

Forest restoration

Transformative trees

Sheil, Douglas; Bargués-Tobella, Aida; Ilstedt, Ulrik; Ibisch, Pierre L.; Makarieva, Anastassia; McAlpine, Clive; Morris, Cindy E.; Murdiyarso, Daniel; van der Ent, Ruud J.; More Authors

DOI

[10.1126/science.aay7309](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aay7309)

Publication date

2019

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Science

Citation (APA)

Sheil, D., Bargués-Tobella, A., Ilstedt, U., Ibisch, P. L., Makarieva, A., McAlpine, C., Morris, C. E., Murdiyarso, D., van der Ent, R. J., & More Authors (2019). Forest restoration: Transformative trees. *Science*, 366(6463), 316-317. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aay7309>

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Forest restoration: Transformative trees

We welcome the attention given to forest and trees by the Report “The global tree restoration potential” (5 July, p. 76), in which J. F. Bastin *et al.* study the potential of tree cover to reduce climate change. However, we are concerned by their neglect of the water cycle. They consider how water influences tree cover but disregard how tree cover influences water. Bastin *et al.* recognize that their extrapolations are not “future projections of potential forest extent” but instead represent potential tree cover “under existing environmental conditions.” However, given the influence of forest on its environment, the concept of potential tree cover under current conditions is problematic. Trees influence several of the variables Bastin *et al.* used to model tree cover, including precipitation quantity, variability, and seasonality, as well as soil moisture and atmospheric water transport (1–4).

While much remains uncertain (2), we know enough to foresee that afforestation and reforestation have potential for both negative and positive hydrological impacts. Negative impacts can result if plantings deplete groundwater and thus exacerbate local water scarcity. Changes can manifest quickly and are a recognized problem with fast-growing monoculture plantations (5). Positive impacts can result when tree cover improves soil and groundwater recharge and storage, such as through suitable species and tree densities (6). Forest cover can also promote rainfall recycling, and thus bolster and stabilize regional and downwind rainfall (1, 7, 8). In suitable circumstances, increased forest cover may even return wetter climates to currently drier regions, expanding the land available for trees (2). These outcomes have profound implications given that reliable access to water is central to achieving the UN Sustainable Development Goals. Accounting for the potentially transformative power of trees regarding both water and carbon offers crucial constraints as well as vast benefits.

Douglas Sheil,^{1,2} Aida Barges-Tobella,^{3,4} Ulrik Ilstedt,⁴ Pierre L. Ibisch,⁵ Anastassia Makarieva,⁶ Clive McAlpine,⁷ Cindy E. Morris,⁸ Daniel Murdiyarso,^{2,9} Antonio D. Nobre,¹⁰ Germán Poveda,¹¹ Dominick V. Spracklen,¹² Caroline A. Sullivan,¹³ Obbe A. Tuinenburg,¹⁴ Ruud J. van der Ent,^{15,16}

¹Faculty of Environmental Sciences and Natural Resource Management (MINA), Norwegian University of Life Sciences (NMBU), 1432 Ås, Norway. ²Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), Bogor, Jawa Barat 16115, Indonesia. ³World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF), 00100, Nairobi, Kenya. ⁴Department of Forest Ecology and Management, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU), 901 83 Umeå, Sweden. ⁵Centre for Ecomics and Ecosystem Management, Faculty of Forest and Environment, Eberswalde University for Sustainable Development, D-16225, Eberswalde, Germany. ⁶Theoretical Physics Division, Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, St. Petersburg, Russia. ⁷School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, The University of Queensland, St. Lucia, QLD 4072, Australia. ⁸INRA, Plant Pathology Research Unit 407, PACA Research Center, 84143 Montfavet, France. ⁹Department of Geophysics and Meteorology, Bogor Agricultural University, Bogor, Indonesia. ¹⁰Centro de Ciencia do Sistema Terrestre INPE, São José dos Campos, São Paulo, Brazil. ¹¹Department of Geosciences and Environment, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Medellín, Colombia. ¹²School of Earth and Environment, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK. ¹³National Centre for Flood Research, Southern Cross University, Lismore, NSW 2480, Australia. ¹⁴Copernicus Institute of Sustainable Development, Utrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands. ¹⁵Department of Water Management, Faculty of Civil Engineering and Geosciences, Delft University of Technology, Delft, Netherlands. ¹⁶Department of Physical Geography, Faculty of Geosciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands.

*Corresponding author. Email: douglas.sheil@nmbu.no

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. D. Ellison *et al.*, *Glob. Environ. Change* **43**, 51 (2017).
2. D. Sheil, *For. Ecosyst.* **5**, 1 (2018).
3. J. S. Wright *et al.*, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **114**, 8481 (2017).
4. J. F. Salazar *et al.*, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.* **22**, 1735 (2018).
5. R. B. Jackson *et al.*, *Science* **310**, 1944 (2005).
6. U. Ilstedt *et al.*, *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 21930 (2016).
7. L. Wang-Erlandsson *et al.*, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.* **22**, 4311 (2018).
8. A. Staal *et al.*, *Nat. Clim. Change* **8**, 539 (2018).

10.1126/science.aay7309