

Species and Habitat Action Plan Assessment Form

Field 1: Action Plan details

Species/Habitat Action Plan	Grass-wrack Pondweed (<i>Potamogeton compressus</i>)
Lead Partner/Agency	British Waterways (Lead Partner), English Nature (Contact Point)
Steering Group/Other organisations	Steering Group not formally constituted but may include all/some of the following: Biological Records Centre British Waterways BSBI Countryside Council for Wales English Nature Environment Agency JNCC Plantlife Richard Lansdown Scottish Natural Heritage University of Hertfordshire University of Liverpool University of Stirling
Work programme in existence?	No agreed work programme in existence.

Field 2: Objectives and targets overview

Number and text	UK	E	NI	S	W	Comments
4.1 Maintain the range and enhance the total population size of grass-wrack pondweed in the UK.	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	
4.2 Facilitate colonisation of new sites.	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	

Field 3: Proposed actions overview

Number and text	UK	E	NI	S	W	Action significant?	Action complete or ongoing? (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)
5.1 Policy and legislation							
5.1.1 Consider how relevant agri-environment schemes could benefit grass-wrack pondweed. (ACTION: MAFF, SOAEFD, WOAD)	✓	✓	x	✓	✓		Not started
5.1.2 Ensure that the requirements of this species are considered during the production of Local Environment Agency Plans and examine applicability of catchment management plans to Scotland. (ACTION: EA, SEPA, SNH)	x	✓	x	✓	✓		Ongoing
5.2 Site safeguard and management							
5.2.1 Consider the value of buffer strips and other measures alongside watercourses in reducing the impacts of nutrient enrichment and pollution on key populations of grass-wrack pondweed. These measures are likely to be most valuable in Broadland, where grass-wrack pondweed grows in drainage ditches that are highly vulnerable to eutrophication. (ACTION: Broads Authority, CCW, EA, EN, MAFF, SNH, SOAEFD, WOAD)	✓	✓	x	✓	✓		Ongoing

5.2.2 As far as possible, ensure that no further sites for grass-wrack pondweed are lost through water abstraction, land drainage or inappropriate watercourse management. (ACTION: EA, IDBs)	✓	✓	x	✓	✓		Ongoing
5.2.3 Devise and implement measures to restrict boat traffic speed in areas where grass-wrack pondweed occurs. Provide off-line refuges where appropriate. (ACTION: British Waterways, Broads Authority, EA)	✓	✓	x	x	✓		Ongoing
5.2.4 Ensure that the requirements of grass-wrack pondweed are considered during canal restoration work. (ACTION: British Waterways)	✓	✓	x	✓	✓		Ongoing
5.3 Species management and protection							
5.3.1 Assess the feasibility and desirability of re-establishing grass-wrack pondweed at suitable sites from which it has been lost. (ACTION: CCW, EN, JNCC, SNH)	✓	✓	x	✓	✓		Ongoing
5.4 Advisory							
5.4.1 Advise landowners and managers who manage waters containing grass-wrack pondweed of its presence, importance and appropriate management for its conservation. (ACTION: CCW, EA, EN, SEPA, SNH)	✓	✓	x	✓	✓		Ongoing
5.4.2 As far as possible, ensure that all agri-environment project officers and members of appropriate liaison groups and partner organisations are advised of the locations of this species, its importance and appropriate management for its conservation. (ACTION: CCW, EN, MAFF, SNH, SOAEFD, WOAD)	✓	✓	x	✓	✓		Not started
5.5 Future research and monitoring							
5.5.1 Collate information, and resurvey sites where necessary, to determine the current distribution and status of grass-wrack pondweed in Britain. (ACTION: CCW, EN, JNCC, SNH)	✓	✓	x	✓	✓		Ongoing
5.5.2 Undertake detailed ecological recording at selected viable sites with a view to improving understanding of the requirements of grass-wrack pondweed and refining techniques for its conservation. (ACTION: JNCC)	✓	✓	x	✓	✓		Ongoing
5.5.3 Where possible, undertake monitoring to determine the effectiveness of the relevant agri-environment schemes in improving water quality and in assisting with the conservation of threatened aquatic plants such as grass-wrack pondweed. Use the results to aid the review process of various schemes. (ACTION: EA, JNCC, MAFF, SOAEFD, WOAD)	✓	✓	x	✓	✓		Not started
5.5.4 Investigate the impact of boat traffic speed on grass-wrack pondweed populations. (ACTION: British Waterways, Broads Authority, EA)	✓	✓	x	✓	✓		Not started
5.6 Communication and publicity							
5.6.1 Raise awareness amongst boating groups of the presence and importance of grass-wrack pondweed. (ACTION: CCW, EN, SNH)	✓	✓	x	✓	✓		Not started

Field 4: Assessment of status

	Not appropriate	Recovered	Signs of recovery	No change	Declining	Lost	Insufficient information
UK					✓		
England					✓		
Northern Ireland	✓						
Scotland						✓	
Wales					✓		

England: populations in canals are declining in some places, especially where restoration and re-navigation has been unsympathetic, but in other places have survived restoration as a result of successful amelioration procedures. However, the “wild” populations in rivers and other natural habitats appear have crashed almost to extinction.

Northern Ireland: *Potamogeton compressus* is not known to occur in Northern Ireland.

Scotland: there were once several sites for *P. compressus* in Angus, which apparently died out by about 1950. Another population was discovered at Loch of Aboyne in 1978, but that also appears to have died out by 1994.

Wales: the only site in Wales for *P. compressus* is the Montgomery Canal. It has declined in parts of the main canal during the last ten years, the decline being associated with restoration followed by increasing re-navigation. It appeared to survive better in the restored sections before boating levels increased. It has been lost from the Guilsfield Arm through overgrowth and drying out. Semi-restoration with limited boat traffic would appear to enable its survival.

Field 5: Summary statement

The Steering Group has not yet met, so progress with implementing the Plan is not well co-ordinated, but several organisations are independently undertaking some of its actions. Current research indicates that *Potamogeton compressus* is already extinct in Scotland and has rapidly declined at its last few semi-natural sites in England (possibly just half a dozen sites or fewer). The canal populations are mainly in un-navigable or lightly-boated canals. Restoration of these canals, followed by increasingly high levels of boating activity has led to the loss of the species on some lengths. The species can survive well on other lengths, even with boats and there are surviving populations on the Montgomery and the Ashton Canal in Manchester. Further survey work and ecological study is urgently required, but an interim assessment of its status would indicate that this species is at risk in all known sites and could be seriously endangered in Britain.

Field 6: Signing off

Contact details	Lead Partner	Contact Point
Name	Jonathan Briggs	Chris Walker
Organisation	British Waterways	English Nature
Assessment date (dd/mm/yy)	29 th October 1999	28 th October 1999

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

Objective/target	4.1 Maintain the range and enhance the total population size of grass-wrack pondweed in the UK.				
Country	Not appropriate	Target achieved	Some progress	No progress	Insufficient information
<i>UK</i>			✓		
<i>England</i>			✓		
<i>Northern Ireland</i>	✓				
<i>Scotland</i>				✓	
<i>Wales</i>			✓		
<p>England: some progress has been made on design of canals to conserve this species after restoration and renewed boat traffic. There is now greater awareness of the need for protection, but this has not so far resulted in preventing the rate of decline. Management of sites such as Aqualate Mere and ditches in the Norfolk Broads is designed to conserve or restore populations, but so far with little success.</p> <p>Northern Ireland: not applicable, as <i>P. compressus</i> does not occur there.</p> <p>Scotland: no work has been undertaken, and the species is believed to have been lost entirely, although definitive survey work may be lacking.</p> <p>Wales: some progress has been made on restoration design and phasing to minimise disturbance in canals. However the issue of increased boating, is the greater threat and so far there is firm agreement on how to deal with this. The offline reserve approach has worked on some sites but can only be regarded as an insurance measure. More progress on conservation of the Montgomery Canal populations is urgently required..</p>					

Table A: Action Plan objectives and targets

Objective/target	4.2 Facilitate colonisation of new sites.				
Country	Not appropriate	Target achieved	Some progress	No progress	Insufficient information
<i>UK</i>				✓	
<i>England</i>			✓		
<i>Northern Ireland</i>	✓				
<i>Scotland</i>				✓	
<i>Wales</i>				✓	
<p>England: The species was introduced to some of the offline reserves along the Montgomery Canal in the 1980s, and it survived for a few years, but is now absent from the reserves in England. The limited success may be due to succession – the main English reserve (Rednal Basin) became overgrown in the mid 1990s and has only recently been opened up. The species has not been re-introduced to this site, or the other reserves in England. The species does survive well in offline areas on other canals in England, notably the Ashton Canal in Manchester.</p> <p>Northern Ireland: as it is not a native species, no action is recommended.</p> <p>Scotland: no known action has been undertaken.</p> <p>Wales: The species was introduced to some of the offline reserves along the Montgomery Canal in the 1980s, and it has survived at a few sites, including the man-made channels at Wern Claypit. It also thrives in the reserve at Whitehouse. The limited success at other reserves may be due to succession as many sites became overgrown in the mid 1990s.</p>					

Table B: Proposed actions

Published action/organisation(s) responsible	5.1.1 Consider how relevant agri-environment schemes could benefit grass-wrack pondweed. (ACTION: MAFF, SOAEFD, WOAD)	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	No work plan.	
Action/workplan undertaken? <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	No.	
Description of work taken and organisation responsible	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
Output and timescale		Action by
Constraints to action <i>(Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</i>		
Action complete or ongoing? <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	Not started.	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
Output and timescale	Agri-environment schemes may be of use in helping to restore sites such as Aqualate Mere, and possibly Blakedown pools. Management plans to be prepared by EN for Aqualate, at least, by 2001.	Action by EN

Table B: Proposed actions

Published action/organisation(s) responsible	5.1.2 Ensure that the requirements of this species are considered during the production of Local Environment Agency Plans and examine applicability of catchment management plans to Scotland. (ACTION: EA, SEPA, SNH)	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	No work plan.	
Action/workplan undertaken? <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	Yes	
Description of work taken and organisation responsible	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
Output and timescale	The Environment Agency (Midlands Region) has conducted research into the distribution of <i>P. compressus</i> . This has resulted in site-specific survey work and targeted restoration (e.g. in Burton-on-Trent) but so far without success.	Action by EA
Constraints to action <i>(Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</i>		
Action complete or ongoing? <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	Ongoing	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
Output and timescale	Future work may be dependent on the Steering Group persuading the Environment Agency to address the issue of the conservation of <i>P. compressus</i> , by identifying the sites and management conditions required.	Action by All

Table B: Proposed actions

Published action/organisation(s) responsible	5.2.1 Consider the value of buffer strips and other measures alongside watercourses in reducing the impacts of nutrient enrichment and pollution on key populations of grass-wrack pondweed. These measures are likely to be most valuable in Broadland, where grass-wrack pondweed grows in drainage ditches that are highly vulnerable to eutrophication. (ACTION: Broads Authority, CCW, EA, EN, MAFF, SNH, SOAEFD, WOAD)	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	No work plan.	
Action/workplan undertaken? <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	Yes	
Description of work taken and organisation responsible	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
Output and timescale	Sites in the Broads are actively managed – e.g. by clearing drains – to facilitate conservation, but apparently with little success in recent years. Buffer strips are also among the recommendations being made for management of the NW Midlands Meres, but so far without implementation.	<i>Action by</i>
Constraints to action <i>(Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</i>	The very limited number of sites where <i>P. compressus</i> still occurs, and its transient nature in some of those sites. Successful management of catchments might have to be a very large-scale programme, involving the restoration of natural hydrological systems over very large areas. Riparian owners need to fully co-operate in any successful scheme	
Action complete or ongoing? <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	Ongoing.	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
Output and timescale	Involve other members of the Steering Group in preliminary discussions of this issue. So far only EN and – to a small degree the EA have taken any action. BW are developing an interest in eutrophication and buffer strips alongside canals, including the Montgomery.	<i>Action by</i> All

Table B: Proposed actions

Published action/organisation(s) responsible	5.2.2 As far as possible, ensure that no further sites for grass-wrack pondweed are lost through water abstraction, land drainage or inappropriate watercourse management. (ACTION: EA, IDBs)	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	No work plan.	
Action/workplan undertaken? <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	Yes	
Description of work taken and organisation responsible	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
Output and timescale	British Waterways has endeavoured to conserve <i>P. compressus</i> , in canals but has had limited success on some sites...	Action by
Constraints to action <i>(Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</i>	The Environment Agency has not yet addressed the issue of <i>P. compressus</i> conservation through catchment-level management plans.	
Action complete or ongoing? <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	Ongoing	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
Output and timescale	Identify all current sites – EN, EA, BW (2000) Identify organisations with primary responsibility for managing those sites (steering group) Produce and implement appropriate management plans (as appropriate)	Action by 2001

Table B: Proposed actions

Published action/organisation(s) responsible	5.2.3 Devise and implement measures to restrict boat traffic speed in areas where grass-wrack pondweed occurs. Provide off-line refuges where appropriate. (ACTION: British Waterways, Broads Authority, EA)	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	No work plan.	
Action/workplan undertaken? <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	Yes	
Description of work taken and organisation responsible	BW has constructed a number of off-line reserves along the Montgomery Canal, with limited success..	
Output and timescale		<i>Action by</i>
Constraints to action <i>(Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</i>	Reserves can only be constructed when restoration is taking place and only with funding, sufficient forward planning and awareness from all partners involved in the restoration. This situation is often difficult to achieve, particularly with local authority and canal society partners.	
Action complete or ongoing? <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	Ongoing	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
Output and timescale	Draw attention to conservation issues facing British Waterways (all steering group members, 2000) Review the success of existing off-line reserves (BW, EA, 2000) Review the Montgomery canal restoration proposals (BW, EN, CCW, 2000)	<i>Action by</i>

Table B: Proposed actions

Published action/organisation(s) responsible	5.2.4 Ensure that the requirements of grass-wrack pondweed are considered during canal restoration work. (ACTION: British Waterways)	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	No work plan.	
Action/workplan undertaken? <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	Yes	
Description of work taken and organisation responsible	BW surveys help ensure that sites with <i>Potamogeton compressus</i> are identified prior to restoration. Options to conserve the species at these sites are being reviewed.	
Output and timescale	Ongoing	<i>Action by</i>
Constraints to action <i>(Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</i>	The financial cost of creating off-line reserves of the type required to achieve success. The capital costs can often be met by partnership funding (but see constraints in 5.2.3) but maintenance costs are more difficult. The unsuccessful reserves on the Montgomery may owe their failure to lack of maintenance commitments.	
Action complete or ongoing?	Ongoing	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
Output and timescale	Reassess the distribution and status of <i>P. compressus</i> throughout the canal system (BW, EN, 2000) Identify priority sites (steering group, 2000) Review canal restoration proposals for priority sites (steering group, BW, 2000)	<i>Action by</i>

Table B: Proposed actions

Published action/organisation(s) responsible	5.3.1 Assess the feasibility and desirability of re-establishing grass-wrack pondweed at suitable sites from which it has been lost. (ACTION: CCW, EN, JNCC, SNH)	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	No work plan.	
Action/workplan undertaken? <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	Yes	
Description of work taken and organisation responsible	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
Output and timescale	The Environment Agency has restored a section of watercourse in Burton-on-Trent with guidance for restoring <i>P. compressus</i> . English Nature has assessed the status of <i>P. compressus</i> in the Midlands Meres and is designing restoration plans. As part of the Montgomery Canal restoration BW will be attempting to restore populations in all the reserve areas including the Guilsfield Arm.	<i>Action by</i>
Constraints to action <i>(Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</i>	Limited understanding of the ecology of <i>P. compressus</i> . The large-scale changes that may be necessary to restore water quality require the co-operation and co-ordination of a large number of bodies.	
Action complete or ongoing?	Ongoing.	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
Output and timescale	The projects outlined above will continue, but no additional work is yet planned. The success or otherwise of the current projects should be reviewed by 2001 (EN, EA, CCW, BW).	<i>Action by</i>

Table B: Proposed actions

Published action/organisation(s) responsible	5.4.1 Advise landowners and managers who manage waters containing grass-wrack pondweed of its presence, importance and appropriate management for its conservation. (ACTION: CCW, EA, EN, SEPA, SNH)	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	No work plan.	
Action/workplan undertaken? <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	Yes	
Description of work taken and organisation responsible	BW have raised awareness of <i>Potamogeton compressus</i> in canal sites where it occurs. The Environment Agency has commissioned a report on its status in the Midlands, and made use of the results to alert site managers when it might be at risk. The BSBI collects distribution information and through its recorders has surveyed numerous sites and spoken to numerous landowners.	
Output and timescale		<i>Action by</i>
Constraints to action <i>(Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</i>	A first task of the steering committee will be to gather and disseminate information on the current status of this species.	
Action complete or ongoing?	Ongoing	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
Output and timescale	Steering Group meeting (2000)	<i>Action by</i> BW

Table B: Proposed actions

Published action/organisation(s) responsible	5.4.2 As far as possible, ensure that all agri-environment project officers and members of appropriate liaison groups and partner organisations are advised of the locations of this species, its importance and appropriate management for its conservation. (ACTION: CCW, EN, MAFF, SNH, SOAEFD, WOAD)	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	No work plan.	
Action/workplan undertaken?	No	
Description of work taken and organisation responsible	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
Output and timescale		Action by
Constraints to action <i>(Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</i>	Steering Group has not yet met.	
Action complete or ongoing? <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	Not started	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
Output and timescale	Steering Group meeting (2000)	Action by BW

Table B: Proposed actions

Published action/organisation(s) responsible	5.5.1 Collate information, and resurvey sites where necessary, to determine the current distribution and status of grass-wrack pondweed in Britain. (ACTION: CCW, EN, JNCC, SNH)	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	No work plan.	
Action/workplan undertaken?	Yes	
Description of work taken and organisation responsible	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
Output and timescale	<p>British Waterways has commissioned and completed surveys of the Montgomery Canal (1997/8), Grantham Canal (1998) and parts of the Ashton Canal (1999).</p> <p>The BSBI has publicised the issue and requested information from members (1999), with survey results from several canals and the pools at Blakedown.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has surveyed the river Trent in Burton-on-Trent.</p> <p>English Nature has conducted survey work in the Broads, the River Dove, and the Meres.</p> <p>JNCC has surveyed parts of the Grantham Canal.</p> <p>Biological Records Centre continues to compile information, and has surveyed sites in Scotland.</p>	<i>Action by</i>
Constraints to action <i>(Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</i>	<i>P. compressus</i> is difficult to identify and may be a quite mobile species. Repeated surveys by specialists may be necessary to ensure that sites are reliably surveyed. The BSBI is encouraging such work, but the process would be greatly facilitated by more organised survey work.	
Action complete or ongoing? <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	Ongoing	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
Output and timescale	Review existing information and resurvey all recent sites. (EN, BW, 2001).	<i>Action by</i>

Table B: Proposed actions

Published action/organisation(s) responsible	5.5.2 Undertake detailed ecological recording at selected viable sites with a view to improving understanding of the requirements of grass-wrack pondweed and refining techniques for its conservation. (ACTION: JNCC)	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	No work plan.	
Action/workplan undertaken? <i>(Please state yes or no.)</i>	Yes	
Description of work taken and organisation responsible	British Waterways has monitored <i>Potamogeton compressus</i> at sites on the Montgomery Canal since the mid-1980's and have plans to make this monitoring more comprehensive. English Nature has undertaken ecological studies in the Norfolk Broads.	
Output and timescale	Research reports by 2000, including a paper in <i>Watsonia</i> in 2000.	<i>Action by</i>
Constraints to action <i>(Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</i>		
Action complete or ongoing?	Ongoing	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
Output and timescale	Current research projects to continue, but no further ecological studies have yet been planned.	<i>Action by</i>

Table B: Proposed actions

Published action/organisation(s) responsible	5.5.3 Where possible, undertake monitoring to determine the effectiveness of the relevant agri-environment schemes in improving water quality and in assisting with the conservation of threatened aquatic plants such as grass-wrack pondweed. Use the results to aid the review process of various schemes. (ACTION: EA, JNCC, MAFF, SOAEFD, WOAD)	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	No work plan.	
Action/workplan undertaken?	No	
Description of work taken and organisation responsible	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
Output and timescale		Action by
Constraints to action <i>(Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</i>		
Action complete or ongoing?	Not started	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
Output and timescale	None planned.	Action by

Table B: Proposed actions

Published action/organisation(s) responsible	5.5.4 Investigate the impact of boat traffic speed on grass-wrack pondweed populations. (ACTION: British Waterways, Broads Authority, EA)	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	No work plan.	
Action/workplan undertaken?	No	
Description of work taken and organisation responsible	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
Output and timescale		<i>Action by</i>
Constraints to action <i>(Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</i>	The action wording is ambiguous – is the action really to investigate the impact of speed (which on canals is only 4 mph) or is it boat traffic itself (which can cause damaging turbidity and fragmentation at any speed)? The impact of boat traffic itself has been the subject of much research but this has not specifically targeted <i>P compressus</i> – but it has highlighted how sensitive aquatic macrophytes are intolerant of boats and <i>Pc</i> is likely to be one of these.	
Action complete or ongoing?	Not started	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
Output and timescale	Not yet planned.	<i>Action by</i>

Table B: Proposed actions

Published action/organisation(s) responsible	5.6.1 Raise awareness amongst boating groups of the presence and importance of grass-wrack pondweed. (ACTION: CCW, EN, SNH)	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	No work plan.	
Action/workplan undertaken?	Yes	
Description of work taken and organisation responsible	<i>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</i>	
Output and timescale	There has been much discussion and publicity relating to the Montgomery canal restoration.	Action by BW, EN, Shropshire Wildlife Trust
Constraints to action <i>(Please provide an explanation of the significant issues or difficulties encountered and how they have been or will be resolved. Any constraints which the steering group are unable to resolve should also be detailed.)</i>	Boating groups are often unsympathetic to the idea of limiting their activities – <i>P compressus</i> is not a particularly charismatic or visible species and so raising their awareness is not always fruitful...	
Action complete or ongoing?	Ongoing	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
Output and timescale	None currently planned.	Action by