

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

Species/Habitat Action Plan	Great crested newt <i>Triturus cristatus</i>
Lead Partner/Agency	Froglife, Herpetological Conservation Trust [HCT], British Herpetological Society [BHS] (Lead Partners); English Nature (Contact Point)
Steering Group/Other organisations	<i>Steering group in existence? Please state yes or no. Please list the organisations represented.</i> Yes. Great crested newt Species Action Plan Steering Group [GCN SAP SG] members are: Froglife, HCT, BHS, EN, CCW, SNH, JNCC, EA, SEPA, The PondLife Project, The Wildlife Trusts, and Herpetofauna Groups of Britain and Ireland [HGBI]
Work programme in existence?	<i>Please state yes or no. If in existence, please use the agreed work programme to update Field 3 and Table B.</i> Yes, draft produced 1998, several revisions since. Circulated to all organisations listed in the Work Programme.

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
4.1 Work in the early 1980s documented a 2% decline in the number of ponds every five years. A more recent report suggests that 42% of great crested newt populations in the London area have been lost in 20 years. Assuming a 0.4-2% annual loss of ponds, and assuming 18,000 populations, then between 72-360 populations are being lost each year. A target of 100 re-colonisations will offset these losses. This represents new ponds required to offset losses due to neglect and should be in addition to preventing site loss through development.		X		X	X	4.1 has caused some confusion because it appears to be background to the targets set out in 4.2 and 4.3, rather than being a target itself. However, this refers to "ponds" while 4.2 is "populations" - this may need clarifying.
4.2 Where feasible, restore populations to 100 unoccupied sites each year for the next five years, creating new ponds and managing habitat where necessary.		X		X	X	We (GCN SAP SG) have interpreted this to mean 100 sites over E, S, W as a whole, disaggregated in proportion to site loss.
4.3 Maintain the range, distribution and viability of existing great crested newt populations.		X		X	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.)
5.1.1 Seek to ensure all ponds known to hold viable populations are identified in Local plans or Part II of unitary development plans, and that the protection and enhancement of the ponds is taken into account in accordance with paragraph 24 of DOE's Planning Policy Guidance note: PPG9. (ACTION: CCW, DETR, EN, LAs, SNH)		X		X	X	Yes	
5.1.2 Consider expanding incentives for pond creation and management on farmland under the Countryside Stewardship and agri-environment schemes.(ACTION: MAFF, SOAEFD, WOAD)		X		X	X	Yes	
5.1.3 Seek to create new pond protection measures to prevent deterioration and loss of great crested newt habitats. (ACTION: DETR, SOAEFD, WO)		X		X	X	Yes	
5.2.1 Seek to ensure that key sites for the great crested newt in Wales are safeguarded, considering SSSI notification where necessary to secure appropriate management. (ACTION: CCW)					X	Yes	
5.2.2 Promote favourable management on all key sites where this species is known to occur. (ACTION: CCW, EN, FA, FE, LAs, SNH)		X		X	X	Yes	
5.2.3 Seek to maintain the number and distribution of occupied sites through habitat restoration or creation of sufficient new sites near existing ones to compensate for local losses. (ACTION: CCW, EN, FA, FE, LAs, SNH)		X		X	X	Yes	
5.3.1 Encourage the natural dispersal of the species to new sites through habitat management and re-creation and, if necessary, consider establishing a translocation or re-introduction programme to restore populations to previously occupied or appropriate new sites. (ACTION: CCW, EN, SNH)		X		X	X	Yes	
5.4.1 Publish guidance for LAs, developers, land managers and others on legal obligations for the species, local management and, where appropriate, translocation techniques for the species. (ACTION: CCW, EN, JNCC, EA, SEPA, RDBs, SNH)		X		X	X	No	Ongoing
5.4.2 Promote training of professional and volunteer surveyors and those involved in the management and conservation of the great crested newt. (ACTION: CCW, EN, SNH)		X		X	X	No	Ongoing
5.5.1 Develop further survey methods, recording, updating and data retrieval systems and surveillance systems to monitor the changes in status and the means of disseminating information. (ACTION: BRC, JNCC)		X		X	X	No	Ongoing

5.5.2 Encourage further surveys to identify important breeding sites. (ACTION: BRC, CCW, EN, JNCC, SNH)		X		X	X	No	Ongoing
5.5.3 Support research on habitat requirements, habitat use, population dynamics and species genetics to determine the favourable conservation status and underpin management advice. (ACTION: JNCC)		X		X	X	No	Ongoing
5.5.4 Expand the National Recording Scheme to ensure regular monitoring of known and potential sites. (ACTION: BRC, JNCC)		X		X	X	No	Not started
5.5.5 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)		X		X	X	No	Ongoing
5.6.1 Further develop communications between statutory authorities and local conservation groups. (ACTION: CCW, EN, SNH)		X		X	X	No	Ongoing
5.6.2 Promote, through publicity and media opportunities, a wider and more sympathetic understanding of amphibian conservation. (ACTION: CCW, EN, SNH)		X		X	X	No	Ongoing

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	X						
Scotland					X		
Wales					X		
Brief text description justifying assessment of status: (~ no more than 100 words for each country/region)							
<p>England: Information on status is very patchy, as there is very little targeted monitoring. However, virtually all surveys undertaken during the course of the reporting period (1995-9) have indicated a decline in the number of occupied ponds, and/or a decline in status of populations, within the survey area concerned. This, combined with the general pattern of ongoing pond loss and neglect (plus fragmentation, etc), make it extremely unlikely that great crested newts are remaining stable or recovering across England. Population loss/decline probably exceeds (re-) colonisation. There may be some local exceptions, where schemes involving pond creation and favourable habitat management are undertaken.</p> <p>Scotland: Largely as for England, except the distribution of populations is considered better understood. A recent review and survey of most known historical sites indicated that there are around 90 occupied breeding ponds, concentrated in key lowland areas. This figure is a large decrease compared to former estimates for Scotland. Some previously reported populations could not be located due to vague information, but many are suspected or known to have been extirpated. Moreover, around one third of populations are based on a single(sometimes isolated) pond, meaning that their viability may be relatively low. Population loss/decline probably exceeds (re-) colonisation.</p> <p>Wales: Largely as for England. Known populations are concentrated in north-east Wales, especially Flintshire; a lower density of populations is present along the borders, south Wales and on Anglesey. Status is little understood due to a lack of widespread monitoring. However, the largest and most viable populations are likely to be those in areas of high pond density pastoral farmland and disused mineral extraction sites. As well as development pressure, these habitat types are threatened mainly by neglect and re-working/ landfill, respectively. Population loss/decline probably exceeds (re-) colonisation.</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.

The SAP has been implemented only in a piecemeal fashion since 1995. This is due to three main factors: (i) the widespread nature of the great crested newt, meaning that a large number of organisations need to be involved and co-ordinated; (ii) the format of the SAP is very much an outline, and needed a Work Programme (or implementation plan) to formulate detailed actions, guide implementation and to assign organisations to particular actions [this has now been done]; (iii) there have been few extra resources available for great crested newt conservation. It has taken a considerable, co-ordinated effort to get the Work Programme produced, and this will help implementation.

However, the target for the creation of new sites is not being met. Moreover, even this target is fairly modest and much more needs to be achieved to maintain great crested newts at a favourable status in Britain. However, a number of activities and projects have been progressing the SAP. The Froglife Common Species Project has provided a secretariat to a Steering Group, and this has enhanced implementation. A number of local survey and pond creation/restoration projects have progressed action on the ground in several areas, but coverage by these projects is relatively small. A range of publications dealing with great crested newt conservation issues have been produced recently, and training courses have been held for a range of SNCOs and NGOs. Note that these are not detailed in this report as they have not been deemed "significant" in the definition provided; however they are regarded as important precursors to action and should not be undervalued.

The key factors that are constraining action are (i) the lack of a targeted, well-resourced national recording and monitoring system; (ii) inadequate regulation of and incentives for farmland management; (iii) inadequate safeguards in forward planning and in development control for great crested newt sites; (iv) inadequate resources and co-ordination for proactive habitat creation and favourable management in general. In addition, monitoring the progress of implementation is very problematic.

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.

Contact details	Lead Partner	Contact Point
Name	Jim Foster, Tony Gent, Mary Swan	Brian Banks
Organisation	Froglife, HCT, BHS	English Nature
Assessment date (dd/mm/yy)	7 Oct 1999	7 Oct 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 (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.

Objective/target (For new or revised targets please provide the new paragraph number and target text.)	4.1 Work in the early 1980s documented a 2% decline in the number of ponds every five years. A more recent report suggests that 42% of great crested newt populations in the London area have been lost in 20 years. Assuming a 0.4-2% annual loss of ponds, and assuming 18,000 populations, then between 72-360 populations are being lost each year. A target of 100 re-colonisations will offset these losses. This represents new ponds required to offset losses due to neglect and should be in addition to preventing site loss through development.				
Country	Not appropriate	Target achieved	Some progress	No progress	Insufficient information
UK	X				
England	X				
Northern Ireland	X				
Scotland	X				
Wales	X				
Text description of target progress (separate for each country/region):					
NB: 4.1 is taken to be background to the targets given in 4.2 and 4.3, rather than a target in itself. Hence, no information is given here on achievement or disaggregation (therefore assume n/a)					
Objective/target (For new or revised targets please provide the new paragraph number and target text.)	4.2 Where feasible, restore populations to 100 unoccupied sites each year for the next five years, creating new ponds and managing habitat where necessary.				
Country	Not appropriate	Target achieved	Some progress	No progress	Insufficient information
UK	X				
England			X		
Northern Ireland	X				
Scotland			X		
Wales			X		
Text description of target progress (separate for each country/region):					
England: The Work Programme sets a minimum target of between 1 and 4 re-colonisations per county per year. It is thought unlikely that this target has been achieved in more than half of the English counties. However, with current resources and monitoring systems, it is impossible to give an accurate assessment of the number of new populations "created" by re-colonisations. In addition, it may take several years for newts to colonise newly restored or constructed habitat. Some progress has been made in that a number of pond creation and habitat management schemes have resulted in colonisation of previously unoccupied sites. The above comments disregard re-colonisations brought about through mitigation schemes, as these are considered to be part of the process of maintaining a no net loss of sites approach, rather than proactive re-colonisation.					
Scotland: Not achieved. Similar situation to England, except that there has been much less activity in terms of pond creation and management for great crested newts. Notable exceptions include the great crested newt metapopulation at Pitmedden Forest, near Cupar, which has expanded through pond creation, and Croy Hill, N Lanarkshire.					
Wales: Not achieved. Similar situation to England; some local pond creation schemes have assisted great crested newts but highly unlikely that the target of 1 to 4 new sites per county per year has been met.					

Objective/target (For new or revised targets please provide the new paragraph number and target text.)	4.3 Maintain the range, distribution and viability of existing great crested newt populations.				
Country	Not appropriate	Target achieved	Some progress	No progress	Insufficient information
UK	X				
England			X		
Northern Ireland	X				
Scotland			X		
Wales			X		
Text description of target progress (separate for each country/region):					
<p>England: Not achieved. As for 4.2, it is difficult to provide a quantitative assessment of how far this target has been achieved, due to the lack of a sufficient monitoring scheme. The range and broad distribution of great crested newt populations has not been diminished. However, a significant proportion (estimated 20-50%) of populations are dependent on ponds which are in a poor state of management (over-shading or silting up). Hence, the density of suitable ponds is probably too low to support viable metapopulations in many areas. The following factors also operate at many sites to reduce medium to long-term viability: fish introduction, loss of terrestrial habitat, fragmentation. Active management to maintain populations in a favourable status is only in place at a minority of sites.</p>					
<p>Scotland: Not achieved. Similar situation to England.</p>					
<p>Wales: Not achieved. Similar situation to England.</p>					

Table B: Proposed actions (Copiable table)

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

<p>Published action/organisation(s) responsible (For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</p>	<p>5.1.1 Seek to ensure all ponds known to hold viable populations are identified in Local plans or Part II of unitary development plans, and that the protection and enhancement of the ponds is taken into account in accordance with paragraph 24 of DETR's Planning Policy Guidance note: PPG9.</p>
--	--

<p>Work plan/organisation(s) responsible (Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</p>	<p>A. Assess means of advising LAs of presence of protected species, and for taking them into consideration in land use planning decisions</p> <p>B. Produce list of gcn sites by administrative area and forward to LAs</p> <p>C. Ensure all GCN sites are identified in Local Plans or Part II of UDPs</p> <p>D. Ensure that all LAs have sufficient access to information on great crested newt distribution within their area</p> <p>E. Distribute advice on pond protection and management to LAs</p> <p>F. Ensure that all LAs have policies covering protected species</p> <p>G. Ensure that all LAs are informed of the implications of great crested newt sites and considered at all stages of planning, in accordance with PPG 9 (England), Technical Advice Note 5 (Wales) and NPPG 14 (Scotland)</p> <p>H. Ensure that all LAs are informed of methods for assessing mitigation schemes; investigate training courses for planners</p> <p>I. Ensure that LAs publicise the provisions of Part I of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as stated in section 25</p> <p>J. Identify review of licensing function to assist conservation</p>	
<p>Action/workplan undertaken? (Please state yes or no.)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Description of work taken and organisation responsible</p>	<p>Please provide details of progress to date, including information about outputs, deadlines, which organisations and where action is being undertaken.</p>	
<p>Output and timescale</p>	<p>Progress is very much piecemeal for this action; although some LAs routinely seek info on newt sites, or are informed by ARGs/WTs/LRCs, there is no national push to ensure that all LAs identify great crested newt ponds in development plans. A Charter for LAs is being devised by Froglife to encourage site designation. Locally there is good liaison between SNCOs/ARGs/ WT and LAs, to ensure that the latter has info on management; eg some LA pond grant schemes now target great crested newt sites (eg Suffolk CC). However overall little seems to be done proactively by LAs to enhance great crested newt ponds.</p>	<p>Action by EN, CCW, SNH, LAs, Froglife, HGBI, HCT, ARGs, WTs</p>
<p>Constraints to action (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>	<p>Lack of sufficient national (and in some cases local) recording scheme. This is a major constraint to progress on many actions in this SAP, and is unlikely to be resolved entirely by the Steering Group.</p> <p>The lack of up to date records in many areas (even where there is a good local recording scheme) is a constraint.</p> <p>Need a national mechanism to encourage and train planners to identify sites on development plans. Also more encouragement to develop (stronger) policies that protect sites according to "pondscape" strategies.</p> <p>LA countryside staff require more resources and training to be able to enhance ponds.</p> <p>Lack of involvement from SNCOs in ensuring that LAs recognise great crested newt sites.</p>	
<p>Action complete or ongoing? (Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	
<p>Next steps</p>	<p>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</p>	

Output and timescale	Main priorities are for A, B and C above.	<i>Action by</i> CCW, EN, DETR, LAs, SNH, BRC, ARGs, HGBI, WTs, BHS, HCT
-----------------------------	---	--

Published action/organisation(s) responsible <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.1.2 Consider expanding incentives for pond creation and management on farmland under the Countryside Stewardship and agri-environment schemes.	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	<p>A. Review existing grant schemes for pond creation, restoration and management</p> <p>B. Consider expanding grant schemes where gaps exist, in consultation with NGOs and SNCOs</p> <p>C. Consider other areas for improving the management of farmland in terms of safeguarding and creating GREAT CRESTED NEWT habitat (including, if possible, reviewing the Common Agricultural Policy)</p>	
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	MAFF (through FRCA) has added 6m buffer zones to Countryside Stewardship options (1998). Froglife delivered a workshop to all English FWAG advisors on management of farmland for amphibians, concentrating on the great crested newt (August 1998). Pond Action and the Ponds Conservation Trust have approached MAFF to request revision of Countryside Stewardship pond grants (1999).	<i>Action by</i> FWAG, MAFF, Froglife, Pond Action
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>	There is not a sufficient national mechanism for addressing pond policy at the strategic level. Needs to be more consideration of the issue by DETR and MAFF. In addition, the recently published (1998) DETR Lowland Pond Survey estimated a low net rate of pond loss, but did not consider the smaller farmland ponds which are often used by great crested newts; this may contribute to a lack of urgency on the matter. The survey also showed that many of the new ponds are created for fish or ducks, and are therefore unsuitable for great crested newts. A fundamental problem is resources - this is a very expensive action and needs much resource input.	
Action complete or ongoing? <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	Ongoing (i.e. one sub-action is ongoing, but NB most of 5.1.2 is even yet to be started)	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
Output and timescale	Most of A, B and C above. In particular, more resources need to be directed towards pond creation and restoration for the agricultural sector, but this needs to be guided to ensure suitable conditions for great crested newts and best use of resources.	<i>Action by</i> MAFF, DETR, SOAEFD, WOAD

Published action/organisation(s) responsible <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.1.3 Seek to create new pond protection measures to prevent deterioration and loss of great crested newt habitats.	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	A. Review the effectiveness of existing protection measures and promote development of new measures B. Develop protocol for handling presumed breaches of legislation	
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	Pond Action have reviewed protection measures and made recommendations for the Lowland Pond Survey report (1998). Froglife has delivered training to SNCOs and NGOs on dealing with great crested newt conservation , including dealing with legislation.	Action by Pond Action, Froglife
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>	Lack of will to promote pond protection measures; pressure from landowner groups to avoid restrictions on land use. Potential "backlash" against such restrictions. Does not offer positive management incentives. Need to identify and register all known sites, then administer and police the system - resource and time implications. Central government has not shown interest in pursuing pond protection measures.	
Action complete or ongoing? <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	Ongoing (but NB much more action required)	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
Output and timescale	Both A and B above need addressing. B could be taken up by PAW (Partnership Against Wildlife crime).	Action by CCW, EN, SNH, DETR, PWLOs

Published action/organisation(s) responsible <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.2.1 Seek to ensure that key sites for the great crested newt in Wales are safeguarded, considering SSSI notification where necessary to secure appropriate management.	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	<p>A. Review existing records to produce register of key sites, forward site details to appropriate CCW, NGOs and LAs</p> <p>B. Review the SSSI series in England and Scotland, the SSSI selection criteria, and the effectiveness of SSSI designation in protecting great crested newt populations; review proposed SAC sites and selection criteria. Determine objectives for site protection.</p> <p>C. Identify key sites, investigate SSSI designation</p> <p>D. Promote site designation in strategic plans, eg SINCs, LNRs</p> <p>E. Develop SSSI site status monitoring</p>	
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	Note: the published action plan states Wales only, but in the Work Programme we have extended the issue to England and Scotland. Two new SSSIs have been declared for great crested newts in north Wales. A review of conservation objectives for SSSIs and SACs is underway at EN (?).	Action by CCW, EN
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>	To some extent, the dearth of detailed survey and monitoring data is a constraint to site designation. There has not been an effective, national targeted survey system in place and this needs to be addressed urgently. However, even where data are available, SNCOs have generally not designated SSSIs for great crested newts in recent years. The great variation in the manner in which non-statutory sites are designated at the county or similar level makes it more difficult to promote great crested newt site safeguard. Also there are difficulties associated with defining meaningful criteria to address conservation needs.	
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	BRC to produce and distribute list of key sites. SNCOs to finalise review of site designation objectives.	Action by BRC, EN, CCW, SNH

Published action/organisation(s) responsible <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.2.2 Promote favourable management on all key sites where this species is known to occur.	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	<p>A. Distribute management advice and information on grant schemes to owners/managers of all important sites</p> <p>B. Review the need for site designation and the protection offered by the different types of designation (SACs, SINC, LNRs, etc)</p> <p>C. Implement site protection measures for all sites; register as Wildlife Sites (SINC etc)</p> <p>D. Implement positive management</p>	
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	Implementation is haphazard; positive management and advice is given in some areas. A small proportion are registered as Wildlife Sites but only a fraction of these are likely to be under positive management. SNH has identified management requirements of specific great crested newt ponds in some areas. Funding for site-specific great crested newt management has been provided by BHS and HCT.	<i>Action by</i> LAs, ARGs, WTs, Froglife, HCT, BHS, EN, CCW, SNH, FWAG, PondLife Project, Land-owners
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 huge number of sites is a practical constraint. Defining key sites may be problematic, especially in areas with relatively high abundance. Most of the best sites are likely not to be designated, therefore funding may not always be easy to find, or conservation objectives easy to define. Also, there is no national system, and often no local system, to keep track of landowners and managers. Resources and guidance need to be given on selecting and designating locally important great crested newt sites.	
Action complete or ongoing? <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	Ongoing (but NB much more action required)	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
Output and timescale	Need for conservation organisations to (a) assist with selection of key sites by liaising with LAs, and (b) assist with management by provision of advice. Landowners to implement positive management.	<i>Action by</i> ARGs, Froglife, HCT, BHS, WTs, LAs, EN, CCW, SNH, FWAG, Land-owners

Published action/organisation(s) responsible <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.2.3 Seek to maintain the number and distribution of occupied sites through habitat restoration or creation of sufficient new sites near existing ones to compensate for local losses.	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	A. Produce list of sites which have potential for restoration or creation of new habitats B. Target owners/managers of suitable sites, provide advice on restoration and creation of ponds C. Provide advice and develop policies/actions to prevent losses of habitats through development or land management	
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	Implementation is haphazard and small-scale. There have been a few attempts, mainly by ARGs, LAs and WTs, to look for restoration opportunities. SNH and EN have also undertaken some restoration planning. Grant schemes funded by EN, BHS and HCT have assisted at some sites.	Action by ARGs, LAs, WTs, FE, BHS, HCT, EN, PondLife Project, Froglife
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 large number of sites makes it difficult to keep track of opportunities as well as progress. Resources for habitat creation and management are limiting. Often there will be little or no contact with most landowners. There are significant resource implications for subsequent management work. Creating new ponds, especially on arable land, is often seen as undesirable by landowners.	
Action complete or ongoing? <i>(Please state yes, not started, or ongoing.)</i>	Ongoing (NB much more action required to have any significant impact)	
Next steps	<i>Please outline future action/work including an indication of expected output, timescale and organisation responsible.</i>	
Output and timescale	ARGs, WTs etc to develop lists of sites suitable for restoration. Encouragement of landowners to promote restoration. Funding bodies to make available more resources for pond work. Planners need to be made more aware of the importance of retaining great crested newt sites.	Action by ARGs, WTs, LAs, MAFF, SOAEFD, WOAD, FWAG, EA, SEPA

Published action/organisation(s) responsible <i>(For new or revised actions please provide the new paragraph number and action text.)</i>	5.3.1 Encourage the natural dispersal of the species to new sites through habitat management and re-creation and, if necessary, consider establishing a translocation or re-introduction programme to restore populations to previously occupied or appropriate new sites.	
Work plan/organisation(s) responsible <i>(Summary of work plan agreed by the steering group, broken down by year if possible.)</i>	<p>A. Distribute management advice and information on grant schemes to site owners/managers</p> <p>B. Produce list of sites for which there are potential grounds for introductions or re-introductions; introduce where appropriate according to good practice (eg IUCN guidelines)</p> <p>C. Encourage liaison with landowners through local conservation groups</p> <p>D. Undertake positive management</p>	
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	Implementation is haphazard. Some landowners/managers in some areas have received information on grant schemes, but only a minority (exception is Scotland where virtually all landowners are known and on a register at SNH HQ). There is a lack of scope for linkage in many developed or agricultural landscapes (though incentives may help). A handful of sites has been proposed for translocation, and very few undertaken. Positive management undertaken at a minority of sites.	<i>Action by</i> ARGs, WTs, EN, CCW, SNH, Froglife, HCT, BHS, PondLife Project, Land- owners
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 large number of sites (and therefore landowners) makes it difficult to provide advice to landowners except on a piecemeal basis at present. A register of all great crested newt sites, with their landowners, on a county (or equivalent) basis would assist. The statutory agencies generally advise against translocation as a proactive conservation tool for great crested newts, and hence it is little practised. Most recorders do not make a note of landowners; this needs to be addressed.	
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	National conservation bodies to advise ARGs etc to record landowners, and to develop advice on management that encourages re-colonisation. Develop system for advising landowners. Investigate desirability and feasibility of translocations. Landowners to undertake management.	<i>Action by</i> Froglife, HCT, BHS, EN, CCW, SNH, EA, SEPA, WTs, ARGs, Land- owners