# Rapid Rainforest Assessment

## Survey form

## Use this form to:

- **RECORD** your survey results including grid references where applicable to help map key features and species, and plan management. You may also find it useful to mark features on a site map as you go.
- **INTERPRET** what your results mean by calculating scores for each section which give you an overview of the current condition of your site and its potential to support rainforest lichens and bryophytes.
- **FIND LINKS TO SPECIFIC MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE** based on different scenarios in your wood.

Brief instructions are given to each section of the survey below. Use the **Species ID Guides** and refer to the **RRA guidance notes** for more detailed instructions and  background information. Once you have completed the survey form, find detailed management guidance in **Rainforest lichens and bryophytes – a toolkit for woodland managers.**

# Start the RRA here

| Date | | Site name/reference | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Surveyor | | Grid reference | |

## 1 Woodland composition

Use the DAFOR scale to indicate the abundance of each tree species in the canopy and then the understorey. D = Dominant (> 75%), A = Abundant (50-75%), F = Frequent (25-50%), O = Occasional (10-25%), R = Rare (<10%). Leave blank for none. You can add any species not listed in the extra rows. Then use the 'interpreting tree composition' table on the next page to find out what this might mean for your woodland and where to go for management recommendations.

### Native species

| Species | Canopy | Understorey |
|---|---|---|
| Alder | | |
| Ash | | |
| Aspen | | |
| Birch | | |
| Bird cherry | | |
| Blackthorn | | |
| Hawthorn | | |
| Hazel | | |
| Holly | | |
| Juniper | | |
| Oak | | |
| Rowan | | |
| Scots pine | | |
| Willow | | |
| Wych elm | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

### Non-native species

| Species | Canopy | Understorey |
|---|---|---|
| Beech | | |
| Cherry laurel | | |
| Cotoneaster | | |
| Douglas fir | | |
| Other conifer (non-native) | | |
| *Rhododendron ponticum* | | |
| Sitka | | |
| **Sycamore** | | |
| Western hemlock | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

# Interpreting woodland composition:

Based on what you recorded above, choose ONE description from the canopy table that best describes the canopy composition at your site, then **AS MANY DESCRIPTIONS AS APPLY** from the understorey table. These will point you to some specific interpretation and management guidance. You will also be able to calculate your **woodland composition score.**

| CANOPY: choose as many descriptions as apply | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Description** | **SCORE** | **Management guidance** |
| Mixed species, though one or two may be more abundant (but not with abundant beech or non-native conifers). | +2 | N/A |
| Canopy is mainly hazel. | +2 | For specific guidance on hazel woods see **Managing stands of hazel**. |
| Canopy is mainly one native species (excluding hazel woods). | +1 | See section on lack of tree species diversity **here**. |
| Beech is frequent in the canopy (also choose this option if sweet chestnut is frequent). | -1 | See section on managing beech **here**. |
| Beech is abundant in the canopy (also score this option is sweet chestnut is abundant). | -2 | See section on managing beech **here**. |
| Non-native conifers are abundant in the canopy. | -2 | See section on restoring conifer plantation to native woodland **here.** |

| UNDERSTOREY: choose as many descriptions as apply | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Description** | **SCORE** | **Management guidance** |
| A patchy understorey of native shrubs. | +2 | N/A |
| There are no/very few native understorey shrubs/ trees. | -1 | See section on lack of tree species diversity **here**. |
| There is little to no regeneration of key or desired canopy-forming species. | -1 | If shading is preventing regeneration see **Diverse woodland structure and composition**. Assess whether over-grazing/browsing may be an issue in Section 5. |
| There is a dense understorey which is thicket-like in places. | -2 | See section on excessive regeneration that can't be addressed with grazing **here**. Where applicable see management of invasive native/non-native species **here** e.g. for beech/sycamore regeneration. |
| Some invasive non-native species present in understorey. | No score: this will be scored in section 6 | See section on invasive non-native species, e.g. *Rhododendron*, **here**. |
| Invasive non-native species frequent understorey. | | |
| **TOTAL Woodland composition score** | | |

# Woodland composition score:

Add together your score for the canopy and understorey to see what this might mean for your survey area.

| | |
|---|---|
| 4 | This indicates the current composition is favourable for a diverse assemblage of lichens and bryophytes. |
| 1-3 | This indicates the wood may benefit from diversification and/or help establishing appropriate regeneration to encourage development of a diverse assemblage of lichens and bryophytes. |
| 0 | This indicates the wood may have issues with invasive species or dense regeneration that need tackling to avoid negative impacts to lichens and bryophytes. |
| <0 | This indicates the current composition is not favourable for lichens and bryophytes and there are multiple issues to address. |

# 2 Woodland structure

For each attribute, circle the score that best matches the description of your survey area, and find out where to look for management guidance for different scenarios. Total your score for the table to see what this says about the structure of your survey area overall.

| Attribute | Description | Score | Management guidance |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Tree age profile** | Young, even-aged wood (i.e. recently established trees). | -2 | See **Habitat fragmentation** for guidance on new woodland. |
| | Mature, even-aged wood (most trees same age/size). | -1 | See section on lack of tree age diversity **here**. |
| | Mixed age wood with mature and younger trees. | +1 | **See Current and future veteran trees** for guidance on establishing future veterans/ veteran features. |
| | Mixed age wood with veteran, mature and younger trees. | +2 | This is desirable, with a range of niches and a succession of trees to become future veterans. |
| | Wood with many veteran trees, lacking younger mature trees. | +1 | See **Current and future veteran trees** for guidance on establishing future veterans. |
| **Canopy cover and open space** | Closed canopy with limited open space. | -2 | See **Diverse woodland structure and composition** for guidance on thinning and open space creation. |
| | Mosaic of closed and open canopy (with around 30% open areas). | +2 | Desirable for bryophytes under denser canopy cover and lichens in better-lit areas. |
| | Very open and well-lit e.g., wood pasture. | +2 | This well-lit habitat is desirable for many rare and important lichens. |
| **Field layer: bramble, ivy and/ or bracken** | Abundant cover throughout. | -2 | If there is dense cover, see **Grazing and browsing** (if grazing is not an option see **Managing woods without grazing and browsing**). See also section on managing bramble and ivy **here**. |
| | Frequent areas of dense cover. | -1 | |
| | Occasional: may be some dense patches but scattered. | +1 | |
| | Rare: sparse cover/isolated patches. | +2 | |
| | **Specify whether this relates to bramble, ivy and/or bracken** | | |
| **Field layer: heather, bilberry/ blaeberry and/or woodrush** | Dense cover throughout, covering dead wood/boulders and growing high around the base of tree trunks. | -1 | See **Grazing and browsing** (if grazing is not an option see **Managing woods without grazing and browsing**). |
| | Patchy cover throughout that may cover large areas but not smothering moss mats or tree bases. | +2 | This can help retain humidity for rich bryo-phyte communities to develop (where dense growth is kept in check by grazing). |
| | Rare or absent. | 0 | This may not be an issue if the wood has not historically had these shrub species present. |
| | **Specify whether this relates to heather, bilberry/blaeberry and/or woodrush** | | |
| **TOTAL Woodland structurescore** | | | |

| Notes |
|---|
|  |

# Woodland structure score:

| | |
|---|---|
| 6+ | This indicates the current structure of the wood is favourable for a diverse assemblage of lichens and bryophytes. NB – it is important however to consider more localised conditions around important habitat features and lichen/bryophyte communities of interest. The following two sections will focus on these. |
| 4-5 | This indicates the current structure of the wood is OK but could be improved for lichens and bryophytes. Existing lichen and bryophyte interest may be under threat and issues may need immediate management to prevent losses. Check the management guidance for the options you selected. |
| 1-3 | This indicates the current structure of the wood is in need of improvement for lichens and bryophytes. Existing lichen and bryophyte interest may be under threat and issues may need immediate management to prevent losses. Check the management guidance for the options you selected. |
| 0 | This indicates the current structure of the wood is not ideal for rainforest lichens and bryophytes. Existing lichen and bryophyte interest may be under threat and issues may need immediate management to prevent losses. Check the management guidance relevant to the options you selected. |
| <0 | This indicates the current structure of the wood is not desirable for rainforest lichens and bryophytes and there is unlikely to be interest present at the moment. Check the management guidance for the options you selected. |

# 3 Habitat features

- Tick features that are present and record grid references (a central 6-figure reference for widespread features and 10-figure references for isolated features).
- Record any management issues affecting features (e.g. ivy, bramble, invasive species, dense regeneration etc.).
- Use the notes column to record the locations of features, issues etc.
- Score the overall abundance for each of the four feature categories (veteran trees, dead wood, rocky substrates and wet features) from 0-3 where 0 = none, 1 = rare (i.e. features are present but uncommon/ covering only a small part of the site), 2 = frequent (i.e. features are not uncommon but neither are they very abundant), 3 = dominant (i.e. the features are very abundant/cover much of the site).

For each of the feature categories you will find relevant links to management guidance. Total your score for the four feature categories to see what this says about the habitat features in your survey area overall.

| Feature category | Feature description | ✓ | Any management issues affecting the feature | Management guidance | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Veteran trees and veteran tree features** ( note that these features may be present on trees that are not yet considered to be veteran by their age). | Old trees with large decay holes/hollows/ dead limbs/ presence of air trees. | | | See **Current and future veteran trees** for managing existing veterans and recruiting new ones if few features recorded. If veterans are impacted by shading from dense regeneration/a dense canopy, see **here**. If impacted by ivy, holly or other invasives, see relevant sections **here.** | |
| | Old trees with exposed wood. | | | | |
| | Presence of dry underhangs. | | | | |
| | Presence of old pollards or old coppice stools. | | | | |
| | Younger trees with veteran tree features e.g. cavities | | | | |
| | Other e.g. sap runs, water-filled rot-holes. (Include details in notes section). | | | | |
| | Presence of old hazel stands i.e. that have not been managed as coppice. | | | See **Managing stands of hazel.** | |
| **Veteran tree score (0-3)** | | | | | |

Record the location of any veteran trees or veteran tree features. For widespread species, a central 6-figure grid reference for the population is sufficient. If the species is confined to a particular area, use a 10-figure grid reference.

| Species name | Grid reference | Notes |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| Feature category | Feature description | ✓ | Any management issues affecting the feature | Management guidance | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Dead wood** | Large diameter lying dead wood (>20 cm). | | | If dead wood is sparse and/or there is no standing dead wood/ rotting stumps see **Retention of dead wood**.<br><br>If features are overgrown with ivy, bramble or other invasives see relevant sections **here**, and if affected by deep shade and dense regeneration see **here**. | |
| | Standing dead wood (diameter >20 cm). | | | | |
| | Rotting tree stumps. | | | | |

| **Dead wood score (0-3)** | |
|---|---|

| **Rocky features** | Boulders. | | | If features are overgrown with ivy, bramble or other invasives see relevant sections **here**, and if affected by deep shade and dense regeneration see **here.** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Rock faces. | | | | |

| **Rocky substrate score (0-3)** | |
|---|---|

| Feature category | Feature description | ✓ | Any management issues affecting the feature | Management guidance | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Wet features | Flushes/boggy areas. | | | Aim to retain canopy cover along watercourses for bryophytes. If features are overgrown with ivy, bramble or other invasives see relevant sections **here**, and if affected by dense regeneration see **here.** | |
| | Streams/rivers. | | | | |
| | Wet rock faces. | | | | |
| | Ravines/waterfalls. | | | | |

| Wet features score (0–3) | |
|---|---|
| | |

## Habitat features score:

| 6+ | This suggests the wood has a range of important habitat features for lichens and bryophytes. Whether the site supports a range of lichens and bryophytes will depend on whether there has been continuity of favourable conditions on those features. The future survival of species interest will depend on maintaining suitable conditions. |
|---|---|
| 4-5 | The wood has some important habitat features for lichens and bryophytes but these are limited. It is very important to ensure favourable conditions, particularly if the features are limited, as the lichen and bryophyte interest may be dependent on a few isolated features. |
| <4 | Habitat features for lichens and bryophytes are somewhat limited. Consider opportunities for creating features where this is possible e.g. through veteranisation and creation of dead wood habitats. |

# 4 Lichens and bryophytes

Complete the table below, focusing on lichen cover on tree trunks/rocks and bryophyte cover on the woodland floor (including ground, banks, lying dead wood and rock features). Circle one score for lichens and one score for bryophytes. Total your score to see what this says about current lichen and bryophyte interest in your survey area. You can find where to look for management guidance in the right-hand column of the table.

| | Description | Score | Management |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Lichens** | Trunks and/or rocky features mostly lacking lichens (bare or covered in ivy/moss). | –1 | If lichen/bryophyte cover is limited, it is important to establish why. If there is dense shading from an overhead canopy, see **Diverse woodland structure and composition**. If they are being shaded out and smothered by a dense shrub/field layer, see **Grazing and browsing**. If there is very dense regeneration, see **Excessive regeneration that cannot be addressed with grazing**. <br><br> If native/non-native species are causing shading/smothering, see relevant sections **here**. |
| | Small number of trees and/or rocky features with lichen on trunks – there are lichens on some trunks but lichens are not abundant. | +1 | |
| | Larger number of trees and/or rocky features with lichens on trunks but dominated by a small range of species. | +2 | |
| | Larger number of trees and/or rocky features with lichens on trunks including some with luxuriant growths of leafy and bushy lichens (photo A). | +3 | |
| **Bryophytes** | Very little/no bryophyte cover visible. | –1 | |
| | Patchy bryophyte cover visible but dominated by one or two species. | –1 | |
| | Larger areas of bryophyte cover visible e.g. carpeting the ground and rocky features, but the bulk of biomass limited to 5 or so species. | +1 | |
| | Patchy bryophyte cover is obvious with a variety of species including brown liverworts on rocky features and logs +/- filmy ferns. | +2 | |
| | Abundant bryophyte cover is obvious with a variety of species including brown liverworts on rocky features and logs +/- filmy ferns. | +3 | |
| **TOTAL Lichens and bryophytes score** | | | |

## Lichens and bryophytes score:

| | |
|---|---|
| 6+ | This suggests a site where conditions are conducive for a range of lichen and bryophyte communities to thrive. Note that it is important to consider this score alongside the other sections in the RRA – current interest doesn't necessarily mean the site is currently in optimum condition, as a negative change in conditions will not immediately cause a decline in species interest (i.e. there is a time-lag effect). |
| 4-5 | This suggests a site where conditions are suitable for some bryophyte and/or lichen species/ communities but not for others. There may be small pockets of interest associated with areas where conditions are/have historically been more favourable. Management might depend on specific site features such as where bryophytes may be a notifiable feature but lichens are not and vice versa. Any management should not cause harm to the main feature of interest. |
| 3 | This suggests a site where conditions are suitable for just one type of bryophyte/lichen community but not for others. There may be isolated bryophyte/lichen interest associated with an area where conditions are/have historically been more favourable. Management might depend on specific site features such as where bryophytes may be a notifiable feature but lichens are not and vice versa. Any management should not cause harm to the main feature of interest. |
| <3 | This suggests the site is not currently high value for lichens or bryophytes. However, this doesn't rule out the possibility of isolated or remnant interest. Rather the score suggests that the general situation in the wood is not conducive to abundant growth of lichens or bryophytes. |

# Indicator species:

Record the location of any indicator species (**see here for ID Guides**). For widespread species, a central 6-figure grid reference for the population is sufficient. If the species is confined to a particular area, use a 10-figure grid reference. Record management issues affecting (or likely to affect) the species e.g. presence of nearby invasives. This will help you to prioritise management actions. Take a photo for verification.

| Species name | Grid reference if applicable | Abundance (DAFOR scale) | Habitat feature/ substrate | Any management issues? | Photo taken? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

# 5 Grazing and browsing

There may be reasons why high, moderate or low levels of grazing/browsing might be desirable depending on the objectives for managing a particular stand of woodland. Use the table to assess grazing/browsing levels in your survey area. Look at each feature in turn: tree regeneration, young shoots on hazel, field layer, bryophytes and boulders. Then consider all these factors together to establish whether grazing/browsing is high, moderate or low. This is a rapid assessment of grazing/browsing level and the categories used here may be different to those of other assessments. For more detailed assessment of grazing/browsing impact we recommend that you use the Woodland Herbivore Impact Assessment (WHIA) alongside this table. This is particularly important in situations where deer are the chief herbivore (e.g. as they are in Scotland's rainforest).

| Feature | Indicators of high grazing/browsing pressure: | Indicators of moderate grazing/browsing pressure: | Indicators of low grazing/browsing pressure: |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Tree regeneration** | Very little/no tree regeneration. No regeneration at all of more palatable species (e.g. oak, rowan, hazel, willow ash and holly). Note: a lack of regeneration can also occur because of factors other than grazing/browsing'. | There is occasional tree regeneration in that saplings of both unpalatable and palatable species of tree are successfully becoming established. Some saplings show signs they have been browsed but others have escaped to grow into young trees. | Both unpalatable and palatable tree species are successfully becoming established. This can become very dense in the absence of grazing/browsing pressure. Signs of browsing are very rare or absent. |
| **Young shoots on hazel** | No young shoots are escaping the bases of hazel bushes. | Some young shoots are escaping browsing from the bases of hazel bushes each year, which ensures that there is a succession of various-aged stems and perpetual habitat for different lichen species to colonise. | Masses of shoots are escaping from the bases of hazel, with older stems in decline, dying or very heavily shaded. |
| **Field layer** | Field layer dominated by grasses. | There are a diverse array of plants in the field-layer that may include bilberry, heather, bramble, wood-rush and ferns, but this is patchy and there are also more open areas. Ivy and honeysuckle may also be present in small quantity. | A coarse field layer that is dominated by just a few vascular plant species. There are unlikely to be any open areas below the uniform cover of the main field-layer species. NB in shaded situations bramble and bracken may be absent but ivy can be frequent. |
| **Bryophytes** | Ground is dominated by bryophytes with very limited vascular plant cover (excluding bracken). | Bryophytes are still abundant on the ground but there is also some patchy vascular plant growth (other than just bracken). | Vascular plant growth such as bramble, woodrush and heather, for example, and their leaf litter is smothering bryophytes on the ground. |
| **Boulders** | Lots of boulders scraped bare of late succession moss mats (e.g. carpet-forming mosses such as *Rhytidiadelphus loreus* and *Hylocomium splendens*) | Boulders have a mixture of early and late succession bryophyte communities. Early succession communities of bryophytes on small boulders are being maintained e.g. brown liverworts such as *Scapania gracilis* with or without filmy-ferns and early colonising species on rocks e.g. in deer/animal trails. | Small boulders are being smothered by late succession moss mats and colonised by vascular plants e.g. ivy, bilberry, heather, bramble etc, with early succession communities absent. |
| **Grazing score** (circle one option) | -3 | +3 | -3 |

## Grazing/browsing score:

Based on your decisions above High, Medium or Low and on your management objectives please score accordingly.

| -3 | In most woodland situations high levels of grazing/browsing is undesirable. A reduction in deer and/or stock numbers over several years would see the development of a better woodland ecosystem that would eventually result in palatable tree species coming back. This approach also means that we would not get the problematic dense tree regeneration and coarse field-layer that often results when there is a sudden cessation of grazing/browsing because of a fence. Herbivores would always remain part of a dynamic woodland ecosystem but in much lower numbers. |
|---|---|
| +3 | Grazing/browsing levels are moderate (as defined here) and desirable. |
| -3 | Low levels of grazing/browsing (as defined here) are undesirable where rainforest bryophytes and lichens might be threatened by a coarse field layer and/or shading from dense sapling regeneration around mature trees. In these circumstances, **grazing/ browsing** should be implemented, but at sites where this is not possible see **Managing woods without grazing and browsing**. If regeneration is very dense see **Excessive regeneration that cannot be addressed with grazing**. |

# 6    Invasive Species

## Invasive non-native species:

For each invasive non-native species, tick the appropriate box to record how extensive it is in your survey area. It is important to record the location of invasives in relation to any species or habitat features of interest recorded in Section 3 and 4 so you can use this to plan and prioritise management action. *Note that for conifers, this section only relates to regeneration. Established conifers and PAWS restoration are dealt with in Section 1.* Once complete, work out your score based on the overall extent of invasive non-native species.

| Species name | Absent | Minor and isolated | Localised at low levels | Low levels through-out | Localised at high levels | High levels though-out | Notes on location of issues in relation to species or features of interest |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Rhododendron* | | | | | | | |
| Non-native conifer regeneration | | | | | | | |
| Beech regeneration | | | | | | | |
| Sycamore regeneration | | | | | | | |
| Cherry laurel | | | | | | | |
| Himalayan balsam | | | | | | | |
| Cotoneaster | | | | | | | |
| Shallon | | | | | | | |
| *Gunnera* | | | | | | | |
| Skunk cabbage | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Choose a score, considering the overall extent of invasive non-native species across the site, and record it in the box below:

| Invasive non-natives absent | Invasive non-natives minor and isolated | Invasive non-natives localised at low levels | Invasive non-natives at low levels throughout | Invasive non-natives localised at high levels | Invasive non-natives at high levels throughout |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |

## Invasive non-native species score:

| | |
|---|---|
| 0 | No intervention needed |
| -1 to -2 | Intervention needed immediately to eradicate and prevent spread. Prioritisation should be based on proximity to important species and habitat features, bearing in mind that it is easier to deal with INNS before they become extensive. |
| -3 to -5 | Intervention needed to eradicate INNS, halt further spread and restore better-lit conditions for any remaining interest in affected areas. Prioritisation should be based on proximity to important species and habitat features. |

See relevant sections of **Management of invasive native/non-native species** for more detailed guidance.

## Native invasive species:

For each issue described, tick the appropriate box to record how extensive it is in your survey area. It is important to record the location of issues in relation to any species or habitat features of interest recorded in Section 3 and 4 so you can use this to plan and prioritise management action. Once complete, work out your score based on the overall extent of these issues.

| Species name | Absent | Minor and isolated | Localised at low levels | Low levels through-out | Localised at high levels | High levels through-out | Notes on location of issues in relation to species or features of interest |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dense holly | | | | | | | |
| Ivy on trees | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Choose a score, considering the overall extent of native invasive species issues across the site, and record it in the box below:

| Native invasives absent | Native invasives minor and isolated | Native invasives localised at low levels | Native invasives at low levels throughout | Native invasives localised at high levels | Native invasives at high levels throughout |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | –1 | –2 | –3 | –4 | –5 |

| Native invasives score | |
|---|---|

## Native invasives score:

| 0 | No intervention needed. |
|---|---|
| –1 to –2 | Intervention may be needed immediately if located near important species and habitat features. |
| –3 to –5 | Intervention needed to control the issues, prevent further spread and restore better-lit conditions for any remaining interest in affected areas. Prioritisation should be based on proximity to important species and habitat features. |

See relevant sections of **Management of invasive native/non-native species** for more detailed guidance.

# 7 Ash Dieback

Use the following two tables to work out the risk level and prevalence level for your site. Multiply these to calculate a threat score. This will give you an indication of the extent to which ash dieback is an issue for lichens at your site currently, and the urgency of implementing mitigation.

**Risk:** Circle the risk level based on how important ash is for lichens at your site.

| Description | Risk description | Risk level | Key management recommendations |
|---|---|---|---|
| Site dominated by other tree species, with ash absent or rare. | Limited risk | 0 | Unlikely to be a major issue. |
| Ash is a component but with plenty of other trees present & lichen interest spread across a range of tree species. | Lower risk | –1 | May need some planning for. Even where ash is a smaller component of the wood, it will still be important to assess what species are on ash and whether they exist on other species. Where lichen interest is only on ash or ash has the best examples of that interest, plan mitigation. |
| Ash supports important lichen species, but other native species also present, especially oak, willow, hazel, rowan. | High risk | –2 | Likely to be an issue that will need planning for e.g. consideration of 'alternative' tree species, see **Tree diseases and pests.** |
| Site is dominated by ash, with most lichen interest on ash trees. | Very high risk | –3 | Likely to be a big issue that will need planning for e.g. consideration of 'alternative' tree species and possibly species translocation, **see Tree diseases and pests.** |

**Prevalence:** circle the prevalence level based on how common ash dieback is at your site.

| DAFOR | Prevalence level |
|---|---|
| Rare | 1 |
| Occasional | 2 |
| Frequent | 3 |
| Abundant | 4 |
| Dominant | 5 |

**Threat score:** calculate by multiplying the risk level and prevalence level.

| Risk level | | Prevalence level | | Ash dieback threat score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **X** | | **=** | |

## Ash dieback threat score

| -6 or lower | Immediate concern – ash is identified as an important tree for lichens at the site, and ash dieback is established. Immediate mitigation should be implemented. |
|---|---|
| -4 to -5 | If site is important for ash but dieback is reported as rare or occasional, mitigation should still be put in place urgently to avoid potential losses. |
| 0 to -3 | If the site is dominated by ash but ash dieback is rare, or if ash is rare on the site or not important for lichens, there is less immediate risk from a lichen perspective. However, mitigation may still be needed. |

**Management:**

If ash is identified as supporting important lichen interest on your site, it is important to consider mitigation. See **Ash dieback** for detailed recommendations. An important consideration will be looking at what alternative tree species you have available that could support the same lichen interest. The DAFOR assessment made in Section 1 will help you to determine this.

| Management Plan | | Score |
|---|---|---|
| If you score -1 or lower, are you implementing a plan to mitigate the impacts? | Yes | 0 |
| | No | 1 |

Final Threat Score: calculate by multiplying the score from the management plan with the previous 'Ash Dieback threat score'.

| Final Ash dieback threat score | |
|---|---|

# Overall RRA SCORE

Add up your scores from Sections 1–7 to get your overall RRA score and enter it here:

## What does this indicate?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 25+ | **Very good** | Suggests a site that is currently in very good condition to support a range of temperate rainforest lichens and bryophytes. There might still be management issues that need addressing, and attention should be focussed on conditions around important habitat features and species, to ensure these remain favourable. |
| 15–24 | **Good** | Suggests a site that is currently in good condition to support some temperate rainforest lichens and bryophytes. However, there are aspects that could be improved and there may be a number of management issues that need addressing. |
| 5–14 | **Fair** | Suggests a site that has potential to support temperate rainforest lichens and bryophytes but current condition is not optimal. There are a range of management issues that need to be addressed, likely including restructuring, grazing adjustments and management of invasive species. |
| <5 | **Poor** | Suggests a site that is not currently in good condition to support temperate rainforest lichens and bryophytes. There are a range of complex and extensive management issues that need to be addressed, likely including considerable restructuring, grazing adjustments and management of invasive species. |

# 8 Notes

Use the following space for freeform notes which you would like to record e.g. for birds to be recorded or dropping sightings.

# Plantlife

Made possible with

**Heritage Fund**

Plantlife is the global charity working to enhance, protect, restore and celebrate the wild plants and fungi that are essential to all life on earth. With two in five plant species at risk of extinction, biodiversity loss is now the fastest it's ever been and Plantlife's work has never been more vital. Plantlife champions and accelerates conservation action, working at the heart of a global network of individuals and organisations, to influence and inspire landowners and land managers, public and private bodies, governments and local communities. As time begins to run out, Plantlife's position as the global voice for wild plants and fungi will help to bring lasting and positive change to our natural world – for everyone's sake.

## To secure a world rich in wild plants and fungi.