

Bombylius minor (Heath bee-fly)

Full report outputted on the 30/07/2003 17:24:20

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	20	Sites/ Populations	2002	Full survey	BENHS Heathland Flies project, annual project reports to English Nature 1999-2001. 2002 Report in preparation.
E	19	Sites/ Populations	2002	Full survey	BENHS Heathland Flies project, annual project reports to English Nature 1999-2001. 2002 Report in preparation.
NI					
S					
W					

2. Trend in Biological Status

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

	Trend:	Accuracy:	Reference for data:
UK	Stable	Full survey	BENHS Heathland Flies project, annual project reports to English Nature 1999-2001. 2002 Report in preparation.
E	Stable	Full survey	BENHS Heathland Flies project, annual project reports to English Nature 1999-2001. 2002 Report in preparation.
NI	Not applicable (does not occur in this country)		
S	Not applicable (does not occur in this country)		
W	Not known		

3. Status of knowledge

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

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

Status of knowledge:	Know ledge sufficient to make some impact, but more research needed.
Notes:	<p>It has not been possible to ascertain the true aculeate hosts of this bee-fly so far in this project. Although some sites where oviposition has occurred have been excavated, no pupal cases or the flies have been found during the project. However, some were found by previous observers of this species. This evidence and recent observational experiences have given us enough details to suggest the essential habitat preferences of this species in both its current main areas, the heaths of Dorset and the sand-dune heath of the Isle of Man.</p>

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 populations at all known sites.

Target start date:	<input type="text" value="2000"/>
Target end date:	<input type="text" value="2003"/>
Target units:	<input type="text" value="Sites/ Populations"/>

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	<input type="text" value="Some progress (behind schedule)"/>	<input type="text" value="37"/>	<input type="text" value="20"/>	<input type="text" value="Full survey"/>	<input type="text" value="Under consideration"/>
E	<input type="text" value="Some progress (behind schedule)"/>	<input type="text" value="35"/>	<input type="text" value="18"/>	<input type="text" value="Full survey"/>	<input type="text" value="Under consideration"/>
NI	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
S	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
W	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

T2: Extend current range, by appropriate management of five sites adjacent to existing sites, by 2010.

Target start date:	<input type="text" value="1999"/>
Target end date:	<input type="text" value="2010"/>
Target units:	<input type="text" value="Sites/ Populations"/>

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	<input type="text" value="No progress"/>	<input type="text" value="5"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
E	<input type="text" value="No progress"/>	<input type="text" value="5"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
NI	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
S	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
W	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Information originally entered by Stephen R Miles on Tuesday, November 19, 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 Loss and fragmentation of heathland habitat, including verge heath, owing to development and scrub encroachment.

2.2 Inappropriate heathland management.

2.3 Loss or shading of vertical sand banks, with consequent decline in numbers of the host bees.

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"/>	3	Habitat loss / degradation - infrastructure development Housing infrastructure
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Habitat loss / degradation - infrastructure development Infilling (e.g. of lakes / ponds / quarries)

- Habitat loss / degradation - infrastructure development | Landfill (for waste)
- Habitat loss / degradation - management practice | Inappropriate heathland management
- Habitat loss / degradation - management practice | Loss of open areas
- Habitat loss / degradation - management practice | Scrub encroachment
- Habitat loss / degradation - woodlands/forestry | Tree / wood planting

Information originally entered by Stephen R Miles on Tuesday, November 19, 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.

Constraint 1:	
Constraint keyword:	Country:
Action plan process Unrealistic timescale for targets	<input type="checkbox"/> UK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> W
Solution:	Solution type:

Priority 1. Forward projection of the targets by 3 years is needed. Many were set before this biodiversity project was properly underway.

Research

Able to resolve:

Constraint 2:

Constraint keyword:

Policy, legislation and designation | Insufficient protection through UK designated sites (SSSI, NNR, MNR)

Country:

- UK E NI S
- W

Solution:

Solution type:

Priority 1. Designated sites need to include excavated sand-pit areas within their boundaries so that the vertical cliff-faces required by this species can be retained on reserves and SSSIs etc.

Site protection / designation

Able to resolve:

Constraint 3:

Constraint keyword:

Country:

Species and habitat management Woodland / forestry management - causing problems		<input type="checkbox"/> UK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S
		<input type="checkbox"/> W
Solution:	Solution type:	
<p>Priority 3. Many of the areas where this species formerly occurred are now coniferous plantations. The most hilly areas of these forests, where open heather with erosion gullies or sand bank cliffs can be re-created or areas that previously held excavated pits, need to be opened up and linked to existing open heathland.</p>	<input type="text" value="Management"/>	
Able to resolve:	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Information originally entered by Stephen R Miles on Tuesday, November 19, 2002
Information last changed by Stephen R Miles on Sunday, December 01, 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"/>	British Entomological and Natural History Society

English Nature

Information originally entered by Stephen R Miles on Sunday, December 01, 2002
Information last changed by Stephen R Miles on Sunday, December 01, 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?

Little or no contact with LBAPs.

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

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:

Slightly important

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

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

Other (please specify):	<div style="border: 1px solid gray; padding: 5px;"><p>A joint field meeting at relevant sites in Dorset and the Isle of Man may be worthwhile. However our project has no funds to support such an endeavour.</p></div>
--------------------------------	---

Information originally entered by Stephen R Miles on Tuesday, November 19, 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:

During the course of the project, since 1999, the species has been found at 13 additional sites in Dorset

Country:

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Action plan process | Steering group established

Success 2:

Description:

Country:

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

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
Keyword:					
<input type="text"/>					

Information originally entered by Stephen R Miles on Tuesday, November 19, 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:

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