CYNGOR CEFN GWLAD CYMRU
COUNTRYSIDE COUNCIL FOR WALES

CORE MANAGEMENT PLAN
INCLUDING CONSERVATION OBJECTIVES

FOR

COEDYDD LLAWR-Y-GLYN SPECIAL AREA OF CONSERVATION (SAC)

Version: 2

Date: January 2008

Approved by: D R Drewett

More detailed maps of management units can be provided on request.
A Welsh version of all or part of this document can be made available on request.

Cyngor Cefn Gwlad Cymru
Countryside Council for Wales

NATURA 2000

Ramsar

Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government
CORFF NODDEDIG | SPONSORED BODY

CONTENTS

PREFACE

This document provides the main elements of CCW's management plan for the site named. It sets out what needs to be achieved on the site, the results of monitoring and advice on the action required. This document is made available through CCW's web site and may be revised in response to changing circumstances or new information. This is a technical document that supplements summary information on the web site.

One of the key functions of this document is to provide CCW's statement of the Conservation Objectives for the relevant Natura 2000 site. This is required to implement the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994, as amended (Section 4). As a matter of Welsh Assembly Government Policy, the provisions of those regulations are also to be applied to Ramsar sites in Wales.

1. VISION FOR THE SITE

This is a descriptive overview of what needs to be achieved for conservation on the site. It brings together and summarises the Conservation Objectives (part 4) into a single, integrated statement about the site.

Around 95% of the site is broadleaved woodland, the majority of which is dominated by native oaks, although birch, rowan and ash may also be locally prominent in the canopy. The woodland has trees of all age classes and contains a significant amount of both standing and fallen dead timber. Natural regeneration of native trees is sufficient to maintain the woodland cover in the long term. The shrub layer (where present) consists of locally native plants that are typical of oak woodland, such as hazel, rowan, holly, and hawthorn. The ground flora is variable in structure and composition. Some areas are dominated by bilberry and heather or wavy hair-grass but there are also extensive areas carpeted by mosses and liverworts, particularly in stream valleys and on the steep slopes. Other typical oak wood plants, such as wood sorrel, common dog-violet, common cow-wheat, bluebell and opposite-leaved golden saxifrage may be locally prominent. Some of the stream gullies support well-developed fern communities, including broad buckler-fern, scaly male-fern, oak fern and beech fern. Lichens, growing on the larger trees, that are indicators of old woodland are gradually spreading throughout the site.

The woodland remains closed over much of the site, especially around the steeper gorges, which support extensive moss and liverwort carpets that are reliant on deep shade and humid conditions. The site also supports a good variety of breeding birds that are typical of upland oak woods, including pied flycatcher, redstart, wood warbler, woodpeckers and birds of prey. There are a variety of different structural elements that provide habitat for these species, including open woodland, dense scrub and ground cover and tree holes for nesting.

2. SITE DESCRIPTION

2.1 Area and Designations Covered by this Plan

Grid references: SN 918 913, SN 916 906, SN 917 901, SN 925 906, SN 937 907

Unitary authority: Powys County Council

Area (hectares): 102.2

Designations covered: Coedydd Llawr-y-glyn Special Area of Conservation (SAC); Coedydd Llawr-y-glyn Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Areas and boundaries are identical.

Detailed maps of the designated sites are available through CCW's web site:

http://www.ccw.gov.uk/interactive-maps/protected-areas-map.aspx

2.2 Outline Description

The site consists of five separate blocks of woodland situated on hill slopes around the headwaters of the River Trannon. The individual blocks are complementary to each other in their botanical interest and display well the range of ecological variation within such acid oakwood types. All are dominated by mostly even-aged sessile oak, but there are variable amounts of downy birch, hazel, holly and rowan, and in some areas pedunculate oak is also present. The ground flora in some areas is dominated by heather and bilberry, whilst in others it is grassier and herbs such as bluebell, wood sorrel and violets are more prominent, although the diversity of such species is never great in woods of this type. Elsewhere, ferns and mosses are abundant and form the major botanical interest.

2.3 Outline of Past and Current Management

Prior to notification as a SSSI in 1985 it is believed that all or most of the woodlands would have been grazed at some time by sheep and cattle. Such use would have been seasonal, and based more on the need for water from the streams in dry summers, and shelter in severe winter weather and during lambing, than on the value of the grazing itself. In addition, some small areas of hazel have been coppiced in the past, both in Coed Pen-y-banc and the Cwm Carreg-ddu block. This would probably have been on an ad hoc basis, and mature oaks would have been similarly taken for local use. Some large areas were clear-felled, most notably in Coed Gwernafon before or during the 1939-45 war. This same wood also contains an area of oak plantation, although other parts of the wood were left to regenerate from the cut stumps. Small areas in both Coed Glan-yr-afon and Coed Ty-newydd have been planted with alien conifers, and the latter also with beech, which is not native in mid Wales.

Since notification, the efforts of statutory agency staff, and latterly the advent of agri-environment schemes, have resulted in significant areas of the site being closed to stock and so freed from grazing pressure. This is now the case in the majority of the Cwm Carreg-ddu block and part of the Coed Pen-y-banc block. Coed Gwernafon has not been grazed since the early 1990s, having been acquired by the Woodland Trust. Part of Coed Ty-newydd is also ungrazed. Coed Glan-yr-afon is now the only large part of the site that is heavily sheep-grazed, although this is still true in smaller parts of all the blocks. It is now unusual for

consent to be given for felling within the woodlands except for safety reasons or to remove alien species, and coppicing is no longer practiced by the landowners.

2.4 Management Units

The plan area has been divided into management units to enable practical communication about features, objectives, and management. This will also allow us to differentiate between the different designations where necessary. In this plan the management units have been based on land ownership.

See attached map showing the management units referred to in this plan.

The following table confirms the relationships between the management units and the designations covered:

Unit number	Unit Name (if any)	SAC	SSSI	CCW owned	Other
Coedydd Llawr-y-glyn					
1	Coed Ty-newydd (north)	✔	✔		
2	Coed Ty-newydd (south)	✔	✔		
3	Coed Pen-y-Banc	✔	✔		
4	Pandy	✔	✔		
5	Tan-lan	✔	✔		
6	Coed y Llechwedd	✔	✔		
7	Coed Esgairiaeth	✔	✔		
8	Cefn-y-cloddiau	✔	✔		
9	Derwyn	✔	✔		
10	Faidre Fawr	✔	✔		
11	Esgairmaen	✔	✔		
12	Faidre Fach	✔	✔		
13	Coed Gwernafon	✔	✔		Woodland Trust
14	Coed Glan-yr-afon	✔	✔		

3. THE SPECIAL FEATURES

3.1 Confirmation of Special Features

Designated feature	*Relationships, nomenclature etc*	*Conservation Objective in part 4*
SAC features		
Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site 1. **Old sessile oak woods with Ilex and Blechnum in the British Isles.**	**EU Habitat Code: 91A0** Generally referred to as ‘ Sessile Oak Woodland’ throughout this document.	1
SPA features		
Not applicable		
Ramsar features		
Not applicable		
SSSI features		
1. Broadleaved Semi-natural Woodland, comprised of the following NVC communities – W11a, W17b and W17c.	See above.	1

3.2 Special Features and Management Units

This section sets out the relationship between the special features and each management unit. This is intended to provide a clear statement about what each unit should be managed for, taking into account the varied needs of the different special features. All special features are allocated to one of seven classes in each management unit. These classes are:

Key Features

KH - a 'Key Habitat' in the management unit, i.e. the habitat that is the main driver of management and focus of monitoring effort, perhaps because of the dependence of a key species (see KS below). There will usually only be one Key Habitat in a unit but there can be more, especially with large units.

KS – a 'Key Species' in the management unit, often driving both the selection and management of a Key Habitat.

Geo – an earth science feature that is the main driver of management and focus of monitoring effort in a unit.

Other Features

Sym - habitats, species and earth science features that are of importance in a unit but are not the main drivers of management or focus of monitoring. These features will benefit from management for the key feature(s) identified in the unit. These may be classed as 'Sym' features because:

a) they are present in the unit but may be of less conservation importance than the key feature; and/or
b) they are present in the unit but in small areas/numbers, with the bulk of the feature in other units of the site; and/or
c) their requirements are broader than and compatible with the management needs of the key feature(s), e.g. a mobile species that uses large parts of the site and surrounding areas.

Nm - an infrequently used category where features are at risk of decline within a unit as a result of meeting the management needs of the key feature(s), i.e. under Negative Management. These cases will usually be compensated for by management elsewhere in the plan, and can be used where minor occurrences of a feature would otherwise lead to apparent conflict with another key feature in a unit.

Mn - Management units that are essential for the management of features elsewhere on a site e.g. livestock over-wintering area included within designation boundaries, buffer zones around water bodies, etc.

x – Features not known to be present in the management unit.

The table(s) below sets out the relationship between the special features and management units identified in this plan:

Coedydd Llawr-y-glyn	**Management unit**								
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**
SAC	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
SSSI	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
NNR/CCW owned									
SAC features									
1. Sessile Oak Woodland	**KH**	**KH**	**KH**	**KH**	**x**	**KH**	**KH**	**KH**	**KH**
SSSI features									
(Broadleaved Semi-Natural Woodland)	**KH**	**KH**	**KH**	**KH**	**x**	**KH**	**KH**	**KH**	**KH**

Coedydd Llawr-y-glyn	**Management unit**								
	10	**11**	**12**	**12**	**14**				
SAC	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔				
SSSI	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔				
NNR/CCW owned									
SAC features									
1. Sessile Oak Woodland	**KH**	**KH**	**KH**	**KH**	**KH**				
SSSI features									
(Broadleaved Semi-Natural Woodland)	**KH**	**KH**	**KH**	**KH**	**KH**				

4. CONSERVATION OBJECTIVES

Background to Conservation Objectives:

a. Outline of the legal context and purpose of conservation objectives.

Conservation objectives are required by the 1992 'Habitats' Directive (92/43/EEC). The aim of the Habitats Directives is the maintenance, or where appropriate the restoration of the 'favourable conservation status' of habitats and species features for which SACs and SPAs are designated (see Box 1).

In the broadest terms, 'favourable conservation status' means a feature is in satisfactory condition and all the things needed to keep it that way are in place for the foreseeable future. CCW considers that the concept of favourable conservation status provides a practical and legally robust basis for conservation objectives for Natura 2000 and Ramsar sites.

Box 1
Favourable conservation status as defined in Articles 1(e) and 1(i) of the Habitats Directive

"The conservation status of a natural habitat is the sum of the influences acting on it and its typical species that may affect its long-term natural distribution, structure and functions as well as the long term survival of its typical species. The conservation status of a natural habitat will be taken as favourable when:

- Its natural range and areas 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 conservation status of a species is the sum of the influences acting on the species that may affect the long-term distribution and abundance of its populations. The conservation status will be taken as 'favourable' when:

- population dynamics data on the species 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."

Achieving these objectives requires appropriate management and the control of factors that may cause deterioration of habitats or significant disturbance to species.

As well as the overall function of communication, Conservation objectives have a number of specific roles:

- Conservation planning and management.

  The conservation objectives guide management of sites, to maintain or restore the habitats and species in favourable condition.

- Assessing plans and projects.

Article 6(3) of the 'Habitats' Directive requires appropriate assessment of proposed plans and projects against a site's conservation objectives. Subject to certain exceptions, plans or projects may not proceed unless it is established that they will not adversely affect the integrity of sites. This role for testing plans and projects also applies to the review of existing decisions and consents.

- Monitoring and reporting.

  The conservation objectives provide the basis for assessing the condition of a feature and the status of factors that affect it. CCW uses 'performance indicators' within the conservation objectives, as the basis for monitoring and reporting. Performance indicators are selected to provide useful information about the condition of a feature and the factors that affect it.

The conservation objectives in this document reflect CCW's current information and understanding of the site and its features and their importance in an international context. The conservation objectives are subject to review by CCW in light of new knowledge.

b. Format of the conservation objectives

There is one conservation objective for each feature listed in part 3. Each conservation objective is a composite statement representing a site-specific description of what is considered to be the favourable conservation status of the feature. These statements apply to a whole feature as it occurs within the whole plan area, although section 3.2 sets out their relevance to individual management units.

Each conservation objective consists of the following two elements:

1. Vision for the feature
2. Performance indicators

As a result of the general practice developed and agreed within the UK Conservation Agencies, conservation objectives include performance indicators, the selection of which should be informed by JNCC guidance on Common Standards Monitoring[1].

There is a critical need for clarity over the role of performance indicators within the conservation objectives. **A conservation objective, because it includes the vision for the feature, has meaning and substance independently of the performance indicators, and is more than the sum of the performance indicators**. The performance indicators are simply what make the conservation objectives measurable, and are thus part of, not a substitute for, the conservation objectives. Any feature attribute identified in the performance indicators should be represented in the vision for the feature, but not all elements of the vision for the feature will necessarily have corresponding performance indicators.

As well as describing the aspirations for the condition of the feature, the Vision section of each conservation objective contains a statement that the factors necessary to maintain those desired conditions are under control. Subject to technical, practical and resource constraints, factors which have an important influence on the condition of the feature are identified in the performance indicators.

[1] Available through www.jncc.gov.uk and follow links to Protected Sites and Common Standards Monitoring.

4.1 Conservation Objective for Feature 1:
Old sessile oak woods with Ilex and Blechnum in the British Isles. (EU Habitat Code: 91A0)

Vision for feature 1

- There is only one feature for the site, and so the vision for this feature is the same as that for the site (please refer to section 1). It is required that the feature be in a favourable conservation status, where all of the conditions set out in the Performance Indicators table (below) are satisfied, and all factors affecting the achievement of these conditions are under control.

Performance indicators for Feature 1

The performance indicators are part of the conservation objective, not a substitute for it. Assessment of plans and projects must be based on the entire conservation objective, not just the performance indicators.

Performance indicators for feature condition		
Attribute	***Attribute rationale and other comments***	***Specified limits***
A1. Extent of oak woodland	The starting point in conserving the site is to maintain the existing area.	*Upper limit*: None (100%). *Lower limit*: 97ha (95%) overall. Within an individual unit 90% may be acceptable.
A2. Distribution	All areas except unit 5.	*Lower limit:* Significant presence in 13 out of 14 units Upper limit: as above
A3. Canopy cover	To be met in at least 90% of samples over the site as a whole. This second target has been set to indicate that some areas have light penetration to encourage natural regeneration.	*Upper limit:* 100% *Lower limit:* 90% AND: There should be a varying pattern of canopy breaks over time within the whole site area.
A4. Regeneration	To be met in at least 50% of significant gaps in canopy. Such gaps should be recorded at each monitoring visit. This indicator is not to be applied elsewhere, since we are more interested in reducing grazing and encouraging bryophytes. As gaps are created naturally then a more varied age structure should develop. However, evidence of regeneration elsewhere on the site would be a positive sign that any grazing is sufficiently low. There should also be a note made of regeneration of non-native species like beech or conifers (but see A5).	*Upper limit*: None *Lower limit*: Presence of viable saplings of native species at least 1.5m high within 10 – 15 years of a gap appearing.
A5. Woodland	To be met in at least 75% of samples	*Upper limit:* None

structure	over the site as a whole.	*Lower limit:* Presence of understorey and field layer, consisting of locally native species.
A6. Deadwood	To be met in at least 75% of samples over the site as a whole. In time when this attribute is better developed on the site, we could alter this to a requirement for much higher volumes of standing and fallen dead wood, but over a far lower proportion of the site. Since much of this site is on steep valley sides there is also the likelihood that most dead wood falls to the bottom of the slopes.	*Upper limit:* None *Lower limit:* Presence of standing and/or fallen deadwood with a minimum diameter of 20cm and minimum length of 2m.
A7. Bryophytes	To be met in selected sample areas	*Upper limit:* None *Lower limit*: 50% cover.
Performance indicators for factors affecting the feature		
Factor	***Factor rationale and other comments***	***Operational Limits***
F1. Grazing pressure	Grazing to the extent practiced routinely by the farming community prevents regeneration of woodland and damages the field layer. Cessation of all grazing over a long period, however, may be detrimental to the field layer, especially bryophytes, as this becomes shaded out. The ideal is either to mimic the very low level within a natural woodland ecosystem, or to periodically vary grazing pressure.	*Upper limit:* 0.1 LSU/ha/year. *Lower limit:* None.
F2. Non-native species	In at least 70 % of samples.	*Upper limits:* 5% cover of non-native trees in the canopy. AND: No beech, rhododendron (or other invasive non-native shrubs) in the understorey or shrub layer *Lower limit:* None.
F3. Woodland Management	Natural ecological processes should be allowed to operate as far as possible. In the majority of units these are gradually creating greater structural diversity.	There is no evidence of tree felling or coppicing within the past five years. (Tree surgery for safety reasons excluded).

5. ASSESSMENT OF CONSERVATION STATUS AND MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS

This part of the document provides:

- A summary of the assessment of the conservation status of each feature.
- A summary of the management issues that need to be addressed to maintain or restore each feature.

5.1 Conservation Status and Management Requirements of Feature 1: Old sessile oak woods with Ilex and Blechnum in the British Isles. (EU Habitat Code: 91A0)

Conservation Status of Feature 1

Objective assessment against the performance indicators has (so far) only been undertaken in unit 13 (2003), and so the following is largely based on the judgement of CCW staff that have been involved in the conservation of these woodlands for many years. **The feature within this site is considered to be in unfavourable condition,** although about half of the units are believed to be recovering. It is unfavourable due to insufficient structural diversity, a lack of regeneration in parts, poor field layer and insufficient deadwood in most units. These conditions are the result of the removal of many of the more mature trees in the middle of the last century, followed by overgrazing in recent decades and removal of any fallen timber, practices that are still occurring in parts of the site. The feature is judged to be recovering because recent changes in management have addressed these issues in several units. However, timescales in woodland ecology are long and it will be many years before some attributes have noticeably improved e.g. amount of deadwood, representation of all age classes.

Assessment of units:

Unit 1	Coed Ty-newydd (north)	Unfavourable, declining
Unit 2	Coed Ty-newydd (south)	Unfavourable, declining
Unit 3	Coed Pen-y-banc	Unfavourable, recovering
Unit 4	Pandy	Unfavourable, declining
Unit 5	Tan-lan	N/A (habitat absent)
Unit 6	Coed y Llechwedd	Unfavourable, declining
Unit 7	Coed Esgairiaeth	Unfavourable, recovering
Unit 8	Cefn-y-cloddiau	Unfavourable, recovering
Unit 9	Derwyn	Unfavourable, recovering
Unit 10	Faidre-fawr	Unfavourable, declining
Unit 11	Esgairmaen	Unfavourable, recovering
Unit 12	Faidre-fach	Unfavourable, declining
Unit 13	Coed Gwernafon	Unfavourable, recovering
Unit 14	Coed Glan-yr-afon	Unfavourable, declining

Management Requirements of Feature 1

This is a difficult site to manage. The number of comparatively small units makes a piecemeal approach inevitable, and a balance has to be struck between lightly grazed areas to benefit bryophytes, and ungrazed areas to encourage regeneration and a more diverse ecological structure. In the past it has proved difficult to alter unsuitable grazing practices. However, good progress has been made in recent years. As a result the situation overall is much better than it was in the past. In order to continue and improve on this it will be essential to maintain good relationships and retain existing Management Agreements, either through CCW or Tir Gofal, and to negotiate new agreements in other areas, where appropriate.

In the longer term, it is essential to closely monitor site condition on a regular basis, both formally and informally, to assess progress towards Favourable Conservation Status, a goal that nonetheless cannot be achieved for several decades. It will also become necessary to consider more subtle management rather than the simple dichotomy of grazed or ungrazed units. Very low-level ongoing grazing would be ideal, but this is usually impractical for the owners. Restoration of adjoining fields to semi-improved status and a lowering of stock numbers would result in a more natural interface between pasture and woodland. Failing that, then most of the site would benefit from stock exclusion in most years, but incorporating short pulses of quite heavy grazing in some years to reduce the dominance of dense vegetation, which is often to the detriment of bryophytes and other less robust constituents of the field layer.

The situation in each of the units is as follows (as of November 2007):

Unit 1: Coed Ty-newydd (north): Unfavourable, declining
Although part of this unit is open to stock, it is a steep and narrow dingle that makes access difficult, even for sheep. As a result, grazing pressure is not high except in a few localized areas. Nonetheless, the unit would benefit from complete stock exclusion, but this is unlikely to feasible an alternative water supply can be provided. The majority of the unit is ungrazed, but still unfavourable due to the presence of non-native species, in particular beech. These should ideally be removed, or regeneration at least controlled.

Unit 2: Coed Ty-newydd (south): Unfavourable, declining
This unit is partly grazed and partly ungrazed, although even in the grazed area the impact decreases as the watercourse in approached and the ground becomes steeper. Beech is again present, together with a few conifers. Management requirements are fencing to remove or at least better control grazing, and removal of non-native trees.

Unit 3: Coed Pen-y-banc: Unfavourable, recovering
Whilst there is no Management Agreement here, the unit has been effectively ungrazed for a number of years, apart from occasional incursions due to the poor condition of the fencing, and this is probably beneficial. It is unfavourable primarily due to lack of full range of age classes, and probably a paucity of deadwood. Only time can provide these.

Unit 4: Pandy: Unfavourable, declining
A small unit that suffers from excessive grazing. The requirement is for a fence or a significant reduction in stock in the adjoining field.

Unit 5: Tan-lan: N/A (habitat absent)
A small area of unimproved pasture.

Unit 6: Coed y Llechwedd: Unfavourable, declining
This unit is grazed by sheep and consequently fails due to lack of regeneration, in addition to age structure and perhaps lack of deadwood. However, it is valuable within the context of the site as a whole for the resulting prominence of bryophytes, and it is would be ideal therefore to reduce the grazing pressure but not remove it entirely.

Unit 7: Coed Esgairiaeth: Unfavourable, recovering
This unit has benefited from a Management Agreement to remove grazing since the mid 1990s. In order to achieve favourable condition this, or similar, needs to continue.

Unit 8: Cefn-y-cloddiau: Unfavourable, recovering
This unit was grazed until recently, but a Management Agreement to exclude stock was signed in 2005 and a fence erected in 2006. No further action is necessary at this stage.

Unit 9: Derwyn: Unfavourable, recovering
This unit was until recently heavily grazed, but entered Tir Gofal in 2005 and a fence was erected to exclude stock soon afterwards. No further action is necessary at this stage.

Unit 10 : Faidre-fawr: Unfavourable, declining
The unit has suffered from excessive levels of grazing, and also some rubbish dumping. However, part was fenced out a few years ago for the owner's own reasons, and this area is now recovering. The remainder continues to decline.

Unit 11 : Esgairmaen: Unfavourable, recovering
This unit has benefited from a Management Agreement to remove grazing for over ten years, but regeneration is still sparse, as is deadwood. In order to achieve favourable condition, this agreement, or similar, needs to continue.

Unit 12 : Faidre-fach: Unfavourable, no change
The unit is open to stock, but is a very steep and narrow dingle, and other than at the edges the effect of grazing is minimal. A fence would be ideal, but the area is small.

Unit 13: Coed Gwernafon: Unfavourable, recovering
At the time of notification this unit was grazed, but has since been acquired by the Woodland Trust, and was fenced out in the early 1990s. There is now significant regeneration, a good woodland structure over most of the area, and accumulating deadwood. On the other hand, bramble is prolific, undoubtedly resulting in suppression of lower plant interest. However, no further action is considered necessary at this stage.

Unit 14 : Coed Glan-yr-afon: Unfavourable, declining
This is the largest remaining unit that suffers from excessive grazing, apart from in a few inaccessible areas. Action is urgently required to address this. Another issue to address is a significant block of conifers, which needs to be clear-felled and replanted with native broadleaves.

6. ACTION PLAN: SUMMARY

This section takes the management requirements outlined in Section 5 a stage further, assessing the specific management actions required on each management unit. This information is a summary of that held in CCW's Actions Database for sites, and the database will be used by CCW and partner organisations to plan future work to meet the Wales Environment Strategy targets for sites.

Unit Number	CCW Database Number	Unit Name	Summary of Conservation Management Issues	Action needed?
001	000342	Coed Ty-newydd (north)	Although part of this unit is open to stock, it is a steep and narrow dingle that makes access difficult, even for sheep. As a result, grazing pressure is not high except in a few localized areas. Nonetheless, the unit would benefit from complete stock exclusion, but this is unlikely to be feasible unless an alternative water supply can be provided. The majority of the unit is ungrazed, but still unfavourable due to the presence of non-native species, in particular beech. These should ideally be removed, or regeneration at least controlled.	Yes
002	000343	Coed Ty-newydd (south)	This unit is partly grazed and partly ungrazed. In the grazed area the impact varies, reducing towards the watercourse as the ground becomes steeper. Overall, regeneration is insufficient, as is the amount of deadwood. Invasive species are present, primarily beech, together with a few conifers.	Yes
003	000344	Coed Pen-y-banc	The unit is divided into two parts. The larger, western area, has been effectively ungrazed for a number of years, apart from occasional incursions due to the poor condition of the fencing, which may be beneficial in controlling the spread of bramble. As the fence deteriorates, however, the level of incursion and consequent impact is likely to increase. It is unfavourable primarily due to its lack of the full range of age classes, and probably insufficient deadwood. Only time can provide these. The smaller area has been fully stock-excluded for many years.	Yes
004	000345	Pandy	A small unit that suffers from excessive grazing, being open to stock on the adjoining larger area of improved pasture.	Yes
005	000346	Tan-lan	Review features of interest.	Yes
006	000347	Coed y Llechwedd	This unit is grazed by sheep and consequently fails due to lack of regeneration, in addition to age structure and perhaps lack of deadwood. However, it is valuable within the context of the site as a whole for the resulting prominence of bryophytes, and it is would be ideal therefore to reduce the grazing pressure but	Yes

Unit Number	CCW Database Number	Unit Name	Summary of Conservation Management Issues	Action needed?
			not remove it entirely.	
007	000348	Coed Esgairiaeth	This unit has benefited from a Management Agreement to remove grazing since the mid 1990s. No further action is necessary at this stage.	No
008	000349	Cefn-y-cloddiau	This unit was grazed until recently, but a Management Agreement to exclude stock was signed in 2005 and a fence erected in 2006. No further action is necessary at this stage.	No
009	000350	Derwyn	This unit was until recently heavily grazed, but entered Tir Gofal in 2005 and a fence was erected to exclude stock soon afterwards. No further action is necessary at this stage.	No
010	000351	Faidre-fawr	The unit has suffered from excessive levels of grazing, and also some rubbish dumping. However, part was fenced out a few years ago for the owner's own reasons, and this area is now recovering. The remainder continues to decline.	Yes
011	000352	Esgairmaen	This unit has benefited from a Management Agreement to remove grazing for over ten years. Regeneration is still sparse, as is deadwood, but no further action is necessary at this stage.	No
012	000353	Faidre-fach	This unit is split into two parts, both small. The western area is open to stock, but is a very steep and narrow dingle, and other than at the edges the effect of grazing is minimal. Some rubbish dumping has taken place. The eastern area is open to stock and severely overgrazed.	Yes
013	000354	Coed Gwernafon	This large unit is owned by the Woodland Trust, and has been ungrazed since the early 1990s. There is now significant regeneration, a good woodland structure over most of the area, and accumulating deadwood. On the other hand, bramble is prolific, undoubtedly resulting in suppression of lower plant interest. However, no further action is considered necessary at this stage.	No
014	000355	Coed Glan-yr-afon	This large unit suffers from excessive grazing, apart from in a few inaccessible areas. Action is urgently required to address this. Another issue to address is a significant block of conifers, which needs to be clear-felled and replanted with native broadleaves.	Yes

7. GLOSSARY

This glossary defines the some of the terms used in this **Core Management Plan**. Some of the definitions are based on definitions contained in other documents, including legislation and other publications of CCW and the UK nature conservation agencies. None of these definitions is legally definitive.

Action A recognisable and individually described act, undertaking or **project** of any kind, specified in section 6 of a **Core Management Plan** or **Management Plan**, as being required for the **conservation management** of a site.

Attribute A quantifiable and monitorable characteristic of a **feature** that, in combination with other such attributes, describes its **condition**.

Common Standards Monitoring A set of principles developed jointly by the UK conservation agencies to help ensure a consistent approach to **monitoring** and reporting on the **features** of sites designated for nature conservation, supported by guidance on identification of **attributes** and monitoring methodologies.

Condition A description of the state of a feature in terms of qualities or **attributes** that are relevant in a nature conservation context. For example the condition of a habitat usually includes its extent and species composition and might also include aspects of its ecological functioning, spatial distribution and so on. The condition of a species population usually includes its total size and might also include its age structure, productivity, relationship to other populations and spatial distribution. Aspects of the habitat(s) on which a species population depends may also be considered as attributes of its condition.

Condition assessment The process of characterising the **condition** of a **feature** with particular reference to whether the aspirations for its condition, as expressed in its **conservation objective**, are being met.

Condition categories The **condition** of **feature** can be categorised, following **condition assessment** as one of the following[2]:

Favourable: maintained;
Favourable: recovered;
Favourable: un-classified
Unfavourable: recovering;
Unfavourable: no change;
Unfavourable: declining;
Unfavourable: un-classified
Partially destroyed;
Destroyed.

Conservation management Acts or undertaking of all kinds, including but not necessarily limited to **actions,** taken with the aim of achieving the **conservation objectives** of a site. Conservation management includes the taking of statutory and non-statutory measures, it can include the acts of any party and it may take place outside site boundaries as well as within

[2] See JNCC guidance on Common Standards Monitoring http://www.jncc.gov.uk/page-2272

sites. Conservation management may also be embedded within other frameworks for land/sea management carried out for purposes other than achieving the conservation objectives.

Conservation objective The expression of the desired **conservation status** of a **feature,** expressed as a **vision for the feature** and a series of **performance indicators**. The conservation objective for a feature is thus a composite statement, and each feature has one conservation objective.

Conservation status A description of the state of a **feature** that comprises both its **condition** and the state of the **factors** affecting or likely to affect it. Conservation status is thus a characterisation of both the current state of a feature and its future prospects.

Conservation status assessment The process of characterising the **conservation status** of a **feature** with particular reference to whether the aspirations for it, as expressed in its **conservation objective**, are being met. The results of conservation status assessment can be summarised either as 'favourable' (i.e. conservation objectives are met) or unfavourable (i.e. conservation objectives are not met). However the value of conservation status assessment in terms of supporting decisions about **conservation management**, lies mainly in the details of the assessment of feature **condition**, **factors** and trend information derived from comparisons between current and previous conservation status assessments and condition assessments.

Core Management Plan A CCW document containing the conservation objectives for a site and a summary of other information contained in a full site **Management Plan**.

Factor Anything that has influenced, is influencing or may influence the **condition** of a **feature**. Factors can be natural processes, human activities or effects arising from natural process or human activities, They can be positive or negative in terms of their influence on features, and they can arise within a site or from outside the site. Physical, socio-economic or legal constraints on **conservation management** can also be considered as factors.

Favourable condition See **condition** and **condition assessment**

Favourable conservation status See **conservation status** and **conservation status assessment.**[3]

Feature **The species population, habitat type or other entity for which a site is designated. The ecological or geological interest which justifies the designation of a site and which is the focus of conservation management.**

Integrity See **site integrity**

Key Feature The habitat or species population within a **management unit** that is the primary focus of **conservation management** and **monitoring** in that unit.

[3] A full definition of favourable conservation status is given in Section 4.

Management Plan The full expression of a designated site's legal status, **vision**, **features**, **conservation objectives**, **performance indicators** and management requirements. A complete management plan may not reside in a single document, but may be contained in a number of documents (including in particular **the Core Management Plan**) and sets of electronically stored information.

Management Unit An area within a site, defined according to one or more of a range of criteria, such as topography, location of **features**, tenure, patterns of land/sea use. The key characteristic of management units is to reflect the spatial scale at which **conservation management** and **monitoring** can be most effectively organised. They are used as the primary basis for differentiating priorities for conservation management and monitoring in different parts of a site, and for facilitating communication with those responsible for management of different parts of a site.

Monitoring An intermittent (regular or irregular) series of observations in time, carried out to show the extent of compliance with a formulated standard or degree of deviation from an expected norm. In **Common Standards Monitoring**, the formulated standard is the quantified expression of favourable **condition** based on **attributes**.

Operational limits The levels or values within which a **factor** is considered to be acceptable in terms of its influence on a **feature**. A factor may have both upper and lower operational limits, or only an upper limit or lower limit. For some factors an upper limit may be zero.

Performance indicators The **attributes** and their associated **specified limits**, together with **factors** and their associated **operational limits,** which provide the standard against which information from **monitoring** and other sources is used to determine the degree to which the **conservation objectives** for a **feature** are being met. Performance indicators are part of, not the same as, conservation objectives. See also **vision for the feature**.

Plan or project **Project:** Any form of construction work, installation, development or other intervention in the environment, the carrying out or continuance of which is subject to a decision by any public body or statutory undertaker.
Plan: a document prepared or adopted by a public body or statutory undertaker, intended to influence decisions on the carrying out of **projects.** Decisions on plans and projects which affect Natura 2000 and Ramsar sites are subject to specific legal and policy procedures.

Site integrity The coherence of a site's ecological structure and function, across its whole area, that enables it to sustain the habitat, complex of habitats and/or the levels of populations of the species for which it is designated.

Site Management Statement (SMS) The document containing CCW's views about the management of a site issued as part of the legal notification of an SSSI under section 28(4) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as substituted.

Special Feature See **feature**.

Specified limit The levels or values for an **attribute** which define the degree to which the attribute can fluctuate without creating cause for concern about the **condition**

	of the **feature**. The range within the limits corresponds to favourable, the range outside the limits corresponds to unfavourable. Attributes may have lower specified limits, upper specified limits, or both.
Unit	See **management unit.**
Vision for the feature	The expression, within a **conservation objective**, of the aspirations for the **feature** concerned. See also **performance indicators.**
Vision Statement	The statement conveying an impression of the whole site in the state that is intended to be the product of its **conservation management.** A 'pen portrait' outlining the **conditions** that should prevail when all the **conservation objectives** are met. A description of the site as it would be when all the **features** are in **favourable condition**.

8. REFERENCES AND ANNEXES

References

Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC). 2004. Guidance on Common Standards Monitoring (CSM): Woodland, Version February 2004. JNCC Report, JNCC, Peterborough.
Available via website at: http://www.jncc.gov.uk

Rodwell, J. S., ed. 1991. British Plant Communities, Volume 1, Woodlands and scrub. Cambridge Cambridge University Press.