



Project developer forum notes

Thursday 16th April 2026

Introduction

Andrew Baker, Senior operational manager of the woodland carbon code (WCC), led the forum.

The previous forum discussion points were summarised.

The current forum discussion points were announced:

- 1) Issues that slow down the process of validation/verification and how changes could be made to improve this.
- 2) Changes that should be included within the WCC 2026 Clarifications.

It was announced that Susan Szymborski-Welsh, the WCC communication officer, and Alice Peace, WCC coordinator, have left the WCC team.

Validation and Verification – How to improve the process

Anna Brand, the WCC Operational Manager, led the discussion on how to improve the validation and verification process.

Questions focused on:

- Guidance should be clearly highlighted/searchable on the WCC website – especially important for new Project Developers (PDs) who are unfamiliar with the processes. This is something that the WCC team are working on, specifically looking at improving search results and linking results towards specific text/sections within a web page.
- Anna mentioned that incorrect contact details on the S&P registry can delay project progress, and asked PDs to keep contact details up to date.
- PDs felt that there is a lack of transparency and communication as to what stage their project is at. This is both within the registry and when the project is with the validator and verifier bodies. There is a notable hold up between the final review being finished and submitting issuances at validation, and it is unclear what is being carried out at this stage that is causing the hold up. As such there was a discussion about adding more stages to the validation and verification processes and within the S&P registry to improve communication.

2026 Clarification Suggestions

Anna and Andrew led the discussion on the potential for a formal clarification this summer.

Questions focused on:

- Why only clear fell conifers were accepted within the cashflow with no thin only conifer option. Andrew spoke about how this was explained in the FAQs tab on the cashflow; essentially describing how the cashflow assumes the most economically productive use of the woodland, to allow woodland owners more flexibility in future as to how they manage their woodland silviculturally.
- Issue raised about native conifers (Yew and Juniper), that are not Scots Pine, being added in as Other conifers, thin, clearfell or CCF in the cashflow documentation. Yew often forms a very small amount of the woodland and will never be clear felled, could this be modified. This type of conifer also implicates verification as it would require a separate stratum. WCC to think about how these issues could be resolved in the next clarification.
- PDs requested a notice in advance of upcoming clarifications to ensure that time is not wasted on filling in old document versions. WCC agreed that this is something that could be improved upon and will ensure to do so for the next clarification.
- Issue raised about auditors asking for a main access point to be added on maps at validation, and this often holds up a project. There is no requirement for this in standard/guidance online. WCC agreed that is correct and will look at making this clear this in the next clarification document.

Actions

Update about remote sensing and verification from WCC requested by PDs.

Action for Andrew: Contact Leon DeBell (WCC Monitoring Advisor) and ask him to present in the next forum to provide an update on remote sensing developments with WCC.

Close

Andrew invited everyone to get in touch with any additional issues or suggestions on what was discussed by emailing info@woodlandcarboncode.org.uk

If stakeholders have any clarification suggestions then please contact us on the above email address by the end of May 2026.

The next PD forum will be in three months' time.