

# *Blera fallax* (a Hoverfly)

Full report outputted on the 30/07/2003 17:18:07

## 1. Status of the habitat / species

Please give your most accurate assessment of the status of your species or habitat for the UK and for each country. Leave the row blank where the species or habitat does not occur in that country.

	Amount:	Units:	Year:	Accuracy:	Reference for data:
UK	2	Sites/ Populations	2001	Partial or sample survey	Rotheray, G. (2001) Assessment of the population status of the priority hoverfly, <i>Blera fallax</i> . Unpublished report to the steering group
E					
NI					
S	2	Sites/ Populations	2001	Partial or sample survey	Rotheray, G. (2001) Assessment of the population status of the priority hoverfly, <i>Blera fallax</i> . Unpublished report to the steering group

<b>W</b>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
----------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Information originally entered by Andy Amphlett on Wednesday, December 04, 2002  
 Information last changed by Andy Amphlett on Friday, December 06, 2002

---

## 2. Trend in Biological Status

Please give your best estimate of the current trend for your species or habitat for the UK, and each appropriate country, using the following categories. Please give an estimate unless there is absolutely no information on which to assess status.

	Trend:	Accuracy:	Reference for data:
<b>UK</b>	<input type="text" value="Stable"/>	<input type="text" value="Partial or sample survey"/>	Rotheray, G.E. & MacGowan, I. (2000). Status and breeding sites of three presumed endangered Scottish saproxylic syrphids. <i>J. Insect Conservation</i> , 4 215-223. Rotheray, G. (2001) Assessment of the population status of the priority hoverfly, <i>Blera fallax</i> . Unpublished report to the steering group.
<b>E</b>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<b>NI</b>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

<b>S</b>	Stable	Partial or sample survey	Rotheray, G.E. & MacGowan, I. (2000). Status and breeding sites of three presumed endangered Scottish saproxylic syrphids. <i>J. Insect Conservation</i> , 4 215-223. Rotheray, G. (2001) Assessment of the population status of the priority hoverfly, <i>Blera fallax</i> . Unpublished report to the steering group.
<b>W</b>			

Information originally entered by Andy Amphlett on Wednesday, December 04, 2002  
 Information last changed by Andy Amphlett on Wednesday, December 18, 2002

### 3. Status of knowledge

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

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

**Status of knowledge:** Knowledge sufficient to make some impact, but more research needed.

**Notes:**

Requirements of Blera fallax are not fully understood. Need more work on: adult food requirements and dispersal powers, conditions that cause and maintain decay in pine stumps, creation of suitable breeding sites etc.

Information originally entered by Andy Amphlett on Wednesday, December 04, 2002

---

## 4. Progress on targets

Each of the revised targets from the 2001 Targets Review is listed below.

For each one please give a qualitative assessment of progress for the UK and each country. You can also enter quantitative information on progress by entering data in each of the target boxes and entering the current amount in the amount box. For more information see Help.

### T1: Maintain the population size at all known sites.

Target start date:

1998

Target end date:

ongoing

Target units:

Individuals

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
<b>UK</b>	Some progress (on schedule) ▼			Informed guess ▼	Yes ▼
<b>E</b>	Not applicable ▼				
<b>NI</b>	Not applicable ▼				
<b>S</b>	Some progress (on schedule) ▼			Informed guess ▼	Yes ▼
<b>W</b>	Not applicable ▼				

**T2: Enhance the population size at all known sites by 2010.**

Target start date:

Target end date:

Target units:

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
<b>UK</b>	Some progress (on schedule) ▼			Informed guess ▼	Yes ▼

<b>E</b>	Not applicable				
<b>NI</b>	Not applicable				
<b>S</b>	Some progress (on schedule)			Informed guess	Yes
<b>W</b>	Not applicable				

**T3: Extend the range of Blera fallax into native pine woods.**

Target start date:

Target end date:

Target units:

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
<b>UK</b>	No progress				
<b>E</b>	Not applicable				
<b>NI</b>	Not applicable				

<b>S</b>	No progress				
<b>W</b>	Not applicable				

Information originally entered by Andy Amphlett on Wednesday, December 04, 2002

---

## 5. Current factors affecting the habitat

When your plan was published the factors (threats) that were thought to be causing loss or decline were listed (in section 2). Re-assessing the current situation may help prioritise actions for your species or habitat. In addition, this enables identification of the main threats to biodiversity across all plans. It is useful to assess whether the importance of different factors is changing and whether there are new issues emerging.

The threat section from the original plan is duplicated below, and a first attempt at categorising the threats has been made. Please confirm that you agree with the categorisation of the original threats identified in the plan (by deleting any wrongly categorised threats and adding the correct category). Please also add to the list any significant threats that have emerged recently, being mindful of environmental issues that have increased in profile or been recognised since plan publication (e.g. climate change). Once you are happy that the list contains all the threats identified in the published plan together with any new ones, please rank them in order of severity (1= highest threat). If the situation has changed and one of the published threats is no longer significant, please leave this in the list but give this rank = 0.

### Current factors affecting the habitat from the original publication:

2.1 Inappropriate woodland management.

2.2 Paucity of breeding sites.

2.3 There is a potential threat from over collecting.

### Keyworded factors:

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

Delete:	Rank:	Keyword:
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Habitat loss / degradation - woodlands/forestry   Inappropriate timing of forestry rotation
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Habitat loss / degradation - woodlands/forestry   Lack of dead wood
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Harvesting   Collection - scientific/leisure
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Intrinsic Factors   Limited dispersal
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Intrinsic Factors   Low population density / size

Information originally entered by Andy Amphlett on Wednesday, December 04, 2002

## 6. Constraints (optional)

Select the three most significant constraints to achieving the targets of the plan, and indicate the order of priority (1-3 with 1 being the most significant constraint). Only include constraints that are acting as a real blockage to delivering the plan targets or leading to a substantial delay in their delivery. For each constraint, please indicate whether you feel that it is within the ability of the lead partner or steering group to resolve the constraint.

<b>Constraint 1:</b>	
<b>Constraint keyword:</b>	<b>Country:</b>
Species and habitat management   Woodland / forestry management - causing problems	<input type="checkbox"/> UK <input type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S

W

**Solution:**

**Solution type:**

Encourage more appropriate management of commercial woodlands: Continuous cover forestry rather than clear-felling; avoid damage to existing stumps; no chemical treatment of stumps; occasionally cut trees 80cms above ground to provide longer-lasting breeding sites.

Management

**Able to resolve:**

**Constraint 2:**

**Constraint keyword:**

**Country:**

Research, survey and information | Habitat creation/restoration techniques poorly understood

UK  E  NI  S  
 W

**Solution:**

**Solution type:**

Continue experimental creation of breeding sites and apply to other woodland sites if successful.

Research

**Able to resolve:**

**Constraint 3:**

<b>Constraint keyword:</b>	<b>Country:</b>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> UK <input type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> W
<b>Solution:</b>	<b>Solution type:</b>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<b>Able to resolve:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Information originally entered by Andy Amphlett on Thursday, December 05, 2002  
Information last changed by Andy Amphlett on Friday, December 06, 2002

## 7. Steering Group

Please list all organisations that are represented on the steering group for your species/habitat (include all organisations that have contributed either directly or by correspondence within the last 3 years). Where a steering group does not exist please leave this form blank.

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

Delete:	Organisation:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Malloch Society
<input type="checkbox"/>	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds

<input type="checkbox"/> Scottish Natural Heritage
--

Information originally entered by Andy Amphlett on Wednesday, December 04, 2002  
Information last changed by Andy Amphlett on Thursday, December 19, 2002

---

## 8. Other Groups/Organisations

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

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

---

## 9. Linkages to LBAPs

a) Which of the following most accurately describes your interaction with LBAPs, up to now?

Good contact with LBAPs, information exchanged.	▼
---	---

b) If you have been in contact with LBAPs how was it initiated?

By Lead Partner	▼
-----------------	---

c) Irrespective of current contact, how important do you consider LBAP co-ordinated action will be in achieving the targets of the plan? Select from category:

Important	▼
-----------	---

d) If you consider LBAP action to be anything other than unimportant, which of the following forms of engagement do you think would be appropriate? (Note, you may tick more than one category.)

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

Other (please specify):

Information originally entered by Andy Amphlett on Wednesday, December 04, 2002  
Information last changed by Andy Amphlett on Wednesday, December 18, 2002

---

>

## 10. Successes (optional)

Have there been key successes in the implementation of your plan that should be drawn to the attention of government, the wider BAP partnership, or the public? Please give a brief description (i.e. 2-3 sentences) of up to three successes and allocate a topic area to each of them:

**Success 1:**

**Description:**

Surveys from 1989 to 1999 and full repeat survey in 2001. Latter provided detailed information as basis for future monitoring.

**Country:**

UK  E  NI  S  W

**Keyword:**

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

**Success 2:****Description:**

Experimental testing of stump management and provision of artificial nest sites at one site. Early results are encouraging.

**Country:**

UK  E  NI  S  W

**Keyword:**

Research, survey and information | Habitat creation/restoration techniques improved

**Success 3:****Description:****Country:**

<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> UK	<input type="checkbox"/> E	<input type="checkbox"/> NI	<input type="checkbox"/> S	<input type="checkbox"/> W
<b>Keyword:</b>					
<input type="text"/>					

Information originally entered by Andy Amphlett on Wednesday, December 04, 2002

---

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

**Sign-off:**

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

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

<b>Contact point:</b>	David Phillips	<b>email:</b>	david.phillips@
<b>Your name:</b>	Andy Amphlet		
<b>Date:</b>	19 December		

---