

Potamogeton compressus (Grass-wrack Pondweed)

Full report outputted on the 01/08/2003 10:45:30

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	29	Occupied 10 km sq.		Partial or sample survey	Various, incl National Atlas and TPDB. Post 1980 only
E	24	Occupied 10 km sq.		Partial or sample survey	Various, incl National Atlas and TPDB. Post 1980 only
NI					

S	1	Occupied 10 km sq.		Partial or sample survey	Various, incl National Atlas and TPDB. Post 1980 only
	W	5	Occupied 10 km sq.	Partial or sample survey	

Information originally entered by Jonathan Briggs on Friday, January 10, 2003
 Information last changed by Jonathan Briggs on Monday, January 13, 2003

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 (slow ing)	Partial or sample survey	Various, inc Whild Assocaites 2002 Report to EN


E	Declining (slow ing) ▼	Partial or sample survey ▼	Various, inc Whild Assocaites 2002 Report to EN
NI			
S	Declining (slow ing) ▼	Partial or sample survey ▼	Various, inc Whild Assocaites 2002 Report to EN
W	Declining (slow ing) ▼	Partial or sample survey ▼	Various, inc Whild Assocaites 2002 Report to EN

Information originally entered by Jonathan Briggs on Friday, January 10, 2003
Information last changed by Jonathan Briggs on Monday, January 13, 2003

3. Status of knowledge

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

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

Status of knowledge:	Know ledge sufficient to make some impact, but more research needed. 
Notes:	<input type="text"/>


Information originally entered by Jonathan Briggs on Friday, January 10, 2003

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 the geographical range of grass-wrack pondweed in the UK.

Target start date:	<input type="text" value="1998"/>
Target end date:	<input type="text" value="ongoing"/>
Target units:	<input type="text" value="Sites/ Populations"/> 

Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
----------	--------	---------	----------	------------

UK	Some progress (behind schedule) ▼			Partial or sample survey ▼	Under consideration ▼
E	Some progress (behind schedule) ▼			Partial or sample survey ▼	Under consideration ▼
NI					
S	Some progress (behind schedule) ▼			Partial or sample survey ▼	Under active development ▼
W	Some progress (behind schedule) ▼			Partial or sample survey ▼	Under active development ▼

T2: Enhance the total population size of grass-wrack pondweed in the UK.

Target start date:

Target end date:

Target units:

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	No progress ▼				
E	No progress ▼				

NI	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
S	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
W	No progress	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

T3: Facilitate colonisation of new sites.

Target start date:

Target end date:

Target units:

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	No progress	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
E	No progress	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
NI	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
S	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

W	No progress					
----------	-------------	--	--	--	--	--

Information originally entered by Jonathan Briggs on Friday, January 10, 2003
Information last changed by Jonathan Briggs on Monday, January 13, 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 Eutrophication of its aquatic habitats.
- 2.2 Neglect and drying out of canals and ditches.
- 2.3 Increase in pleasure boat traffic and associated disturbance and pollution.

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"/>	1	Habitat loss / degradation - freshwater River engineering works
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Habitat loss / degradation - management practice Inappropriate ditch management
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Habitat loss / degradation - management practice Inappropriate water channel / river bank management
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Human disturbance Interference / displacement
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Human disturbance Other recreation / tourism
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Human disturbance Watersports / fishing
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Intrinsic Factors Restricted range
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Pollution - freshwater Agricultural (nutrient enrichment)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Pollution - land Agricultural (nutrient enrichment)

Information originally entered by Jonathan Briggs on Monday, January 13, 2003

Information last changed by Jonathan Briggs on Monday, January 13, 2003

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:

Communication | Best practice guidance - lack of

Country:

UK E NI S
 W

Solution:

Lead Partner/Steering Group can address this

Solution type:

Communication / publicity

Able to resolve:

Constraint 2:

Constraint keyword:

Research, survey and information | Autecology - poor know ledge

Country:

UK E NI S
 W

Solution:

University research needed - but needs funding

Solution type:

Research

Able to resolve:		<input type="checkbox"/>
Constraint 3:		
Constraint keyword:		Country:
Funding and incentives Species / habitat champion not found		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> W
Solution:		Solution type:
Funding needed, incentives needed - might be achieved w ith cahmpion - but this seems unlikely		
Able to resolve:		<input type="checkbox"/>

Information originally entered by Jonathan Briggs on Monday, January 13, 2003

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:

- Biological Records Centre
- Botanical Society of the British Isles
- British Waterways
- Countryside Council for Wales
- English Nature
- Environment Agency
- National Museum of Wales
- Plantlife
- Richard Lansdown
- Scottish Natural Heritage
- University of Hertfordshire
- University of Liverpool

University of Liverpool Botanic Garden (Ness)

University of Stirling

University of Wales, Cardiff

Information originally entered by Jonathan Briggs on Monday, January 13, 2003

Information last changed by Jonathan Briggs on Monday, January 13, 2003

8. Other Groups/Organisations

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

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

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:

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.)

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

Other (please specify):

Information originally entered by Jonathan Briggs on Monday, January 13, 2003

>

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:

Reviews of distribution in UK (EA funded study) show decline 'natural' rivers, and relatively high importance of canal populations

Country:

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Research, survey and information | Baseline survey - achieved or started

Success 2:

Description:

This is a fairly obscure plant, receiving little attention before the UKBAP - progress is slow so far, but the Steering Group's formation is a critical and significant step.

Country:

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Action plan process | Steering group established

Success 3:

Description:

Country:

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Information originally entered by Jonathan Briggs on Monday, January 13, 2003

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

Sign-off:

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

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

Contact point:	<input type="text"/>	email:	<input type="text"/>
Your name:	<input type="text"/>		
Date:	<input type="text"/>		