



National Forest Management Grant (NFMG) Assessment Score 2022/23

Scoring is based on the contribution a scheme makes to the National Forest Green Print. The assessment scoring system is divided into key sections from which a score is applied to each, depending on the content and merit of each scheme. An indicative threshold score of 23 points is applied for proposals, however this is subject to change dependant on the range of applications received.

Each section receives a score weighting, in order to prioritise key outcomes for the National Forest.

The scores are:

- 0 - Poor = minor or no contribution
- 1 - Average = some contribution to this aspect of the strategy
- 2 - Good = strong contribution to this aspect of the strategy
- 3 - Exceptional = very strong contribution to this aspect of the strategy.

Woodland/Farm Management Plan (x1 weighting)

- 0 – No woodland/Farm management plan in place or proposed for scheme
- 1 – Basic woodland/Farm management plan in place
- 2 – Woodland/Farm management plan approved by National Forest Company (NFC)
- 3 – Woodland/Farm management plan prepared by agent and fulfils any permission requirements.
- 4* – Woodland/Farm management plan not required (e.g. Non woodland options or training only) or plan is proposed for scheme and approved by National Forest Company (NFC).

*(*Priority scoring for schemes which meet specific National Forest strategy outcomes)*

Example scenarios:

- 0. Woodland that has no current Woodland Management Plan and is not planning to develop one as part of the grant scheme - **Score 0**
- 1. Basic Woodland Management Plan in place, information will include; species present, age of woodland, risk management and future plans – **Score 1**
- 2. Woodland Management Plan approved by National Forest Company – **Score 2**
- 3. Woodland Management Plan approved by Forestry Commission – **Score 3**
- 4. No requirement for Woodland Management Plan if the scheme only covers Non woodland options or training. Or, if a Woodland Management Plan is proposed as part of the grant and will be produced and approved during the grant period – **Score 4**

Flora and Fauna Health & Resilience (x2 weighting)

- 0 – Scheme doesn't incorporate works for Flora and Fauna health or resilience
- 1 – Scheme will benefit Flora and Fauna health and habitat resilience (e.g. thinning or coppicing + pest control)
- 2 – Scheme addresses current Flora and Fauna health threat through active works and pest management (e.g. removal of infected Ash + pest control, Tree Surgery)

3 – Scheme proposes to combat current or future Flora and Fauna health issues and increase the overall resilience of the habitats (e.g. collaborative work with neighbour or membership of a local pest management group)

Public Access (x2 weighting)

Reject – Net reduction of access to the site

0 – No access provided

1 – Access provided to the site, but works do not seek to improve it

2 – Access provided to the site, with works seeking to improve it (e.g. ride edge thinning + fence and tree guard removal)

3 – Access provided to the site with works seeking to positively improve the visitor experience (e.g. Score 2 + new signage, way-marking of new routes)

Nature Conservation (x2 weighting)

Reject - Damages existing habitats or designated sites

0 – Scheme does not include works to improve biodiversity within the site

1 – Scheme includes works to improve biodiversity in one area of the site (e.g. pond restoration or hedgelaying)

2 – Scheme includes works to improve biodiversity potential across the site (e.g. new bird and bat boxes or riverside grass margins)

3 – Scheme seeks to improve biodiversity potential across the site and create new habitats within the woodland or farmland (e.g. Score 2 + coppicing, deadwood creation and bee and bird food mixes)

Skills Training (x1 weighting)

0 – No skills training identified in the scheme

1 – Skills training identified which benefits one individual

2 – Skills training identified which benefits more than one individual

3 – Skills training which benefits volunteers or community groups to build knowledge and/or practical skills in order to diversify habitats or work woodland into a new way

Risk (x1 weighting)

0 – Very high risk of the overall grant total being unclaimed – historic examples of large amounts of unclaimed grant

1 – High risk of the overall grant total being unclaimed – historic examples of significant amounts of unclaimed grant

2 – Medium risk of the overall grant total being unclaimed – large work programme that may result in unclaimed grant

3 – Low risk of the overall grant total being unclaimed – suitable work programme proposed and no history of significant amounts of unclaimed grant

Strategic Fit (x3 weighting)

0 – Proposed scheme will not benefit the habitats present or the owners objectives

1 – Scheme seeks to address one or two priorities for the particular site, missing key elements to improve or protect the site as a whole, or scheme seeks to fund considerable operations on land which has previously had grant funding.

2 – Scheme addresses several priorities for the site, but does not include a key element, appropriate for its age/stage of development and the advice received to date

3 – Scheme is fully fit for purpose for the site (at this point in time), no additional works would be appropriate, or further enhance the site

4* – Strategic scheme which achieves a high priority outcome for the NFC (including location, scale, exemplar project with wider learning benefits etc.)

*(*Priority scoring for schemes which meet specific National Forest strategy outcomes)*

Example scenarios:

0. Scheme proposes to remove ecologically valuable scrub layer of woodland and exposes the site to greater threat from pests and disease – **Score 0**
1. Land owner has received advice and engagement through NFC and agent, but is applying for a single operation (e.g. fence removal). Other works could be considered – **Score 1**
2. Land owner which seeks to remove redundant fencing and carry out ride edge thinning and scalloping for access and biodiversity, but does not identify tree health as a priority, despite having grey squirrel damage and 20% Ash – **Score 2**
3. Site with no prior engagement, applying for a management plan only to identify future opportunities and works – **Score 3**
4. Scheme which is located on the National Forest Way, it proposes innovative works which enhances the site for locally rare or important wildlife or protects the site from major risks – **Score 4**