

Revising the CCFM C&I framework
TWG Chairs meeting

October 9-11, 2002
Edmonton, Alberta

Potential Issues for Discussion

For comment before meeting by chairs

1) Number of indicators:

There are 83 indicators under the 6 criteria in the 1995 version of the CCFM C&I framework. In the revised framework, as it currently stands, there are 92 indicators under the 5 criteria reviewed so far. The number of indicators will increase once criterion 4 has been reviewed. We must strive to make sure that the revised C&I framework is as simple as possible, but no simpler. The indicators in the framework must be examined for overlap, redundancy, and the extent to which they meet the attributes set out at the beginning of the review process. However, having said that, it is important to note that in the National Status 2000 report, several indicators were sometimes used to report on one indicator in the framework.

Example: 5.3.2 "Total employment in all forest-related sectors" in the current framework was reported on in National Status 2000 with three figures, namely "direct employment in Canada's forest sector", "Output of production per employee" and "average income". Likewise indicator 2.1.3 "Area and severity of fire damage" was reported on with number of fires, area burned, wood losses in Canada and the estimated fire return intervals for ecozones.

2) Balance between environmental, social and economic criteria

It may be desirable to more evenly balance the number of indicators between the environmental, economic and social aspects of sustainability. In the 1995 (current) version of the C&I framework there are 48 indicators under Criteria 1-4, 16 under criterion 5, and 19 under criterion 6. In the revised framework to date, there are 34 indicators under criteria 1-3, 33 under criterion 5 and 25 under criterion 6.

3) Consistency in naming indicators:

- a. There is variation in the naming of indicators amongst the criterion. Some groups have opted to have very descriptive names that precisely define what is being measured. Others have chosen to use more simplistic names, that capture the essence of what is being measured in a more lay fashion, while more thoroughly describing the indicator elsewhere. We need to find a consistent way of naming indicators throughout the framework.

Example: 5.3.3 Employment vs. 2.3.1 Percent and area of harvest area successfully regenerated

4) Consistency in naming criteria and elements:

Suggestions have been made for renaming elements and criteria. Again, in some cases the name is very simple, in other cases, references to values or desired directional changes have been removed. We need to find a consistent way of naming criteria and elements in the new framework

Example: Criterion 2 - Forest ecosystem condition and productivity vs. maintenance and enhancement of forest ecosystem condition and productivity

5) Aboriginal Indicators:

Some of the indicators developed by TWG 6 are designed to address aboriginal values, issues and concerns. Some of the aboriginal indicators address social issues from an aboriginal perspective, while others address economic or environmental issues from an aboriginal perspective. From a strictly technical point of view, a number of approaches to placing these indicators in the C&I framework are possible including (i) grouping the aboriginal indicators together under one criterion; and (ii) placing each aboriginal indicator under one of the existing 6 criterion addressing similar values, issues or concerns. Associated with this issue is the fact that there is a certain amount of duplication between some aboriginal and non-aboriginal indicators. Combining some aboriginal and non-aboriginal indicators may be a possibility, but requires discussion.

Example:

6.3.1 Employment rate in aboriginal forest-based communities vs. 5.3.3 employment

6.3.2 Education attainment levels in aboriginal forest-based communities vs. 6.5.3 Education attainment levels in forest-based communities

6) Core, Supporting and Potential Indicators:

The definitions of Core, Supporting and Potential indicators were developed collectively by the TWG chairs, yet, as one might expect of groups working independently, different approaches to applying these terms emerged from the groups. A consistent approach needs to be applied to all indicators in the framework.

Example: some groups have identified indicators that are both Core and Potential, i.e. very important, but not measurable in the short term.

7) Indirect indicators of SFM:

Some indicators are only indirectly related to the values, issues or concerns identified with each criterion. Indirect indicators are often suggested when more direct measures are unavailable. The extent to which such indicators are desirable in the revised C&I framework needs to be determined.

Example, the value of "road density" as an indicator of the sustainability of an ecological condition or process such as biodiversity has been questioned. While it may be an indicator of industrial activity, access or edge, determining a causal relationship to biodiversity is challenging. On the other hand, road density has been used as a surrogate for forest fragmentation, which has often been cited as a key cause of biodiversity decline (or least bird biodiversity).

8) Indicators over which Forest Management has little control:

Some of the revised indicators may address issues over which forest management may have little, if any control. Climate change indicators, or indicators of annual precipitation

are a potential example of this. What change in forest policy or management could be made if annual precipitation declines or if climate change occurs. On the other hand, the role of the forest as a carbon store and a moderator of climate is of interest to the public and the public does not generally want to see the forest's capacity in this role diminished. The extent to which these types of indicators should be included in the revised framework needs to be determined.

9) The role of process indicators:

A number of "process" indicators have been suggested, particularly in areas where national scale data has proven very difficult to collect in the past (e.g. the % of area with "standards"). How closely such indicators are related to sustainability has been questioned because linkages between standards and sustainability depends on monitoring, enforcement, information and appropriate standard setting in the first place. On the other hand, with issues such as soil and water conservation, the collection of data has been so problematic that more direct national indicators have proven to be elusive. This has been compounded by differences in the types of soil and water problems across the country and jurisdictional differences in harvesting techniques and soil and water guidelines and regulations. Discussion of such indicators is required to decide on how best to use them in the revised C&I framework. A different approach may be to outline what we should measure to address a particular value, issue or concern, and then describe what we can measure. This may help illustrate where the biggest gains would be from additional monitoring efforts.

Example: 3.1.3 Percentage of net harvested area in compliance with locally applicable soil disturbance standards

10) Overlapping indicators

Different groups have suggested a number of similar indicators. These indicators need to be examined to reduce redundancy, decide on where such indicators can best be placed in the framework, and determine how linkages can be drawn between the indicator and all relevant criteria.

Example, the area of forest converted to non-forest land use has implications for criterion 1, 2 and 3. Wherever the indicator finally resides, clear linkages to the other relevant criterion should be captured. Furthermore, subtleties in indicator as it relates to the different criteria need to be captured. For example, 2.1.3 "percent and area of forest permanently disturbed by anthropogenic activities" and 3.1.1 "forest converted to a land-use that will degrade soil and water resources" maybe very similar except that while conversion to agriculture may remove forest land from timber productivity (important for criterion 2), it may not degrade the soil (and therefore would not be included in 3.1.1). This would need to be reflected in the framework and in the subsequent indicator report

11) Consistency in definitions:

It will likely be beneficial to develop consistent definitions for commonly used terms in the framework like "forest-type", "forest land", "age-class", "ecozone" or "protected areas"