use of interpretative materials and the involvement of the media, zoos and other captive collections. (Action: CCW/EN/HCT/Zoos)		X				Medium	Started
<b>Linkage to other plans</b>							
<b>6.1</b> Linkage to other HAPs, notably for Lowland Heathland and Coastal sand dunes but also for other habitats such as Maritime cliffs and slopes, urban. Links must be made to projects that are monitoring habitats identified through the EC Directive to ensure inclusion of sand lizard needs in any assessment of Favourable Condition/FCS. (Action: EN/ HAP SGs, HCT)		X				Yes	On-going: but with need to develop a procedure to take on board the needs of sand lizards in the plans.

**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	n/a						
Scotland				X			
Wales			X				
Brief text description justifying assessment of status: (~ no more than 100 words for each country/region)							
<p>England: Data do not allow changes to be quantified accurately though a 'subjective' site by site assessment has been made. Probable increase in status in the Weald (Surrey/Hampshire) and in Devon/Cornwall through habitat management &amp; re-introductions (where the species was extinct prior to re-introduction). Likely decline overall, in Dorset with conservation effort seemingly being offset by declines through habitat neglect (and the consequent growth of trees / scrub that shade out / replace heathland habitat), urban issues (e.g. fires, damage by trampling / mountain bikes) and difficulties associated with achieving appropriate management. Probably nett balance between losses and gains in NW England. Specific measures to enhance the species are lacking from many habitat management schemes. Still absent from much of former range (e.g. Berkshire, Kent).</p> <p>Scotland: Single introduced population. Seems to be persisting.</p> <p>Wales: Single re-introduction has brought species back to a site in Wales, thus enhancing status from prior to SAP/ Species Recovery Programme when status was 'Extinct'.</p>							

**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.

**Progress has been made through considerable investment of Species Recovery Programme (1994 to 1997); re-introductions have exceeded targets and there has been some progress on habitat linkage. Continuing existing, and development of new and forthcoming, initiatives, e.g. LIFE projects, urban heath initiatives and habitat conservation schemes and the continued funding for SAP work, will further help take this Action Plan forward. However, existing habitat management schemes have not to date included sufficient provision for sand lizards (e.g. linkage of populations, sand provision, safeguarding sensitive areas) and are being implemented in such a way that they do not fully realise their potential for this species. In some cases they may even be detrimental to the species' needs\*\*. Continued site neglect (e.g. leading to tree and scrub growth) lack of open sand and direct threats (e.g. arson) and development pressure are undermining significantly the progress made through this plan.**

**\*\* Note: this comment is the one area of disagreement between the HCT and English Nature. See attached explanation.**

**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.

<b>Contact details</b>	<b>Lead Partner</b>		<b>Contact Point</b>
<b>Name</b>	Keith Corbett	Andrew Nicholson	Andrew Nicholson
<b>Organisation</b>	The Herpetological Conservation Trust	English Nature	English Nature
<b>Assessment date (dd/mm/yy)</b>			

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.

<b>Objective/target</b> (For new or revised targets please provide the new paragraph number and target text.)	4.0 a&b Achieve favourable status in Britain by 2015 and a monitoring programme to measure progress to this goal by 2002.				
<b>Country</b>	<b>Not appropriate</b>	<b>Target achieved</b>	<b>Some progress</b>	<b>No progress</b>	<b>Insufficient information</b>
UK				X	
England				X	
Northern Ireland	X				
Scotland	X				
Wales			X		
Text description of target progress (separate for each country/region):					
<p>This target has been added since the publication of the plan as a means to identify conservation goals. Some progress has been made, e.g. through Species Recovery Programme, LIFE projects, etc. However losses of and deterioration of habitat and populations in England appear to more than offset the gains. Urban issues, habitat neglect and difficulties in undertaking management, even on sites in control of conservation bodies/authorities, (whether through resources, or through need to refine management methods to make them specifically effective for the species) contribute to this position. The species has been re-introduced to Wales. The target has relevance at the UK and England &amp; Wales levels, as it is the UK that reports to Europe while the species is only found in England and Wales (except for one introduced population in Scotland).</p>					

<b>Objective/target</b> (For new or revised targets please provide the new paragraph number and target text.)	4.1&4.2 Re-establish 10 populations to restore the range and distribution in suitable habitat within its former range by 2000.				
<b>Country</b>	<b>Not appropriate</b>	<b>Target achieved</b>	<b>Some progress</b>	<b>No progress</b>	<b>Insufficient information</b>
UK					
England		X			
Northern Ireland	X				
Scotland	X				
Wales		X			
Text description of target progress (separate for each country/region):					
<p>Populations have been re-established at sites through the Species Recovery Programme and further translocations have been carried out since. However, while these re-introductions help offset the loss of range, they do not compensate for reductions in populations size/abundance, etc. in Britain. These are generally to small and often isolated sites. This target now seems unambitious relative the need to restore distribution and national population status.</p>					

<b>Objective/target</b> (For new or revised targets please provide the new paragraph number and target text.)	4.3 Maintain all breeding populations at current levels and enhance where possible. <i>This objective relates only to sites that were extant at the time of publishing the Action Plan (December 1995). This needs to be monitored via an assessment of habitat quality/damage, records of management and/or an assessment of population status. Management to sustain population levels should be in place by on the majority of relevant sites by 2005 and all sites by 2010.</i>				
<b>Country</b>	<b>Not appropriate</b>	<b>Target achieved</b>	<b>Some progress</b>	<b>No progress</b>	<b>Insufficient information</b>
<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):					
Fit between Habitat Action Plans and the needs of the Species Action Plan needs to be improved.					
<u>North-west</u> : Lack of site management briefs and hence of habitat management specifically for this species has offset gains. Locally there have been some notable gains, e.g. Birkdale/Ainsdale frontal Dune systems.					
<u>Weald</u> : Gains throughout the Weald in area with generally few losses of populations through neglect, etc.					
<u>New Forest</u> : Populations re-introduced to the New Forest pre-1995 have been successful and flourishing though very limited scope for dispersal due to poor habitat due to management unsympathetic to the species in the area.					
<u>Dorset</u> : Species specific management briefs to enhance the status of the species are largely lacking. Overall improvement in extent and protection of heathland, with considerable management input, but this doesn't fully achieve potential for the species at present and does not compensate for the continuing losses of the species and deterioration of their habitat e.g. via neglect and fires.					

<b>Objective/target</b> (For new or revised targets please provide the new paragraph number and target text.)	4.4 Reverse the fragmentation of sites by habitat re-creation and management. <i>This is important to make individual sites larger and more robust and to link adjoining populations/sites. It will include action within sites (mostly via habitat restoration) and between sites via re-creation; e.g. through heathland and dune re-creation projects.</i>				
<b>Country</b>	<b>Not appropriate</b>	<b>Target achieved</b>	<b>Some progress</b>	<b>No progress</b>	<b>Insufficient information</b>
<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):					
<i>This is important to make individual sites larger and more robust and to link adjoining populations/sites. It will include action within sites (mostly via habitat restoration) and between sites via re-creation; e.g. through heathland and dune re-creation projects.</i> Progress in the Weald, Merseyside and Dorset though the potential has not been realised. Notably there is considerable scope in Forestry Commission land in Dorset. Very limited and localised progress on heath re-creation on former farm land, etc., often with minimal targets (e.g. target for East Dorset District Council is only 1 ha over 10 years)					



**Table B: Proposed actions (Copiable table)**

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

<b>Published action/organisation(s) responsible</b> (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)	5.1.1 Encourage the development and uptake of management schemes and incentive payments for heathland management and restoration in southern England and ensure that these include provision to assist sand lizard conservation. <i>While these schemes are predominantly in southern England such mechanisms may also be appropriate elsewhere. Prepare specific provisions for sand lizard conservation for inclusion in such schemes</i>	
<b>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible</b> (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)	Promote schemes such as Countryside Stewardship (MAFF) and Reserves Enhancement Scheme and Wildlife Enhancement Scheme (EN) to encourage habitat management Develop Tomorrow's Heathland Heritage (HLF) and <i>LIFE</i> (EU/DETR) projects for heaths and specifically for sand lizard interests in Dorset and New Forest. <i>LIFE</i> funded project in Merseyside has been valuable to sand lizards. Identify and cost specific conservation management measures for sand lizards Integrate measures for the species within habitat management schemes Prepare and cost specific prescriptions for sand lizards that can be incorporated in habitat management schemes Incorporate them into habitat management schemes	
<b>Action/workplan undertaken?</b> (Please state yes or no.)	Yes: schemes being implemented but often without incorporating specific measures for sand lizards	
<b>Description of work taken and organisation responsible</b>	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	WES & RES schemes developed by EN and being implemented CS schemes developed by MAFF and being implemented THH bid being developed <i>LIFE</i> project undertaken in Merseyside, in progress in New Forest and being developed for Dorset	Action by MAFF and EN HCT and EN
<b>Constraints to action</b> (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.)	Inclusion of specific measures for species not given highest priority Resources available for including complexity in management prescriptions Long time scale for THH bid for Dorset <i>LIFE</i> bid for Dorset delayed Need for greater consultation with herpetologists	
<b>Action complete or ongoing?</b> (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)	On-going	
<b>Next steps</b>	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Prepare and cost specific prescriptions for sand lizards that can be incorporated in habitat management schemes Incorporate them into habitat management schemes	Action by HCT and EN

<b>Published action/organisation(s) responsible</b> <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.1.2 Consider the removal of limited areas of woodland on former heathland to allow linkages of fragmented heathland populations and expand populations within forests	
<b>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible</b> <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	Forestry Commission heathland restoration plan (FC) General consideration of mechanisms to facilitate large scale removal of plantations (e.g. via land swaps) Consideration in planning documents and strategic plans, e.g. Structure Plans, Minerals Plans, Forest Design Plans for potential for habitat re-creation	
<b>Action/workplan undertaken?</b> <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	Yes: some management work undertaken	
<b>Description of work taken and organisation responsible</b>	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Re-creation of heathland in Forestry Commission land Creation of further links between sand lizard populations Discussions over policy on-going and links to national forestry strategy considered	Action by FA and FE.
<b>Constraints to action</b> <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>	Need for felling licences and for compensatory planting (see next bullet point) Forestry Strategy in England sets high target for increase in forest area. Removal of trees for heathland clearance is seen as working against this target. This leads to potential difficulties regarding felling licences and requirements for compensatory planting of trees. No mechanism to secure large areas of heath re-creation, e.g. Funding; future work may be prejudiced in Dorset if THH funding not available	
<b>Action complete or ongoing?</b> <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	On-going	
<b>Next steps</b>	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Further consultation on objectives and potential for sand lizard conservation Re-creation of further heathland in Forestry Commission land in Dorset, Surrey, Hampshire, Berkshire and Sussex Creation of further links between sand lizard populations	Action by FA and FE.

<b>Published action/organisation(s) responsible</b> <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.1.3 Seek to ensure that dune management policies are consistent with sand lizard needs in occupied areas	
<b>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible</b> <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	No agreed plan: actions being undertaken by individual authorities with advice from other bodies. Development of draft SAC document for Merseyside dunes included measures for sand lizards Specific management plans being developed elsewhere to promote sand lizard conservation needs	
<b>Action/workplan undertaken?</b> <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	Yes	
<b>Description of work taken and organisation responsible</b>	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Development of specific plans and policies to integrate sand lizard conservation needs within management plans for dunes e.g. Studland and Sefton Coast	<i>Action by LAs, NT, EN, MoD</i>
<b>Constraints to action</b> <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>	Resources Need to take on board sand lizard conservation needs alongside other habitat, etc, requirements	
<b>Action complete or ongoing?</b> <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	On-going	
<b>Next steps</b>	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Review progress Identify shortfalls Address shortfalls Involvement of herpetologists in appropriate habitat / site management groups	<i>Action by LAs, NT, EN, MoD, HCT</i>

<b>Published action/organisation(s) responsible</b> (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)	5.1.4 Review Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 and Habitats Regulations 1994 to ensure they provide adequate protection for and means of conserving sand lizards and provision for enforcement to allow these to be effective	
<b>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible</b> (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)	<p>Need to:          comply fully with EC Directive          include powers of access          ensure positive management          increase police powers          allow survey over whole range of species          control release of non-native, invasive plant species (e.g. <i>Gaultheria</i>)</p> <p>No specific work plan: review of legislation underway by DETR/ JNCC and other statutory agencies and by NGOs</p> <p>Review of effectiveness and constraints of the legislation / listing (JNCC/ PAW/ Wildlife &amp; Countryside LINK)          Recommendations for change to legislation proposed (PAW/ W&amp;C Link)          Proposals to DETR for consideration</p>	
<b>Action/workplan undertaken?</b> (Please state yes or no.)	Yes	
<b>Description of work taken and organisation responsible</b>	Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Review of effectiveness and constraints of legislation produced via JNCC / W&C Link contract Recommendations made by PAW on necessary changes	Action by DETR, police/PAW
<b>Constraints to action</b> (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>Focus on achieving necessary changes to 'site protection' detracts from needs specifically for species protection          Slow progress by JNCC          Lack of clarity about political will for such changes          Need to comply with, and need to interpret, EU legislation</p>	
<b>Action complete or ongoing?</b> (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)	On-going	
<b>Next steps</b>	Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Consult widely on proposals Offer proposals for consideration by Government	Action by DETR / JNCC

<b>Published action/organisation(s) responsible</b> (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)	5.1.5 Review and amend planning guidance (eg. PPG 9 in England), practice and policies to reflect the importance of the planning process in achieving BAP targets and fully implement the EC Habitats Directive	
<b>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible</b> (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)	Review mechanisms by which species are protected through planning guidance and relate these to national / European legislative requirements Develop framework for conservation of reptiles through the planning process Prepare leaflet on reptiles and development Identify policy needs Identify and make changes to planning guidance and procedure	
<b>Action/workplan undertaken?</b> (Please state yes or no.)	Yes	
<b>Description of work taken and organisation responsible</b>	Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Draft guidance for planning authorities and developers Identification of possible conservation policies and procedure to link planning to BAP and to take account of needs of protected species	Action by DETR, LAs, EN, ALGE, HCT/ Froglife/ HGBI to advise.
<b>Constraints to action</b> (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.)	Resources in statutory and Governmental bodies Difficulty in making changes to planning process Need to raise priority of these actions	
<b>Action complete or ongoing?</b> (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)	On-going; though progress limited. Draft texts of framework and of leaflet prepared.	
<b>Next steps</b>	Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Identify protocols for dealing with planning casework where it affects reptiles Identify policy needs and make proposals for consideration by DETR and Government Guidance for planning authorities and developers Firmer conservation policies and procedure to link planning to BAP and to take account of needs of protected species	Action by DETR, LAs, EN, ALGE, HCT/ Froglife/ HGBI to advise

<b>Published action/organisation(s) responsible</b> <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.2.1 Review SSSI coverage of sand lizard sites in Wales <i>and England</i> and seek to ensure all significant populations are designated.	
<b>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible</b> <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	Agreed action relates only to Wales; need also to include England Map species occurrence data against SSSI boundaries Assess level of protection afforded to the species through this mechanism Site boundaries and SSSI need for sand lizards to be assessed by statutory agencies against framework of overall objectives for the SSSI series for this species Ensure consideration of sand lizards in reviews of SSSIs selected against habitat guidelines / objectives Review outstanding needs	
<b>Action/workplan undertaken?</b> <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	Yes	
<b>Description of work taken and organisation responsible</b>	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Additional SSSIs identified and notified in Dorset. Additional SSSI identified in Surrey Additional SSSI identified in Merseyside and other sites to be reviewed soon	Action by CCW and EN
<b>Constraints to action</b> <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>	Need to maintain a finite series of SSSIs Review of SSSI criteria / guidelines for the species not planned Comprehensive data sets not easily available for study Resources	
<b>Action complete or ongoing?</b> <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	Started	
<b>Next steps</b>	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Other sites in Merseyside to be reviewed soon Review of SSSI boundaries and occurrence of sand lizard populations Assess SSSI objectives and determine outstanding needs	Action by CCW and EN and HCT

<b>Published action/organisation(s) responsible</b> <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.2.2 Identify all sites with sand lizards to LAs for identification in Development Plans. <i>Address need to provide SINC protection for sand lizard populations.</i>	
<b>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible</b> <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	Develop data management system that allows collection, collation, exchange and interpretation of data Develop system for passing data to LAs taking due account of sensitivity of data Identify lists of 'key sites' for herpetofauna Identify criteria for classifying sites as SINC Identify sites and designate them as SINC	
<b>Action/workplan undertaken?</b> <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	Yes – but limited	
<b>Description of work taken and organisation responsible</b>	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Data management system developed Input to specific development plans undertaken by NGO and statutory bodies Data management systems developed in some areas (e.g. Merseyside)	<i>Action by:</i> CCW, EN, LAs, and HCT/ARGs and WTs
<b>Constraints to action</b> <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>	Availability of data and need for a database system to record and store information and need for systems to allow sensitive areas to be identified Difficulties regarding data ownership, copyright and confidentiality Difficulties obtaining good and comprehensive data (lack of suitably competent surveyors) Funding and resources to develop systems and undertake survey SINC criteria not being developed; tend to be based on botanic/habitat criteria. Hard to obtain data that allow comparison of 'quality' of herpetofauna sites Consultation between appropriate statutory and non-statutory bodies to ensure appropriate sites are identified and designated Need to develop liaison between Wildlife Trusts and herpetological organisations and collection and exchange of herpetological data	
<b>Action complete or ongoing?</b> <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	On-going	
<b>Next steps</b>	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Develop data management systems providing information to LAs Develop system for passing data to LAs taking due account of sensitivity of data Identify criteria for classifying sites as SINC; identify sites as SINC for the species	<i>Action by</i> HCT/WTs/ Froglife/ ARGs and EN.

<b>Published action/organisation(s) responsible</b> (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)	5.2.2a <i>Develop standard guidance and protocols to ensure consistent high quality advise and clear working practices in reptile casework (to inform developers, consultants and LAs)</i>	
<b>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible</b> (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)	Review mechanisms by which species are protected through planning guidance and relate these to national / European legislative requirements Develop framework for conservation of reptiles through the planning process and identify organisations who are responsible for actions Prepare leaflet on reptiles and development	
<b>Action/workplan undertaken?</b> (Please state yes or no.)	Yes	
<b>Description of work taken and organisation responsible</b>	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Draft framework for herpetofauna casework produced by EN Draft text for reptiles and development leaflet in preparation Protocols being developed for work on great crested newts that should assist our understanding of work needed for reptiles Guideline produced by Herpetofauna Groups of Britain and Ireland (HGBI) to address mitigation standards for reptile and amphibian species	Action by EN/HCT/ Froglife/ CCW
<b>Constraints to action</b> (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.)	Lack of resources in statutory agencies Lack of emphasis on species conservation meaning that this work does not achieve a high priority relative to conservation of designated sites.	
<b>Action complete or ongoing?</b> (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)	On-going	
<b>Next steps</b>	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Produce guidelines/ framework for action Achieve change in planning policy Produce leaflet on reptiles and development	Action by EN, CCW, SNH, HCT and Froglife/ HGBI, IEEM, Consultant, ALGE.

<b>Published action/organisation(s) responsible</b> (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)	5.2.3 Consider habitat re-creation on suitable heathland and dune vegetation to consolidate and expand the current range	
<b>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible</b> (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)	Identify suitable areas of former dune and heathland now lost, e.g. to agriculture, mineral extraction or forestry (e.g. via Dorset Heathland Re-creation Plan; dune restoration projects in Merseyside). Further develop funding schemes to encourage habitat re-creation Include potential for increasing the area of habitats in to site management plans and ensure liaison between herpetological specialists and land managers Re-creation of habitats	
<b>Action/workplan undertaken?</b> (Please state yes or no.)	Yes	
<b>Description of work taken and organisation responsible</b>	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Sand lizard habitats and potential habitats assessed for scope for extension / habitat re-creation Areas of suitable habitat identified in plans Areas of suitable habitat re-created Re-creation of heathland in Forestry sites	Action by CCW, EN, FA, FE, LAs, MAFF, MoD, other landowners HCT and WTs).
<b>Constraints to action</b> (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.)	Lack of resources in statutory agencies Lack of funding for work to re-create habitat away from existing habitats or designated sites. Where schemes are potentially available for re-creation (e.g. Countryside Stewardship) they might not be ideal or provide sufficient incentive Limited liaison with herpetological and conservation groups with an interest in sand lizard conservation on planning documents and strategic plans Selection of areas do not always provide maximum benefit for sand lizards Delay in finalising Heathland Re-creation Plan for Dorset	
<b>Action complete or ongoing?</b> (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)	On-going – but with limit gain at present	
<b>Next steps</b>	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Sand lizard habitats and potential habitats assessed for scope for extension / habitat re-creation Areas of suitable habitat identified in plans Areas of suitable habitat re-created Further develop schemes and incentives	Action by CCW, EN, FA, FE, LAs, MAFF, MoD, other landowners HCT and WTs).

<b>Published action/organisation(s) responsible</b> <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.3.1 Ensure sand lizard needs are catered for in programmes of cutting, burning or grazing management on sites supporting populations or likely to do so	
<b>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible</b> <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	Schemes, such as Countryside Stewardship (MAFF), Reserves Enhancement Scheme (RES) and Wildlife Enhancement Scheme (EN), need to be promoted to encourage habitat management Need to develop Tomorrow's Heathland Heritage (HLF) and <i>LIFE</i> (EU/DETR) projects for heaths and specifically for sand lizard interests in Dorset and New Forest. <i>LIFE</i> funded project in Merseyside valuable to sand lizards. Projects proposing burning, grazing or cutting should adopt a particularly cautious and sensitive approach in areas where reptiles are present Specific measures for sand lizards need to be identified and costed to ensure that positive gains can be made for the species and that harm to them is minimised. Particular attention needs to be paid to the fact that sand lizards are relatively immobile and that re-colonisation potential is limited. Measures for the species need to be integrated within such schemes including exclusion of important areas and reducing size/ timing/ locality of burns, etc.	
<b>Action/workplan undertaken?</b> <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	In part: increased awareness of reptile needs noted but not all schemes take on board sufficient measures to protect the species	
<b>Description of work taken and organisation responsible</b>	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	WES schemes developed by EN and being implemented CS schemes developed by MAFF and being implemented THH bid being developed <i>LIFE</i> project undertaken in Merseyside, underway in New Forest and being developed for Dorset Consideration is being given to increase the sensitivity of management in areas where burning and grazing are traditionally used (e.g. New Forest)	<i>Action by</i> CCW, EN, SNH, RSPB, LAs, NT, HCT
<b>Constraints to action</b> <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>	Inclusion of specific measures for species not given highest priority Lack of resources dedicated towards including the necessary complexity in to management prescriptions Long time scale for THH bid for Dorset <i>LIFE</i> bid for Dorset delayed Need for greater consultation with herpetologists Lack of herpetological expertise and resources to advise Balancing 'traditional' management aims with species conservation needs	
<b>Action complete or ongoing?</b> <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	On-going: though some significant projects have made little progress. Specific prescriptions for reptiles being developed and discussions with land managers 'on going'.	
<b>Next steps</b>	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Improve liaison between herpetological specialists, organisations developing schemes / management projects and land managers Prepare and cost specific prescriptions for sand lizards that can be incorporated in habitat management schemes incorporating cutting, burning and grazing Discuss and agree these measures	<i>Action by</i> CCW, EN, SNH, RSPB, LAs, NT, HCT.

<b>Published action/organisation(s) responsible</b> (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)	5.3.1a Develop local plans/SAPs/BAPs to set sand lizard conservation in a local context in all areas currently with the species and those where reintroduction would be appropriate	
<b>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible</b> (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)	Ensure Lead Partners are involved in local Biodiversity Action Plan groups / local habitat management groups / groups implementing Habitat Action Plans locally Ensure awareness of the conservation needs and priorities of this species Prepare Local / Regional Action Plans for the sand lizard and ensure inclusion in relevant habitat plans Provide assistance for implementation of local plans	
<b>Action/workplan undertaken?</b> (Please state yes or no.)	Yes	
<b>Description of work taken and organisation responsible</b>	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Production of Local / Regional Action Plans (e.g. . Sefton Coast & Wirral, Purbeck, SW England, Surrey, Berkshire, Cornwall) Local habitat action plans prepared (e.g. Hampshire) Local Plans started to be implemented (e.g. Sefton Coast & Wirral) Support provided to implementing local plans from HCT and EN.	Action by: LAs, EN, CCW, HCT, ARGs, WTs
<b>Constraints to action</b> (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.)	Failure to fully co-ordinate local and national action plans such that national targets and objective not always taken on board. Production of national plan out of synchronisation with production of local plans Local Agenda 21 committees under-funded and lack links to Biodiversity objectives / BAPs Inadequate funding for local level co-ordination (notably at County Council / equivalent level) Lack of integration of species needs in habitat plans Policy Guidance from Government does not adequately direct needs for implementing BAP at local and national level Lack of specific knowledge / consultation to integrate species actions in to local / Regional BAPs. Need to ensure areas with potential for sand lizard re-introduction, and not only extant populations, take the species into account in Local BAPs.	
<b>Action complete or ongoing?</b> (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)	Started	
<b>Next steps</b>	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Production of comprehensive set of Local / Regional Action Plans Ensure comprehensive coverage of species' needs in Local habitat action plans Local Plans implemented Further support provided to implementing local plans from HCT and EN and local 'ownership' of plans by competent organisations	Action by: LAs, EN, CCW, HCT, ARGs, WTs

<b>Published action/organisation(s) responsible</b> <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	<i>5.3.1b Prepare site management objectives for sand lizards and ensure that specific conservation measures for the species are included in all plans and management schemes for all designated sites (statutory and 'second tier' designations) and nature reserves with this species. These should consider the relevance of the site relative to adjacent populations, etc.</i>	
<b>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible</b> <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	Identify all sites for which sand lizard conservation is an objective Prepare site management briefs for appropriate sites looking at sand lizard conservation and monitoring needs where this is important in achieving the objectives for the species Integrate these 'briefs' in to site management plans Integrate sand lizard conservation objectives into the definition of Favourable Condition for assessing site condition Implement programme of site management including actions needed specifically for sand lizard conservation Undertake a programme of monitoring to ensure that the species is at a favourable status on the sites.	
<b>Action/workplan undertaken?</b> <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	Yes – only just started with minimal input at present	
<b>Description of work taken and organisation responsible</b>	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Limited number of site management briefs prepared for a number of sites, mostly during Species Recovery Programme (e.g. re-introduction sites) Sand lizards conservation needs at specific sites identified for inclusion in sites managed under habitat conservation schemes (e.g. WES) A draft text has been prepared that identifies sand lizard habitat requirements in Favourable Condition assessments for heathland sites Included sand lizard specific measures in some site management briefs being prepared by EN and CCW Discussed need for site management briefs in Sefton and Wirral and agreed approach Prepared draft brief for one site in Merseyside	<i>Action by  EN, CCW,  HCT, WTs,  LAs</i>
<b>Constraints to action</b> <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>	Lack of time and resources Shortage of liaison between land/ habitat managers and herpetological specialists Insufficient inclusion of species conservation needs when preparing site management briefs – often need for detailed knowledge, additional information and complexity in management Balancing 'conflicting needs' of management for different species and different habitats Need to disseminate expertise to ensure management prescription are implemented Many management plans already completed and in progress.	
<b>Action complete or ongoing?</b> <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	On-going	
<b>Next steps</b>	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	

<b>Output and timescale</b>	<p>Identify all sites for which sand lizard conservation is an objective</p> <p>Prepare site management briefs looking at sand lizard conservation and monitoring needs where necessary</p> <p>Integrate these 'briefs' in to site management plans</p> <p>Integrate sand lizard conservation objectives into the definition of Favourable Condition for assessing site condition</p> <p>Implement programme of site management including actions needed specifically for sand lizard conservation</p> <p>Design and undertake a programme of monitoring to ensure that the species is at a favourable status on the sites.</p>	<p><i>Action by</i>  <i>EN, CCW,</i>  <i>HCT, WTs,</i>  <i>LAs</i></p>
-----------------------------	---	--

<b>Published action/organisation(s) responsible</b> <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.3.2 Maintain all breeding populations at current levels and enhance where possible	
<b>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible</b> <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	Prepare management objectives and plans/briefs where necessary for all known sand lizard populations Assess status of all known sand lizard populations Agree/ ensure appropriate management will be undertaken to maintain and, where appropriate, enhance status of population Monitor populations to maintain information about status of species (probably based around assessment of habitat condition)	
<b>Action/workplan undertaken?</b> <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	Yes	
<b>Description of work taken and organisation responsible</b>	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Considerable work undertaken during sand lizard Species Recovery Programme On-going programme of management of habitats	<i>Action by CCW, EN and SNH and HCT to advise in advisory and funding role: action for all land owners and managers</i>
<b>Constraints to action</b> <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>	Lack of funding and resources Specific management not undertaken for sand lizards on sites being managed for their habitats. Need to enhance sand lizard habitats, etc, not specifically identified in management plans or habitat conservation plans and schemes Neglect of habitats – lack of legislation (or other mechanisms) to ensure appropriate management is undertaken Lack of information: sand lizard ‘management briefs’ not prepared for sites Need to ensure awareness of presence and of conservation needs of the species on all sites Need to prevent damaging activities, especially on sites that are not nature reserves Activities by third parties, notably arson, horse riding and mountain biking that damage sand lizard habitats and directly harm threaten animals: particular problems and resource constraints on urban sites Continuing threats from development both directly and indirectly (e.g. increased land use pressure), road schemes and mineral extraction Continuation of harmful activities for managing land, such as rabbit gassing , cutting, burning, landscaping	
<b>Action complete or ongoing?</b> <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	On-going	
<b>Next steps</b>	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	

<b>Output and timescale</b>	<p>Management objectives and where necessary plans/briefs for all known sand lizard populations prepared</p> <p>Status of all known sand lizard populations assessed</p> <p>Appropriate management needs agreed and undertaken to maintain and, where appropriate, enhance status of population</p> <p>Populations monitored to maintain information about status of species monitored</p>	<p><i>Action by CCW, EN and SNH and HCT to advise in advisory and funding role: action for all land owners and managers</i></p>
-----------------------------	--	---

<b>Published action/organisation(s) responsible</b> <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.3.3 Where feasible, and following identification of suitable sites, consider 10 translocations to re-establish the former range and distribution of the species in suitable habitats (for example coastal sand dunes) (Action: CCW, EN, HCT). This target includes Species Recovery Programme targets (already achieved). Excluding these, revised targets should be: identify a re-introduction rationale and list of proposed sites and areas by 2000. Initiate 3 translocations by 2010	
<b>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible</b> <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	Identify potentially suitable sites and maintain list of these Discuss and agree with land owners and appropriate authorities the benefits / appropriateness of a translocation Ensure appropriate management is being undertaken and will continue to be undertaken Ensure animals are available for re-introduction such that these will not compromise natural populations, e.g. via the maintenance of a captive breeding programme or collecting from sites where this is sustainable Devise a programme and undertake translocations Monitor	
<b>Action/workplan undertaken?</b> <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	Yes	
<b>Description of work taken and organisation responsible</b>	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	11 sites with sand lizards re-introduced by 1997 (target exceeded)	Action by HCT with CCW, EN, ARGs/WTs
<b>Constraints to action</b> <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>	Achieving agreement with landowners and appropriate authorities: this was not always forthcoming Difficulties with ensuring adequate numbers of animals for re-introduction; notably captive breeding efforts for Merseyside stock have not produced required numbers Ensuring sufficient flexibility with re-introduction programme to accommodate unexpected large numbers of animals from the captive breeding programme (Dorset stock) Insufficient forward planning	
<b>Action complete or ongoing?</b> <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	Complete – but target revised to aim for a more realistic ambition of achieving a nationally favourable status.	
<b>Next steps</b>	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Identify potentially suitable sites and maintain list of these Discuss and agree with land owners and appropriate authorities the benefits / appropriateness of a translocation Ensure appropriate management is being undertaken and will continue to be undertaken Ensure animals are available for re-introduction such that these will not compromise natural populations, e.g. via the maintenance of a captive breeding programme or collecting from sites where this is sustainable Devise a programme and undertake translocations Monitor	Action by HCT with CCW, EN, ARGs/WTs landowners LAs
<b>Published action/organisation(s) responsible</b> <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.3.4 Further develop and refine captive breeding programme following a review of its role and function.	

<b>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible</b> <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	Review actual and potential captive breeding facilities Identify co-ordinator and 'stud book' keeper Agree 'captive-loan' agreements to ensure project is correctly co-ordinated and that there is no misunderstanding about ownership Ensure separate vivaria established for each of the different 'stocks' Undertake captive breeding Ensure close liaison between members of the captive breeding group	
<b>Action/workplan undertaken?</b> <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	Yes	
<b>Description of work taken and organisation responsible</b>	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Vivaria for the different stock established System for monitoring and recording captive breeding programme established Captive loan agreement prepared Coordinator for scheme appointed	<i>Action by Action: HCT, Zoos, EN, CCW</i>
<b>Constraints to action</b> <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>	Captive breeding success is variable Lack of animals available in captive breeding programme for Merseyside and Surrey races Obtaining permissions for collecting animals and insufficient forward planning Difficulty in co-ordinating captive breeding effort and need for release to the wild	
<b>Action complete or ongoing?</b> <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	On-going	
<b>Next steps</b>	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Further develop existing vivaria Assess need for, and if necessary develop, further vivaria Obtain additional animals for breeding Ensure co-ordination of production with need for release	<i>Action by HCT, Zoos, EN, CCW</i>

<b>Published action/organisation(s) responsible</b> <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.4.1 Ensure that relevant LAs and landowners and managers of sites containing sand lizards are aware of its needs, legal status and importance of conserving the species and that advice on its management is available	
<b>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible</b> <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	Develop data management system to allow easy exchange of information about sand lizard locations to appropriate authorities/ organisations Inform all land owners of the presence of the species Provide necessary information about legal status, conservation and management needs and in particular activities that could directly threaten the species.	
<b>Action/workplan undertaken?</b> <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	No	
<b>Description of work taken and organisation responsible</b>	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	No agreed plan of action; formal action not yet undertaken.  However some site owners have been informed of sand lizard interest by HCT or statutory bodies	<i>Action by</i> CCW, EN, FA, SNH, LAs, HCT
<b>Constraints to action</b> <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 identified as part of Species Recovery Programme Need to ensure that Local Authorities are able and prepared to undertake this action; resource constraints may impede progress Local records management systems may not all be fully compatible with data systems operated by the appropriate sections in Local Authorities. Difficulties have been encountered with liaison between sections in Local Authorities. No clear Government Guidance to identify this as a requirement for local authorities to undertake Data management system that allows ease of transfer of information not established at a national level (though may be at local level, e.g. Merseyside)	
<b>Action complete or ongoing?</b> <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	Not started – though limited progress made on an <i>ad hoc</i> basis	
<b>Next steps</b>	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Develop data management system to allow easy exchange of information about sand lizard locations to appropriate authorities/ organisations Inform all land owners of the presence of the species Provide necessary information about legal status, conservation and management needs and in particular activities that could directly threaten the species.	<i>Action by</i> CCW, EN, FA, SNH, LAs, HCT, ARGs

<b>Published action/organisation(s) responsible</b> (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)	5.4.2 <i>Provide detailed information about the conservation and management needs of sand lizards through written advice and training, etc, so that the necessary management can be taken forward</i>	
<b>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible</b> (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)	Circulate copies of the published sand lizard conservation handbook (Moulton & Corbett 1999) produced during the Species Recovery Programme project to land owners, LAs and other appropriate bodies. Produce prescriptive advice on habitat management Identify training needs and develop courses, etc, as needed Manage sites to demonstrate best practice and to illustrate 'ideal habitat' for the species	
<b>Action/workplan undertaken?</b> (Please state yes or no.)	Yes	
<b>Description of work taken and organisation responsible</b>	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	No agreed plan of action; Training relating to herpetofauna species needs included in heathland training courses Copies of conservation handbook circulated on an informal basis to land owners	Action by EN, CCW with HCT/WWF
<b>Constraints to action</b> (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.)	Resources for providing training courses Need to agree detail of management amongst all conservation bodies Need for a wider level of competence amongst land managers for particular techniques and approaches appropriate to this species	
<b>Action complete or ongoing?</b> (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)	On-going	
<b>Next steps</b>	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Continue circulating handbook on ad-hoc basis Circulate handbook more systematically develop training courses including sites where best practice and 'ideal habitat' can be demonstrated	Action by EN, CCW with HCT/WWF

<b>Published action/organisation(s) responsible</b> (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)	5.5.1 Investigate and refine methods for permanently controlling and redressing habitat degradation by bracken and <i>Gaultheria</i> .	
<b>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible</b> (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)	Undertake field trials to assess success of current techniques Monitor success of use of herbicides and other methods over time Devise controlled experiment to take account of local variations in conditions and possibly strains of target species	
<b>Action/workplan undertaken?</b> (Please state yes or no.)	Yes	
<b>Description of work taken and organisation responsible</b>	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Field trials to review effective of <i>Gaultheria</i> control undertaken during Species Recovery Programme Long term monitoring of bracken control undertaken by HCT, EN (WES), RSPB and others Trials undertaken by other organisations e.g. ITE	Action by HCT, RSPB, LAs, EN
<b>Constraints to action</b> (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.)	Resources – long term, controlled studies required Geographic variation in need and in conditions Lack of liaison between researchers and field operators Need to develop techniques that are appropriate and sensitive to sand lizard habitats Need stronger legal position to ensure that species such as <i>Gaultheria</i> are controlled and to justify scientific study.	
<b>Action complete or ongoing?</b> (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)	On-going: little progress directly through sand lizard SAP. need to develop links with other projects	
<b>Next steps</b>	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Determine and document extent of and problems caused by <i>Gaultheria</i> and disseminate this information Increased liaison and exchange of information between research groups and field workers Further field trials / additional research Production of guidelines about effective methods of bracken and <i>Gaultheria</i> control Implementation of these methods	Action by CCW, EN, JNCC, MAFF and HCT: link to Heathland HAP project

<b>Published action/organisation(s) responsible</b> (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)	5.5.3 Encourage the regular monitoring of known populations, <i>devise monitoring objectives and devise a meaningful and repeatable method for assessing the status of these populations</i>	
<b>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible</b> (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)	Determine objectives for monitoring based on a national assessment of favourable status and on local conservation / site protection needs Determine a monitoring programme Co-ordinate efforts of field surveyors Develop data management systems and data exchange agreements	
<b>Action/workplan undertaken?</b> (Please state yes or no.)	Yes	
<b>Description of work taken and organisation responsible</b>	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Prepared draft monitoring programmes for Dorset and Sefton Coast & the Wirral Regular monitoring undertaken in all areas	Action by CCW, EN, JNCC, ARGs: co-ordinated by HCT).
<b>Constraints to action</b> (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.)	Lack of a national system for recording species data HCT database system currently not operational and consequently limited availability or ease of access to data that have been collected Need / desire to keep data confidential Difficulty in surveying sand lizards and especially in collecting data about status Lack of competent surveyors and shortage of time / resources within these; need for other organisations being involved other than specialist NGOs. Recording is limited to a short time period and is highly weather dependent No agreement over objectives for monitoring	
<b>Action complete or ongoing?</b> (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)	On-going	
<b>Next steps</b>	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Determine objectives for monitoring based on a national assessment of favourable status and on local conservation / site protection needs Determine a monitoring programme Co-ordinate efforts of field surveyors Develop data management systems and data exchange agreements	Action by CCW, EN, JNCC, ARGs: co-ordinated by HCT).

<b>Published action/organisation(s) responsible</b> (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)	5.5.5 Evaluate the impact of grazing management on sand lizards and identify appropriate protocols, if necessary.	
<b>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible</b> (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)	Develop and agree approach to studying impact of grazing on sand lizard establish field trials at appropriate and representative sites Monitor Review results Define protocols for grazing regimes at sites with sand lizards based on the outcome of the research	
<b>Action/workplan undertaken?</b> (Please state yes or no.)	Yes	
<b>Description of work taken and organisation responsible</b>	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Monitoring programme developed through National Lowland Heathland Programme but not implemented Site trial established at Hartland Moor NNR Field observations of habitat structure made at 3 sites with grazing	Action by EN, HCT
<b>Constraints to action</b> (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.)	Resources No agreed methods for research Differences of views as to management requirements and objectives Limited liaison between organisations involved Difficulty in undertaking research that can provide meaningful and conclusive results that will in turn benefit management	
<b>Action complete or ongoing?</b> (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)	On-going: but at an insufficient level to determine impacts	
<b>Next steps</b>	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Develop and agree approach to studying impact of grazing on sand lizard establish field trials at appropriate and representative sites Monitor Review results Define protocols for grazing regimes at sites with sand lizards based on the outcome of the research	Action by EN/Heath HAP SG

<b>Published action/organisation(s) responsible</b> (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)	6.1 Linkage to other HAPs, notably for Lowland Heathland and Coastal Sand Dunes but also for other habitats such as Maritime cliffs and slopes and Urban. Links must be made to projects that are monitoring habitats identified through the EC Directive to ensure inclusion of sand lizard needs in any assessment of Favourable Condition/FCS. (Action: EN/ HAP SGs)	
<b>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible</b> (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)	Identify appropriate HAPs Gain involvement with appropriate HAPs Ensure the integration of sand lizard conservation measures in the implementation of the HAPs	
<b>Action/workplan undertaken?</b> (Please state yes or no.)	Yes	
<b>Description of work taken and organisation responsible</b>	Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Project to match SAPs to HAPs undertaken HCT involvement with HAP	Action by EN, HAP SGs, HCT
<b>Constraints to action</b> (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.)	Time and resources Conflicting needs within Action Plans Complexity of implementation	
<b>Action complete or ongoing?</b> (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)	On-going: some progress	
<b>Next steps</b>	Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.	
<b>Output and timescale</b>	Gain involvement with appropriate HAPs Ensure the integration of sand lizard conservation measures in the implementation of the HAPs	Action by EN/ HAP SGS, HCT

**To: JNCC Biodiversity Information Service  
Gavin Measure, EN Biodiversity officer**

Date: 5 October 1999

*Amendments to Sand Lizard Species Action Plan reporting form*

Since submitting the sand lizard SAP reporting form I have spoken to Andrew Nicholson at EN's Dorset Team. He has identified some areas of the SAP reporting form that he has suggested need changing. Some points merely required clarification; on one point we do not agree.

I offer this as a note to attach to the amended plan which now incorporates the comments as identified below.

*Clarification*

- i. Pg. 2: section 4.3: delete bold text saying “**\*\*synopsis of status**” . Change made to report.
- ii. Pg. 8: Assessment of status: Field 4: Should not read ‘data are too few’ but rather ‘data do not allow’. Change made to report.
- iii. Pg. 8: Assessment of status Field 4: References to ‘urban issues’ and to ‘habitat neglect’ maybe unclear. Additional text to be added to clarify the issues. Change made to report.
- iv. Pg. 8: Assessment of status Field 4: Delete bold text saying ‘**reasons**’. Change made to report.
- v. Pg. 11: Section 4.3: typo. change ‘inout’ to ‘input’. Change made to report.

**Point of disagreement**

Andrew Nicholson from EN disagreed with the reference on page 8 in Field 5 in connection with habitat management schemes that said “***In some cases they may even be detrimental to the species’ needs.***” The HCT did not wish to remove this statement as it remains concerned that current and proposed practice do and have jeopardised the survival of sand lizard populations and have, at least in the short to medium term, resulted in damage to the features of the habitat required by sand lizards.

We have therefore italicised the text and marked it as the one point of disagreement.

This comment refers mostly to certain ‘sustainable’ management practices such as burning and grazing. The impacts on reptiles are inadequately researched (see action 5.5.5) but where these impact on important areas for sand lizards threats to the species, and therefore to the objectives of the Action Plan in the short to middle term, are real. Indeed such concerns lie at the root of the action in section 5.3.1.

Other practices that cause concern result from the way in which work is carried out. Insensitive approaches to tree removal, for example, can result in damage to important features that the HCT regard as vital for conservation of the species. Lack of follow-up management can also result in areas of former heathland reverting to swathes of bracken or, in some cases, birch or bramble. We also are at variance as to the nature of the end product – we feel the presence of scattered trees and shrubs in certain locations provide value both to mature heather and offer habitat features of value to reptiles.

The HCT appreciate EN's perspective. Certainly it is important to bring back positive management, and the move to tackle heathland degradation (which is a very significant problem for reptiles and heathland habitats) and we welcome the fact that significant steps have been taken to do this. We also agree that heathland will generally regenerate where heather has been disturbed and often (especially in former plantations) heather regeneration can even be improved through such disturbance. We agree that these management techniques can, and do, provide significant benefits for other components of the heathland system, including other rare species. We also appreciate the desire to implement management that potentially offers a sustainable solution and the equal desire to get the job done as quickly and as efficiently as possible. Therefore we share many of the ideals put forward by EN.

However we believe that insufficient attention is paid to detail or to attempting to incorporate due precautions or sensitivity to specific needs of some threatened species. This, we suggest, is not confined to sand lizard interests. Where there is potential for risks we would advocate a more precautionary approach. While we appreciate why such complications may be overlooked, we still believe that this is an area that needs to be addressed to prevent avoidable damage.

While we would not wish to over state these differences of opinion, and suggest that it is inappropriate to do so, the HCT is keen to schemes adopted that are encouraging more sensitivity and certainly wish to see a greater acceptance and support for proposals that we feel more fully take these ideas on board.

Note: This concern is different to the need to incorporate specific positive measures to benefit sand lizards in schemes (e.g. bare ground, etc), another area that we feel needs to be addressed to allow them to fully achieve their potential.

Tony Gent  
Director  
The Herpetological Conservation Trust.

cc: Andrew Nicholson, EN