| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | **Funding for Ireland CAP Strategic Plan interventions 2023-2027 (BirdWatch Ireland 2021)** | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Environmental benefit (red=zero, amber/yellow=poor, dark green = very good, light green = could be better). | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | **2023-2027** | **% of budget** | **Environmental benefit** | **Total IE CAP budget = in billions** | **9,832.60** | | | | |
| 4 | Basic Income Support for Sustainability | 3,642.50 | 37% | | Direct payment. Requires meeting conditions and Statutory Mgt requirements (some articles of relevant EU Laws like Birds Directive, Habitats Directive, Water Framework Directive, Nitrates Directive. Only 1% of farmers are inspected for conditionality compliance. | | | | | |
| 5 | Complementary income support for young farmers (CIS-YF) | 177.9 | 2% | | Direct payment | | | | | |
| 6 | Complementary redistributive income support for sustainability (CRISS) | 593.1 | 6% | | Transfer of funds from larger farms to smaller farms; considered impactful at higher % but unclear whether this will drive productivity. No environmental linkage. | | | | | |
| 7 | Eco-Scheme | 1,482.90 | 15% | | Some elements of ecoschemes rewards farmers for activities like cutting fertiliser use but fert prices already high and shd drive reductions, so is this compensation for high prices? Space for nature element is not ambitious as no focus on improving quality of habitats. % allocation of 7 and 10% is still below findings of national research showing that most farms have higher % of habitats when all habitats are considered and not just EU list of GAEC 8 habs. Overall low ambition. Poor value for money. | | | | | |
| 8 | Sectoral Intervention for | 0.6 | 0.01% | | Must be clear that this is not a support for pollinators but rather honey | | | | | |
| 9 | Protein Aid | 35 | 0.36% | | good to increase tillage; how much going to non-animal feed? | | | | | |
| 10 | Sectoral Intervention in the Fruit and Vegetable Sector | 39 | 0.40% | | Excludes most smaller hort farmers | | | | | |
| 11 | **Total Pillar 1** | **5,971.00** | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | **Pillar 2** | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Areas of Natural Constraint | 1,250.00 | 12.71% | | no link to environmental action in this scheme | | | | | |
| 15 | Agri-environment climate measure (AECM) | 1,500.00 | 15.26% | | Inadequate measures to halt farmland bird declines (breeding wader scheme included but half the funding of what BWI proposed as necessary). Targeted results based component called Cooperative Projects is very promising but only 20,000 farmers included out of 130,000. Overall does not address the biodiversity crisis on farmland. | | | | | |
| 16 | AECM Training | 21.6 | 0.22% | | Must be focused on biodiversity, water and climate. Timing is critical. Scale of training need is huge. Environmental results are dependent on training of farm advisors in biodiversity, water and climate but specialist ecological advice is also required and this is not catered for. | | | | | |
| 17 | Straw Incorporation Measure | 50 | 0.51% | | Climate benefits but insufficient research on impacts to ground nesting birds and other biodiversity. | | | | | |
| 18 | Organic Farming | 256 | 2.60% | | Good, enough? 2.6% of the budget isnt 7.5% as the target is, but depends on what its spent on. eg payment rate per ha. but this is definitely a big increase on the previous ammount (about 75 milion) | | | | | |
| 19 | On farm investments* / TAMs | 100 | 1.02% | | Must ensure activities eligible for funding are changed from current TAMs which is driving intensive agriculture. | | | | | |
| 20 | Suckler Carbon Efficiency | 260 | 2.64% | | Climate benefits unproven in past Beef genomics scheme | | | | | |
| 21 | Beef and Sheep Producer Organisations | 1.5 | 0.02% | | ? | | | | | |
| 22 | Continuous Professional Development for Advisors | 1.9 | 0.02% | | Important that this is focused on biodiversity, climate and water | | | | | |
| 23 | European Innovation | 36.1 | 0.37% | | Good | | | | | |
| 24 | Knowledge Transfer | 71.1 | 0.72% | | Must be well designed to get max benefit | | | | | |
| 25 | Dairy Beef Welfare Scheme | 25 | 0.25% | | Supporting production. Unclear of welfare element | | | | | |
| 26 | Sheep Improvement Scheme | 100 | 1.02% | | Looks like a headage payment which could be even more destructive to habtiats=more sheep | | | | | |
| 27 | Collaborative Farming | 2 | 0.02% | | No clear enviro action or benefit | | | | | |
| 28 | Technical Assistance | 6.3 | 0.06% | | ? | | | | | |
| 29 | LEADER | 180 | 1.83% | | LEADER is a good initiative with supports for diversification incl on farm processing etc; however this looks like a drop in funding, which continues a bad trend. | | | | | |
| 30 | **Total Pillar 2** | **3,861.60** | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | **Total CSP 2023-2027** | **9,832.60** | | | | | | | | |