

Najas flexilis (Slender Naiad)

Full report outputted on the 31/07/2003 11:15:39

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	35	Sites/ Populations ▼	2002	Partial or sample survey ▼	Wingfield (2002)
E		▼		▼	
NI		▼		▼	
S	35	Sites/ Populations ▼	2002	Partial or sample survey ▼	Wingfield (2002)
W		▼		▼	

Information originally entered by Martin Gaywood on Thursday, November 07, 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) ▼	Partial or sample survey ▼	Wingfield (2002), SNH in house surveys
E	Lost (pre BAP publication) ▼	Full survey ▼	ENEA/LDNPA surveys 1990s
NI	▼	▼	
S	Declining (continuing/accelerating) ▼	Partial or sample survey ▼	Wingfield (2002), SNH in house surveys
W	▼	▼	

Information originally entered by Martin Gaywood on Thursday, November 07, 2002
Information last changed by Martin Gaywood on Wednesday, December 11, 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 effectively deliver the plan targets. ▼

Notes:

Autecological study of slender naiad at Univ Glasgow funded by SNH, has just been completed.

Information originally entered by Martin Gaywood on Thursday, November 07, 2002
Information last changed by Martin Gaywood on Thursday, November 07, 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 remaining populations.

Target start date:

1995

Target end date:

Ongoing

Target units:

Sites/ Populations

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Some progress (on schedule) ▼	35	35	Partial or sample survey ▼	Under active development ▼
E	▼			▼	▼
NI	▼			▼	▼
S	Some progress (on schedule) ▼	35	35	Partial or sample survey ▼	Under active development ▼
W	▼			▼	▼

T2: If biologically feasible, restore the species to its former range, including to its known site in the Lake District by 2004

Target start date: 1999

Target end date: 2004

Target units: Sites/ Populations ▼

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Unknown ▼			▼	▼

E	No progress			Full survey	Under active development
NI					
S	Some progress (behind schedule)			Partial or sample survey	Under active development
W					

Information originally entered by Martin Gaywood on Thursday, November 07, 2002
Information last changed by JNCC on 03 April 2003

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 Restrictions on light penetration due to heavy weed growth and nutrient enrichment from sources such as sewage effluent and fertiliser run-off from fish farms.

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	Invasive/non-native species (directly affecting species) Competition
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Pollution - atmospheric Acid precipitation
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Pollution - freshwater Agricultural (nutrient enrichment)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Pollution - freshwater Industrial / commercial
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Pollution - freshwater Sediment
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Pollution - freshwater Sewage

Information originally entered by Martin Gaywood on Thursday, November 07, 2002
Information last changed by Martin Gaywood on Wednesday, December 11, 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:

Species and habitat management | Water quality decline

Country:

UK E NI S
 W

Solution:

Ensure high water quality controls are enforced at known Najas sites. Solutions are linked to the mesotrophic lake BAP and include: Review of consents (e.g. on Esthwaite), further capital investment, further improvements to wastewater treatment systems, incentives for changes in land management etc.

Solution type:

Able to resolve:

Constraint 2:

Constraint keyword:

Action plan process | Unrealistic timescale for targets

Country:

UK E NI S
 W

Solution:

This applies in particular to the English former range (further info to come....).

Solution type:

Able to resolve:

Constraint 3:

Constraint keyword:

Species and habitat management | Farming practice - causing problems

Country:

UK E NI S
 W

Solution:

Related to constraint 1. Agricultural use of Najas site catchments needs to be more carefully assessed and changed if necessary.

Solution type:

Able to resolve:

Information originally entered by Martin Gaywood on Thursday, November 07, 2002

Information last changed by Martin Gaywood on Wednesday, December 11, 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"/>	English Nature
<input type="checkbox"/>	Environment Agency
<input type="checkbox"/>	North West Water
<input type="checkbox"/>	Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew
<input type="checkbox"/>	Scottish Environment Protection Agency
<input type="checkbox"/>	Scottish Natural Heritage
<input type="checkbox"/>	University of Glasgow

Information originally entered by Martin Gaywood on Thursday, November 07, 2002
Information last changed by Martin Gaywood on Wednesday, December 11, 2002

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:

- Royal Botanic Gardens, Edinburgh
- Scottish Executive Environment and Rural Affairs Division
- Scottish Wildlife Trust
- Stirling Council

Information originally entered by Martin Gaywood on Thursday, November 07, 2002
Information last changed by Martin Gaywood on Wednesday, December 11, 2002

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 LBAP

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:

Slightly important

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 Martin Gaywood on Thursday, November 07, 2002
Information last changed by Martin Gaywood on Wednesday, December 11, 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:

There are now five cSACs for which naiad is a qualifying species.

Country:

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Policy, legislation and designation | Improved protection through site designation - international (SPA, SAC, RAMSAR)

Success 2:**Description:**

A detailed autecological study of the species has just been completed

Country:

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Research, survey and information | Autecology - improved know ledge

Success 3:**Description:****Country:**

Aw areness of slender naiad and conservation implications raised amongst personnel of relevant organisations.

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Communication | Raised aw areness / profile among general public

Information originally entered by Martin Gaywood on Thursday, November 07, 2002

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: SNH **email:** martin.gaywo

Your name: Martin

Date: 20 December