

Rural Affairs and Environment Committee

Climate Change (Scotland) Bill Submission from Scottish Environment LINK

Scottish Environment LINK (LINK) welcomes the opportunity to give written and oral evidence to the Committee on the forestry proposals in the Climate Change (Scotland) Bill. Established in 1987, LINK is the forum for Scotland's voluntary environment organisations - 33 member bodies representing a broad spectrum of environmental interests with the common goal of contributing to a more environmentally sustainable society. LINK provides a forum and network for its member organisations, enabling informed debate, and assisting co-operation within the voluntary environmental sector. LINK assists communication between member bodies, government and its agencies and other sectors within civic society. Acting at local, national and international levels, LINK aims to ensure that the environment is fully recognised in the development of policy and legislation affecting Scotland.

Introduction

In principle we welcome the fresh look at how the Forestry Commission Scotland (FCS) can deliver for climate change but we are particularly uncomfortable, as we have highlighted before¹, with woodland creation for carbon sequestration becoming the primary driver for the government and the National Forest Estate (NFE). LINK has repeatedly expressed its view that the best way to respond to climate change is to first reduce green house gas emissions by moving away from carbon based energy production, reducing energy consumption and energy loss. We see carbon sequestration as one of the secondary responses that feature further down the list of the multiple benefits forestry provides.

The plans proposed in the recent consultation and the enabling powers in the Climate Change (Scotland) Bill are controversial and as yet, they have not been fully explained or costed. Our detailed concerns on these proposals are presented below.

It is LINK's view that these proposals require more considered thought and discussion. As a result we are unhappy with the wide reaching enabling powers in Section 47, Sub-sections 1, 2 and 4 being included in the Bill. Rather we would like to see any specific powers that may be identified, brought forward in the future, after they have been properly explored and consulted upon.

We do however welcome the inclusion of Sub-section 3, a), b), c) and d) (i) which allows the FCS to enter into joint ventures for renewable energy projects because these proposals are specific, directly relevant to the Bill's aims, and help to enable objectives already set out in the Scottish Forestry Strategy (SFS).

Question 1. Do you envisage that the Forestry Commission could play a greater role than it does at present in reducing greenhouse gas emissions or in alleviating or responding to the effects of climate change? If so, what suggestions would you make?

It is LINK's view that there has been a clear change in policy drivers for forestry in the last 18 months, in favour of forestry and woodland creation for climate change 'mitigation'. LINK has

¹ Scottish Environment LINK Woodland Task Force papers: *Forestry policy and carbon sequestration in Scotland* (Ministerial Briefing, 2008); *Scottish Forestry Strategy consultation response* (2006); *Environment Review Group Report* (2006).

always accepted that creating new woodland contributes to the process of carbon sequestration but it cannot sequester more than a small proportion of the total carbon emissions generated each year.

Government efforts to reduce CO₂ emissions are best concentrated on mitigation activities such as better insulation of the existing housing and office stock, reduction of transport emissions and restructuring our energy supply away from carbon based energy sources.

The National Forest Estate, whilst having a role to play in carbon sequestration, has a greater role to play in climate change adaptation and making space for nature. Unfortunately climate change adaptation has not been properly considered in these forestry proposals.

Therefore, LINK believes, carbon sequestration should not be a primary driver for woodland creation. Rather it should be one of a range of benefits arising from long term, multi-benefit forestry. This would mean carbon storage can be assured in perpetuity and the woodland creation can provide additional benefits to society, such as new and enhanced public access, greater biodiversity, and landscape maintenance and enhancement.

LINK believes that to properly address these issues and to look at the role of carbon across all types of land use in Scotland, we need a Sustainable Land Use Strategy to be implemented a holistic approach to integrated land use and delivery of multiple public benefits.

Question 2. Do you consider that either of the Government's consultation proposals (on entering into joint ventures and on leasing cutting rights) would enhance the Forestry Commission's role in dealing with greenhouse gas emissions and climate change?

JOINT VENTURES:

In principle we have no objection to legislation being amended to allow FCS to undertake joint ventures with renewable energy companies, subject to appropriate safeguards, because we support the principle of injecting new resources into forestry and climate change delivery. These joint ventures would be directly contributing to the government's renewable energy targets and could provide funding and expertise in developing our renewable energy sector.

Any joint ventures would require careful consideration and we would expect safeguards to be in place to prevent inappropriate developments and an adverse effect to habitats that must be retained to enable adaptation to climate change. These safeguards should include the following requirements:

- That there is protection for other public benefits such as: Plantation Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS), woods of high nature conservation value, biodiversity, priority open ground habitats, public access and recreation provision.
- That FCS will undertake full Environmental Impact Assessments on the joint ventures.
- That all proposals will follow the full planning process and any supplementary planning guidance on preferred locations for renewable projects.

Any money raised from such ventures would need to be properly reinvested in climate change actions and a protocol may need to be developed to ensure this delivers the greatest possible environmental benefit, including emissions reductions and wildlife adaptation.

CUTTING RIGHTS

There is considerable concern that by implementing this proposal, other non-timber production public benefits would not be well served. This is largely because the income that the FCS

generates from the leased production forest may impact on other multi-benefit forestry it carries out on the rest of the estate.

For these proposals to be considered further, LINK would expect that:

- The economic case is properly laid out. This has not yet happened and therefore it is not possible for us to comment on the financial aspects of the proposals with any confidence.
- A full and satisfactory Strategic Environmental Assessment is undertaken on the fully costed proposals.
- A proper assessment is undertaken of the impact on the remaining FCS activities and ability to deliver the SFS. At present the FCS carry out a complicated balance of economic, social and environmental activities (including for the landscape and the historic environment) within their forests. Transferring the more commercial parts of the national estate for a period of perhaps 75 years could potentially and severely constrain funding of the social and environmental aspects of FCS activities.
- There is a full explanation of how enhanced delivery of non-market benefits will take place. For example meeting the commitments of the Scottish Biodiversity Strategy, UK Biodiversity Action Plan, EU Birds and Habitats Directive and the biodiversity theme of the SFS.
- Evidence is provided that all the capital raised from the leases would be reinvested into forestry and associated climate change actions. So far there have only verbal 'in principle' assurances which are inadequate. In the absence of clearly set out protocols and structures we are not be able to further consider the proposals.
- Accessibility must be retained if the land is leased. There is a significant difference between a right to access and accessibility.
- Any company or body leasing the land would have to ensure that the land was certified against the UK Woodland Assurance Standard (UKWAS) for the entirety of the lease.

There is concern that releasing over 100,000ha of new land into the Scottish Rural Development Programme (SRDP) may lead to increased competition for woodland management funds, without increasing the SRDP budget. LINK would wish to see assurances that high quality land management for biodiversity, landscape conservation, historic environment and access would not lose out.

Question 3. Do you envisage any implications for nature conservation, biodiversity or recreational interests from the two proposals and, if so, what are they?

LINK is concerned that the woodland expansion elements of these proposals could threaten the conservation of open ground habitats and species, either by woodland creation, or lost opportunities to restore such habitats. For that reason, LINK urges the Scottish Government and its delivery bodies not to repeat the woodland expansion mistakes of the past, and to actively reverse the biodiversity damage created by inappropriate afforestation. Woodland expansion in Scotland must be carried out sensitively to ensure the protection and enhancement of important biodiversity and the delivery of multiple public benefits.



Question 4. Do you believe there are any implications for rural employment from the two proposals and, if so, what are they?

LINK does not have a specific view on the employment implication of these proposals because it is largely outside of our members' direct remit. We would however say that we would not want to see a reduction of actively managed woodland in Scotland and it would be a disadvantage to the forestry sector if valuable skills and knowledge is not retained within the industry.

Question 5. Do you have any other views on these two proposals from the Government?

Within the FCS consultation document, there was a suggestion of creating a not-for profit trust (NFPT). This suggestion strongly implies a social and environmental purpose for such a body (i.e. public rather than commercial benefit), as well as some stakeholder representation in its governance arrangements, but this is not explicit in the proposals and that gives us some cause for concern.

LINK would need to see the following guarantees in order to further consider the proposal:

- All income from the lease of land and cutting rights to be invested through the NFPT into multiple public benefits through forestry and related climate change actions. This means investment in climate change adaptation as well as 'mitigation'.
- The NFPT is constituted to deliver forestry related public benefits and priorities as laid out in the Scottish Forestry Strategy and in particular in relation to climate change 'mitigation' and adaptation.
- The NFPT will enable creation of significant areas of new native woodland.
- All woodland creation funded through the new structure should be UKWAS certified.

LINK would not support the idea of the NFPT using lease and cutting rights income to solely create new production forests. All new woodland created should be multi-purpose and provide significant public benefit. If the NFPT creates new woodland in the same proportion as the current estate, it will create 87% exotic species – this would be contrary to the vision of the SFS and would not be supported by LINK. In order to achieve the current SFS vision, more than 6,000 hectares of native woodland is required per annum for the next 50 years (35% of the enlarged forest cover of 25% land area). We cannot see the logic of the NFPT creating more production forest to sell or lease off and create more in a cyclical fashion.

**LINK Woodland Task Force
3 February 2009**

The following member organisations have agreed this statement:

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| Archaeology Scotland | Ramblers' Association Scotland |
| Association for the Protection of Rural Scotland | RSPB Scotland |
| Bumblebee Conservation Trust | Scottish Native Woods |
| Butterfly Conservation Scotland | Scottish Wildlife Trust |
| Friends of the Earth Scotland | Woodland Trust Scotland |
| National Trust for Scotland | WWF Scotland |

For further information, please contact:

Angus Yarwood, Convenor of the Scottish Environment LINK Woodland Task Force
Woodland Trust Scotland, St Stephens Centre, St Stephen Street, Edinburgh. EH3 5AB
Tel: 0131 558 8619 Mobile: 0782 455 2016 Email: angusyarwood@woodlandtrust.org.uk