

Taxon name	Taxonomic studies required	Studies of native or archaeophyte status required	Further mapping data required for analysis	Reasons for appearing on the Waiting List	References
<i>Aconitum napellus</i>	Yes	Yes		The supposed native form (referred to as subsp. <i>napellus</i>) was only discovered in 1821. Garden forms are very widely planted and frequently escape. Taxonomic studies could help to determine whether a separate subspecies exists and which records refer to it.	
<i>Aethusa cynapium</i> subsp. <i>agrestis</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data	
<i>Agrostemma githago</i>	Yes	Yes		This species was believed extinct as an archaeophyte, but has recently appeared very widely. This is likely to be because of its popularity in ‘wild flower’ seed mixes, for which the origin is not the UK. Some occurrences may result from buried UK seed sources, but unless genetic markers can be found to distinguish UK material from non-native forms, it is not possible to determine the threat faced by the UK plant.	
<i>Alchemilla minima</i>	Yes			Originally described by Walters, he no longer considers it a valid taxon. Further work is required to separate this from <i>A. filicaulis</i> .	Bradshaw, 1964, Rich & Jermy, 1998.
<i>Anthyllis vulneraria</i> subsp. <i>lapponica</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data	
<i>Arctium nemorosum</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data	
<i>Arenaria serpyllifolia</i> subsp. <i>lloydii</i>	Yes			Accepted as a subspecies in <i>Flora Nordica</i> , but considered only a dune ecotype in Stace’s flora.	Stace, 1997; Jonsell, 2002.
<i>Artemisia norvegica</i> subsp. <i>scotica</i>	Yes			There is a question over whether this represents an endemic subspecies.	Sell & Murrell, 1006.
<i>Asperula cynanchica</i> subsp. <i>occidentalis</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data	Tutin & Chater, 1974.

Taxon name	Taxonomic studies required	Studies of native or archaeophyte status required	Further mapping data required for analysis	Reasons for appearing on the Waiting List	References
<i>Asplenium 'cuneifolium'</i>	Yes			The serpentine form of <i>A. adiantum-nigrum</i> is considered to be an ecotype by Stace, but is referred to as subsp. <i>silesiacum</i> in <i>Plant Crib 1998</i> , and as an undescribed distinct species in <i>Flora Nordica</i> .	Stace, 1997; Rich & Jermy, 1998; Jonsell, 2002.
<i>Betula pubescens</i> subsp. <i>pubescens</i>	Yes		Yes	This subspecies is included in both Stace's flora and <i>Flora Europaea</i> , but not in <i>Flora Nordica</i> . More mapping data are required for analysis.	Atkinson, 1992; Tutin <i>et al.</i> , 1993; Stace, 1997; Jonsell, 2000.
<i>Betula pubescens</i> subsp. <i>tortuosa</i>	Yes		Yes	This subspecies is included in both Stace's flora and <i>Flora Europaea</i> , but not in <i>Flora Nordica</i> . More mapping data are required for analysis.	Atkinson, 1992; Tutin <i>et al.</i> , 1993; Stace, 1997; Jonsell, 2000.
<i>Brachypodium pinnatum</i>			Yes	The distinction between this and <i>B. rupestre</i> was not found until after the publication of the <i>New Atlas</i> , and so almost no mapping data are available.	
<i>Brachypodium rupestre</i>			Yes	The distinction between this and <i>B. pinnatum</i> was not found until after the publication of the <i>New Atlas</i> , and so almost no mapping data are available.	
<i>Bromus hordeaceus</i> subsp. <i>longipedicellatus</i>		Yes	Yes	Described after the publication of the <i>New Atlas</i> , and hence no mapping data are available. It may be a neophyte, but the UK may also have the only remaining world populations.	Spalton, 2001.
<i>Bromus pseudosecalinus</i>	Yes			Generally considered to be a neophyte in the UK, but the taxonomy remains uncertain. Whatever its status, the UK may now have the only remaining world populations.	Spalton, 2003.
<i>Caltha palustris</i> subsp. <i>radicans</i>	Yes			<i>Flora Nordica</i> lists this as a subspecies, but Akeroyd considers it a variety, as there is continuous variation between it and subsp. <i>palustris</i> .	Akeroyd in Tutin <i>et al.</i> , 1993; Jonsell, 2000.
<i>Campanula rotundifolia</i> subsp. <i>montana</i>	Yes		Yes	Possible endemic subspecies.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.

Taxon name	Taxonomic studies required	Studies of native or archaeophyte status required	Further mapping data required for analysis	Reasons for appearing on the Waiting List	References
<i>Centaurea debeauxii</i> subsp. <i>nemoralis</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Centaurea debeauxii</i> subsp. <i>thuillieri</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Centaurea nigra</i> subsp. <i>nigra</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Centaurea nigra</i> subsp. <i>rivularis</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Cochlearia atlantica</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	
<i>Cochlearia micacea</i>	Yes		Yes	Taxonomic work ongoing.	Rich & Dalby, 1996.
<i>Cochlearia micacea</i> subsp. <i>alpina</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	
<i>Cochlearia micacea</i> subsp. <i>micacea</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	
<i>Cochlearia officinalis</i> subsp. <i>scotica</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	
<i>Cochlearia pyrenaica</i> subsp. <i>alpina</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Cochlearia pyrenaica</i> subsp. <i>pyrenaica</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Cynodon dactylon</i>		Yes		'Native or alien' in the <i>New Atlas</i> , its status in the UK remains uncertain, with some populations being considered possibly native in W. Cornwall. It is frequently found as a casual species.	
<i>Dactylorhiza fuchsii</i> subsp. <i>hebridensis</i>	Yes			Bateman suggests that this is a stabilised hybrid between <i>D. fuchsii</i> and <i>D. maculata</i> . More research is required into the whole group.	
<i>Dactylorhiza incarnata</i> subsp. <i>coccinea</i>	Yes			No distinctive allozyme markers exist to support this as a separate subspecies. More research is required into the <i>incarnata</i> group.	Bateman (In press)

Taxon name	Taxonomic studies required	Studies of native or archaeophyte status required	Further mapping data required for analysis	Reasons for appearing on the Waiting List	References
<i>Dactylorhiza incarnata</i> subsp. <i>incarnata</i>	Yes			More research is required into the <i>incarnata</i> group.	Bateman (In press)
<i>Dactylorhiza incarnata</i> subsp. <i>pulchella</i>	Yes			More research is required into the <i>incarnata</i> group.	Bateman (In press)
<i>Dactylorhiza maculata</i> subsp. <i>rhoumensis</i>	Yes			More research is required into the whole group.	
<i>Euphorbia villosa</i>		Yes		This species is extinct in the UK. It is unclear whether it was formerly native in woodland near Bath, or was an introduction. More historical research required.	
<i>Festuca arenaria</i> subsp. <i>arenaria</i>	Yes		Yes	This subspecies was not included in Stace's flora, and no mapping data are available.	
<i>Festuca arenaria</i> subsp. <i>oraria</i>	Yes		Yes	This subspecies was not included in Stace's flora, and no mapping data are available.	
<i>Festuca ovina</i> subsp. <i>hirtula</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Festuca ovina</i> subsp. <i>ophiolithicola</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Festuca ovina</i> subsp. <i>ovina</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Fumaria muralis</i> subsp. <i>muralis</i>			Yes	An enigmatic taxon, which has not been recorded for many years. Insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Fumaria reuteri</i>		Yes		Possibly an archaeophyte, but late first record (1904) suggests it is a recent introduction. Critical genus, so could have been overlooked.	
<i>Galium mollugo</i> subsp. <i>erectum</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Galium mollugo</i> subsp. <i>mollugo</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Galium verum</i> subsp. <i>maritimum</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Gentianella anglica</i>	Yes			Genetically very similar to <i>G. amarella</i> , but flowers early and is morphologically distinct.	Winfield <i>et al.</i> , 2003.

Taxon name	Taxonomic studies required	Studies of native or archaeophyte status required	Further mapping data required for analysis	Reasons for appearing on the Waiting List	References
<i>Geranium purpureum</i> subsp. <i>forsteri</i>	Yes			More analysis of the distinctions is required. Yeo cites cytological and floral differences.	Yeo, 2003.
<i>Geranium purpureum</i> subsp. <i>purpureum</i>	Yes			More analysis of the distinctions is required. Yeo cites cytological and floral differences.	Yeo, 2003.
<i>Geranium robertianum</i> subsp. <i>celticum</i>	Yes		Yes	May only represent an extreme within a variable species. Insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Geranium robertianum</i> subsp. <i>maritimum</i>	Yes		Yes	May only represent an extreme within a variable species. Insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Gladiolus illyricus</i> subsp. <i>britannicus</i>	Yes			It is uncertain whether <i>G. illyricus</i> is represented by an endemic subspecies in the UK, and more work is required to determine this. However, the species has been analysed, which is equivalent to including the subspecies in the analysis.	
<i>Heracleum sphondylium</i> subsp. <i>flavescens</i>		Yes		May be native in E. Norfolk. More analysis required.	
<i>Hieracium argillaceum</i>		Yes		Not definitely native.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Hieracium asperatum</i>		Yes		Possibly introduced.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Hieracium aviicola</i>		Yes	Yes	Not definitely native, few localities known.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Hieracium chlorophyllum</i>		Yes	Yes	Not definitely native, only known from one location.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Hieracium commixtum</i>		Yes	Yes	Not definitely native, only one locality known.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Hieracium coniops</i>			Yes	Known only from three sites, but may well be more common.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Hieracium dowardense</i>		Yes	Yes	Not definitely native, few localities known.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Hieracium festinum</i>		Yes	Yes	Not definitely native, few localities known.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Hieracium glevense</i>		Yes		Not definitely native.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Hieracium inquinatum</i>		Yes	Yes	Possibly introduced, only one locality known.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Hieracium kentii</i>		Yes	Yes	Not definitely native, few localities known.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.

Taxon name	Taxonomic studies required	Studies of native or archaeophyte status required	Further mapping data required for analysis	Reasons for appearing on the Waiting List	References
<i>Hieracium lanceolatum</i>	Yes			Known from only one site, but taxonomic work required to separate it from <i>H. prenanthoides</i> .	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Hieracium mammidens</i>		Yes	Yes	Not definitely native, but may be endemic, few localities known.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Hieracium megapodium</i>		Yes	Yes	Not definitely native, but unknown outside Great Britain. Few localities known.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Hieracium microspilum</i>		Yes		Not definitely native.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Hieracium rectulum</i>	Yes		Yes	Few localities known. Taxonomic issues to be resolved.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Hieracium salicetorum</i>		Yes	Yes	Not definitely native, Sell lists just three sites.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Hieracium salticola</i>		Yes		Not definitely native.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Hieracium scanicum</i>		Yes		Not definitely native.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Hieracium sinuolatum</i>		Yes	Yes	Not definitely native, though not known outside Great Britain. Few localities known.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Hieracium subprasiniifolium</i>		Yes		Not definitely native, but unknown outside Great Britain.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Hieracium subramosum</i>		Yes	Yes	Not definitely native, and probably extinct.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Hieracium virgultorum</i>		Yes		Not definitely native.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Huperzia selago</i> subsp. <i>arctica</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data.	Corner <i>et al.</i> in Rich & Jermy, 1998.
<i>Huperzia selago</i> subsp. <i>selago</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Hypochaeris radicata</i> subsp. <i>ericetorum</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Lathyrus hirsutus</i>		Yes		A casual species in most of the UK, it may have some claim to native status in the Thames estuary. It is rare and declining in northern France, with a very scattered distribution.	F. Rumsey pers. comm.

Taxon name	Taxonomic studies required	Studies of native or archaeophyte status required	Further mapping data required for analysis	Reasons for appearing on the Waiting List	References
<i>Lavatera cretica</i>		Yes		First recorded in the UK in 1859, a late date if it were a native plant. It is a weed in the Mediterranean region, and does not persist in most of its Cornish sites.	
<i>Leontodon autumnalis</i> subsp. <i>autumnalis</i>	Yes		Yes	More work required, insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Leontodon autumnalis</i> subsp. <i>pratensis</i>	Yes		Yes	More work required, insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Leucanthemum vulgare</i> subsp. <i>cantabricum</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Leucanthemum vulgare</i> subsp. <i>crassifolium</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Limonium binervosum</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	
<i>Limonium binervosum</i> subsp. <i>anglicum</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	
<i>Limonium binervosum</i> subsp. <i>binervosum</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	
<i>Limonium binervosum</i> subsp. <i>cantianum</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	
<i>Limonium binervosum</i> subsp. <i>mutatum</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	
<i>Limonium binervosum</i> subsp. <i>saxonicum</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	
<i>Limonium britannicum</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	
<i>Limonium britannicum</i> subsp. <i>britannicum</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	
<i>Limonium britannicum</i> subsp. <i>celticum</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	

Taxon name	Taxonomic studies required	Studies of native or archaeophyte status required	Further mapping data required for analysis	Reasons for appearing on the Waiting List	References
<i>Limonium britannicum</i> subsp. <i>coombense</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	
<i>Limonium britannicum</i> subsp. <i>transcanalis</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	
<i>Limonium dodartiforme</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	
<i>Limonium loganicum</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	
<i>Limonium paradoxum</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	
<i>Limonium parvum</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	
<i>Limonium procerum</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	
<i>Limonium procerum</i> subsp. <i>cambrense</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	
<i>Limonium procerum</i> subsp. <i>devoniense</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	
<i>Limonium procerum</i> subsp. <i>procerum</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	
<i>Limonium recurvum</i> subsp. <i>humile</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	
<i>Limonium recurvum</i> subsp. <i>portlandicum</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	
<i>Limonium recurvum</i> subsp. <i>recurvum</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	
<i>Limonium transwallianum</i>	Yes			Taxonomic work ongoing.	
<i>Limosella australis</i>		Yes		Possibly neophyte. First recorded in 1897 in Wales, the only records in Europe. It is widespread in the southern hemisphere with a range extension up the east coast of North America. Distribution not stable, and mostly in artificial habitats.	Jones, 1991.

Taxon name	Taxonomic studies required	Studies of native or archaeophyte status required	Further mapping data required for analysis	Reasons for appearing on the Waiting List	References
<i>Lonicera xylosteum</i>		Yes		First recorded in 1770, it was known to be a garden plant by 1600 and is easily spread by birds. However, the continental range just reaches northern France, and it occurs in semi-natural woodland.	
<i>Lythrum portula</i> subsp. <i>longidentatum</i>	Yes			Apparently an ecologically distinct form, but there is much overlap in leaf sizes, and it probably only differs by a single character.	C. Preston pers. comm.
<i>Lythrum portula</i> subsp. <i>portula</i>	Yes			Uncertainly distinguished from preceding subspecies.	
<i>Melampyrum arvense</i>		Yes		First recorded in 1716, a rather late date for such a conspicuous plant if it were an archaeophyte or native. Its pattern of decline, however, is similar to that shown by archaeophytes associated with arable habitats.	
<i>Melampyrum pratense</i> subsp. <i>commutatum</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data.	Smith, 1963.
<i>Melampyrum pratense</i> subsp. <i>pratense</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data.	Smith, 1963.
<i>Molinia caerulea</i> subsp. <i>arundinacea</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Montia fontana</i> subsp. <i>amporitana</i>	Yes		Yes	More work required, insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Montia fontana</i> subsp. <i>variabilis</i>	Yes		Yes	More work required, insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Ononis repens</i> subsp. <i>maritima</i>	Yes		Yes	More work required, insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Ononis repens</i> subsp. <i>repens</i>	Yes		Yes	More work required, insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Petrorhagia prolifera</i>		Yes		A weed throughout the world. Possible early records cannot be distinguished from <i>P. nanteuillii</i> .	Akeroyd & Beckett, 1995.
<i>Pilosella officinarum</i> subsp. <i>euronota</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Pilosella officinarum</i> subsp. <i>melanops</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.

Taxon name	Taxonomic studies required	Studies of native or archaeophyte status required	Further mapping data required for analysis	Reasons for appearing on the Waiting List	References
<i>Pilosella officinarum</i> subsp. <i>micradenia</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Pilosella officinarum</i> subsp. <i>officinarum</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Pilosella officinarum</i> subsp. <i>tricholepia</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Pilosella officinarum</i> subsp. <i>trichoscapa</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Pilosella officinarum</i> subsp. <i>trichosoma</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Pilosella peleteriana</i> subsp. <i>peleteriana</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Pilosella peleteriana</i> subsp. <i>subpeleteriana</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Pilosella peleteriana</i> subsp. <i>tenuiscapa</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Polygala vulgaris</i> subsp. <i>collina</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Polygala vulgaris</i> subsp. <i>vulgaris</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> subsp. <i>aquilinum</i>	Yes		Yes	More work required, insufficient mapping data.	Page & Jermy in Rich & Jermy, 1998; Jonsell, 2000.
<i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> subsp. <i>fulvum</i>	Yes		Yes	Probably only an ecotype, since DNA work in Australia and USA by Sheffield does not support this subspecies.	Thomson, 2004.
<i>Pteridium pinetorum</i>	Yes		Yes	More work required, insufficient mapping data.	Thomson, 2004.

Taxon name	Taxonomic studies required	Studies of native or archaeophyte status required	Further mapping data required for analysis	Reasons for appearing on the Waiting List	References
<i>Rhinanthus angustifolius</i>		Yes		First record in 1724, but not recognised in the South Downs stronghold until 1966. A critical species, poorly separated in Europe, where it was also recorded late with its population centre to the south of our area. Most populations adjacent to agricultural land.	
<i>Rhinanthus minor</i> subsp. <i>minor</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Rhinanthus minor</i> subsp. <i>stenophyllus</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Rumex acetosa</i> subsp. <i>biformis</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data.	Holyoak in Rich & Jermy, 1998.
<i>Sedum telephium</i> subsp. <i>fabaria</i>	Yes		Yes	More work required, insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Sedum telephium</i> subsp. <i>telephium</i>	Yes		Yes	More work required, insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Senecio aquaticus</i> subsp. <i>erraticus</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Senecio aquaticus</i> subsp. <i>ornatus</i>	Yes		Yes	Possible endemic, but more research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Senecio jacobaea</i> subsp. <i>dunensis</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Senecio vulgaris</i> subsp. <i>denticulatus</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Serapias parviflora</i>		Yes		May be native or alien. If it is native, then it is certainly a new arrival. It was agreed that newly arrived species should be present for 25 years before a conservation status would be given.	Murphy, 1994; French <i>et al.</i> (1999).
<i>Solidago virgaurea</i> subsp. <i>minuta</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Sonchus arvensis</i> subsp. <i>arvensis</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Sonchus arvensis</i> subsp. <i>uliginosus</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Sonchus asper</i> subsp. <i>asper</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Sonchus asper</i> subsp. <i>glaucescens</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.

Taxon name	Taxonomic studies required	Studies of native or archaeophyte status required	Further mapping data required for analysis	Reasons for appearing on the Waiting List	References
<i>Sparganium erectum</i> subsp. <i>erectum</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Sparganium erectum</i> subsp. <i>microcarpum</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Sparganium erectum</i> subsp. <i>neglectum</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Sparganium erectum</i> subsp. <i>oocarpum</i>			Yes	Insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Stachys alpina</i>		Yes		First record in 1897 is late if it were supposed to be native. However, its population dynamics show short-lived appearances after long periods of dormancy, meaning that it could have been missed. In Europe it reaches Belgium and northern France, so its occurrence in the UK as a native plant is not implausible.	
<i>Symphytum officinale</i> subsp. <i>bohemicum</i>	Yes		Yes	More work required, insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Symphytum officinale</i> subsp. <i>officinale</i>	Yes		Yes	More work required, insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Taraxacum atactum</i>		Yes		Not definitely native.	
<i>Taraxacum boekmanii</i>		Yes		Not definitely native.	
<i>Taraxacum ekmanii</i>		Yes		Not definitely native.	
<i>Taraxacum expallidiforme</i>		Yes		Not definitely native.	
<i>Taraxacum fasciatum</i>		Yes		Not definitely native.	
<i>Taraxacum hamiferum</i>		Yes		Not definitely native.	
<i>Taraxacum lacinosifrons</i>		Yes		Not definitely native.	
<i>Taraxacum lamprophyllum</i>		Yes		Not definitely native.	
<i>Taraxacum lepidum</i>		Yes		Not definitely native.	

Taxon name	Taxonomic studies required	Studies of native or archaeophyte status required	Further mapping data required for analysis	Reasons for appearing on the Waiting List	References
<i>Taraxacum necessarium</i>		Yes		Not definitely native.	
<i>Taraxacum ostenfeldii</i>		Yes		Not definitely native.	
<i>Taraxacum polyodon</i>		Yes		Not definitely native.	
<i>Taraxacum pruinatum</i>		Yes		Not definitely native.	
<i>Taraxacum pseudoproximum</i>		Yes		Not definitely native.	
<i>Taraxacum sagittipotens</i>		Yes		Not definitely native.	
<i>Taraxacum scotiniforme</i>		Yes		Not definitely native.	
<i>Taraxacum subcyanolepis</i>		Yes		Not definitely native.	
<i>Taraxacum texelense</i>		Yes	Yes	Not definitely native, known from one locality.	
<i>Taraxacum undulatum</i>		Yes		Not definitely native.	
<i>Taraxacum wallonicum</i>		Yes		Not definitely native.	
<i>Taraxacum xanthostigma</i>		Yes		Not definitely native.	
<i>Teucrium chamaedrrys</i>		Yes		A declining persistent garden escape, with one possibly native and morphologically distinct population in coastal downland turf. This population was first detected in 1945, and its status requires clarification.	Rose, 1988.
<i>Thalictrum minus</i> subsp. <i>arenarium</i>	Yes		Yes	Recognised as a subspecies in <i>Flora Nordica</i> . More work required, insufficient mapping data.	Jonsell, 2000.
<i>Tripleurospermum maritimum</i> subsp. <i>nigriceps</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Tripleurospermum maritimum</i> subsp. <i>vinicaule</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Ulmus glabra</i> subsp. <i>glabra</i>	Yes		Yes	More work required, insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Ulmus glabra</i> subsp. <i>montana</i>	Yes		Yes	More work required, insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Urtica dioica</i> subsp. <i>galeopsifolia</i>	Yes		Yes	Taxonomic work ongoing. Some cytological and morphological distinctions, but unclear how well these correlate.	Geltman, 1992.

Taxon name	Taxonomic studies required	Studies of native or archaeophyte status required	Further mapping data required for analysis	Reasons for appearing on the Waiting List	References
<i>Valeriana officinalis</i> subsp. <i>collina</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Valeriana officinalis</i> subsp. <i>sambucifolia</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Valerianella locusta</i> subsp. <i>dunensis</i>	Yes		Yes	More research required.	Sell & Murrell, 2006.
<i>Veronica spicata</i> subsp. <i>hybrida</i>	Yes			More work required.	Pigott & Walters, 1954.
<i>Veronica spicata</i> subsp. <i>spicata</i>	Yes			More work required.	
<i>Vulpia unilateralis</i>		Yes		First recorded in 1903, very late if supposed to be a native species, but it is extremely inconspicuous. Habitats are either artificial or disturbed semi-natural calcicolous grassland. On the continent it reaches north to Belgium and France, suggesting that the UK distribution is plausibly native. More ecological and historical research required.	
<i>Zannichellia palustris</i> subsp. <i>palustris</i>	Yes		Yes	More work required, insufficient mapping data.	
<i>Zannichellia palustris</i> subsp. <i>pedicellata</i>	Yes		Yes	More work required, insufficient mapping data.	