



UK priority species pages – Version 2

To find out more about the JNCC priority species pages visit <http://www.jncc.gov.uk/page-5161>

To find out more about JNCC visit <http://www.jncc.gov.uk/page-1729>

SPECIES PAGES FOR 2007 UK BAP PRIORITY SPECIES

(see endnotes for an explanation of the various components of this compilation).

Cicindela sylvatica Linnaeus, 1758**Heath Tiger Beetle****1 General information**

| | |
|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Level 1 | Terrestrial invertebrates |
| Level 2 | beetle |
| On 1997 UK BAP list | Species Action Plan |

2 UK BAP criteriaⁱ

| | | | |
|-------------------------|--|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. International threat | 2. International responsibility (2a) + moderate decline in UK (2b) | 3. Marked decline in the UK | 4. Other important factor(s) |
| False | False | True | True |

3 Evidence for Criteriaⁱⁱ

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Criterion 1 | |
| Criterion 2a | |
| Criterion 2b | |
| Criterion 3 | 65% decline over 40 years. Between 1900-70 (mean 1945) and 1970-2004 (mean 1985). This equates to a 48% decline over a 25-year period. Given the very substantial growth in recorder effort over this same period, this decline is certainly an underestimate: the true decline will have been greater than 50%. There has been a substantial contraction of the range of this species. Its UK stronghold is on the Dorset heaths where there are at least 4 populations. It has been lost from the New Forest but still persists in two populations on the Surrey heaths. |
| Criterion 4 | For a species on the current Priority List, factors that caused the original decline are still operating or the species' population has not recovered to a point where it is likely to be viable in the long term |

4 Distribution by Country

| | | | | |
|---------|----------|-------|------------------|----------------------|
| England | Scotland | Wales | Northern Ireland | International Waters |
| Y | N | N | N | |

5 Distribution Information

| | |
|--|---|
| Distribution data source | Stage 1 information, BAP 2005 reporting and NBN Gateway |
| Distribution data notes | |
| number of sites (where less than or equal to 10) | 6 |
| Units used for number of sites | Site(s) / population(s) |

6 Actions identified by expertsⁱⁱⁱ

| Action number | Action text | Reporting category |
|---------------|---|------------------------------------|
| 1 | Without sustained action to implement conservation measures on its known sites, this is a highly vulnerable species. | Species-specific management action |
| 2 | Wider countryside measures to conserve functional lowland heathland should benefit this species. <i>C. sylvatica</i> requires lowland heathland with extensive bare ground in the form of quite extensive areas of bare, consolidated sand. | Wider "landscape" action |
| 3 | Survey is needed to find any new sites, monitoring is needed to understand the status of the species at existing sites. This data is needed to allow reporting against success criteria. Good progress has been made in developing survey techniques and in understanding the distribution of this species - this needs to be built on. | Species-specific monitoring/survey |
| 4 | The needs of this species should be incorporated into the lowland heathland HAP. | Priority habitat action |

7 Signpost to Priority Habitat^{iv}

| |
|--------------------------|
| Priority Habitat Name |
| Heath: Lowland Heathland |

8 Additional information from specialists^v

| Attribute | Value |
|-----------------------------|--|
| NBN current scientific name | <i>Cicindela sylvatica</i> |
| NBN common name | Heath Tiger Beetle |
| classification level 1 | Terrestrial invertebrates |
| classification level 2 | beetle |
| Crit 3 Decline % | 65 |
| Crit 3 Decline no of years | 40 |
| Crit 3 Decline dates | Between 1900-70 (mean 1945) and 1970-2004 (mean 1985) |
| Crit 3 supporting info | This equates to a 48% decline over a 25-year period. Given the very substantial growth in recorder effort over this same period, this decline is certainly an underestimate: the true decline will have been greater than 50%. There has been a substantial contraction of the range of this species. Its UK stronghold is on the Dorset heaths where there are at least 4 populations. It has been lost from the New Forest but still persists in |

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| | two populations on the Surrey heaths. |
| Crit 4 other important factors | Good progress has been made in developing survey techniques and in understanding the distribution of this species. Good progress has also been made in understanding its management requirements. However, without sustained action to implement conservation measures on its known sites, this is still a highly vulnerable species. This species has often co-occurred with two other BAP carabid beetles: <i>Poecilus kugelannii</i> and <i>Anisodactylus nemorivagus</i> . |
| Sources | Ground Beetle Recording Scheme database. Luff, M.L. (1998) Provisional atlas of the ground beetles (Coleoptera, Carabidae) of Britain. Huntingdon: Biological Records Centre. Boyce, D. (2004) Scarce Ground Beetle Project: final report on work 2000 - 2004. Unpublished report to English Nature. |
| Quality | Excellent. |

10 Species designations^{vi}

| Abbreviation | Reporting Category | Designation | Designation description | Year | Source | Comment |
|-------------------|--|----------------------|---|------|---|---|
| England NERC S.41 | Biodiversity Lists - England | England NERC S.41 | Species “of principal importance for the purpose of conserving biodiversity” covered under section 41 (England) of the NERC Act (2006) and therefore need to be taken into consideration by a public body when performing any of its functions with a view to conserving biodiversity. | 2008 | Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 - Species of Principal Importance in England (section 41) and Wales (section 42) | Geographic constraint=Listing is for England only |
| BAP:2007 | Biodiversity Action Plan UK list of priority species | Priority Species | The UK List of Priority Species and Habitats contains 1150 species and 65 habitats that have been listed as priorities for conservation action under the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UK BAP). | 2007 | UK list of Priority Habitats and Species | status on former BAP list: Species Action Plan |
| Notable:A | Rare and scarce species (not based on IUCN criteria) | Nationally Notable A | Taxa which do not fall within RDB categories but which are none-the-less uncommon in Great Britain and thought to occur in 30 or fewer 10km squares of the National Grid or, for less well-recorded groups, within seven or fewer vice-counties. Superseded by Nationally Scarce, and therefore no longer in use. | 1992 | A review of the scarce and threatened beetles of Great Britain Part 1 (Hyman, P.S. revised and updated by M.S. Parsons.) | |

UK BAP 2008 reporting^{vii}

(nb this only applies to species on the original 1997 UK BAP priority species list)

11 General status

| Country | Attribute | Value |
|---------|-------------------------------|---|
| UK | | |
| | Date | 2008 |
| | Status unknown | No |
| | Value | 6 |
| | Units | Site(s) / population(s) |
| | Accuracy | Sample or full survey |
| | Adequate data | Yes |
| | Data on NBN | Some |
| | Refer to LBAP data | Yes |
| | Edits made by reporting group | |
| England | | |
| | Date | 2008 |
| | Status unknown | No |
| | Value | 6 |
| | Units | Site(s) / population(s) |
| | Accuracy | Sample or full survey |
| | Adequate data | Yes |
| | Data on NBN | Some |
| | Refer to LBAP data | Yes |
| | Data source / comments | There has been greater clarification of the population status of this species following fieldwork early on in the project life, with range extension, population amalgamation, and dismissal of erroneous |

| | | |
|--|-------------------------------|--|
| | | records allowing a better focus of effort from the 2006-2007 period. The number of sites has moved up from the 4 known to 6 at the moment. |
| | Edits made by reporting group | |

8 Trends

| Country | Attribute | Value |
|---------|-------------------------------|---|
| UK | | |
| | Date | 2008 |
| | Status unknown | No |
| | Trend | Fluctuating - probably stable |
| | Accuracy | Partial survey |
| | Adequate data | No but likely by 2011 |
| | Data on NBN | No |
| | Refer to LBAP data | No |
| | Edits made by reporting group | |
| England | | |
| | Date | 2008 |
| | Status unknown | No |
| | Trend | Fluctuating - probably stable |
| | Accuracy | Partial survey |
| | Adequate data | No but likely by 2011 |
| | Data on NBN | No |
| | Refer to LBAP data | No |
| | Data source / comments | Certainly populations at the 2 donor sites are capable of reaching good numbers, even if these are subsequently depressed by poor weather. However, the range is still small and there is population vulnerability because of this. Because of the other uses of the site, access is constrained and this will limited what can be achieved, in some sense. However, the effort going into the creation of new bare |

| | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---|
| | | and early sauccessional ground will greatly assist this and a ranger of other heathland species, so the prospects are good. |
| | Edits made by reporting group | |

9 Successes

| Success text | Success category 1 | Success category 2 | England | NI | Scotland | Wales | Edits by reporting group |
|---|----------------------------------|---|---------|----|----------|-------|--------------------------|
| A new population was discovered in 2006, with an overlooked population extension being noted on 1 of its well known sites. There are now 6 sites known for this beetle, with habitat management following on behind this work programme. | Research, survey and information | Baseline survey - achieved or started | Yes | No | No | No | |
| Donor sites have been indentified for work and a process and protocols established for moving gravid females to the new sites. This work has already resulted in a small trial trnasolocartion, though it is not possible to truly guage the success of this endeavour yet. | Research, survey and information | Ex-situ / reintroduction techniques - studies completed or underway | Yes | No | No | No | |

10 Threats

| Threat category 1 | Threat category 2 | England | NI | Scotland | Wales | Edits made by reporting group |
|-------------------|-------------------|---------|----|----------|-------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|-----|----|----|----|--|
| Habitat loss / degradation - management practice | Fires | Yes | No | No | No | |
| Habitat loss / degradation - management practice | Lack of disturbance | Yes | No | No | No | |

15 Constraints

| Rank | Constraint category 1 | Constraint category 2 | Constraint summary | England | NI | Scotland | Wales | Solution category | Solution summary |
|------|-----------------------|---|--|---------|----|----------|-------|-------------------------|---|
| | | | | Yes | No | No | No | | |
| 2 | Partnership | Voluntary / charitable body - lack of involvement | Seeming reluctance of the Surrey Biodiversity Network to fully engage in this project and assist in the ways that they can has been reported. It is hoped that this is a short term oversight. | Yes | No | No | No | Communication/publicity | The geographic linkage of this species to their area of responsibility needs re-enforcement, as does the require to synchronise with other funding and activity streams to maximise BAP delivery. |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------------------|--|-----|----|----|----|--|--|
| 2 | Funding and incentives | Agency grant - support required | The work programme effectively halted through lack of funding, and the translocation programme will not reach its true potential until adequate resources are forthcoming. | Yes | No | No | No | Funding, resources and incentive schemes | Needs a medium term support package to ensure the necessary work is carried out. |
|---|------------------------|---------------------------------|--|-----|----|----|----|--|--|

11 State of Knowledge

| State of knowledge category | Notes | Edits made by reporting group |
|--|--|-------------------------------|
| Knowledge sufficient to make some impact, but more research needed | being biennial, the environmental impacts of the past do play a big role in the current population. The larval time period is also treated as being fairly constant in terms of the impacts of threats, whereas they may well be quite vulnerable to management work at particular times. This has a bearing on at least one of their sites. We have an increasing understanding of their ecological needs, though previous funding gaps have held this work back a little. The fieldwork has enabled a greater understanding of the ecology of this species to be better grasped. | |

ENDNOTES

ⁱ An explanation of these criteria is included at Annex 3 of [UK Biodiversity Action Plan: Report on the Species and Habitat Review](#). BRIG (ed. Ant Maddock) 2007. This review was organised in two stages. Stage 1 looked at the scientific evidence for selecting the UK List of Priority Species and Habitats while stage 2 considered the conservation action needed for these species and habitats and provided signposts to the means of implementing action.

ⁱⁱ The information on evidence and the species distribution is as presented on the UK BAP website. Users can download a spreadsheet of the [Stage 1 species evidence](#) from the home page of the UK BAP website.

ⁱⁱⁱ Actions were assigned to each and every priority species by expert groups convened at Stage 2 of the Review process. These were subsequently categorised into “signpost categories”. This information is as shown on the UK BAP website See the link for [categorisation \(signposting\) of UK priority species](#).

^{iv} Where a species action is clearly linked to a BAP priority habitat, the name of the relevant habitat or habitats was identified by the stage 2 expert group.

^v This information has been derived from Stage 1 of the priority species review, and is presented in the “marine”, “terrestrial invertebrates” and “other terrestrial species” sheets within the spreadsheet of the [Stage 1 species evidence](#). The information presented here varies according to the taxonomic group. Please note that some of these data have been written for other Expert Group members and may not be of great value to a wider audience.

^{vi} Information on conservation designations has been extracted from JNCC’s collation of information on [species designations](#). The designations shown in version 2 of these pages are as at December 2010.

^{vii} As part of the 2008 UK BAP reporting round lead partners of national plans were asked to answer a number of specific questions. The data will be analysed and used for the UK and country level reports. All of the responses provided through BARS as part of the 2008 reporting exercise are available to [download](#). Note that in the December 2010 version of these pages (version 2) includes corrections to previously truncated text fields.