

## **Native Woodlands Partnership for Scotland**

### **Meetings of meeting held at Silvan House, Tuesday 9 March 2004**

#### **Present:**

Gordon Patterson – FCS (Chair)	Peter Quelch – FCS (Secretary)
Richard Thompson – FC (NRS)	Richard Wallace - FCS
Moira Baptie – FCS (FE)	Deborah Long (am only) - Plantlife
Scott Wilson –Forest Ecologist	Kathy Velander - IEEM
Craig Campbell – NFUS	Jeanette Hall and Mike Smith - SNH
Mike Wood – RSPB/LINK	Derek Mackinnon - SEERAD
Graeme Morison and Alan Drever (am only)– SNW	

#### **In attendance:**

Roland Stiven, (consultant)	Tim Clifford (consultant)
-----------------------------	---------------------------

#### **Apologies:**

Sallie Ballie – FC (Forestry Group)	John Craig – DCS
Duncan Stone – SNH	Jo Lenthall – Scottish LBAP Co-ordinator
Andrew Barbour – SLF	Donald Bailey – SEERAD
Jamie Farquhar – FTA	Jonathan Hughes – WT

#### **1 Introductions**

GP welcomed new members Deborah Long, Kathy Velander, and Richard Wallace.

#### **2 Minutes of Previous meeting (13 November 2003)**

These were accepted as a true record.

#### **3 Matters Arising**

*Matters arising from the meeting on 2.9.03* – all were taken as either completed, or discharged, or would be raised in this agenda. The exception was the arrangement of a liaison meet between SEPA and FCS which was still being planned, and a date expected soon.

*Matters arising from the last meet of 13.11.03* - all action points completed or will arise in this agenda, except for following:

AP3 *Defining favourable condition* – Sallie Bailey had asked for comments on Mike Smith's draft report. However she was not present to report on progress with this work – DEFERRED

AP4 - *LMB HAP* – GP noted that a draft HAP had now been submitted to DEFRA, along with the Upland Birch HAP for Scotland. Targets for these HAPs would be reviewed in 05/06 in any case. Copies of both final draft HAP submissions will be circulated to members when we have them – ACTION - PQ

AP5 - *Additional members* – PQ said that all interested parties had been invited. Some others may be interested in being corresponding members who would see minutes and papers only, eg pinewood managers group, or the community woodlands movement. It had been pointed out that there was no archaeology/woodland history representative and PQ would discuss with Tim Yarnell. – ACTION – PQ

*Agenda Item 8 – Review of N/W and Future Needs* – the longer paper intended by GP is still outstanding, but is needed for a board meeting in late March. The NWPS will be circulated with a new paper – ACTION – GP

CC asked if such a paper would feed into the SFS when next reviewed? RW pointed out the chance to influence the SFGS review by 22.3.04. GP said some grant rules had already been adjusted to favour native woodlands, eg in interpreting the 300m FHN buffer zone, and in allowing creation of core new areas in South Scotland. GP asked that members reply with their views direct to that consultation. For example they could suggest new target woodland types for grant priority, or the way in which the 60% or 90% funding was decided. – ACTION – ALL MEMBERS

MW asked about the SFS Review; the regionalisation of the SFS would be important and there would be an opportunity to influence local regional fora and strategies, ie connecting HAPs and SAPs into the local process and informing the local debate. It was agreed that this work could be taken into account by the subgroup looking at the work plan for NWPS, and in any communications strategy we might develop.

GP raised the point that there was a parallel process running with the SBS. CC said the Scottish Agricultural Strategy was also due for review next year, and that these various land use and conservation processes should be brought together and considered in parallel. There was strong agreement.

*Terms of Reference – Paper 1.04.* These had been revised after the last meeting and were agreed as a way forward for NWPS. Adding a member for cultural heritage (*see above*) would emphasise that the group was representing all aspects of native woodlands and not strictly the biodiversity ones.

#### **4 Native woodland training course**

PQ gave out paper 2.04, the latest course outline from FTS. This was now available for comments on content and speakers. Discussed subgroup membership to take this course further – SNH point of contact to be JH. Others interested on being on the subgroup were SW, MW, DL and JH, as well as PQ, MB, RT and RW for FC. SEERAD would be kept in touch with developments.

KV suggested ecotourism could have a slot, and there were suggestions for developing markets, NTFPs, and utilisation. DL suggested international aspects could be covered in more detail. PQ explained how every topic could not be covered in depth, but that smarter searches for advisory materials as envisaged in the WEARD database would help field people find relevant advice easier. Some topics would be covered later in short and specialised courses.

Regarding participants (there were no FC nominations yet) it was hoped that some NGO and perhaps SNH participants would take part in the pilot course 4-6 May. The course could be advertised at the LBAP conference on 19 March. Discussions would need to take place with Richard Price about marketing the course and the balance of membership.

Members felt that the contents of this course would make more sense seen in the context of all environmental training in forestry, and it was agreed that PQ circulate a paper showing all planned courses. ACTION – PQ

ACTION ALL – send any comments on aspects missing or comments on topic emphasis to PQ

## **5 Communications**

### **5a – Communications strategy.**

In response to the question of whether we needed one, MW felt that we should identify the message we wished to get over first, then the audience. MW has experience developing similar communications strategies and volunteered to produce a paper for the next meet. It was planned to develop FC web pages which would house minutes and papers from this group. CC suggested we think about the media after we have got the message and audience defined.

ACTION – MW

### **5b Promotional and advisory materials**

PQ introduced Roland Stiven who was working on a contract to distil out new information sheets regarding woodland habitats and species. A first draft paper was handed out (not numbered), compiled by redrafting, updating and making Scotland-specific the materials Roland had been given. The source documents eg the UK NWHAP definitions paper and other papers for Scotland by A Jones, had been simplified without losing essential detail. The UK paper could still be kept in the background as a fuller reference for those who needed it. Roland's paper (if on the internet) can also contain many links to other sources of info, eg BAP reporting, species dossiers, lists of forestry bap species, etc.

Members agreed that this paper would be useful reference material and could be published as such. The challenge was then to take that material and create first, training handouts, and then new more popular promotional outputs. Roland suggested the first need was to ask R Price of FTS what exactly he needed as course handouts. ACTION: ROLAND

CC agreed that this document was advisory and not promotional and should be published as such. He felt that there was also a need to promote native woods as a land-use to farmers. There is a big opportunity to influence how land is used following CAP reform and a new document is needed to explore and promote this. GP said that this sort of promotional material could follow later in the year after we had agreed a communications strategy, and that working up this sort of material was not part of Roland's immediate contract.

The final table in Roland's paper contains localised targets – it was confirmed that these are from A Jones' paper, derived from modelling. It was suggested that Roland insert a qualifier about the process which led to this table being produced. GM felt there was a need for more contact between national and local baps. GP said that he and PQ would be talking to the LBAP officer's conference on 19.3.04. Also there is a meeting to develop strategic FHNs further on 23.3.04.

ACTION: ROLAND to revise paper in light of these discussions.

## **6 Work programme for NWPS**

PQ presented paper 5.04, being a table of the priority topics agreed at previous meetings, with short updates on progress against those tasks. Comments included: Item 11 - Add 'communications'.

Item 6 – as well as providing advice to LBAPs can there be feedback from them to the national level, on bap progress? Prompted discussion of a reporting system, eg BARS which was being trialled in non-woodland habitats.

Item 2 – The review of haps in 05/06 is only to be targets, not major objectives. SW asked why SFGS and FE between them could not monitor bap progress, but RW pointed out that the WGS data could not do that, but that GLADE system for SFGS should be able to give that info in future. It was agreed that monitoring progress was

vital and not well performed at present. We were not recording our achievements – we needed robust new monitoring systems to assist with reporting. Reporting is not the problem, accurate monitoring is.

Item 3 species lists – discussion on the various species lists and the need for clarity, especially as the Scot Exec has asked for a new Scottish list of bap species. Task 3 talks of a selected list of Scottish woodland bap species that we do more for. Such lists should not be confused with UKBAP priority species – we are talking of prioritising within those species.

It was decided that this paper useful though it was, should be turned into a smart work programme for year one and an outline for years 2 and 3 for circulation to the group. Aim for end of April draft for circulation.

ACTION: MB, RW, PQ

## **7 Native woodland inventory**

GP spoke to paper 3.04 giving the background to a decision by FCS to undertake a new map-based inventory of all native woodlands in Scotland. Tim Clifford was just starting a contract to look at options and methodologies on how to achieve this. One problem was trying to fit in with everyone's agendas, when what is needed is a basic woodland inventory layer to which additional aspects like wood pasture, veteran trees, timber utilisation could be added later or separately. The new inventory must be simple, robust, replicable, optimise the use of existing data, and have a tiered approach.

The basic data to capture were: location with a mapped boundary, also extent, type and condition. Polygons were a problem and the most up to date OS tiles would be used. Also smallest minimum size to record, maybe 0.1 (cf SSNWI) or 0.25 (SFGS) or 2ha (SAWI) – 0.5 ha seemed sensible?

Update-ability was also key, so linking to NIWT and GLADE and FE database. There were consistency issues with many existing data sources.

There were other desirable but non-essential criteria which could be surveyed such as structure, non-woodland habitats, deadwood, biodiversity indicators, threats, utilisation, surrounding land-use, current management, antiquity, archaeology, recreation etc. There is an issue of collecting absolute data, or data derived from other things. There are many other issues to consider for a new inventory, such as data storage and collection, compatibility, updating, costs and value for money, outside sources of funds. SW suggested that a joint NGO/government approach would be more likely to attract funding than a government only project.

Asked whether NIWT2 will run in Scotland, GP said that survey resources would need to be diverted onto the n/w inventory over the next few years and this would probably delay availability of broader forestry inventory information of the type which NIWT provides. GP agreed there should be a reference to this trade-off in the letter to be sent to stakeholders (below).

TC will issue a scoping paper by the end of March. GP will also send an introductory letter to other bodies and stakeholders before TC starts contacting them about the inventory. ACTION: TC,GP

## **8 CAP reform**

CC gave a short powerpoint explaining Good Agricultural and Environmental Condition (GAEC). GP's paper 4.04 was then presented. It refers to tables in the longer Scot Exec consultation paper which had been emailed to members beforehand. There were problems with different parts of Europe seeing scrub/tree

colonisation of fields in different ways. Scotland was looking for more tree regeneration, other countries saw that as a retrograde step losing valuable seminatural pastureland.

Discussion ensued on links between RSS and SFGS/FWPS, also on the status of some grazed woodlands which are counted by IACS as forage hectares despite being denser than 20% canopy.

RT mentioned the new research project commissioned by DEFRA on defining overgrazing in woodlands and members were keen to hear more about that. The main action point from this discussion was that members would be updated with how negotiations developed on CAP reform. GP would report back from a relevant working group he sits on. ACTION GP

## **9 Updates from members**

A few papers were handed round or circulated before the meeting:  
*N/W Research Update* – RT  
*West Highland Woodland Grazing Project* – newsletter and press release (via PQ)

*NWDG* – JH described forthcoming *NWDG* activities and promised to email all members. ACTION JH

## **10 Dates for future meetings**

4/5 August confirmed for next meet – over two days including field visits, and to the Borders. Possible topics, FHN, riparian woodland restoration, cultural landscapes, Ettrick Forest project etc.

ACTION: PQ to discuss with relevant members and FCS staff

November meeting – date to be arranged by email: ACTION: PQ