



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

The trouble with trees; afforestation plans for Africa

Citation for published version:

Bond, WJ, Stevens, N, Midgley, GF & Lehmann, C 2019, 'The trouble with trees; afforestation plans for Africa', *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, vol. 34, no. 11, pp. 963-965.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2019.08.003>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1016/j.tree.2019.08.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2019.08.003)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Trends in Ecology & Evolution

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



1 **The trouble with trees; afforestation plans for Africa**

2 William J. Bond^{1,2}, Nicola Stevens³, Guy F. Midgley³, Caroline E.R. Lehmann^{4,5,6}

3 1 Department of Biological Sciences, University of Cape Town, Rondebosch 7701,

4 2 South African Environmental Observation Network (SAEON), Private Bag X7, Claremont
5 7735, South Africa

6 3 Department of Botany and Zoology, Stellenbosch University, Private Bag X1, Matieland
7 7602, South Africa

8 4 Tropical Diversity, Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH3 5LR, United Kingdom

9 5 School of GeoSciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3FF, U.K.

10 6 Centre for African Ecology, School of Animal, Plant and Environmental Sciences, University
11 of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, 2050, South Africa

12 Corresponding author: Bond, W.J. (william.bond@uct.ac.za)

13

14 Keywords: carbon sequestration, savannas, afforestation

15

16 **Abstract**

17 Extensive tree planting is widely promoted for reducing atmospheric CO₂. In Africa, 1
18 million km², mostly of grassy biomes, has been targeted for 'restoration' by 2030. The target
19 is based on the erroneous assumption that these biomes are deforested and degraded. We
20 discuss the pros and cons of exporting fossil fuel emission problems to Africa.

21 **Main text**

22 Africa is the grassiest continent. The grasses support Africa's great natural asset, the
23 remaining herds of the Pleistocene megafauna (Figure1). Africa's grassy biomes are rich in
24 forest-averse birds, reptiles, plants, and insects. They were the cradle of our hominid
25 ancestors and today are home to over 300 million people. But these open grassy landscapes
26 could be transformed if trees-for-carbon projects inappropriately target them, for example,
27 by 'restoring forest landscapes' over 1 million km² by 2020 and 3.5 million km² by 2030
28 (<http://www.bonnchallenge.org>). These are vast areas: the 2030 target is equivalent to the
29 combined area of the 10 largest European countries (France, Spain, Sweden, Norway,
30 Germany, Finland, Poland, Italy, the UK and Romania), or 45% of Australia, or 36% of the
31 USA. But much of this new plantation area is planned for Africa rather than the global North.

32

33 Targeted areas are based on global maps of 'deforestation' and 'degradation' [1](
34 <http://www.wri.org/applications/maps/flr-atlas/#>). The maps erroneously assume that low
35 tree cover, in climates that can support forests, are deforested and 'degraded'. The bizarre
36 result is that ancient savanna landscapes, including the Serengeti and Kruger National Park,
37 are mapped as deforested and degraded (because tree cover is reduced by elephants,

38 antelope and several million years of grass-fuelled fires). This profound misreading of
39 Africa's grassy biomes has now led to an off-shoot of the Bonn challenge, the AFR100,
40 targeting 100 million hectares of mostly savanna for 'reforestation' by 2030 (Figure
41 1)(<https://afr100.org>). Funding has been secured from Germany, the World Bank and other
42 donors with more than one billion dollars pledged over the next 10 years. Twenty eight
43 African countries have signed up to AFR100 with each country pledging to afforest an
44 explicit target area. For example, Mozambique has committed to 'restoration' of one million
45 hectares, South Africa to 3.6 Mha, Kenya to 5.1 Mha, and Cameroon to 12 Mha. Cameroon's
46 pledge requires converting a quarter of the country to plantations, Nigeria's 32% and
47 Burundi's 72% [2].

48

49 Committing such vast areas to plantations for the next century should raise many questions.
50 An obvious one for industrial countries that are funding these projects is whether
51 afforestation (planting new trees, rather than restoring areas known, historically, to have
52 been closed forests) will work to cool the climate. There is growing scientific scepticism.
53 Smith et al. [3] discussed all 'negative emissions technologies' (NET), including afforestation,
54 enhanced mineral weathering, and chemical capture, and concluded that none will be
55 effective in reducing carbon at the scale needed. The NET are merely a distraction, they
56 argue, from the serious business of reducing emissions by reducing fossil fuel use. Baldocchi
57 and Penuelas [4] evaluated the potential of the Earth's ecosystems to sequester carbon and
58 concluded that planting trees will not significantly reduce atmospheric CO₂. Lewis et al [2]
59 argued that restoration of forests is effective, but that plantation forestry is not. They
60 calculated that if 350 Mha were restored natural forests, 42 Gt of C would be sequestered

61 by 2100 compared to 1 Gt C for the same area afforested with pines and eucalypts. Their
62 analysis implies that converting African savannas to plantations is pointless as a mitigation
63 measure. At the optimistic extreme, Bastin et al [5] estimated 205 Gt C could be stored by
64 planting up the world's potential forest land, including 'sparse vegetation and grasslands'.
65 Their estimates have been challenged, not least because they assumed zero soil C stocks in
66 targeted sites [J. Veldman, Pers. Comm. 2019]. An underappreciated problem is that
67 biophysical consequences of afforestation can negate climate effects of reducing CO₂ [6].
68 Forests absorb more incoming radiation than grasslands so that plantations may cause a net
69 warming, rather than the intended cooling. The net radiative effects of planting trees,
70 warming or cooling, vary with latitude and local conditions. Evaluating their magnitude
71 requires a different set of scientific skills from carbon accounting so that biophysical effects
72 are seldom considered in trees-for-carbon projects [6].

73

74 The limited benefits of afforestation for reducing atmospheric CO₂ have not been widely
75 appreciated. Exploring aspects of the Bonn challenge helps give perspective. Carbon dioxide
76 in the atmosphere is currently increasing at about 4.7 Gt C per year (1 Gt= 1000 000 000
77 tons) [7]. To nullify this growth rate in atmospheric CO₂ (G_{ATM}) by a NET programme, such
78 as planting trees, would cost \$47 billion at \$10 per Mg C sequestered (\$172 billion at
79 \$10/Mg CO₂). The billion dollars promised for the Bonn programme, over a 10-year
80 programme, is <0.5% of the minimum needed to balance G_{ATM} . Other NET technologies are
81 supposedly workable at \$100 per Mg C sequestered making them even less affordable [3].
82 Either the funders are short-changing African participants, or they do not see afforestation
83 as a serious contributor to CO₂ reduction.

84 Tree planting is land hungry. To appreciate how hungry, consider the area needed to
85 sequester current G_{ATM} of 4.7 GtCy^{-1} . This will depend on total C sequestered in plantations
86 which varies with climate, tree species, soil type, forest management, and rotation time.
87 Carbon sequestered increases after planting and then diminishes as trees mature. Trees
88 would need harvesting, their carbon preserved, and plantations re-established to maintain
89 their sequestration potential [8]. Optimistic estimates are of 10-year cycles for tropical
90 plantations [11]. Mean carbon sequestered ranges from 1 to $3.4 \text{ Mg C ha}^{-1}\text{y}^{-1}$ in the tropics
91 [3,9] (the Bonn challenge used $1.32 \text{ MgCha}^{-1}\text{y}^{-1}$). Using these values, you would need to
92 plant up 14 to 47 million km^2 of plantations to sequester current G_{ATM} . For optimistic
93 estimates, you would need to afforest an area 53% larger than the USA or 85% of Russia. For
94 less productive plantations you would need upwards of a third of the world's land area. If
95 Africa reached the 100 million ha target, G_{ATM} would be mitigated by a mere 2.7 % per year.
96 If this seems very small reward for afforesting a continent, consider that the coal that drove
97 200 years of the industrial revolution took 400 million years to accumulate. How can we
98 possibly expect to grow enough trees to stuff all the carbon back again in just a few
99 decades?

100

101 Ironically, several researchers have argued that the grassy biomes targeted for afforestation
102 are better than forests at conserving carbon [10]. This is partly because forests, especially
103 plantations of eucalypts and pines, are vulnerable to high severity fires and will become
104 more so as the world warms. Most of the carbon stored in grasslands is below-ground,
105 where it persists through fire [10]. In Africa, which accounts for 70% of the world's annually
106 burnt area, suppressing grass-fuelled fires is manageable but suppressing high intensity

107 plantation fires is not. Furthermore, grasslands themselves can have high rates of carbon
108 sequestration below-ground. It has even been hypothesised that the Pliocene spread of
109 grasslands locked up so much carbon in soils that it triggered the Ice Ages [11].

110

111 What will massive afforestation of Africa's grassy biomes mean for the countries committing
112 themselves to AFR100? The initial cash injection into 'restoration' is attractive for
113 governments funding job creation and infrastructure. However, one billion dollars spread
114 over 100 million hectares is just \$10 per hectare. In the rush to launch AFR100, there has
115 been little time to explore costs, social, economic, ecological, of converting Africa's
116 grasslands and savannas to plantations [12]. The global scale of tree planting promoted by
117 AFR100 and similar programmes ignores local concerns over land tenure, competition with
118 agriculture and conservation and imposes this single dominant land use for generations to
119 come.

120 In trading water for carbon, it has been repeatedly shown using multi-decadal catchment
121 experiments and hydrological models that replacing native grasslands with plantations
122 reduces streamflow [13]. Reduction in streamflow from savanna afforestation will have
123 critical impacts on dry season water supply for local communities. In South Africa, new
124 afforestation is restricted by legislation so as to conserve water resources for land users
125 backed by a major government programme to remove invasive trees spreading from
126 plantations.

127

128 What of the alternatives to NET of drastically reducing emissions by reducing dependence
129 on fossil fuels? In one year (2016-2017), the UK reduced overall emissions by 12 million tons
130 of CO₂ equivalent (=3.7 M tons C), through reduced use of coal for electricity generation
131 (<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics>). That equates to 3.3 M ha of open ecosystems
132 turned into plantations (at 1 Mg C ha⁻¹y). Given the land use change envisaged for tree
133 planting, over enormous areas, sustained for decades, with such poor gains in carbon
134 reduction, we find it difficult to understand why afforestation is so widely supported. As
135 demonstrated by the UK, emissions reductions by reducing fossil fuel dependency are
136 feasible without reducing economic growth and are far more effective in reducing rates of
137 CO₂ increase than afforestation. Indeed, trees-for-carbon projects can be seen as a
138 distraction from the urgent business of reducing fossil fuel emissions. Planting 100 million
139 hectares of trees, far away in Africa, might reduce the urgency of emissions reductions in
140 industrial countries that are the major sources of greenhouse gases [3].

141

142 We suggest that serious and urgent consideration needs to be given to the wisdom of
143 continuing continental scale afforestation in Africa and elsewhere. We strongly endorse tree
144 planting to restore closed forests destroyed in historical times (reforestation), the retention
145 of intact forests that remain, and the planting of trees in urban areas for shade and
146 enjoyment. But the afforestation envisaged by global tree-planting programmes is based on
147 wrong assumptions. Far from being deforested and degraded, Africa's savannas and
148 grasslands existed, alongside forests, for millions of years before humans began felling
149 forests. A better way of supporting Africa's transition to a future warmer world might be to

150 promote energy efficient cities in this rapidly urbanizing continent so that Africa follows a
151 less carbon-intensive trajectory of development than other emerging economies.

152

153 References

- 154 1. Laestadius, L. et al. (2011) Mapping opportunities for forest landscape restoration.
155 *Unasylva* (English ed.), 62(238), 47-48.
- 156 2. Lewis, S.L. et al. (2019) Regenerate natural forests to store carbon. *Nature* 568, 25–28.
- 157 3. Smith, P. et al (2016) Biophysical and economic limits to negative CO₂ emissions. *Nat.*
158 *Clim. Change* 6(1), 42.
- 159 4. Baldocchi, D. and Penuelas, J. (2019) The physics and ecology of mining carbon dioxide
160 from the atmosphere by ecosystems. *Glob. Chang. Biol.* 25, 1191–1197
- 161 5. Bastin, J. F. et al (2019) The global tree restoration potential. *Science*, 365(6448), 76-79.
- 162 6. Bright, R. M. et al. (2015) Quantifying surface albedo and other direct biogeophysical
163 climate forcings of forestry activities. *Glob. Chang. Biol.* 21(9), 3246-3266.
- 164 7. Le Quéré, C. et al. (2018) Global Carbon Budget 2018. *Earth System Science Data*, 10,
165 2141–2194. <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-10-2141-2018>
- 166 8. Smith, L. J. and Torn, M. S. (2013) Ecological limits to terrestrial biological carbon dioxide
167 removal. *Clim. Change* 118, 89–103
- 168 9. Busch, J. et al. (2019) Potential for low-cost carbon dioxide removal through tropical
169 reforestation. *Nat. Clim. Change* 9(6), 463
- 170 10. Dass, P. et al. (2018) Grasslands may be more reliable carbon sinks than forests in
171 California. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 13, 074027.
- 172 11. Retallack, G. J. (2013) Global cooling by grassland soils of the geological past and near
173 future. *Ann. Rev. Earth Planetary Sci.*, 41, 69-86.
- 174 12. Ryan, C. M. et al. (2016) Ecosystem services from southern African woodlands and their
175 future under global change. *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. B: Biol. Sci.* 371(1703), 20150312.
- 176 13. Jackson, R. B. et al. (2005) Trading water for carbon with biological carbon
177 sequestration. *Science*, 310, 1944–1947. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1119282>
- 178 14. Veldman, J.W. et al. (2015) Where tree planting and forest expansion are bad for
179 biodiversity and ecosystem services. *BioScience* 65, 1011–1018.
- 180 15. White, F. (1983) *The vegetation of Africa*.
- 181 16. Jenkins, C.N. *et al.* (2013) Global patterns of terrestrial vertebrate diversity and
182 conservation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U.S.A* 110, E2602–E2610.
- 183 17. Gilbert, M. et al. (2018) Global distribution data for cattle, buffaloes, horses, sheep,
184 goats, pigs, chickens and ducks in 2010. *Scientific data* 5, 180227

185

186


187 **Figure Legend**

188 Figure 1. Large scale tree-planting in Africa will severely impact African grassy biomes.

189 a) Areas identified as suitable for reforestation [14]

190 (<http://www.wri.org/applications/maps/flr-atlas/#>) have significant overlap with the
191 distribution of African grassy ecosystems (adapted from [15]) which are important centres
192 of b) ungulate and c) carnivore diversity [16] (number species/10kmx10km grid cell) that also
193 provide valuable ecosystem services to much of Africa's population as indicated by the d)
194 distribution of cattle across Africa [17]. Figures created by Nicola Stevens.

195



196