28/01/02

SUSTAINING ENGLAND'S WOODLANDS

Questionnaire

Please continue on separate sheets as necessary. You do not need to answer every question.

Name DR. R.A. FULLER
Address Institution of Environmental Sciences
PO Box 16
Bourne. PE10 9PB

If this response reflects the views of a representative body, please supply details:
Institution of Environmental Sciences.

How would you best describe yourself (or your organisation)? Please tick one:

Woodland owner	☐	Local/public authority	☐
Forestry agent/consultant/contractor	☐	Forest user	☐
Environmental organisation	☑	Timber processor	☐

Other (please state).....

Do you (or does your organisation) own woodland?

Yes, more than 10 hectares	☐
Yes, less than 10 hectares	☐
No	☑

Do your views reflect your experience of a particular region? If so, please tick. This is so that differences in priorities for each Government region can be assessed.

North East England	☐	West Midlands	☐
North West England	☐	East England	☐
Yorkshire & Humber	☐	South East England	☐
East Midlands	☐	South West England	☐
Greater London	☐	All England	☑

Do you want your views to be confidential? If so, please tick here: ☐

Please return by 28 January 2002 to:

Jo Ellis
The Forestry Commission
National Office for England
Great Eastern House
Tenison Road
Cambridge, CB1 2DU

Telephone: 01483 838447
Facsimile: 01223 460699

Email: jo.ellis@forestry.gsi.gov.uk

Section 1.

Questions about how the FC engages with woodland owners, and how the FC could help to ensure that forestry is sustainable in economic, environmental and social terms. Please refer to paragraphs 23–43 of the consultation document.

Q. 1 Do woodland owners and the wider public need to know more about what sustainable woodland management means?

Yes ☑ Maybe ☐ No ☐ No opinion ☐

If so, what should be the FC's role in achieving this?

Production and distribution of educational and informative literature

Q. 2 How can the FC engage with the owners of woodlands where it sees appropriate active management as being a priority for sustainability? What are the main barriers preventing engagement?

Direct consultation is the most effective but is resource intensive and may be hindered by lack of funding.

Q. 3 Is there a case for the FC supporting work which enhances the economic value of timber?

Yes ☑ Maybe ☐ No ☐ No opinion ☐

If so, how should this support be given?

Assistance with developing markets - alternatives for low-quality products and identification of niche markets for high grade products and woodland uses (eg shooting).

Q. 4 Should the FC support owners and/or woodland businesses in the harvesting, processing and sale of timber products from their woodlands?

Yes ☑ Maybe ☐ No ☐ No opinion ☐

If so, why is this necessary and how should this support be given?

To encourage this activity.

Q. 5 To what extent should the FC (rather than other bodies) involve itself in developing markets for woodland products and services? Which woodland products and services should the FC support?

Q. 6 Do you see a role for the FC in helping owners to exploit the commercial potential of their woodlands in areas other than timber production?

Yes ☑ Maybe ☐ No ☐ No opinion ☐

If so, how might the FC help?

As suggestions in paras 25 & 29.

Q. 7 In what situations is direct public support for non-market benefits necessary to ensure the economic sustainability of woodland management?

Consumer organisations support for 'Buy British'.

Q. 8 Should the FC do more to support the implementation of Habitat Action Plans and/or Species Action Plans in woods?

Yes ☑ Maybe ☐ No ☐ No opinion ☐

If so, how should this support be provided?

Q. 9 What other measures are needed from the FC to support woodland biodiversity and conservation?

Q. 10 Which environmental issues need to be tackled by co-operative working at a scale larger than individual woods? How should the FC help to tackle these issues?

Public access for recreation, decline in bird population, etc.
To be addressed through liaison with national bodies (Environment Agency, English Nature, etc) and Local Authorities and Associations (farmers, etc)

Q. 11 Should the FC do more to help to reduce the damage caused by deer in woods?

Yes ☐ Maybe ☐ No ☐ No opinion ☐

If so, how could this help be most effectively delivered?

Q. 12 Should the FC do more to help to reduce the damage caused by grey squirrels in woods?

Yes ☐ Maybe ☐ No ☐ No opinion ☐

If so, how could this help be most effectively delivered?

Q. 13 What would encourage more woodland owners to open their woods for public access, especially in areas where there is a demand for woodland recreation or the woodland forms part of a wider countryside recreation and access initiative? In particular, what would encourage the provision of access over a long term, for example the lifetime of the owner?

Grants for the provision of facilities by owners (this would also assist local employment).

Q. 14 What mechanisms could be used to encourage the provision of high quality and a diverse range of recreational opportunities in appropriate woodlands?

Local liaison and advice from Forest Enterprise.

Q. 15 Is there a role for Forest Enterprise in helping owners to manage woods where there may be especially complex public demands?

Yes ☑ Maybe ☐ No ☐ No opinion ☐

Q. 16 Are there other ways in which local communities should be involved in forestry?

Yes ☑ Maybe ☐ No ☐ No opinion ☐

If so, how can the FC facilitate this involvement?

Liaison with local amenity groups.

Section 2.

Questions about how the FC could remove some of the barriers to woodland management which are currently faced by woodland owners, and questions about the current grants. See paragraphs 44–57of the consultation paper.

Q. 17 Are current planning grants an appropriate way to help woodland owners plan management effectively?

Yes ☐ Maybe ☐ No ☐ No opinion ☐

Are there other ways in which the FC should help owners to plan management?

Q. 18 Should FC grants be conditional upon long-term planning?

Yes ☐ Maybe ☐ No ☐ No opinion ☐

If so, is this necessary in all woods, or is it a higher priority in particular kinds of woods?

Q. 19 Is a lack of suitable contractors preventing sustainable woodland management?

Yes ☐ Maybe ☐ No ☐ No opinion ☐

If so, should the FC involve itself in supporting the contractor base, and how could it do this most effectively?

Q. 20 Do woodland owners and managers need additional advice or training to help them manage woods sustainably?

Yes ☐ Maybe ☐ No ☐ No opinion ☐

If so, in what areas (subjects) is advice and training particularly needed?

Q. 21 Would a publicly funded 'extension service' be the most appropriate method of providing good quality advice and support to woodland owners and managers?

Yes ☐ Maybe ☐ No ☐ No opinion ☐

What would be the most effective ways of delivering such advice?

Q. 22 What role should grants play in encouraging sustainable forest management?

Q. 23 Please use the following table to comment on current grants. Sometimes a grant may be good in principle, but the actual delivery of the grant reduces its effectiveness. For this reason, the table asks for your comments on both the principle and the delivery of each kind of grant.

	Your comments on the principle of this form of grant	Your comments on the delivery of this grant and suggestions for improvement – for example the rate of payment; the activities included or excluded; the accompanying regulations.
Annual Management Grant		
Restocking Grant		
Woodland Improvement Grant 1 (Public access)		
Woodland Improvement Grant 2 (Under-managed)		
Woodland Improvement Grant 3 (Biodiversity)		

Q. 24 In principle, are Challenge funds effective at encouraging sustainable woodland management in existing woods?

Yes ☐ Maybe ☐ No ☐ No opinion ☐

Q. 25 Is it appropriate for the FC to support UKWAS certification through grant aid?

Yes ☐ Maybe ☐ No ☐ No opinion ☐

If so, what would be the best way of providing this support?

Section 3.

Questions about how the FC should work with partners and target action to achieve the Government's priorities for forestry. See paragraphs 59–68 of the consultation paper.

Q. 26 Do you think that the FC should increase its role as an ambassador for forestry, doing more to promote forestry as an instrument of policy delivery?

Yes ☑ Maybe ☐ No ☐ No opinion ☐

If so, please suggest which areas it should increase its activity.

Q. 27 Do you think that doing more to support others who are delivering the forestry agenda would be a cost-effective way for the FC to support sustainable forestry?

Yes ☐ Maybe ☑ No ☐ No opinion ☐

If so, what type of projects or initiatives should it support?

Q. 28 In what circumstances should the FC take a lead in co-ordinating the formation and working of partnerships?

Q. 29 Do you support the principle of flexibility and targeting of support for sustainable forest management?

Yes ☑ Maybe ☐ No ☐ No opinion ☐

If so, how should this support be targeted? If not, why not?

Q. 30 What steps need to be taken to ensure that FC support for forestry is better integrated with other government support mechanisms?

Q. 31 In your experience, which areas of FC support for sustainable forestry need most improvement in efficiency? Do you have suggestions for how improvements should be made?

Section 4.

Questions on the priorities for spending. See paragraphs 69–71 of the consultation document.

Q. 32 Please rank the six most important areas for support from 1 to 6, with 1 being of highest priority. You may wish to suggest other priorities for support – please include these in your ranking.	
	Ranking (1 to 6)
Helping owners and the wider public to understand what sustainable forest management means (paragraph 24)	1
Engaging with owners of woodland where the FC would particularly like to see management (paragraph 25)	4
Promoting the economic sustainability of woodland management through help with improving timber quality, harvesting, processing and/or sale of wood and timber (paragraphs 26–27)	2
Promoting economic sustainability through market development (paragraph 28)	3
Promoting economic sustainability through helping with the sale of other goods and services (paragraph 29)	
Doing more to support the environmental sustainability of woodland management (paragraphs 32–33)	
Working in partnership to tackle large-scale environmental issues (paragraphs 33–35)	5
Helping to reduce the damage caused by grey squirrels (paragraph 35)	
Helping to reduce the damage caused by deer (paragraph 36)	
Helping owners to encourage public access and recreation (paragraphs 37–43)	6
Helping owners to increase community involvement in forestry (paragraphs 37–43)	
Helping owners to plan management effectively (paragraphs 45–46)	
Ensuring that there is a skilled contractor resource available to owners (paragraphs 47–48)	
Ensuring that good advice is readily available to owners and managers (paragraphs 49–51)	
Altering existing grants to better support sustainable forest management (paragraphs 52–55)	
Supporting owners in achieving certification against the UKWAS standard (paragraphs 56–57)	
Increasing the FC's 'ambassadorial role' for forestry (paragraph 60)	
Doing more to support others who are delivering the forestry agenda (paragraph 60)	
Taking a lead in co-ordinating partnerships (paragraph 61)	
Improving the flexibility and targeting of support (paragraphs 62–65)	
Other	
Other	

Q. 33 Is the current balance (see paragraph 70) between support for woodland creation and support for existing woodland management reasonable?

Yes ☐

No, too much support for existing woodland ☐

No, not enough support for existing woodland ☐

No opinion ☑

Q. 34 Could changes to the tax regime make an important contribution to supporting sustainable forest management in existing woods?

Yes ☐ Maybe ☑ No ☐ No opinion ☐

If so, what changes would you like to see, and why?

Q. 35 Are there any other means of support that the FC should provide to ensure the sustainable management of existing woodland, which are not covered in your responses to the questions above? Please be specific.