	What age are you?	occupation?	answered	What is the approximate size of your holding (expressed in ha)?	farming sector are you primarily engaged in ?	implement capping of Basic Income Support Scheme payments at an	convergence stop at 85% of the national average payment entitlement value in 2026, or go to a higher percentage?	to allocate	to reduce the percentage?	funding be redistribute d to farmers	mechanisms in order to bring about a fairer distribution of direct payments (Capping, Convergence and Redistribution)?	Ireland go beyond the requirement of 25% of direct payments to be allocated to eco-	the flexibility in the regulation to reduce the percentage	be a specific intervention to	Have you any observations to make on the proposed draft interventions?	Are there any additional interventions you would like to suggest for inclusion in the CSP?
Male	55-64	Part-time farmer		10-25	Beef	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	Yes		Reducing payments of less than €15000 with convergence should be ruled out	Yes	No		Cap should be lower than €66000. Should be lowered to equate average industrial wage	Greater support for land mobility measures to encourage new entrants to farming and encouraging earlier exit of older farmers
Male	45-54	Part-time farmer		10-25	Sheep	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	No	Yes		
Male	55-64	Full-time farmer		25-50	Beef	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	Yes	Yes	Meat factory getting cap repayment	Yes	No	No	No	No payment on multi national companies eg greencore
Female	55-64	Full-time farmer		25-50	Sheep	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No		Each farmer should be paid a capping too the size of their own land and reduced on rented land	Yes	No	Yes	No	Get action to help get young farmers in way of support payments a
Male	55-64	Full-time farmer		25-50	Beef	€ 100,000	85%	Yes	No		Payments should be prioritised for full time genuine farmers is main income is agricultural	No	No	No	Suckled cow cap not equitable	Create a good simple "reps" type eco-scheme not a load of mickey mouse schemes
Male	55-64		Government official in agriculture	<10	Other	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	Yes	No	Incentivise young farmers	Yes	No		Discourage intensive agriculture incentivise	Incentivise smallholder organic production
Male	45-54	Full-time farmer	agrioditaro	75-125	Beef	€ 66,000	85%	No	No	No	Redistribution	No	No		Full-time drystock farmer be it suckler cow beef or sheep are struggling most from low income and the necessary reinvestment that is required. This can be done through a decent suckler cow and ewe payment ie at least 350 euro per suckler cow and 40 per ewe.   Also 60% Tams grant for full-time drystock farmers	See above so importance of anc payment
Male	35-44	Full-time farmer		50-75	Tillage	€ 100,000	85%	No	Yes		Convergence is unfair. Full time farmer should be supported.	No	No		Full time farmers need support to put food on the table. Part time farmers do not. 'Larger' farms spend more money in the local economy but many depend on supports to remain viable.	Additional support for native protein crops
Male	35-44	Part-time farmer		25-50	Beef	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No		Capping at 50k with real purpose ie exclude any shielding of bps through family labour etc and front loading is fair wsy possible. Lump sum payments for small holdings with less than 5k turnover		Yes	No	No capping of suckled cow numbers, let market forces dictate a reduction on a national level whilst individuals can continue.  No gender specific grants this will lead to false herd numbers.	weak men made decisions to appease a man in europe.
Male	45-54	Part-time farmer		25-50	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	Yes	Yes	Redistribution	No	Yes	Yes	Pay only active farmers	No

<u> </u>																
Male	35-44	Part-time farmer		10-25	Beef	€ 66,000	85%	No	No	Yes	convergence is taking from the most active farmers even those on small holdings who are highly dependent on them for survival and increasing value for others that are not dependent on them, eg. dairy farms with low value entitlements and large scale extensive farms with very little activity on them. Capping is the fairest measure.		Yes	No	most eco schemes add significant cost to the farmers and therefore limit the benefits to farmers incomes	
	55-64	Full-time farmer		50-75	Beef	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	No	Yes		
Male	>65	Member of a farm family		125-175	Sheep	€ 100,000		No	No	Yes	Capping	No	Yes	Yes		
Male	45-54	Member of a farm family		10-25	Beef	€ 100,000	> 85 %	Yes	Yes	Yes		No	Yes	Yes		
Male	45-54	Full-time farmer		25-50	Sheep	€ 100,000	85%	No	No	Yes	A small farmer that had good single farm payment of 12000 now reduced to 8000 over last few years he had good entitlements but now has a very poor cash flow	No	No	No	keep farmers that are farmers who are working the land not the systemalive for the country side they live in and the parish to enjoy even tho they not farmers.	person has .then the wild life will survive
Male	>65	Member of a farm family		75-125	Dairy	€ 100,000	85%	No	Yes	No	no convergence.those who have high value entitlements earned them. Restructuring scheme for redistribution , no capping.	No	Yes	No	a scheme to support farm incomes as a lot of farm produce is sold below the cost of production.	Eco schemes and the likes should be seperate from income supports.
Male	>65	Member of a farm family		50-75	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	Large or factory farms should get benefits	No	Yes	No		
Male	55-64	Full-time farmer		50-75	Beef	€ 66,000	85%	No	Yes	No		No	Yes	No		
Male	< 35	Full-time		125-175	Beef	€ 100,000	85%	No	Yes	No	To many cuts	No	No	No		
Male	45-54	Full-time		25-50	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	Non farmers getting more than people like me struggling to make a living	No	No	No		
Female	35-44	Part-time farmer		<10	Organic (all sectors)	€ 100,000	> 85 %	Yes	Yes	Yes	Stragging to make a living	Yes	No	Yes		
Female	35-44	Other	I'm a farm goods consumer	<10	Organic (all sectors)	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	Yes	Combine the measures to support moves to smaller holdings more in line with soil association and regeneration theory.	Yes	No	Yes		Financial State support should be reallocated to non glyphosate and fertiliser use, smaller/medium farms, 100% eco and organic practices.
Male	35-44	Part-time farmer		50-75	Sheep	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	No	Convergence	No	Yes	No	Sheep farmers should not be obliged to join QA scheme for the welfare scheme if they produce store lambs	
Male	55-64	Full-time farmer		75-125	Beef	€ 66,000	85%	No	No	No	Farmers who made financial investment on the back of CAP will face ruin	No	Yes	Yes		Hedges only to be cut every third year
Male	>65	Full-time farmer		10-25	Sheep	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	There are no positive rewards for farming with nature	Yes	No	No	Small family farms are not viable without external resources and support	Ensure supports to maintain small family farms and encourage rural development without tourism which inevitably leads to rural depopulation. Children of rural farms must be encouraged to remain in rural areas. Ee
Male	45-54	Full-time farmer		<10	Sheep	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes		Yes	No	Yes		
	L	Tarriel	1									1				1

Female	35-44	Member of a farm family	Farmers wife 2	5-50	Beef	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	No	Convergence a uniformed way of equalising payments to farmers based on their level of commitment and time given to their farming practices. Carbon sequestration needs to be fair, most farmers carbon credits based on the level of their farming practices. A universal study should be carried out to assess each farm on Ireland to ensure carbon is measured fairly and what every farmer can do to reduce their carbon footprint and contribute to the climate turnaround needed to save our planet.		Yes	Yes	Not all farmers interact with state agencies, online consultations or through agri advisors. Don't forget to speak to the 25% of farmers that just get on with their work with no input to these draft interventions.	farming in the campaign to
Female	45-54		Organic Farm 5 adviser		Organic (all sectors)	€ 66,000	85%	No	No	Yes	Capping	Yes	No	No		
Male	< 35	Other				€ 66,000	85%	No	No	No		Yes	No	No		
	55-64	Member of a	2	5-50	Beef	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	Yes		Yes	No	No		
	45-54	farm family Part-time			Sheep	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	Yes		Yes	No	No		
		farmer			-		0070									
Male	35-44	Part-time farmer	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	10	Other	€ 66,000		Yes				Yes	No	Yes		
Male	< 35		Unemployed			€ 100,000	85%	Yes	Yes	Yes	That the EU keep changing the rules	No	Yes	No	Very bad for Irish farming	No□ Ireland should leave the EU and be able to control its OWN farming industry
Male	55-64	Full-time farmer	>	175	Sheep	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	Yes	No	None	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Male	>65	Full-time farmer	2	5-50	Dairy	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	No	Very high payments should capped. Redistribution should be done by increasing payment on the first so many hectares for everyone eg. first 40ha.	No	Yes	No	Ban on soiled water spreading in winter will be counter productive and may cause soiled water and slurry to be spread in unsuitable weather. A weather based approach to soiled water should be taken.	
Male	45-54	Part-time farmer	5	0-75	Sheep	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	Larger farmers are paid far too much	Yes	No	No	Minister is extremely weak throughout process	
Female	45-54	Member of a farm family	7		Organic (all sectors)	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	Yes	Current system allows for significant payment to industrial farms while disproportionately less to small and medium sized farmers   Capping and redistribution will allow flexibility for farmers currently not in receipt of entitlements to receive them and should be the main mechanism for a fairer distribution with knock on positive effects for the environment		No	Yes	More importantly specific intervention should favour youth	As above
Male	35-44	Other	Landscape Architect			€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	Yes		Yes	No	No		Enable EIP Life schemes to recommend stocking dendities and other measures without compromising Cap payments.
Male	35-44		Setting up < small part time farm	10	Beef	€ 100,000	> 85 %	Yes	Yes	Yes	Farmers not rewarded for sequestered carbon. Agriforestry land is being sterilised. This could give 30% tree cover nationally overnight if land was designated as grazing as opposed to forestry		No	Yes	Will ye invest in rainwater harvesting and infrastructure. Also off grid solar solutions to lower farm running costs	~ -
Male	55-64	Full-time	7	5-125	Dairy	€ 66,000	85%	No	No	No		No	Yes	Yes		
Female	35-44	farmer Full-time	2	5-50	Dairy	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	Yes	Capping	No	No	No		

Male	55-64	Other Paramedic and lease entitlements	<10	Beef	€ 100,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	Allow farmers to work the land not lay wasted	Yes	No	Yes	Family farms should be given the opportunity to share payments to each other if there are disputes in family farms and mediation to share SFP  Large payments can be shared and require negotiation with family's
Male	35-44	Full-time farmer	10-25	Organic (all sectors)	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	Cap top earners and spread payments on a percentage basis to all active farmers and not feedlot farmers. Entitlements should be returned to their rightful lands and owners as of cap payments prior to 2013.	No	Yes	Yes	A standard rate of payment for beef and sheep
Female	>65	Member of a farm family	10-25	Beef	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	Yes	Yes		No	Yes	No	It's crazy to cut beef production
Female	35-44	Member of a farm family	25-50	Sheep	€ 66,000	85%	Yes		Yes		Yes	No	Yes	
Female	45-54	Part-time farmer	10-25	Beef	€ 100,000	85%	No	No	Yes	Convergence	No	Yes	Yes	Small family farm have to stay
Male	45-54	Part-time farmer	<10	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	Capping and redistribution	Yes	No	No	
Female	45-54	Full-time farmer	10-25	Beef	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	No	No	
Male	45-54	Part-time farmer	75-125	Sheep	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	No	Some farmers are paid too much, others too little	Yes	No	No	
Male	35-44	Part-time farmer	25-50	Sheep	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	Yes	Yes	Larger farmers who are already profitable receiving grants that are too high. Part of the reason why large farmers are profitable is because of small farmers that breed sheep or cattle. Small farmers are vital part of the food chain and who can help level environmental issues too. Problem with ifa teargas and depth ag is that they only want to support dairy and large farmers. Small farmers contribute much more to local business and keep local economy going.	Yes	No	Yes	Use small farmers to help level/improve environmental improvements whilst giving suitable benefits to them as large farmers squeeze them out in capitalism. Small farmers are needed to produce animals for large farmers to profit on. Vital part of food chain. It would be useful to conduct a cost benefit analysis on benefit to local economy small businesses and local employment of1 million euro in grants to large farmers and 1 million in grants to small farmers. Small farmers constantly told that what we do is not good enough and squeezed by millionaires.
Male	55-64	Full-time farmer	25-50	Dairy	€ 66,000	> 85 %	No	No	No		No	Yes	No	
Female	35-44	Full-time farmer	50-75	Dairy	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	No	Alot of payments are going to armchair farmers, not active young farmers	No	No	Yes	
Female	45-54	Member of a farm family	25-50	Sheep	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	Yes	Redistribution	Yes	No	No	
Male	35-44	Part-time farmer	<10	Organic (all sectors)	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	Yes	We need to see an increase in allocation of payments year on year to resilient and regenerative small scale farming.   Farmers protecting the quality of the soil, need to be supported. Its essential we have the highest quality soil possible going into the future.   If farmers are not protecting and increasing the quality of our soil, its completely unfair for present and future generations.		No	Yes	A balance between agriculture, economy and ecology needs to be worked on.  Small scale farmers like Community Supported Agriculture farmers, need to be supported more, to increase the quality of our soil and food.

Female	55-64	Other	Renting land	25-50	Other	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	Yes	Yes	Redistribution	No	Yes	Yes	
			looking to go in farming												
Male	55-64	Part-time farmer		10-25	Beef	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	Yes	Capping amounts claimed it should be at a lower amount toaid the smaller farmers	No	No	No	
Male	55-64	Full-time farmer		25-50	Sheep	€ 100,000	85%	Yes	No	No		Yes	No	No	
Male	< 35	Part-time farmer		25-50	Beef	€ 66,000		Yes	No		Entitlements should be linked to land, should not be allowed to lease entitlements, this only allows people not farming earn money for nothing.	No	No	No	
Male	>65	Full-time farmer		25-50	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	
Female	55-64	Other	Parent, envoirmental activist □			€ 100,000	85%	Yes	No	Yes	Don't know	Yes	No	Yes	No No
Male	< 35	Part-time farmer		50-75	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	Beef barons and sheiks should not be receiving big cap payments,	No	Yes	No	
Male	35-44	Part-time farmer		25-50	Other	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	Yes	Cap the intensive farming and support real sustainable food production measures	Yes	No	No	The farm lobby is out of date. Follow the science, Farmers will follow the incentives
Male	55-64	Member of a farm family		<10	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	Yes	Yes	convergence	Yes		Yes	□ Farm land has three uses farming, environment and recreation.□ There is no measure for recreation on the policy □ □
Male	35-44	Part-time farmer		<10	Beef	€ 100,000	> 85 %	Yes	Yes	Yes	The (old) young Farmer, where they are farming for more than 5 years, didn't benefit from Installation Aid & were too (old more than 5 years in 2015) for the Young Farmer Scheme.	No	Yes	Yes	
Female	55-64	Other	Volunteer for conservation			€ 100,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes		Yes	No	Yes	
Male	55-64	Full-time	charity	25-50	Beef	€ 66,000		Yes	Yes	No		No	Yes	No	
Male	>65	farmer Other				€ 66,000		Yes	No	Yes	more should be put into saving our planet and climate change mitigation.	Yes	No	Yes	
Male	55-64	Other	Public servant			€ 66,000	85%	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	No	No	Farming policy should NOT be about subsidising farmers' incomes. Farming should be primarily about wise use of the nation's land. We are still locked in a colonial mindset of 'maximise production for export'. This is NOT wise use of our nation's land. We need to farm less and leave more room for undisturbed nature, which provides us with so many other, unpriced services.

-	¥.				<u>-</u>		¥ <b>-</b>		•	<del>_</del>	-	·			
Male	35-44	Full-time farmer	75-125	Beef	€ 100,000	85%	No	Yes	No	Farmers have made commitments with Loans farm development severe cuts to Bps beyond 85% will cause additional financial hardship to progressive farmers. Timeline is too short to go beond 85%	-9960000N352	Yes	Yes		
Male	55-64	Full-time farmer	50-75	Dairy	€ 66,000	85%	No	Yes	No	I think it verymucj discrimares against progressive farmers	No	Yes	Yes	It has to be user friendly to all	No
Male	45-54	Full-time farmer	50-75	Beef	€ 66,000	85%	No	Yes	No	There should be no annual reduction & it should be index linked.	No	Yes	Yes		Suckler farmer's need over €300 for the upkeep of the cow & working long hours even during the night to calve cow's.
Male	>65	Full-time	25-50	Other	€ 66,000	85%	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	None	Alternative enterprise
Male	< 35	Farmer Part-time farmer	25-50	Sheep	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	Beef Barron's getting payments. Feedlots should not be considered farm under the payment scheme	Yes	No	No	Incentives to help young farmers get land. Early farm retirement scheme is a must. Stopping large dairy farms buying poorer land on local young people to offset their nitrates is no longer acceptable.	Same as above
Female	55-64	Full-time farmer	50-75	Sheep	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	Yes	No	The difference in entitlement values. The forgotten farmers who ate a small group of real young farmers. They entered farming because they love it not because there was a young farmer scheme. Many of the so called young farmers never have or never will set foot on a farm and then leave when scheme is up.	1	No	Yes		Use of low income farms for profitable enterprises. Which may mean a complete change such as solar panels or growing certain crops.
Male	35-44	Part-time	75-125	Sheep	€ 100,000	> 85 %	No	No	Yes		No	Yes	Yes		
Male	45-54	farmer Part-time farmer	<10	Other	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	Yes	small and medium farmer must be kept alive for economic social and environmental reasons. Big farm do not bring benefice to rural ireland: it reduce the number of jobs, income for workers and it is totally unsustainable. We need to move resources to alternative agriculture model from export oriented to Farm to Fork short supply chain.		No	No	Organic farming must be boost taking resources from big industria farming companies	fund local food production through CSA
Male	45-54	Part-time farmer	25-50	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %	No	Yes	No		Yes	No	No	No	Target payments to wildlife and habitat management
Male	>65	Other Vegetable	<10	Organic (all	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	Yes	Yes	Capping	Yes	No	No		and habitat management
Male	55-64	Full-time farmer	75-125	sectors) Sheep	€ 100,000	85%	No	Yes	No	The impact on a full time farmer producing sheep on difficult lowland soils where the annual income arising is less than the direct payments under the present supports will be disproportionate when the triple impacts of convergence, CRIS and redistribution of environmental payments under the proposed eco scheme. When these cuts are applied to high level basic payments the impacts are absolutely appalling. There is an absolute need to design an environmental support scheme that is available and accessible to this type of farm, also the sheep welfare scheme needs to be increased to offset some of the proposed cuts in income.		Yes	No	totally against any potential inter generational transfer as the future income potential is decimated to the point where no young person would tolerate it.	accessible to lowland farms
Male	55-64	Full-time	10-25	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %	No	No	Yes	Object to the reduction of suckler cows	No	Yes	No		
		farmer	1								-53				

Female	35-44	Other				€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	Yes		Yes	No	Yes	
Male	35-44	Part-time farmer		50-75	Sheep	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	Yes	Yes	People being paid for intensive farming that is harmful to envoirment	Yes	No	No	Hill farming is dieing. I think a better organic scheme should be implemented to make labour intensive farming viable again therefore keeping shops schools and services in the community
Male	45-54	Part-time		50-75	Other	€ 66,000	85%	No	Yes	No	Capping	No	Yes	Yes	
Female	45-54		From a farming family, working in environmental / rural development sector	50-75	Beef	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	Yes	Capping and Redistribution	Yes	No	Yes	Smaller marginal farms such as Upland farms should be supported with specific measures to reflect the unique biodiversity and ecosystems services provided - one size does not fit all  The EIPs and Farming for Nature programmes have been piloted - we know they work - they should now be mainstreamed to farming across Ireland to support the objectives of the Green Deal. Agri-environmental and agrienergy systems such as anaerobic digestion should also be supported in RESS 2 policy. there is a conflict of policies between DAFM and DECC otherwise.
Male	55-64	Full-time farmer		50-75	Organic (all sectors)	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	No	convergence was to take place in current system but in my case it did not and i think it is unfair that anyone under the national average should be penalised/ claw back/ if they buy higher value entitlements.  and because it was the middle reference year the department told me i didn,t fit into any catagory  it has also come to my attention that there was no convergence in the current system because the money was taken off on the previous system and given back to over the next 5 years i hope the same thing won,t hapen again. and to make a fairer distribution of direct payments there should be a bit of leeway for people in different situations yours		No	Yes	i have not seen them not very good on computer
Male	>65	Member of a farm family		50-75	Beef	€ 100,000	85%	No	No	Yes	Convergence should not go beyond 85% as it will destroy smaller producers with high value entitlements	No	Yes	No	Money for eco schemes should not be taken from farmers entitlements, it should be from national government funds. Entitlements are the property of the holder and should not be taken from the owner
Female	e < 35	Member of a farm family		25-50	Organic (all sectors)	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	No	Those that had high stock 20 years ago have always got more subsidies, regardless of what they have done since. All hectares should be paid equally up to the cap, plus eco schemes uncapped.	I .	No	Yes	They are a cast improvement on existing, and must not be watered down by derogation  Farm transfer incentives should have a higher age cap for females, for family and biological reasons
Male	45-54	Full-time farmer		75-125	Organic (all sectors)	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	No	Huge payments to the big boys. Always backed up by the IFA. Poorer are not represented	Yes	No	Yes	More acknowledging what some farmers have already done for the environment. Penalise those who have ever done damage

Female 35-44	Full-time farmer	75-125	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	No	Totally unfair that people that had high stocking in reference years are still benefiting financially. I know of illegal overstocking in reference years where the recipient has gained hundreds of thousands of tax payers money as a result. This should stop! Farming is farming and all full time farmers should be paid a basic fixed wage, eco schemes can then be paid additionally. There needs to be pay parity, one person should not be receiving hundreds of thousands or even over 60k simple because they have a large holding or because they had high stock etc in the reference years.	Yes	No	Yes	Stop listening to bully lobbyists who own huge holdings and are over represented by the IFA	Yes females being expected to take over the farm before 35 is totally sexist. We already have out biological clocks or young children to be worry about without this extra stress. Please extend this upwards by at least ten be years to make it fair. Males do not have such pressures
Male 45-54	Full-time farmer	125-175	Tillage	€ 100,000	85%	No	Yes	No	Reform is regressive, anti-productive and socialist in tone. We are not in kindergartenagriculture is a businessentitlements were earned or bought and are to compensate producers for producing a product in a high cost economy while selling the product at world market prices. CAP is like "Tied Aid"constantly adding terms and conditions to our aid system.		Yes	No	environmental value for CAP budget. As tillage farmers we have had the same grain price for 30 years, with no increase in CAP	return of investment is less than 1%what businessman would invest commercially in a family farmwe are now vocationaland being left to die a slow death
Male < 35	Part-time farmer	10-25	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	Introducing capping into the Beef suckler farming enterprise is unfair. Particularly for young farmers that can potentially increase the herd size or maintain it. This is shouldn't be a negative as farming at a suitable stocking rate and incorporating best practices and breeding programmes will result in more efficient and sustainably enterprise in the long term. Introducing a herd capping to one of the least profitable enterprises will only stunt and hurt Irelands food producing sector.		No	No	eco schemes should be results based and relevant to the type of land being farmed	
Male 45-54	Part-time farmer	25-50	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	Full convergence is fairest and it does not discriminate against people with poorer land and in Spa's etc	No	Yes	No	Full convergence should be brought in as quickly as possible. A strong meaningful environmental scheme should either be incorporated in the basic payment or funded separately especially for people with land in spa's sac's etc This needs to be a minimum for €10,000	No
Male 45-54	Full-time farmer	50-75	Tillage	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes		Yes	No	Yes	increase substantially per hectare payments for organic farming	

Male >65	Full-time farmer	<10	Tillage	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	No	Basic payments should be equal. What is not fair is one tillage farmer on 40ha receiving 40 thousand euros and another tillage farmer 2 miles down the road on 40ha receiving 10 k while doing the same practices. Then farmers should be rewarded more for performing environmentally favourable to what the EC wants them to do. To me at the end of the day a subsidy is a subsidy and should not be getting traded as a property through estate agents. This should also be fixed and traded through the department without clawback	No	No	category and I don't see any mention of them in the draft. I would like to see something to deal with them mentioned	As above, something to deal with the forgotten farmer. I also see an issue arising in the dairy sector with the amount of slurry being produced. I think that a push on slurry separation and the movement of animal produced solids onto tillage farms would be a good balancer for an ecological issue that is definitely an issue. I don't know how to factor that into a scheme but it would be an environmental improver
Male 45-54	Part-time farmer	25-50	Tillage	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	No	Convergence is unfair Capping with redistribution will bring about a fairer share but do not distribute only to farmers with less than 30 ha as that does not encourage active farmers. The distribution should be equally to farmers with less than 60ha.	Yes	No	have not been calculated.	
Female 45-54	Full-time farmer	10-25	Beef	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	Yes	Yes	Small farm holdings are continually struggling to survive, they need more financial assistance	Yes	Yes		Rare breeds need to be helped more financially to save them. Small farms are vital to retain the countryside
Male < 35	Part-time farmer	25-50	Tillage	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	Dairy farms are being protected despite their effect on the environment being equal to or greater that other types of farming. Payments should at least be dependent on rigourous environmental regulations. We also hear nothing about the capping of the dairy herd even though the national herd should now be reduced. This implies suckler and beef herds will be sacrificed to prop up dairy exports. Payments should be made on the basis of environmental responsibility and not as a means to expand dairy farmers' share of the market. Payments to dairy should be capped and redistributed to smaller farms in the promotion of biodiversity and environmentally responsible production. Part of which, I am afraid, involves reducing livestock herds across the board.	No	Yes	Any draft interventions should be made with a reduced national herd (for all) in mind.	
Male 35-44	Other	Part-time Environmenta I Journalist		€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	Yes	In subsidy terms, a connection to land area is pointless. We're subsidising the farmer, not the land. So redistribution as a primary mechanism makes the most sense, while capping is essential.	No	Yes		
Male 55-64	Full-time farmer	10-25	Organic (all sectors)	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	Yes	Should be no cuts to farmers under 30 Yes hectares and €10000 direct payment. Has to be a floor on cuts	No	Yes		No cap on suckler numbers
Male < 35	Member of a farm family	In partnership 25-50 with my parents on a suckler and beef finishing farm	Beef	€ 66,000	85%	No	Yes	No	Redistribution through eco shemes uncapped No	No	No	The suckler herd is being hung out to dry and getting all the unfair press	

Male	< 35	Full-time farmer		<10	Organic (all sectors)	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	Ensure organic payment reflect full costs of organic production, invest in organic sector-infrastructure to stimulate sector growth, prioritise organic farming in eco schemes.	Yes	No	Yes	Ensure organic payment reflect full costs of organic production, invest in organic sector- infrastructure to stimulate sector growth, prioritise organic farming in eco schemes.	
															reward climate an environmental performance of organic farms and non organic farms.	
Male	< 35	Other	Agricultural Contractor			€ 66,000	> 85 %	No	No	Yes	Agricultural contractors without a holding aren't able to avail of the CAP schemes	No	Yes	Yes	Agricultural contractors should get support for carbon efficient machinery such as Low emission slurry spreading equipment	
Male	55-64	Full-time		10-25	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	Yes	Yes		No	No	No		
Male	45-54	farmer Part-time farmer		25-50	Sheep	€ 100,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	Penalties are too severe in some cases eg some Glas penalties. 100% convergence is fairest	No	No	No	Keep it simple.	payment for farmers who allow the public access to their lands eg greenways/cycleways
Male		Part-time farmer		25-50	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %		No	Yes	The current system is based on historic payments based on stocking rates, quotas and farming systems that applied during the reference period.  - Stocking rates and farming systems have changed significantly in the past 20 years.  - The processing sector is using these payments as part of its efforts to build artificial buffers to control prices - At the very least payments need to be recalibrated - I know farmers who have significantly reduced cow numbers and reduced stock numbers to by upto 80% The redistribution of payments will increase the efficiency and profitability of smaller farms and will enable enterprises to expand i.e. rather than decrease the number of profitable farms - it will increase the number.	No	No	No		
Female	45-54	Full-time		75-125	Dairy	€ 100,000	85%	Yes	No	No		No	No	Yes		
Male	55-64	farmer Full-time farmer		10-25	Beef	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	Yes	Yes	suckler and beef are very low margin of profit, give more money for eco schemes and less for beef production.	Yes	No	Yes	make eco- scheme as big as possible, and most farmers will jump at it, guaranteed i would say.	more trees planted on farms,to help with climate change,most beef farmers are willing if paid NOW.
Male	>65	Part-time		<10	Other	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	Yes	Yes	Capping	Yes	No	No	no	n0
Male	35-44	farmer Part-time farmer		10-25	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	Yes	Yes	Substantial payments to large acre farmers makes it impossible to compete against them on purchases. Capping, full convergence and redistribution should be used.	No	Yes	No	no	no
Male	< 35	Part-time farmer		25-50	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	Yes	Yes	The new suckler cow scheme is unfair due to the capping of cow numbers if you take part in the scheme		Yes	Yes	The suckler cow scheme is unfair that the cow numbers are capped i you take part in the scheme	e suckler cow scheme is unfair that the cow numbers are capped if you take part in the scheme
Male	45-54	Full-time farmer		75-125	Dairy	€ 66,000	85%	No	No	No	Making viable farms unviable just giving money to farmers that are unproductive and will contribute nothing to economy of rural Ireland just take all money they can get and farm with minimum number of livestock	No	Yes	No		

Male	>65	Full-time farmer	<10	Sheep	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	Yes	Huge payments being given to people who are not engaged in farming for more than 50% of their working time	Yes	No	Yes	More resources directed to the more disadvantaged areas of Ireland	Reduce herd numbers.
Male	35-44	Part-time farmer	50-75	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	No		No	No	Yes		
Male	45-54	Part-time farmer	50-75	Organic (all sectors)	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	Existing entitlements are linked to production during the reference years. This unfairly disadvantaged organic farmers who had reduced output due to conversion to organic production. The continued linkage of BISS payments to historic production is unjustified.  Capping at €60000, full flattening (ideally) of 100% convergence and at least 10 % front loading. Voluntary coupled support (Protein Aid Scheme) has also a role to play in meeting the objectives.	Yes	No	Yes	Full flattening with payment on all eligible areas would be transparent fair and administratively straight forward to implement.	Scrubland should be eligible for payment if it contributes to general objective (ii) :to support and strengthen environmental protection, including biodiversity, and climate action, and to contribute to achieving the environmental- and climate-related objectives of the Union, including its commitments under the Paris Agreement;
Male	45-54	Part-time farmer	50-75	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	Existing entitlements are linked to production during the reference years. This unfairly disadvantaged organic farmers who had reduced output due to conversion to organic production. The continued linkage of BISS payments to historic production is unjustified.  □  Capping at €60000, full flattening (ideally) of 100% convergence and at least 10 % front loading. Voluntary coupled support (Protein Aid Scheme) has also a role to play in meeting the objectives.	Yes	No	Yes	Full flattening with payment on all eligible areas would be transparent fair and administratively straight forward to implement.	V
Female	45-54	Part-time farmer	25-50	Sheep	€ 100,000	85%	Yes	Yes	Yes	As a female part time farmer I have always asked the question how many part time farmers are in the country my thinking is the percentage is high with a large quantity working in the agri business sector as an employee of an agri business pay in to agri business employee is low and we are then rely on both income.  huge issue coming to all part time farmers is the prescription meds and I don't think part time farmers were considered or certainly out lambing flocks were not. As regards gender I fought to go to ag college fought to buy land and fought to inherit which is still an issue for me renting land is also a gender issue	Yes	Yes	Yes	Those looking to do something or involved in researching irish wool should be rewarded	I have already submitted for irish wool!!!
Male	45-54	Part-time farmer	10-25	Sheep	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	New older farmers not treated fairly who started farming in recent years. Larger farmers devising ways in avoiding losing CAP ie company's being set up IFA protecting your large farmers only, and not representing all its members. Cap payment should be capped at 50,000 per holding.		No	Yes		
Male	45-54	Part-time farmer	10-25	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	The payment are historical. Convergence	Yes	No	Yes	Need to put money into innovation on farms	Include Social Farming in Ireland CAP budget and Include the Rural social scheme in the CAP budget.
Male	35-44	Full-time farmer	>175	Beef	€ 100,000	85%	No	Yes	No	convergence is unfair. payments moving to unproductive land and also to part time farmers	No	Yes	No	capping of sucklers very unfair	

N.A. I	1.05	D 11:		75.405	D (	6 400 000	05.0/	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	ls.	l N I		1./	la i	- In I		
Male	< 35	Part-time farmer		75-125	Beef	€ 100,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	No		Yes	No	No		
Male	45-54	Part-time farmer		50-75	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	Yes	Yes		No	Yes	No		
Female	45-54	Other	Ecologist					Yes	No	Yes		Yes	No	Yes		
Male	45-54	Full-time farmer		125-175	Beef	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	Yes		Reducing the entitlements and the basic payments	No	Yes	No	Forestry allowed on brown land	
Male	45-54	Full-time		25-50	Beef	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	Yes	Yes		No	Yes	Yes		
Male	35-44	farmer Part-time farmer			Organic (all sectors)	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	old reference years. New system should be biased towards environmentally friendly farming practices	Yes	No	Yes		Organic Farmers should recieve Payments on account in january to offset OCB fees and other up front costs. The OFS payment rate be increased to 600 euro /Ha and OCIS to 60% with more innovative equipment like composters be added to the list.
Male	45-54	Part-time farmer		10-25	Sheep	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	More money redistributed from Pillar 1 to Pillar	Yes	No	No		
Male	55-64	Full-time farmer		25-50	Dairy	€ 100,000	85%	Yes		Yes		No	Yes	Yes		I would like to see a support put in place for farmers with under 100 cows. I would like to see more supports for beef and dairy farmers with under 50 hectares.
Male	< 35	Member of a farm family		10-25	Sheep	€ 100,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes		No	No	No		
Male	35-44	Part-time farmer		25-50	Beef	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	Yes	No	Non active farmers receiving Cap payment, cap should reward productive, efficient farmers, redistribution	No	Yes	No	Capping suckler number for new scheme is wrong, suckler numbers have reducing naturally for last number of years, sucklers cows have less impact on environment than dairy cows, reduced stocking rates	Capping dairy cows, reduced stocking rate on dairy herd relating LU per hectare
Male	< 35	Member of a farm family		25-50	Sheep	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	No		No	Yes	Yes		
Male	55-64	Part-time farmer		25-50	Sheep	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cap should have been reformed from EU level as historical dates going back 20 years is not good enough.   I only started farming at the age of	No	No	No	no	no
Female	55-64	Full-time farmer		125-175	Beef	€ 66,000	85%	No	No	No	ordinary farmers who work very hard need fairer payments.Capping and reducing payments from beef barons .	No	No	Yes	I think EU should listen to the farmers on the ground.	I think women who own farms deserve an extra %of eu payments. Also young farmers male or female need encouragement to farm .I would like to see the old Installation Scheme back in place, also the early retirement scheme along side that.

Female	>65	Member of a		50-75	Sheep	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	No		Yes	No	Yes	Female farmers should be	Scrub land should be entitled
		farm family									irrespective of historical production				encouraged to farm their own lamd. Even if some challenges are faced that are different to male counterparts	
Male	>65	Full-time farmer		50-75	Sheep	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	All areas if land should receive equal payments irrespective of historic production.	Yes	No	Yes	Female farmers should be encouraged to fanr their own land by any means reasonably necessary	Scrub land should receive equal entitlements as the open land as that is where many livestock spend a considerable amount of time, such as shading from the summer warmth or sheltering from harsh wintery conditions. The trees, pants and fauna in this area also reduce carbon emissions, which is critical for the continuity of farming.
Female	< 35	Member of a farm family		50-75	Sheep	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	No	All the areas of land should be on equal payment irrespective of historical production.   New entitlements should be put on land that was classed as excluded. Scrub land.	Yes	No	Yes	Female farmers would face difficulties that male counterparts might not , to give encouragement to female farmers	Scrub land should receive equal entitlements as other open land as this is the area where livestock spend alot of time, for example shading in the warm summer or sheltering from harsh weather conditions in the winter. The trees and other plants also help control carbon emissions.
Male	>65	Part-time		10-25	Beef	€ 100,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes		No	No	No		
Male	35-44	farmer Part-time farmer		125-175	Beef	€ 66,000	85%	No	Yes	Yes	redistribution - pay the active farmerd	Yes	No	No	increase the suckler cow payment must be looked at	the new eco scheme must attract all farmers including the intensive farmers and be encouraged to join not like the current pilot reap scheme
Male	55-64	Other	Student	<10	Other	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	Capping	Yes	No	Yes		
	35-44	Part-time farmer		50-75	Beef	€ 66,000	85%	No	Yes	No	A total departure from historic system is needed. Individuals receiving direct payments who are not farming is not what the CAP was designed for. New succession mechanisms essential.	No	Yes	No		More young farmer supports and less restrictions on what is a young farmer.
Female	35-44	Other	Husband of a farmer	50-75	Organic (all sectors)	€ 66,000		No	Yes	No	Pay all farmers the same amount is the only fair system and forget about redistribution	Yes	No	No	Ecp schemes could be a great way of helping to tackle climate change and carbon emissions if correctly designed with ideas such as paying farmers to reduce cow numbers, planting biodiversity belts on farms, substantial tree planting on farm ditches etc	

Male	>65	Full-time farmer	50-75	Organic (all sectors)	€ 66,000	> 85 %	No	Yes	No	100% convergence is the only fair system and if this is implemented then no redistribution should occur PAYMENT FOR PER HECTARE FARMED	Yes	No	No	ECO schemes should be 40% of CAP. the european union is moving towards environmental protection as the cornerstone of CAP and Ireland must follow
Male	35-44	Part-time farmer	50-75	Organic (all sectors)	€ 66,000	> 85 %	No	Yes	No	I think that 100% convergence is the only fair system. It is completely unfair that farmers often located next door to each other are receiving different amounts of payment for their farmed land. If 100% convergence occurs I feel that there should be no CRISS as every farmer will receive the same amount per hectare which is fair. The size of a farm holding should not influence CAP- you should be paid on a per hectare farmed bases   Capping should be even lower than 66,000 in my opinion as any individual receiving such huge amounts of money is unfair to the overall system and the monies saved should be used for Eco schemes or to increase the amount paid per hectare to all farmers		No	No	The EU is moving towards an Environmental based CAPThus more focus is needed on ECO - funding in Ireland   Almost all European countries have moved to 100% convergence why is Ireland considering any different?
Male	< 35	Part-time	<10	Sheep	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	Yes	Yes		No	Yes	No	
Male	55-64	farmer Full-time farmer	10-25	Organic (all sectors)	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	Yes	No bottom limit on area or value, unfair on small farmers with high value entitlements	Yes	No	Yes	
Male	< 35	Full-time farmer	50-75	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	We would be considered a large farm on good, productive land	Yes	No	Yes	Organic farmers are currently excluded from some Eco scheme (due to a perceived double payment issue), this should change to encourage further work towards improving our environment. Organic farmers need more capital/grant support to develop their businesses and processing. Organic payments are lower in Ireland than in the rest of the EU with very little advisory support and guidance provided by the state or advisory services. This lack of commitment by the state and others can leave organic farmers feeling isolated, unsupported and lacking the expertise/advice which is offered to all other sectors of Irish agriculture.
Male	35-44	Part-time farmer	10-25	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	Large payments based on historic farming and land area. Capping, convergence and redistribution should be used to boost income on farms under 20ha.		Yes	No	
Male	55-64	Full-time farmer	10-25	Organic (all sectors)	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	Yes	Reducing entitlement value on small size farms totally unfair, should have a lower limit of 10,000 total value on 30 hectares.	Yes	No	Yes	Existing organic farmers must not be excluded from area based payments in new schemes as happened in GLAS.  Some intervention to top below cost of production selling by supermarkets

Male	35-44	Full-time farmer	25-50	Dairy	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	No	Redistribution can't be taken from active farmers to support those who have large land parcels lightly stocked to somehow mitigate the general populations strive to live there lives as they wish and let someone else worry about the environment consequences of there carbon footprint.		Yes	No	striving to make massive environment inroads so we become carbon neutral but maybe only stand still in our overall carbon emissions consequences on futher weather patterns. For instance a tree in the tropics can grow up to 9 times faster than a tree in northern united. le of farmers do is all about cheque in small part business a road where animals ar	the post is such a of there overall and we go down a e our end of life
														based products. This is evidence from a study done by Edinburgh university	
Male	< 35	Full-time farmer	50-75	Dairy	€ 100,000	85%	Yes	No	Yes		No	No	No		
Male	< 35	Part-time farmer	75-125	Sheep	€ 100,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	No		No	No	Yes		
Male	>65	Part-time farmer	50-75	Beef	€ 100,000	> 85 %	No	No	No		No	No	No	take pillar 2 money for KT. They are already getting €40m in National funding from DAFM for KT. The CAP money should be given solely to private advisers, who even though they have 55,000 not be allogated as trategy as	etrategy, to ensure and advisers are ually and fairly in ccess to research e. Teagasc must wed lead this sthey will steal all ey for themselves.
Male	35-44	Part-time farmer	25-50	Beef	€ 100,000	85%	Yes	No	Yes	Derogation farmers should get reduced payments	Yes	No	No	inspection	gulation and s on derogration farms exporting
Male	55-64	Other	Citizen		€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes		Yes	No	No	big as possible shift to both nature and climate friendly farming a spend as co-finance	ri-environment should be as large s possible (ie fully ed by the State and est amount)
Male	55-64	Other	Consultant Obstetrician & Gynaecologis t							Organic crop farming is producing the most healthful food whilst supporting the environment and biodiversity: it should receive CAP at the highest rate to make healthy food affordable to the poor; animal farming destroys waterways, leads to biodiversity loss, 1/3 of Irish green house gases; it leads to antibiotic resistance and animal products are the foods responsible for Irelands main causes of premature death: Cardiovascular diseases, cancer, diabetes, obesity			Yes		

Male < 35	Member of a farm family	75-125	Sheep € 1	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	Direct payments should correspond to eco payments. One should not be in danger due to	Yes	No	Yes	Locally led aspects of the eco scheme should be applied to a	Introduce a payment for resource farming of
	raiiii laiilliy							Increasing the profitability of farms will allow for a reduction in direct payments. This can be accomplished through payment for resources such as carbon store/water protection etc				larger area within the sensitive habitats and measures for the more productive areas should have different measures applied.	carbon/water/air quality/rural recreation/tourism beauty
													With more work becoming home based the smaller communities will thrive. Introduce a benefit grant or scheme for local producers to easily access the local market privately or through food chain organisations. Increase the measures for farmers to choose from in the glas etc schemes. Allow for flexability in these choices as farms change. Locking a piece of land into a specific measure for 5 years is difficult, and when the land comes out of this measure the usage may change reducing the effectiveness of this measure. Wild bird cover for example would have allowed populations to increase while food was available but when this is gone there may not be enough food for the population.
Female 55-64	Member of a farm family	75-125	Organic (all € 1 sectors)	100,000	Yes	No	No		Yes	No	Yes		Adequate record keeping of imports of organic grains and food products from EU and non EU countries.
												ether EU countries and acts as a deterrent for Irish farmers to farm organically. Organic farmers should have automatic access to eco-schemes other than GLAS to further boost their environmental and climate performance. Organic payments should be made in parallel with echo schemes. Organic farmers should not have to forgo one payment to allow them inclusion in another scheme as this is totally nonsensical. We should be encouraging all to save the environment not penalizing them for being eco conscious.	HOIT EO COUNTILES.

Male 35-44	Other	Advisor	Tillage	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	No	wide gap in Payments which is partly historic going back to payments in the 90,s plus greening percentage. Use a flat rate of payment per Ha claimed in each year, No Entitlements. Top ups for better environmental practices and top ups for small farmers and certain young farmers where farm investment is needed.	No	No	Need simpler no nonsense rules around payments. Better circumvention of rules. The allowance of 30% features in an eligible parcel is ok,but there are now many parcels, or corners of fields that have been converted to parcels that wont be eligible as they are over 30%, example are old Reps Habitats or the GLAS grove of trees.	Aids for carbon Farming separate from Schemes such as farmers maintaining old grass land, Silver culture, farming with nature,. Aids for on farm production of energy by farmer eg roof solar panels, Digestors or Locality digesters owned and operated by a group of farmers (not through large companies taking chunks of farmland) Aids for Local Farmer Markets providing fresh food, and aids to local farmers supplying these once being farmed in a beneficial way to the environment eg non use of chemicals fertilisers or other chemicals ( almost organic farming without the Organic Label, maybe use of an environment friendly label.)
Male < 35	Other	Land Management Advisor	Sheep	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	Payments need to be allocated to farmers who are a part of a results based system and should be supported with locally led advisors rather than department officials/fresh out of college graduate who have no understanding of that particular farm and land area	No	No	There needs to be more full time roles for projects such as the hen harrier, corncrake and curlew. This will support farmers as they alone cannot save wildlife without help. Lovely hedgerows with bird seed mixes planted along them are lovely but when you have 3+ million hooded crows and 4+ million foxes nothing is managing to survive with theses generalist predators hoovering up everything. Currently these are part time roles for the curlew/hen harriers etc is not sufficient and these birds are continuing to decline steeply. Without full time professional nest protection officers we can wave by to a whole suite of our native ground nesting birds	funded and have an independent panel of stakeholders committed to professional management of our natural resources and most importantly to be honest about what can be accomplished by working together. The whole process will need to be reviewed continuously to ensure things doesn't stagnate as most initiatives do. The era of spending more and more

.

													as a good example is going extinct in front of our very eyes in Ireland and not enough is being done about it. We need action NOW to halt the climate and biodiversity crisis we finds ourselves in before it's too latewe are very close to losing everything and we must never get to that stage for our future generations have a human right to hear the haunting call of the curlew on a late springs afternoon as most of us did growing up. Thank you for your help and for taking my comments on board
Male	Full-time farmer	25-50	Dairy	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	No		No	Yes	Soiled water ban unworkable. If an eight week ban is introduced for spreading, farmers will need 10 weeks storage for soiled water, not the 4 weeks proposed. This will be extraordinarily costly. Soiled water has very little nutrients so surely should be spread when the ground and weather is suitable throughout the winter rather than forcing farmers to spread before and after	the spreading of soiled water using weather forecasting in conjuction with met Eireann, announcing spreading periods for counties when the weather is good during the proposed banned period.
												banned period when the weater my not be suitable. Stating that soiled water and slurry must be kept separate when they need to be mixed to water down slurry to be spread through LESS equipment does not make sense either. Clarification is also needed as to what coverings are suitable to cover outdoor tanks and what is the most effective at preventing ammonia. Some of these proposals do not seem well thought through.	
Male	Part-time farmer	25-50	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No		I think it's very simple, stop prolonging the problem and implement 100% convergence, there is an opportunity here to level the playing field. everyone should have the same payment per hectare for BPS why should I be subsidised less than my neighbour or peer? In no other industry anywhere would this divide be tolerated, it's hard to believe that such a divide exists in a government backed subsidy. I understand some people will suffer decreases in payments but they have had that privilege for far too long, they will learn to adapt like the rest of us to farm on a lower subsidy. I do believe there should be a cap on payments also, or possibility a reducing balance on entitlements at certain thresholds. But yes there needs to be a realistic cap to counteract the greed and willingness of people to try take advantage of the system.		No	I ask those in charge to take advantage of this unique long awaited opportunity, don't take half measures with the aim to trying to keep everyone happy, do what's right and level BPS payments.	The second secon

														also would like to see the so called armchair farmers clamped down on, there is no easy way to do that but I do believe checks on reinvested capital over a few year window might be one way to check the validity of the farmer?
Male 45-54	Full-time farmer	50-75	Sheep	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	No	There is a need to address low value payment entitlements for sheep farmers who were destocked in advance of the reference years plus the historical and outdated nature of the valuation of those entitlements. Being disadvantaged in terms of income also had the effect that many farmers were not in an economic position to take avail of TAMS grants. So they lost out on the double, whereas farmers on high value payments could afford to avail of the grants and develop and progress their farm making it even more profitable. The capping and convergence of payments can only have a positive effect on the wider rural economy and help make		No	No	It is time to create an economic balance for farming which in the long term will provide the means protect rural Ireland both socially, economically and environmentally.	Targeted TAMS for farmers who were on low value payments to help enable them to catch up in terms of farming infrastructure with those who could afford to avail of TAMS grants in the past and in turn finally help make such farms safer, productive and viable in the long term.
Female 55-64	Part-time farmer	25-50	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	No	smaller and medium sized farms an attractive career choice for younger people. Small to medium sized farms must be viable to attract young people to farming and in the long term protect rural Ireland both socially, economically and environmentally.  any capping is unfair. any quota system is unfair. need more incentives for younger people to go into farming.	No	Yes		return payments lost previously to farmers for SCRUB areas as this was a penalty to farmers who CHOOSE to encourage wild life	
													and environmental friendly practices without being forced to do so	could be seen as eco

			1	<b>.</b>			Г	Г			T		
Female 45-54	Other	Member of the public concerned about our environment	Other	€ 100,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes		Yes	No	Yes	I am tired of seeing hedgerows cut to shreds, wetlands drained and the loss of birds, plants, insects. We are losing our wildlife because of intensification of agriculture. It is time for it to stop. Farmers need
													our support but we cannot continue with the same way of farming which is homogenising the landscape in a race to get as much from the land as possible. Society is paying for the profits of corporations. This must stop. Our natural heritage is a critical part of overall heritage. It is as important as traditional music, poetry and prose. Indeed our wildlife was celebrated in songs, poems and stories. Future generations will not thank us. Farming must stop the overloading of fertilisers and nutrients destroying water quality and give land back to the Curlew and Lapwing.
Female 55-64	Part-time farmer	<10	Sheep	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	Ideally direct payments should be linked to results particularly in the eco scheme. There	Yes	No	Yes	
									should be a form of annual ecological monitoring done by the farmer which is sent to and audited by the Dept. This should demonstrate that a change in farming methods leads to improved biodiversity. Farmers should also be paid for three years to stop using N, P & K and to grow plants that improve these in the soil. After four years there would be no need for payment as the crop yields will have improved as the soil improves. This would alleviate fertiliser run-off into waterways, reduce pollution and improve the aquatic environment. Farmers who do no till seed drilling and grow multi species crops simultaneously should also be encouraged to take the leap financially. The improved yields after a couple of years will mean that long-tern payments are not necessary. The current system is unfair to those who are older especially under TAMS. Any farmer of any age should be eligible to improve his/her farm,				
									especially if they are trying use sustainable energy systems etc.				

Female 35-44	Other			€ 66,000		Yes	No	Yes	Currently 90% of the investment goes to male farmers. Only 10% of the land in women's ownership is eligible for basic payments. Analysis reveals further inequalities in payment amounts; on the top and bottom□ 60 CAP payments across 5 counties in the North/West Irish women farmers make up on□ average 3% of the top payments while making up on average 20% of the lowest payments.	Yes	Yes	routes into schemes and supports. Address land transfer for women. Expenditure priorities must address the imbalance and recognise the 74,000 women working on farms and the 16,000 herd owners.	Transfer groups under the next CAP who have at least three women participants. This top-up payment should be in the region of 15% per participant. □ Increase registered farm partnerships - All joint farm partnerships where a woman is a named partner should receive a 60% Targeted Agriculture Modernisation Schemes (TAMS) grant, in the next evolution of □ TAMS in CAP. □ A 35% top-up to annual farm payments for young women farmers under 40 years of age in the next CAP. □ Generational renewal and gender equality - New women entrants over 40 to get a 25% top up on their single farm payment. □ Women must be named as a specific group and Dept of Agriculture set a target to reach a 25% sole or joint female farm ownership □ level within the next CAP
Male 35-44	Member of a farm family	50-75	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %	No	No	No	Complete decoupling, past and present, is the basis of the fairest payment scheme.  The continuation of the 2000-2002 basis for payment, including the ability to consolidate entitlements is unjust.  This was very unfair on farmers who for whatever reason were running a reduced stocking rate in those years or were renting out land. Examples include parents renting out part of the holding until their child is in a position to manage the holding. The continuation also unduly benefits those who, in anticipation of decoupling, used any means including illegal means to maximise their entitlements for the reference years.  The whole purpose of decoupling was to remove any connection between production and payments, but by maintaining a historical	No	Yes	trying to set up a scheme where 90% of farmers can tick enough boxes to qualify for the maximum payment.	

New York Program Country and C					
House graphed a south of a payment to the beginned and the section of the south of				level of support, payments remained coupled	
Interest to the control of the contr				to past production, distorting the market.□	
Interest to the control of the contr					
a way assembled any shelf. Pillerance is a representation of the contract personal and the production in contract personal and the contract personal					
popular thronous policy products and the policy and				keeping the land in good agricultural and	
rorthe detail course are no includation.  The course of th				environmental condition. Differences in	
rorthe detail course are no includation.  The course of th				payment based on past production create an	
confirms as obtained at least one way will have seen and in the control of the co					
here out of fore to each officer to work or make if it is not distort each off the total of the total of the total of the total or the total of the total or the					
cover that the appropriate can be an act and considered and act and act of the trained of applications reported to can be a cell of the trained of applications reported to can be a cell of the trained of applications and act and act of the trained of applications and act and act of the act and act of the act and act and act and act and act and act act and act act and act					
includes the control production in cross to effect the leader of control production of the contr					
settlem at context of parameters. Pergrenary actual for context of the settlem of					
work of an the basis of granular larver more in discluder a wild of protection the more in discluder and in discluder and in the internation of the protection of the protecti				-	
environmental plant and cover and Staffacture of the Staffacture of th					
SMRs, and Julie devicement of SMRs is the other price should be a first price of the state of th					
college system should be facilitied.  Pullifer and registary expected upon designation are could  continued to upoply commission and only and not populate the country of the commission of the country o					
continue to early major various and major various continue out to continue to early (minimum activity and no popularies) for artiflute in a continue to early (minimum activity and no popularies) of a stratificity exit.    Consistence structure to early (minimum activity and no early activity)					
Positive and dispellate conditions could personnel by the control of the condition of the c					
continue to apply (minimum activity and no generate from that states that the product of the minimum activity and no described the minimum activity and not activity to the continue to the co					
continue to apply (minimum activity and no generate from that states that the product of the minimum activity and no described the minimum activity and not activity to the continue to the co				Decitive and negative conditions could	
cammonts for airchitect status.  Exposed a beginned to be accurate prepared for the example prepared for the establishment of the frequency based on this successful establishment after than on the successful establishment and paint of the successful establishment as against farmers who later been family in an establishment and establishment are successful establishment and establishment and establishment are successful establishment and establishment and establishment are successful establishment and establishment and establishment are successful establishment and establishment and establishment are successful establishment and establishment and establishment and establishment are successful establishment and establishment					
Los schemes anoud de results- carber than achino-based, for susample systems for the achino-based for susample systems for the susample systems fo					
actions based, for example, payment for the scalabilithment of a hodgrow based on its successful idealabilithment author than on the based of its initial planning.  Many coo-schomes discriminate against farmers were have been farming in an accopyably sensitive manner. Establishment of hodgrows has been supported in various software and the cleation of acciding and the school of the control of the properties of the properti				payments for airstrips etc.)	
actions based, for example, payment for the scalabilithment of a hodgrow based on its successful idealabilithment author than on the based of its initial planning.  Many coo-schomes discriminate against farmers were have been farming in an accopyably sensitive manner. Establishment of hodgrows has been supported in various software and the cleation of acciding and the school of the control of the properties of the properti					
establishment of a hedgerow based on its successful catalishment labor than on the basis of its infall planting  Many excandeness discontinuous against fairness who have been fairning in an coologically sensitive manner. Establishment of hedgerows has been supported in various statemens, and the restablishment of enedgesian focus eroses such as similar consistences, and the restablish of escopical focus eroses such as similar consistences, and the restablishment of escopical focus eroses such as similar consistences areas have historically board in description of the similar consistences areas have historically board in activation of the despite me fact that a natural or established feature is much more volubulate than an artificially created one. In some cases of farmers cleared natural woold acreas marked as inetigitale across one of significant control of the plant inces on the same displace, they could be per familiare on the same displace, they could be per familiare on the same displace, they could be per familiare on the same displace, they could be per familiare on the same of the same of the cornect of market and the linear or mes-biased payment, with a runtiplipal for large formation of the same of the cornect of market and the linear or mes-biased payment, with a runtiplipal for large formation of the same  Purdamentally, land should a strate a basic payment, with a runtiplipal for large formation of the same					
successful calabilithment stand to the not be basis of its initial planting."  Many occadement discriminate against farmers with have been forming in an evologically sensitive mainter. Establishment of hedgework has been supported in various schemes, and the credition of evolutional focus states such as small copes, however these such as small copes, however these such as small copes, however these payment, and their release such as small copes, however these payment, and their release such as small copes, however these payment, and their release such as small copes, however these payment, and their release such as small copes, however these small copes, however the small copes and sm					
I want you sections to list an interest position of the formation of the f					
Many eco-schemes discriminate against farmers who have been farming in an ocologically sensitive manner. Establishment of hedgerows has been supported in various and ocologically sensitive manner. Establishment of hedgerows has been supported in various and sensitive sensitiv					
farmers who have been farming in an ecologically sensitive manner. Establishment of hedgerows has been supported in various schemes, and the creation of ecological flocus areas such as small copses, however these areas have historically been coulded from payment, and their returnion is not supported, dought the fact that a ratural or established material in many payment, and their returnion is not supported, dought the fact that a ratural or established material in many payment, and the returnion of established material in many payment, and the state of the				basis of its initial planting. □	
farmers who have been farming in an ecologically sensitive manner. Establishment of hedgerows has been supported in various schemes, and the creation of ecological flocus areas such as small copses, however these areas have historically been coulded from payment, and their returnion is not supported, dought the fact that a ratural or established material in many payment, and their returnion is not supported, dought the fact that a ratural or established material in many payment, and the returnion of established material in many payment, and the state of the					
ecologically sensitive manner. Establishment of hedgerows has been supported in various schemes, and the crestion of acological focus areas have historically been excluded from permons and their rotations is not supported. If you are the control of the control				· ·	
of hedgerows has been supported in various schemes, and the crusion of ecological facus areas such as small oopses, however these arous have historically been arcluded from payment, and their retention is not supported, despite the fact that a natural or established feature is much more valuable than an intificially occasion on an intificially occasion on an intificially occasion on an intificially occasion on an intificial occasion of the supported of the supp					
schemes, and the creation of ecological focus areas such as small coppess, however these areas have historically been excluded from payment, and their retention is not supported, despite the fact that a natural or established feature is much more valuable than an artificially created one. In some cases if farmore cleared natural wooded areas marked as ineligible stret wood as marked the land eligible, they could then plant trees on the new eligible land, maintaining its eligibility. If hodgenows and smalls woodlands are to be valued as habitats, then there should be linear or area-based payments for the correct maintenance of enisting hedgenows in situ.					
areas such as small copes. however these areas have historically been excluded from payment, and their retention is not supported, despite the fact that a natural or established feature is much more valuable than an artificially created on maps, in order to make a similar processor of the proce					
areas have historically been excluded from payment, and then retention is not supported, despite the fact that a natural or established feature is much more valuable than an artificially created one. In some cases if farmers cleared natural wooded areas marked as incligible scruto on maps, in order to make the land eligible, they could then plant trees on the now eligible land, maintaining its eligibility. If hedgerows and small woodlends are to be valued as habitats, then there should be linear or area-based payments for the correct maintenance of existing hedgerows in situ.					
payment, and their retention is not supported, despite the fact that a natural or established leature is much more valuable than an artificialty created one, is nowe cases if farmers cleared natural wooded areas marked as ineligible sortub or maps, in order to make the land eligible, they could then plant trees on the now eligible land, maintaining its eligiblity. If hedgerows and small woodlands are to be valued as habitats, then thore should be linear or area-based payments for the correct maintanance of existing hedgerows in situ."  If rundamentally, land should attract a basic payment, with a multiplier for agricultural condition (0-1) based on its condition relative to optimal agricultural condition (0-1) based on its condition relative to optimal agricultural condition (0-1) based on its condition relative to optimal agricultural condition of the land. I Eco scheme payments, which should exceed 25% of payments, should apply to land on a similar basis, but with a priority multiplier (0-1) and an environmental condition oftitiplier (0-1) and an environmental condition multiplier (0-1), so for example a pristlen Rohura site would				·	
despite the fact that a natural or established feature is much more valuable than an artificially created one. In some cases if farmers cleared natural wooded areas marked as ineligible. Sex out on maps, in order to make the land eligible, they could then plant trees on the now eligible land, maintaining its eligibility. If hedgenows and small woodlands are to be valued as habitats, then there should be linear or area-based payments for the correct maintenance of existing hedgenows in situ.□  □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □				areas have historically been excluded from	
feature is much more valuable than an artificially treated one. In some cases if atmers cleared natural wooded areas marked as ineligible scrub on maps, in order to make the land eligible, they could then plant traces on the now eligible land, maintaining its eligibility. If hedgerows and small woodlands are to be valued as habitats, then there should be linear or area-based payments for the correct maintenance of existing hedgerows in situ. □    Fundamentally, land should attract a basic payment, with a multiplier for agricultural condition (0-1) based on its condition relative to optimal agricultural condition of the land. □   Eco scheme payments, which should exceed 25% of payments, should apply to land on a similar basis, but with a promy multiplier (0-1) and an environmental condition multiplier (0-1), so for example a pristine Natura's let would				payment, and their retention is not supported,	
artificially created one. In some cases if farmers cleared natural wooded areas marked as ineligible scrub on maps, in order to make the land eligible, they could then plant trees on the now eligible land, maintaining its eligibility. If hedgerows and small woodlands are to be valued as habitats, then there should be linear or area-based payments for the correct maintenance of existing hedgerows in situ. \( \)				despite the fact that a natural or established	
farmers cleared natural wooded areas marked as ineligible scrub on maps, in order to make the land eligible, they could then plant trees on the now eligible land, maintaining its eligibility. If hedgerows and small woodlands are to be valued as habitats, then there should be linear or area-based payments for the correct maintenance of existing hedgerows in situ    Description				feature is much more valuable than an	
as ineligible, they could then plant trees on the now eligible that, was could then plant trees on the now eligible land, maintaining its eligibility. If hedgerows and small woodlands are to be valued as habitats, then there should be linear or area-based payments for the correct maintenance of existing hedgerows in situ. U				artificially created one. In some cases if	
the land eligible, they could then plant trees on the now eligible land, maintaining its eligibility. If hedgerows and small woodlands are to be valued as habitats, then there should be linear or area-based payments for the correct maintenance of existing hedgerows in situ. □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □				farmers cleared natural wooded areas marked	
the land eligible, they could then plant trees on the now eligible land, maintaining its eligibility. If hedgerows and small woodlands are to be valued as habitats, then there should be linear or area-based payments for the correct maintenance of existing hedgerows in situ. □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □				as ineligible scrub on maps, in order to make	
the now eligible land, maintaining its eligibility.  If hedgerows and small woodlands are to be valued as habitats, then there should be linear or area-based payments for the correct maintenance of existing hedgerows in situ.     Compared to the content of the correct maintenance of existing hedgerows in situ.				·	
If hedgerows and small woodlands are to be valued as habitats, then there should be linear or area-based payments for the correct maintenance of existing hedgerows in situ. □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □					
valued as habitals, then there should be linear or area-based payments for the correct maintenance of existing hedgerows in situ. □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □					
or area-based payments for the correct maintenance of existing hedgerows in situ. □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □					
maintenance of existing hedgerows in situ.				· ·	
Fundamentally, land should attract a basic payment, with a multiplier for agricultural condition (0-1) based on its condition relative to optimal agricultural condition of the land.   Eco scheme payments, which should exceed 25% of payments, should exceed 25% of payments, should apply to land on a similar basis, but with a priority multiplier (0-1) and an environmental condition multiplier (0-1), so for example a pristine Natura site would					
payment, with a multiplier for agricultural condition (0-1) based on its condition relative to optimal agricultural condition of the land. □  Eco scheme payments, which a pollud exceed 25% of payments, should apply to land on a similar basis, but with a priority multiplier (0-1) and an environmental condition multiplier (0-1), so for example a pristine Natura site would					
payment, with a multiplier for agricultural condition (0-1) based on its condition relative to optimal agricultural condition of the land. □  Eco scheme payments, which a pollud exceed 25% of payments, should apply to land on a similar basis, but with a priority multiplier (0-1) and an environmental condition multiplier (0-1), so for example a pristine Natura site would					
payment, with a multiplier for agricultural condition (0-1) based on its condition relative to optimal agricultural condition of the land. □  Eco scheme payments, which a pollud exceed 25% of payments, should apply to land on a similar basis, but with a priority multiplier (0-1) and an environmental condition multiplier (0-1), so for example a pristine Natura site would					
payment, with a multiplier for agricultural condition (0-1) based on its condition relative to optimal agricultural condition of the land. □  Eco scheme payments, which a pollud exceed 25% of payments, should apply to land on a similar basis, but with a priority multiplier (0-1) and an environmental condition multiplier (0-1), so for example a pristine Natura site would				Fundamentally, land should attract a basic	
condition (0-1) based on its condition relative to optimal agricultural condition of the land. □ Eco scheme payments, which should exceed 25% of payments, should apply to land on a similar basis, but with a priority multiplier (0-1) and an environmental condition multiplier (0-1), so for example a pristine Natura site would				· ·	
to optimal agricultural condition of the land. □ Eco scheme payments, which should exceed 25% of payments, should apply to land on a similar basis, but with a priority multiplier (0-1) and an environmental condition multiplier (0-1), so for example a pristine Natura site would					
Eco scheme payments, which should exceed 25% of payments, should apply to land on a similar basis, but with a priority multiplier (0-1) and an environmental condition multiplier (0-1), so for example a pristine Natura site would					
25% of payments, should apply to land on a similar basis, but with a priority multiplier (0-1) and an environmental condition multiplier (0-1), so for example a pristine Natura site would					
similar basis, but with a priority multiplier (0-1) and an environmental condition multiplier (0-1), so for example a pristine Natura site would					
and an environmental condition multiplier (0-1), so for example a pristine Natura site would					
so for example a pristine Natura site would					
Score i i, write a crop monoculture with poor					
				Score i i, wille a crop monoculture with poor	

									biodiversity indicators may score 0.1*0. Payments relating to features should apply and be similarly adjusted.  Ecological payments may be tapered for large holdings, as for example the organic payment tapers after 60Ha, however the tapering should not taper to the same degree as for the organic payments, as this would present an effective disincentive for larger farmers to consider farming in an ecologically sensitive manner, which may require more labour on large holdings and hence drive up costs, but would provide employment as well as ecological benefits.			
Male 35-44	Full-time farmer	50-75	Organic (all sectors)	€ 66,000	85%	Yes	No	Yes	Entitlement values based on farm performance No from almost 20years ago. Alot of farmers with high entitlement values farm to break even and distort mart prices.	No	Yes	With regard to organic farming: □ There needs to be a higher payment rate per hectare for
												the organic scheme, greater than or equivalent to the payment rates offered in the REAP scheme. There is of course environmental benefits attributed to the reap scheme but the fact remains, farmers are being paid to farm a little more "organically" but not being able to avail of market premiums for organic produce. It is highly subsidised food being sold as a commodity. Some farmers took the easy option of higher payment rates in reap while still being able to use fertiliser etc. There should be no exclusion of organic farmers from these eco schemes. □  In relation to allocation of organic funding; a specific body within bord bia should take control of promoting organic produce at home and abroad. This will drive the sector forward and should help to increase premiums/ demand. The message and provenance of organic food is not clear amongst customers. There is widespread view that an organic label is applied just so the retailer can charge more. There is no understanding in the public of the certification body's, record keeping organic

							<u> </u>		1			1			Trecord recepting, organic
															standards and audits. □ Given the land area targets
															for organic farming, it is
															essential that an organic
															demonstration farm be
															established for trials and
															research. The Teagasc
															Solohead farm is reasonably central and is currently doing
															alot of work on zero N clover
															systems. It is ideally placed.
															With regard to agroforestry:
															there needs to be greater
															flexibility in this area.
															Currently agroforestry is classed in the very same
															way as forestry and as such
															can not revert back to
															agricultural use. I may not
															have the correct terms but
															essence of my point is that
															agroforestry can in some
															instances be short to medium term or the
															layout/placement of tree lines
															may be added to or reduced
															over time. Minimum tree
															numbers per hectare and the
															reclassification of land are
															disincentives for me personally. However I do
															believe even a small number
															of trees added would have
															benefits for the environment
															and biodiversity. There is
															huge potential in this area to
															meet tree planting targets
															without reducing our capacity to produce food. □
Male	< 35	Member of a	10-25	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %	No	No	Yes	Convergence at 90%	No	No	No	I find the proposal to cap the	- Keep things simple. There
Iviale		farm family	10-20	Beel	2 00,000	- 00 /0				Convergence at 5070	110	140		suckler herd very disheartening.	are so many new schemes
														January Januar	and new obligations on
															farmers now that it is
															impossible to keep up. Slow
														would be to maximise efficiency on	100000
														the farm with regard to existing facilities on the farm and land	to think about their options and do what is right for their
														available in order to provide an	farms. All new schemes need
															to be very clear on how they
														sustainable enterprise for the next	
														generation. It would be extremely	requirement on farmers are
														frustrating if increasing the number	

											of livestock on the farm was a way to do this but I was prevented in doing so by the department. It is a strange and dangerous thing for the government to put a limit on the ambition of the young people in the country.□  I think farmers have shown great awareness and engagement with regard to environmental issues and climate change and are more than willing to cooperate with sensible schemes to negate the impact of farming on the environment.  Putting a cap on or reducing the suckler herd in Ireland is not a sensible option, particularly when other countries are increasing their numbers while people's livelihoods here in such a small country are hugely impacted. I think farmers are taking far more than their fair share of the burden when it comes to tackling climate issues. The response needs to be balanced across all sectors and then proportionate within each sector so to see suckler farmers (mainly the west of Ireland) targeted with such a crude measure that would have such a huge impact on livelihoods is worrying. In any case, I think this is a measure the farmers of Ireland will simply refuse to accept.	
Female	45-54	Part-time farmer	<10	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	We need to reward rather than penalise farmers who are doing the right thing in regard to climate change and biodiversity. We need to include active strategies for biodiversity, seed saving, hedgerow development, basic farm payment, gender equality. At the moment small horticultural producers can't live on their income and yet only 1% of our farms grow vegetables, the lowest in Europe. 75% of those who applied for the organic farming scheme last year were refused so we are not supporting those farmers who want to be part of the solution	No	Yes	'guardians of the land' etc□ □ Some key issues that need to be resolved:□ □ Ending chemical pollution□ □ •Stop poisioning the soils and	☐ More supports for diverse farmers and gender equality ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Ending chemical pollution ☐ ☐ ● Stop poisioning the soils and waterways with chemicals as a matter of urgency and penalise, rather than reward, farmers who do

	• There have already been	significant cases taken
	significant cases taken aga	nst against Monsanto
	Monsanto internationally so	why is internationally so why is
	Ireland still not banning rout	ndup, Ireland still not banning
		tions on roundup, knowing the
	health and biodiversity loss	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		health and biodiversity
	Supporting Local Organic F	
	Production	
		Supporting Local Organic
	•Why can't Ireland become	
	Leading Green Organic Foo	
	Producer in the world? We	
	the soil, fresh Atlantic air ar	
	rain! □	Food Producer in the world?
		oport for We have the soil, fresh
	growers of organic vegetab	
	Why were 75% of farming	•We need more tangible
		years support for growers of
	organic farming scheme?	
	•We need to become more	
	sufficient in our food produc	• •
	encouraging more local, org	
	food and less reliance on in	nports. scheme?□
	At the moment we are impo	rting •We need to become more
	70% of all organic produce	which self sufficient in our food
	results in increased air mile	
	carbon footprint. □	local, organic food and less
	•Organic food production bu	_
	rather than depletes soil, is	•
	healthy and nutritious and a	
	pollution of our land and wa	
	sources.	miles and carbon footprint.
	•We need to be able to mee	•
		vegan builds rather than depletes
		_
	and vegetarian diets around	•
	world.	nutritious and avoids
	•Develop a formal internship	•
	programme in the horticultu	
		farmers  •We need to be able to meet
		people the growing demand for
		nvolved organic vegan and
	in horticulture □	vegetarian diets around the
	•Build a market for local org	
	food in ireland. We need a	•
	resourced national PR cam	
	There is no marketing of clean	sector to provide labour for
	organic food in Ireland and	this farmers and also incentive
	must change. We need to s	upport for young people to take ove
		umers farms and get involved in
	through a range of measure	<u> </u>
		al retail •Build a market for local
	outlets. □	organic food in ireland. We
		munity need a well-resourced
	initiatives to ensure resilien	
	local level (community alloti	. •
	school gardens, local marke	•
	etc)	this must change. We need
	Dublic Dresumanast	to support growers to reach
	Public Procurement □	their consumers through a
		range of measures from

		•Introduce new procurement	farmers markets to traditional
		guidelines for all public serv	
			of food of the fo
			ecially   community initiatives to
		in schools, hospitals and pu	
		buildings	level (community allotments,
			latory school gardens, local
		for all state instirutions to pro	
		· ·	Public Procurement□
		local organic food in their	
		resturants or food service. T	
		this in Copenhagen in 2007	_
		now 90% of food in public	guidelines for all public
		institutions is coming from lo	
		organic food producers □	organic food supply/circular
			economy especially in
		Labeling and Branding □	schools, hospitals and public
			buildings
		•Need clear labeling to link	•Policies which make it
		ingredients to farms - production	
		Ireland means nothing exce	
		we make a profit on ingredie	
		from anywhere else □	resturants or food service.
		•Need to identify all chemica	s used They did this in Copenhagen
		in the process which are cur	rently in 2007 and now 90% of food
		not listed (e.g. acid sprayed	on in public institutions is
		grain) (See Joanna Blythma	n's coming from local organic
		book 'Swallow This')□	food producers□
		Move from Meat to Veg	Labeling and Branding□
		production□	
			•Need clear labeling to link
		•We need to move from bee	and ingredients to farms -
		dairy to more diversification	and produced in Ireland means
		organic horticulture. □	nothing except that we make
		•The current system of food	
		production is unsutainable for	j .
		families, rural communities a	
		detrimtal to biodiversity and	
		climate. □	process which are currently
		International Actions / Globa	-
		Solidarity □	on grain) (See Joanna
		•We also need to greatly exp	, ,
		our support for food systems	
		countries around the world v	,
		most susceptible to climate	Move from Meat to Veg
		change. What happens whe	
		farm is underwater and your	
		source is completley cut off?	
		need to take our international	
		responsibilites very seriously	
		support those most in need.	
			production is unsutainable
		Seedsaving □	for farm families, rural
			communities and is detrimtal
		•We urgenIty need more	to biodiversity and the
		investment in seedsaving as	
			nat we International Actions / Global
		are saving heritage seeds a	
		support organisations who d	
		/Drown Envolone Coods Iris	h ovpond our oupport for food
		(Brown Envelope Seeds, Iris	h expand our support for food systems in the countries

							plant native speices througout the island to protect against climate events  •Bring international speakers like Vandana Shiva from India to Ireland to inform policy and action   Biodiversity and Native Woodland   We need to support farmers to support biodiversity and plant native woodland.	change. What happens when your farm is underwater and your food source is completley cut off? We need to take our international responsibilites very seriously
Female	55-64 Full-time farmer	25-50 Organic (all sectors)	€ 66,000 > 85 %	Yes No	Current system benefitted large farmers by focusing on historical payments. All three mentioned mechanisms are necessary to save our smaller farms and our environment.	Yes		schemes in order to acheive a just transition.

					specifics mentioned for organics. This means specific grant aid for the hemp/flax sector in line with EU Commission committments to the sectors.
Male	< 35 Full-time farmer	25-50 Dairy	€ 100,000 85% Yes	No Yes I believe it can be done to an even balance for all farmers.	Simple schemes that are useful to farmers and not so many terms and conditions and penalties. Suckler farmers should have the option to increase their number to their land size. What difference does it make. KT discussion groups should be 1.30mins long.  farmers are not enthusiastic to attend if it is 2 hours and 2 hours means farmers dont pay attention in the last 45minutes. Beef farmers have to make a living from their work and there has to be incentives for farmers to want to farm their land otherwise all the jobs (meal suppliers, fertiliser suppliers and local co ops) will have no next generation farmers to support their industries. Farmers seem to be supporting other jobs more than themselves. Farmers will not join any scheme without asking questions. If they are not pleased with the terms and conditions they will simply not join and this results in unspent funds. The government knows what farmers want at this stage. Farmers are willing to adapt especially enthusiastic farmers under 40. This means there should be many incentives for generational renewal e.g. early retirement scheme.

Male 35-44	Full-time	25-50	Beef	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	The main problem with the current and No	Yes	Yes	Capping The Suckler cow numbers	Generational Renewal not
Widio   OO 11	farmer	20 00	Bool	C 00,000	5 00 70	100			Previous CAP format is that the Pillar 1 Direct	100		is wrong and a clear indication of a	
									Payment is intrinsically linked to a certain type			willingness to sacrifice Suckler	scheme Ireland once had.
									of farming activity ( Namely intensively			farmers so the dairy industry can	Gender Balance needs
									Finishing Male Cattle for Irish beef Factories )			pollute Ireland even further in the	addressing also.
									which occurred during 3 Reference years over			name of corporate profits and	_
									20 years ago. Now leaving out the length of			shareholder returns.	
									time that has passed since those Reference				
									years a huge inequality in how Pillar 1 Farm				
									income supports are distributed is that it				
									actually takes on no consideration of what the				
									various Farmer incomes are before CAP				
									income support is directed out. We have lived				
									through 2 decades of the farmers with the				
									highest incomes from their farms before Farm				
									Subsidy is taken into account receiving the				
									highest rates of income supports from CAP				
									and those Farmers on the lowest incomes				
									receiving the least, beggars belief really				
									doesn't it. This anomaly has been truly				
									exacerbated by the explosion of the Dairy				
									Sector, Teagasc figures stating Dairy Farmers have an average annual income of 79000 euro				
									albeit with CAP supports included those				
									supports apparently accounting for around				
									25000 euro of their income, so a scenario				
									where a farmer is earning 53000 euro in profit				
									from his farm and along comes another 25000				
									euro of EU income support at the back end of				
									each year. Now you might argue this Dairy				
									Farmer is getting the 25000 euro for the public				
									and environmental good he is doing in his area				
									on his farm but we all know that to be				
									completely wrong as he is the biggest				
									producer of methane Gas and biggest user of				
									nitrogen and pesticides in his area, so the				
									biggest offenders get rewarded for damage				
									done annually. Feedlots receiving large				
									amounts of PILLAR 1 monies is very hard to				
									justify to anyone i would add, again force				
									feeding large numbers of cattle, sheep and				
									pigs in a totally unnatural environment just				
									because it makes the owners or beef factories				
									more wealthy doesn't really tally with all this				
									environmental concern we are claiming to be				
									interested in now. □				
									I suggest a very useful and fair way to deal				
									with the distribution of Pillar 1 Supports would				
				<del></del>			<del></del>		be to link in with another state body, namely				
									Revenue Commissioners and find out how				
									much profit the different entities in the state				
									engaged in Farming are making and simply				
									target the CAP monies at the sectors making				
									the least in an ascending order with those				
									making the least from farming subsidized the				
									strongest and those making the most				
									subsidized the least. Makes a lot of sense				
									really when you take time to consider it. Our				
									Department is always talking about better				
									targeting supports at where it is genuinely				
									needed so in a nutshell there is a way.				
									Teagasc seem to have loads of data on the				
									various farm sector incomes so that would be				
									a useful guide too. Front loading of payments				
									is a must happen in Ireland to try and right				
									some of the gross wrongs of the past and				
									present. For the sake of Family Farms in				
									Ireland will you our leaders please intervene in some way to assure these honest hardworking				
<u> </u>						I						l .	1

									kind compassionate people a living on their Farms. Please.		
Male < 35	Full-time farmer	50-75	Beef	€ 66,000	85%	No	No	No	I think that the redistribution can be unfair as in many cases this will take money away from middle sized farms who are depending on this money and give it to smaller farms where income from farming is not depended on as much.	Yes	I believe that the proposed suckler scheme is currently too harsh. To not allow someone to increase numbers is unfair especiall When there can be a change in circumstances such as obtaining more land or maybe someone might only have gotten into the sector in recent years and does not have a high number. Worst case scenario should be that even if someone increases numbers they are only paid on their reference number. Additionally where new schemes replace existing schemes it would be bizarre if the payments per head are not considerably higher than their predecessors considering that farmers payments are going to be cut. Payments need to at least replace the money that is being taken from farmers in both their current bps and schemes such as beep , bdgp and the sheep welfare scheme.
Female 45-54	Full-time farmer	75-125	Dairy	€ 100,000	85%	No	Yes	Yes	Pay to active farmers. This does NOT include No meat plant owners, politicians, organised crime bosses, plc's unless farm companies, and any other entity not engaged in active farming.	Yes	No  There has been farming in Ireland for over 5,000yrs., that we know of. I am a farmer, my father & could include a gender grandfather & great grandfather were all farmers, working with Nature & 'The Environment' to  Introduce a new Early Retirement Scheme. This could include a gender incentive if so required.

											produce wonderful organic, sustainable food. My father farmed like this for the first of his farming life. Then the 'experts' got involved. They started 'advising' the people who had been doing this for over 5,000years! The latter of my Dad's farming life was based on the 'experts' advice. Now we have global warming and climate change. Now we think different 'experts' are going to fix these problems. Our income is going to be based on their opinions, with no clue of farming. Their income will also be based on this but will not flucuate and will only increase. And at the end of their stint, we will probably have only a greater mess. By the way, My Dad is still alive, so it is only in the very recent past that all this damage has come about.	
Male 35-44	Full-time farmer	75-125	Tillage	€ 66,000	> 85 %	Yes	No	Yes	What is unfair is that direct payments are being held like a property, these are supposed to be a subsidy yet anyone can buy them and apply for them in any sector, in my knowledge of the history of EU farm subsidy they are supposed to support the lower income sectors yet there is now no limitations to what any one sector can be paid. Personally I think subsidys should at least be part coupled back to the tillage and meat producers with strong environmental measures applied. I also was in the forgotten farmer group which was pretty unfair. Plus because of my lower entitlement value tillage farmer have to avail of the eco scheme glas which I am ok with but I look at my plus neighbours and I see every acre tilled ditch to ditch. My dairy neighbours are the same. Eco needs to be enforced to everyone but there has to be a way to show farmers that eco is ok. le.	No	Lower the capping figure and redistribute to lower and medium sized holdings to try get more farmers to stay on the land. As I said to my IFA man no body needs to be receiving more than 50k in supports as they're farm should be earning well enough for them at that stage of acerage	

Reduced production, less produce should mean better prices