

# SouthEastTIMBERassociation

Dear Andrew,

I am following up on my email of the 2 December 2021 regarding the source of funding for the ANU & Frontier Economics report, to again seek a response.

You also may be aware that some media, including the Canberra Times have recently published new reports, to highlight some of the flaws that the South East Timber Association have identified in the report that you co-authored.

Given the various media outlets have cherry picked the SETA summary, attached is a copy of the SETA summary of the major flaws in your co-authored paper. There are a number of other flaws that were not fully analysed due to time constraints.

If you wish to undertake a detailed review of your report beyond what has been covered in the SETA summary, the additional areas you may also wish to cover include, but are not limited to:

1. The negative multipliers that would impact local economies if the forest industry was to be closed.
2. The findings of your report that are in stark contrast to a recent comprehensive scientific study carried out by national forest carbon experts (including from CSIRO)
3. [https://www.fwpa.com.au/images/resources/Amended\\_Final\\_report\\_C\\_native\\_forests\\_PNC285-1112.pdf](https://www.fwpa.com.au/images/resources/Amended_Final_report_C_native_forests_PNC285-1112.pdf).
4. The report uses incorrect factors to determine carbon storage in wood products in landfills, leading to underestimation of the carbon benefits of wood. It incorrectly attributes unrealistically high decay factors (23% decay) to the National Greenhouse Inventory, when in fact the Inventory clearly states on page 353 that the decay factor adopted for wood in the national inventory is much lower at 10.  
<https://www.industry.gov.au/sites/default/files/April%202021/document/national-inventory-report-2019-volume-2.pdf>
5. There are a number of other flaws in the carbon accounting component of the report. I will leave these to your expertise to recognise and rectify.

If you are wondering why SETA is contacting you, we were encouraged by comments made in the media by vice chancellor Schmidt which were reported in the Sydney Morning Herald on 13 August 2021.

*Professor Schmidt said ANU researchers' ideas needed to be subject to robust scrutiny.*

*"In this age of misinformation, it is also vital that we have a press that upholds the free exchange of ideas, respectful debate, and most importantly, an unbiased reporting of fact, observations and knowledge," he said.*

*"A press that wilfully distorts the truth, bends the facts, that uses its position of power and influence to further vested interests, not only undermines our democracy – it impoverishes our understanding of the world and the complex challenges we face."*



[southeasttimberassociation.com](http://southeasttimberassociation.com) OR find us on Facebook

# SouthEastTIMBERassociation

Consequently, SETA members have taken the time to subject your report to robust scrutiny and are deeply concerned by our findings.

I would greatly appreciate your advice as to the source of funding that was used to cover your time in co-authoring the report and the cost of the Frontier Economics component of the report.

Yours Sincerely,  
Peter Rutherford  
SETA Secretary

