

Tetrao tetrix (Black Grouse)

Full report outputted on the 01/08/2003 11:28:08

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	6510	Displaying males ▼	1996	Full survey ▼	Hancock et al. 1999. Bird Study 46: 1-15 (survey was undertaken in 1995/96)
E	855	Displaying males ▼	2002	Full survey ▼	Warren, P. 2002. Report to England BAP steering group
NI	0	▼		▼	

S	4960	Displaying males	1996	Full survey	Hancock et al. 1999. Bird Study 46: 1-15 (survey was undertaken in 1995/96)
	246	Displaying males	2002	Full survey	Lindley, P. 2002. Draft report to UK BAP steering group

Information originally entered by Julian Hughes on Friday, November 08, 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	Declining (continuing/accelerating)	Informed guess	Hancock et al. 1999. Bird Study 46: 1-15
E	Increasing	Full survey	Warren, P. 2002. Report to England BAP steering group

NI	Not applicable (does not occur in this country)		
S	Declining (continuing/accelerating)	Informed guess	Some evidence of stabilisation in one or two areas, but no recent comparative data in most areas
W	Increasing	Full survey	Lindley, P. 2002. Draft report to UK BAP steering group

Information originally entered by Julian Hughes on Friday, November 08, 2002
 Information last changed by Julian Hughes on Thursday, December 19, 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:

Good autecological knowledge and sufficient to provide basis for habitat management/advice. However, there remain gaps in knowledge of the precise mechanisms driving the decline, which may vary in different habitats/areas of the UK, and both the scale and the precision (e.g. level of tree removal necessary) of management measures necessary to reverse the decline.

Information originally entered by Julian Hughes on Friday, November 08, 2002

Information last changed by Julian Hughes on Friday, December 20, 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 of black grouse (at least at its 1996 level).

Target start date:

1999

Target end date:

Ongoing

Target units:

Displaying males

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Some progress (behind schedule) ▼	6510		Informed guess ▼	Yes ▼
E	Target exceeded (plan progress) ▼	800	855	Full survey ▼	Yes ▼
NI	Not applicable ▼				
S	Some progress (behind schedule) ▼	4960		Informed guess ▼	Yes ▼
W	Target exceeded (plan progress) ▼	131	246	Full survey ▼	Yes ▼

T2: Restore the range of black grouse to its 1988-91 extent by 2008-11 as measured by BTO surveys.

Target start date:

Target end date:

Target units:

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Unknown ▼	432			Yes ▼

E	No progress	61	43	Full survey	Yes
NI	Not applicable				
S	Unknown	319			Yes
W	No progress	40	23	Full survey	Yes

T3: In the long term (20 years), increase the range of the black grouse in the UK.

Target start date: 1999

Target end date: 2019

Target units: Occupied 10 km sq.

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	No progress				
E					
NI	Not applicable				

S	No progress				
W	No progress				

T4: In the long term (20 years), increase the population of the black grouse in the UK.

Target start date:	1999
Target end date:	2019
Target units:	Displaying males

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	No progress			Informed guess	Yes
E	Some progress (on schedule)			Full survey	Yes
NI	Not applicable				
S	No progress			Informed guess	Yes
W	Some progress (ahead of schedule)			Full survey	Yes

T5: Promote re-colonisation of formerly occupied areas between currently isolated populations by 2005.

Target start date:

Target end date:

Target units: ▼

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	<input type="text" value="No progress"/> ▼	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="Informed guess"/> ▼	<input type="text" value="Yes"/> ▼
E	<input type="text" value="No progress"/> ▼	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="Full survey"/> ▼	<input type="text" value="Yes"/> ▼
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"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="Unknown"/> ▼	<input type="text" value="Yes"/> ▼
W	<input type="text" value="No progress"/> ▼	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="Full survey"/> ▼	<input type="text" value="Yes"/> ▼

Information originally entered by Julian Hughes on Friday, November 08, 2002
 Information last changed by Julian Hughes on 06 January 2003

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 Over-grazing and agricultural improvement have removed key food plants such as bilberry, heather and birch scrub in many areas. These plants also support invertebrate prey items important for chicks, and provide nest sites. Sheep grazing in woodland can reduce the shrub understorey which is utilised by the species.
- 2.2 The shading out of the understorey in maturing conifer plantations.
- 2.3 Drainage and overgrazing of mires destroy two important black grouse food sources - the flowers of cotton grass and invertebrates. Rushes, which provide nesting cover and sources of insect food, are also affected adversely. Loss of wet flushes and riparian vegetation in afforested areas also leads to loss of food plants and invertebrates.
- 2.4 The re-seeding of traditional hay meadows or enclosed rough grazings destroys plants such as sedges, rushes, sorrel, buttercups and clover, which are important food plants.
- 2.5 Over-frequent moorland burning can lead to the formation of impoverished acidic grasslands.
- 2.6 Fragmentation of black grouse habitat often leads to small populations which are unlikely to persist.
- 2.7 Considerable numbers of black grouse are killed by collisions with deer fences. Overhead power and telephone cables may also be a problem.
- 2.8 Predation may be a limiting factor in some regions. Studies have shown the main predators to be foxes and crows.

2.9 Disturbance of lekking birds has been identified as a severe problem at some isolated sites.

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	Accidental mortality Pylon / building / fence collision
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Changes in native species dynamics Predation
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Habitat loss / degradation - agriculture Inappropriate grazing (due to timing or livestock type)
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Habitat loss / degradation - agriculture Intensive grassland management
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Habitat loss / degradation - agriculture Re-seeding of pastures / grassland
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Habitat loss / degradation - extraction/drainage Drainage (for agriculture)
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Habitat loss / degradation - management practice Loss of open areas
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Human disturbance Interference / displacement
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Human disturbance Other recreation / tourism

- Intrinsic Factors | Limited dispersal
- Intrinsic Factors | Low population density / size
- Pollution - atmospheric | Global warming / sea-level rise

Information originally entered by Julian Hughes on Friday, November 08, 2002
 Information last changed by Julian Hughes on Friday, December 20, 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:
Funding and incentives Agricultural schemes - changes needed to structure / payments	<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:

In all countries, agri-environment schemes need to be more flexible, especially to encourage shepherding (to avoid local overgrazing/undergrazing) and mixed livestock and arable systems. In Scotland and Wales, substantial increase required in funding; In England, flexibility in management of vegetation is required within 10 year agri-environment agreements, otherwise lack of variance in structure likely to lead to reversal of recovery (time resource is one handicap in enabling this flexibility to occur, and the revision of AE schemes provides an opportunity to rectify this).

Funding and incentive schemes

Able to resolve:

Constraint 2:

Constraint keyword:

Funding and incentives | Woodland Schemes - changes needed to structure / payments

Country:

UK E NI S
 W

Solution:

Solution type:

Insufficient incentive available to private forestry managers to achieve habitat mosaic (restructuring of tree spacing et within the Forest Design Plan) on the scale required; SFGS starting in April 2003 may provide a means to deliver this in Scotland.

Funding and incentive schemes

Able to resolve:

Constraint 3:

Constraint keyword:

Research, survey and information | Monitoring surveys required

Country:

UK E NI S
 W

Solution:

Funding for surveys, especially of forestry habitats, to enable targeted habitat management to be undertaken

Solution type:

Survey / monitoring

Able to resolve:

Information originally entered by Julian Hughes on Friday, November 08, 2002
Information last changed by Julian Hughes on Friday, December 20, 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:

British Association for Shooting and Conservation

- Country Landowners and Business Association
- Countryside Council for Wales
- Deer Commission for Scotland
- Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
- Durham Biodiversity Partnership
- English Nature
- Farmers Union of Wales
- Forest Enterprise
- Forestry and Timber Association
- Forestry Commission
- Game Conservancy Trust
- Heather Trust
- Ministry of Defence

- Moorland Association
- Moorland Gamekeepers Association
- National Assembly for Wales Agriculture Department
- National Farmers Union of Scotland
- National Trust
- NFU Cymru
- Northumberland National Park Authority
- Northumbrian Water
- Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
- Scottish Executive Environment and Rural Affairs Division
- Scottish Landowners Federation
- Scottish Natural Heritage
- Severn Trent Water

- Snowdonia National Park Authority
- Tilhill/EFG
- Wales Wildlife & Countryside Link
- Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority

Information originally entered by Julian Hughes on Friday, November 08, 2002
Information last changed by Julian Hughes on Friday, December 20, 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"/>	Argyll & Bute LBAP
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cairngorms Partnership
<input type="checkbox"/>	Central Scotland Black Grouse and Capercaillie Group

- Farming and Wildlife Advisory Group
- Fountain Forestry
- ScottishPower
- Spey Black Grouse Study Group
- Tayside Black Grouse Study Group

Information originally entered by Julian Hughes on Friday, December 20, 2002
Information last changed by Julian Hughes on Friday, December 20, 2002

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?

By Both

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):

Although the UK Steering Group has had only limited formal contact with LBAPs, some of the individual organisations comprising the Steering Group have greater contact (e.g. development of collaborative projects, direct provision of advice)

Information originally entered by Julian Hughes on Friday, November 08, 2002
Information last changed by Julian Hughes on Thursday, December 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:

Country:

Partnership of CCW, FE, RSPB and private landowners/forestry managers, part funded by European Union and National Assembly for Wales, undertook large-scale habitat management (principally forestry thinning and heather cutting) at six key sites holding (in 1997) 80% of Welsh population. Population has increased by 43% since 1998 at these sites, compared to further declines and contraction in range elsewhere here in Wales.

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Species and habitat management | Species population size increase

Success 2:

Description:

Country:

Project officer, funded by EN, GCT, MoD, Northumbrian Water and RSPB, has drawn up management plans for farmers and shooting estates in the North Pennines and worked closely with RDS/EN staff in order to provide funding for reductions in grazing, planting of native ghyll woodlands and other management measures. Numbers of lekking males and breeding productivity have increased in areas where grazing has been reduced; 70 000 ha of moorland, 25 000 ha of rough grazing and 1000 ha of meadows in the North Pennines are now under Countryside Stewardship agreement. The black grouse population in England has increased by 12% since 1998.

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Species and habitat management | Species population size increase

Success 3:

Description:

Country:

A recovery project in Argyll & Bute, launched in spring 2002 and involving FC, RSPB and SNH through the LBAP, has drawn in new funding sources for black grouse work, including Scottish Power and the Esmee Fairbairn Foundation. Initially concentrating on surveys and training for forestry managers, it is hoped to build on the successes of similar projects in the North Pennines, Wales and south west Scotland, to deliver appropriate habitat changes, especially in forestry plantations. It has become clear that jointly-funded project officers are the most effective means to advocate changes for black grouse on the ground, though flexible statutory land managers and sufficient funding through grant schemes are also critical to achieving changes at the necessary scale.

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Partnership | Other

Information originally entered by Julian Hughes on Friday, December 20, 2002
Information last changed by Julian Hughes 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:

Dr Andy

email:

andy.douse@

Your name:

Julian Hughes

Date:

6.1.03
