

**Forestry Commission Scotland's response to feedback from  
the first public consultation (June 24 – September 16<sup>th</sup>) on the  
review of the Scottish Forestry Strategy.**

No	Question	Main Feed-back	FCS Response
1	What do <u>you</u> think have been the best things to have happened in forestry since 2000?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public awareness &amp; involvement</li> <li>• Recreation and access</li> <li>• Community engagement (including Regional and National Forestry Forums )</li> <li>• Scottish Forest Industries Cluster</li> <li>• Scottish Forestry Grants Scheme</li> <li>• Woodlands in and Around Towns</li> <li>• Attention to broadleaved &amp; native woodlands</li> <li>• Provision for Mountain Biking</li> <li>• National Forest Land Scheme</li> <li>• Timber Transport Forum</li> </ul>	We will aim to build on these successes.
2	Has the Forestry Strategy failed to deliver anything important?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community benefits</li> <li>• Access</li>   <li>• Increase in woodland resource</li> <li>• Increase in commercial resource</li>   <li>• Non-timber benefits</li>   <li>• Historical value</li>   <li>• Development of forestry biomass</li> </ul>	<p>These two areas have attracted positive comments as well as negative ones. This indicates a need for consistent and transparent communication, provision and delivery of these services.</p> <p>The rate of expansion of woodlands has certainly declined since 2000. Macaulay Research Consultancy Services and Forest Research have been commissioned to help us rationalise the <u>potential</u> for woodland expansion (based on desired outcomes) in Scotland.</p> <p>This aspect has a potential role in rural business diversification and this will be reflected in the revised Strategy.</p> <p>This area was given insufficient attention in SFS2000. We aim to rectify this in the revised Strategy.</p> <p>The heightened awareness of climate change has focused minds on this matter. Forestry will be expected to fulfil an important role in helping to deliver the Scottish Climate Change programme.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Deer control</b></li> <li>• <b>Lack of expansion of riparian woodland.</b></li> <li>• <b>Lack of measurable targets</b></li> </ul>	<p>There have been significant advances in the management of woodland deer populations over the last five years and densities are now more in balance with desired habitats. This has required major investment on the national forest estate as well as by many private woodland owners. Nevertheless, there is still much to do, particularly in relation to collaborative, deer management with other land-uses.</p> <p>This can be addressed through Forest Habitat Networks and collaborative working within the River Basin Management Planning process.</p> <p>The difficulty is in ascribing targets that have real meaning for such a multifunctional land use. Nevertheless, the expectation is for a small number of relevant, high level targets, backed up by indicators of progress.</p>
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Is the broad content of the current Scottish Forestry Strategy still relevant and appropriate?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>General agreement that the broad thrust of SFS 2000 remains relevant and appropriate.</b></li> <li>• <b>A desire to see continued efforts towards sustainability in the management of the Scottish woodland resource – with a particular emphasis on people.</b></li> <li>• <b>Need to promote a long-term vision.</b></li> <li>• <b>Improved communication with stakeholders.</b></li> </ul>	<p>We will attempt to reflect “evolution rather than revolution” in the revised SFS.</p> <p>The revised SFS will link closely with the Executive’s Sustainable Development Strategy and will be delivered through the internationally recognised process of Sustainable Forest Management.</p> <p>The revised SFS will be a “leadership” document, setting out a clear vision, desired outcomes, objectives and actions.</p> <p>This is a given and it will be a question of “how” rather than “whether”.</p>
<b>4</b>	<p><b>Are any changes now required to the Forestry Strategy’s Vision, Guiding Principles and Strategic Directions?</b></p> <p><b>If so what are they?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Increase in community value (benefits) required.</b></li> <li>• <b>Improved “sustainability” and a change in ordering of the five strategic directions.</b></li> </ul>	<p>Great strides have been made in community engagement over the last five years and this encouraged people to seek more from their local forests. This is welcomed and has been noted as a particularly strong (and unifying) theme in the consultation responses.</p> <p>The appropriate mix of objectives will vary from area to area but an underlying theme will be to maximise public benefits by meeting people’s needs (social, economic and environmental). This will relate closely the Executive’s Sustainable Development Strategy.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Recognition of the potential impacts of climate change.</b></li> <li>• <b>Improvements to public access.</b></li> </ul>	<p>Climate change is already happening and its implications are extremely serious. It will therefore feature strongly in the revised SFS with attention given to mitigation, adaptation and carbon sequestration.</p> <p>Considerable investment in the quality and range of access facilities has taken place over the last five years, both on the national forest estate and in the private/voluntary sector. However, we do recognise the need to continue to help reduce the “barriers” to public access for all sectors of society.</p>
<b>5</b>	<p><b>Should any of the existing Priorities for Action be dropped?</b></p> <p><b>If so, which ones?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Only 11% of responses indicated a desire to see any existing Priorities for Action dropped. Of those there was a divergence of views – some advocating that timber production should be demoted whereas others thought that environmental and social issues should be secondary to economic priorities.</b></li> </ul>	<p>None of the existing priorities for action appear to be strong candidates for “closure”. However, we recognise the need to create clearer linkages between desired outcomes, objectives and actions. Likewise we will aim to create synergy rather than opposition between the three strands of sustainable development.</p>
<b>6</b>	<p><b>Should there be any new Priorities for Action?</b></p> <p><b>If so what should they be?</b></p>	<p>Just over half of the responses suggested new priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Woodfuel market development</b></li> <li>• <b>“Integrated” forestry at the landscape scale (including the need for a Planning Advice Note on forestry).</b></li> <li>• <b>Greater local involvement in landscape design and planning</b></li> <li>• <b>Sustained timber production (“normality”) – suggested level = 9 million m3 p.a</b></li> </ul>	<p>The revised SFS will support this as part of the climate change debate and the growth of the renewables sector.</p> <p>The revised SFS should complement other land use strategies (and vice versa). We also see local authorities having a core role in this process through the planning system and through Indicative Forestry Strategies and Woodland Frameworks. Likewise the development of River Basin Management plans, led by SEPA, will help achieve landscape scale integration.</p> <p>This philosophy is already embedded but further emphasis will be given to this.</p> <p>The concept of “normality” is not new and clearly has social and environmental benefits as well as economic ones. Establishing the appropriate level of normality will be given careful consideration.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Increase forestry's contribution to tourism.</b></li> <li>• <b>Maximise community benefits through local economic development via the community planning process.</b></li> <li>• <b>Need to integrate wind-farms and forestry (positive and negative comments received)</b></li> </ul>	<p>We aim to increase the synergies between forestry and tourism.</p> <p>The role of forestry as a vehicle for sustainable development will be emphasised together with potential delivery mechanisms.</p> <p>The tension between the development of some forms of renewable energy resources and the sustainability of forest management is recognised. Further guidance on this matter will be given in the SFS.</p>
<b>7</b>	<p><b><i>Is an appropriate balance being achieved between the economic, environmental and social aspects of forestry?</i></b></p> <p><b><i>If not, please give specific examples.</i></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Only 18% of responses agreed that an appropriate balance had been struck and 39% did not.</b></li> <li>• <b>Conflicting views were apparent with opinion divided on the weighting given to economic, as opposed to social or environmental values.</b></li> </ul>	<p>We accept that the question set up an unhelpful separation between the three strands of sustainable development and that this inhibits innovative thinking in relation to forestry. We will therefore try to reflect a more holistic, longer-term view of sustainable forest management.</p> <p>We recognise that more needs to be done to achieve synergy rather than opposition between the components of sustainability.</p>
<b>8</b>	<p><b>Do you agree that the Scottish Forestry Strategy should be focused primarily on increasing the benefits of forestry to the people of Scotland?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Over half of respondents agreed with the statement but with the following caveats:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>A global rather than purely national view of people ought to be taken.</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Recreation and tourism are particularly important.</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Social aspects should be prioritised.</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Without an economically sound basis for forestry the other two legs of the sustainability stool will not be affordable.</b></li> <li>➤ <b>The statement does not do justice to the stewardship role of forestry (i.e. include wildlife).</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>We accept this although we believe that focusing on Scottish people (and visitors to Scotland) will, in any case, deliver a global perspective.</p> <p>Noted although we will be suggesting a broad interpretation of recreation (eg mental and physical health as an outcome from recreation).</p> <p>The emphasis should be on public benefits. Our comments at Question 7 about the unhelpful separation between social, economic and environmental issues are relevant here.</p> <p>We understand the point being made but, again, our response at Question 7 is relevant.</p> <p>We believe that forestry's stewardship role is implicit in the focus on people but the point made is valid.</p>

<p><b>9</b></p>	<p><b>Should woodlands play a greater role in helping Scotland deal with climate change?</b></p> <p>If so, how?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An overwhelming majority said yes.</li> <li>• <b>Methods included:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➢ Woodfuel market development</li> <li>➢ Carbon and carbon credit forestry (opinion divided on the latter)</li> <li>➢ Carbon substitution (use of timber in place of high energy-embedded products)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Many saw a role for forestry in supporting other renewable energy resources and in adaptation strategies such as flood mitigation, “protection forestry”.</li> </ul>	<p>The implications of “Climate change” will receive significant attention in the revised Scottish Forestry Strategy. We intend setting out how forestry can contribute to Scotland’s Climate Change Programme.</p>
<p><b>10</b></p>	<p><b>What should be the role of forestry in sustainable rural development?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local employment</li> <li>• Assistance for small-scale, locally based enterprise</li> <li>• Non-direct benefits eg tourism</li>   <li>• Wood-fuel and timber housing</li>   <li>• Education</li>   <li>• Local control and management</li> </ul>	<p>The revised Strategy will seek to support the Green Jobs Strategy for Scotland by diversifying the employment opportunities (supported by skills enhancement) for forest based (or located) businesses. Non-timber forest products and outputs will be included in this approach.</p> <p>Affordable local housing has already been identified as a key issue through the National Forest Land Scheme.</p> <p>We see both these subjects as: important elements of our response to climate change; good examples of sustainable development; having a strong role in adding local value; and helping to develop people’s understanding of the wider benefits of forestry.</p> <p>The importance of Education (particularly the use of forests as an outdoor learning resource) will be highlighted in the revised Strategy.</p> <p>The SFS will embrace the principles set out in the National Forest Land Scheme and “Working in Partnership – Our Commitment”.</p>
<p><b>11</b></p>	<p><b>How could forestry become more of an exemplar of sustainable development in Scotland?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximise local use of wood</li> <li>• Use of wood-fuel</li>   <li>• Provision of construction grade timber for housing</li> </ul>	<p>There is great social, environmental and (potentially) economic merit in encouraging the local use of forest products, particularly the utilisation (including value-adding) of what are currently low value or niche products.</p> <p>A key objective is to continue to increase the penetration of wood in to the construction sector. This will require product innovation, consistent supply and cost control.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Diversify forest management</b></li> <li>• <b>Certification</b></li> </ul>	<p>Diversification of forests is already well underway and should continue. A key part of this is the restructuring of even-aged plantations (sometimes with limited tree species diversity) and the comments made under Question 6 are relevant if this restructuring is to proceed cost-effectively.</p> <p>Diversifying the <u>management</u> of forests has also been facilitated via the National Forest Land Scheme, FCS's commitments to working in partnership and the wider implications of Land Reform. The recent publications: "<i>Community Partnerships on the national forest estate</i>" and "<i>Community Involvement in private woodlands</i>" provide some good examples</p> <p>Certification provides an independent verification of Sustainable Forest Management against an agreed standard (the UK Forest Standard). An increase in the area of certified forests (all of the national forest estate is already certified) is, we agree, highly desirable.</p>
<b>12</b>	<b>How should Scotland respond to the opportunities presented by the increasing supply of timber from Scotland's woodlands?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Maximise local processing</b></li> <li>• <b>Increase the diversity and quality of timber production</b></li> <li>• <b>Maintenance of the timber production peak</b></li> </ul>	<p>See our response at Question 10 &amp; 11</p> <p>The greater use of home-grown timber in construction and heating is a major opportunity and will require product innovation and a competitive timber supply chain. The SFS will reflect on this point.</p> <p>See our response at Question 2 &amp; 6</p>
<b>13</b>	<b>How could the overall economic potential of Scotland's woodlands be increased?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Identification of value-added products</b></li> <li>• <b>Strategic planning</b></li> <li>• <b>Diversification of forest type and management</b></li> </ul>	<p>A common theme in responses was for the need to address "quality" issues through silvicultural practice (e.g. thinning) and more careful selection of sites for timber production (including hardwood timber production).</p> <p>The current study being undertaken for FCS by Macaulay Research Consultancy Services and Forest Research will provide an important springboard to address the above.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>R&amp;D and business support</b></li>   <li>• <b>Manage and establish “fit-for-purpose” woodland</b></li>   <li>• <b>Recognition and utilisation of non-market benefits.</b></li>   <li>• <b>Improve transport networks</b></li> </ul>	<p>The need for appropriate “push” mechanisms (e.g. Scottish Forestry Grants Scheme, Land Management Contracts) and “pull” mechanisms (e.g. Research &amp; Development and support for businesses) is accepted.</p> <p>This is one of the key messages coming out of consultation exercise. The revised SFS must articulate appropriate guidance and leadership to underpin this essential requirement. In doing so it must reflect on future as well as current needs.</p> <p>This will be a key component of business diversification and community development.</p> <p>The last five years have seen significant progress in relation to reducing the impact of timber haulage. Nevertheless, timber transport has been very clearly identified as an area requiring further serious attention in relation to cost reduction and mitigation of potential impacts on roads and communities. The Timber Transport Fund was identified as a positive measure albeit with comments that £13m insufficient.</p> <p>The revised SFS will seek to address these points.</p>
<p><b>14</b></p>	<p><b>Should the private and public forestry sectors engage further in social issues such as deprivation, health, equality, and disability?</b></p> <p><b>If so, how?</b></p> <p><b>Where is this a high priority in Scotland?</b></p>	<p>This was regarded as a cumbersome and potentially leading question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>55% agreed and 37% did not.</b></li>   <li>• <b>Via Community Participation</b></li> <li>• <b>Via Health promotion</b></li> <li>• <b>Active partnerships (eg BTCV Green Gym)</b></li>   <li>• <b>Via Planning and policy frameworks</b></li>   <li>• <b>Urban and peri-urban areas</b></li> </ul>	<p>There appears to be general support for the concept, albeit qualified in that forestry’s role should be to support other services rather than try to be the “lead” player.</p> <p>These suggestions point to the need for co-operation and co-ordination with other primary service providers and to establish imaginative partnerships. Engaging communities in the decision-making process should become a “given”.</p> <p>The importance of local authorities and the Planning system as a means of supporting and encouraging social enhancements via forestry came out very clearly in several responses and is accepted.</p> <p>Clearly there is likely to be a higher overall need in those areas of higher population density. However, there</p>

			<p>was a very strong message not to ignore rural areas as they have their own special needs that might not be as immediately apparent but are, nevertheless, a critical factor in terms of sustainable rural development.</p>
<p><b>15</b></p>	<p><b>Has there been sufficient focus on the contribution of woodlands to the enhancement of our natural heritage?</b></p> <p><b>If not, what more needs to be done?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>25% thought it had, 32% thought not and 41% offered no response.</b></li> <li>• <b>Forest Habitat Networks (FHNs), with a particular focus on riparian zones</b></li> <li>• <b>Habitat restoration (with a particular emphasis on PAWs) and high level commitments relating to SSSIs. Leadership role for the national forest estate.</b></li> <li>• <b>Better landscaping (and including more native species)</b></li> <li>• <b>Strategic partnerships</b></li> <li>• <b>Better monitoring, aided by a Woodland Stewardship Monitoring Grant</b></li> <li>• <b>Sustained effort in “Forest Enterprise Scotland” to reach acceptable environmental standards.</b></li> </ul>	<p>The responses indicated a fairly marked polarisation of opinion, this confirming our comments at Question 7. It would be extremely helpful if the revised SFS could close the perceived gap between social, environmental and economic perspectives as, in reality, they simply express a continuum of sustainable development.</p> <p>Thinking on FHNs has evolved rapidly in the last few years and will be reflected in the revised SFS. Likewise the development of River Basin Management Plans (stemming from the Water Framework Directive) will give added impetus to this matter.</p> <p>This will be picked up in the SFS as part of the commitments made in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UKBAP) and the Scottish Biodiversity Strategy (SBS). Comments about the leadership role of the national forest estate have been noted.</p> <p>Good landscape design will be an embedded principle in the SFS. The choice of species will reflect another underlying need for woodlands to be “fit-for-purpose”.</p> <p>We welcome offers of partnerships to achieve common goals.</p> <p>We certainly recognise the need for <u>effective</u> monitoring to inform future decisions – rather than data collection for its own sake.</p> <p>There were many very positive comments about the stewardship of the national forest estate. Indeed, this was reflected in the second 5-year independent Certification of that estate via the UK Woodland Assurance Scheme (UKWAS). Nevertheless, there were sufficient comments made during the consultation process to indicate that consistency in achieving appropriate standards requires continuing monitoring and attention.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Education</b></li> </ul>	<p>This is one of the key objectives in the Scottish Biodiversity Strategy and the SFS will reflect this.</p>
<p><b>16</b></p>	<p><b>Has there been sufficient focus on the contribution of woodlands to the enhancement of our cultural heritage?</b></p> <p><b>If not, what more needs to be done?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>20% thought it had, 32% thought not and 48% did not offer a comment.</b></li> <li>• <b>Better promotion of historical sites</b></li> <li>• <b>Improved landscape designations</b></li> <li>• <b>Promotion of “living culture”</b></li> <li>• <b>Strategic partnerships</b></li> <li>• <b>Recompensing landowners for the costs of archaeological surveys.</b></li> </ul>	<p>Again, the responses reflected a degree of polarised opinion (see the FCS response at Question 15) as well as a general lack of awareness of the subject’s range. When combined with feedback from public meetings and informal discussions with a range of individuals and organisations, it was clear that the enhancement of our cultural and living heritage has the potential to meet a range of social, environmental and economic needs. This did not receive sufficient focus in SFS 2000 and will be addressed in the revision.</p> <p>There was a strong and convincing argument about the historical value, in their own right, of some woods and trees. Likewise, points were well made about the value of “living culture”. FCS accepts that the enhancement of cultural heritage “in the round” has an important role in terms of people understanding and enjoying the context of human interactions with forestry and associated land uses.</p> <p>We welcome offers of partnerships to achieve common goal</p> <p>The Scottish Forestry Grants Scheme and Land Management Contracts can help address this but the comment underlines the disparity between some landowners’ perspective that archaeology is a “burden” and some archaeologists’ view that forestry should be treated as a “developer” (the ‘developer pays’ principle). We understand those viewpoints but see merit in closing the gap so that cultural heritage and forestry are seen as mutually compatible and advantageous.</p>
<p><b>17</b></p>	<p><b>How can the forestry sector be better integrated with other land uses?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Partnership between key stakeholders</b></li> <li>• <b>Land Management Contracts</b></li> <li>• <b>Common Rural Development funding</b></li> <li>• <b>Local community engagement and management</b></li> </ul>	<p>The SFS review is being conducted in parallel with the development of the Scottish Rural Development Strategy and Rural Development Plan. Likewise development of Land Management Contracts should enable far greater cohesion between the various land-use sectors.</p> <p>See our response at Question 10.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of the Historic Land-use Assessment data sets in forestry planning and FHNS</li> <li>• Inclusion of forestry in farming courses.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted as a component of good design planning.</p> <p>The same is true of farming in forestry courses. There is clearly a need to teach holistic approaches to land-use management.</p>
18	<p><b>How should we determine the appropriate extent and distribution of woodland in Scotland?</b></p> <p><b>How <u>much</u> woodland do we need?</b></p> <p>]</p> <p><b>What <u>type</u> of woodland do we need?</b></p> <p><b><u>Where</u> do we need it?</b></p>	<p>This was regarded as a cumbersome and potentially leading set of questions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By site suitability and an assessment of local need.</li> <li>• A caveat that woodland expansion targets should be connected to a clear commitment to delivering UKBAP targets.</li> <li>• By a set of guiding principles to enable the identification of national priorities in any particular locality and habitat/site suitability.</li> <li>• The previous aspiration of 25% woodland cover accords with a general view that the figure could lie in the range 20-30%. Interestingly NGO and local community groups thought the figure could be higher.</li> <li>• Several responses took strong exception to having a target at all, preferring the focus to be on the better management of existing woodlands. This viewpoint was also reflected in comments that quality was as important as quantity and that we simply need the right trees in the right places for appropriate purposes.</li> <li>• Sufficient to sustain 9m m3 of timber production p.a.</li> <li>• Fit-for-purpose and multipurpose woodland (woodlands which take account of their social, economic and environmental context and needs).</li> <li>• Woodlands which enhance and extend native woodlands, and which contribute to FHNS and riparian zones.</li> <li>• Where it is fit-for-purpose; producing maximum economic, social, landscape and conservation value while detracting least from the production of those values through other means.</li> <li>• In and around towns.</li> </ul>	<p>The Macaulay Research Consultancy Services and Forest Research study will help us address these points at a strategic level.</p> <p>As above.</p> <p>As above. We feel that a single “target” is unlikely to be meaningful but rather it should be built up from a sequence of requirements based on the multifunctional roles of forestry. This will require significant, subsequent Regional input if it is to address holistic land-use issues.</p> <p>See our response at Question 6.</p> <p>We take this as read and the revised Strategy must give form and direction to this general concept. A widespread desire was to see woodlands with the capability of providing a spectrum of types of timber production (from large-scale production for industry through to local niche markets and the development of a hardwood timber sector).</p> <p>Agreed as part of the overall mix of appropriate woodlands.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>This is certainly a priority but not the only one.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where it would mitigate climate change.</li> <li>• Forest Habitat Networks and native woodland expansion areas.</li> </ul>	<p>See our response at Question 9.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>
19	<p><b>Should regional priorities be reflected in the revised Strategy?</b></p> <p><b>If so, how?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 40% agreed and 19% disagreed.</li> <li>• Within the “disagree” camp was a view that there was no need for an additional layer of discourse between the national and the local level.</li> <li>• Through local adaptation and local forums.</li> <li>• Through the community planning process.</li> <li>• Integrating the spatial perspectives of the National Planning Framework for Scotland with community engagement and subsequent delivery of land-use objectives.</li> <li>• Review of Indicative Forestry Strategy guidance.</li> </ul>	<p>This has been a particularly interesting area of debate. Our view is that each of the five forestry Regions have a number of priorities, few, if any, of which are <u>specific</u> to that Region. However, for each there will be markedly different <u>local</u> needs and hence very different weightings of priorities.</p> <p>The SFS should be a national, leadership document giving sufficient clarity for Regional Forestry Forums (working with other bodies such as local authorities and Area Advisory Boards) to then guide FCS towards the sensitive delivery of local and national needs. Without that Regional perspective it will be hard to achieve effective synergies between the various land-use sectors or effective prioritisation of limited resources.</p> <p>Again, we see an important role here for Regional Forestry Forums to guide FCS towards effective co-operation and co-ordination with other bodies.</p> <p>The revised SFS will give far more prominence to the National Planning Framework than SFS 2000. Likewise, much guidance is contained in Scottish Planning Policies (SPPs), Planning Advice Notes (PANs) and National Planning Policy Guidelines (NPPGs). There is likely to be a continuing role for Indicative Forestry Strategies through local development plans and/or strategic development plans. In addition Forestry Frameworks, at a scale between policy (IFS) and delivery can be helpful tools for assessing forestry opportunities. We see, therefore, a role for the Regional Forestry Forums to work alongside other partners in helping to ensure that IFS guidance remains valid, practical and responsive to the rapidly changing land-use issues.</p>
20	<p><b>Is the balance of support mechanisms for forestry about right?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 29% thought not and 22% thought it was.</li> </ul>	<p>Given the comments about reduced levels of woodland expansion, a need to enhance the quality of management in existing woodlands and the reluctance of some private</p>



			tier 2.
<b>21</b>	<p><b>Could forestry incentives be better focused on key priorities?</b></p> <p><b>If so, how?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 39.5% thought they could and only a small percentage thought they could not.</li> <li>• Focus on grants for good management</li> <li>• Specific incentive schemes (eg focused on UKBAP/SBS priorities, social forestry, wood-fuel etc)</li> <li>• Focus on the future timber resource including transport infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<p>With continuing pressure on public funds, prioritisation will be essential.</p> <p>The Macaulay Research Consultancy Services and Forest Research Study will help inform where and how incentives could be targeted for highest overall public benefit.</p> <p>As above.</p> <p>As above.</p>
<b>22</b>	<p><b>Do you have any additional comments that would help us with the review of the Scottish Forestry Strategy?</b></p>	<p>There were 72 responses to this question of which the top priority was the development of partnerships to aid and assist in the delivery of objectives.</p> <p>Other composite suggestions were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote a clear, long-term vision</li> <li>• Longer review period</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved local consultation, community engagement and local delivery.</li> <li>• Ensure that forestry operates as a successful business within Scotland as a whole.</li> <li>• Reduce the complexity and quantity of questions in the second consultation and "jargon-bust".</li> </ul> <p>There were a large number of other specific comments.</p>	<p>We agree that it will be vital to get "buy-in" to the SFS from as wide a range of partners as possible.</p> <p>We need to articulate a long-term vision but we also need to ensure that the Strategy has immediate relevance and an ability to react to the rapidly changing social, environmental and economic conditions.</p> <p>Noted as a general principle (now embodied in FCS's Policy Document "<i>Working in Partnership – Our Commitment</i>").</p> <p>Forestry's primary role is to contribute to the success of "Scotland plc" rather than "Forestry plc". This will need to combine business, environmental and social successes.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>An individual response to each of these is not appropriate but all have been read and considered. The draft SFS will be an opportunity for respondents to see if and how their detailed comments have been taken in to account.</p>

19/12/2005