

Jynx torquilla (Wryneck)

Full report outputted on the 31/07/2003 09:38:26

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	3	Displaying males ▼	2002	Informed guess ▼	
E	0	Displaying males ▼	2002	Best guess ▼	
NI		▼		▼	
S	3	Displaying males ▼	2002	Informed guess ▼	
W		▼		▼	

Information originally entered by Stuart Benn on Wednesday, December 04, 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	Fluctuating / No clear trend	Informed guess	Rare Breeding Birds Panel data and other records, this species has virtually been lost as a breeding species.
E	Lost (pre BAP publication)	Informed guess	Rare Breeding Birds Panel data and other records
NI			
S	Fluctuating / No clear trend	Informed guess	Rare Breeding Birds Panel data and other records, there are now only sporadic breeding records.
W			

Information originally entered by Stuart Benn on Wednesday, December 04, 2002
Information last changed by Stuart Benn on Wednesday, December 04, 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 insufficient and no suitable research programme in place.
Notes:	Know ledge of the reasons for the decline in this species is lackir and there is currently no likelihood that research could be carried out to rectify this.

Information originally entered by Stuart Benn 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: Retain the wryneck as a regular breeding species in the UK.

Target start date:

1998

Target end date:		ongoing			
Target units:		Breeding pairs/units ▼			
	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	No progress ▼			Best guess ▼	Under consideration ▼
E	No progress ▼			Best guess ▼	Under consideration ▼
NI	▼			▼	▼
S	Unknown ▼			Best guess ▼	Under consideration ▼
W	▼			▼	▼

Information originally entered by Stuart Benn 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:

2.2 Loss of nesting habitat, especially the felling of orchards and over-mature trees, which were replaced by orchards of young trees or converted to arable.

2.3 Increasing use of pesticides. In common with a number of other species, the wryneck population decline coincided with the increasing use of agricultural chemicals in lowland habitats. It seems likely that this reduced the amount of insect food available.

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"/>	2	Habitat loss / degradation - agriculture Loss of orchards
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Habitat loss / degradation - agriculture Ploughing
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Intrinsic Factors Low population density / size
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Pollution - land Agricultural (other agro-chemicals)

Information originally entered by Stuart Benn 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.

Constraint 1:	
Constraint keyword:	Country:
Species and habitat management Species population size decrease	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> W
Solution:	Solution type:
The population is at such a low level that there is little that can be done other than try to protect any sporadic breeding attempts.	Other
Able to resolve:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Constraint 2:	
Constraint keyword:	Country:
	<input type="checkbox"/> UK <input type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S

	<input type="checkbox"/> W
Solution:	Solution type:
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Able to resolve:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Constraint 3:	
Constraint keyword:	Country:
<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> UK <input type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S
	<input type="checkbox"/> W
Solution:	Solution type:
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Able to resolve:	<input type="checkbox"/>

Information originally entered by Stuart Benn on Wednesday, December 04, 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.

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?



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:



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 Stuart Benn on Wednesday, December 04, 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:

Country:

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Success 2:

Description:

Country:

 UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Success 3:

Description:

Country:

 UK E NI S W

Keyword:

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"/>		
