

Circular wood use can accelerate global decarbonisation but requires cross-sectoral coordination

Eilidh Forster (✉ afp239@bangor.ac.uk)

Bangor university <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9081-7580>

John R. Healey

Bangor university

David Styles

University of Galway

Gary Newman

Woodknowledge Wales

Research Article

Keywords: circular economy, wood, forestry, life cycle assessment, bioeconomy, sustainability, system change

Posted Date: March 31st, 2023

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-2745784/v1>

License:   This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Productive forestry can deliver multifaceted climate-change mitigation benefits, including carbon sequestration and avoided emissions from fossil-fuel-derived product substitution. However, predominantly linear use of wood substantially limits the potential mitigation contribution of forestry value-chains. Using lifecycle assessment, we show that more circular and cascading use of wood can provide immediate and sustained climate change mitigation by reducing demand for virgin wood, increasing carbon sequestration and storage, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Despite the clear benefits of implementing circular economy principles in forestry value-chains, we identify many functional barriers impeding the structural reorganisation needed for such complex system change. A mind-set shift towards knowledge sharing and collaboration is fundamental to transform the value-chain into an effective societal change system and lead to coherent action; with trade organisations performing important advocacy and organising functions, and governments driving wood flow transparency to reveal efficiency and resourcing opportunities.

Main

The forestry value-chain is a key pillar of the 'circular economy' (CE)^{1,2,3,4,5} as a major source of renewable biomaterial, and can deliver multifaceted climate mitigation benefits, including carbon sequestration and avoided emissions from fossil-fuel-derived product substitution⁶. Global consumption of primary processed wood products is predicted to rise by between 60%⁷ and 170%⁸ by 2050, but current value-chains are suboptimal⁹ and won't sustainably meet future demand under the predominant linear economy model¹⁰. There is considerable scope to increase the sustainability of forestry value-chains and increase their contribution to achieving net-zero greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions¹¹, in alignment with Paris Agreement¹² goals. Currently, decarbonisation and circular economy policies tend to have a narrow sectoral focus, e.g. on development of zero emissions energy generation, afforestation for residual carbon offsetting, or increasing use of renewable materials in place of fossil-fuel-derived materials¹³. Yet there appears to be little cross-sectoral integration of these sustainability objectives, and little focus on more circular use and recycling of wood as part of a coherent decarbonisation strategy^{14,15}. There is therefore a need for prospective lifecycle assessment (LCA) with widely-defined (multi-use) boundaries to quantify the additional mitigation potential of implementing CE principles in the forestry value-chain, to provide critical evidence for systemic change necessary to deliver rapid and sustained climate change mitigation.

Transitioning to a CE is a 'wicked' problem^{16,17,18} requiring large socio-economic structural changes and industrial re-organisation¹⁹. Hundreds of organisations operate in the forestry value-chain at a national level; increasing to many thousands at a global level. To overcome the 'organising' challenge that results in suboptimal climate change mitigation, the forestry value-chain must function as a societal change

system (SCS), with shared overarching goals and principles guiding coherent and convergent action²⁰. A high-functioning SCS needs to perform seven critical change functions: system visioning; system organising; resourcing; learning; measuring; advocating; and prototyping to achieve change effectively²⁰. However, no analysis of the forestry value-chain as a SCS has yet been performed. Barriers to CE have previously been identified and catalogued as external factors impacting action at an organisation level^{21,22} (e.g. political, economic, sociological, technological, legal and environmental factors) but not against value-chain system-functioning criteria. SCS analysis of the forestry value-chain is needed to identify attributes that limit the system-change functions, in order to determine pragmatic steps to overcome these barriers.

This study aims to address these two important evidence gaps, to inform effective policy and industry actions targeting net-zero emissions ambitions. First, we identify wood use strategies that substantially increase climate-change mitigation by applying dynamic, consequential LCA²³ to four wood-use scenarios over a 28-year study period, to 2050. Second, we propose key enablers of system change by interviewing forestry value-chain actors on perceived barriers to circularity and analysing responses against a societal change matrix (of functions needed to achieve system change²⁰). By combining insights from LCA and SCS analysis we identify what to change, and how to change it.

Analysis of wood use strategies in a UK context

The UK domestic forestry value-chain (UK timber production and processing) supplies around 20% of domestic needs; the UK relies heavily on imports, but exports very little²⁴. Since the wood-flows out of UK forests mostly remain within national boundaries, traceability is high – making the UK an ideal case study for LCA of a whole forestry value-chains (from the forest through to harvested-wood-product (HWP) end-of-life). We use consequential LCA²³ to assess the climate-change mitigation impact – measured as 100-yr global warming potential (GWP) expressed as carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) emissions – for business-as-usual (BAU) 'BAU' UK-forestry value-chain wood use during 2022-2050, accounting for the effects of progressive industrial decarbonisation (i.e. increasing deployment of zero-emissions technology). We then assess three alternative wood use scenarios to calculate the climate-change mitigation impact of enhanced 'cascading', 'circular' and 'cascading&circular' uses (Figure 5, methods). Enhanced 'cascading' involves more production of sawnwood and less production of wood panels in the UK. Enhanced 'circular' involves manufacture of recycled medium density fibreboard (rMDF) from recovered waste MDF. 'Cascading&circular' combines the two. We modelled the impact of delaying the implementation of these scenarios from year 5 to year 10.

Carbon emissions distribution across value-chain

To observe relative GWP contributions of different components in the value-chain for the 'BAU', 'cascading', 'circular' and 'cascading&circular' scenarios, we analyse wood processing CO₂e emission sources (Scopes 1, 2, 3 and 4, defined in Figure 1) in the year 2035.

In all four scenarios, wood panel production is the biggest CO₂e emitter - contributing 63% of 'BAU' net Scope 1-3 GWP, of which around 40% is attributed to Scope 3 emissions from the use of resins (Figure 1). 'BAU' MDF production also involves high Scope 1-3 emissions and high consumption of virgin material (Figure 5, methods), implying substantial opportunity to reduce GWP impact. 'Avoided emissions - product substitution' contributes the greatest GWP "credit" across all scenarios (delivered by woodfuel substituting for fossil fuel, and sawnwood substituting for concrete in construction, in similar magnitudes). Avoided emissions offset all value-chain emissions and deliver net negative Scope 1-4 emissions of -2.1 to -3.9 million tonnes CO₂e in 2035.

Compared to 'BAU', the 'cascading' wood flow scenario has higher 'sawmill' emissions, more HWP carbon storage, and lower 'wood panel production' emissions, resulting in 35% lower Scope 1-3 emissions overall (Figure 1). Therefore, greater cascading use is beneficial from a national emissions accounting perspective (since these Scope 1-3 emissions are UK-attributed). However, it doesn't lead to significant global GWP benefits (i.e. net Scope 1-4 emissions) since imported HWP volumes (and associated emissions) adjust to balance changes in UK production and maintain stable UK consumption. The 7% GWP reduction in the 'cascading' scenario is from increased HWP carbon storage in UK-produced sawnwood. 'Avoided emissions – product substitution' benefits are unchanged from 'BAU' to 'cascading' since UK-HWP consumption is static and emissions from UK- and imported-HWP production are equivalent.

Circular use reduces demand for virgin wood

The greatest differentiating factor across the four scenarios is the net carbon sequestration gain from reduced harvesting (in non-domestic forests) in the circular wood flow scenarios ('circular' and 'cascading&circular') (Figure 1). Circular wood flow scenarios reduce consumption of virgin wood relative to the 'BAU', increasing 'avoided emissions - reduced harvest' and delivering GWP credits countering all (125% of) 'BAU' Scope 1-3 emissions. Circular scope 1-3 process emissions also reduce (because of lower energy demand for rMDF production compared to MDF production), along with imported HWP emissions (due to a net increase in UK-HWP production). Despite reduced fossil fuel emission avoidance via less waste wood fuel availability than in the 'BAU', the 'circular' and 'cascading&circular' scenarios achieve 85% and 87% greater net (Scope 1-4) GWP credit in 2035 than the 'BAU', and 73% and 75% more than the 'cascading' scenario, respectively.

The greatest GWP credit is achieved by the combined 'cascading&circular' scenario, which is 1% more effective than 'circular' alone (Figure 1). This subtle enhancement is because the 'circular' scenario also achieves improved cascading use compared to 'BAU' wood use due to redirection of virgin material at the forest gate from wood panel production to sawmills. Therefore, the additional cascading material flow enhancements in the combined 'cascading&circular' scenario only lead to marginal further benefits. Overall, all modelled cascading and circular changes to material flow from the 'BAU' result in larger GWP credits, both when considering net Scope 1-3 and net Scope 1-4 GWP impacts.

GWP benefit of circular wood use is resilient to industrial decarbonisation

The relative net GWP impacts of the four wood use scenarios in 2035 (Figure 1), are reflected in the dynamic annual net GWP impacts throughout the period 2022-2050 (Figure 2a-d). Every year, the 'cascading&circular' scenario delivers the lowest GWP burden (or greatest GWP credit), followed closely by 'circular', whereas 'cascading' provides only marginal GWP benefit over the 'BAU'. We apply the same progressive industrial decarbonisation factors to the relevant value-chain components (i.e. processing emissions) in all four scenarios, so that net Scope 1-3 GWP shrinks over time (Figure 2a&b), while net Scope 1-4 GWP becomes less negative over time (i.e. net credits shrink), reflecting diminishing 'avoided emissions – product substitution' (Figure 2c&d). Net Scope 1-4 GWP of 'circular' and 'cascading&circular' wood use scenarios is less affected by industrial decarbonisation, since diminishing (avoided emission) factors do not apply to the dominant biogenic carbon storage credits ('change in HWP C storage' and 'avoided emissions – reduced harvest').

Early implementation optimises impact

Since annual net Scope 1-4 GWP credit declines over time, prompt transition to 'circular' and 'cascading' wood use in the first five years achieves both an earlier and faster rate of cumulative GWP benefit than delaying action by a further five years (Figure 2c&d). When implemented in year 5, the 'cascading&circular' scenario achieves an average annual GWP credit of -3.7 million tonnes CO₂e per year post-implementation, and a cumulative credit of -96.6 million tonnes CO₂e by 2050 (Figures 2c&3c). However, when implemented in year 10, the respective GWP credits are -3.4 and -87.5 million tonnes CO₂e (Figures 2d&3d).

Circularity creates a carbon sink

A 'net-zero' (Scopes 1-3) GWP forestry value-chain is only achievable by 2050 if circular wood use is implemented. Dynamic results show that annual Scope 1-3 GWP impact (which is typically used to set industry level decarbonisation targets) reduces over time with industrial decarbonisation (Figure 2a&b). However, it will only reach or bypass net zero by 2050 if 'circular' or 'circular&cascading' wood use is implemented in parallel with industrial decarbonisation. Implementing the 'circular' or 'circular&cascading' scenarios achieves (Scope 1-3) net zero by 2050 and thereafter becomes a net carbon sink (Figure 2a&b).

'BAU' annual net Scope 1-3 GWP impact will become net zero when industry fully decarbonises. 'BAU' Scope 1-4 GWP will become net zero at the same time, since imported-HWP countries are assumed to decarbonise at the same rate as the UK so 'avoided emissions – product substitution' will also become zero. However, while Scope 1-3 emissions and 'avoided emissions - product substitution' diminish over time, circular wood use continues to provide annual GWP benefits via 'HWP C storage' and 'avoided emissions - reduced harvesting'. Therefore, 'circular' or 'cascading&circular' wood use can lead to the forestry value-chain becoming an enduring (Scope 1-4) net carbon sink (even before considering the potential contributions of afforestation and bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (BECCS)).

Circular wood use complements afforestation as a 'net zero' strategy

Implementing 'circular' or 'circular&cascading' wood use achieves considerable immediate GWP benefit, followed by a lower yet sustained benefit to 2050 (Figure 2c&d, 3c&d). In comparison, GWP benefit of 'afforestation' (defined in Figure 3) builds gradually and increases pace as it approaches 2050 (Figure 3c&d). The best-case combined GWP impact of 'afforestation' and 'circular&cascading' wood use is -258.8 million tonnes CO₂e by 2050, while 'afforestation' alone will only achieve -162.3 million tonnes CO₂e by this year (Figure 3c). Significant further benefit from 'afforestation' will continue to accrue after 2050 from ongoing carbon sequestration in forest growth, and later from HWP⁶. Therefore, as part of a 'net-zero' carbon strategy, circular wood use is complementary to the GWP impact of afforestation.

Barriers to circularity

We gathered information on experiential knowledge of barriers to decarbonisation and transitioning to a CE via in-depth semi-structured interviews with seventeen individuals from diverse organisations across the UK forestry value-chain (tree nursery, tree planting, forest management, harvesting, sawmilling, wood panel manufacturing, biotechnology, carbon markets, land agents and trade organisations). We organised and defined the barriers identified by participants under the seven change-function categories

needed for an effective SCS²⁰. Twenty-four barriers to change are identified and indicate weaknesses in the performance of every SCS change function in the forestry value-chain (Table 1).

Shared 'system visioning' is the bond needed to create coherent action in multi-stakeholder collaborations²⁷, beginning with a broad global vision that provides common guidance for principles adapted to local conditions²⁰. During interviews we found there is no clear unifying global vision for the role of forestry in a net-zero CE. Rather, narrow focus on fragmented implementation of zero emissions technologies to decarbonise particular operations and subsectors predominates. Participants reported organisation strategy focussing only on decarbonisation, or no strategy at all (Table 1). Thus, despite being long-established, we deduce that the UK forestry value-chain is not organised appropriately to facilitate complex system change. A SCS requires 'organising' of effort and stakeholders in ways that provide coherent aggregation of voice at scale in order to be heard. This can include collaborations and networks of organisations²⁰, such as trade organisations, which are numerous in the UK forestry value-chain. During interviews, participants reported a lack of willingness to collaborate and co-ordinate between value-chain stakeholders and stakeholder groups (Table 1), which limits organising of efforts, shared learning, and therefore effective SCS function.

Mind-set and capacity for learning are key at the individual, organisational, and system levels. Addressing complex change challenges demands new ways of thinking about problems and of taking action. 'Learning' change initiatives can include advancement and sharing of knowledge from the prototyping of new technologies or business models; they can also include multi-stakeholder networks that focus on establishing events, interactions, and publications to support realising the vision²⁰. During interviews we identified a culture where sharing of knowledge and experience is not consistent across the value-chain. Interviewees reported slow public release of new forestry research; and a number of important knowledge gaps, such as the exploitable material properties of alternative commercial tree species and the carbon impact of silvicultural practises across different soil types. Wood processors conveyed a negative attitude towards shared learning on implementation of decarbonisation initiatives (Table 1). Overall, we observed low awareness of the potential role of forestry value-chains in a CE.

Adequate financial and personnel resources are essential for change agents to be able to perform their role, individually and collectively²⁰. However, shared 'resourcing' barriers are identified by participants from across the value-chain, with low operating profit margins and uncertain future wood supply concerns dominating; the latter is compounded by uncertain government land-use subsidies, a convoluted woodland creation approval process and unpredictable revenue from voluntary carbon markets impeding afforestation. Participants reported that these barriers delay stakeholder decision-

making, restrict ability or willingness to invest in change initiatives, and impede recruitment and retention of skilled labour (Table 1).

A change system requires a social dynamic that motivates and drives change²⁰. However, we found that value-chain stakeholders feel little social pressure to change, from either industry peers or consumers – perhaps reflecting an apparent absence of change stewards ‘advocating’ for circular wood value chains. We also found that conservatism towards change and innovation is limiting ‘prototyping’ of new technologies, and also new ways of organizing, new policies, new financial products, and ideas to influence consumption. Few examples of large-scale CE demonstration projects have materialised to date (Table 1).

In order to appraise the wider GWP impact and circularity of the forestry value-chain, more holistic ‘measuring’ is needed at the value-chain level to benchmark, reveal opportunities for improvement and then monitor improvements²⁰ towards CE principles implementation. Participants reported that limited transparency of “waste” wood flows is a barrier to effective value-chain measuring that limits development of waste wood markets. There is also a lack of practicable metrics for stakeholders at an organisational level, to quantify baseline GWP and circularity performance, and to monitor progress (Table 1).

Table 1 Societal change system matrix analysis of perceived barriers to circularity and decarbonisation in the UK forestry value-chain. Barriers identified in stakeholder interview responses are categorised according to the system functions needed for effective change²⁰. Potential counter enablers are subsequently proposed to overcome the identified barriers.

Function	Barriers to change	Enablers to change
System visioning	<p>No unifying (global) vision for the role of forestry in a net zero circular economy. Vision has narrow focus on decarbonisation.</p> <p>Weak or no presence of circular economy principles applied to forestry value-chains in vision.</p>	<p>Develop a unifying global vision for forestry in a CE by an international coalition of respected forestry and wood organisations (reflecting the global nature of HWP trade) to guide development of localised (regional, national and industry) vision.</p> <p>Develop a national road-map, led by trade organisations, defining CE vision and principles to guide action nationally.</p>
System organising	<p>Limited willingness to collaborate across industry organisations and networks, and other initiatives, leading to gaps in effort and unquantified missed opportunities (e.g. biotechnology and silviculture).</p> <p>Incoherent policy relating to circular material use. Hindered by frequent turnover of politicians.</p> <p>Inadequate waste-wood sorting system.</p> <p>Fragmented land ownership and use.</p> <p>No centralised co-ordination of multiple small operators in timber haulage.</p>	<p>Greater engagement and collaboration between sub-groups of the forestry value-chain. Unite trade associations under a coalition change initiative to work coherently towards an agreed shared vision.</p> <p>Develop and agree a value-chain CE action plan, including decarbonisation and circularity targets and a strategy for transformation.</p> <p>Map existing change initiatives to identify gaps or duplications in efforts, as well as opportunities for synergies.</p> <p>Establish change steward(s) to create spaces, encounters, and supporting relationships between change initiatives to reveal and address gaps in effort, unproductive duplication and competition, and potential synergies (in each sub-system – with co-ordination across sub-systems).</p> <p>Enhance organisation of waste-wood recovery and sorting system to enable development of recovered wood markets: define coherent national policy that incentivises circularity initiatives (and removes conflicting policy, e.g. biomass incentives); reinforce with supporting waste regulation.</p>
Resourcing	<p>Uncertainty of land-use subsidies and voluntary carbon market prices delays action.</p> <p>Investment risk limits investment. The risk is due to reducing UK harvest volumes, lengthy and expensive woodland creation planning applications, uncertain land-use subsidies and voluntary carbon market prices.</p> <p>Low cost-competitiveness (of wood/bio-products vs alternatives)</p> <p>Low profit margins, which limit business reinvestment and recruitment.</p> <p>Limited government support for decarbonisation initiatives.</p>	<p>Increase government commitment and support for commercial woodland creation schemes. Provide clarity on subsidies for woodland creation (environmental land management scheme (ELMS) in England, and equivalent schemes in the other UK nations).</p> <p>Develop a voluntary carbon standard recognising the contribution of HWP to decarbonisation and the CE.</p> <p>Simplify the planning application system for woodland creation.</p> <p>Increase government financial support for effective CE and decarbonisation change initiatives.</p> <p>Influence relative pricing of wood-based products to reflect holistic value in a CE, i.e. reward resource-use efficiency and low embodied carbon, via differential government subsidies or regulatory barriers.</p>

	<p>Insufficient price differential between higher (carcassing) and lower (fencing) value sawnwood products to incentivise hierarchical cascading use, and insufficient or unfavourable price differential between HWP and non-wood substitutes to favour HWP.</p>	
Learning	<p>Low awareness and knowledge of CE, specifically the role and potential impact of the forestry value-chain within it, and its implications for decarbonisation. Production-system thinking is prevalent in the forestry value-chain, rather than change-system thinking.</p> <p>New information/research slow to be made public (but subsequently disseminated quickly).</p> <p>Gaps in research and/or knowledge sharing - manifest as lack of knowledge, for alternative commercial species to Sitka spruce, of their silvicultural characteristics and commercial wood properties (for new bio-products); and effect of different silvicultural techniques on carbon stocks in (different types of) soil.</p>	<p>Form a collaborative organisation(s) that acts as a change steward(s), to help develop a new 'change-system' mind-set through all levels of the value chain.</p> <p>More innovation and less conservatism by businesses across the value-chain.</p> <p>More collaborative research and knowledge-sharing initiatives across the value-chain.</p> <p>Better quantity and quality of evidence from research, in particular from better "evidence synthesis" across different research studies.</p>
Measuring	<p>Poor transparency of material flow through the value-chain. Particularly poor transparency of flow of recovered wood to cascading and end-of-life uses.</p> <p>No widely agreed circularity metrics.</p> <p>Low participation in monitoring of emissions, particularly by SMEs.</p>	<p>Regulation for mandatory reporting of wood flow through the value-chain, in particular for waste wood.</p> <p>Development and application of practical circularity metrics at organisation and value-chain levels.</p> <p>Calculating, reporting and monitoring of GHG emissions at organisation and value-chain levels.</p> <p>Development of value-chain circularity and decarbonisation targets in the form of an industry road-map and transformation strategy document.</p> <p>Regulation for mandatory materials-inventory for new construction projects (and maintained by asset owner over the structure's life in order to facilitate recovery and recycling at end-of-life).</p>
Advocating	<p>No prevalent change stewards applying pressure on the value-chain to transition towards</p>	<p>Create a collaborative organisation(s) that acts as a change steward(s) to take on advocacy roles, including lobbying of government to implement supporting policy and regulation.</p>

	<p>decarbonisation and circularity across the value-chain.</p> <p>Low social pressure felt from industrial, commercial and public consumers of wood – due to lack of awareness and apparent interest.</p>	<p>A community of value-chain stakeholders advocating for CE system change within their professional networks (led by principles set out by the change steward(s) and road-map).</p> <p>Organisations set and declare internal decarbonisation and CE targets and request suppliers to do the same.</p> <p>Communicate change initiatives and successes widely to increase social pressure and build energy for change.</p> <p>Engage and collaborate with existing impactful CE advocates (e.g. Ellen MacArthur Foundation⁴).</p>
Prototyping	<p>There is conservatism towards change. Interviewees reported lack of prototyping to support a shift to net-zero CE, such as new ways of organising, policies, financial products and ways of influencing consumption. Few large-scale demonstration projects.</p>	<p>Stakeholders, acting individually and collaboratively, from across the value-chain (e.g. commercial businesses, academia, consumers, trade organisations, government) to embrace the principles of CE will help evolve a culture compatible with conceiving and implementing innovative initiatives. For example, organisations could integrate innovation into company policy and culture; fund or collaborate on academic research; and engage with emerging businesses and technologies.</p>

Change initiatives for progress

A shared CE vision for the forestry value-chain, functioning as an effective SCS, needs to be agreed upon internationally (Table 1). An effective SCS forestry value-chain could incorporate climate-smart forestry^{28,29}, cascading wood uses³⁰, “cyclical materials flows, renewable energy sources and cascading energy flows... to limit the throughput flow of materials and energy to a level that nature tolerates..., respecting their natural reproduction rates”³¹.

Even with a shared CE vision, coherent-convergent action across the forestry value-chain is challenging because of the diverse sub-sectors and scales of businesses, from owner-operators to subsidiaries of global corporations. Trade organisations could play an important organising and influencing role²⁰ in transitioning the forestry value-chain towards an effective SCS. However, despite the many shared barriers to change reported across the diverse stakeholders interviewed, there remains a lack of collaboration across numerous trade bodies representing industry sub-sectors. Trade bodies could become multi-stakeholder ‘bridging leaders’^{32,33} of change by aligning in their individual³⁴ efforts towards the shared vision (Table 1, Figure 4).

We suggest that an international group of progressive forestry and wood organisations collaborate to define a shared long-term strategic vision for the role of the forestry value-chain in delivering a net-zero CE, and develop a road-map (in consultation with value chain stakeholders) to guide coherent-convergent action, identifying key opportunities and enablers for change, based on scientific evidence. This is foundational for effective change. The next critical step is consistent, widespread advocacy of the vision and road-map, in order to create energy for change and turn aspiration into action. Change stewards, including trade bodies must advocate within the forestry value-chain to drive collaboration, knowledge sharing and innovation (supported by creating spaces for stakeholders to collaborate and exchange ideas); and outside the forestry value-chain, to lobby government for coherent supporting policies across relevant domains (agriculture/land use, built environment, waste management, climate and environment, energy). Unity of message, aligned to the shared vision is critical.

Since our LCA analysis provides clear evidence of the climate-change mitigation benefits of cascading and circular wood value chains, mandates or incentives to recycle waste wood could represent critical control points to maximise climate-change mitigation arising from commercial forestry. Mandating detailed reporting of wood flows – particularly recovered wood use – could reveal opportunities for CE initiatives (such as MDF recycling, rMDF production and increasing sawnwood production), and enable measuring, target setting and monitoring of progress. It could facilitate enforcement of higher wood recycling rates, as well as broader implementation of Extended Producer Responsibility³⁵ to drive recyclability of HWP by making producers responsible for management of their products when they become waste. Mandatory decommissioning plans at the design phase of construction projects over a threshold value; along with a mandatory materials-inventory (including technical specifications, such as timber grade) post-construction phase, could drive up recoverability and recycling of used construction materials. However, to ensure true development of CE at a global level, and to prevent leakage, there also needs to be strong governance on the use of biomass for bioenergy. A key benefit of circular wood use is reduced demand for virgin wood (Figures 1-3), which would be undermined if use of virgin wood for bioenergy increased to replace recycled waste wood (fuel).

Creating a funding mechanism for implementing and scaling-up circular economy initiatives in forestry value-chains is needed to overcome resourcing barriers in this financially-constrained sector. Forestry value-chain businesses are not directly credited for most emissions-reductions or carbon-sequestration gains from improved circularity (Figure 1) and they will not be motivated or have sufficient resources to invest in operational or structural changes without financial support.

Finally, simplifying and accelerating the planning approval process for productive forest planting would reduce costs, complexity and delays to afforestation. These policy changes would also convey public

support for productive forestry, indirectly enhancing recruitment prospects and growth of the sector. This will help to ensure longevity of domestic wood supply and ability to meet future demand sustainably, as well as providing important carbon sequestration in the short- and long-term.

Conclusion

We present new evidence substantiating the climate-change mitigation benefit of organising more circular forestry value-chains, and demonstrate how such value chains could interact with commercial afforestation to deliver immediate and sustained decarbonisation. Implementing cascading and circular wood use could deliver 50% more cumulative climate-change mitigation by 2050 than decarbonisation of linear wood value chains alone. Circular wood use can reduce Scope 1–3 process emissions, particularly for rMDF manufacturing, though this is not true across all value chains since extra process steps and energy demand can also lead to higher direct emissions^{31,36}. Most mitigation is achieved via product substitution and increased carbon storage in forests (via reduced harvest demand) and products. Looking beyond business-level emissions accounting is therefore imperative to realise the significant contribution that a more circular forestry value-chain could make towards a net-zero circular economy. Governments can support change at scale by introducing coherent policy, regulation, green procurement and financial incentives.

Lack of organisation across the forestry value-chain is impeding a transition to circular principles. There is an urgent need for a global shared CE forestry value-chain vision to organise collective efforts and create energy for change, leading to coherent-convergent action by all. Consistent advocating will create social pressure²⁰ and could stimulate broader collective support for the CE vision, inside and outside the value-chain; in policy, finance, technology and consumer domains. Failing to become an effective SCS and implement circularity initiatives heightens the risk of overshooting Paris Agreement-aligned GHG emissions targets, or worse, increasing biogenic carbon emissions due to forest degradation caused by harvest rates rising with global demand for wood, exacerbated by linear wood use.

Methods

Goal of LCA

Dynamic consequential life cycle assessment²³ was performed on the UK forestry value chain to calculate the GWP impact of four UK wood flow scenarios (Figure 5) over the period 2022 to 2050, in order to quantify the potential climate mitigation effect of increasing cascading and circular wood use. We also compared the GWP impact of the four wood flow scenarios against a UK afforestation scenario in order to benchmark the impact of increasing cascading and circular wood use against another core, forest-related 'net-zero' GHG emissions strategy.

Wood flow scenarios

The four wood flow scenarios assessed include business as usual (BAU) UK wood use ('BAU', Figure 5a) and three scenarios representing increased cascading and circular use of wood (Figures 5b,c&d). In the circular and cascading scenarios we minimised direct changes to 'BAU' UK production of (virgin, i.e. not including waste wood) 'woodfuel', 'fence poles' and 'other' harvested wood products (HWP) as much possible in order to clearly observe the impacts of the intended key material flow changes, described below. However, due to the complex and dynamic nature of wood flow some changes across UK HWP production volumes were unavoidable. In cascading scenarios (Figure 5b&d), more material is directed to sawmills, which increases supply of sawmill residues to woodfuel. We reduced the flow of logs from the forest gate to woodfuel to counter this and to minimise change to the net 'BAU' (virgin) UK woodfuel production.

In circular and cascading scenarios (Figures 5b,c&d), imported HWP volumes (not shown) are adjusted in response to changes in UK HWP production in order to maintain constant UK supply (domestic plus imports), with the exception of increasing imported woodfuel to replace recycled waste medium density fibreboard (rMDF) in the circular scenarios (Figures 5c&d). This results in a real net reduction in UK woodfuel consumption in circular scenarios.

Afforestation scenario

The afforestation scenario involves planting 20,000 ha per year from 2022 to 2050, with 50% commercial conifer forest (Sitka spruce), and 50% 50:50 conifer:broadleaf forest (Sitka spruce; Douglas fir; Corsican pine; silver birch; rowan; oak). Harvesting of commercial conifer forest is assumed to commence 50 years after planting, which is beyond the time-period considered in this study.

Scope of LCA

The LCA scope includes 'UK forestry operations', 'UK wood processing', 'UK HWP C sequestration' and 'UK-bioenergy production' associated with softwood produced from UK forests, except pulpwood (accounting for 5% of UK harvest) (Figure 6). Pulp and paper manufacturing is highly partitioned from the rest of the value chain and is excluded from the study. Annual UK softwood harvest is assumed to be constant at 9.5 million green tonnes per year²⁴.

Since we are considering the consequential impact of shifting from 'BAU' wood use and because the annual UK harvest rate is constant in all scenarios, UK 'forest ecosystem' C sequestration is set to zero in all scenarios. However, for circular scenarios (Figure 5c&d) that use less virgin wood, gains in forest C

sequestration from reducing non-domestic harvesting are calculated - 'Avoided emissions – reduced harvest'.

HWP C sequestration benefits are also set to zero for the 'BAU', since we are considering the consequential impact of shifting from 'BAU' wood use. 'HWPs C sequestration' accounts for an increase/decrease to the UK HWP C pool relative to the 'BAU' due to changes in 'UK wood processing' (Figure 6) in the circular and cascading wood flow scenarios (Figures 5b,c&d).

In order to clearly observe the consequential impacts of increasing cascading and circular wood use, embodied emissions from processing and transport of 'BAU' imported HWPs is set to zero. The GWP impact of changes to 'BAU' HWP imports (in scenarios 5b,c&d) are calculated – 'Imported HWP processing (change from 'BAU')' and 'Imported HWP transport (change from 'BAU')'.

Results are presented under Scopes 1 & 2, Scope 3 and Scope 4 emissions categories (defined in Figure 6) in order to provide further insight into where emissions arise in the value chain.

Process emissions

Process GHG emissions are calculated for: 'UK forestry operations' (including tree seedling production, site preparation, planting, harvesting and timber transport (from forest to wood processor); 'UK sawmilling'; 'UK wood panel production' (particleboard, MDF and rMDF); 'UK woodfuel production'; 'imported-HWP processing' (change from BAU) and 'imported-HWP transport' (change from BAU). GHG emissions were calculated from secondary data (Ecoinvent v.3.539 using OpenLCA v1.7.4), scaled to the four material flows (Figure 5). The production and transport of all material and energy inputs were accounted for, as were the construction or manufacture of infrastructure and capital equipment. Full life cycle inventories (and impact calculations) are provided in S1-6, with an example inventory table for the 'BAU' wood flow scenario in S7. Given the focus of this paper is on climate-change mitigation, only the global warming potential (IPCC 2013 GWP 100a) impact category was evaluated, expressed as kg CO₂e. The LCA scope includes direct and indirect GHG emissions from wood production, processing, transport and use (Figure 6). The GHG emissions from wood processing are treated as the same per unit product for equivalent UK- and imported-HWPs.

Terrestrial carbon

Harvest reduction due to recycling MDF (leading to 'Avoided emissions – reduced harvest') was calculated as the volume of recycled MDF converted to green tonnes equivalent using conversion factors developed by Forest Research (refs). We assume that harvest reduction occurs in countries from which

imported-HWP is exported, but use UK net forest ecosystem carbon change factors as a proxy for this international effect. Specifically, we assume that a Sitka spruce forest equal to the total area of UK commercial forest, 710,000 ha, shifts from a 50-year harvest rotation, to a 54-year rotation – with the resulting annual harvest reducing by the defined amount. ‘Avoided emissions – reduced harvest’ is calculated as the annualised, 28-year (study period) average gain in forest ecosystem (soil and biomass) carbon as a result of shifting to the longer rotation.

Forest growth, decay and harvest volumes were calculated using the Carbon Budget Model for the Canadian Forest Sector (CBM-CFS3)³⁹, which complies with carbon estimation methods outlined in the 2003 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Good Practice Guidance For Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry⁴⁰, and the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories⁴¹. It was parameterised using best-fit yield tables from Forest Yield, the standard yield model for forest management in the UK⁴². For mixed species forests (defined in the afforestation scenario), aggregate group yield classes (YC) were calculated based on weighted mean YCs. CBM-CFS3 outputs include annual soil and biomass carbon stocks.

HWP carbon

Retirement rates of HWP were calculated according to IPCC⁴³ simple decay approach. Thus, there is a carbon transfer from domestic forest carbon pools to HWP at the point of harvest, which is emitted from the HWP pool at the time of end-of-life of that HWP. We account for annual release of carbon to the atmosphere from HWP (including fuelwood) where wood came from domestic harvest. We do not account for imported HWP. We use IPCC⁴⁴ and modified HWP decay factors⁴⁵ to calculate HWP retirement emissions. Emissions from landfill disposal of retired HWP (very low in the UK⁶) are excluded. ‘UK-HWP C sequestration (change from BAU) ’ is calculated as the annualised, 50-year average gain in UK-HWP C as a result of change to UK HWP production in cascading and circular scenarios (Figure b-d) compared to ‘BAU’.

Substitution credits

Substitution credits were calculated following the same method as Forster et al. (2021)⁶. Fuel-to-energy conversion factors (for natural gas and wood chips) were taken from Ecoinvent data (Ecoinvent v.3.539 using OpenLCA v1.7.4) unit processes⁴⁶ to calculate fossil fuel substitution by dedicated biomass energy generation and incineration with energy recovery for wood waste. Emissions avoidance through substitution of mineral construction materials was estimated by translating the final mass of construction timber (150 tonnes at 20% moisture per ha thinned forest) into an area of timber-framed wall using industry standard design: 0.0175 m³ of timber per 1 m² wall (BRE IMPACT database⁴⁷

accessed via eToolLCD® software – S5). 1 m² of timber frame wall replaces 1 m² of single skin, 140-mm concrete block and mortar (sand:cement ratio 10:3) wall with 10-mm jointing in typical UK house construction. Avoided emissions were then calculated using emission factors from Ecoinvent for the manufacture of concrete blocks, sand and cement. Substitution credits are subject to progressive decarbonisation factors, outlined in the following section.

Progressive industrial decarbonisation

Projected industrial decarbonisation factors are applied to all process emissions across forestry operations, wood processing and transport – for domestic and imported HWP. They are also applied to substitution credits for avoided (natural gas) electricity generation and concrete production. Decarbonisation assumptions are elaborated in S8. Bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (BECCS) deployment is not accounted for, owing to the short time horizon of the study and unpredictable timeline for BECCS technology readiness.

Societal change system analysis

We captured experiential knowledge of key stakeholders operating in the forestry value chain in order to identify perceived barriers to CE and then performed societal change system analysis to understand the value chain capacity for change.

Participants

Fifteen individuals from the membership of the UK Confederation of Forest Industries (Confor) were selected, in consultation with Confor senior leadership, to participate in semi-structured, one-to-one interviews; thirteen agreed to take part. Four participants from outside Confor's membership were also invited, in order to strengthen representation of sub-sectors not prevalent in the membership base, including wood recycling and wood panel manufacturing. We were unable to recruit a participant from the forestry investment sector. Seventeen individuals were interviewed in total.

Participants were selected for their level of experience (seniority), area of expertise (sub-sector) and geographical location. Participants mainly represented private sector organisations, but public forestry organisations were also included. Interviewees were geographically spread to capture variation in experiences from across the UK. Interviews took place online via Microsoft Teams or by telephone. Most interviews lasted between 45 and 60 min, with five lasting 30-45 minutes. Fourteen were video and audio recorded (with automated transcription). Three were not recorded and notes were taken manually. This research complied with Bangor University's Research Ethics Policy; Code of Practice for the Assurance of

Academic Integrity and Quality Assurance in Research; and the General Data Protection Regulation. Informed verbal consent was obtained from all participants.

Interviews

Participants were asked about decarbonisation and circularity initiatives in their business in order to determine the experiences (successes and challenges) of each interviewee's organisation with regard to energy use, energy reduction, carbon reduction and wood use efficiency. Then they were asked broader questions about their sub-sector and the whole value chain regarding barriers and enablers of change towards decarbonisation and circular economy (SI xx – interview questions).

Analysis of interview content

Directed content analysis^{48,49} was applied to whole-interview video recordings and manual notes using a combination of deductive and inductive approaches⁴⁹. First, we developed an analysis matrix based on the five change sub-systems (column headers) and seven change functions of an effective change system (row headers), to organise the interview data. Synthesised and anonymised interview data is provided in S9.

The five change sub-systems are:

1. Technology - research organisations and companies developing new technologies and innovations;
2. Policy - governmental bodies, including regulators and legislators, and other stakeholders that engage in coproduction or influencing of rules and policies;
3. Producer - the infrastructure that produces, processes and distributes wood-based products;
4. Consumer - demand for wood-based products and the influence of demand; and
5. Finance - public and private sector capital, and organisations innovating in and influencing financial markets.

Every change sub-system must perform the following seven change functions for an effective change system.

1. System Visioning - A shared vision that creates coherence among stakeholders and change initiatives;
2. System Organising - Organising of effort and stakeholders in ways that provide coherent aggregation of voices at scale;

3. Resourcing - Provision of financial and personnel resources needed for action;
4. Learning - Development and exchange of knowledge arising from prototyping;
5. Prototyping - Developing and testing of new technologies, ways of organizing, policies, financial products and ideas;
6. Measuring - Assessing progress towards the vision, and identifying opportunities for improvement; and
7. Advocating - Social pressure and energy for change. (Definitions adapted from Waddell (2017)²⁰).

We synthesised the interview data for the five sub-systems into one whole-system, with the barriers still categorised under the seven change functions. We then followed inductive analysis principles to develop further categories within the bounds of the seven change functions in the matrix to describe and group the barriers to change. For example, within the 'system organising vision' function category, the following sub-categories were created to group and describe the barriers reported by participants within this function: 'limited willingness to collaborate', 'incoherent policy', 'poor waste sorting system', 'fragmented land ownership' and 'no-centralised co-ordination of multiple small operators.' This was performed for all seven change-function categories. The concepts discussed were complex and sometimes interconnected so manual coding was applied to avoid the risk of missing relevant information.

References

1. Murray, A; Skene, K. and Haynes, K. The Circular Economy: An Interdisciplinary Exploration of the Concept and Application in a Global Context. *Journal of Business Ethics* vol. 140 369–380 (2017)
2. Barros, M.V., Salvador, R., do Prado, G.F., de Francisco, A.C. and Piekarski, C.M. Circular economy as a driver to sustainable businesses. *Cleaner Environmental Systems* vol. 2 100006 (2021)
3. Kirchherr, J., Reike, D. and Hekkert, M. Conceptualizing the circular economy: An analysis of 114 definitions. *Resources, Conservation & Recycling* vol. 127 221–232 (2017)
4. Ellen MacArthur Foundation. Circular Economy Introduction. Available at <https://ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/topics/circular-economy-introduction/overview> (Accessed 2022)
5. Korhonen, J., Honkasalo, A. and Seppälä, J. Circular Economy: The Concept and its Limitations. *Ecological Economics* vol. 143 37–46 (2018)
6. Forster, E.J., Healey, J.R., Dymond, C. and Styles, D. Commercial afforestation can deliver effective climate change mitigation under multiple decarbonisation pathways. *Nature Communications* 12: 3831 (2021) <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-021-24084>
7. FAO. Global forest sector outlook 2050: Assessing future demand and sources of timber for a sustainable economy – Background paper for The State of the World's Forests 2022. FAO Forestry Working Paper, No. 31. Rome. Provisional. (2022)
8. van Romunde, R. Gresham House, Global Timber Outlook 2020: An in-depth report on the global forestry industry. Octagon Point, 5 Cheapside, London EC2V 6AA (2020)

9. 9United Nations (UNECE) and FAO. Circularity concepts in forest-based industries. United Nations publication ECE/TIM/SP/49 ISSN: 1020 7228 (2021)
10. 10Egenolf, V., Distelkamp, M., Morland, C., Beck-O'Briena, M. and Bringezua, S. The timber footprint of German bioeconomy scenarios compared to the planetary boundaries for sustainable roundwood supply. *Sustainable Production and Consumption* vol. 33 686–699 (2022)
11. 11 Jahan, I., Zhang, G., Bhuiyan, M. and Navaratnam, S. Circular Economy of Construction and Demolition Wood Waste—A Theoretical Framework Approach. *Sustainability* vol. 14, 10478. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su141710478> (2022)
12. 12 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Paris Agreement. Adoption of the Paris Agreement, 21st Conference of the Parties, Paris: United Nations. AN OFFICIAL PUBLICATION (2015)
13. 13 Committee on Climate Change. The Sixth Carbon Budget - The UK's path to Net Zero. Presented to the Secretary of State pursuant to section 34 of the Climate Change Act 2008. (2020)
14. 14European Commission. Environment. Circular Economy: Implementation of the Circular Economy Action Plan (2018)
15. 15 Ludvig, A et al Comparing policy options for carbon efficiency in the wood value-chain: Evidence from Austria. *Journal of Cleaner Production* vol. 292 125985 (2021) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.125985>
16. 16Churchman, C.W. Guest editorial: Wicked problems. *Management Science* vol. 14 B141-B142 (1967)
17. 17Rittel, H.W.J., and Webber, M.M. Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences* vol. 4 155–169 (1973)
18. 18Waddock, S., Meszoely, G.M., Waddell, S., & Dentoni, D. The complexity of wicked problems in large scale change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management* vol. 28 993–1012 (2015)
19. 19Fragkos, P. Analysing the systemic implications of energy efficiency and circular economy strategies in the decarbonisation context. *AIMS Energy* vol. 10(2) 191–218 (2022)
20. 20Waddell, S. Societal Change Systems: A Framework to Address Wicked Problems. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* vol. 52(4) 422–449 (2016)
21. 21Kirchherr, J., Piscicellia, L., Boura, R., Kostense-Smit, E., Muller, J., Huibrechtse-Truijens, A. and Hekkert, M. Barriers to the Circular Economy: Evidence From the European Union (EU). *Ecological Economics* vol. 150 264–272 (2018)
22. 22Neves, S.A. and Marques, A.C. Drivers and barriers in the transition from a linear economy to a circular economy. *Journal of Cleaner Production* vol. 341 130865 (2022)
23. 23 Weidema, B. P., Ekvall, T. & Heijungs, R. Guidelines for application of deepened and broadened LCA. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/8be5/9252f6790328a6360d506df522de78bbce4c.pdf> (2009)
24. 24 Forest Research. Forestry Statistics 2018, A compendium of statistics about woodland, forestry and primary wood processing in the United Kingdom. <https://www.forestresearch.gov.uk/tools-and->

- resources/statistics/forestry-statistics/forestry-statistics-2022/ (2022)
25. 25Bhatia, P., Ranganathan, J., and World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) The GHG Protocol. A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard Revised Edition. ISBN 1-56973-568-9 (2001)
 26. 26Russell, S. Working Paper: Estimating and Reporting the Comparative Emissions Impacts of Products. World Resources Institute (2019)
 27. 27Gray, B.G. *Collaborating: Finding common ground for multiparty problems*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers (1989)
 28. 28Verkerk, P.J., Costanza, R., Hetemäki, L., Kubiszewski, I., Leskinen, P., Nabuurs, G.J., Potočník, J., Palahí, M. Climate-Smart Forestry: the missing link Forest Policy and Economics Volume 115, 102164 (2020)
 29. 29Nabuurs, G.J., Johannes, P., Verkerk, Schelhaas, M.J., Olabarria, J.R.G., Trasobares, A., and Cienciala, E. Climate-Smart Forestry: mitigation impacts in three European regions. From Science to Policy 6. European Forest Institute. (2018)
 30. 30Odegard, I., Croezen, H., and Bergsma, G. Cascading of Biomass. 13 Solutions for a Sustainable Bio-based Economy. Making Better Choices for Use of Biomass Residues, By-products and Wastes. Netherlands: N. p., (2012)
 31. 31Korhonen, J., Honkasalo, A., Seppälä, J. Circular Economy: The Concept and its Limitations Ecological Economics 143 37–46 (2018)
 32. 32Brown, L.D. Bridging organizations and sustainable development. Human Relations, 44, 807–831 (1991)
 33. 33Brown, L.D. (2015, Winter). Bridge-building for social transformation. Stanford Social Innovation Review, 34–39 (2015)
 34. 34Matsueda, N. Collective vs. individual lobbying. European Journal of Political Economy 63 101859 (2020)
 35. 35European Parliament. DIRECTIVE 2008/98/EC OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 19 November 2008 on waste and repealing certain Directives. Annex 1, Chap. 2, Article 8. OJ L 312 22.11.2008 (2015)
 36. 36Jarre, M., Petit-Boix, A., Priefer, C., Meyer, R., Leipold, S. Transforming the bio-based sector towards a circular economy - What can we learn from wood cascading? Forest Policy and Economics Vol. 110 101872 (2020) Methods References
 37. 37Wood Panel Industry Federation. Industry Statistics. https://wpif.org.uk/Industry_Statistics (2022)
 38. 38Wood Recyclers Association. UK Waste Wood Market Statistics 2020. Obtained from correspondence with Wood Recyclers Association. (2022)
 39. 39Kurz, W. A. *et al.* CBM-CFS3: A model of carbon-dynamics in forestry and land-use change implementing IPCC standards. *Ecol. Modell.* 220, 480–504 (2009).

40. 40IPCC. *Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry*. https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/03/GPG_LULUCF_FULLEN.pdf (2003)
41. 41IPCC. *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Volume 4 Chap. 4*. http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/pdf/4_Volume4/V4_04_Ch4_Forest_Land.pdf (2006).
42. 42Matthews, R. W., Jenkins, T. A. R., Mackie, E. D. & Dick, E. C. *Forest Yield: A handbook on forest growth and yield tables for British forestry*. <https://www.forestresearch.gov.uk/research/forest-yield-a-handbook-on-forest-growth-and-yield-tables-for-british-forestry/> (2016).
43. 43IPCC. *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Volume 4 Chap. 12*. https://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/pdf/4_Volume4/V4_12_Ch12_HWP.pdf (2006).
44. 44IPCC. *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Chap. 3 Appendix 3a* https://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/gpglulucf/gpglulucf_files/Chp3/App_3a1_HWP.pdf
45. 45Dymond, C. C. Forest carbon in North America: annual storage and emissions from British Columbia's harvest, 1965–2065. *Carbon Balance Manag.* 7, 8 (2012).
46. 46Wernet, G. *et al.* The ecoinvent database version 3 (part I): overview and methodology. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* 21, 1218–1230 (2016).
47. 47BRE. IMPACT database v5 (accessed via etool LCA software). (2018).
48. 48Arrasoudi, A., Nabavi, F.H., Armat, M.R., Ebadi, A. and Vaismoradi, M. Directed qualitative content analysis: the description and elaboration of its underpinning methods and data analysis process. *Journal of Research in Nursing.* 23(1) 42–55 (2008)
49. 49Elo, S. and Kyngas, S.H. The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing.* 62(1), 107–115 (2008)

Figures




Figure 1

Snapshot in year 2035 of the distribution of Global Warming Potential impacts for four UK forestry value-chain scenarios

Bars represent global warming potential (GWP) impact in tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent emissions (CO₂e) for four modelled UK wood material flow scenarios (methods, Figure 5), under decadal decarbonisation assumptions (described in SI). ‘BAU’ represents 2022 UK wood material flow. Enhanced ‘cascading’ involves higher UK sawnwood production and lower UK wood panel production. Enhanced ‘circular’ involves manufacture of recycled medium density fibreboard (rMDF) from recovered waste MDF. ‘Cascading&circular’ combines the two. Emissions sources are separated into value-chain components on the x-axis (and represented in the LCA boundary diagram, Figure 6). ‘UK Forestry operations’ includes tree nurseries, site preparation, tree planting, harvesting and timber transport from forest to wood processor. ‘Change in UK HWP C storage’ is net gain or loss of carbon (C) stored in HWP manufactured in the UK from UK produced timber. ‘Change in import emissions’ is the net gain or reduction of transport emissions associated with a change in volume of imported HWP. ‘Avoided emissions – reduced harvest’ is increased carbon storage in forest as a result of lower demand for virgin material leading to lower harvest rates. ‘Avoided emissions – product substitution’ is emissions from concrete production that are avoided due to carcassing wood substituting for concrete in construction, and emissions from burning fossil fuels that

are avoided due to woodfuel use. Emissions are grouped under 'Scopes'^{25,26}. Scope 1 is direct process emissions. Scope 2 is emissions from the generation of energy imported into processes. Scope 3 is emissions from manufacturing of materials imported into processes (the dominant source here is from resins used in wood panel production – shown with shading in wood panel production bars; scope 3 emissions from other processes are too small to observe in this chart). Scope 4 is avoided emissions, in this case from product substitution, reduced harvest (circular scenarios only), and changes in imports. Scope 4 is typically not included in industry decarbonisation target-setting. However, it is important for quantifying the consequential whole-lifecycle impact of system changes. Hence, net GWP impact is presented including and excluding Scope 4 emissions.




Figure 2

Annual global warming potential impact of alternative UK forestry value-chain scenarios with stepped decadal decarbonisation

Global warming potential (GWP) impact is based on a static wood harvest of 9.5 million green tonnes per annum in the UK over the study period. Stepwise, decadal decarbonisation is applied in 2030, 2040 and 2050, which causes the stepped shape in the graphs. Graphs allow comparison of net GWP impacts, without (a&b) and with (c&d) Scope 4 emissions included to observe the important and changing

contribution of Scope 4 (avoided) emissions over time as linked industries decarbonise. The graphs also enable comparison of net GWP impacts of implementing circular and cascading scenarios after 5 years (a&c) and 10 years (b&d) to observe the impact of delaying action.




Figure 3

Cumulative global warming potential impact of alternative UK forestry value-chain scenarios with stepped decadal decarbonisation

Global warming potential (GWP) impact is based on a static UK harvest of 9.5 million green tonnes per annum over the study period. Stepwise, decadal decarbonisation is applied in 2030, 2040 and 2050. Graphs allow comparison of net GWP impacts, without (a&b) and with (c&d) Scope 4 emissions included to observe the important and changing contribution of Scope 4 (avoided) emissions over time. Graphs also enable comparison of net GWP impacts of implementing circular and cascading scenarios after 5 years (a&c) and 10 years (b&d) to observe the impact of delaying action. Comparing the potential Scope 1-4 GWP impact of the forestry value-chain from existing UK forests alongside the potential effects of a UK national afforestation scenario shows the relative impact and complementarity of these climate mitigation strategies. The afforestation scenario assumes a planting rate of 20,000 ha per annum (50% commercial conifer forest, and 50% 50:50 conifer:broadleaf forest) from 2023 to 2050.




Figure 4

Interaction needed between forestry value chain, trade bodies and government to evolve a societal change system that delivers transition to circular economy principles and optimised climate change mitigation from the forestry value chain. Black text indicates a call to action.




Figure 5

Wood flow Sankey diagrams for four modelled UK wood flow scenarios. Flows are scaled to a UK harvest of 100% in order to clearly observe differences between scenarios. Imported HWP are not shown in this Figure but are accounted for in the LCA, as defined in the methodology text.

- (a) 'BAU' wood flow, is UK domestic timber production, wood processing and waste wood recovery, taken from nationally reported data^{24,37&38}.
- (b) 'cascading' wood flow, arises from a strategy to increase the conversion of UK harvested wood to carcassing (construction sawnwood). This results in increasing carcassing production and decreasing wood panel production, compared to 'BAU'. There is no change to recovered waste wood flow in this scenario.
- (c) 'circular' wood flow, arises from a strategy to increase recycling of recovered waste wood and involves recycling waste MDF and producing rMDF. This results in less (virgin) harvested wood used in wood panel production and diversion of 'spared' material to sawmills, leading to increased conversion of harvest to sawnwood, mainly packaging/pallets and fencing. Diverting waste MDF from woodfuel to rMDF also results in lower wood fuel use and energy production.
- (d) 'cascading & circular', is 'cascading' wood flow (b) combined with MDF recycling.




Figure 6

Scope and boundary of the life cycle assessment. Scope 1 is direct GHG emissions; Scope 2 is GHG emissions associated with the generation of electricity, heating/cooling, or steam purchased for own consumption; Scope 3 is indirect GHG emissions other than those covered in scope 2²⁵. Avoided emissions (Scope 4) are GHG emission reductions that occur outside of a product's life cycle or value chain, but as a result of the use of that product²⁶.

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [S1LCABAU.xlsx](#)
- [S2LCAscascading.xlsx](#)
- [S3LCACircular.xlsx](#)
- [S4LCAscascirc.xlsx](#)
- [S5LCAResultssummary5yr.xlsx](#)
- [S6LCAResultssummary10yr.xlsx](#)
- [S7LifecycleinventoryBAU.docx](#)
- [S8Decarbonisationassumptions.docx](#)
- [S9Interviewdata.xlsx](#)