
Minutes
Okanagan Sustainable Forest Management Plan
Public Advisory Group Meeting
Ramada Inn, Kelowna, B.C.
November 26, 2009

Attendees

Keith Boulter	Paul Ross	Randy Hardy	Lorne Bradley
Mike Watkins	Rob Kennett	Ted McCrea	Grant Thompson
Don Guild	Clive Johnson	Brian Drobe	Pat Salm (Consultant)
Mark Hopkins (Facilitator)			

1.0 Introductions and Agenda Review

Following the self-introduction of the PAG members, the agenda was reviewed; The Facilitator added a discussion of the PAG Membership list to the Agenda.

2.0 Review of Action Items from April 9, 2009 PAG Meeting

The updated Action Item Table was reviewed by the PAG. (*Updated version attached*) Specific comments/action arising from the review included:

In relation to Action Item 19 (BCTS rare ecosystem study – now completed) Clive Johnson expressed concern that species presence or absence was becoming too much of a proxy for rare ecosystem/rare plant communities presence or absence. Feels that many things are changing at the lower elevations at a rapid pace. Wondered if licencees are getting full picture, are they benefitting from direct observation.

Clive: If a licencee noted a common species in an uncommon habitat for that species would it be managed for?

Paul: Yes, we look for those sorts of situations.

Clive: need to adjust planning and actions according to local situations, too much reliance on animals.

Paul: Historically, we've looked more closely at animals than habitat. We can now use BCTS study to augment habitat/ecosystem planning.

Randy: Kerry has been in contact with Lisa Scott on some of these habitat/rare ecosystem issues as that is her "area".

Mike: Are “known ecosystems” covered on the CDC website?

Pat: Yes, although the terminology is a little different

2.0 Weyerhaeuser and the Defined Forest Area – Brian Drobe

Brian: announced that Weyerhaeuser was withdrawing from the CSA –SFM process across all of its operations. The following points were noted in relation to this announcement:

Given the current financial state of the industry Weyerhaeuser was looking for efficiencies in all aspects of the business. In relation to CSA this included amalgamation of DFA planning areas, and improved efficiency of the audit process (noted that many audit results were redundant across the divisions).

Corporate alignment with USA where operations are already certified to the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI).

Noted that SFI too, is currently under revision

Weyerhaeuser in the Okanagan will undergo an assessment audit in Dec '09 with a registration audit to follow in Jan '10

Weyerhaeuser will report all CSA –SFM information for 2009. Their level of reporting in subsequent years still needs to be resolved with other licencees. Brian felt they could continue to report on some of the indicators.

Pat: Commented that CSA was the 1st National SFM standard in the world and was developed for Canada where this is a high level of public ownership of Forest lands. In the US, where SFI was developed, there is a much higher percentage of private forest land. SFI does not have the level of public participation required by CSA.

Rob: Is there a common understanding of how Weyerhaeuser’s departure may affect things?

Paul: There are discrete BCTS operating areas in the Southern part of the DFA/TSA.

Pat: This will depend on the degree of Gorman’s involvement of in the overlap with Weyerhaeuser’s operating area.

Rob: If a non-CSA reports on some or all of the targets it is not necessary that they actually meet the target – not helpful if they don’t though. May need to confine reporting strictly to actual areas of operation

Mike: Is a review of the operating area map part of the Plan Review?

Pat: Yes.

3.0 Licencee Audit Results

3.1 Gorman Bros. Audit Results – Randy Hardy

Randy outlined the findings of the Audit of their operations conducted on October 5-9, 2009 (summary to be posted to the website) No “Non-conformances” or “Areas of Concern” were noted over the course of the Audit. However, 7 “Opportunities for Improvement” (OFI’s) were noted. Three of the OFI’s were considered internal administrative issues and were not discussed in detail, however, the following OFI’s were:

7.3.1 DFA Description

Should clarify of relationship with Westbank Community Forest. It was agreed that this will be clarified during plan re-write process.

5.3.1 TOR Revisions.

The auditor felt that PAG TOR should be revised to reflect current plan status. (e.g. The TOR states that an SFM plan will be developed – although it is now completed)
This will be addressed in Plan re-write

7.3.3.1 Shared Responsibilities and Weyerhaeuser’s role in the SFMP

This item was previously discussed during today’s agenda.

7.3.6 Target and Reporting Disconnect

The auditor noted a number of inconsistencies between the stated Indicator Targets and the Information reported in the Monitoring Report, specifically for indicator’s 4,8,10 and 21.

Action Item: The identified inconsistencies should be amended during the course of the plan re-write and addressed in the Monitoring Report questionnaire for 2009.

7.4.3.1 Communications/Indicator 35

Auditor suggested that PAG meeting minutes should be publicly available, rather than password protected on the website. Following discussion on the topic, there was no clear decision. Instead it was agreed that the facilitator seek polled advice from a broader cross-section of the PAG

Action Item: Facilitator to electronically poll PAG members for input on topic of Public availability of PAG meeting Minutes.

3.2 Tolko Industries Audit – Rob Kennett

The focus of this years audit was mainly on silvicultural operations as there was little other activity on the licence(s). The audit was conducted over the period May 19-22, 2009. There were no areas of “non-conformance”. There were two “Areas of Concern” (detailed in the report posted to the website). Neither incident resulted in environmental damage.

There were six OFI’s identified in the audit Report:

5.2(d) First Nations Meetings

Auditor suggested Face-to-Face meetings with First Nations on planning issues. Licencees collectively agreed that they have been working on this over the last year.

5.2(e) Without Prejudice Clause

Auditor suggested that a “without prejudice” clause be added to all SFM related correspondence with First Nations. Licencees agreed this has been inconsistently applied and should be broadened in its application. Grant Thompson felt this to be a beneficial addition.

7.4.3.1 Public Availability of PAG Minutes

Discussed above

7.3.6 Indicators Target and Reporting Inconsistencies

As discussed under the Gorman Audit, above.

3.3 Weyerhaeuser Canada Audit Results – Brian Drobe

Action Item: Brian to send copy of Weyerhaeuser Audit Results to Mark H for website posting
--

Positive Audit aspects:

Auditor felt Weycan had a good internal Incident Reporting system (in relation to small trespass) and appreciated how previously raised issues had been addressed.

Area of Concern:

The auditor noted the same inconsistency between the Targets and the Reporting that was raised in both the Gorman and Tolko audits. As discussed, these will be addressed during the re-write, and Monitoring Report questionnaire process.

Indicators 8 and 10:

The auditor suggested that the reporting be revised to include only the DFA area, not the TSA. This will need to be explored further by the licencees.

Indicator 28:

The auditor would like to see further breakdown on the types of stakeholders attending meetings, not just the total number.

Action Item: The Facilitator will request this information be added to the 2009 Monitoring Plan Report. This should also be incorporated in the Plan re-write.

Indicator 16 – Regeneration Delay Reporting

The auditor felt consideration should be given to reducing the target from the current 36 months. Brian: felt here was some room to reduce the number, but not much. There have been longer delays in recent silvicultural activity due to current fiscal situation.

Clive: Is there a problem with waiting another year? Felt in many instances there was nothing lost by doing so. Felt that rushing can lead to exacerbation of some problems (e.g. mistletoe, root rot, etc.)

Licencees (collectively): Some areas, yes there can be problems, some not.

Facilitator: Commented that BCTS had previously stated that they have less control over harvest and reforestation dates – dealing with market loggers

Grant: Commented that WFN is in that sense similar to a market logger.

Action Item: Facilitator to add some history from recent Monitoring Reports to the 2009 report. This will help with evaluating the potential for amending the target for Indicator 16

Paul: How did audit participating PAG members find the Auditor?

Grant: Was quite impressed with the thoroughness. Asked a lot of questions of contractors

3.4 BCTS Audit Report

No representative from BCTS was able to attend this meeting. The Facilitator distributed the results of their audit.

No non-conformances were noted during the audit. Opportunities for Improvement related largely to internal administrative issues. Summary of Audit will be posted to website.

4.0 PAG Membership List

The Facilitator outlined the issue identified during the audit of some Kamloops Licencees. The Auditor questioned the “currentness” and applicability of the current PAG membership list. Many more names appear on the list than have been recently and actively contributory.

Following a discussion amongst the members, it was agreed that if members miss two consecutive PAG meetings (Spring and Fall) and have not otherwise expressed a desire to remain part of the PAG their names will be removed from the list.

Agreement: if members miss two consecutive PAG meetings (Spring and Fall) and have not otherwise expressed a desire to remain part of the PAG their names will be removed from the list.

Action Item: The Facilitator is to poll all current “members” listed as PAG members and ascertain their status and desired level of involvement.

Mike: Do the terms used by the Auditors actually mean anything specific, or is the terminology up to the individual auditors?

Pat: The new standard addresses the issue of standardization and the auditor certification process. There are specific terms that should be used; however, there is room for individual reporting emphasis within the standard. Currently, the two primary registration auditors (QMI and KPMG) use slightly different terminology in relation to their audit findings.

5.0 Extension of the 2008 Plan (and 2009 Addendum)

The Facilitator outlined the issue that the current SFM Plan and the 2009 addendum only cover the period up to Dec 31st, 2009. As the new Plan is anticipated to be ready for April 1st it makes little sense to produce another Plan/addendum to cover the period Jan-Mar, 2009. Also, he desire to extend the 2009 Monitoring Report to cover the 15 month period Jan 1, 2009 to March 31st, 2010 was discussed.

Agreement: The PAG agreed to the following:

1. Extension of the current 2008 Okanagan SFM Plan and the 2009 addendum to it to cover the period Jan 1st, 2010 to March 31st 2010. and,
2. The extension of the 2009 Monitoring Report to cover the 15 month period; Jan 1, 2009 to March 31st, 2010.

The licences also proposed that future Plans and Monitoring Reports be revised to cover the period April 1st to March 31st of each year. There were no objections from the PAG members.

Agreement: Commencing April 1st, 2010 all future SFM Plans and Monitoring Reports will cover the period April 1st to March 31st of each year

6.0 Updating the Okanagan SFM Plan to the Z809-08 Standard – Pat Salm

Pat: Distributed a binder to each of the PAG members and outlined organization and contents of each section. Of particular note is page 75 of the new Z809-08 standard which highlights the changes from the previous standard.

6.1 Terms of Reference (TOR)

The current PAG TOR meets all of the requirements of the new standard with the exception of the following:

Section 5.3(XIV) Evaluation of the Public participation Process - which Pat had added to the TOR (last bullet under Introduction)

Information: The PAG agreed to the amend this section to include the wording, “Web Links to relevant information will be posted on the website (see Communication below)”

Communication: The PAG agreed to the amend this section to include the wording, “...advisory group members and posted to the website; <http://thompsonokanagansustainableforestry.ca> for broad distribution to all the public”

A section entitled: Evaluation of the Public Process has been added to the TOR, stating: “Participants satisfaction with the public process will be measured through the completion of an annual survey. Survey Results will be included in the annual SFM Monitoring Report”.

Other agreed upon items: In reference to the TOR, it was also noted that:

1. References to Weyerhaeuser should be removed from the TOR as they are withdrawing from the process.
2. References to completed aspects of the SFM development process should be removed or updated as well. Specifically, under “Goals” The text should be amended to state “...Develop and Maintain...” rather than “develop” an SFM Plan
3. Reference to the “Dynamic Roundtable” process should be removed and replaced with a statement to the effect that the Facilitator will mediate parties in dispute. Included in attached, revised TOR

A copy of the amended PAG TOR as agreed to at the meeting is attached to these minutes.

6.2 Criteria #1 Discussion Items

The PAG collectively reviewed the supplied discussion paper related to Maintenance of Populations and Communities over Time. Specifically, the paper entitled, “Maintaining Wild Populations and Communities in the Face of Human Disturbance”.

Discussion on the above noted paper was combined with discussion on the requirement to address “Locally available Processes and Methods for Identifying sites with special biological and Cultural Significance”

In response to questions from PAG members, Licencees indicated that Forest Stewardship Plans must contain strategies to conserve cultural/biological resources.

Pat: Described the processes used by BCTS to gather and include such information in their Plans.

Paul: Described in Detail the referral process currently used to inform and gather information from First Nations. (This often leads to plan or field work revisions)

Licencees: indicated that generally First Nations concerns are focused at the “block” level, rather than at the “Landscape Level”

Randy: Described Gorman’s approach to Archaeological Overview Assessments, etc. In addition, described their Working Agreements with some Bands on these issues.

Grant: does the Internal Reviews for the Westbank First Nation. It is a daunting task. Capacity is always an issue as they receive referrals from numerous entities- not just Forestry (which are comparatively well done).

Randy: Indicated that once a Site Plan is written there is a peer review conducted to ensure items are not missed

Rob: Indicated that in some cases the MoF may have access to Arch. information not generally available to licencees.

Licencees: Indicated that contractors are well instructed to cease operations in the case of unexpected arch. Evidence (Standard operating Procedures) these are part of their pre-work Instructions.

Grant: Do licencees feel Referral Process in working?

Randy: Generally, yes, but there are always exceptions.

Paul: believes everyone wants to do the right thing, but everyone has pressures of some sort. A number of approaches have been tried including “blank map” but as stated above First Nations generally want to discuss site specifics.

Clive: Are Historic Trails addressed in the SFMP?

Licencees: No but they’re treatment/management is described in each company’s FSP

Clive: Would like to see some process for reporting “unknown” archaeological features. Is there a role for this in the SFMP

<p>Action Item: Paul will contact the Tolko Planner on how they deal with previously unknown sites.</p>
--

Clive: I am particularly interested in pre-industrial trails, but recent trails as well. Noted that the LRMP addresses “non-identified” trails.

Pat: Depending on what Paul comes up with, it might be better if the process for reporting these types of features is described in the plan rather than attempting to come up with a specific target for the SFM Plan.

7.0 Criteria #1 Indicators

Prior to the meeting Pat had categorized each of the existing Indicators as to their “fit” with the new Core Indicator requirements, into one of three categories, specifically

- No modification required
- Some modification required
- Not required as part of New Core Indicators

There were also instances where there is no current Indicator appropriate for a new core requirement. The following details the discussions/agreements for each Indicator:

7.1 Ecosystem Diversity

Indicator 1.1.1 Ecosystem by Area

The revised targets (from existing indicators) presented by Pat was discussed

Rob: Commented that Tree Farm Licences report every five years, but on a different schedule than the Timber Supply Review.

Mike: Would like to see the comments section reflect some Historic Numbers and the reasons for any changes.

Agreement: The draft targets for 1.1.1 was agreed to by the PAG subject to the removal of the phrase: “(in conjunction with the TSR)” for the second target.

Indicator 1.1.2 - Forest Areas by Type or Species Composition

It was proposed hat the Current target for Indicator # 7 be adopted as the target for Indicator 1.1.2.

Following some discussion on the appropriateness of the 70% target, it was agreed to keep the target as stated in the current Plan.

Agreement: It was agreed by the PAG that the current target for Indicator 7, should be retained/utilized as the target for Indicator 1.1.2.

Indicator 1.1.3 Forest Area by Seral Stage or Age Class

It was proposed by Pat that the current target for Indicator 1 and the adjusted target for indicator 8 (previously discussed in Indicator 1.1.1 above) be combined as a two-fold target for Indicator 1.1.3.

Following limited discussion on the proposal. The PAG agreed to this approach.

Agreement: The PAG agrees that the current targets for indicators 1 and 8 (as proposed by Pat) should be adopted as the dual targets for new Indicator 1.1.3

Indicator 1.1.4 Degree of within-Stand Structural Retention

The current SFM Indicator 5 was categorized by Pat as one requiring some modification to meet the requirements of New Indicator 1.1.4

Noted that the proposed target Indicator needs to be revised to indicate “...2-5 stub trees and/or wildlife tree per hectare...”

Clive: Where does mule Deer winter range get considered? Don't necessarily want all retention patches located along waterways.

Paul: MDWR is considered where appropriate, very site-specific consideration.

Following discussion, the PAG agreed to a revised wording to this Indicator target. As follows,

Agreement: The proposed wording for the Indicator 1.1.4 Target as to be revised as follows: "100 percent of harvested cutblocks requiring wildlife tree retention (patches or individual trees) will be completed in accordance with their Site Plan"

7.2 Species Diversity

Pat: Commented that in the general sense indicator 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 relate to short and long-term focus, respectively.

Indicator 1.2.1 - Degree of Habitat Protection for Selected Focal Species Including Species at Risk

Mike: Commented that he has previously objected to the word "known" in the Forest Practices Code sense of the word.

Paul: Described process of moving/replacing OGMA's which are >70% dead. Looking to protect "rare", not necessarily "old" stands.

Mike: Do you have the information to manage for rare ecosystems within the OGMA program?

Pat: If we think OGMA's have done a good job at capturing the rare ecosystems, we could look at their placement and/or replacement on the landscape.

Clive: believes that the LRMP process identified and protected 90-95% of the rare ecosystems on the landscape.

Mike: wants assurance that the OGMA's are capturing habitat issues.

Lorne: Has any attempt been made to see if any of these rare ecosystems are replacing themselves following logging?

Paul: described the Niskonlith Indian bands trial to look at post-harvest plant communities.

Mike: I would like to defer discussion on 1.2.1 to later in agenda

Paul: Government generally uses GAR's to provide direction. Paul described process of including GAR direction into FSP.

Action Item: Licensees to determine if there is GIS coverage for rare ecosystems within OGMA's. If so there is a good possibility that something could be reported on with respect to their management and retention. More information and possible target to be circulated if GIS coverage can be accessed.

Indicator 1.2.2 - Degree of Suitable Habitat in the Long Term for Selected Focal Species including Species at Risk.

Comment: New indicator that relies upon the *Section 7* notices. These are generally used to identify specific areas (hectares) of habitat to be retained in the short term until Government follows through with it's plans to establish this amount of area in Wildlife Habitat Areas.

Rob: Once sufficient Habitat is established...section 7 "goes away".

Mike: Is the MoF making progress with this approach on these areas?

Rob: Yes, there have been a few examples lately.

Clive: when is Dennis Lloyd's "new information" going to be available?

Rob: It is available now, but difficult to use (no stocking standards for new sub-zones/ site series, No references in LRMP, etc.)

Rob: historically most emphasis has been on animals rather than ecosystems.

Don: shares concern over shift in focus to animals rather than ecosystems.

Pat: given the Element is Species Diversity, perhaps the best spot for any target for rare ecosystems fits better under the first Element – Ecosystem Diversity.

Action Item:

1. Kerry to provide more information on this topic and circulate for discussion at the next meeting.
2. Agreed that proposed targets for 1.2.1 and 1,2,2 are ok, but still a concern that something is missing as far as rare ecosystems go (although it might fit better under 1.1.1).

Pat: distributed "backgrounder" on section 7 notices – where the actual hectares needing protection for each of the species at risk are identified.

Indicator 1.2.3 – Proportion of Regeneration Comprised of Native Species

Two options were presented for consideration by the PAG on this Indicator; utilize current Indicator 9 or the alternative presented by Pat.

Following discussion on the two approaches, the PAG Agreed to adopt the New proposed wording.

Agreement: The Target for Indicator 1.2.3 will read, “100 percent of trees planted will conform to plan commitments related to the species requirements within approved stocking standards”.

8.0 Next Meeting

The next meeting will be: **Thursday December 10th,
Tolko’s Vernon Office
3000 28th Street
Vernon, BC
9:00am to 4:00pm**

Topics for discussion/review include:

- conclusion of discussion on Indicators 1.2.1 and 1.2.2
- conclude targets for indicators 1.3 and 1.4
- Criteria #2 – Ecosystem Condition and Productivity
- Criteria #4 – Global Ecological Cycles (time allowing)

PAG members should familiarize themselves with the supplied background and discussion papers for these Criteria in advance of the meeting. If attending members have not yet received the material it will be provided at the meeting. A background paper on Climate Change has been posted to the SFM website. www.thompsonkanagansustainableforestry.ca

**Weyerhaeuser, Tolko, Gorman Bros, BCTS¹
Okanagan Sustainable Forest Management Plan**

**SFM Advisory Group
Terms of Reference and Procedures**

Last revised Nov 26, 2009

Introduction

The purpose of the Terms of Reference and Procedures is to define the goals, tasks, roles and procedures that will guide the development of the Tolko, Gorman Bros, and BCTS² Okanagan Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) Plan. The SFM Plan has been developed based on the Canadian Standards Association (CSA) Standard CAN/CSA-Z809, and will be applied to

¹ Okanagan-Columbia Business Area

² Also referred to as "Participating licensees"

the participating licensees' operating area within the Arrow-Boundary and Okanagan Shuswap Forest Districts.

The Terms of Reference and Procedures include the following sections:

- Goals
- Operating guidelines
- Conflict of interest
- Timelines
- Roles and responsibilities
- Resources
- Decision-making process
- Information
- Communication
- Changes to the process.
- Evaluation of the public participation process

Goals

The goals of the process are to:

- Develop and maintain an SFM plan in accordance with the CSA guidelines
- Develop procedures for the Advisory Group to monitor the effectiveness of the SFM Plan. Provide ongoing public input into the implementation, monitoring and continual improvement of the SFM Plan.

Operating Guidelines

The SFM Plan will be maintained by Weyerhaeuser, Tolko, Gorman Bros. and BCTS based on advice and recommendations provided by the SFM Advisory Group. The SFM Advisory Group will include a cross-section of participants with varying interests and backgrounds. Participants in the process will:

- contribute to the development of the SFM Plan
- attend meetings on a regular basis
- consider the views of others in developing recommendations
- act in “good faith” in all aspects of the process
- aim to reach decisions on the basis of consensus
- support an open and transparent process in both the development and implementation of the SFM Plan.

Meetings of the SFM Advisory Group will be open to the general public, and as a minimum will be held twice a year with an additional field trip to review issues of concern in the field.

The SFM Plan for participating licensees’ operating areas will comply with all existing legislation and regulations and will be consistent with the strategic direction and intent of the Okanagan-Shuswap LRMP and the Kootenay-Boundary Regional Land Use Plan.

Sustainable ecosystem management will be characterized by resource management practices that are ecologically sound, scientifically based, socially and culturally responsible, and recognize and respect First Nations interests.

Conflict of Interest

Advisory group members will declare any possible or perceived conflict of interest pertaining to a specific discussion topic, should the situation arise. In such cases, the advisory group will decide on the members’ level of involvement relative to the specific topic matter.

Timelines

The SFM Advisory Group will be engaged to review annual progress on performance measures with a goal of continual improvement of the SFM Plan.

Roles and Responsibilities

Active Members of the Public Advisory Group (PAG)

Active members of the PAG commit to regular attendance to, and participation in, Advisory Group meetings and field trips. Active members receive all PAG information and communication including the most recent SFM Plan and Monitoring Report, draft agendas, meeting summaries, information of interest, and invitations for additional participation (audits,

special non PAG meetings, and information sessions). A list of active members, including contact information, is maintained.

Partial Participants of the Public Advisory Group

Partial participants are those that are interested in the SFM Plan process but have decided they cannot fully commit the time and effort required to be an active member of the Advisory Group. Partial participants receive the most recent SFM Plan and Monitoring Report. Included with this correspondence is an invitation, and encouragement, to more fully participate as an active member of the Advisory Group. Any additional Advisory Group communication is available to partial participants on request. A list of partial participants, including contact information, is maintained.

SFM Advisory Group Functioning

Participation in the SFM Advisory Group is open to all interested members of the public. First Nation participation in the advisory group is valued and will be encouraged. Government participation and support is valued, particularly in the capacity of technical advisor on how the SFM Plan aligns with legislation, policy and government direction. Public members agree to participate in the advisory group as an individual member of the public and not as a representative of any interest group. A record of attendance will be included as part of each meeting summary.

The roles and responsibilities of participants in the process are to assist the participating licensees in their development of the SFM Plan by:

- expressing local values that relate to the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers (CCFM) SFM criteria and critical elements
- setting objectives that describe a desired future state or condition for each value
- developing indicators to be used to assess progress in meeting goals
- setting targets related to each indicator that will provide a clear, specific statement of expected results
- developing procedures for monitoring the effectiveness of the SFM plan including annual meetings of the SFM Advisory Group to review results of performance measures and the outcomes of any CSA audits.

The long-standing rights and interests of First Nations will be considered in the development of the SFM Plan. Participation in the Public Advisory Group by First Nations is without prejudice to Aboriginal title and rights and treaty rights.

The participating licensees will engage an independent facilitator who is knowledgeable about the CSA certification process to assist the SFM Advisory Group in its work. The role of the facilitator will be to:

- facilitate advisory group meetings
- prepare agendas and summaries for meetings
- prepare a work plan and time table for the process
- assist participants in developing recommendations for the SFM Plan.

Resources

Public participants traveling to attend meetings will be reimbursed at a rate equivalent to the provincial government Group I rate.

Expenses incurred in the development of this Plan will be the responsibility of the participating licensees. These will include, but not be limited to, meeting facility rental, catering, publishing and printing costs and field trip transportation.

Decision-making Process

Participants in the process will aim to reach decisions on the basis of consensus. Consensus is defined as “agreement by all participants on a recommendation related to the SFM Plan process or on the final SFM Plan”.

In negotiating to reach consensus, participants agree to:

- negotiate in good faith
- state concerns openly and directly and as interests rather than positions³
- listen carefully, ask questions and educate themselves regarding the interests of others
- share relevant information.

When consensus is reached, a written record of the agreement will be recorded in the meeting summary.

If consensus is not achieved, the facilitator will assist the participants in resolving their differences. If consensus is still not achieved, participants will agree to disagree and the options defined in the negotiation process will be recorded in the meeting summary. The participating licensees will consider all options in development of the final SFM plan and will provide a written explanation for decisions taken where consensus was not achieved. The participating licensees will consider consensus recommendations of the SFM Advisory Group as advice to guide the development of the SFM Plan. In the event that the participating licensees decide not to accept a consensus recommendation of the SFM Advisory Group, a written explanation for this decision will be included in the SFM Plan process documents.

Non consensus items will be periodically revisited by the facilitator and disagreeing parties to work towards common ground and consensual agreement.

Consensus will not be required for housekeeping items such as scheduling meeting dates and locations.

Information

The SFM Plan process will be supported by relevant information including the CSA SFM guidelines and supporting reference documents, examples of other

³ Interests are defined as the needs, wants, fears and concerns that are connected to an issue. Positions are defined as a predetermined solution to a problem without consideration for the interests of others.

British Columbia-based SFM Plans, and other technical information as required. Web links to relevant information will be posted on the website (see Communication section below). Where desired by the advisory group the participating licensees will seek to provide internal or external experts to gain a better understanding of a particular issue.

Communication

Agendas and meeting summaries will be prepared for each meeting. These materials will be distributed to members of the SFM Advisory Group and as requested, to other interested members of the public. Revised SFM Plans and Annual Monitoring Reports will be shared with advisory group members and posted to the website: <http://thompsonokanagansustainableforestry.ca> for broad distribution to all public. The Plans and Reports will also be shared with all affected First Nation communities.

Changes to the Process

The Terms of Reference and Procedures for the SFM Plan process may be changed at any time during the process in accordance with the decision-making process described under the section so named, above.

Evaluation of the Public Participation Process

Participant's satisfaction with the public process will be measured through the completion of an annual survey. Survey results will be included in annual SFM performance reporting.