

Nicola Thompson Fraser SFM PAG

March 31, 2011 Meeting. 9:00 am Ashcroft River Inn

Attendance: Jim Baker, Francis Vyse, Bert Parke, Dave Tremblay, Michael Bragg, Tony Buckley, Jason Yates, Dave Poole, Wendy McKinney, Corey Korumi, Katharine Shewchuk, Simon Warhurst, Jerry Canuel, Andrea Inwards, Frank Etchart, Leona Antoine, Peter Grauer, Tom Dickinson, Graham Everett. Guests: Jim McCormack, Paul Wooding, Murphy Shewchuk

Facilitator: Pat Salm

Minutes: Rick Cooper

Meeting started at 9AM. Started with introductions and review of the meeting agenda (Frances requested that an explanation of the new Ministry responsible for Forests be given).

Website: Reviewed the new Thompson Okanagan SFM website. Pat walked through the website and how to access the members-only section.

Monitoring Summaries:

Reviewed the Kamloops North Thompson SFM monitoring summary for 2010 results.

Reviewed the summary section of the Monitoring Report – how indicators and targets align with criteria and overall performance within each criteria as measured by the achievement of indicators/targets. Discussed how reporting occurred for each specific organization, then rolled up in the report for the TSA.

Discussed the change made in how the monitoring reports were shared with the PAG in advance of the meeting (hard copies not made – website used to disseminate information). Printed copies were then made available for the meeting discussions. PAG is okay with digital versions of annual monitoring summary.

Specific Indicator/Target discussion (for Kamloops North Thompson):

- Stand level retention (indicator #5)KNT has done quite well over the past 5 years.
- Grass seeding (Target #10) was not met. Target was not met because 2 NRFL licensees could not confirm if certified seed was used. MoF involved in collecting the data from individual NRFL holders and do the best they can to verify performance against stated indicators.
- Roads and landings (Indicator #15), target is at 6%, but licensees have always met this target. In new NTF plan Merritt and Kamloops are at a 6% target, Lillooet is at 7%, because of uncertainty over what is achievable with the new licence that Aspen Planers has picked

up in Lillooet. Group discussion confirmed that 6% and 7% targets were appropriate and may be revisited with subsequent reporting.

- Annual allowable cut (Indicator #16)- graph is fixed on the website. Showing an undercut in Kamloops TSA. What is the legal implication? Is it +/- 10%? Every five years, companies must harvest their cut. There is no legal consequence of under harvesting. Under cut wood is taken by the Ministry and repackaged and sold by BCTS, or bid out as NRFL's. Discussion proceeded on the small patches that are sometimes left behind, then subsequently harvested in later years or not harvested at all. Concern was that in some people's opinion, these patches should be part of the initial harvest to avoid amendments and rebuilding deactivated roads. All agreed that there are many reasons for leaving patches behind (other forest values, economics, species/size concerns, etc) and the best way to manage harvest planning was in the initial planning and layout stage.
- Public survey (Indicator 33) results, all average greater than 3, so nothing extra to report there.
- Company monitoring summaries. BCTS did not meet 2 indicators, but overall both were met at the plan level. BCTS was within the variance but decided to report to the PAG anyways. Public members of the PAG agreed that they would like to hear when companies do not meet the target. Even if they are meeting the variance. Briefly reviewed, Canfor, Tolko, and Gilbert Smith company summaries.

Action: In subsequent Monitoring Reports, all licensees to identify situations when they do not meet the hard target, but do meet the target when the variance is applied.

- There were no other recommended changes to potential indicators and targets in the Nicola Thompson Fraser SFM Plan as a result of the review of the Kamloops North Thompson SFM Plan.

Reviewed the one page Lillooet SFM monitoring summary for 2010.

Aspen Planers was not actively harvesting in the area in 2010. As such they opted not to report on the indicators within the existing Lillooet SFM Plan (developed by the PAG and supported by Ainsworth). However because of their activity with respect to road maintenance and reforestation they opted to report on those related targets as contained in the 2010 Merritt SFM Plan. The public appreciated the reporting of this summary information, knowing it's a transition year.

Reviewed the Merritt SFM monitoring summary for 2010 results.

Reviewed the summary section of the Monitoring Report similar to that of the Kamloops North Thompson – how indicators and targets align with criteria and overall performance within each criteria as measured by the achievement of indicators/targets. Discussed how reporting occurred for each specific organization, then rolled up in the report for the TSA.

Discussed the new website, and the ability to review stats on visitors as a way of demonstrating how it reaches a broader audience. Pat advised he can do a roll up of website traffic – where visitors to the site are from, how much time they spent on the site, which web pages were more frequently visited.

Action: Pat will provide a website report summary to the group towards the end of the year.

Specific Indicator/Target discussion (for the Merritt TSA)

- Indicators/targets not met were 2, 4, and 15.
- Indicator #2 (riparian) had 5 incidents by multiple licensees where riparian commitments in the Plan were not met (vs. a target of none). Licensee summaries have details on each incident. Each licensee has a management system that runs in the background and ensures each one is investigated, and has corrective and preventative actions assigned and completed. Each incident is also generally reviewed by the auditor.
- Indicator #4 (First Nations) had one incident where a First Nations commitment was not adhered to. Licensee encroached on a buffer zone – again the Licensee summary at the back of the report has more information.
- Indicator #15 (equivalent clear cut area) was not met. The licensee directed their hydrologist to large watersheds with lots of logging and after reviewing risk, did not conduct a hydrological assessment of one small watershed.
- Indicator #35 (public satisfaction survey). The survey used different questions than that in Kamloops (alignment on the survey for the NTF process still needs to be refined for 2011 reporting). While the overall survey score met the target, there were 3 individual questions where the average scoring ended up to be less than a 3 – satisfactory score. Where this occurs, the SFM Plan commits to discuss these and see if there is any further follow-up needed. The 3 survey questions were numbers 14, 15 and 16- all related to advisory group representation and communication. Discussion followed along with a review of the specific comments that were sent in related to the 3 questions. Pat explained the recent efforts licensees have made to reach out to the public including the new website, recent local advertising and letters to all First Nation Communities. In the end, the PAG felt ok with these efforts and felt nothing further was needed in relation to these 3 questions. With the heavy workload now completed (combining the 3 SFM Plans and upgrading to the new CSA Z809 Standard), public members of the PAG hope that more time can be spent on building awareness and knowledge within the existing group such as information talks by resource professionals.

BREAK

Discussion items.

Background:

Pat sent a note out to all public members of the advisory group listing the new CSA standards discussion items and seeing if there was any appetite to further review any of them, and if so, which ones.

Members responded with their choices and Pat collated this into the top 4 topics as follows:

- Forest fragmentation and forest loss
- Local and regional protected areas and integrated landscape management
- Management practices and regulatory requirements that protect water quality and quantity
- Climate change impacts and adaptation

Jerry Canuel offered to provide information on the first of these topics - Local and regional protected areas and integrated landscape management. Other discussion items will be scheduled for subsequent meetings.

Discussion Item: Local and regional protected areas and integrated landscape management.

Jerry distributed a series of coloured maps that identified the location of protected areas such as parks, and other areas reserved from harvesting or having harvest restrictions such as Old Growth Management Areas, Wildlife Habitat Areas and Ecological Reserves. Jerry reviewed where they exist, and process they went through to create them. The Kamloops LRMP process and resulting protected area designations was used as one example whereas Merritt did not go through a Land and Resource Management Plan process to formally designate additional protected areas. Another process was used for the designation of Wildlife Habitat Areas, where orders are written by government to protect habitat for species at risk. The public members were appreciative of the maps – they visually demonstrated the amount of protected area found in the area summary tables in the Nicola Thompson Fraser SFM Plan.

The subsequent discussion led to a request for a map of historical fires in the NTF plan area to see what effect fire has had on the ecological diversity of the area. Licencees were not sure how far back this information was available but felt they could source this information. Jerry (Aspen) offered to provide a map showing fire history for the NTF Plan area at the next meeting. It was discussed what the role of the Ministries' Forest For Tomorrow is in reforesting areas impacted by fires and other catastrophic events.

Action: Jerry to provide a map of historical fires in Plan area to the PAG at the fall meeting.

New government structure (Tony Buckley)

The newly created Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations (MFLNRO), is a collection of the traditional Ministry of Forests, Integrated Land Management Bureau and water tenuring. Steve Thompson is the minister, and Doug Konkin is the deputy minister. For this area of the Southern Interior of BC, Kevin Dickinson is the regional director MFLNRO. Similar positions occur for the Kootenay and Caribou areas. Dave Peterson is the executive director of all 3 regions. The BC Forest Service organization does still exist, and there will still be a 100 year celebration. The Range program is still part of the Ministry as is Front Counter BC. Water permitting and water stewardship are also part of MFLNRO. A question arose on who owns the Water Act modernization from PAG members. Subsequent to the meeting Tony provided the a web link to access more information on this: Water Act Modernization: Ministry of Environment, www.livingwatersmart.ca/water-act/

Forest research is part of each regional office. PAG members expressed some concern that we are losing research capabilities with this new structure. One thought was to invite the head of this Region's research section, Ken Soneff to next meeting if PAG is really interested. Nothing was really decided here so please let Pat know if you are interested and feel this would be a benefit to the group.

Marketing the CSA Standard, (Paul Wooding, PEFC Canada)

Paul Wooding is here representing PEFC Canada, and as a member of the CSA User Group. Delivered presentation and slides on PEFC Canada (added to the end of these minutes).

CSA User Group Chairman's award – presentation

On behalf of John Dunford, the Chair of the CSA User Group, Paul Wooding presented plaques to CSA User Group companies, and wooden, hand carved bowls to public members as winners of the 2010 Chairman's Award. Well done!!! Special thanks to Murphy Shewchuk for taking pictures of the group following the awards. The award is given as recognition for efforts of the advisory group in promoting Sustainable Forest management and advancing the CSA Standard. The User Group appreciates the opportunity to remind the broader public of one of the key strengths of the CSA certification – their requirements for public participation. More on the CSA User Group can be found on their website: csasfmforests.ca

LUNCH

External audit findings and SFM Plan updates

Most of the participating licencees have had an audit since the last PAG meeting. Companies most recent audit reports are posted on the NTF website:

<http://thompsonokanaganustainableforestry.ca/documents.htm>

Changes to the SFM plan:

The above mentioned audits resulted in improvement opportunities to the NTF SFM Plan. Pat had earlier posted these (in their entirety) in the members section of the website – look for the link to “2010 NTF SFM Plan with suggested changes”. Not all changes were reviewed at the meeting but some of the more important items are covered below. It was agreed at the meeting that we would keep this document on the website even after the Plan changes were made.

Specific changes:

Area under the plan., page 18. Added in more detail about other certifications to help show how much of the Plan area is being managed under PEFC endorsed certifications. This was an audit finding.

Added in Gilbert Smith licence numbers (these were in earlier version but somehow were dropped from the final version).

Page 46, species at risk. Does not specifically mention plants. Mentioned species at risk, and monitoring report stated plants, but indicator only alludes to animals. Changed to make it more clear that plants are included in the species at risk target.

Carbon indicator, audit finding recommended some wording change that more closely link the targets to the indicator. This provides more justification for the PAG’s selected targets.

PAG Terms of Reference. Appendix II-Roles and Responsibilities, Added dispute resolution process to the section title “Decision making/dispute resolution process”. Dispute resolution was part of this section already, added this process to the title.

A Plan change that is still a work in progress (will not be made until after discussion at the fall meeting) is the extra detail planned to go in Section 2 regarding the Plan Area. Frances and Aline are still doing working through this and hope to complete this spring/summer.

PAG agreed that Pat will make changes as proposed to the NTF Plan and will post this revised version to the website. No additional hard copies of the Plan will be made. Members section will have the ‘changed’ document for PAG members to view. PAG requested a one page summary of changes to preface the SFM plan for PAG members.

<p>ACTION: Pat to create a one page summary of all significant changes to SFM plan.</p>
--

2011 Field Trip

Tolko volunteered to host this falls field tour. PAG advised they would like to look at Red/Blue species, CWD, fires and their effects if possible. Please let Michael know if there are other items/issues that you would like to review during the field trip.

Tentative date is September 29th. Tour to occur around Tolko operations near Barriere.

As there were no other topics or issues that the PAG wished to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 1400hrs

PEFC presentation follows...

Introduction to the Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification (PEFC)



Nicola Thompson Fraser Public Advisory Group
March 31, 2011

FILE

Pan European Forest Certification Council

- Created in 1999 by European forest land owners as an umbrella organisation to provide a framework for the mutual recognition of credible national forest certification standards
- Formed as Pan European Forest Certification Council
- Canada the first non-European nation to join
- Now the Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification (PEFC)
- Not a certification standard but an endorsement of national standards
- Exception is the PEFC Chain of Custody standard



FILE 2

PEFC - Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification

34 member countries – 28 with endorsed standards

Argentina	Czech Republic	Latvia	Slovenia
Australia	Denmark	Lithuania	Spain
Austria	Estonia	Luxembourg	Sweden
Belarus	Finland	Malaysia	Switzerland
Belgium	France	Netherlands	United Kingdom
Brazil	Gabon	Norway	United States
Cameroon	Germany	Poland	Uruguay
Canada	Ireland	Portugal	
Chile	Italy	Slovakia	

FILE 3

PEFC in Canada

- Canada a member of PEFC International since 2001 and represented by CSA International until 2009
- PEFC Canada a not-for-profit legal entity formed in late 2008
- Became the member in PEFC International for Canada in January 2009
- Represent interests of organizations certified to the CSA Sustainable Forest Management standard
- Manage PEFC Chain of Custody program for Canadian companies
- Issue PEFC logo use licences to qualified organizations in Canada

FILE 4

PEFC Canada Who's Who

PEFC Canada Board of Directors

- John Dunford – Chairman
- Mike Alexander – Treasurer
- Paul Wooding – Secretary
- Guy Tremblay – Director

PEFC Canada National Governing Body - 15 members representing:

- Producers
- Professional, Academia & Practitioners
- Government & Regulatory Authorities
- Environmental & General Interest
- Standards & Conformity Assessment

FILE 5

PEFC Canada Statistics

PEFC in Canada	January 2009	January 2010	January 2011
CSA Certified forest (million ha)	82.8	72.8	62.5
PEFC Chain of Custody Certificates	123	198	221
PEFC Logo Use Licence Holders	18	67	73

FILE 6

Canada's Contribution to PEFC Certification

PEFC certified forest worldwide:

- 231 million ha of certified forest – 26 countries

Canada's contribution to global PEFC certification:

- CSA in Canada: 62.5 million ha - 27% of global total
- SFI in Canada: 51.1 million ha - 22% of global total

FILE 7

PEFC Endorsement

- CAN/CSA-Z809-02 endorsed in March 2005 for a 5-year period
- Received an extension of endorsement to March 2011
- CAN/CSA-Z809-08 approved by SCC May 2010
- Submitted to PEFC for re-endorsement in July 2010
- Assessment process is ongoing, expect conclusion by mid-2011
- Submission to PEFC includes CAN/CSA-Z804-08 *Sustainable Forest Management for Woodlots and Other Small Area Forests* for initial endorsement

FILE 8

PEFC Endorsement Requirements

PEFC endorsed standards must meet requirements for:

- the standard setting process
- implementation of the standard
- specific sustainable forest management criteria
- certification and accreditation

Endorsement process can take ± 10 months

FILE 9

PEFC Labels

On-product labels



Off-product label



FILE 10

PEFC Canada/CSA SFM User Group Promotion

- CSA SFM User Group
 - New promotional logo
 - Promotional brochures
 - Newsletters
 - User Group website www.csasfmforests.ca
 - Chairman's award
 - Advocacy – procurement policies
 - Trade shows



FILE 11

PEFC Canada/CSA SFM User Group Promotion

- PEFC Canada Website www.pefccanada.org
- PEFC International promotional material
- PEFC North America Promotions initiative – along with other NA endorsed systems SFI and ATFS
- PEFC International Collaboration Fund - up to CHF 40,000
 - Would permit more promotional materials based on input by a creative strategies consulting group

FILE 12

PEFC Canada/CSA SFM User Trade Shows

Globe 2008	March 2008	Vancouver
Direct Marketing Association Expo	October 2008	Las Vegas
Greenbuild 2008	November 2008	Boston
Print World	November 2008	Toronto
American Institute of Architects	May 2009	San Francisco
Gravure Association of America	June 2009	Toronto
Print in the Mix	October 2009	Toronto
Greenbuild 2009	November 2009	Phoenix
Graphics Canada	November 2009	Toronto
American Institute of Architects	June 2010	Miami Beach
Canadian Green Building Council	June 2010	Vancouver
Greenbuild 2010	November 2010	Chicago
Print World	November 2010	Toronto
American Institute of Architects	May 2011	New Orleans
Greenbuild 2011	October 2011	Toronto
Graphics Canada	November 2011	Toronto

FILE 13

Government Procurement Policies

PEFC Canada/CSA SFM User Group work with DFAIT, FII, FPAC & PEFC International to promote government procurement policies exclusive of all forest certification systems:

- UK Central Point of Expertise on Timber Procurement (CPET)
- Netherlands Timber Procurement Assessment Committee (TPAC)
- Belgian Federal Government Procurement Policy on Timber and Timber Products

FILE 14