

Carbon Finance – COMMUNITY BENEFITS

Chat Box Text

Your chair is Ruchir Shah, Director of External Affairs, Scottish Wildlife Trust
For full bio: <https://www.seda.uk.net/carbon-finance-community-benefits>

Dr Matthew Hannon, Professor of Sustainable Energy Business and Policy, University of Strathclyde
<https://www.seda.uk.net/carbon-finance-community-benefits>

Carbon Offsetting for Communities – four pod episodes that unpack the key headlines run by Matt Hannon

Carbon Offsetting for Communities (<https://www.scottishinsight.ac.uk/Programmes/JustTransition/CarbonOffsetting.aspx>) – four pod episodes that unpack the key headlines run by Matt Hannon

Emma Cooper - Scottish Land Commission: Scottish Land Commission definition of community benefits from land: Community benefits are the intentional social and economic benefits from land that are offered to the local community on a negotiated basis for their lasting well-being.

Dr Calum Brown, Co-chief Scientist, Highlands Rewilding <https://www.seda.uk.net/carbon-finance-community-benefits>

nick domminney: Why are we even discussing what Greenpeace and similar organisations have called the thoroughly discredited idea of carbon offsetting? It is the most pernicious form of greenwash and encouraging "community" involvement in facilitating this involvement ie those who are often the victims of the climate crisis, is even more so.

Lindsay Mackinlay: Not all carbon offsetting schemes are bad..some are well thought-out and involve much nature restoration in this country

John Uttley: Reacted with 👍

Sian Scott: Reacted with 👍

Emma Cooper, Head of Land Rights & Responsibilities, Scottish Land Commission <https://www.seda.uk.net/carbon-finance-community-benefits>

nick domminney: Carbon offsetting lets polluters carry on emitting CO2e with no incentive to cut them. There is virtually no CO2e benefit to the biosphere

Carbon Offsetting for Communities <https://www.scottishinsight.ac.uk/Programmes/JustTransition/CarbonOffsetting.aspx> – four pod episodes that unpack the key headlines run by Matt Hannon
Episodes can be found here if you scroll down a touch: <https://www.localzeropod.com/episodes>

Eilidh: Reacted to with 👍

Sian Scott: Reacted with 👍

John Uttley: @nick domminney What you say has often been true. But we need to avoid throwing the baby out with the bath water. Offsets have a legitimate role to play in science-based pathways to net zero. There is significant work going on globally, and in the UK (BSI) to define who can purchase carbon credits, specifically asking about buyers net zero strategies and action.

Martin - Highland: Reacted with 👍

Lindsay Mackinlay: Reacted with 👍

Graeme McCormick: If AGFRR was introduced and had a land type targeted at land used as carbon offset, the rate could be set at 100% of a financial value of the carbon credit

Lindsay Mackinlay: Also, carbon offsetting is often carried out by companies who simply cannot reduce their carbon footprint anymore due to the nature of their activities....

Louise Ross: Reacted with 🙌

John Uttley: @Graeme McCormick What is AGFRR?

Mairi McFadyen: Reacted to "Dr Matthew Hannon, P.." with 👍

DarraghKeenaghan: Would that public interest test when land is transferred, include when it is being passed to another family member? i.e. an estate owner to one of their children
Annual Ground Floor and Roof Rent

John Uttley: Reacted with 👍

Nick domminney: Offsetting is indeed legitimate, indeed it is encouraged, particularly by UK government, but aimed at letting the worst climate culprits carry on emitting

Emma Cooper - Scottish Land Commission: @Robbie Kernahan yes, we do include that in the guidance which will be published on Thursday. It is important though to recognise that the delivery of environmental benefits - whilst they do benefit communities - are not sufficient by themselves to be considered community benefits.

Lindsay Mackinlay: Nick..I agree there are dodgy companies using offsetting to avoid making change but there are also some good companies out there too reducing carbon emissions as well as offsetting...

Ailsa Raeburn, Chair, Community Land Scotland
<https://www.seda.uk.net/carbon-finance-community-benefits>

Duncan Bryden: How can communities - mainly volunteers - develop the capacities to contribute to projects and manage financial benefits. Currently some Renewable community benefits are distributed through a third party like Foundation Scotland as local capacity is limited.. Retaining democracy at community level can also be challenging. Many community councils have been disbanded.

Clare Cooper Bioregioning Tayside: Reacted with 👍

nick domminney: You may well be right, Lindsay, but there are few criteria for judging those and, in any case, the market in offsetting will favour those offsetters who have the deepest pockets ie the Shells BPs etc

Norrie MacPhail: Replying to "You may well be righ..."

Nick - what is your positive contribution or recommendation then?01:08:00

nick domminney: Replying to "You may well be righ..."

Use legislation and any other legal means to store CO2 in land and outlaw carbon offsetting except via publicly controlled situations with verifiable CO2e reduction by the emitters

Question: Do the panel feel that the current public consultation procedures for new forestry schemes (inc native broadleaf) are not sufficient to address community issues?

Morag Paterson: Reacted with 👍

Henry Leveson-Gower, CEO Promoting Economic Pluralism
<https://www.seda.uk.net/carbon-finance-community-benefits>

DCTollick: Does the panel agree that Carbon sequestration/nature recovery needs to start urgently as a societal enterprise, and for universal benefit; it is not of particularly rural benefit in a country like ours, where most of the climate impacts will be on urban lives.

John Uttley: Reacted with 👍

Lindsay Mackinlay: Reacted with 👍

Andy Wightman: Ailsa mentioned my blog. You can find it here <https://andywightman.scot/2023/11/why-scotland-should-stop-selling-carbon/>

Ruchir Shah (Scottish Wildlife Trust): Reacted with 👍

Andy Wightman: Offsetting indeed has a role but ONLY in offsetting unavoidable emissions which are those left once avoidable emissions have been eliminated (that is what net-zero is about). The current market is not working. Scottish carbon credits are being sold for companies to offset their Scope 1 emissions for example - that's happening in Cairngorms in Revere project. Many are being sold to enable companies to be carbon neutral which is NOT net-zero. So all of this sequestration potential has gone forever but should ever have ONLY be used for unavoidable emissions. Unless and until there is a regulated means of ensuring that credits are being sold ONLY for offsetting unavoidable emissions then no community should have anything to do with them or they will be complicit in undermining the journey to net-zero.

Eleanor Fraser: Reacted with 👍

Lindsay Mackinlay: Reacted with 👍

vanessa halhead ERCA SRA: with 👍

Mairi McFadyen: Reacted with 👍

Ewan Jenkins: Reacted with 👍

nick domminney: Thank you Andy. I would have said that if I had the wit

Louise Ramsay: The detail in the Agricultural bill is critical. If this doesn't work to incentivise (or not penalise) landowners to dedicate land to nature restoration projects then many of the proposed projects, supported by NRF etc will be diminished and community benefit will be diminished along with it.

jglendinning: Reacted with 👍

Clare Cooper Bioregioning Tayside: Reacted with 👍

Sophie Cooke reads "Tangled Web". Sophie is an award-winning poet, novelist, and short story writer and a regular contributor to SEDA Land. This poem was sponsored by the Open University Scotland.

Barbara Chalmers: Reacted with 👍

Ian Fraser: Reacted with 👍

Barbara Chalmers: 🙌🙌🙌

Eleanor Fraser: Wow very beautiful poem thank you

Andy Wightman: lovely. thanks

Clare Cooper Bioregioning Tayside: Reacted with 👍

Ian Fraser: "The voluntary carbon market is open participation by anyone, sellers and buyers, with little or no regulatory oversight. The extent to which it is doing anything to hasten the journey to net-zero is, in fact, completely unknown. Similarly, the extent to which the Woodland Carbon Code is doing anything to achieve (real) net-zero is unknown." for me this is a key section of Andy Wightman's recent blog. <https://andywightman.scot/2023/11/why-scotland-should-stop-selling-carbon/>

Rachel Skene, Manager, NW2045 Regional Land Use Partnership

<https://www.seda.uk.net/carbon-finance-community-benefits>

Andy Wightman: Another important point is that sequestration in a net-zero world will need to sequester GHG already in the atmosphere including those being emitted from now on. Thus credits being sold NOW for avoidable and/or unavoidable emissions are NOT available for this vital function beyond 2045/50. At the current rate, there will be little left. It will all have been credited against Scope 1 emissions and so we will be in a lot of trouble.

DarraghKeenaghan: Reacted with 👍

DCTollick: Replying to "Another important po..."
yes, it's a common misconception that net zero solves anything (even if CC offsets were credible), when all it does is holds us on the current trajectory towards disastrous warming

John Uttley: Replying to "Another important po..."
Well, net zero certainly solves something, compared with business as usual!

DCTollick: Reacted with 👍

John Uttley: @Andy Wightman Are you entirely confident that there is no legitimate role for offsets as part of a science-based path to net zero for a company that cannot immediately move from business as usual to 'unavoidable emissions'? I think there needs to be room for nuance. The concept of unavoidable emissions is pretty slippery in any case. What is unavoidable today may not be so tomorrow. I am certainly agree that voluntary carbon markets are in need of radical improvement.

vanessa halhead ERCA SRA: What happened to the Scottish Land Use Strategy? Previous work on this never seemed to grasp or tackle the big issues. But other countries have successful land use strategies.

nick domminney: Reacted with 👍

DCTollick: Reacted with 👍

John Uttley: QUESTION: Matt mentioned the need to consider restorative justice for past inequalities, presumably with regard to historic patterns of land ownership and rural economy. How do we introduce this into new natural capital markets without placing an unfair burden on new actors compared with traditional landowners and land-based enterprises?

Morag Paterson: Reacted with 👍

Andy Wightman: Replying to "@Andy Wightman Are y..."
there is a legitimate role. Agree on some unavoidable today but not tomorrow. Question is what role voluntary private offsets have in such scenarios. At moment there is a wild west with land being locked up for (one example) offsetting Scottish Governments touring Cabinet 2019...

John Uttley: Reacted with 👍

Anna Lehmann: Replying to "QUESTION: Matt menti..."
This is THE question, thank you John for phrasing it so eloquently

Ulrich Loening: Anybody want to add something about soil? It is a huge carbon sequester if we would only let it do so.

nick domminney: Matthew (and others) are talking about how communities can best exploit the carbon market without questioning the emitters

Mairi McFadyen: Reacted with 👍

Ulrich Loening: Replying to "QUESTION: Matt menti..."
Look at the Global Carbon Incentive Fund, which follows Prof Rajan.

DCTollick: Replying to "QUESTION: Matt menti..."

reparations being any easier to apportion than the deconstruction of ecosystems into commodities? What about recovering the nature debt from tax - everyone understands and expects tax.

Lindsay Mackinlay: Reacted to "QUESTION: Matt menti..." with 👍

Graeme McCormick: Surely the biggest threat is the loss of species and how these can be regenerated and recovered. If that is the case then there is an urgent need to take the market out of most of our land from the Border to the Northern isles. This will create a massive tapestry of land totally focussed on regeneration and recovery. To achieve this quickly as we must, instead of incentives Government needs to impose annual taxation or rent on all land at such a level that in rural and urban Scotland at such rates that owners will offer to surrender much if their land to government instead of being liable to pay the tax or rent. The Scottish Government has the power to do this now under the Devolution Settlement. I've spoken to representatives from two large land owners who indicated off the record that they could consider surrendering land as it doesn't feature in their core business plans anyway.

Norrie MacPhail: Reacted with 👍

Ian Fraser: Reacted with 👍

How do you think Land-Use Planning can be used to regulate/influence developments/projects?

Louise Ramsay: I agree with Henry that this is about partnerships/relationship

Lizzie Williams: Reacted with 👍

DCTollick: Reacted with 👍

Ewen McLachlan: Here's how fast the market is moving 7,000 acres of blanket bog for £7million on the aptly named Glutt estate. Complete with three active peatland restoration projects with a potential cumulative claimable emissions reduction of 189,524 tCO₂e over 100 years.

Equate the value of £995 per acres of peatland restoration over 100 years...

No mention of community that lives on or around the estate.

https://assets.savills.com/properties/GBEDRUEDR230039/EDR230039_EDR23000911.PDF

Toby Anstruther: Replying to "Surely the biggest t..."

There may be an unintended consequence similar to the removal of subsidies in NZ: some land use was massively intensified to generate additional (short term?) value to cover the loss (or in your case, tax) ... with the result that nature suffered in those areas.

Duncan Bryden: Consenting processes like planning can require those seeking to gain consent to demonstrate clearly how they will deliver benefits. Placing the focus on the 'developer; would help communities

nick domminney: Good to get some figures Ewan. And which company/emitter has the wherewithal to pay that?

vanessa halhead ERCA SRA: Replying to "QUESTION: Matt menti..."

Our system of land ownership is determined by our long history of power structures in the UK. That history is now totally inappropriate for our current and future needs. I can't understand why we are so afraid of the scale of land reform that is needed to recognise this.

Morag Paterson: Reacted with 👍

Ewen McLachlan: Reacted with 👍

Norrie MacPhail: Reacted with 👍

Scottish Ecological Design Association: Reacted with 👍

Barbara Chalmers: Replying to "QUESTION: Matt menti..."
Applaud that Rachel. Why don't we pay communities. Sick of it.

Morag Paterson: Reacted with 👍

Clare Cooper Bioregioning Tayside: Reacted with 👍

Ewen McLachlan: Reacted with 👍

Scottish Ecological Design Association: Reacted with 👍

Henry Leveson-Gower: Reacted with 👍

Lindsay Mackinlay: Not all private companies or private finance are bad..please avoid tarring every private enterprise with the same brush based on poor or past bad practice....there are good guys out there too that you do not want to lose through overly-onerous requirements...

John Uttley: Reacted with 👍

Eleanor Fraser: Reacted with 👍

Jayne Wilkinson: Reacted with 👍

Ewen McLachlan: Replying to "Good to get some fig..."
Which community has access to the level of funds required to benefit from the restoration for the greater good?

Anna Lehmann: I agree with Henry on most things especially on the need to mix funding and use all sources at hand, but I would say that the additionality requirement built HUGE pitfalls into the carbon market that create perverse incentives. It is a huge worry that this could be magnified in the biodiversity space. I agree that direct relationships with funders are critical, but many of them are sitting on their hands and waiting for guidance on how their contribution can be measured and reported. regulation on the demand/ claims side is key here to overcome these two challenges

Clare Cooper Bioregioning Tayside: Replying to "QUESTION: Matt menti..."
Community Scientists could also be paid to help 'ground truth' data on their doorstep.

Morag Paterson: Reacted with 👍

Lizzie Williams: Reacted with 👍

Henry Leveson-Gower: Reacted with 👍

Graeme McCormick: Replying to "QUESTION: Matt menti..."
Agreed! The only way we can have dramatic change is making ownership a liability as well as an asset through taxation. Why do we subsidise community buyouts where the payments to landowners is the modern equivalent of compensation for ending slavery?

Ian Fraser: Replying to "Not all private co..."
I agree - there are certainly bad actors out there, but it's wrong to assume that they are all bad.

Norrie MacPhail: Replying to "QUESTION: Matt menti..."
Absolutely right Rachel, much as Andy Wightman has been proposing for years. That's probably too big a decision for those in power to make - beyond their ken, as it were.

Mairi McFadyen: Reacted with 👍

Andy Wightman: Community ownership is not a gold standard. Lots of private individuals and businesses want to own land. Are all our houses and farms to be community owned? We need to

be careful about how we promote concepts like “gold standards” This is why governance is key (agree with Matt there)

John Uttley: Reacted with 👍

DCTollick: Reacted with 👍

Will Boyd-Wallis sings “Hot Air”. Will is the West Highlands Operations Manager for the National Trust for Scotland.

Ian Fraser: singer songwriter Will Boyd-Wallis is very good!

Barbara Chalmers: Reacted with ❤️

Lizzie Williams: Reacted with ❤️

Ewen McLachlan: Reacted with 🙌

Eleanor Fraser: Reacted with ❤️

Rosslyn: Reacted: Reacted with ❤️

Gail Fraser: Reacted with ❤️

Elaine Macintosh - NatureScot: Reacted with ❤️

vanessa halhead ERCA SRA: Reacted with 👍

Helen Armstrong: Reacted with 👍

Lizzie Williams: Thank you Will ❤️

gordon gray stephens: Reacted with 🙌

Lydia Cole: Reacted with ❤️

Sara Harkins: Reacted with 🙌

Julia Clough - Scottish Wildlife Trust:: Reacted with 🙌

Sara Harkins: Reacted with 🙌

Clare Cooper Bioregioning Tayside: Reacted with 🙌

John Uttley: Reacted with 👍

Tamsin Cunningham: Reacted with ❤️

Matthew Hannon: Reacted with 👍

jglendinning: Reacted with 👍

Norrie MacPhail: Reacted with 🙌

wboydwallis: Thanks for listening.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5H2mdOU4Hek>

Link to song above. Thanks folks

Toby Anstruther: It feels like - on the back of our greater understanding of the science of climate - that there should be a case for developing the legal field of Nuisance to pick up carbon-emitters. Apart from the legal threat (which might initially seem remote) it would also signal a change of national values; ket to delivering the sort of [carbon & biodiversity] change which we desparately need.

Responsibilities are owned to neighbours/communities and other stakeholders regardless of land ownership. These should be clearly signalled / set out.

Eleanor Fraser:

Agree! (This is why I'm going into climate law)

Barbara Chalmers: Creative interludes as fresh as walking outdoors. Thanks.

Graeme McCormick: I agree! If the land tapestry is owned by the Government on our behalf its stewardship can be devolved to different players who meet a statutory requirement and are monitored

vanessa halhead ERCA SRA: We have been discussing much of this at the Scottish Rural and Islands Parliament in Fort William last week. The issue of local governance is a critical issue and the total inadequacy of community councils (which were designed in the 1970s to be inadequate). Everyone should get involved in responding to the Scot Gov 'Democracy matters' consultation: <https://consult.gov.scot/local-government-and-communities/democracy-matters/>

Mairi McFadyen: Reacted with ❤️

Norrie MacPhail: Reacted with 👍

Barbara Chalmers: 🙌

Ewen McLachlan: Reacted with 👍

DCTollick: Replying to "It feels like - on t..."
and the legal challenges by company A asking if company B's 'net-zero status' is fabricated

Toby Anstruther: Reacted with 👍

Toby Anstruther: Replying to "I agree! If the lan..."
I'm not sure that ownership isn't a bit of red herring in this debate. Responsibilities (whether formally regulated or not) are key.

KirstyTait: Agree we need serious local democracy - question for the panel - What are your thoughts on the potential of Local Place Plans as a vehicle for communities to have a voice and be able to engage in land use decisions?

Morag Paterson: Reacted with 👍

Matthew Hannon: Reacted with 👍

Toby Anstruther: Reacted with 👍

nick domminney: Toby and others in the q&a suggest (I think) that, at least, there should be criteria for communities to evaluate those who want to use their land as offset. It would be interesting to see what communities would say the £millions from Shell or £ not much from a responsible offsetter

Matthew Hannon: @Andy Wightman thanks. My point is that given the broad scale that local governments operate at across rural areas in Scotland then more informal modes of governance tend to play a more powerful role. This may be community ownership, it may be 100% private/public ownership of a project. The reality is that it's often a blend (partnerships, subsidies, community benefit funds etc.). We need an open and honest conversation about when and where power lies with different modes of nature-based solutions project governance and how this plays out in practice/reality in terms of lasting community benefit.

Mairi McFadyen: Reacted with 👍

Alan McDonnell: Reacted with 👍

Andy Wightman: But woodlands for example CAN sequester the carbon needed to be sequestered AFTER we achieve net-zero but much of this potential is being squandered by spending the credits on Scope 1 and 2 emissions that are all avoidable.

DCTollick: yes, ref do more on emissions now - BUT carbon recovery needs started now for 30 years time

Andy Wightman: Replying to "yes, ref do more on ..."

yes - that's my point. Which is why we should not be selling credits now to offset annual scope 1 and 2 emissions

DCTollick: Reacted with 👍

Nikki Sinclair: Reacted with 👍

Barbara Chalmers: Absolutely need to change local democracy model. So broken.

Ewen McLachlan: Reacted with 👍

Graeme McCormick: There is a group who are part of a political party proposing the potential of communities becoming executive councils and contracting with the existing 32 councils bureaucracies and/or any other professionals to deliver the services the new executive communities determine.

Fiona Jackson LLT National Park: Local Place Plans could play a significant role here!!

Replying to "Toby and others ibn ..."

An ethical register for communities and a pricing system where the higher the damage a company does to the environment the higher, the price of a biodiversity unit.

Eleanor Fraser: Reacted with 👍

Mairi McFadyen: Where is the funding/support for local communities to write Local Place Plans? Huge burden / expectation on volunteers

Lizzie Williams: Reacted with 👍

KirstyTait: Reacted with 👍

DarraghKeenaghan: Reacted with 👍

Ewen McLachlan: Replying to "Where is the funding..."

Pshaw! There's a nice wee booklet, but sadly no route to funding consultants to undertake the Place Plan...

Fiona Jackson LLT National Park: The Park Authority at loch lomond-trossach provides funding for communities to prepare Plans. I help support this Not perfect but we try.

Mairi McFadyen: Reacted with 👍

02:03:58 Clare Cooper Bioregioning Tayside: Replying to "Where is the funding..."

Yes agree - that is what we are finding on a piece of work we are doing about how LPP's are being used by communities to advance Biodiversity and Climate Change action.

Nikki Sinclair: Reacted with 👍

vanessa halhead ERCA SRA: We are just completing a Local Place Plan for the Black Isle. We had funding from Highland Council to employ facilitators for this. It would be impossible to do without this. Its too early to assess the outputs and impact of the LPP

Mary Schmoller Storas Uibhist: My question is where are the Politicians in all of this? They are leaders using the Local Authority funds from our taxes. They can access levels of funding for infrastructure.

Gail Fraser: LPPS have been discussed a lot at the SEDA Land Building Futures conversations. Recordings of which are available on our website and No, 4 to be held early next year. Will feed this debate into the report.

KirstyTait: Reacted with 👍

Mairi McFadyen: Reacted with 👍

Barbara Chalmers: I wrote Stranraer's Place Plan. All been great and first to be adopted by Council. However no capacity locally to take things forward. Typical. (I'm speaking at a public meet this week with different hat on - I tend to consult on 6 month engagement projects. This will no doubt be confusing that I'm not updating on Place Plan.)

Ewen McLachlan: Reacted with 👍

Eleanor Fraser: Reacted with 👍

Clare Cooper Bioregioning Tayside: Reacted with 👍

Morag Paterson: Reacted with 👍

C Taylor: Surely the damage storm has just caused to rural Scotland makes that a silly question

John Uttley: FIRNS Community of Practice is meeting for the 1st time this month... making FIRNS more than the sum of its parts

Ewen McLachlan: Hmm don't urban and city populations cause much more damage to the environment than those in the rural and remote rural? You can't depend on the rural to bail you out when the urban needs to make real emission changes...

Eleanor Fraser: Reacted with 👍

DCTollick: Replying to "Hmm don't urban and ..." per head?

John Uttley: Reacted with 👍

John Uttley: Replying to "Hmm don't urban and ..."

Do we need another reason to set rural and urban communities against each other?

Lindsay Mackinlay: Reacted with 👍

Henry Leveson-Gower: Replying to "FIRNS Community of P..."

That is good. Hopefully it will look at how the projects can practically collaborate around funding and governance to mutual benefit. But I don't think this is how the scheme is designed.

John Uttley: Replying to "FIRNS Community of P..."

This is fundamental Henry. I hope to see active collaborations emerge

Henry Leveson-Gower: Reacted with 👍

Replying to "Hmm don't urban and ..."

Has to be. Look at the fire at Durness a couple of years back that burned for a week and released the equivalent of Edinburgh's emissions for a year.

DCTollick: Replying to "Hmm don't urban and ..."

@John Uttley we need to see landscape recovery as a societal issue, not simply a rural one

John Uttley: Reacted with 👍

Kenny Taylor: Replying to "Hmm don't urban and ..."

Agree that it's unproductive to have rural/urban set against each other in planning mitigation. And the reality, perhaps surprisingly to many, is that it's rural dwelling that has the largest carbon footprint per capita.

Lizzie Williams: Reacted with 👍

DCTollick: Reacted with 👍

Jon H: @Matthew Hannon true that urban centres responsible for majority of emissions but most rural local authorities have much higher emissions per capita: W Isles 10X that of Glasgow City per capita

Lizzie Williams: Replying to "Hmm don't urban and ..."

Maybe there is potential for carbon finance to help us reduce those rural carbon footprints.

John Uttley: Replying to "@Matthew Hannon true..."
But, this is a societal issue. Rural emissions benefit city dwellers and vice versa
Ewen McLachlan: Reacted with 👍

Matthew Hannon: QUESTION: Matt mentioned the need to consider restorative justice for past inequalities, presumably with regard to historic patterns of land ownership and rural economy. How do we introduce this into new natural capital markets without placing an unfair burden on new actors compared with traditional landowners and land-based enterprises?
This is a very good question and not sure I have a short, pithy answer. I defer to colleagues (historians? public policy scholars?) who have a sense of how past injustices have been dealt with, both in Scotland and elsewhere.

Henry Leveson-Gower: Reacted with 👍

Jon H: Replying to "@Matthew Hannon true..."
some, maybe, but unclear how peatland emissions benefit city dwellers

nick domminney: How disappointing to hear that public funding for rural projects relies on Natural Capital evaluations. The concept of Natural Capital is the thoroughly discredited ideology which is used to justify carbon offsetting and carbon credits. This explains a lot

Rachel Skene she/her NW2045: no that's in danger of reducing what I said- we sought to be more informed....

Andy Wightman: We should scrap Land and Buildings Transaction Tax. It arises most where land is bought and sold - a lottery if we tie it to communities. Revenues from LBTT should be transferred to recurrent land tax (obv non-domestic rates)

Morag Paterson: Reacted with 👍

Ian Fraser: But who in Scottish politics is pushing / would push for that?

Ewen McLachlan: Replying to "@Matthew Hannon true..."
How would the urban reach Net Zero targets without sequestration through Peatland restoration?

Jon H: Replying to "@Matthew Hannon true..."
By reducing emissions
NB peatland restoration reduces emissions but doesn't deliver meaningful sequestration (good to do for biodiversity too)

Lydia Cole: Reacted with 👍

Toby Anstruther: Replying to "We should scrap Land..."
A problem with Rates is how these disadvantage physical businesses in communities vs. Remote internet businesses. Local physical businesses are part of their communities and should be encouraged [not discouraged by this tax]

Umar Farooq: Reacted to "But who in Scottis..." with 👍

Barbara Chalmers: What was that network Rachel mentioned?

Lydia Cole: Replying to "@Matthew Hannon true..."
Not on relevant timescales, certainly.

Jon H: Reacted with 👍

Emma Cooper - Scottish Land Commission: Replying to "We should scrap Land..."
Whilst there may be issues with LBTT, it does exist and so it is a tool we could use differently.

Andy Wightman: Leave you with observation that carbon credits validated by Woodland Carbon Code in Scottish Border is being used to offset Shell customers purchases of petrol and diesel - just one example of why the system is utterly broken <https://www.shell.co.uk/shell-go-plus.html>

Eleanor Fraser: Reacted with 🤔

Mairi McFadyen: Reacted with 👍

Henry Leveson-Gower: Reacted with 👍

DCTollick: Reacted with 👍

Lizzie Williams: Replying to "What was that networ..."
I think that would have been the network of the 5 Regional Land Use Partnerships pilot programmes. Representatives of each RLUP have been gathering to share learning etc regularly throughout the pilot (2021-2024).

Emma Cooper - Scottish Land Commission: Land Commission work on natural capital is here: <https://www.landcommission.gov.scot/our-work/governance-ownership/natural-capital>

Andy Wightman: Replying to "But who in Scottish ..."
It was key recommendation of Mirrlees Report in 2011.

Rachel Skene she/her NW2045: www.northwest2045.scot

Morag Paterson: Thanks everyone, interesting session

Norrie MacPhail: Thanks all - fascinating event

Andy Wightman: Thanks - fascinating chat.

Toby Anstruther: Reacted with 👍

nick domminney: Reacted with 👍

Mairi McFadyen: Thanks all

John Uttley: Thanks everyone. Very lively and interesting!

Ewen McLachlan: Great chat, well done all.

Jennifer MacPherson: Thank you all - very interesting event.

DCTollick: thanks all

Lindsay Mackinlay: Thank you!

nick domminney: Thanks to all

Eleanor Fraser: Thanks everyone!

Elaine Macintosh - NatureScot: Thanks

Jasmine- ECCAN: Fantastic event and very well done facilitation. Thank you to everyone from Edinburgh Communities Climate Action Network 😊

Rosemary Sorrie: interesting and thought provoking thanks

Elaine Macintosh - NatureScot: Thanks all, excellent.