

Turdus philomelos (Song Thrush)

Full report outputted on the 01/08/2003 11:47:52

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	115000	Displaying males	2000	Informed guess	Extrapolated from Gibbons, Reid & Chapman: The New Atlas (incorporating 10 yr smoothed CBC trend)
E					No data available
NI					No data available
S					No data available
W					No data available

Information originally entered by Andy Evans on 06 January 2003
Information last changed by Andy Evans on Monday, January 13, 2003

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	Partial or sample survey	http://www.bto.org/birdtrends/wcrsouth.htm (data for 1994-2000)
E	Increasing	Partial or sample survey	http://www.bto.org/birdtrends/wcrsouth.htm (data for 1994-2000)
NI	Not known	Partial or sample survey	small sample
S	Stable	Partial or sample survey	http://www.bto.org/birdtrends/wcrsouth.htm (data for 1994-2000)

W	Increasing	Partial or sample survey	http://www.bto.org/birdtrends/wcrsouth.htm (data for 1994-2000)

Information originally entered by Andy Evans on Wednesday, December 11, 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 effectively deliver the plan targets.
Notes:	BAP action to research w oodland design for song thrush remain outstanding

Information originally entered by Andy Evans on Wednesday, December 11, 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 in numbers of song thrush in the UK by the year 2000.

Target start date:	1995
Target end date:	2000
Target units:	<input type="text"/>

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Target achieved	100	112	Partial or sample survey	Yes
E	Target achieved	100	107	Partial or sample survey	Yes
NI	Unknown	100		Partial or sample survey	
S	Target achieved	100	118	Partial or sample survey	Yes
W	Target achieved	100	134	Partial or sample survey	Yes

T2: Maintain the UK geographical range of the song thrush at the 1995 level as measured by the frequency of occupation of BBS squares.

Target start date:	1995
Target end date:	Ongoing
Target units:	<input type="text"/>

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
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	<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"/>

T3: Maintain the UK population size of the song thrush at or above the 1995 level as measured by the BBS index.

Target start date: 1995

Target end date: Ongoing

Target units:

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Target achieved	100	<input type="text"/>	Partial or sample survey	Yes
E	Target achieved	100	<input type="text"/>	Partial or sample survey	Yes
NI	Unknown	100	<input type="text"/>	Partial or sample survey	Yes
S	Target achieved	100	<input type="text"/>	Partial or sample survey	Yes
W	Target achieved	100	<input type="text"/>	Partial or sample survey	Yes

T4: By 2010, increase the geographical range at least to the 1968/72 range.

Target start date: 1995

Target end date: 2010

Target units:

Occupied 10 km sq.

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Unknown			Full survey	Under consideration
E	Unknown			Full survey	Under consideration
NI	Unknown			Full survey	Under consideration
S	Unknown			Full survey	Under consideration
W	Unknown			Full survey	Under consideration

T5: By 2010, increase the population size at least to the 1970 level as measured by the CBC/BBS index.

Target start date:

1995

Target end date:

2010

Target units:

Breeding pairs/units

Progress

Target

Current

Accuracy

Monitoring

UK	Some progress (behind schedule) ▼	100	43	Partial or sample survey ▼	Yes ▼
E	▼			▼	▼
NI	▼			▼	▼
S	▼			▼	▼
W	▼			▼	▼

Information originally entered by Andy Evans on Wednesday, December 11, 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 Reasons for the decline are poorly understood but may relate to the following factors:

2.1.1 Changes in farming affecting food supply and the availability of nest sites, particularly the switch from spring to autumn sowing of cereals, and possibly the increased use of pesticides.

2.1.2 Severe winter weather and dry soil conditions affecting food supply.

2.1.3 Predation by corvids and foxes.

2.1.4 Competition with blackbirds.

2.1.5 Hunting in southern France.

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"/>	1	Habitat loss / degradation - agriculture Intensive crop regimes
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Habitat loss / degradation - agriculture Loss of mixed farming
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Habitat loss / degradation - extraction/drainage Drainage (for agriculture)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Pollution - atmospheric Global warming / sea-level rise
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Pollution - land Agricultural (other agro-chemicals)

Information originally entered by Andy Evans on Wednesday, December 11, 2002

Information last changed by Andy Evans on Monday, January 13, 2003

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> UK <input type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> W
Solution:	Solution type:
Develop prescriptions to deliver damp grass/ditches in summer	Funding and incentive schemes
Able to resolve:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Constraint 2:	
Constraint keyword:	Country:
Policy, legislation and designation Agriculture (incl. Common Agricultural Policy)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S

W

Solution:

Solution type:

Persuade EU to implement appropriate changes at mid-term review

Legislation and policies

Able to resolve:

Constraint 3:

Constraint keyword:

Country:

Funding and incentives | Agricultural schemes - changes needed to structure / payments

UK E NI S
 W

Solution:

Solution type:

UK Govts to make more money available through further modulation

Funding and incentive schemes

Able to resolve:

Information originally entered by Andy Evans on Monday, December 09, 2002
Information last changed by Andy Evans on Wednesday, December 11, 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 Trust for Ornithology
<input type="checkbox"/>	Countryside Council for Wales
<input type="checkbox"/>	Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
<input type="checkbox"/>	Department of Agriculture and Rural Development Northern Ireland
<input type="checkbox"/>	Department of Agriculture for Northern Ireland
<input type="checkbox"/>	Department of Agriculture for Northern Ireland
<input type="checkbox"/>	English Nature
<input type="checkbox"/>	Environment and Heritage Service
<input type="checkbox"/>	Game Conservancy Trust
<input type="checkbox"/>	Joint Nature Conservation Committee

- National Assembly for Wales Agriculture Department
- Pesticides Safety Directorate
- Scottish Executive Environment and Rural Affairs Division
- Scottish Natural Heritage
- Syngenta

Information originally entered by Andy Evans on Wednesday, December 11, 2002
Information last changed by Andy Evans on Wednesday, December 11, 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:

Unimportant

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):

>

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:

Partnership between Defra, SCAs, NGOs and industry to deliver research results and policy change

Country:

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Partnership | Government support

Success 2:

Description:

Autecological research identified causes of decline

Country:

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Research, survey and information | Autecology - improved know ledge

Success 3:

Description:

Country:

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Funding and incentives | Heritage Lottery Funding secured

Information originally entered by Andy Evans on Wednesday, December 11, 2002

Information last changed by Andy Evans on Monday, January 13, 2003

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:

Defra

email:

andy.evans@

Date:

13 01 03
