

## **Wales Wetlands Ecosystem Group**

Meeting No: 1

Date: 13 January 2009

Venue: Hafren Meeting Room, 1<sup>st</sup> floor Ladywell House, Newtown, Tel 01686 613158. (Map attached).

Time: 10:30 – 16:00

### **Agenda**

1. Introductions
2. Confirmation of group membership – any gaps?
3. Review of background to groups' formation as part of the new approach to BAP delivery in Wales.
4. Review of group remit, Terms of Reference and immediate key tasks, leading to development of work programme.
5. Overview of existing policy measures of relevance to wetlands
6. Paper for next meeting of WBP
7. Possible event for Wales Biodiversity Week, 4-16 June 2009
8. AOB – date of next meeting

### **NOTE:**

- Parking is available at Ladywell House on a first come basis
- Lunch will not be provided! There is a shop nearby!
- Please check your e-mail at 4.00 PM on the 12<sup>th</sup>. in case of late cancellation for bad weather/flu etc!. E-mail me a mobile contact number if you wont have e-mail access.
- The meeting room is on the same floor as the CCW office but not within it.

PSJ, CCW Bangor

7 January 2009

**Chris Uttley – Countryside Council for  
Wales**



# Wetlands in River Basin Planning. A check list.



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government  
CORFF NODDEDIG SPONSORED BODY

# Aim of the talk?

---



The key aim is to provide a series of shortcuts or checklists for you to use to ensure that each river basin management plan is doing as much as it can for wetlands.

To bypass the puzzling world of WFD process and interpretation.



# Wetlands and the Water Framework Directive



# Features of WFD & RBMP



- Deadlines extended where-ever possible (to 2027)
- Derogations, less stringent objectives and exemptions used where-ever possible
- Increasing focus on “quick wins” and “statutory priorities”
- Items in the “too difficult”, “too expensive” and “non-statutory” box likely to be sidelined



# What does the WFD offer to wetlands?



- Are Wetlands non statutory and too difficult?
- Received wisdom is that wetlands are not automatically included in the WFD and must somehow be squeezed in through creative interpretation. That they are not a statutory part of the WFD.

**FORTUNATELY, THIS IS WRONG!**



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government  
CORFF NODDEDIG | SPONSORED BODY

# What does the WFD offer to wetlands?



Wetlands will be the direct beneficiaries of measures if:

1. They are designated as part of a water dependent N2K protected area (SAC/SPA).
2. Part of the riparian zone, and so part of the morphological quality element of a surface water body
3. They are identified as a “Groundwater dependent terrestrial ecosystem”.
4. Their creation or restoration is needed as part of a supplementary measure to achieve an Environmental Objective.





# Member States obligations for N2K Protected Areas?



- *Article 4. In making operational the programme of measures specified in the River Basin Management Plan....*
- *(1c) .....for protected areas Member states shall achieve compliance with any standards and objectives within 15 years of the WFD entering into force (unless otherwise specified in the source Directive).*
- Note: *“Shall achieve compliance....”*  
*“Within 15 years...”* i.e. 2015





# What are the Objectives?



- The environmental objectives under Article 4 for wetlands SAC/SPA are basically the conservation objectives required to ensure that features meet Favourable Conservation Status
- Compliance with the Habitats/Birds Directive for water dependent features is a prerequisite for compliance with the WFD



# Application of the Programme of Measures to N2K wetlands



- The Habitats and Birds Directives are listed in the **Basic Measures** and should therefore be brought to bear in the WFD.
- All aspects of the PoM can be brought to bear to achieve “any standards and objectives” for N2K sites on the register.
- Examples of Measures for N2K wetlands sites: Control of diffuse pollution, Control of drainage, reducing disturbance, invasive species control, morphological restoration, plus the “usual“ (abstraction, point source control)



# Do the derogations apply to N2K wetlands?



- Article 4 (8 & 9) state that the application of all the derogations, exemptions and less stringent objectives must be:
  - a. Consistent with the implementation of other existing community environmental legislation and
  - b. Must guarantee at least the same level of protection as existing community.
- i.e. the only derogations that apply to any N2K site on the register are those within the Habitats and Birds Directives. WFD cannot be used to justify achieving less than the N2K directives require.
- This will severely curtail the use of derogations on N2K sites.



# Checklist for N2K wetlands



- Check that all wetlands SACs/SPAs are on the register of protected areas?
- Make sure that the RBMP includes specific measures to bring each SAC/SPA wetland into favourable condition by 2015. If not, ask why?
- Check with NE/CCW to see what measures they are proposing for N2K wetlands?
- Ask what monitoring will be carried out under WFD for these wetlands?
- Ask for assurance that any derogations, exemptions or extended deadlines used in the plan are compatible with the Habitats and Birds Directives.
- Check particularly that HMWB & AWB designations will not impinge on wetland protection, restoration & creation



# Groundwater dependent wetlands



## Rationale

- “Good Groundwater Status” depends upon there being no significant damage to “Groundwater dependent terrestrial ecosystems” from water quantity / quality impacts
- If a GWDTE is significantly damaged then measures must be applied to groundwater to reverse the damage to the wetland.
- “Significant damage” is that level of damage equivalent to causing a feature or site to be in unfavourable condition.
- This means that any SAC/SSSI/LNR wetland that depends upon groundwater, but is not in favourable condition because of groundwater impacts, is eligible for measures to bring the site into favourable condition.





# What types of measures might be available?



- Measures may include re-location of abstractions or discharges, diffuse pollution control.
- In some cases (multiple pressures acting on groundwater) it may be more cost effective to control drainage or remove land use impacts than reduce abstraction
- Measures may include “prevent or limit” to reverse contaminant trends (Groundwater Directive), or measures to ensure “no deterioration” of groundwater *sufficient to cause damage to wetlands*



# Checklist for groundwater dependent wetlands?



- Make sure the RBMP identifies and lists all wetlands that are GWDTE?
- Ask which ones are significantly damaged?
- Ask which ones are at high risk or good status/low confidence?
- Ask to see specific measures identified in the plan that will reverse significant damage or prevent deterioration of those at high risk?
- Ask which GWDTE will benefit from measures to prevent or limit pollutant trends. Ask which ones will benefit from no deterioration measures?
- Ask what monitoring will be carried out for groundwater dependent wetlands to improve info?





# Wetlands that form part of a surface water body



## Rationale

Wetlands that form part of the riparian, lake shore or inter-tidal zone form part of the “hydro-morphological quality element” (HQE) for water bodies.

- At High status, water bodies must have full Hydro-morphological functioning i.e. undisturbed
- At Good and less-than-good, morphology must support biological quality sufficient to achieve GES/GEP



# What measures would be available?



- Preventing loss of further littoral, riparian and inter-tidal wetlands. (High Status water bodies)
- Creation or restoration of additional wetlands to support GES/GEP



# Checklist for wetlands as part of surface water bodies



- Seek clarity on whether wetlands next to or near to Water Bodies are part of morphology quality element water body?
- Ensure measures are identified to protect and maintain existing wetland extent adjacent to the high status water bodies. (i.e. floodplain, littoral or inter-tidal wetlands)
- Ensure measures are identified to restore or create new wetlands required to support biological quality elements at GES/GEP
- Now and in the future - ensure any loss of wetlands due to new development (Article 4 (7)) are fully identified and tests explained in RBMP.



# What is Article 4(7)?



- “Lawyers gift”
- “Officials nightmare”

Allows deterioration of ecological status as a result of changes to physical modifications of water body or sustainable human development activities if:

1. All steps are taken to mitigate the impact, and;
2. The reason for the modification are explained in the RBMP, and;
3. The reason for the modification are of overriding public interest and/or delivers more benefits to sustainable development than achieving the environmental objective, and;
4. No better (environmental) alternatives exist that are technically feasible and not expensive.



# Wetlands as measures for water bodies and protected areas



Creation or restoration of wetlands maybe a cost effective measure to achieve environmental objectives:

- Benefits for Flood protection
- Benefits for groundwater re-charge
- Nutrient/sediment/pollutant load abatement
- Restoration of flow regime and morphology
- Conservation of biological diversity



# Checklist for wetlands as measures



- Ensure RBMP identifies where environmental objectives cannot be achieved by basic measures alone.
- Ensure that wetland creation/restoration have been included in cost effectiveness work as alternatives wherever possible
- Check that each RBMP clearly identifies where wetlands have been created as part of a measure
- Develop score card for RBMPs based on amount wetland created.





# Summary



- The WFD can deliver real measures and benefits for wetlands without creative interpretation!
- Vigilance is needed by those reading RBMPs to check that they deliver on statutory aspects of wetlands in WFD
- Perhaps we should develop a league table for RBMPs?

Thank you



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government  
CORFF NODDEDIG | SPONSORED BODY



**Agenda Item 4.**

**Key early tasks of Wales Wetlands Ecosystems Group (from WBP paper ‘WBP Future of BAP Biodiversity Mechanism Final Draft 29 Oct 20\_final).**

Key tasks defined by WBP (cross referenced to identified sections of WBP paper <i>WBP Future of BAP Biodiversity Mechanism Final Draft 29 Oct 20_final</i> ) circulated 6/1/09.	Comments and early suggested priorities for the group – for discussion at first meeting
1. Set objectives/targets for the habitat and relevant species at the Wales and LBAP level ( <i>App I, sect II.1.</i> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review/modify(?) objectives/targets established in 2005 for the 2<sup>nd</sup> generation of plans (see paper <i>Wetland HAP new targets</i> circulated 6/1/09). How well do these tie in with Wales Environment Strategy targets?</li> <li>• Review / modify <i>pro rata</i> targets derived from above for LBAPs and issued on WBP website (see Excel file <i>Copy of disaggregated Hab targetswbpversept1st07 WBG website version</i> circulated 6/1/09).</li> </ul>
2. Prioritise the most important actions needed to deliver the four lowland wetland habitat action plans ( <i>main text, p.3, 4.II</i> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify and prioritise actions.</li> <li>• Develop an implementation plan for Welsh wetlands for sanction by partners and WBP. Would need to (i) prioritise actions, (ii) identify mechanisms and players, both new and existing, (iii) identify funding requirements.</li> </ul>
3. Identify and carry out priority projects for delivery ( <i>main text, p.3, 4.II</i> )	<p>Needs to flow out from 2. Immediate possibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of funding bids / mechanisms to develop one or more Wetland Restoration Projects across Wales – e.g. need Project Officers with a budget to undertake capital works, and then money to build local capacity through grazing/machinery rings etc for ongoing management.</li> <li>• Advice to WAG on strategic funding requirements</li> <li>• Policy reform</li> <li>• Production of guidance on key priorities and geographical areas for action</li> <li>• Development of vision ‘glossy’ for Welsh wetlands?</li> </ul>
4. Set targets at the LBAP level ( <i>main text, p.3, 4.II</i> ).	<p>See 1 above – also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to review usefulness of <i>Priority Habitats of Wales</i>.</li> <li>• What do LBAPs want? Would more specific guidance be helpful?</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible role for a Welsh Wetland Vision</li> </ul>
<p><b>5.</b> Engage appropriately with local partnerships to align delivery (<i>App I, sect II.1.</i>)</p>	<p>Relevant to 4 above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Run project to determine what local partnerships (= to LBAPs?) actually need us to provide?</li> <li>• Opportunity to achieve this presented by WBP plan to run 3 regional Workshops in February/March 2009 to roll out the new BAP approach in Wales to LBAP Partnerships and other staff working at a local/regional level.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.</b> Coordinate possible funding &amp; research bids (<i>main text, p.3, 4.II</i>), identify opportunities for leveraging resources and coordinate bids for research or implementation (<i>App I, sect II.1.</i>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mostly covered by 3 above.</li> <li>• Influence development of proposed biodiversity and geodiversity grant aid scheme.</li> </ul>
<p><b>7.</b> With local biodiversity partnerships, agree the most important areas for landscape-scale delivery (<i>main text, p.3, 4.II</i>), identify priority areas for delivering biodiversity enhancements and improving connectivity at a landscape scale (<i>App I, sect II.1.</i>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key landscape scale areas for lowland wetlands are fairly obvious – e.g. Dyfi Estuary, Cors Caron, Anglesey Fens, Lleyn Fens, Mynydd Bach Peatlands (Ceredigion).</li> <li>• We could run a project to define and develop these, but how to engage with LBAPs and Regional Spatial Planning Fora?</li> <li>• Lowland wetlands relatively poorly interconnected with the exception of coastal and floodplain grazing marsh. Key emphasis should be on wetlands as part of a wider semi-natural landscape – with marshy grassland, heath etc.</li> </ul>
<p><b>8.</b> Identify knowledge gaps and address directly or recommend to WBP how they should be filled(<i>App I, sect II.1.</i>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing markets for wetland products.</li> </ul>
<p><b>9.</b> Identify policy blockages and through representation to policy group help drive policy development and monitor outcomes(<i>App I, sect II.1.</i>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undertake review of policy measures of relevance to wetland habitats; identify areas where reform or new policy development is needed.</li> </ul>
<p><b>10.</b> Instigate monitoring to enable reporting against progress with habitat/species targets (<i>App I, sect II.1.</i>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficult one!</li> <li>• Issue relevant to BAP delivery generally – not just wetlands.</li> <li>• Suggest we refer back to WBP for guidance.</li> </ul>

<b>11.</b> Coordinate reporting for habitats and species ( <i>App I, sect II.1.</i> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• V incomplete picture on BARS</li> </ul>
<b>12.</b> Further develop ecosystem approach, taking into account ecosystem services and carrying capacity ( <i>App I, sect II.1.</i> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JNCC project is looking at this with respect to wetlands. CCW project also.</li> </ul>
<b>13.</b> Provide advice on habitat management for land managers ( <i>App I, sect II.1.</i> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collate and disseminate existing guidance – develop web facility (hosted by WBP).</li> <li>• Support development of local nodes of expertise – e.g. Pembs Wetlands Partnership, Anglesey &amp; Llyn Fens LIFE project, Project Officers elsewhere.</li> </ul>
<b>14.</b> Liaise with other ecosystem groups where joint approaches would be beneficial ( <i>App I, sect II.1.</i> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting of ecosystem group chairs has been mooted.</li> <li>• Dereliction issue of equal relevance to grasslands and heathlands group.</li> <li>• Diffuse pollution relevant to freshwater group.</li> </ul>
<b>15.</b> Provide representation to any UK habitat groups established ( <i>App I, sect II.1.</i> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CCW a member, but future role of the UK level group very unclear.</li> <li>• Important to retain links – there is much we can learn from.</li> </ul>

PSJ, CCW Bangor  
7 January 2009

**Wales Wetlands Ecosystem Group – draft notes of first meeting, 13 January 2009**

**Present:** Peter Jones (Chair, CCW), Kathryn Birch (CCW), Stephen Bladwell (RSPB Cymru), Julie Bowes (WAG, Dept of Rural Affairs), Chris Dyson (CCW), Bryan Jones (Environment Agency), Rob Jones-Parry (Wildlife Trusts), Chris Uttley (CCW, Member of WBP Policy Group), Kate Williamson (SNPA / LBAPs) & Helen Buckingham (National Trust, Chair of Grasslands & Heathlands Ecosystem Group)

**Apologies:** Justin Hanson (Anglesey & Lleyn Fens LIFE project manager)

**Table 1. Actions points from meeting of 13 Jan 2009. Priority actions have been pulled out to form Table 2.**

Blue highlight: issues for referral to WBP

Green highlight: issues for referral to Policy Group.

<i>Action / discussion point</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Immediate action</i>	<i>Progress by 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting (1 April 2009).</i>
<b>Group membership / relationship to other groups</b>			
Review gaps in membership of WWEG.	Include LBAP representation from S. Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust may wish to join. Group felt that WBP facilitator would also be helpful to answer generic queries on the spot.	Invite Bethan Cox from Pembs LBAP and seek view of WWT on whether they wish to join: <b>PSJ</b> Invite Charles Grisedale: <b>PSJ</b> Invite WBP facilitator: <b>RJ</b>	
<b>Objectives / targets review</b>			
National (UK) objectives and targets for habitat plans regarded as broadly suitable, despite reservation of some members about issue of over-prescription. Generic emphasis of target 1 on 'no loss' regarded as critical		No loss action – but uncultivated land regs have size thresholds. Take up with Policy Group.	
Hectare targets for LBAPs already issued and regarded as generally helpful, but LBAPs could use more specific guidance on which areas are key for which habitats.		Seek steer from LBAPs at regional workshops. Best approach may be to contribute directly to development of projects in LBAP areas – e.g, Derelict Sites project of Table 2.	

Complete mapping of species to habitats and action categories	Vital to guide detailed formulation of actions.	Task & finish group working on this. <b>SB</b> to keep group informed. Design and targeting of derelict sites project would reflect species actions.	
Extend remit of group to include lowland blanket bog	Lowland blanket bog is technically covered by the blanket bog HAP and thus the Upland Ecosystems Group. However, lowland blanket bog in lowland enclosed contexts faces much the same issues as other lowland wetland habitats and should be addressed along with these.	Raise with chair of upland group (Barbara Jones): <b>PSJ</b>	Proposal agreed with Barbara. Wetlands Group will cover lowland blanket bog.
Targets for reducing consumptive use of peat in national lowland raised bog plan	Target should be reflected in local action.	Develop means of encouraging LBAPs to include actions for reducing consumptive use of peat in their areas.	
<b>Funding</b>			
Propose that group is given influence on criteria/priorities for biodiversity grant scheme, or even a fixed allocation	Group needs resourcing to deliver its remit.	Raise with WBP: <b>PSJ</b>	
Lack of funding for project development a key impediment	Even modest funding would help in developing bids	Raise with WBP: <b>KW</b>	
<b>Information exchange / communication</b>			
WBP to consider development of a wetland ecosystems section on WBP website	Much useful information could be posted. Could also be a forum for information exchange and posting Q/A. Makes sense to utilise an existing familiar and well structured website.	Raise with WBP: <b>PSJ</b>	
Circulate key outputs of earlier Wales Wetland Forum to members	Includes (i) review of how future agri-E delivery might be structured to benefit both wetland biodiversity and wider environmental outcomes, notably flood risk management and diffuse pollution, and (ii) WWT 'projects & funding' work.	<b>CU</b> to provide web-links or electronic copies.	
Develop a vision for Welsh wetlands?	Vision would identify a set of common priorities and high level objectives for wetlands for communication to	Group agreed it wanted to focus on action rather than the production of a vision. No further action on a specific product,	

	stakeholders.	though website should include set of visionary statements/principles.	
Event for Wales Biodiversity week	Raise profile of wetlands	Seek opportunity to link formation of group and communication of its remit to relevant events rather than plan a specific event. <b>All</b>	
Offer presentation to next WBP meeting	Inform WBP of group aims and areas where it needs action/guidance from partnership	Offer presentation: <b>PSJ</b>	
<b>Links to LBAPs</b>			
Ensure group is represented at proposed regional workshops in 09	Seek steer from LBAPs and other regional partners on services which group to provide	<b>*Offer attendance at regional workshops to WBP secretariat: PSJ</b>	
Review coverage of wetland habitats/species in Welsh LBAPs	Ensure priority areas for wetlands are covered.	<b>KW &amp; PSJ</b> to review	
Invasive species	IS only a local issue in the main – notably <i>Rhododendron</i> and <i>Crassula</i> .	Maintain watching brief – members to report issues to group as they arise.	
<b>Date of Next Meeting: 1 April 2009</b>			

**Table 2. Priority actions identified at the first meeting of the Wales Wetlands Ecosystem Group.**

Blue highlight: issues for referral to WBP

Green highlight: issues for referral to Policy Group.

<b>Action</b>	<b>Rationale</b>	<b>Immediate action where identified</b>
Develop a pilot ‘Derelict Sites’ project for restoring wetland sites in unfavourable condition because of management neglect (usually due to agricultural abandonment), cultural enrichment (diffuse pollution) and drainage. Management neglect a key issue for many BAP wetland species.	These factors are the most common cause of unfavourable condition across the wetland series. Section 15 mechanism is under-funded and in any case often can’t address lack of local capacity for appropriate management – critically lack of appropriate stock, husbandry and equipment. Project would cover mixture of statutory and non-statutory sites. Three counties of Dyfed a possible focus due to number of sites and high coincidence of habitats. Links to connectivity and EGS.	Develop and consult on project proposal – take forward in partnership with Grasslands & Heathlands Ecosystem Group and PONT. <b>*Will require external funding – capacity issue in ability to prepare bid needs to be raised with WBP.</b>
Complete site notification programme (SSSI) in Wales.	Many priority wetland sites which meet the minimum standards for notification remain without statutory protection, making it very much harder to focus the full	<b>*Needs to be considered by WBG within context of WES as this action is likely to apply to many ecosystems. Capacity issue for CCW.</b>

	scale of required restoration measures.	Continue peatland survey programme: CCW
Improve coverage of lowland wetlands in wildlife sites (sites of local importance) series across Wales.	Many key non-stat wetland sites are not currently registered. Site series needs to be reviewed against WBG guidelines, and gaps filled. This will help ensure that priority sites are not omitted from the WES Outcome 21 objective	*Collate lists of sites of local importance – ideally as a GIS layer. Could WBP facilitate this? Group to review series, propose additions /deletions.
Develop objectives and prescriptions for wetlands for the Axis II agri-E review.	Axis II has significant potential for wetland habitats and species, but only if the right objectives and prescriptions are in place.	Offer services of Group in drafting objectives and prescriptions – imminent action in next 3-4 months. CU, PSJ & RJ to identify process for feeding in, JB to take offer of help to next Axis II meeting. Main subject categories (with group leads identified) are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Core wetland management (PSJ)</li> <li>2. Diffuse pollution (CU)</li> <li>3. Water level management/hydrology (BJ)</li> <li>4. Habitat Creation (RJ)</li> <li>5. Dereliction (management neglect) (PJ)</li> </ol>
Improve payment schedules for wetlands in future agri-E provision in Wales.	Current agri-E provision perceived as not sufficiently remunerative for wetlands – particularly re-wetting options.	Influence development of future payment schedules. Policy Group to advise on best approach.
Improve ability of agri-environment project officers to recognise and utilise opportunities for wetland enhancement. Raise awareness of wetland habitats and key areas for them in Wales.	Wetland pose specific and often specialised issues and opportunities – training is required to maximise utility of agri-E provision.	Training function. Ask Policy Group to advise on how to progress this.
Ensure wetlands receive appropriate coverage in WFD River Basin Management Plans.	Plans considered unlikely to include sufficient action for wetlands.	Pete Jones, Chris Uttley and Rob Parry to develop method for review and group involvement.
Drainage-mediated groundwater impacts should be addressed by Water Framework Directive and abstraction licensing.	Drainage mediated impacts on groundwater are not presently addressed by the UK’s interpretation of WFD. Such impacts are more relevant than abstraction in Wales. Some 320 SSSI in Wales are estimated to have some degree of groundwater dependency.	Influence impact assessment methodology and ensure drainage mediated impacts can be covered under Programmes of Measures. Include surface drainage of groundwater in abstraction licensing system.
Develop a policy covering maintenance of agricultural drainage by EA.	Policy exists for England, but not Wales. Policy needed to ensure appropriate focussing of drainage activity and maximise opportunities for wetland restoration.	Refer to Policy Group
Catchment Sensitive Farming projects to include priority wetland areas.	Limited number of catchments likely to be targeted in 2010 – representation of wetlands within these uncertain.	Influence selection of CSF areas Research needed to identify critical wetland catchments.



	Modelling of diffuse pollution effects largely limited to freshwater sites to-date.	Scope representation of wetlands in catchments to be covered from 2010. Need to influence remit of CSF officers. Collaborate with Upland Ecosystems Group on this action.
Create a library of key wetland projects which would make critical contribution to BAP/WES targets. This would not be restricted to large-scale projects	CCW programme a good starting point – also Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust project for earlier Wetland Forum. Group felt that a list of projects would be useful to slot into other funding programmes.	Produce first draft for circulation to group (PSJ)
Develop an implementation programme for wetlands.	Provide a structure for group activity, identify what needs to be done to deliver remit, identify critical resource gaps	EA (BJ) to work up in further detail. Needs a project officer!

### Recommendations for actions to be considered by Policy Group

Table 2 lists many actions which relate to policy measures. The wetlands group includes a member of the policy group and in many cases we feel able to contribute directly to the policy actions identified above, with the caveat that we will report progress and obstacles to the policy group. Items for referral to the policy group at this stage are highlighted in green.

Peter Jones  
CCW Bangor  
19 Jan 2009