

Caprimulgus europaeus (Nightjar)

Full report outputted on the 31/07/2003 07:41:57

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	3093	Displaying males	1992	Full survey	Morris A, Burges D, Fuller RJ, Evans AD & Smith KW. 1994. The status and distribution of Nightjars <i>Caprimulgus europaeus</i> in Britain in 1992. <i>Bird Study</i> 41: 181-191. Note that the quoted population figure from 1992 is 3400 males, which corrects for a perceived population estimate of 10%. This is, however less meaningful for reporting purposes.
E	2864	Displaying males	1992	Full survey	Morris A, Burges D, Fuller RJ, Evans AD & Smith KW. 1994. The status and distribution of Nightjars <i>Caprimulgus europaeus</i> in Britain in 1992. <i>Bird Study</i> 41: 181-191.

NI	0	Displaying males	1998	Informed guess	Species Action Plan at http://www.ukbap.org .
S	41	Displaying males	1992	Full survey	Morris A, Burges D, Fuller RJ, Evans AD & Smith KW. 1994. The status and distribution of Nightjars <i>Caprimulgus europaeus</i> in Britain in 1992. <i>Bird Study</i> 41: 181-191.
W	188	Displaying males	1992	Full survey	Morris A, Burges D, Fuller RJ, Evans AD & Smith KW. 1994. The status and distribution of Nightjars <i>Caprimulgus europaeus</i> in Britain in 1992. <i>Bird Study</i> 41: 181-191.

Information originally entered by Dave Hoccom on Friday, November 22, 2002
 Information last changed by Dave Hoccom on Monday, November 25, 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:
UK	Increasing	Informed guess	Proceedings of a UKBAP seminar organised by the RSPB and Forest Enterprise, 18 September 2000 (unpublished)
E	Increasing	Informed guess	Proceedings of a UKBAP seminar organised by the RSPB and Forest Enterprise, 18 September 2000 (unpublished)
NI	Lost (pre BAP publication)	Informed guess	Species Action Plan at http://www.ukbap.org.uk
S	Stable	Informed guess	Proceedings of a UKBAP seminar organised by the RSPB and Forest Enterprise, 18 September 2000 (unpublished)

W	Increasing	Informed guess	Proceedings of a UKBAP seminar organised by the RSPB and Forest Enterprise, 18 September 2000 (unpublished)

Information originally entered by Dave Hoccom on Friday, November 22, 2002
 Information last changed by Dave Hoccom on Friday, November 22, 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:	Know ledge sufficient to make some impact, but more research needed.
Notes:	<p>Priorities for further research: further work investigating the impact of human-related disturbance on heath-nesting nightjars, to include the possible interaction with nest predation; assessing the implications of continuous cover forestry systems for forest-nesting birds. The effects of adverse weather during breeding, migration or while on wintering grounds, have not been quantified but are likely to be significant.</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 a population of at least 3400 churring males.

Target start date:

1998

Target end date:

ongoing

Target units:

Displaying males

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Target achieved	3093		Informed guess	Under active development
E	Target achieved	2864		Informed guess	Under active development

NI	Not applicable				
S	Target achieved	41		Informed guess	Under active development
W	Target achieved	188		Informed guess	Under active development

T2: Halt the decline in range of the nightjar (there were 268 occupied ten km squares in 1992).

Target start date: 1998

Target end date: ongoing

Target units: Occupied 10 km sq.

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Unknown	268			Under active development
E	Unknown	199			Under active development
NI	Not applicable				
S	Unknown	18			Under active development

W	Unknown	51			Under active development
----------	---------	----	--	--	--------------------------

T3: Increase the numbers of nightjar to 4000 churring males by the year 2003 (an 18% population increase in 10 years).

Target start date:	1998
Target end date:	2003
Target units:	Displaying males

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Unknown	3693			Under active development
E	Unknown	3394			Under active development
NI	Not applicable				
S	Unknown	61			Under active development
W	Unknown	238			Under active development

T4: Increase the range of nightjar to at least 280 ten km squares by the year 2003 (a 5% range increase in 10 years).

Target start date:	<input type="text" value="1998"/>
Target end date:	<input type="text" value="2003"/>
Target units:	<input type="text" value="Occupied 10 km sq."/> ▼

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	<input type="text" value="Unknown"/> ▼	<input type="text" value="280"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> ▼	<input type="text" value="Under active development"/> ▼
E	<input type="text" value="Unknown"/> ▼	<input type="text" value="206"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> ▼	<input type="text" value="Under active development"/> ▼
NI	<input type="text" value="Not applicable"/> ▼	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> ▼	<input type="text"/>
S	<input type="text" value="Unknown"/> ▼	<input type="text" value="54"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> ▼	<input type="text" value="Under active development"/> ▼
W	<input type="text" value="Unknown"/> ▼	<input type="text" value="20"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> ▼	<input type="text" value="Under active development"/> ▼

T5: In the long term (next 20 years), restore nightjar to parts of its former range in, for example, south-west England, west Midlands, north-west England, south-west Scotland and Northern Ireland.

Target start date:	1998
Target end date:	2018
Target units:	Occupied 10 km sq. ▼

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Unknown ▼				Under active development ▼
E	Unknown ▼				Under active development ▼
NI	No progress ▼			Informed guess ▼	No ▼
S	Unknown ▼				Under active development ▼
W	Not applicable ▼				

Information originally entered by Dave Hoccom on Friday, November 22, 2002
 Information last changed by Dave Hoccom on Friday, December 20, 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 The area of heathland in the UK has undergone a dramatic reduction during the course of this century due to agricultural land claim, afforestation and built development. For example, it is estimated that 40% of England's lowland heathland has been lost since the 1950s. Threats continue from housing and infra- structure developments.
- 2.2 Where heathland lacks appropriate management, it will become unsuitable as nesting habitat due to invasion by bushes and trees.
- 2.3 Nightjars require extensive areas of suitable feeding habitat, especially uncultivated land. The loss of such habitats within a few kilometres of the nesting area may result in a decline in the number of birds.
- 2.4 It is possible that a decline in the availability of large insects caused by changes in agriculture (such as the indirect effects of pesticides) and/or climatic change, may have affected nightjar populations.
- 2.5 In commercial forests, nightjars nest in the young stages of plantations, while there is still bare ground between the trees. If no other suitable habitat becomes available in other new or young stands, local population declines could occur as the recently planted blocks mature.

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"/>	6	Habitat loss / degradation - agriculture Abandonment of marginal land

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 | Habitat loss / degradation - infrastructure development Housing infrastructure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | Habitat loss / degradation - management practice Inappropriate heathland management |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | Habitat loss / degradation - management practice Scrub encroachment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 | Habitat loss / degradation - woodlands/forestry Inappropriate timing of forestry rotation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 | Human disturbance Other recreation / tourism |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 | Pollution - atmospheric Global warming / sea-level rise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 | Pollution - land Agricultural (other agro-chemicals) |

Information originally entered by Dave Hoccom on Friday, November 22, 2002
 Information last changed by Dave Hoccom on Wednesday, December 18, 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:

Species and habitat management Habitat quality declining (including due to poor management)	<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>The HLF-funded Tomorrow's Heathland Heritage (THH) programme, and restoration programmes operated by major heathland owners - often drawing on European funds (LIFE) or agri-environment payments - should restore a large proportion of the low land heathland resource to favourable ecological condition by 2008. Post THH, a sustainable source of funding ongoing heathland management needs to be identified and secured to ensure that the gains made are not lost.</p>	<p>Funding and incentive schemes</p>
Able to resolve:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Constraint 2:	
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> S
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> W
Solution:	Solution type:

A proactive approach is needed to ensure that those commercial forests (both public and private) where the forestry management system is a critical determinant of nightjar numbers, continue to operate to long-term management plans that aim to maintain the value of the site to nightjars (for some, this is a requirement of the SPA designation).

Management

Able to resolve:

Constraint 3:

Constraint keyword:

Country:

Species and habitat management | Habitat creation / restoration - not achieved

UK E NI S
 W

Solution:

Solution type:

A strategic and proactive approach to the large-scale re-creation of low land heathland, agreed by the main conservation agencies and organisations, coupled with an appropriate funding strategy, is required if the area of suitable breeding and foraging habitat available to nightjars is to be increased.

Legislation and policies

Able to resolve:

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"/>	Forest Enterprise
<input type="checkbox"/>	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds

Information originally entered by Dave Hoccom on Monday, November 25, 2002
Information last changed by Dave Hoccom on 20 December 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.

Delete:	Organisation:
<input type="checkbox"/>	British Trust for Ornithology

- Countryside Council for Wales
- Defence Estates
- English Nature
- Forestry Commission
- Hampshire Ornithological Society
- Wildlife Trusts

Information originally entered by Dave Hoccom on Friday, November 22, 2002
Information last changed by Dave Hoccom on 20 December 2002

9. Linkages to LBAPs

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



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.)

- 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): LBAPs have a potential role in advocating general heathland conservation policy to Local Planning Authorities. They could also help secure small areas of suitable breeding and foraging habitat in those English counties from which nightjars have been lost

Information originally entered by Dave Hoccom on Monday, November 25, 2002
Information last changed by Dave Hoccom on Friday, December 20, 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:

A good relationship between the Lead Partner organisation and the statutory Contact Point has led to an improved understanding of the nature of the threat to nightjars, and of what is required to overcome both threats and constraints to plan progress. The nature of the relationship has allowed progress to be made without the need for a formal steering group.

Country:

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Partnership | Statutory agency involvement

Success 2:

Description:

Country:

The efforts of the statutory conservation agencies and non-governmental organisations to defend low land heathland from the pressures of development have resulted in some notable successes. The siting of new buildings and associated infrastructure next to important heaths has been prevented, by demonstrating the potential for negative effects on the presence and breeding success of, amongst others, nightjars.

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Policy, legislation and designation | Other

Success 3:

Description:

Country:

A good understanding has been developed of how forestry management practices influence nightjar use of commercial forestry plantations. Discussions are ongoing as to how to ensure that key commercial forests remain of value to nightjars while meeting production targets, focussing on those forestry-nesting populations designated as SPAs.

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Species and habitat management | Woodland / forestry management improvement

Information originally entered by Dave Hoccom on Monday, November 25, 2002

Information last changed by Dave Hoccom on Friday, December 20, 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:	Rod Leslie	email:	rod.leslie@for
Your name:	David Hoccom		
Date:	20 December		
