

Summary of Workshop Questions

QUESTION 1.

(HM) WHAT HAS GONE WELL SINCE 2000?

NATIONAL	GRAMPIAN
Increased public activity ➡	➡
Improved Design of Woodlands	
Cultural/Institutional change - more open (compare with agriculture) ➡	➡
Co-ordination of incentives	
Stewardship grants	Investment in timber processing contribution of private forests
Development of Strategy ➡	➡

(IR) WHAT HAS GONE WELL SINCE 2000?

NATIONAL	GRAMPIAN
Improved Quality of Restock	Locational premium/challenge funding
National Forest Land Scheme	Improved quality of restock
	Increased biodiversity (sporting)

(UU) WHAT HAS GONE WELL SINCE 2000?

NATIONAL	GRAMPIAN
SFGS	SFGS
Stewardship ➡	➡
Aim to improve woodlands/existing woods	➡
Evolution not Revolution ➡	➡
Increased opportunities for biodiversity	
	Large increase in productive new planting
Raised awareness amongst politicians ➡	➡
	Increase in recreation
Continuation of restructuring ➡	➡

(EB) WHAT HAS GONE WELL SINCE 2000?

NATIONAL LEVEL	GRAMPIAN LEVEL
SFGS /	New Locational Premiums
More riparian	Locational Premiums in Grampian have encouraged afforestation of agricultural land
Native Woodlands Prioritised	
Community Development	
Standard costs pay for better quality of work more financial incentive to produce multi-functional quality woodland	
Forest Plans are good	

Question 2.

(IR) WHAT HAS NOT GONE WELL?

NATIONAL	GRAMPIAN
NFLS	
Depressed Timber Prices	➔
Increased Bureaucracy certification & Grants ➔	➔
Lack of Information and Measurable Targets	Failed to control deer
Suspected Decrease in Productive Forest Area	

(UU) WHAT HAS NOT GONE WELL?

NATIONAL	GRAMPIAN
Too Much Bureaucracy for small schemes	➔
	Grants now too complicated
Insufficient integration of Government strategies at Executive Dept Level	
Uncertainty of CAP reform	
Woody Biomass (renewables) not gone well	
Community ownership not gone so well as expected ➔	➔
Aspiration of 25% forest cover - no chance!!	
Product Prices - Disincentive to Forest	

Work	
------	--

(EB) WHAT HAS NOT GONE WELL?

NATIONAL LEVEL	GRAMPIAN LEVEL
Strength of pound affecting timber prices	
Increased costs - fuel Too much of centralised processing and increased timber miles	
Lack of employment for local communities (Loss of Schedule D taxation)	Particularly affects Grampian
Recycling affects marketing, demand, revenue	
Grampian Challenge Fund was misleading re ecology	➡ May have been driven by Aberdeenshire as indicative strategy
Scheme on ground may not match contract quality. Forest plans limited - main focus on productive woodlands	

(HM) WHAT HAS NOT GONE WELL?

NATIONAL	GRAMPIAN
Returns? - economic realism	
Overly prescriptive	
New native woodlands - bit of a con ➡	➡
Lack of representation and engagement of private owners. Weakness in process/consultation ➡	➡
Not engaging with all people (education) and (urban)	
Silviculture given a minimal role ➡	➡

Question 3.

(UU) WHAT SHOULD BE OUR TOP PRIORITIES NOW?

NATIONAL	GRAMPIAN
Timber Production ➡	➡
Do not lose sight of this and non-traditional products	
Economic tie to renewable energy	
Incentive for growers to small roundwood utilisation.	
Certification cost - contributions for small woodlands ➡	➡
Less emphasis on community involvement where there is no significant local benefit	

IR WHAT SHOULD BE OUR TOP PRIORITIES?

NATIONAL	GRAMPIAN
Assessment of quality of timber resource ➡	➡
Integration of forest/farming with more even distribution of funding	Continued woodland expansion needs LP
Add value to timber products. Promote use of Scottish Timber in innovative Building Design	
Improve nations's health biodiversity	

(EB) WHAT SHOULD BE OUR TOP PRIORITIES?

NATIONAL	GRAMPAIN
Forest plans for all forest operatiions	
Forest Plans to address management in all woodlands with better integration of agriculture and forestry	
Collaboration between neighbours re felling coupes and habitat networks	
Branding opportunities to be explored ➡	➡ Lower timber miles promote small sawmills - small niche markets

(HM) WHAT SHOULD BE OUR TOP PRIORITIES?

NATIONAL	GRAMPIAN
Higher profile on quality of forest management ➡	➡
Demonstrable sustainability ➡	➡
Support for certification ➡	➡
Increased local use of timber (sustainable economies) ➡	➡
Greater efforts to reach a wider public ➡	➡
Less prescriptive as to what a forest should be ➡	➡

Summary of Questions answered by “Post its” at meeting

Question 1

What do you think have been the best things to have happened in forestry since 2000?

Answer:

Locational Premium.
SFGS.
Removing conifers from river banks.

Question 2

Has the Forestry Strategy failed to deliver anything important?

Answer:

Continuing care of broadleaved borders after planting.
Paper management good but not forest management.
Silviculture.
Information on the quality of the timber resource.

Question 3

Is the broad content of the current Forestry Strategy still relevant and appropriate?

Answer:

Never was.

Question 4

Are any changes now required to the Forestry Strategy’s Vision, Guiding Principles and Strategic Directions? If so what are they?

Answer:

Targets
Targets
Less emphasis on "native" more thought on silviculture.

Question 5

Should any of the existing Priorities for Action be dropped? If so, which ones?

Answer:

Question 6

Should there be any new Priorities for Action? If so what should they be?

Answer:

Bring private owners into the consultation.

Question 7

Is an appropriate balance being achieved between the economic, environmental and social aspects of forestry? If not, please give specific examples.

Answer:

Minimum felling age 60 years.

Question 8

Do you agree that the Scottish Forestry Strategy should be focused primarily on increasing the benefits of forestry to the people of Scotland?

Answer:

Question 9

Should woodlands play a greater role in helping Scotland deal with climate change? If so, how?

Answer:

Increased market - to encourage carbon to be locked up in wood products - and sustained supply, to encourage investment in industries using timber.

Pay timber growers a "carbon credit" (thus; provide an incentive for more planting; 'reduce' global ?; help timber market.

Global warming is leading to change in appropriate species. Don't limit choices to indigenous species.

Shelterbelts fast growing species to mature before changes make other species unsuitable.

Question 10

What should be the role of forestry in sustainable rural development?

Answer:

Provide local employment locally - sawmills, planting squads.

More use of forest land for rural housing.

Integration of Forestry/Agriculture.

Question 11

How could forestry become more of an exemplar of sustainable development in Scotland?

Question 12

How should Scotland respond to the opportunities presented by the increasing supply of timber from Scotland's woodlands?

Question 13

How could the overall economic potential of Scotland's woodlands be increased?

Answer:

Make haulage and forest diesel cheaper.

Early thinning, pruning.

DF not SS.

Promote uses for hardwoods as well as conifers. Promote more non-timber uses - walks, bikes, camps.

Question 14

Should the private and public forestry sectors engage further in social issues such as deprivation, health, equality, and disability? If so, how? Where is this a high priority in Scotland?

Question 15

Has there been sufficient focus on the contribution of woodlands to the enhancement of our natural heritage? If not, what more needs to be done?

Question 16

Has there been sufficient focus on the contribution of woodlands to the enhancement of our cultural heritage? If not, what more needs to be done?

Question 17

How can the forestry sector be better integrated with other land uses?

Answer:

Scottish Landuse Policy

Leisure value to tourists (who enjoy most forests from a distance) would be increased if trees were not planted in rows or patches of only 2 different species. Hillsides look very unnatural under present practices.

Question 18

How should we determine the appropriate extent and distribution of woodland in Scotland? How much woodland do we need? What type of woodland do we need and where do we need it?

Answer:

Same level of support per ha for all users
Surveys need to include areas of natural regeneration of native species.

Question 19

Should regional priorities be reflected in the revised Strategy? If so, how?

Answer:

Question 20

Is the balance of support mechanisms for forestry about right? If not, how should it change?

Answer:

Bring back schedule D

Question 21

Could forestry incentives be better focused on key priorities? If so, how?

Answer:

Economic link between anticipated strategy outputs and sector financial incentives.

Question 22

Do you have any additional comments that would help us with the review of the Scottish Forestry Strategy?

Answer:

Privatise the state forest holding
Shorttermism 5 year strategy too early to review

CYNICS CORNER

How can we review this strategy when we have no information on indicators of progress/
Let the know of the silvicultural options and costs don't rely on the public otherwise they might choose apple trees on granite at 2000ft