

Submitted to Future Grant Support for Forestry  
Submitted on 2023-05-16 21:24:16

Ministerial Foreword - Forestry in Scotland is a sector that we can be justly proud of.

## 1 - Introduction and Rationale for Providing Grant Support for Forestry

1. Do you agree that grant support for forestry should continue to be improved and developed as a discrete scheme within the overall package of land support?

Yes

Please explain your answer in the text box.:

Forestry is an important land use, but it should be considered alongside the sustainable management of land in the round. Too often forestry, especially commercial plantations are being located on land which is of value to biodiversity-which is declining seriously in Scotland. Accordingly for new woodland planting on bare land we would like to see public consultation strengthened and Environmental Screening and Assessment much improved. Some new forestry schemes are directly reducing the habitat of IUCN Near Threatened species such as nesting curlew for which Scotland has a global responsibility, and many valuable areas in the Uplands and Upland fringes which are outside the SSSI network are being lost. If Scotland is serious about addressing the decline in Biodiversity, then change is required. Access to FGS grants to establish new plantations should thus be given more rigorous scrutiny. The procedures introduced by The Forestry (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017 which weakened the previous screening and EA requirements must be reviewed in our view, to ensure forest expansion is not done at the expense of conserving biodiversity.

We consider the FGS should do much more to deliver public benefit, particularly public access, biodiversity management and enhancement, and the repair of damaged habitats. Public involvement in deciding on where new forests are established, and what sort of forests they are and how they are managed has to be improved.

Sustainable management, more public goods from more diverse forests that are richer in nature are required, and this is what the FGS should support. A national effort to expand and restore our ASNW, and PAWS sites must be a priority.

2. Are there any changes that would allow for better complementarity between the forestry and agriculture funding options?

Yes

Please explain your answer in the text box.:

1. In some Woodland Management Units open space has been provided for conservation and amenity purposes, but all too often this is unmanaged and invasive species such as Sitka Spruce take over. We would like to see support for appropriate levels of cutting, mowing or grazing in such cases. Failure to properly manage such areas should lead to a review of the grant provided by FGS.
2. To encourage farmers to participate in the establishment of new plantations, where these are acceptable, we would like to see the removal of the requirement to always replant. A crop of trees is no different to a crop of potatoes, but a landowner or farmer finds it impossible to bring land once planted back in to agricultural production once it is afforested. This is a block, which deters appropriate forestry planting, and is also an impediment to correcting the mistakes of the 70's and 80's when considerable areas now considered inappropriate for forestry were planted. In some cases removing such areas and restoring them to say blanket peatland, would be the best outcome for biodiversity. We do not think any such change should apply where planting is done using native trees for conservation purposes, or on PAWS or ASNW sites.
3. Where invasive Sitka Spruce or other non-native trees are self seeding onto open land, and this is damaging to agricultural or conservation values, we consider the manager of the bare land should be eligible for support from FGS grants to tackle the problem. Furthermore, before such plantations are established the Environmental Screening should consider such potential impacts, and a buffer zone, or selection of non invasive tree species be chosen to minimise this serious adverse impact now affecting many peatlands, moorlands or other specialist habitat areas of Scotland, including NNR's such as Flanders Moss, as well as numerous SSSI's.
4. Where overgrazing by domestic livestock is preventing the regeneration of woodland, eg birch woods used as shelter, then the agricultural grant support system such as the new headage payments, must focus on finding a remedy-either by withdrawing support to prevent overgrazing, or requiring areas and to be protected from browsing to allow seedlings to survive and grow.

## 2 - Forests Delivering for Scotland's Climate Change Plan

3. How can the support package for forestry evolve to help tackle the climate emergency, to achieve net zero, and to ensure that our woodlands and forests are resilient to the future climate?

Please explain your answer in the text box.:

1. Where the establishment of new forests is concerned, the FGS should not support ploughing, or other establishment methods that release soil Carbon. Furthermore establishing forests on peatlands, and wet organic soils is also disruptive to nature and in many cases will release more Carbon in the first 10-20 years than is sequestered by tree growth. We cannot afford to add to Carbon emissions if we are to meet net zero.
2. We recommend that ploughing is prohibited, and mounding not permitted on peat of greater than 30cm depth.
3. No FGS grant should be available for plantation forests to be established on peat greater than 30cm depth.
4. Peatland sites that were planted with trees and where damaged peat greater than 50cm remains, the priority should be to restore such areas by

careful harvesting and restoration to active peatland. This should be grant aided by FGS. Such action should target plantations which are still in a first rotation ie less than 30-40 years old.

5. To address pest issues, monocultures should be avoided. We advise that any plantation should not have more than 50% of any single species, and that all plantations should aim to have 3 commercial species, and at least 2 native tree species in the mix, together with open space protecting priority habitats where these occur.

6. Finance. We support grants through the FGS where these are targeted at providing public benefits for example for biodiversity recovery, managing watercourses and flooding, and providing access and public amenity. The highest grants should go to forests and woodlands that provide the greatest public benefit eg Restoring an ASNW through natural regeneration and deer control, with no fencing.

The lowest grants per hectare, should go to plantations of non-native trees, that only offer the minimum required by regulation for biodiversity etc, and which use deer fences. We envisage a hierarchy of grant rates with ASNW, PAWS restoration and restructuring to benefit biodiversity and protected habitats and species at the top with diminishing support for schemes that manage forests and WMU's which have a stronger commercial plantation focus.

We are also of the view that it is anomalous to give commercial plantations tax exemptions, and then grants to replant once the 'crop' is harvested and sold. Most other Countries might offer establishment grants for the first rotation, but few that we are aware of do so again after harvesting. Grant must focus instead on the delivery of public goods. Second rotation plantations should only receive FGS support where they go beyond the requirements of UKFS.

4. Private investment through natural capital and carbon schemes can make a valuable contribution to climate change. Do you agree that the grant support mechanism should have more flexibility to maximise the opportunities to blend private and public finance to support woodland creation,

Not sure

Please explain your answer in the text box.:

It depends!

Grant from the taxpayer should be focussed on paying for public goods. Paying for non-native commercial plantations to be established and managed should be primarily funded by market returns. Arguably the advent of Carbon code payments, should be reward enough for commercial woodland owners, together with the much higher returns being generated by timber markets.

We see no logic in paying for the establishment of second rotation, or restocks of commercial woodlands and plantations. As the income from harvesting attracts no tax, and with other tax benefits available we would rather that taxpayers funds prioritise addressing biodiversity loss and the provision of other public goods.

We are also puzzled how grant-aided plantations can pass the additionality tests that are at the heart of the Carbon market system. If grant from the state is offered and justified in part due to the Carbon benefits that accrue, then marketing any Carbon sequestered to third party buyers looks at best a grey area in terms of the International rules governing the voluntary carbon market and the important additionality tests. If the trees would have been planted in any event, because of the grant offered, is the Carbon payment warranted? Are the trees additional planting?

We do consider that more attention should be given to likely market demand in 20-30 years from now to help shape public regulation and grant support of forestry. This should help prioritise support for the type of forests we establish, and the products that can be won from them. It is likely for example that our demand for construction grade timber will grow. Whereas will newsprint demand and pallet wood be a market in 30 years time? So establishing diverse commercial woodlands on better soils and in more sheltered areas, where the timber is of higher quality might command grant premiums because they offer more diverse products that future economies need.

Lastly we are very wasteful of the wood we use, recycling and reuse is still rudimentary in many sectors, and this needs to be addressed, for example in the building and construction sector. Timber is often sent to landfill in skips, and Councils are not yet fully equipped to recycle waste wood products. We would like to see a cross sectoral initiative to address this.

5. How could the current funding package be improved to stimulate woodland expansion and better management across a wide range of woodland types, including native and productive woodlands?

Please explain your answer in the text box.:

We do not support woodland expansion for its own sake. Woodlands and forestry in Scotland is dominated by the rapid expansion that occurred in the 1970's to date, of largely non-native commercial plantations in upland sites, often dominated by peat soils. Some were established on very important areas for biodiversity, contributing to the serious declines that for example the State of Nature reports have documented.

Our priority is therefore:

1. The protection and appropriate management of all ASNW woodland in Scotland, and opportunities for it to expand through natural regeneration, preferably without the use of deer fencing.
2. Addressing lost habitats eg Montane woodland, and high altitude scrub.
3. Increasing incentives for PAWS owners and managers to restore these woodlands to a more natural ASNW state.
4. Restoring open ground habitats such as peatlands or wet grasslands found within Woodland Management Units, and under plantations established in the last 30 years (ie only 1 forest rotation).

Our Second Priority is:

1. Establishing more diverse commercial plantations with more tree species, on better land to provide for future needs, which offer biodiversity and or amenity benefits.

## 2. Supporting Communities in managing forests sustainably

Our lowest priority is :

1. Establishing commercial plantation forests with few tree species, on semi-natural open ground habitats eg herb rich grassland, heather moorland or shallow peatland sites that offer only minimal benefits for biodiversity and other public goods.

The highest payments should be applied to our first priority, the lowest to our third priority reflecting the contribution made to public goods and benefit. A menu of options, with the highest payments for desired public benefit outcomes should be at the core of the FGS.

6. Do you agree that it should be a requirement of grant support that woodlands are managed to ensure that they become more resilient to the impacts of climate change and pests and disease?

Yes

How can the grant scheme support this?:

By requiring that a more diverse selection of tree species must be used in future in commercial plantation woodlands incorporating a higher percentage of native species and scrub woodland.

Ensuring that drains and other establishment techniques do not contribute to soil erosion or flood events, and that streams and water courses are buffered by at least 10m from each bank of implanted land to prevent silt run off and the loss of dissolved Carbon.

Harvesting plans and roading for extraction must be designed to avoid hydrological impacts, or cause run off of water or silt. Roads on steep slopes must be avoided.

More open space within woodland blocks should be retained to allow the passage of beneficial insects, birds and bats that can prey on insect pest species.

We would be concerned if such a requirement forced managers of ASNW to undertake damaging activities or introduce inappropriate species into native woods, when the resilience question is still unknown in terms of its impact on native tree species which may in fact be adaptable to predicted conditions.

## 3 - Integrating Woodlands on Farms and Crofts

7. Which of the following measures would help reduce the barriers for crofters and farmers wanting to include woodland as part of their farming business? Please select all that apply.

Better integration of support for woodland creation with farm support mechanisms, Clearer guidance on grant options, Flexibility within options, Information on how current land use could continue with trees integrated throughout

Are there others not listed above?:

The fact that a transfer of farmland, or open ground to woodland is a one way street deters many people from switching land to forestry use. If the requirement to retain a plantation crop as forest in perpetuity could be removed, more landowners would consider establishing a commercial woodland knowing that in say 30 or 40 years they had the option of returning the land to agricultural use if circumstances had changed.

We are concerned that the loss of semi-natural grazing land is leading to losses of biodiversity, from plants, butterflies to birds. Screening of proposals is often poor, and consultation over the permanent transfer of land use of substantial areas is difficult for communities and organisations to navigate, especially when assessments and environmental surveys are rushed or poorly executed. It seems to us that unless an area is an SSSI, little concern for the presence of BAP priority species or EU priority habitats is taken.

We would however like to see incentives for farmers and crofters to undertake good environmental screening so that important areas for biodiversity on their crofts and farms are identified, and advice on management offered. This is especially important to conserve the precious remaining herb rich grasslands in Scotland, and nesting wading birds. This must be a pre condition for obtaining FGS grant, and should itself be supported under FGS. When areas where no adverse impacts are likely to occur have been identified the establishment of woodland can be encouraged, with advice and grant funding. Again we would prefer that planting native woodland is prioritised, and public benefit maximised.

8. Establishing small woodlands can have higher costs. What specific mechanisms would better support small scale woodlands and woodland ownership?

Please explain your answer in the text box.:

See our comments above.

We think higher rates of payment are warranted by the delivery of public goods. The maintenance of small woodlands, and existing farm woodlands can be a challenge, and neglect is widespread, but it is better to address the state of existing woodlands on farms and crofts before planting more. Thus a programme of small woodland management grants should be considered as part of the future FGS, with say a cut off for any enhanced grants of 10ha in size.

## 4 - Forests Delivering for People and Communities

9. How can forestry grants better support an increase in easily accessible, sustainably managed woodlands in urban and peri-urban areas?

Please explain your answer in the text box.:

1. The introductory text assumes that forestry is an open and easy to engage with sector-often it is not, and this is a barrier to community engagement and involvement, and this applies to both communities of place and communities of interest.
2. Forestry consultation, both in terms of the establishment of new forests and woodlands, and consultation over the management of existing forests must work better. Many schemes give minimal public information, an outline map and a list of species to be planted, with percentages of each. This is not effective consultation!  
Many forests are managed from distant offices, and few staff are known to communities who may live next to the forests, but are unaware of impending forestry operations.
3. In some communities, for example in Dumfries and Galloway we are aware of concerns that commercial forestry is now so dominant a land use, that more forests are unwelcome-a sign of failure in the consultation and decision making process.
4. These issues need to be addressed by both the state and private sectors.
5. We wonder if a proportion of monies received from schemes accepted under the Woodland Carbon Code for example, might be made available to communities of place and interest, to invest in community wellbeing and say the recovery of biodiversity, or provision of nature trails and footpaths? This is similar to the community interest funds provided by wind farm developers.

10. How can grant support for forestry better enable rural communities to realise greater benefits from woodland to support community wealth building?

Please explain your answer in the text box.:

See our comments above.

The FGS and UKFS must work to much higher standards of public consultation and engagement and the quality of Environmental Assessments has to improve so that discussion and subsequent decisions are fully informed. Get this right and more communities of interest and place will feel comfortable about engaging in the process.

The management planning for woodlands should stimulate discussion about how local enterprises can be involved, including the diversification of uses to support tourism, access and wildlife watching amongst others. This is listed in for example UKWAS as an example of good practise, but in truth the sector has a long way to go.

Grant support should be conditional on meeting these requirements listed above.

11. How can the forest regulatory and grant processes evolve to provide greater opportunities for communities to be involved in the development of forestry proposals?

Please explain your answer in the text box.:

Forestry regulation is difficult to navigate, and often hidden from view to local communities and communities of place, as they appear on Forestry websites often in a completed application, and not as a scoping proposal. Furthermore many proposals are accompanied by poor Environmental screening, and as such are data deficient. Full EA rarely occurs, as scale or location thresholds eg presence of SSSI's applies in so few cases, even where many Scottish Biodiversity Priority habitats or species are being impacted. Often very large areas proposed for new afforestation have far less public consultation and environmental screening than say a handful of wind turbines on a fraction of the area. Indeed the Scottish Government has relaxed EA regulations for forestry in recent years, reducing consultation opportunities and this has not helped relationships.

We recommend:

1. All new forestry proposals must have an environmental screening undertaken by a suitably qualified ecologist, with at least 3 visits covering the Spring, Summer and Autumn/Winter. ( note some habitats are now so depleted eg flower meadows and herb rich grasslands, that even small planting proposals can destroy them, hence the need to screen all schemes).The presence of EU priority habitats eg peatland areas, red or amber listed species or Scottish BAP priority species, should then trigger a discussion with NatureScot and other appropriate experts to determine if a full EA is required. In some cases the advice at this stage may be the area is unsuitable for forest establishment.
2. The local Council, Community Council and key agencies eg HES, NatureScot and NGO's who hold helpful data eg Scottish Wildlife Trust or RSPB Scotland should be notified of the outline proposals and given an opportunity to raise any issues for consideration, prior to formal submission of any application.
3. Sufficient time to consider issues raised must be built in to the system, and the applicant should offer, and if requested hold a meeting at which interested members of the community and other stakeholders can attend. After which there should be time for reflection and the applicant should respond explaining how any concerns or ideas raised have been addressed.
4. At this stage the application, amended as appropriate should enter the formal consenting process led by Scottish Forestry, and be subject to formal evaluation and consultation. All relevant data, including detailed maps, road infrastructure, fencing etc must be made available to the public.

12. How can the forestry regulatory and grant processes evolve to ensure that there is greater transparency about proposals and the decisions that have been made on them?

Please explain your answer in the text box.:

Forestry is a large land user, but the regulatory system seems reluctant to place any limit on commercial forest expansion at a catchment or regional scale. This leads to cynicism as some schemes are not in the best interests of biodiversity, or local communities but seem to get waived through. The National targets for forest cover are driving expansion, and this makes it hard for those with legitimate concerns to be heard. At best a compromise is usually the outcome, with a smaller area approved. But in some cases areas that were protected for agriculture or biodiversity in the 1980's and where proposed planting areas were reduced, are now being consented for planting undoing the agreements reached then. This breaches trust.

We wonder if Scottish Forestry and current EA regulations, and the consulting process used can truly take a balanced approach weighing up the needs of biodiversity, agriculture and other interests? Surely more than just SSSI areas need to be protected to deliver the 30x30 commitments made by the Scottish Government, and the statements made in support of the Scottish Biodiversity Strategy? Open ground priority habitats do not get accorded sufficient weight in the consenting process nor do high priority species unless they are within an SSSI.

It would help if access to the FGS had stronger conditions at the outset to safeguard and enhance biodiversity, including for open ground sites and dependant species.

Similarly addressing the opportunities to restore PAWS, and areas of formerly rich habitats eg blanket peatlands now under trees should be prioritised.

Preventing the spread of self seeding invasive non native trees on to neighbouring open ground, and throughout WMUs and ASNW is another step that could be taken, to deal with a growing problem for conservation and other managers caused directly by current forestry practise. Prevention is better than the cure, so selecting non invasive tree species and leaving buffers around sensitive sites and areas which are unplanted should be standard practise, Or else the 'polluter' should pay.

Strategic Land Use Planning may help decide the optimum approach to integrating different land uses, in areas at say a catchment scale, but at present forestry regulation and decision making tends to focus on the area proposed for planting, not the wider area in which it is situated and any adverse impacts in this wider landscape. This must surely change.

We hope these ideas can stimulate further work on this key question.

13. Forestry grants have been used to stimulate rural forestry businesses by providing support with capital costs. Do you agree that this has been an effective measure to stimulate rural business?

Yes

a. How could this approach be used to support further forestry businesses?:

We consider research and testing new techniques should involve State led partnerships so that innovation and learning is encouraged, and difficult issues are evaluated properly. This is especially important in tackling pests and disease control, but also in evaluating the impact of novel forestry management techniques on say the climate, or silt run off. Similarly we would like well managed tests to occur before new species of trees are introduced, or novel pest control methods are adopted.

We would like to see direct support for saw mills that are prepared to process native tree species, such as Scots Pine, or native Broadleaves. The lack of woodland management is often associated with a paucity of processing opportunities for relatively small batches of native trees, meaning it is uneconomic to manage such woodland.

b. How could this approach be used to support further skills development?:

14. How could the FGS processes and rules be developed to encourage more companies and organisations to provide training positions within the forestry sector?

Please explain your answer in the text box.:

We suggest that large applicants for support, whether on their own behalf, or as management companies should as a condition of grant either contribute to a 'training fund' used to facilitate apprenticeships and other skills training, or directly offer such opportunities themselves.

We think a sliding scale approach may be needed but even if this was set at say 2.5% of the grant received a substantial pot of money could be accumulated to fund apprentices and develop skills. This would allow courses to be established and bursaries and other assistance offered to participants. Similarly a share of Carbon payments should be shared with local communities, and be available to invest in biodiversity recovery.

## 5 - Forests Delivering for Biodiversity and the Environment

15. The primary purpose of FGS is to encourage forestry expansion and sustainable forest management, of which a key benefit is the realisation of environmental benefits. How can future grant support better help to address biodiversity loss in Scotland including the regeneration and expansion of native woodlands?

Please explain your answer in the text box.:

Forestry expansion can and is causing biodiversity loss, particularly species and habitats found on open habitats. But when done appropriately of course nature can benefit and biodiversity enhancement can occur eg through restoring PAWS to ASNW. Examples of the harms caused are for example the threats to wild plants in Scotland- <https://bsbi.org/plant-atlas-2020-in-scotland> or to a threatened bird species- <https://besjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/1365-2664.12167>

Many foresters find this an uncomfortable fact and offer no remedy. Some claim the problem is caused by farming or other causes. Whilst many issues are from such causes, Forestry is fragmenting many open ground habitats, as well as causing direct loss of species of conservation concern. This needs to be addressed, not least to prevent the steady loss and fragmentation of open ground habitats used by priority species. This is where better screening and regulation is absolutely essential. Forest expansion in the Uplands and Upland fringes is a cause of concern particularly for wading birds like the Eurasian Curlew, and many other protected priority species. SG Forestry Policy should therefore make it far clearer that forest expansion should not be at the expense of biodiversity.

We have already listed our suggestions for ensuring the FGS delivers public benefit as its first priority, and that woodland establishment and management should favour locations, and species mixes that offer opportunities for biodiversity.

We recommend that all new planting schemes should be required to commit 30% by area of the WMU to biodiversity recovery and enhancement. All existing priority habitats and priority species within the proposed area for planting must first be protected, and sustainable management to ensure the continuation of them on site agreed, using ecological advice where appropriate. Areas dedicated to this objective would contribute towards the 30%.

If areas of priority habitat, and species are not found on the proposed planting site, or cover an area less than 30% then the applicant should be required to establish native woodland, restore or create wet features, scrub, herb rich grassland, standing dead wood, and protection for veteran native trees, or other valuable conservation features so that 30% by area can be managed for biodiversity, thus contributing to Scotland's 30x30 targets and biodiversity recovery.

We note that forestry operations also feature regularly in the statistics of loss and damage to SSSI's as well. Surely greater efforts are needed by NatureScot and Forestry regulators to address this if Biodiversity recovery is to become a reality? Should FGS grant, or part of it, not be forfeit if damage to protected sites occurs? Action to protect and enhance SSSI's should be a core concern of the FGS.

Tree guards and related plastic materials should be phased out and truly biodegradable substitutes adopted. Failure to remove and recycle tree guards after say 10 years should result in the automatic loss of 10% of any FGS payment.

The use of Pesticides should be prohibited on ASNW sites and reduced elsewhere.

Neonicotinoid products should have no place at all in Forestry management because of the harm they do to insects and birds.

The Scottish forestry estate, is also beset by Invasive species, particularly *Rhododendron ponticum*, and increasingly self sown Sitka and some other commercial forestry species. All woodlands where *R. ponticum* is found must have a containment and removal plan, agreed prior to entry to the FGS. This is especially important on or adjacent to ASNW and PAWS sites. Grant to tackle *R. ponticum* must be increased urgently and a strategic plan to remove it implemented.

As already stated invasive Sitka and other commercial species is a rapidly growing problem. Owners of open ground sites where this is occurring should be eligible for FGS grant support. All new planting should be screened to ensure, either an open ground unplanted buffer is kept between the new plantation and a priority open ground habitat/SSSI. Or tree species selection in this buffer avoids species known to have invasive properties.

16. Herbivore browsing and damage can have a significant impact on biodiversity loss and restrict regeneration. How could forestry grant support mechanisms evolve to ensure effective management of deer populations at:

Landscape scale?:

Deer overgrazing remains a significant problem in large areas of Scotland, preventing natural regeneration, damaging habitats through browsing and trampling, and causing much expenditure on deer fencing, which can itself damage biodiversity through collisions with fences eg Capercaillie, or by creating unnatural hard boundaries between wooded areas and open habitats.

The FGS should encourage collaboration between managers to minimise the use of fencing and instead deer management/control. Schemes which have not explored deer control options should not be accepted into the FGS. Higher payments to support deer control by shooting to bring numbers down to levels that encourage natural regeneration are required. Deer control would allow a wider range of tree species to be used in commercial plantations, and facilitate the recovery and regeneration of ASNW.

In some areas livestock are also causing problems and preventing the regeneration of birch and other woodlands. There should be a link between the FGS and Agricultural payments eg the new headage payments for sheep, to encourage livestock management that allows seedlings of birch and other native species to survive in such woodlands. Many are on their last legs and urgent action is required. This might involve the temporary deployment, over say 10 years of stock fencing, or other types of stock enclosure that allows regeneration to occur. We cannot see how grazing by livestock that is diminishing native woodland condition can be classed as good agricultural practise. Indeed agricultural overgrazing is destroying native woodlands in Scotland, yet unlike the wanton felling of trees seems not to be controlled and prevented. This is a failure of regulation. So carrots and regulatory sticks are required to address the problem involving agricultural and forestry levers.

Small scale mixed land use?:

The problems are similar to the case above in effect and impact but the solutions can be more complex so a flexible approach is needed, linked to a small woodland grant component of the FGS, and regulatory support from the Agricultural strand of SG. This is an area ripe for a task force approach with advice, demonstration farms and supporting grant schemes.

If you wish to make any other relevant comments, please do so in the text box below.

Please add your comments here.:

## About you

What is your name?

Name:

[redacted]

What is your email address?

Email:

[redacted]

Are you responding as an individual or an organisation?

Organisation

What is your organisation?

Organisation:

RESTORE, The Effective Lobby For Nature

Scottish Forestry would like your permission to publish your response. Please indicate your publishing preference:

Publish response only (without name)

We may share your response internally with other Scottish Forestry policy teams who may be addressing the issues you discuss. They may wish to contact you again in the future, but we require your permission to do so. Are you content for Scottish Forestry to contact you again in relation to this consultation exercise?

Yes

I confirm that I have read the privacy policy and consent to the data I provide being used as set out in the policy.

I consent