

From: European Academies' Science Advisory Council (EASAC)

To: Latvian Academy of Sciences

Email dd. 7 April 2017

We found the comments from the Latvian Academy of Sciences most helpful and have been able to incorporate almost all of them in significant amendments to the text sent to the printer this week. It was also very helpful that your colleagues pointed to the issue of analysing carbon flows at the stand or landscape level (page 4), since this has featured prominently in recent arguments between Chatham House, IEA bioenergy and others (see references below).

Our group did not directly address this, but we added a short clarification that scientific information on the marginal impacts of changes at the stand level have to be integrated with other factors (economic, regulatory and social) in order to determine the overall effects at landscape level. We have also inserted a sentence that evaluating impacts on carbon stock changes may also need to consider interactions between bioenergy demand and forest management. We hope this is an adequate response to your comments, since to go into these points in more detail would require us to involve the expert group in additional work and significantly delay the project. The matter can however be taken up further in post-publication debate on the interpretation of the science.

We thank you again for your detailed analysis and thoughtful comments and sincerely hope that the above changes will allow the Latvian Academy of Sciences to accept the publication of the report.

With best wishes,

Mike Norton

EASAC

Environment Programme Director