

**CANADIAN COUNCIL OF FOREST MINISTERS'
CRITERIA AND INDICATORS OF
SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT
INDICATOR REVIEW**



**THIRD TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETING
26 – 28 AUGUST, 2002, Halifax, Nova Scotia**

MEETING SUMMARY

DRAFT

INTRODUCTION

On March 15, 2002, five Technical Working Groups (TWGs) for reviewing the indicators in the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers' (CCFM) framework of Criteria and Indicators (C&I) of Sustainable Forest Management met for the first time via web conference. The objective of this meeting was to define the scope of the work to the TWG members and provide the necessary background information. Each Technical Working Group was assigned the task of refining the indicators under one of Criteria 1, 2, 3, 5 or 6 in the CCFM C&I framework. At this meeting, members were asked to individually produce a preliminary list of indicators for their criterion.

On April 25th and 26th 2002, five Technical Working Groups met for the second time in Ottawa. The goal of this meeting was to sort through an initial list of draft indicators that each group had put together earlier in April and reduce the list to less than 20 potential indicators per Criterion. Participants were given a list of attributes that each indicator should possess, and each group was asked to describe the rationale for the indicator and give measurement units.

The groups were also asked to try and provide additional information for each indicator, including approaches to measurement, interpretation, benchmarks, and links to other C&I processes. Some groups were able to provide more of this information than others. By the end of the meeting, each group had compiled a list of indicators with additional information. During the summer, each group worked on their own, meeting several times by email or teleconference, to further refine their indicators.

The groups came back together for a third and final time in Halifax on August 25 - 27, 2002. The objectives of this meeting were:

- Discuss and agree on a final set of indicators for the Criteria
- Identify barriers to reporting and potential costs of overcoming the barriers
- Identify benchmarks for indicators where possible
- Identify indicators as core, supporting or potential

MEETING SUMMARY

On August 25th, some TWG members participated in a field trip organized by Peter Duinker and the Nova Forest Alliance, with participation from the Western Newfoundland Model Forest, and the Fundy Model Forest. The purpose of this trip was to: provide examples of indicator development in other forestry situations; provide an opportunity to interact with others who have first hand experience developing indicators; to reinforce the importance of developing indicators that are relevant to the criteria, understandable, measurable, have reference values and can be forecast; and provide an opportunity to discuss issues of scale in indicators, from local level to national level.

On August 26th, the TWGs met to begin finalizing their indicator recommendations. Tom Neimann provided an introductory presentation to answer some frequently asked questions, provide guidance to the TWGs on the review objectives and review the agenda for the two days. Following this, Bill Dalton, from the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, gave a presentation on Ontario's recent experiences developing a provincial C&I framework and report. Following the presentations, participants moved to their breakout groups for the remainder of the day.

On August 27th, the meeting began with a plenary session, where each group gave an overview of the indicators they had developed to date. A question period followed each group's presentation, allowing for interactive discussion of indicators and common issues faced by all groups. After the plenary session, participants moved to their separate breakout groups for the rest of the day. The plenary at the end of the meeting was cut short because most groups felt that they had more to gain by remaining in their breakout sessions than by coming back together in plenary. A short plenary session of 15 minutes was held to thank the TWG participants and advise them of the next steps in the review process.

NEXT STEPS

While most TWGs did conclude their work at the meeting, some groups also agreed to meet by email or teleconference during the month following to tie up loose ends with their indicators. TWG Chairs agreed to submit their group's recommended set of indicators to the C&I Secretariat by the end of September. In October, the TWG Chairs will meet to assemble the separate TWG recommendations into a single framework, looking for overlaps and areas of consolidation. The TWG Chairs will report the results of their deliberations back to the TWG members for feedback before presenting the recommendations to the CCFM C&I Task Force.

APPENDIX 1: FIELD TRIP PARTICIPANTS

TWG 1

Mr. Rory Thompson (Chair), Alberta Sustainable Resource Development
Dr. Rick Bonar, Weldwood of Canada, Ltd.
Dr. John Innes, University of British Columbia
Dr. Brenda McAfee, Canadian Forest Service

TWG 2

Mr. Dwayne Dye (Chair), Saskatchewan Department of Environment and Resource Management
Ms. Daniel Cantin, IUCN The World Conservation Union
Mr. Dave Fong, Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Forest Resources and Agri-Foods
Dr. Brian Kotak, Tembec Paper Group – Pine Falls Operation

TWG3

Dr. Mike Curan, BC Ministry of Forests
Dr. Patrick Nantel, Canadian Forest Service

TWG 5

Mr. Tom Niemann (Chair), BC Ministry of Forests
Mr. Laurie Gravelines, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources
Mr. Peter McQuarrie Nova Scotia Department of Natural Resources
Mr. René Samson, Canadian Forest Service

TWG 6

Mr. Dan Cooligan (Chair), Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources
Dr. John Parkins, Canadian Forest Service

C&I EXPERT ADVISOR

Dr. Peter Duinker, Dalhousie University

MODEL FORESTS

Brian Donovan, Fundy Model Forest
Karen Saunders, Western Newfoundland Model Forest
Brian Sykes, Nova Forest Alliance

INVITED PARTICIPANT

Bill Dalton, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources

C&I SECRETARIAT

Simon Bridge

APPENDIX 2: TWG MEETING PARTICIPANTS

TWG 1

Mr. Rory Thompson (Chair), Alberta Sustainable Resource Development
Dr. Rick Bonar, Weldwood of Canada, Ltd.
Dr. John Innes, University of British Columbia
Dr. Brenda McAfee, Canadian Forest Service
Mr. Ed Wicken, Wildlife Habitat Canada
Dr. Stephen Woodley, Parks Canada

TWG 2

Mr. Dwayne Dye (Chair), Saskatchewan Department of Environment and Resource Management
Ms. Daniel Cantin, IUCN The World Conservation Union
Mr. Dave Fong, Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Forest Resources and Agri-Foods
Dr. Brian Kotak, Tembec Paper Group – Pine Falls Operation
Mr. Roj Miller, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources

TWG 3

Mr. Len Moores (Chair), Newfoundland Department of Forest Resources and Agri-Foods
Dr. Mike Curan, BC Ministry of Forests
Ms. Margaret Donnelly, Forest Products Association of Canada
Dr. Jim Fyles, McGill University
Dr. Patrick Nantel, Canadian Forest Service
Mr. Jean-Pierre Jeté, Ministère des ressources naturelles du Québec
Dr. Stephen Yamasaki, Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, Montréal Chapter

TWG 5

Mr. Tom Niemann (Chair), BC Ministry of Forests
Dr. Gary Bull, university of British Columbia
Mr. Laurie Gravelines, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources
Mr. Rick Groves, Tembec Industries Inc.
Mr. Peter McQuarrie Nova Scotia Department of Natural Resources
Mr. Martin von Mirbach, Sierra Club of Canada
Mr. René Samson, Canadian Forest Service

TWG 6

Mr. Dan Cooligan (Chair), Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources
Ms. Jennifer Dunlap, New Brunswick Department of Natural Resources
Ms. Solange Nadeau, Canadian Forest Service
Dr. John Parkins, Canadian Forest Service

EXPERT ADVISORS

Dr. Vic Adamowicz, University of Alberta
Dr. Peter Duinker, Dalhousie University

INVITED PARTICIPANT

Bill Dalton, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources

C&I SECRETARIAT

Simon Bridge

APPENDIX 3: FIELD TRIP AGENDA

THIRD TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETING

FIELD TRIP

August 25, 2002

Halifax, Nova Scotia

- 8:00 Depart Holiday Inn Select Parking lot for Pockwock
- 8:45 Arrive HRM Water Treatment Plant at Pockwock
- 8:45 - 11:30 Pockwock Bowater Research Project-Overview (Nancy McInnis Leek, Todd Smith,
 - Focus on what is being measured, why it is being measured and how will the information be used?
- 11:30 - 12:15 Travel to Airport Hotel
- 12:15 -1:00 Lunch (sandwich and soup)
- 1:00 - 3:00 C&I Presentations (20 minutes each)
 - Fundy Model Forest - Brian Donovan
 - Nova Forest Alliance - Brian Sykes
 - Western Newfoundland Model Forest - Karen Saunders
 - CCFM -C&I Task Force Member – National level indicators
 - Discussion - 40 minutes (how do local level indicator approaches relate to the national C&I effort and vice versa) are there opportunities to improve?
- 3:00-4:00 Field Stop - Criterion 5 - Assessing the Aesthetic Characteristics of the Viewscape.
- 4:00-4:30 Field Stop - Criterion 5 Quantity of Litter/Garbage Deposited
- 4:30- 5:30 - Field Stop - Criterion 3 - Extent of harvest area with significant soil disturbance
 - Percentage of forests managed under BMP's and other guidelines
 - Percentage of riparian zones meeting specifications
- 6:15 Arrive back at Holiday Inn Select

APPENDIX 4: MEETING AGENDA

THIRD TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETING

August 26 – 28, 2002

Halifax, Nova Scotia

Holiday Inn Select Halifax Centre

Objectives

- Discuss and agree on a final set of indicators for the Criteria
- Identify barriers to reporting and potential costs of overcoming the barriers
- Identify benchmarks for indicators where possible
- Identify indicators as core, supporting or potential

Monday, August 26 *Pre-meeting field trip*

Tuesday, August 27

8:00 – 9:00	Registration & Continental Breakfast – Guild West Room
9:00 – 10:30	Plenary session – Guild West Room <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Welcome• Introductory Remarks• Presentation on Ontario's State of the Forest Report
10:30 – 10:45	Move to breakout rooms
10:45 - noon	Work in breakout groups (morning break provided in breakout room)
Noon – 13:00	Lunch
13:00 – 17:00	Work in breakout groups Afternoon break provided in breakout rooms

Wednesday, August 28

8:00 – 8:30	Continental Breakfast – Guild West Room
8:30 – 10:45	Plenary Session – Guild West Room <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Presentation of indicators by TWGs followed by discussion
10:45 – 11:00	Break & move to breakout rooms
11:00 - noon	Work in breakout groups – revisions to indicators
Noon – 13:00	Lunch
13:00 – 14:30	Work in breakout groups
14:30 – 14:45	Break
14:45 – 16:00	Plenary session – Guild West Room <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Presentation of indicator lists• Closing remarks
16:00	Meeting Adjourned

APPENDIX 5: TOM NIEMANN'S PRESENTATION

CCFM C&I Indicator Review

What Readers Want

Technical Working Groups

Meeting

August 27, 2002

Tom Niemann

C&I to do what?

- Assist progress towards SFM,

specifically by helping:
 - ◆ *Define*
 - ◆ *Monitor*
 - ◆ *Communicate*
- Meet national & int'l commitments to use C&I (National Forest Strategy, Agenda 21)

C&I framework should:

- **Assist report writers with**
 - ◆ structure to ensure comprehensiveness
 - ◆ logic to guide the narrative
- **Assist readers with**
 - ◆ clear design to help find parts of interest
 - ◆ easy links to related work
 - e.g. MP, UN, provincial SOF, LLI, certification

What readers? ...they want?

- **public, interest groups, decision makers**
 1. **relevant to values/issues**
 2. **credible, comprehensive C&I**
 3. **clear, concise language**
- **people with little time for C&I**
 4. **clear design to help find parts of interest**
- **domestic and international**
 5. **Canadian values**
 6. **clear links to international work**

Readers

Want:

1. relevant to values/issues
2. credible, comprehensive C&I
3. clear, concise language
4. clear design to help find parts of interest
5. Canadian values
6. clear links to international work

Desired Indicator

Attributes:

1. Relevant
2. Measurable
*C&I framework
3. Understandable
4. Can be Forecast
*C&I framework
5. Have reference values
*C&I framework

Things to think about:

1. Relevant?

- ➡ Is the indicator related to the criterion?
- ➡ Does it assess SFM at the national level?
- ➡ Is it responsive?
- ➡ Were all focus group (Canadian) values addressed?

◆ good indicator - forest age-class structure

◆ bad indicator - global market share

Things to think about:

2. Measurable?

- ➡ Is the indicator precisely defined, measurable?
- ➡ Is it suitable for data collection at national level?
- ➡ Is measurement costly or difficult?
- ➡ Can it be measured consistently over time?

◆ good indicator - employment

◆ bad indicators - "...turbidity, etc."

- mutual learning mechanisms

Things to think about:

3. Understandable?

- ➡ **Is the indicator useful to the intended audience?**
(an interested and informed public, decision makers)
- ➡ **Is it relatively easy to interpret?**
- ➡ **Is it easy to present and understand?**

- ◆ **good indicator - water quality**
- ◆ **bad indicator - index of the diversity of the local industrial base**

Things to think about:

4. Can it be forecast?

➡ Is the indicator science-based?

➡ Do scientific forecasting tools exist?

◆ good indicator - mean annual increment

◆ bad indicator - expenditure on international forestry

Things to think about:

5. Reference values?

- ➡ Does the indicator have a historical baseline?
- ➡ Can a “Canadian” target be identified?
- ➡ Does the indicator wording include or imply methods or reference values? (it should not)
- ➡ Is the wording non-directional? (it should be)

- ◆ good indicator - number of threatened species
- ◆ bad indicator - increase in value-added

Things to think about:

Is the C&I framework sound?

➡ **Is the framework comprehensive?**

Are there gaps (that a reader would notice)?

➡ **Is the design clear and logical (to the reader)?**

Are indicators in the best place?

Do the indicators overlap/duplicate?

1.1.1 - 1.1.2 - 2.2.1, 1.1.3 - 3.2.3 - 5.4.4, 1.2.2 - 2.3.2,
3.1.2 - 4.2.1 - 5.1.2, 4.4.4 - 6.5.1, 5.2.3 - 6.5.2,
5.3.3 - 6.2.4, 6.2.3 - 6.3.1, 6.2.5 - 6.5.4, 6.4.1/2/3

➡ **Are links to Montreal Process and provincial reports clear (to readers of other jurisdictions)?**

➡ **Your thoughts and preferences, please.**

After this meeting

- **TWG Chairs will consider**
 - ✓ recommendations of TWGs
 - ✓ Priority ranking (core, supporting, potential)
 - ✓ Topic structure
 - ✓ Montreal Process
 - ✓ NFS linkages
- **TWG Chairs may move indicators and elements around**
- **Results will be circulated to TWGs**
- **TWG Chairs will finalize and submit recommendations to CCFM C&I TF**