

RIJEČ UREDNIŠTVA

ŠTO NAM DONOSI GLASGOWSKA KLIMATSKA KONFERENCIJA?

Nedavno je završena velika UN-ova klimatska konferencija COP26 donošenjem globalnog sporazuma „Glasgowski klimatski pakt“. Ujedno su potvrđeni svi nerazriješeni elementi u mehanizmima za provođenje Pariškog sporazuma o klimatskim promjenama iz 2015. godine i dogovorena transparentnost postupaka u njegovom provođenju. U sklopu potpisane Deklaracije o korištenju šuma i zemljišta, koju je do sada podržalo preko 140 država u kojima se nalazi više od 90 % svjetskih šuma, **čelnici zemalja** obvezali su se zajednički raditi na zaustavljanju i preokretanju gubitka šuma i degradacije zemljišta do 2030. godine.

Prvi cilj konferencije odnosio se na ograničavanje povišenja globalne prosječne temperature na razinu koja je znatno niža od 2 °C iznad razine u predindustrijskom razdoblju, kao i ulaganje napora u njezino ograničavanje na 1,5 °C. Drugi cilj odnosio se na prilagođavanje učincima klimatskih promjena i usklađivanje financijskih tokova s razvojem otpornim na klimatske promjene. U tom cilju do 2025. godine planira se mobilizirati 100 milijardi američkih dolara. Kao predvodnik u borbi protiv klimatskih promjena EU se obvezala do 2030. godine smanjiti emisiju stakleničkih plinova za najmanje 55 % u odnosu na 1990. godinu.

Opći je zaključak da će šume biti od vitalnoga značaja za postizanje ciljeva u borbi protiv globalnog zatopljenja. Prema istraživanjima World Resources Institute (WRI), šume apsorbiraju 30 posto emisije ugljikovog dioksida. Iako je šuma prirodni klimatski tampon u borbi protiv globalnog zatopljenja, činjenica je da se u svijetu površina šuma i dalje ubrzano smanjuje.

Na sastanku je sudjelovao i hrvatski predsjednik Vlade gospodin Andrej Plenković. Najavio je prestanak proizvodnje električne energije dobivene iz ugljena najkasnije do 2033. godine te povećanje udjela obnovljivih izvora energije u ukupnoj potrošnji na više od dvije trećine. Izrazito pohvalno je govorio o hrvatskom šumarstvu i njegovoj stoljetnoj tradiciji, što se inače od naših političara jako rijetko čuje. Jedna od aktivnosti koje Hrvatska planira u sljedećem razdoblju je i sadnja milijun dodatnih stabala godišnje do 2030. godine. Pod tim se podrazumijeva povećanje sadnje sa sadašnjih devet milijuna stabala na 10 milijuna, kako bi se anuli-

rale emisije stakleničkih plinova koje stvaraju vozila turista prilikom dolaska u Hrvatsku. Ta njegova najava u javnosti je otvorila niz pitanja, poput onoga kakvo je trenutno stanje naših šuma, da li se one ubrzano krče, mogu li Hrvatske šume d. o. o. ispuniti ovakav ambiciozan plan i sl. Sva ta pitanja još jednom su pokazala nerazumijevanje i nepoznavanje šuma i šumarstva. Ponajprije u hrvatskom šumarstvu krčenje šuma je zabranjeno osim u propisanim slučajevima, **što dokazuje i povećanje površina pod šumom. U javnosti se pošumljavanje**, dakle sadnja sadnica, povezuje jedino s obnovom šuma. Stoljetna tradicija hrvatskoga šumarstva obnovu šuma temelji na prirodnoj obnovi, dok se izuzeto od toga pošumljavaju gole, neobrasle i nešumske površine, ili one šumske površine zahvaćene požarima i ostalim katastrofama na kojima prirodna regeneracija nije moguća ili iz bilo kojeg drugog razloga nije uspjela. To nažalost ne znaju ni „Briselski činovnici“ kada, kao što je to bio slučaj s ledolomom u Hrvatskoj 2014. godine, kao sanaciju priznaju i financijski valoriziraju samo sadnju stabala. Uz ostalo time na uznapredovale šumske površine s klimatogenim vrstama vraćamo pionirsku vrstu i time činimo „korak unazad“.

Sljedeća opasnost je ograničavanje sječe, čitaj gospodarenje šumama. Koliko god to imalo smisla kao zaustavljanje krčenja šuma, u Hrvatskoj i zemljama s razvijenom šumarstvom to može imati negativne posljedice. Ograničavanje šumarskih zahvata kroz pasivno zaštićivanje šuma, preferiranje „starih šuma“ i sl. negativno će se odraziti na njihovo stanje i zaustaviti proces njihove obnove. Poznato je da mlade šume najviše prirašćuju, a time i apsorbiraju najviše CO₂.

Drugo je pitanje kako raspolažemo s posječenom drvnom masom. Da li je dovoljno finaliziramo, da li drvo upotrebljavamo kaskadno, da li ga recikliramo ili to sve nadomještamo potrebom za novim količinama? Isto tako zapitajmo se kako i koliko drvo upotrebljavamo kao ekološki najprihvatljiviji energent. Činjenica je da sustavno još nismo savladali pridobivanje biomase iz naših šuma, a drveni pelet čiju smo proizvodnju, zahvaljujući jeftinoj sirovini, podigli na zavidnu razinu, završava pretežito u drugim zemljama, smanjujući im onečišćenja stakleničkim plinovima.

Uredništvo

EDITORIAL

WHAT DOES THE GLASGOW CONFERENCE BRING US?

The major UN climate conference COP26 recently ended with the adoption of the global “Glasgow Climate Pact” agreement. At the same time, all unresolved elements in the mechanisms for the implementation of the 2015 Paris Agreement on Climate Change were acknowledged and the transparency of the procedures in its application was agreed upon. As part of the signed Declaration on Forests and Land Use, which has so far been supported by over 140 countries in which more than 90 % of world’s forests are located, the leaders pledged to “halt and reverse forest loss and land degradation” by 2030.

The first objective of the conference was to limit the increase in global average temperature to a level significantly lower than 2 °C above the level in the pre-industrial period, as well as to invest efforts in limiting it to 1.5 °C. The second objective was to adapt to the effects of climate change and align financial flows with climate-resilient development. To this end, it is planned to mobilise 100 billion US dollars by 2025. As a leader in the fight against climate change, the EU has committed itself to reducing greenhouse gas emissions by at least 55 % by 2030 compared to 1990.

The general conclusion is that forests will be vital in achieving the goals of fighting against global warming. According to research by the World Resources Institute (WRI), forests absorb 30 per cent of carbon dioxide emissions. Although the forest is a natural climate buffer in the fight against global warming, the fact is that the world’s forest area continues to decline rapidly.

The Conference was also attended by the Croatian Prime Minister, Mr Andrej Plenković. He announced the cessation of electricity production from coal by 2033 at the latest and an increase in the share of renewable energy sources in overall consumption to more than two thirds. He spoke highly of Croatian forestry and its century-old tradition, which is otherwise rarely heard from our politicians. One of the activities that Croatia is planning in the next period is the planting of one million additional trees per year by 2030. This means an increase in the planting from the current nine million trees to ten million in order to annul the greenhouse gas emissions generated by tourist vehicles arriving in Croatia.

The Prime Minister’s announcement raised a number of questions in the public, such as what the current condition of our forests is, whether they are being rapidly cut down, whether the company Croatian Forests Ltd can meet such an ambitious plan, and others. All these issues once again showed a lack of understanding and ignorance of forests and forestry. First of all, cutting down forests is prohibited in Croatian forestry, except in prescribed cases, as evidenced by the increase in forest areas. The public associate afforestation, that is, planting seedlings, only with forest regeneration. Throughout the century-long tradition of Croatian forestry, forest regeneration has been based on natural regeneration, while bare, unforested and non-forested areas are afforested, including those forest areas affected by fires and other disasters where natural regeneration is not possible or has failed for any other reason. Regrettably, the “Brussels bureaucrats” do not know this either, otherwise they would not, as was the case with ice-break in Croatia in 2014, have recognized and financially valorised only the planting of trees as a recovery measure. Among other things, by doing this we are returning the pioneer species to forest areas improved by climatic species, thus making a “step backwards”.

The next danger lies in limiting felling, (read: managing forests). As much as it makes sense to stop cutting down forests, in Croatia and countries with developed forestry it may have negative consequences. Restricting forestry operations through passive protection of forests, preferring “old forests”, etc. will have a negative effect on their condition and stop the process of their regeneration. It is well known that young forests increment the most and thus absorb the highest amounts of CO₂.

Another question is how we dispose of the felled wood mass. Are we finalizing it sufficiently, are we cascading wood, are we recycling it, or are we replacing it all with the need for new quantities? Let us also ask ourselves in what way and in what amounts we use wood as the most environmentally friendly energy source. The fact is that we have not yet systematically mastered the extraction of biomass from our forests, while wood pellets, the production of which we have raised to an enviable level thanks to cheap raw material, end up mostly in other countries, reducing their greenhouse gas pollution.

Editorial Board