



- We know that the two biggest threats to biodiversity are exploitative land management techniques and climate change, so I'm going to address these two together.
- I want to get you excited about the idea of integrating timber growing into existing farm businesses, as a strategy to benefit both biodiversity and carbon, and production and profitability. Because I like to have my cake and eat it.

Link: https://www.ourplanet.com/en/video/how-to-restore-our-forests/



I'm not going to talk about the UK Forestry Standard because I'm sure you're all aware of the forest regulatory system,

so for over 20 years this has been the framework agreed between governments, environmental NGOs and foresters,

to ensure that forest management doesn't damage wildlife and carbon sites (SSSI's and peat bogs), creates diverse forests, creates edge habitats, protects soil and water, and harvests in sensible coupes that create structural diversity.

But I'm going to refer to it because want to look forwards from this standard practice, to what forestry is delivering and can hopefully deliver for you, in terms of enhancing biodiversity *through* increased production.

UK Forestry Standard is here: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/upload s/attachment_data/file/687147/The_UK_Forestry_Standard.pdf





Timber is a valuable crop: it wasn't at the start of the century and you'll still meet people who don't realise this has changed.

These are sales from public sector forests – a conservative trend compared with the private sector.

You expect to get about 400 tonnes per hectare, so this figure translates to just under £10,000 per hectare. Last year private growers have regularly making double this or treble this for good quality spruce.

It does fluctuate, so this year it's gone back down because of a flood of wind and beetle damaged wood from Europe – but that is creating a long-term shortfall in the European timber supply so anyone who can grow timber to fill it is in luck.

Once you've got a forest established with a nine-year gap between each coup, you have income in most years from either thinning or harvest.

es Se	Production and consumption of wood in the UK
foi	50.008
Dal	40,000
lok	50,000
b0	92 20,000
Ü	10.000
ect	0
ote	1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2
	Sawmith Pulpmit Woodbased panes
the second s	

We are highly dependent on imported wood in the UK.

This shows production in green and our consumption in orange. Immediately we can see that producing timber here shortens supply chains and keeps production under our eye.



Timber products might be harder to import in future. Global development means increasing demand for everything from toilet paper to mass timber buildings.

Timber is renewable, but it is certainly not infinite.

This research from OECD provides a picture of how much stuff we use now, in the dark colours, and to 2060, in the light colours.

Timber is one of the biggest growth areas, with global demand projected to treble.

We can also see that there is an enormous projected growth in mineral materials; these are non-renewable and have an enormous carbon impact. If we are to replace steel or concrete or coal with fossil-free alternatives, we need to grow a lot more trees.

Global Material Resources Outlook to 2060 published February 2019



The UK is the second largest net importer of forest products in the world. Only the massive developing economy of China imports more timber than our little island.

We have a huge global forest footprint.



Timber growing is becoming more sustainable globally.

The kind of things we've done in the UK through the Forestry Standard have been developed globally by sustainability labels over a generation – FSC and PEFC are standard for timber in the UK

And also by New Generation Plantations which is what it says, a new generation of timber growers, NGOs and local communities collaborating to ensure forests don't cause damage and do create multiple benefits.



But timber is becoming so much in demand that pressure to over-exploit natural forests keeps growing.



This is a very striking figure: planted forests make up only 7% of global forest cover, but provide 33% of commercial timber.

Those tree farms that David Attenborough talked about are a pretty efficient way to produce timber. The best way to protect intact natural forests under threat from timber production, I would argue, is to make it uneconomic to exploit them by outcompeting them with a sustainably-produced farm product.



But I'd like to get you thinking about a second way in which forestry on a Scottish farm can protect global forests.

This is a new film which Scottish Forestry have just put up on Youtube, starring Biggar farmer Peter Gascoigne, talking about the integrated benefits of timber and lamb production. He found feed costs going down and lamb survival going up, his poorer land stopped losing money and began to produce a valuable crop.

I don't want to dwell on this because I'm not a farmer but I do commend this film (10 minutes).

Link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aW0UQW9ih8o



I just heard on *Farming Today* yesterday that the UK imports 3 million tonnes of soya each year, forming 60% of protein fed to livestock.

If utilising forestry to create shelter and better use of pasture in Scotland, means lowering feed requirements and lowering that huge pressure to produce soy at all costs, that's not just cost-savings for the Scottish farmer: that's giving a break to the jaguar and the orangutan and all the other rich biodiversity of tropical rainforests that are threatened by its production.

And that means Scottish lamb and beef are taking strides towards becoming truly eco-friendly protein.



So this integrated production brings us back to the UK.

This graphic which is actually from Finland, but it demonstrates my next point which is about where our future society is physically going to come from.

Our society needs food, houses, clothing, furniture, tech, power:

And if we want them renewably and without climate change, then it's people like you who are going to be producing them. Not miners or nuclear physicists or geologists, but farmers.



So what are the trees growing on your farm going to be for?

With food it's obvious that it grows from the land. But with the rest of our stuff, you can grow it or you can mine it.

And this is the first huge biodiversity benefit of growing timber, because if you're not growing trees, someone else will be drilling oil, or quarrying stone, or smelting iron, or blasting clinker, because that's what stuff is made of, if it's not made of timber.

This is Glasgow. You could make all of that from timber. This is like the bit where the devil takes Jesus up to a mountain and shows him the kingdoms of the world and says 'all this can be yours' – except this is the good version – "all this you can produce!"



This is a Scottish firm who build super-energy efficient homes, from panels engineered largely from OSB, oriented strand board, which is this stuff that you see around building sites. It's made by Norbord in Inverness, from Scottish timber.

We don't build houses from oak beams these days – at least not houses for ordinary people.



This is 540 new affordable homes in Anderston in Glasgow built by another company, CCG using their own off-site timber panel system.



And of course the point about these timber buildings is that they are made out of captured atmospheric carbon.

Locking up timber in buildings while new trees grow in their place is one of the best forms of carbon capture and storage we have available.

This graphic shows a building in London made of Cross-Laminated Timber, CLT – so instead of panels with insulation you engineer enormous blocks of timber.

It's very sustainable,

very versatile,

counterintuitively very fire resistant because the blocks just char on the outside and don't collapse as steel-framed structures do,

and you can lock up massive amounts of carbon.

There's a lot of discussion about CLT as the new wonder-material, and a bit of competition about which UK city is going to have the first UK CLT plant – maybe Aberdeen, maybe Newcastle – but what it's going to need is lots and lots of timber. It needs farmers to be the carbon-storage conveyor belt.



But storing carbon isn't the only important thing.

If you grow trees, you capture some carbon and you can sell it under the woodland carbon code;

If you grow timber, you can store carbon in products over different lengths of time while the forest captures more.

But more and more research is showing that the biggest carbon benefit of all is the carbon not emitted from mineral materials you didn't use: steel, concrete, oil, plastic, coal.

When we're talking about growing the green economy, we need to be talking a lot more about material substitution.

Full report: https://www.confor.org.uk/media/247533/eskdalemuirsummary-report-and-infographic.pdf



So when you're thinking forests and carbon remember the three s's -

sequestration, storage, and substitution -

or because that's a bit hard to say: suck, stick and swap.

all three elements are what equals the carbon sink



But what about the biodiversity on the farm itself? In the last part of this talk I want to talk about productive forestry for biodiversity.

Here are three Scottish forests:

On the left, a nineteenth-century estate forest planted by the Duke of Atholl

In the middle, a twentieth-century forest – either planted by the Forestry Commission or by private investors under tax incentives.

On the right, a modern twenty-first century forests – planted by private landowners through agri-environment schemes.

Almost all forests in these three categories all of them had twin aims of providing timber and enhancing natural capital.

Obviously the 200 year-old ones look most impressive and have the richest biodiversity

The twentieth-century ones are just getting there now: you can see a lot of harvesting, deadwood, and restocked young trees.

The modern ones clearly don't look very exciting yet, but we are getting

smarter and smarter about making them as much like ancient woodland as quickly as possible.



I want to bust one myth before anyone mentions it. I've been surveying the evidence about forestry and biodiversity for a forthcoming Confor publication, and I have not found a single piece of evidence that demonstrates that, for new woodlands, native tree species are measurably better for biodiversity than exotic ones *per se*.

A small number of species are only associated with particular trees, so of course native trees are essential for these species, which is why all timber-producing woodlands include some. For example, Ash-associated species have been in the headlines because of dieback. This shows that 45 species of fungi, lichen and invertebrate are at risk of dying out along with their host ash trees. But 910 species which live on Ash will also live on other trees – some only on certain trees, but for many, any wood will do.

So native species are important – but for reversing the general decline in biodiversity, it's just trees

Reference:

https://livingashproject.org.uk/pdfs/FCRN029%202017.%20Ecological%20imp acts%20of%20ash%20dieback%20and%20mitigation%20measures.pdf



There are plenty of studies which demonstrate that the exotic trees we grow for timber are very good hosts for the vast majority of UK woodland ecology of fungi, bryophytes, lichens, ferns, flowers, invertebrates, birds and mammals,

and that it is *management practices* which have the big impact.

For example, this study by in 2010 which sampled native and exotic forests across the UK found little difference in biodiversity value, and the ones they found were explained by forest management practices.

And there are three biggies:



The best thing in the world you can do in a wood for biodiversity is leave and create deadwood.

This is the stuff the fungi, the bryophytes, the invertebrates love.



The Conservation Volunteers have some excellent information on this in their Dead Good Deadwood blog.



Another really important thing is structural diversity within the forest.

This management practice is standard in the UK through the UK Forestry Standard and felling license process.

When you plant timber, you will have to include a range of species and open spaces,

and when you harvest it, you will have to harvest it in sections like this so the forest always has a diversity of ages, maximising the edge effects and the range of habitats. You can see this on any forested Scottish hillside at the moment as old forests are harvested and restructured to meet these standards.



Why is this important?

A study of woodland birds found that while some preferred the very edges of woodland or little fragments of woodlands and hedgerows, and (goldcrests and crossbills really like deep forest interiors; what the majority of birds love best is structural edges inside woodlands.

If we look at woodland bird numbers, although we've successfully stemmed the decline of woodland generalist species, which are the ones happy on the edge, woodland specialists, which like the edges inside the sizeable areas of woodland, are still struggling.

I suspect this decline represents the effect of government policy steering farmers away from woodland management. Hopefully the rise in sustainable management of woodlands for timber will result in their numbers starting to rise, but an essential component of that is farmers seeing the potential of their woodlands.



The third vital component of woodland management for wildlife is light.

A special feature of UK woodlands is lack of shade-tolerant species of tree.

So whereas woods in Europe or North America would have an understorey of trees growing up underneath,

UK and especially Scottish woodlands have assemblages of bryophytes, ferns and flowers that have adapted to the dappled light under our canopy.

Most famously bluebells.

This photo shows two stands, Western Hemlock on the left and Scots pine on the right, thinned in the same way, but you can see that under the pines enough light is getting through to the ground for plants to grow.



Everyone blames Sitka spruce for being dark and having no light or life – but if it's like that it's either been planted on a very windy site or the owner hasn't thinned it – either because they planted it on a too-windy site, or because timber prices were low when they should have thinned it, or because they didn't know much about forestry.

The problem is not poor species but poor management. You can perfectly well have a sunny wood of spruce or Douglas fir.

Some species, like Western Hemlock, beech or sycamore, need to be managed carefully more heavily thinned to compensate for their heavier shade cover.



And what do these three top actions for biodiversity – deadwood, internal edges, and light – have in common when it comes to managing woodland?

They are all achieved by harvesting timber.

Because conifers grow fast, and are harvested fast, you're effectively accelerating the natural cycle of woodland. Plant a wood over the course of 10 years, after 15 years do the first thinning, and already you've got deadwood, internal structural diversity and have let in light – and you've started making money.

It will take centuries for a native biodiversity woodland to achieve those things, and you'll never make money – and it will never yield that timber which protects global forests, captures carbon and creates the green economy.



Summary: Farm forestry for biodiversity, eight ways:

Global forests 1) outcompeting illegal timber markets; 2) developing lower-input livestock systems

Climate change: 3) sequestering 4) storing 5) substituting carbon

Biodiversity in the farm woodland: 6) leaving deadwood 7) creating internal edges 8) letting in light