

Tetrao urogallus (Capercaillie)

Full report outputted on the 01/08/2003 11:29:07

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	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
E	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<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	1100	Individuals	1998	Full survey	Bird Study 49, 177-185, 2002.
W	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Information originally entered by Kenny Kortland on Monday, December 16, 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 (slow ing) ▼	Partial or sample survey ▼	Brood counts and lek surveys
E	▼	▼	
NI	▼	▼	
S	Declining (slow ing) ▼	Partial or sample survey ▼	Brood counts and lek surveys
W	▼	▼	

Information originally entered by Kenny Kortland on Monday, December 16, 2002
Information last changed by JNCC on 03 April 2003

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:	Research on impact of climate change and predators required.

Information originally entered by Kenny Kortland on Monday, December 16, 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: Halt the decline of the capercaillie in its core range in eastern and central Scotland by 2000.

Target start date:

1995

Target end date:

2000

Target units:

Individuals

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Some progress (behind schedule) ▾				
E	▾				
NI	▾				

S	Some progress (behind schedule) ▼			Partial or sample survey ▼	Yes ▼
W					

T2: Expand the range of the capercaillie by 2010.

Target start date:	1995
Target end date:	2010
Target units:	Individuals ▼

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	No progress ▼				
E					
NI					
S	No progress ▼			Partial or sample survey ▼	Yes ▼
W					

T3: Increase the population of capercaillie in Scotland to 5000, by 2010.

Target start date: 1995

Target end date: 2010

Target units: Individuals

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	No progress	5000			
E					
NI					
S	No progress	5000		Partial or sample survey	Yes
W					

Information originally entered by Kenny Kortland on Monday, December 16, 2002
Information last changed by JNCC on 03 April 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 The factors affecting this species are poorly understood but may include:
 - 2.1.1 Predation due to a reduction in keeping.
 - 2.1.2 Collisions with deer fences.
 - 2.1.3 Over-shooting and human disturbance.
 - 2.1.4 Over-grazing by deer and sheep reducing the vigour of ground vegetation.
 - 2.1.5 An increase in adverse weather conditions during June when chicks are newly hatched.

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:
---------	-------	----------

- Accidental mortality | Pylon / building / fence collision
- Accidental mortality | Terrestrial bycatch - poisoning
- Changes in native species dynamics | Predation
- Habitat loss / degradation - agriculture | Inappropriate grazing (due to timing or livestock type)
- Human disturbance | Other recreation / tourism
- Pollution - atmospheric | Global warming / sea-level rise

Information originally entered by Kenny Kortland on Monday, December 16, 2002
 Information last changed by Kenny Kortland on Monday, December 16, 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:
Policy, legislation and designation International - general (e.g. on climate change)	<input type="checkbox"/> UK <input type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S

W

Solution:

Solution type:

Changing weather patterns may be ultimate cause of poor productivity

Research

Able to resolve:

Constraint 2:

Constraint keyword:

Country:

Species and habitat management | Woodland / forestry management - causing problems

UK E NI S
 W

Solution:

Solution type:

Reduce grazing in woods and prevent inappropriate silviculture in capercaillie habitat

Site protection / designation

Able to resolve:

Constraint 3:

Constraint keyword:

Country:

Partnership | Government - lack of support

UK E NI S

W

Solution:

Solution type:

More stringent policies on key issues

Legislation and policies

Able to resolve:

Information originally entered by Kenny Kortland on Monday, December 16, 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:

Centre for Ecology and Hydrology

Deer Commission for Scotland

Forest Enterprise

- Forestry and Timber Association
- Forestry Commission
- Game Conservancy Trust
- Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
- Royal Zoological Society of Scotland
- Scottish Gamekeepers' Association
- Scottish Landowners Federation
- Scottish Natural Heritage

Information originally entered by Kenny Kortland on Monday, December 16, 2002
Information last changed by Kenny Kortland on Monday, December 16, 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 LBAP

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):

Information originally entered by Kenny Kortland on Monday, December 16, 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:

Forestry Commission Capercaillie Core Areas

Country:

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Policy, legislation and designation | Improved protection through site designation - local (LNR, SNCI, Community Wildlife Areas)

Success 2:

Description:

Country:

<input type="text" value="Scottish Executive Fence Challenge Fund"/>		<input type="checkbox"/> UK	<input type="checkbox"/> E	<input type="checkbox"/> NI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S	<input type="checkbox"/> W
Keyword:						
<input type="text" value="Species and habitat management Other"/>						
Success 3:						
Description:				Country:		
<input type="text" value="Forestry Commission guidance improved."/>				<input type="checkbox"/> UK	<input type="checkbox"/> E	<input type="checkbox"/> NI
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S	<input type="checkbox"/> W	
Keyword:						
<input type="text" value="Species and habitat management Other"/>						

Information originally entered by Kenny Kortland on Monday, December 16, 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" value="Mick Marquiss"/>	email:	<input type="text" value="m.marquiss@c"/>
-----------------------	--	---------------	---

Your name: Kenny Kortlan

Date: 16 December
