



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).

Doros profuges (Harris, [1780])

Phantom Hoverfly

1 General information

Level 1	Terrestrial invertebrates
Level 2	fly
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	52% decline over 25 years, Pre/post 1980
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	Y	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)	
Units used for number of sites	

6 Actions identified by expertsⁱⁱⁱ

Action number	Action text	Reporting category
1	Protection of sites with stable populations	Species-specific management action
2	Preparation of management plan for known sites and inclusion of this species including ensuring that its needs are safe-guarded	Species-specific management action
3	Further autecological research needed.	Species-specific research
4	Restoration schemes for calcareous grasslands should incorporate the retention of properly managed scrub and woodland edge habitats as positive features.	Priority habitat action
5	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.	Species-specific monitoring/survey
6	Safeguard and enhance habitat at known sites.	Species-specific prescriptive habitat action

7 Signpost to Priority Habitat^{iv}

Priority Habitat Name
Calcareous Grassland : Lowland Calcareous Grassland

8 Additional information from specialists^v

Attribute	Value
NBN current scientific name	Doros profuges
NBN common name	Phantom Hoverfly
classification level 1	Terrestrial invertebrates
classification level 2	fly
Crit 1 Global threat	European and Eastern Palearctic species. This species is decreasing in Europe and threatened and decreasing in the Atlantic Region (M. Speight, pers. comm.).
Crit 1 European threat	European and Eastern Palearctic species. This species is decreasing in Europe and threatened and decreasing in the Atlantic Region (M. Speight, pers. comm.).
Crit 1 Supporting info	
Crit 2 % of global pop	N/a
Crit 2 % of European popn	N/a
Crit 2 % of int population Supporting info	
Crit 2 Decline %	52%
Crit 2 Decline no of years	25
Crit 2 Decline dates	Pre/post 1980

Crit 2 declines supporting info	This hoverfly has been recorded from a total of 29 10km squares, but there are no post-1980 records for 15 of these.
Crit 3 Decline %	52%
Crit 3 Decline no of years	25
Crit 3 Decline dates	Pre/post 1980
Crit 3 supporting info	This hoverfly has been recorded from a total of 29 10km squares, but there are no post-1980 records for 15 of these.
Crit 4 other important factors	The factors causing the decline were not known when this species was first added to the BAP priority list, and this is still the case. It is unlikely that such factors will have been removed by chance, so further study is required before the decline can be halted and recovery can begin.
Sources	Plant (2000), The wasp hoverfly <i>Doros profuges</i> (Harris): report of the 1999 survey. EN Research Report No. 352.
Quality	Distribution data is based on an extensive review of all records received by the hoverfly recording scheme.
Criterion(existing bap species)	1,3,4

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
RedList_GB_Pre94:VU	Red Listing based on pre 1994 IUCN guidelines	Vulnerable	Taxa believed likely to move into the Endangered category in the near future if the causal factors continue operating. Superseded by new IUCN categories in 1994, but still applicable to lists that have not been reviewed since 1994.	1991	A review of the scarce and threatened flies of Great Britain - Part 1 (Falk, S.J.)	pre 1994 IUCN criteria

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	17
	Units	Site(s) / population(s)
	Accuracy	Partial survey
	Adequate data	No and not likely by 2011
	Data on NBN	Some
	Refer to LBAP data	No
	Edits made by reporting group	
England		
	Date	2008
	Status unknown	No
	Value	17
	Units	Site(s) / population(s)
	Accuracy	Partial survey
	Adequate data	No and not likely by 2011
	Data on NBN	Some
	Refer to LBAP data	No
	Data source / comments	At least 17 locations have been recorded for this species since 1975, presumably reflecting an underlying population structure rather than just vagrants or adventives. One could surmise that the

		adult stages may be short lived, with a longer but unknown larval stage.
	Edits made by reporting group	
Scotland		
	Date	2008
	Status unknown	No
	Value	1
	Units	Individuals
	Accuracy	Sample or full survey
	Adequate data	No and not likely by 2011
	Data on NBN	No
	Refer to LBAP data	No
	Data source / comments	Mull record as previously reported. No apparent repeat recording since that time.
	Edits made by reporting group	

8 Trends

Country	Attribute	Value
UK		
	Date	2008
	Status unknown	No
	Trend	Declining (continuing/accelerating)
	Accuracy	Best guess
	Adequate data	No but likely by 2011
	Data on NBN	Some
	Refer to LBAP data	No
	Edits made by reporting group	

England		
	Date	2008
	Status unknown	No
	Trend	Declining (continuing/accelerating)
	Accuracy	Best guess
	Adequate data	No and not likely by 2011
	Data on NBN	Some
	Refer to LBAP data	No
	Data source / comments	This species continues to appear in very low numbers, but suggests a declining trend . Some analysis of data has taken place, covering the period pre-1900 to post 1990, which suggested a small increase, though other factors could explain this. Records from the well founded Hoverfly Recording Scheme show only 7 locations from the period 2000-2008, with most of these around 1 wide area in southern England, with only 1 recent record from NW England, and no further Scottish or Welsh records. Whether this trend is real or not remains to be tested, but this species remains most elusive, and occurs in a habitat subject to much change.
	Edits made by reporting group	

9 Successes

Success text	Success category 1	Success category 2	England	NI	Scotland	Wales	Edits by reporting group
No successes reported			No	No	No	No	No success reported

10 Threats

Threat category 1	Threat category 2	England	NI	Scotland	Wales	Edits made by reporting group
Habitat loss / degradation - management practice	Scrub clearance	Yes	No	No	No	

15 Constraints

Rank	Constraint category 1	Constraint category 2	Constraint summary	England	NI	Scotland	Wales	Solution category	Solution summary
1	Research, survey and information	Autecology - poor knowledge	Aside from some anecdotal comments on scrub edge and ant association, there is little really known about this species.	Yes	No	No	No	Research	more research effort

1	Research, survey and information	Species is difficult to find or survey	without a good consistent uK population it will be hard to work on this species more than record the useful but casual observations that are already made.	Yes	No	No	No	Survey/monitoring	Hopefully more general field survey will uncover a viable population, or a breakthrough in how to find this species.
---	----------------------------------	--	--	-----	----	----	----	-------------------	--

11 State of Knowledge

State of knowledge category	Notes	Edits made by reporting group
Knowledge insufficient and no suitable research programme in place	Some work has been carried out, though the continuing lack of a decent and re-findable population makes progress difficult. Some observations were carried out by chance in 2004 on an individual near Silverdale in Lancashire, featuring various behavioural traits that remain unexplained. The yellow meadow ant was present on this site, though not, apparently <i>Lasius fuliginosus</i> . The linkage with ants has been suggested by a number of workers. It seems to like wood edge and scrub edge, in particular where sapling trees are invading onto grassland. That is exactly the habitat where conservation organisations often intervene to remove invasive scrub. We remain, however, little further advanced in our understanding of the ecology of this rare species. More work is planned in the near future: a two day survey visit in early summer to the Morecambe Bay area to search for adults of <i>Doros profuges</i> . • a two day survey visit in early summer to the Basildon area to search for adults of <i>D. profuges</i> . • a two day search in autumn for early stages of <i>D. profuges</i> in and around ant nests in the Yealand Hall Allotment SSSI. It is hoped that this further work will assist our understanding.	

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.