ISSN 2009-4086

National Parks and Wildlife Service

Conservation Objectives Series

Illancrone and Inishkeeragh SPA 004132



National Parks and Wildlife Service, Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage,

90 King Street North, Dublin 7, D07 N7CV, Ireland.

Web: www.npws.ie E-mail: natureconservation@npws.gov.ie

Citation:

NPWS (2025) Conservation Objectives: Illancrone and Inishkeeragh SPA 004132. Version 1. National Parks and Wildlife Service, Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage.

> Series Editors: Maria Long and Colin Heaslip ISSN 2009-4086

Introduction

The overall aim of the Habitats Directive is to maintain or restore the favourable conservation status of habitats and species of community interest. These habitats and species are listed in the Habitats and Birds Directives and Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas are designated to afford protection to the most vulnerable of them. These two designations are collectively known as the Natura 2000 network.

European and national legislation places a collective obligation on Ireland and its citizens to maintain habitats and species in the Natura 2000 network at favourable conservation condition. The Government and its agencies are responsible for the implementation and enforcement of regulations that will ensure the ecological integrity of these sites.

A site-specific conservation objective aims to define favourable conservation condition for a particular habitat or species at that site.

The maintenance of habitats and species within Natura 2000 sites at favourable conservation condition will contribute to the overall maintenance of favourable conservation status of those habitats and species at a national level.

Favourable conservation status of a habitat is achieved when:

- its natural range, and area it covers within that range, are stable or increasing, and
- the specific structure and functions which are necessary for its long-term maintenance
- exist and are likely to continue to exist for the foreseeable future, and
- the conservation status of its typical species is favourable.

The favourable conservation status of a species is achieved when:

• population dynamics data on the species concerned indicate that it is maintaining itself on a long-term basis as a viable component of its natural habitats, and

• the natural range of the species is neither being reduced nor is likely to be reduced for the foreseeable future, and

• there is, and will probably continue to be, a sufficiently large habitat to maintain its populations on a long-term basis.

Notes/Guidelines:

1. The targets given in these conservation objectives are based on best available information at the time of writing. As more information becomes available, targets for attributes may change. These will be updated periodically, as necessary.

2. An appropriate assessment based on these conservation objectives will remain valid even if the targets are subsequently updated, providing they were the most recent objectives available when the assessment was carried out. It is essential that the date and version are included when objectives are cited.

3. Assessments cannot consider an attribute in isolation from the others listed for that habitat or species, or for other habitats and species listed for that site. A plan or project with an apparently small impact on one attribute may have a significant impact on another.

4. Please note that the maps included in this document do not necessarily show the entire extent of the habitats and species for which the site is listed. This should be borne in mind when appropriate assessments are being carried out.

5. When using these objectives, it is essential that the relevant backing/supporting documents are consulted, particularly where instructed in the targets or notes for a particular attribute.

Qualifying Interests

| * indicates a priority habitat under the Habitats Directive | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| 004132 | Illancrone and Inishkeeragh SPA | | | |
| A045 | Barnacle Goose <i>Branta leucopsis</i> | | | |
| A193 | Common Tern Sterna hirundo | | | |
| A194 | Arctic Tern Sterna paradisaea | | | |
| A195 | Little Tern Sterna albifrons | | | |

Please note that this SPA overlaps with Rutland Island and Sound SAC (002283). See map 2. The conservation objectives for this site should be used in conjunction with those for the overlapping site as appropriate.

Supporting documents, relevant reports & publications

Supporting documents, NPWS reports and publications are available for download from: www.npws.ie/Publications

NPWS Documents

| Year : | 2002 | | |
|----------|---|--|--|
| Title : | The 17th Annual Report on the breeding performance at colonies in Mulroy Bay and Lough Swilly | | |
| Author : | Perry, K.W.; Speer, A. | | |
| Series : | Unpublished Report | | |
| Year : | 2013 | | |
| Title : | A review of the SPA network of sites in the Republic of Ireland | | |
| Author : | NPWS | | |
| Series : | Published Report | | |
| Year : | 2019 | | |
| Title : | Irish wetland bird survey: waterbird status and distribution 2009/10-2015/16 | | |
| Author : | Lewis, L.J.; Burke, B.; Fitzgerald, N.; Tierney, T.D.; Kelly, S. | | |
| Series : | Irish Wildlife Manuals No. 106 | | |
| Year : | 2021 | | |
| Title : | Estimated foraging ranges of the breeding seabirds of Ireland's marine special protected area network | | |
| Author : | Power, A.; McDonnell, P.; Tierney, T.D. | | |
| Series : | Published NPWS report | | |
| Year : | 2022 | | |
| Title : | Rockabill Tern Report, 2022 | | |
| Author : | Allbrook, D.; Dunne, S.; Fink, A.; Newton, S. | | |
| Series : | BirdWatch Ireland Seabird Conservation Report to NPWS | | |
| Year : | 2022 | | |
| Title : | Kilcoole Little Tern Conservation Project Report, 2022 | | |
| Author : | Johnson, G.C.; Kavanagh, P.; Burke, B. | | |
| Series : | BirdWatch Ireland Seabird Conservation Report to NPWS | | |
| Year : | 2022 | | |
| Title : | Lady's Island Lake Tern Report 2022 | | |
| Author : | Stubbings, E.; Büche, B.; Murray, T.; Newton, S. | | |
| Series : | BirdWatch Ireland Seabird Conservation Report to NPWS | | |
| Year : | 2023 | | |
| Title : | Lady's Island Lake Tern Report 2023 | | |
| Author : | Stubbings, E.; Büche, B.; Murray, T.; Newton, S. | | |
| Series : | BirdWatch Ireland Seabird Conservation Report to NPWS | | |
| Year : | 2023 | | |
| Title : | Rockabill Tern Report 2023 | | |
| Author : | Fihey, A.; Crowley, C.; Fitzgerald, M.; Newton, S. | | |
| Series : | BirdWatch Ireland Seabird Conservation Report to NPWS | | |
| Year : | 2024 | | |
| Title : | l adv's Island Lake Tern Report 2024 | | |
| | | | |
| Author : | Stubbings, E.; Büche, B.; Doyle, H.; Burke, B.; Newton, S. | | |

Page 5 of 15

| Year : | 2024 |
|----------|---|
| Title : | Rockabill Tern Report 2024 |
| Author : | Coughlan, K.; Roberts, E.; Streker, R.; Newton, S. |
| Series : | BirdWatch Ireland Seabird Conservation Report to NPWS |

Other References

| Year : | 1973 | | |
|----------|--|--|--|
| Title : | Population Dynamics of Barnacle Geese, Branta leucopsis, in Ireland | | |
| Author : | Cabot, D. | | |
| Series : | Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy. Section B: Biological, Geological, and Chemical Science, 73, 415–443 | | |
| Year : | 1978 | | |
| Title : | Population models for common terns in Massachusetts | | |
| Author : | Nisbet, I.C.T. | | |
| Series : | Bird-banding, 49(1), 50-58 | | |
| Year : | 1980 | | |
| Title : | Population dynamics of a Common Tern colony | | |
| Author : | DiCostanzo, J. | | |
| Series : | Journal of Field Ornithology, 51(3), pp.229-243 | | |
| Year : | 1985 | | |
| Title : | The 1984 all Ireland tern survey | | |
| Author : | Whilde, A. | | |
| Series : | Irish Birds 3: 1-32 | | |
| Year : | 1995 | | |
| Title : | Seabird monitoring handbook for Britain and Ireland: a compilation of methods for survey and monitoring of breeding seabirds | | |
| Author : | Walsh, P.; Halley, D.J.; Harris, M.P.; del Nevo, A.; Sim, I.M.W.; Tasker, M.L. | | |
| Series : | JNCC, Peterborough | | |
| Year : | 1995 | | |
| Title : | Impacts of hunting disturbance on waterbirds - a review | | |
| Author : | Madsen, J.; Fox, A.D. | | |
| Series : | Wildlife Biology 1(4):193-207 | | |
| Year : | 1997 | | |
| Title : | The status and distribution of breeding sandwich, roseate, common, arctic and little terns in Ireland in 1995 | | |
| Author : | Hannon, C.; Berrow, S.D.; Newton, S.F. | | |
| Series : | Irish Birds, 6: 1-22 | | |
| Year : | 1999 | | |
| Title : | Managing grassland for wild geese in Britain: a review | | |
| Author : | Vickery, J.; Gill, J. | | |
| Series : | Biological Conservation, 89(1), pp.93-106 | | |
| Year : | 2003 | | |
| Title : | Implications for seaward extensions to existing breeding seabird colony Special Protection Areas | | |
| Author : | McSorley, C.A.; Dean, B.J.; Webb, A.; Reid J.B. | | |
| Series : | JNCC Report No. 329 | | |

| Year : | 2008 | | |
|----------|--|--|--|
| Title : | Colony habitat selection by Little Terns Sternula albifrons in East Anglia: implications for coastal management | | |
| Author : | Ratcliffe, N.; Schmitt, S.; Mayo, A.; Tratalos, J.; Drewitt, A. | | |
| Series : | Seabird, 21: 55-63 | | |
| Year : | 2010 | | |
| Title : | How Representative is the Current Monitoring of Breeding Seabirds in the UK? | | |
| Author : | Cook, A.S.C.P.; Robinson, R.A. | | |
| Series : | BTO Research Report No. 573 | | |
| Year : | 2019 | | |
| Title : | Desk-based revision of seabird foraging ranges used for HRA screening | | |
| Author : | Woodward, I.; Thaxter, C.B.; Owen, E.; Cook, A.S.C.P. | | |
| Series : | BTO Research Report No. 724 | | |
| Year : | 2019 | | |
| Title : | Report under Article 12 of the Birds Directive Period 2013-2018 | | |
| Author : | EEA | | |
| Series : | European Environment Agency. European Topic Centre on Biological Diversity. Pp 1-9. https://cdr.eionet.europa.eu/Converters/run_conversion? file=ie/eu/art12/envxztxxq/IE_birds_reports_20191031-130157.xml&conv=612&source=remote | | |
| Year : | 2020 | | |
| Title : | Common tern (Sterna hirundo), version 1.0. In Birds of the World (S. M. Billerman, Editor) | | |
| Author : | Arnold, J.M.; Oswald, S.A.; Nisbet, I.C.T.; Pyle, P.; Patten, M.A. | | |
| Series : | Cornell Lab of Ornithology, Ithaca, NY, USA | | |
| Year : | 2020 | | |
| Title : | Arctic tern (Sterna paradisaea), version 1.0. In Birds of the World (S. M. Billerman, Editor) | | |
| Author : | Hatch, J. J.; Gochfeld, M.; Burger, J.; Garcia, E. F. J. | | |
| Series : | Cornell Lab of Ornithology, Ithaca, NY, USA | | |
| Year : | 2023 | | |
| Title : | Seabirds Count: a census of breeding seabirds in Britain and Ireland (2015-2021) | | |
| Author : | Burnell, D.; Perkins, A.J.; Newton, S.F.; Bolton, M.; Tierney, T.D.; Dunn, T.E. | | |
| Series : | Lynx Nature Books, Barcelona | | |
| Year : | 2023 | | |
| Title : | Home range of a long-distance migrant, the Greenland Barnacle Goose <i>Branta leucopsis</i> , throughout the annual cycle | | |
| Author : | Doyle, S.; Cabot, D.; Griffin, L.; Kane, A.; Colhoun, K.; Redmond, C.; Walsh, A.; McMahon, B.J. | | |
| Series : | Bird Study, 70(1-2), pp.37-46 | | |

Conservation Objectives for : Illancrone and Inishkeeragh SPA [004132]

A045 Barnacle Goose Branta leucopsis

To restore the Favourable conservation condition of Barnacle Goose in Illancrone and Inishkeeragh SPA, which is defined by the following list of attributes and targets:

| Attribute | Measure | Target | Notes |
|---|---|---|--|
| Winter population trend | Percentage change in number of individuals | Long term winter population trend is stable or increasing | The national population of wintering Barnacle Goose in Ireland has increased by 102% from 1993 - 2018 (Lewis et al., 2019) as monitored by the International Census of Greenland Barnacle Goose. During the baseline assessments to inform SPA designation, 235 Barnacle Goose were estimated to be using this SPA (4 year mean of census counts for baseline period 1993 - 2003; see NPWS, 2013). More recent data showed a population of 119 Barnacle Goose used the SPA during the period 2013 - 2023 (4 year mean of census counts from the International Census of Greenland Barnacle Goose). This represents a population decrease of 50% since the baseline period, in contrast to the national trend |
| Winter spatial distribution | Hectares, time and intensity of use | Sufficient number of locations, area, and availability (in terms of timing and intensity of use) of suitable habitat to support the population target | Distribution encapsulates the number of locations and area of potentially suitable habitat for the wintering population and its availability for use. The suitability and availability of habitat areas are likely to vary throughout the season, for example, due to variation in land management practices or the abundance of resources available (due to natural variation and other factors). This will affect the spatio-temporal patterns of use of the habitats by the wintering population |
| Disturbance at wintering site | Intensity, frequency, timing and duration | Disturbance occurs at levels that do not significantly impact the achievement of targets for population trend and spatial distribution | The impact of any significant disturbance (direct or indirect) to the wintering population will ultimately affect the achievement of targets for population trend and/or spatial distribution. Disturbance contributes to increased energetic expenditure which can result in increased likelihood of winter mortality or reduced fitness (if energy expenditure is greater than energy gain) and, in turn, negatively impact population trends (see, for example, Madsen and Fox, 1995). Factors such as intensity, frequency, timing and duration of a (direct or indirect) disturbance source must be taken into account to determine the potential impact upon the targets for population trend and spatial distribution |
| Barriers to connectivity and site use | Number, location, shape and hectares | Barriers do not significantly impact the wintering population's access to the SPA or other ecologically important sites outside the SPA | Barriers limiting the population's access to this SPA or ecologically important sites outside the SPA will ultimately affect the achievement of targets for population trend and/or spatial distribution. Factors such as the number, location, shape and area of potential barriers must be taken into account to determine their potential impact. Access to ecologically important sites outside the SPA must also be considered as a single SPA may not satisfy all the ecological requirements of the wintering population, and it may require access to other SPAs or sites for certain activities, such as foraging when preferred foraging areas are unavailable due to disturbance, extensive flooding, or other factors |

| Forage spatial distribution, extent and abundance | Location, hectares, and forage biomass | Sufficient number of locations, area of suitable habitat and available forage biomass to support the population target | This species is a grazing herbivore. Historically, in Ireland, foraging habitat included salt marsh, but currently the species is typically associated with open coastal pasture, mostly improved and semi- improved agricultural grasslands. Barnacle Goose grazes on leaves, stems, rhizomes, roots and seeds, with grass and <i>Plantago/Bellis/Festuca</i> swards comprising preferred food sources (Cabot, 1973). This species selects a preferred sward height of <10cm but birds can feed on swards >15cm if preferred areas are depleted (based on birds in Islay, see Vickery and Gill, 1999). Birds are highly likely to exhibit foraging site fidelity and may be found foraging on offshore islands as well as commuting to forage on the mainland. Maximum foraging distance is approximately 7km for wintering birds (Doyle et al., 2023) |
|--|--|--|---|
| Roost spatial distribution and extent | Location and hectares of roosting habitat | Sufficient number of locations, area and availability of suitable roosting habitat to support the population target | Roosting is a critical ecological requirement for the wintering population. When roosting, this species uses open habitats (primarily pastures) that provide wide sightlines for the birds and which are typically adjacent to water bodies; thus, offshore islands are commonly used. Birds exhibit strong roost site fidelity (Doyle et al., 2023). Daytime roosting is also a common behaviour, where birds minimise activity levels to conserve energy, while benefitting from the vigilance of other flock members. A lack of sufficient and suitable roosting habitats can result in increased mortality risk, whether indirectly (e.g. via increased energy expenditure travelling to/from roost sites) or directly (e.g. via increased predation risk), or reduction in site use; this would ultimately affect the achievement of targets for population trend and/or spatial distribution |
| Supporting habitat: area and quality | Hectares and quality | Sufficient area of utilisable habitat available in ecologically important sites outside the SPA | The wintering population can make extensive use of suitable habitats in important areas outside the SPA for foraging and roosting. The extent, availability and quality of these supporting habitats may be of importance for the resilience of the SPA population. Suitable supporting habitats include those highlighted in the attributes for foraging and roosting habitat |

A193 Common Tern *Sterna hirundo*

To restore the Favourable conservation condition of Common Tern in Illancrone and Inishkeeragh SPA, which is defined by the following list of attributes and targets:

| Attribute | Measure | Target | Notes |
|---|--|--|--|
| Breeding population size | Number of Apparently Occupied Nests (AON) | Long term SPA population trend is stable or increasing | Surveys of the breeding terns of this site in 1984 and 1995 recorded 23 and 59 pairs of Common Tern (Hannon et al., 1997). The islands have been surveyed regularly since 1995. Subsequent surveys report a combined estimate for both Common Tern and Arctic Tern, which is similar in appearance, due to logistical constraints in monitoring this site. It is assumed that Common Tern are the less abundant species as they comprised of 10% and 21% of the Common/Arctic Tern population in 1984 and 1995 (Whilde, 1985; Hannon et al., 1997). Between 2004 and 2011 the population of breeding Common/Arctic Tern ranged generally between 50 to 200 pairs. The population slumped between 2012 and 2016, with the numbers dropping to below 10 pairs. However, the population increased in 2022 and 2023 with an estimated 100 and 60 pairs being recorded. This represents a long term decline from 1984 which contrasts with the national population trend that has increased in that time period (Burnell et al., 2023) |
| Productivity rate | Number of fledged young per breeding pair | Sufficient to maintain a stable or increasing population | There was no productivity data available for this species in this SPA. A lack of comprehensive Irish data precludes the identification of a minimum productivity rate for this species at site level. Walsh et al. (1995) set out methods to estimate the productivity rate for this species. A productivity rate of 1.1 young per pair is needed to maintain a colony according to DiCostanzo (1980) and Nisbet (1978). However, it has been noted that colonies with productivity rates of 0.6 and above can have stable or growing tern populations. Colonies such as Rockabill Island have supported a stable/growing Common Tern population with a productivity rate between 0.6 and 1.1 (Allbrook et al., 2022). American Mink <i>Neogale vison</i> is a known predator of terns in Ireland and Co. Donegal (Perry and Speer, 2002) and has been recorded within the SPA. It is possible that this invasive species may have an impact on the abundance and productivity of Common Tern at this site |
| Distribution: extent of available nesting options within the SPA | Numbers and spatial distribution | Sufficient availability of suitable nesting sites throughout the SPA to maintain a stable or increasing population | Common Tern are ground nesting birds. Typically colonies are found in open areas with loose substrate, such as sand or shingle, with some scattered vegetation to provide cover for chicks (Arnold et al., 2020). Illancrone and Inishkeeragh are two marine islands situated approximately 8km to 9km off the coast of Co. Donegal. Common Tern breed on both these islands and the results of the 1984 and 1995 surveys suggest that the populations are of similar size between the two islands (Hannon et al., 1997) |
| Forage spatial distribution, extent, abundance and availability | Location, hectares, and forage biomass | Sufficient number of locations, area of suitable habitat and available forage biomass to support the population target | Common Tern are largely piscivorous, feeding on small fish up to 150mm in length (Arnold et al., 2020). Common Tern feed almost entirely on live, aquatic prey (Arnold et al., 2020). Based on several studies, Woodward et al. (2019) provide estimates (i.e. overall mean, mean of maximum distances across all studies, and maximum distance recorded) of Common Tern foraging ranges from the nest site during the breeding season, which are 6.4km, 18km, and 30km respectively (see Power et al., 2021) |

| Disturbance at the breeding site | Intensity, frequency, timing and duration | Disturbance occurs at levels that do not significantly impact on birds at the breeding site | Disturbance events at the nest site/breeding colony level can result in a reduction of overall productivity and even lead to the abandonment of the breeding colony. The impact of any significant disturbance (direct or indirect) to the breeding population will ultimately affect the achievement of targets for population size and/or spatial distribution. Disturbance contributes to increased energetic expenditure which can result in increased likelihood of mortality or reduced fitness (if energy expenditure is greater than energy gain) and, in turn, negatively impact population trends. Factors such as intensity, frequency, timing, and duration of a (direct or indirect) disturbance source must be taken into account to determine the potential impact upon the targets for population size and spatial distribution |
|--|--|---|--|
| Disturbance at areas ecologically connected to the colony | Intensity, frequency, timing and duration | Disturbance occurs at levels that do not significantly impact on breeding population | Tern species can make extensive use of the waters adjacent to their breeding colonies for non site- specific maintenance behaviours (e.g. courtship, bathing, preening) as defined in McSorley et al. (2003). Additionally, some species may engage in maintenance behaviours outside of the breeding colony but not in the water. For example, terns may roost on rocky islets or beaches away from the breeding colony |
| Barriers to connectivity | Number, location, shape, and area (ha) | Barriers do not significantly impact the population's access to the SPA or other ecologically important sites outside the SPA | Terns, particularly during the breeding season, require regular access to waters ecologically connected to the colony in order to forage, as well as to engage in other maintenance behaviours. Based on several studies, Woodward et al. (2019) provide estimates (i.e. overall mean, mean of maximum distances across all studies, and maximum distance recorded) of Common Tern foraging ranges from the nest site during the breeding season, which are 6.4km, 18km, and 30km respectively (see Power et al., 2021) |

A194 Arctic Tern *Sterna paradisaea*

To restore the Favourable conservation condition of Arctic Tern in Illancrone and Inishkeeragh SPA, which is defined by the following list of attributes and targets:

| Attribute | Measure | Target | Notes |
|---|--|--|--|
| Breeding population size | Number of Apparently Occupied Nests (AON) | Long term SPA population trend is stable or increasing | Surveys of the breeding terns of this site in 1984 and 1995 recorded 209 and 224 pairs of Arctic Tern (Hannon et al., 1997). The islands have been surveyed regularly since 1995. Subsequent surveys report a combined estimate for both Arctic Tern and Common Tern, which is similar in appearance, due to logistical constraints in monitoring this site. It is assumed that Arctic Tern are the more abundant species as they comprised 90% and 79% of the Common/Arctic Tern population in 1984 and 1995 (Whilde, 1985; Hannon et al., 1997). Between 2004 and 2011 the population of breeding Common/Arctic Tern ranged between 50 to 200 pairs. The population slumped between 2012 and 2016, with the numbers dropping to below 10 pairs. However, the population increased in 2022 and 2023 with 100 and 60 pairs being recorded (NPWS internal files). This represents a long term decline from 1984 which contrasts with the national population trend that has increased in that time period (Burnell et al., 2023) |
| Productivity rate | Number of fledged young per breeding pair | Sufficient to maintain a stable or increasing population | There was no productivity data available for this species in this SPA. Annual productivity estimates are available from the wardened tern colonies of Rockabill and Lady's Island Lake. Over a three-year period (2022 - 2024) the average productivity estimates were 0.24 and 0.93 chicks per nest respectively (Stubbings et al., 2022, 2023 and 2024; Coughlan et al., 2024; Fihey et al., 2023; and Allbrook et al., 2022). American Mink <i>Neogale vison</i> is a known predator of terns in Ireland and Co. Donegal (Perry and Speer, 2002) and has been recorded within the SPA. It is possible that this invasive species may have an impact on the productivity of Arctic Tern at this site. As this species is long-lived there is a possibility that a population could be returning to a nest site annually but not fledging any chicks. Caution should be taken when interpreting the results of tern breeding numbers, especially on offshore islands, without having productivity data |
| Distribution: extent of available nesting options within the SPA | Numbers and spatial distribution | Sufficient availability of suitable nesting sites throughout the SPA to maintain a stable or increasing population | Distribution encapsulates the number of locations and area of potentially suitable nesting habitat for the breeding population and its availability for use. The suitability and availability of habitat across the SPA may vary through time. This will affect the spatio-temporal patterns of use of the habitats by Arctic Tern. Terns are ground nesting birds. Typically colonies are found in open areas close to the shore, frequently in areas with loose substrate or low vegetation (Hatch et al., 2020). In Ireland all known large colonies are situated on marine or inland islands of varying distances from the mainland/shore. Illancrone and Inishkeeragh are two marine islands situated approximately 8km to 9km off the coast of Co. Donegal. Arctic Tern breed on both these islands but the majority of the population is found on Inishkeeragh. It has been speculated that between years Arctic Tern can move between different islands such as Roaninish SPA |

| Forage spatial distribution, extent, abundance and availability | Location, hectares, and forage biomass | Sufficient number of locations, area of suitable habitat and available forage biomass to support the population target | Arctic Tern are largely piscivorous. The most frequent fish prey are small, schooling species commonly caught in open water, at tide rips, and over predators (e.g. jellyfish and marine mammals). These are usually 1- or 2-year-old fish from the Clupeidae (herring), Gadidae (cod, pollock) and Ammodytidae (sandeel) families (Hatch et al., 2020). Based on several studies, Woodward et al. (2019) provide estimates (i.e. overall mean, mean of maximum distances across all studies, and maximum distance recorded) of Arctic Tern foraging ranges from the nest site during the breeding season, which are 6km, 26km, and 46km respectively (see Power et al., 2021) |
|--|--|---|---|
| Disturbance at the breeding site | Intensity, frequency, timing and duration | Disturbance occurs at levels that do not significantly impact on birds at the breeding site | Disturbance events at the nest site/breeding colony level can result in a reduction of overall productivity and even lead to the abandonment of the breeding colony. The impact of any significant disturbance (direct or indirect) to the breeding population will ultimately affect the achievement of targets for population size and/or spatial distribution. Disturbance contributes to increased energetic expenditure, which can result in increased likelihood of mortality or reduced fitness (if energy expenditure is greater than energy gain) and, in turn, negatively impact population trends. Factors such as intensity, frequency, timing, and duration of a (direct or indirect) disturbance source must be taken into account to determine the potential impact upon the targets for population size and spatial distribution |
| Disturbance at areas ecologically connected to the colony | Intensity, frequency, timing and duration | Disturbance occurs at levels that do not significantly impact on breeding population | Seabird species can make extensive use of the waters adjacent to their breeding colonies for non site-specific maintenance behaviours (e.g. courtship, bathing, preening) as defined in McSorley et al. (2003). Additionally, some species may engage in maintenance behaviours outside of the breeding colony but not in the water. For example, terns may roost on rocky islets or beaches away from the breeding colony |
| Barriers to connectivity | Number, location, shape, and area (ha) | Barriers do not significantly impact the population's access to the SPA or other ecologically important sites outside the SPA | Seabirds, particularly during the breeding season, require regular access to waters ecologically connected to the colony in order to forage, as well as to engage in other maintenance behaviours. Based on several studies, Woodward et al. (2019) provide estimates (i.e. overall mean, mean of maximum distances across all studies, and maximum distance recorded) of Arctic Tern foraging ranges from the nest site during the breeding season, which are 6km, 26km, and 46km respectively (see Power et al., 2021) |

Conservation Objectives for : Illancrone and Inishkeeragh SPA [004132]

A195 Little Tern *Sterna albifrons*

To maintain the Favourable conservation condition of Little Tern in Illancrone and Inishkeeragh SPA, which is defined by the following list of attributes and targets:

| Attribute | Measure | Target | Notes |
|---|--|--|--|
| Breeding population size | Number of Apparently Occupied Nests (AON) | Long term SPA population trend is stable or increasing | Surveys of the breeding terns of this SPA in 1984 and 1995 recorded 5 and 13 pairs of Little Tern (Whilde, 1985; Hannon et al., 1997) and the islands have been surveyed regularly since (NPWS, internal files). Subsequent surveys have shown that the population tends to peak at approximately 20 pairs with groups of 20 to 30 individual breeding birds recorded most years. In 2016 the population was estimated to be 14 pairs, similar to 1995, and the population in 2023 was estimated to be approximately 20 pairs (Burnell et al., 2023, NPWS internal files). This indicates that the population of Little Tern is stable or moderately increasing. The national population trend has seen a significant increase for this species but this can be attributed to the growth of the colony at The Murrough SPA where the population has increased rapidly since the establishment of a wardening project in the 1980s (Burnell et al., 2023) |
| Productivity rate | Number of fledged young per breeding pair | Sufficient to maintain a stable or increasing population | There was no productivity data available for this species in this SPA. A productivity rate of 0.7 chicks per pair is required for population stability for Little Tern, according to an analysis of seabird population by Cook and Robinson (2010). American Mink <i>Neogale vison</i> is a known predator of terns in Ireland and Co. Donegal (Perry and Speer, 2002) and has been recorded within the SPA. It is possible that this invasive species may have an impact on the productivity of Little Tern at this site. As this species is long-lived there is a possibility that a population could be returning to a nest site annually but not fledging any chicks. Caution should be taken when interpreting the results of tern breeding numbers, especially on offshore islands, without having productivity data |
| Distribution: extent of available nesting options within the SPA | Numbers and spatial distribution | Sufficient availability of suitable nesting sites throughout the SPA to maintain a stable or increasing population | Distribution encapsulates the number of locations and area of potentially suitable nesting habitat for the breeding population and its availability for use. The suitability and availability of habitat across the SPA may vary through time. This will affect the spatio-temporal patterns of use of the habitats by Little Tern. Little Tern have bred on both these islands historically but they typically nest on Inishkeeragh |
| Forage spatial distribution, extent, abundance and availability | Location, hectares, and forage biomass | Sufficient number of locations, area of suitable habitat and available forage biomass to support the population target | Little Tern are largely piscivorous; studies from an east coast Irish colony show that sandeels (<i>Ammodytes</i> spp.) along with clupeids and, to a lesser extent, gadoids can form important prey bases (Johnson et al., 2022). Based on two studies on a single colony, Woodward et al. (2019) summarises the mean foraging range and the mean- maximum foraging range as 3.5km and 5km, respectively |

| Disturbance at the breeding site | Intensity, frequency, timing and duration | Disturbance occurs at levels that do not significantly impact on birds at the breeding site | Disturbance events at the breeding colony can result in a reduction of overall productivity and even lead to the abandonment of the breeding colony. The impact of any significant disturbance to the breeding population will ultimately affect the achievement of targets for population size and/or spatial distribution. Disturbance contributes to increased energetic expenditure, which can result in increased likelihood of mortality or reduced fitness (if energy expenditure is greater than energy gain) and, in turn, negatively impact population trends. Factors such as intensity, frequency, timing, and duration of a (direct or indirect) disturbance source must be taken into account to determine the potential impact upon the targets for population size and spatial distribution. Human disturbance can impact on breeding success, as colonies are often sited on beaches used by the public (Ratcliffe et al., 2008) |
|--|--|---|--|
| Disturbance at areas ecologically connected to the colony | Intensity, frequency, timing and duration | Disturbance occurs at levels that do not significantly impact on breeding population | The Little Tern has the smallest foraging range of seabirds breeding in Ireland (Woodward et al., 2019) |
| Barriers to connectivity | Number, location, shape, and area (ha) | Barriers do not significantly impact the population's access to the SPA or other ecologically important sites outside the SPA | Seabirds, particularly during the breeding season, require regular and efficient access to marine waters ecologically connected to the colony in order to forage as well as to engage in other maintenance behaviours. Based on two studies on a single colony, Woodward et al. (2019) summarises the mean foraging range and the mean-maximum foraging range as 3.5km and 5km respectively |





Gaoth=Dobh.ai Dobhar Rann na Feinste N56 An Grogán Má Loch an Iúir Cn Croich Uí Bhaoill Cno Cruach Phádraig Cnoc na Sc Cnoc Chró Bheithe Cnoc a Cnoc an tSoi Choc na Teanga Meáin N56 Sliabh Legend Illancrone and Inishkeeragh SPA 004132 Rutland Island and Sound SAC 002283 Ν Map version 1 Date: June 2024