

# **A Discussion Document on the Native Tree Cover Expansion aspects of the Consultation on Ireland's Forest Strategy and Implementation Plan Draft for 2023-2027.**

**November 2022**



For (a) response to the public consultation

(b) the Technical Advisory Panel of Woodlands of Ireland and Foresters and Ecologists on the approved list for the Native Woodland Scheme plus any other stakeholders not already included.

## **Contents**

Introduction

Goals of the Forest Service of DAFM

Actions in the implementation plan most relevant to the use of indigenous genetic stock:10, 11, 38, 56, 58, 61, 64, 69, 79

Other Aspects: Yield Class filter, Reconstitution, Hen Harrier SPAs, Freshwater Pearl Mussel

Conclusion

Appendix 1: estimating the use of indigenous genetic tree stock

Appendix 2: New proposed afforestation grant rates and premiums

## Introduction

Ireland's Forest Strategy and Implementation Plan Draft which is for public consultation until the 29<sup>th</sup> November 2022, has proposed significant increases in grant and premium rates and a broader range of tree planting options available, which should in turn increase the demand for trees of all species.

The link to the Draft is here: <https://www.gov.ie/en/publication/public-consultation-on-forestry/#public-consultation-on-the-draft-forest-strategy-and-the-environmental-assessment-of-the-draft-forest-strategy-implementation-plan>

This discussion document was prepared as a submission to the Forest Service and also for circulation in advance of a meeting to be scheduled of members of the Technical Advisory Panel (TAP) of Woodlands of Ireland and Foresters and Ecologists on the approved list for the Native Woodland Scheme.

The purpose of the document is to encourage dialogue around the questions that the Strategy and Implementation Plan raise about capacities to deliver both in the public and private sector.

The use of native species of trees derived from native seed sources (indigenous genetic stock) in a range of afforestation and reforestation measures as described in the Implementation Plan are explored here. The conservation or restoration of existing native semi-natural woodland will be covered in a further submission to the Forest Strategy and Implementation Plan in the coming weeks.

### **Goals of the Forest Service of DAFM:**

Some of the proposed Goals in the Plan influencing achievement of the target number of hectares planted per annum for each Intervention of the Plan include:

- *Establish new organisational arrangements to facilitate ongoing monitoring, reporting and implementation of the new Forest Strategy (2022-2030)*
- *Building on the learning outcomes of Project Woodland, public consultation and engagement will continue to be an important tool used to improve transparency, efficiency and effectiveness of regulation and in policy decision making.*
- *Better integration of trees and forests with other land uses at farm, catchment and landscape level. Create more coherence between agriculture, forest policies and biodiversity supports that result in a closer alignment between traditional agricultural activities and forestry.*

The goal setting is followed by a series of actions - the ones that appear to be most relevant to the use of indigenous genetic stock are commented on below.

## **Actions most relevant to the use of indigenous genetic stock**

**Action 10.** *Support the work of the Land use Review Group (EPA led) to ensure that balanced land use options inform forest establishment decisions.*

The Land Use Review when complete should inform the 'Plan Led Approach' as referred to in the Plan and stemming from the Regulatory Review in Project Woodland.

Woodlands of Ireland has previously circulated a discussion document regarding developing criteria for mapping potential Protective Forest Zones in catchments :

<https://www.woodlandsofireland.ie/wp-content/uploads/Protective-Forest-discussion-document-March-2020-1.pdf>

Some of the aspects explored in our document are reflected to an extent in the proposed 'Forests for Water' Afforestation (150ha/annum) and 'Reforestation for Biodiversity and Water Protection' (125ha/annum) measures. The targets set however don't go far enough to address the need to develop extensive permanent buffering between forestry/ agriculture and water courses.

If the average width of the buffer zones these pilot measures provide is 30m wide then their contribution to water protection and compliance with the Water Framework Directive (WFD) by 2027 is only 50km and 42km respectively per annum on a national basis. The 3m x 3m spacing of trees in the specification indicates that there is an understanding within the FS that '*Structurally diverse riparian buffers, i.e., those that contain a mix of trees, shrubs, and grass, are much more effective at capturing a wide range of nutrients than a riparian buffer that is solely of trees or grass*' (Cao et al, 2018).

Could the piloting of these measure be reviewed midterm in the new programme with a view to ramping up their application considerably? Should buffering in specific locations be mandatory?



**Image 2:** DAFM Inspector Eugene Curran records a 30yr old silvopasture plot in Co. Antrim 2022

**Action 11.** *Align tree planting measures in Agri-Environment Schemes with forest creation support measures.* Intervention 1

Under EU Commission Regulation No 702/2014 of 25 June 2014, Article 33, the agroforestry schemes currently operating on the island of Ireland function both under the RDP funded Agri-environment measures in Northern Ireland, and under Exchequer funded Forestry measures in the Republic of Ireland (See image 2 above).

In discussions with farmers and members of the Irish Agroforestry Forum (IAF), a key issue is around land designations in the Republic which impede the uptake of the agroforestry scheme. In Northern Ireland, farmers can avail of agroforestry payments without having any effect on any other agricultural payments they receive. Whereas in the Republic, land going into Agroforestry loses its' agricultural designation. Woodlands of Ireland are suggesting that DAFM consider **providing Agroforestry incentives both through the Agri-environment and Forestry measures** due to the urgency needed to respond to deadlines for compliance with the Water Framework Directive plus responding to both the Biodiversity and Climate Emergencies.

In addition the Forest Reproductive Material (FRM) regulations should be extended to cover all tree stock used in Agri-environment measures.

**Hedge habitats** and their maintenance are not fully integrated into the Agroforestry scheme specification, even though they form the most obvious example of traditional Agroforestry.



**Image 3:** DAFM Ecologist Katharine Duff and Liam Byrne Woodland Contractor (Pro Silva Chair) provide inputs to the NWS training event at the NPWS Reserve, Deputies Pass, Wicklow June 2022

**Action 38.** *Provide advisory and knowledge transfer services to support landowners in the forest establishment decision.* Intervention 5

The new Forestry Programme signals a bigger shift towards increasing use of indigenous genetic stock of native species (c.38%) to be future managed in the broad range of silvicultural systems (inc. non- intervention) under the umbrella of Continuous Cover Forestry (CCF). See an analysis of stock numbers for the Programme at Appendix 1 below.

**A national forestry education and training strategy is needed** as part of the Implementation Plan rather than just ad hoc events that provide no certification in the European Framework of Qualifications.

The voluntary group currently composed of representatives from SETU, UCD and Ballyhaise Agriculture College regarding promoting Forestry Education doesn't have the capacity to do a systematic training needs analysis as a first step in developing the education and training strategy.

A permanent entity within DAFM in partnership with DHLGH and industry stakeholders needs to take responsibility for leading and ensuring that there is adequate capacity in the Universities, Colleges and Training Skillnets. Table 1 below showing the steady increase in Establishment grants paid is only one indication of why Native Woodland will become a significant aspect of this education and training strategy, particularly in relation to nursery production, development of hardwood products and markets.



**Image 4:** Deer fenced area of natural regeneration, NPWS managed reforestation Wicklow NP 2022

**Action 56.** *Implement support schemes for the establishment of native forests and the conservation or restoration of existing and **emergent forests** based on ecological criteria.* Intervention 1,4,6

The Plan/Programme contains a range of support schemes.

The support scheme to support expansion of existing nurseries is welcome but EFQ certified education and training is needed to encourage more new start ups by the midterm review.

The move of '**Emergent Woodland**' into the establishment side of the Programme could be an enlightened move by the Forest Service but there is concern that the significantly lower premium attached to this subsection of a site (up to c. €16,000/ha lower than the farmer rate over 20 years) could lead to scrub/ emergent woodland clearance prior to Establishment applications for fear of losing the opportunity of maximum premium payment for all land parcels submitted. As currently presented the move of 'Emergent Woodland' from NWS Conservation over to the general Establishment measures looks not fully worked through.

Because the early stage successional stages occurring with scrub/emergent woodland in the development of woodland provide a 'sour dough starter' for future healthy woodland soil conditions, they can assist in the more rapid establishment of semi-natural woodland habitats.

See Section 3. *The Classification of Scrub and Emergent Woodland* in the 'Emergent Woodland Review' on our website at <https://www.woodlandsofireland.com/wp-content/uploads/Emergent-Woodland-Review-June-2020-Autosaved.pdf>

In Calvert et al 2021 discussion on **Succession**:

*'Many studies have considered succession (i.e., the process by which community membership changes over time) in grasslands (Archer et al., 1988), old fields (Keever, 1950; Myster & Pickett, 1994) and other wild ecosystems. In those studies, the first species to colonize will help facilitate the next wave of colonizing species, and the final species in a mature ecosystem inhibit the colonization of other species (once a climax community is reached). In wild nature, such clean successional dynamics are rare, but they seem to be the norm in sourdough starters.'*

Where a land parcel of emergent woodland is to be incorporated into an establishment, afforestation or reforestation project the ecological value that this adds in terms of species and structural diversity plus ecosystem services, needs to be fully recognised, especially where it forms more than 15% of a site, given that below that threshold of 15% it could be counted into an Area of Biodiversity Enhancement (ABE).

The early stages of colonisation by natural regeneration of native species and plant succession leading to the thicket stage of 5m in height (or 4m for wet woodland) on sections of a site may well warrant a lower rate of (e.g. for partial enrichment planting) or no grant but not paying a similar rate of premium as received for establishment contradicts the Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) concept on parts of sites that should be coming in **as integrated applications for woodland creation** rather than 2 separate applications for 2 separate rates of premium.

**Natural regeneration:** as referred to in the plan Appendix 5 Native Tree Area Scheme part 2.5.2

*'Natural regeneration has many advantages over planting (e.g. the conservation of the local genetic biodiversity, lower site inputs and disturbance, reduced pressure on limited planting stock). However, it is difficult to predict whether or not natural regeneration will occur on a given site within the available timeframe under the Native Tree Area scheme. It is envisaged that natural regeneration of native species may occur on many sites, particularly along hedgerows. This will enrich species diversity within the young emerging forest, and should be encouraged and retained as part of the developing forest ecosystem. See image 4 above.*

***However, due to its Native Tree Area Scheme (Draft) unpredictability and the scheme timeframe, natural regeneration cannot form part of the species area being applied for under this scheme. Instead, all of the area submitted must be planted at the outset. The site must not be disturbed or the land-cover changed in preparation for gaining entry to the scheme. Existing natural tree regeneration or tree cover in areas that are transitioning towards forest can be retained and incorporated into the new forest.'***

The above paragraph is perplexing and seems to suggest that no grant or premium (PES) will be paid where significant natural regeneration is already in place. Again the implications of that don't appear to have been fully thought through - no incentive to submit the regen areas for permanent land use change.

**Action 58.** *Continue to implement the Woodland Environment Fund to facilitate the planting of native forests by providing an access point for businesses to part fund their establishment.*

Intervention 1

The Woodland Environment Fund (WEF) is oddly named as there is no actual pool of money to distribute. The 100% grant aid from exchequer sources for the native woodland scheme is generally adequate to cover the cost of establishment. Businesses participating are providing a one off payment to land owners in order to associate with the contract. This can be beneficial in relation to consolidating the decision of landowners to entering the establishment scheme and indicate Corporate Social Responsibility activity on the part of the donor. Table 1 below indicates a strong upward trend in NWS Establishment (set to be over 600ha in 2022) WEF is included as a small part of that.

Native Woodland Scheme Conservation (NWS Cons.) measures in contrast are not as yet linked to the WEF promotion. Costs of works with NWS Cons. can often exceed the available budget offered by the grant, particularly in cases of severe invasive species infestation combined with deer predation on natural regeneration and or steep and rocky terrain presenting challenging conditions for fencing, control of invasives and general maintenance.

Is there any particular reason why the WEF concept could not also be applied to NWS Cons. where it is badly needed?

Perhaps the WEF could be rebranded as Woodland Environmental Friend(s)

Regarding the 'Natural Capital Facilitators' that need to be engaged for WEF applications: could the Implementation Plan clarify who is responsible for paying them and how can the small number of them on the WEF Register of Participating NCF list be expanded?



**Image 5:** Site preparation -inverted mounds on green field site Redcross, Co. Wicklow January 2022



**Action 61.** Increase the level of native forests as a percentage of total forest establishment.  
intervention 1

The level of native forests as a percentage of total forest establishment has been increasing substantially for the past 10 years as indicated in Tables 1 and 2 below.

## NWS ESTABLISHMENT HECTARES 2005-2022 (17 NOV.)



**Table 1:** Native Woodland Establishment figures from 2005 to November 2022 (DAFM 2022).

BROADLEAVES PLANTING OUTTURN REPORT																				
Report date: 13th Oct. 2022																				
	Total planting in ha								2022 Monthly planting in ha											
	2015 (full year)	2016 (full year)	2017 (full year)	2018 (full year)	2019 (full year)	2020 (full year)	2021 (full year)	2022 (year to date)	Jan.	Feb.	March	April	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
Conifer	5,029.77	5,229.50	4,374.60	2,932.13	2,656.73	1,615.79	1,187.47	1,083.53	45.11	143.93	153.64	56.86	167.39	111.75	158.24	142.34	104.29			
Broadleaves	1,263.04	1,270.30	1,361.35	1,066.35	893.16	818.53	829.01	795.38	23.53	123.21	136.57	78.29	136.96	96.32	68.94	74.38	57.40			
Total (ha)	6,292.81	6,499.80	5,535.75	3,998.48	3,549.89	2,434.32	2,016.48	1,878.91	68.64	267.12	290.21	135.15	304.35	208.07	227.18	216.50	161.69	0.00	0.00	0.00
% Broadleaves (of total)	20%	20%	21%	27%	25%	34%	41%	42%	34%	46%	47%	58%	45%	46%	30%	34%	36%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

  

### % Broadleaves (of total planting)

Year	% Broadleaves
2015 (full year)	20%
2016 (full year)	20%
2017 (full year)	21%
2018 (full year)	27%
2019 (full year)	25%
2020 (full year)	34%
2021 (full year)	41%
2022 (year to date)	42%

**Table 2:** Afforestation proportions of Broadleaves to Conifers 2015-2022 (source Forest Service)

From the data in table 2 above, the rolling average percentage of broadleaves in the 2015-2022 is c.29% of the total area of what has been planted. In the same time period within that total broadleaf figure c.36% (around 2,900ha) was applied through the Native Woodland Scheme (NWS) using predominantly indigenous genetic stock (with the exception of derogations allowing the use of typically Dutch provenance Oak when native Oak was in short supply). Much if not all of the Birch and Alder used in non NWS broadleaf planting will tend to be of indigenous genetic stock.

Approximately 47% of the trees proposed for planting in the new Forestry Programme are broadleaves and within that number 8 out of 10 broadleaves are intended to be of indigenous genetic stock.

**Managing the demand for tree planting stock:** The Implementation Plan indicates financial support for the expansion of existing nurseries to meet the expected increase in demand.

This will require additional seed collectors for the seed collection and storage facilities for that seed.

As it takes 2 to 3 years or more to increase the availability of stock, shortages of many species can be anticipated in these years. **Derogations** to use non-native stock of specific species such as Rowan can pose **plant health risks** such as fire blight therefore consideration should be given to extending the approval period for contracts to the end of the Forestry Programme in 2027. Contracts could then proceed once sufficient supplies of indigenous genetic stock or other becomes available.

This should be strictly operated with an agreed protocol for how the queuing and distribution of available stock is done, following the issuing of approval notices. For example state bodies or their subsidiaries / trusts of which they (or their staff members) are one of the beneficial owners should receive approvals for planting on a quota basis, in order to maintain a sense of impartiality between the broad range of stakeholders wishing to avail of planting stock and DAFM financial support in reasonable time frames.

Coillte tends to take care of its own native species requirements and provides its surplus if available to the rest of the market from time to time. Given the projected increase in demand envisaged in the Plan and the backdrop of the Climate and Biodiversity Crises, what are the risk versus the rewards for Coillte regarding investment in native species nursery expansion, particularly into container grown stock as previously available from Clone Nursery in Aughrim, Wicklow?

Could container grown stock with slow release fertiliser provide part of the solution to improving the performance of pioneer woodland on 'acid sensitive' sites subject to EPA approval?

There are a number of start-up (and restart) nurseries emerging in Northern Ireland and the rest of the country which may contribute perhaps an additional 600,000 native trees per annum into the all island market.

None so Hardy are the main suppliers to the private sector for over 30 years. They endeavour to anticipate the likely demand and meet that demand to the best of their ability, which is not an easy task, given the long lead in time to build up stocks.

**Action 64.** *Support the establishment and natural regeneration of native forest on post-industrial cutaway peatlands, where appropriate.* Intervention 1

This refers to a specific project between Bord na Móna and Coillte. The Bord na Móna Biodiversity Action Plans indicate that 25-30,000 ha of their 80,000ha estate is likely to revert to native semi-natural woodland without significant intervention. The project aims to speed up natural plant succession and regenerative processes through experimental direct seeding, some planting and use of cuttings in a number of sites totalling 1500ha.

**Action 69.** *Support the establishment of a National Deer Management Forum (DAFM led) where stakeholders will be convened to develop a holistic strategy to the management of the wild deer population*

In a recent media article: *'Beautiful deer are nibbling native woodlands into non-existence'* <https://www.irishexaminer.com/lifestyle/outdoors/arid-40996661.html> 03/11/2022 the author Anja Murray eloquently and informatively emphasizes one of a number of the key drivers of biodiversity loss in native and semi-natural woodland.

Woodlands of Ireland had participated in the Irish Deer Management Forum (<http://idmf.ie/>) until the forum ceased to function in recent years. We produced a 'Deer and Forestry in Ireland' Information Note (<https://www.woodlandsofireland.ie/wp-content/uploads/No.-7-Deer-NWS-InfoNote.pdf>) as part of a series available on our website and in printed form (hard copies can be supplied on request) plus we commissioned a National Deer Strategy Report 2009: <https://www.woodlandsofireland.com/deer-and-forestry-in-ireland/>

At the <https://smartdeer.ie/> seminar at UCD on 10th May 2022, there was an informal announcement from DAFM attendees that the Forum would be reconvened soon.

Action 69 is welcome but should be rephrased as: *Support the **re-establishment** of a National Deer Management Forum.* The reasons for the ending of the previous forum should be assessed and the lessons learnt brought forward to the new entity.

**Action 79.** *Establishment of a number of pilot areas to develop a plan led approach to afforestation in collaboration with stakeholders. These pilot areas will help inform a national approach to plan led afforestation.*

#### **Intervention 7 - Climate Resilient Reforestation**

##### **Element 1: Reforestation for CCF 200ha/annum**

There are a range of silvicultural systems that could be applied in Continuous Cover Forestry, which can be mixed species stands including both native and non-native species.

The target for this element lacks ambition, given that there is predicted to be c. 6,000ha of clear felling and reforestation designed for clear fell, per annum happening at the same time.

The window for a significant shift to CCF continues to open now given the peak of planting in the 1995/1996 is coming up for felling during this forestry programme, where rotation lengths are now anecdotally at around 30 years for spruce.

There is concern that when this wave passes without a significant shift to CCF, then another generation of mainly clear felling will be set in motion.

Training courses for this should be included in the **national forestry education and training strategy**

##### **Element 2: Reforestation for native forests 200ha/annum**

Versions of CCF could be applied here also. Given the underspend in Forestry in the last decade, if the demand for this measure exceeds 200ha/annum (provided the stock is available) then the target cap should be lifted.

## Other Aspects:

### Yield Class filter.

Some sites put forward for native woodland establishment have been filtered out of potential funding on the basis that they aren't in the Forest Service's view capable of achieving the broadleaved equivalent of yield class 14 Sitka spruce (14m<sup>3</sup> per hectare per annum). This aspect needs to be reviewed in general and considered for removal as a criteria in wet woodland types, areas with environmental designations, national parks, nature reserves and any location where bands of native species are used for buffering between agriculture/ forestry and water or in new protective forest zones around Annex 1 woodland habitats as appropriate.

### Intervention 8 – Reconstitution 700ha

#### Measure 2 Reconstitution and Underplanting (Ash Dieback) Scheme



**Image 6:** Severe Ash dieback in a plantation established in 2005 at Gorravagh, Co. Leitrim.

The reduced frequency of Ash in semi-natural woodland and hedges as a result of *Hymenoscyphus fraxineus* the Ash dieback disease poses a major challenge to both foresters and ecologists as well as public authorities.

Plantations of Ash have been severely impacted as seen in image 6 above. Nearly 17,000 ha of Ash have been planted between 1990 and 2012 (DAFM stats 2021).

Options available to owners of badly impacted Ash plantations should continue to include funding to restock with other native species with timber potential such as Oak, Wild cherry, Scots pine and Birch.

Premiums should at least match the reforestation elements 1 and 2 premium rates and duration.

Mature Ash trees have other organisms such as species of birds, insects and lichens that depend on their presence to live successfully. There is an increasing amount of dead standing trees on roadside hedges and in woodlands, posing a threat to the public. Not all trees will die of disease, therefore efforts need to be made to identify and conserve disease resistant trees and to collect and propagate seed from them.

**Hen Harrier SPAs:** According to FS sources, permission to plant in these areas is unlikely, following the Appropriate Assessment (AA) outcome on the Draft Threat Response Plan for the species, which is approaching a conclusion now. Achieving compliance with EU law regarding Hen Harrier conservation involves a range of complex tasks requiring ongoing co-operation between several Depts, Landowners and NGOs. Adjacent areas or islands of lands within the SPAs will require screening and probably further steps in the AA process.

**Freshwater Pearl Mussel (FPW):** In the WoI discussion document on protective forest referred to above Dr. Evelyn Moorkens, a leading authority on the species, emphasises the risk that new upland stands of native species on peat soils could periodically reduce the flow levels of water into streams where there are FPW populations and pose an additional threat to their continued existence therefore doesn't recommend targeting establishment of new native woodland there.

## Conclusion:

The proposed new or revamped tree planting measures are progressive in a number of ways, particularly in reforestation and support for existing nurseries. Concerns are raised about the supply and demand capacity for indigenous genetic stock, the lack of integration of early stage woodland into afforestation, the lack of integration of hedge habitat management into agroforestry (and forestry generally) and the application of the yield class filter.

Some of the targets on pilot measures, particularly for CCF should be revisited at the midterm review.

## Appendix 1: estimating the use of indigenous genetic tree stock

The Implementation Plan of the new Forestry Programme proposes an 8,000ha annual afforestation target broken down by Forest Type:

Forest Type Annual Target (ha) x stocking density		indigenous genetic stock estimate
FT1 Native forests 1,150 x 3000 trees/ha = 3,450,000		3,450,000
FT2 Forests for water 150 x 1100 = 165,000		165,000
FT3 Forests on Public Lands 150 x 3000 = 450,000		450,000
FT4 Amenity forests & Neighbourwoods 50 x 2500 = 125,000		50,000
FT5 Emergent Woodland / Rewilding 50 x 1000 = 50,000		50,000
FT6 Broadleaf, mainly oak 250 x 3200 = 800,000		160,000
FT7 Broadleaf, mainly birch, alder 250 x 2500 = 625,000		625,000
FT8 Agroforestry 100 x 400 = 40,000 25%		10,000
FT9 Seed Orchards 5 x 500 = 2,500 20%		500
FT10 CCF 800 x 2500 = 2,000,000 10%		200,000
FT11 Mixed forests: Scots Pine, Douglas Fir 400 x 2500 = 1,000,000 10%		100,000
FT12 Mixed for mainly spruce, 20% broadleaves 4,645 x 2500 = 11,612,500 – 15%		1,742,000
Native Tree Area Scheme Annual Target 700ha x 1100		<u>= 770,000</u>
Subtotal trees per annum Establishment	21,090,000	7,772,500

### Intervention 7 - Climate Resilient Reforestation has additional targets requiring planting stock.

Element 1: Reforestation for CCF 200ha x 2500 = 500,000 10% 50,000

*In general elevations above 300 metres are to be avoided as the risk of windthrow increases significantly.*

Element 2: Reforestation for native forests 200ha x 3200 = 640,000

Element 3: Reforestation for Biodiversity/ Water Protection 125ha x 1100 = 137,500

**Intervention 8 – Reconstitution** 700ha x 2000 = 1,400,000 c.30% 400,000

Measure 2 Reconstitution and Underplanting (Ash Dieback) Scheme

Total tree stock for all planting **23,767,500** of which 38% indigenous genetic stock **9,000,000**

## Appendix 2: New proposed afforestation grant rates and premiums

	Forest Type	Grant Rates (excluding fencing)		Premium Payments				
		Current Grant/ha	Proposed Grant/ha	Current Premiums/ha	Proposed Annual Premium/ha	Current Number of Premiums	Proposed Number of Premiums for Non-Farmers	Proposed Number of Premiums for Farmers
FT1	Native Forests	€5,620	€6,744	€665	€1,103	15	15	20
FT2	Forests for Water*	New	€6,744	New	€1,142	New	15	20
FT3	Forests on Public Lands**	€9,920	€11,044	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
FT4	NeighbourWoods***	€8,800	€10,200	New	€1,142	New	15	20
FT5	Emergent Forests	New	€2,500	New	€350	New	15	20
FT6	Broadleaf, mainly oak	€5,620	€6,744	€645	€1,037	15	15	20
FT7	Other Broadleaf	€3,595	€4,314	€605	€973	15	15	20
FT8	Agroforestry	€5,620	€8,555	€645	€975	5	10	10
FT9	Seed Orchards	New	€10,000	New	€1,142	New	15	20
FT10	Continuous Cover Forestry	New	€5,421	New	€912	New	15	20
FT11	Mixed High Forests: Conifer, 20% broadleaves	€3,710	€4,452	€590	€863	15	15	20
FT12	Mixed High Forests with mainly spruce, 20% broadleaves	€3,215	€3,858	€510	€746	15	15	20
Native Tree Area Scheme will be paid at FT1 and FT2 rates. Premiums will be paid over 10 years rather than 20 at a rate of €2,206 per ha annually for NTA1 and €2,284 per ha annually for NTA2								
*	Additional payment of €1,000 per ha will be paid to landowner on completion of planting							
**	Grant includes Trails, Seats & Signage Facilities and Derelict Site payment							
***	Grant includes Facilities payment							



Pocket Oakwood of c.1.5ha Sligo 2022

## References

Archer et al. (1988) Archer S, Scifres C, Bassham CR, Maggio R. *Autogenic succession in a subtropical savanna: conversion of Grassland to Thorn Woodland*. Ecological Monographs. 1988;58:111–127. doi: 10.2307/1942463. [[CrossRef](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]

Cao, X., Song, C., Xiao, J. and Zhou, Y., 2018. *The Optimal Width and Mechanism of Riparian Buffers for Storm Water Nutrient Removal in the Chinese Eutrophic Lake Chaohu Watershed*. Water, [online] 10(10), p.1489. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/w10101489>

Calvert MD, Madden AA, Nichols LM, Haddad NM, Lahne J, Dunn RR, McKenney EA. *A review of sourdough starters: ecology, practices, and sensory quality with applications for baking and recommendations for future research*. PeerJ. 2021 May 10;9:e11389. doi: 10.7717/peerj.11389. PMID: 34026358; PMCID: PMC8117929.

*Forest Statistics Ireland 2021* DAFM 2021

Keever (1950) Keever C. *Causes of succession on old fields of the piedmont, North Carolina*. Ecological Monographs. 1950;20:229–250. doi: 10.2307/1948582. [[CrossRef](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]

Myster & Pickett (1994) Myster RW, Pickett STA. *A comparison of rate of succession over 18 yr in 10 contrasting old fields*. Ecology. 1994;75:387–392. doi: 10.2307/1939542. [[CrossRef](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]

Woodlands of Ireland is funded by



**An Roinn Tithíochta,  
Rialtais Áitiúil agus Oidhreachta**  
Department of Housing,  
Local Government and Heritage

**An Chomhairle Oidhreachta  
The Heritage Council**



Department of  
**Agriculture,  
Food and the Marine**  
An Roinn  
**Talmhaíochta,  
Bia agus Mara**