



Nova Forest Alliance
Nova Scotia's Model Forest Project
Criteria and Indicators - Status Report

March 27, 2000

FORWARD

I am pleased to provide you with a status report on our progress to date on Criteria and Indicators (C & I). This report will provide a summary of the work the NFA Partnership has undertaken over the past year to develop a set of indicators. These indicators or measurements are intended to make it possible to monitor and report on our progress towards achieving sustainable forest management.

The Partnership has been continuously engaged on the C & I project through a series of meetings and workshops, and have selected a set of indicators for testing and presentation in a State of the Forest Report on the NFA area.

A total of 35 indicators have been selected for testing and a number of indicator testing teams have been established to spread the workload among the Partners and to ensure that partner ideas and data are incorporated into the development and implementation of methodologies for indicator measurement.

Once we have completed the testing, the next challenge is to present the indicators in a format and language that can be understood by a broad range of partners. The success of our effort at the NFA will prove useful to individual partners as they pursue sustainable forest management reporting or certification programs. Indicators, methods of measurement and even the actual values and statistics should be directly applicable to other reporting systems.

Furthermore, success within the NFA will provide a solid contribution to the requirement of reporting C & I's at the provincial scale. On behalf of the NFA Management Committee, I wish to extend our thanks to the C & I Committee and staff of the NFA on progress to date, and to challenge the teams to finalize a State of the Forest Report by the end of March, 2001.

Eldon Gunn
Chairman
Nova Forest Alliance

Table of Contents

FORWARD	i.
BACKGROUND.	1
PROGRESS TO DATE.	2
Present Situation	7
INDICATORS TO BE TESTED BY THE NFA	8
Teams Working on Indicators	8
Indicators	8
GLOSSARY	11
APPENDICES.	12
Numeral Listing Change of NFA LLI	13
Criteria and Indicators – Indicator Teams	14
Meeting Attendance List	15

BACKGROUND

The notion of Criteria and Indicators of Sustainable Forest Management recently came into prominence in 1993 when the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers stated the need for a system to measure performance of Sustainable Forest Management. In 1997 a framework for Criteria and Indicators (C & I) was released by the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers (CCFM), and each province was challenged to adopt the framework and apply it provincially. In 1996 each of the Model Forests were encouraged to adopt the C & I framework at the local level and develop local level indicators. The Nova Forest Alliance (NFA) in its proposal to the Model Forest Network has committed to develop a sustainable forest management process. The development of a set of criteria and indicators for the conservation and sustainable development of the Nova Forest Alliance forest area is needed. To accomplish this, a Criteria and Indicators committee was established to focus on the development of criteria and local level indicators for the Nova Forest Alliance.

The premise adopted by the NFA Partnership is that by working together we can develop a better sustainable forest management indicator process more quickly and less expensively than any of the partners doing it alone. The process began, in October of 1998, with an adoption of the approach developed by the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers. This decision recognized the extensive amount of work done by the CCFM on the values and objectives, and the significant public involvement in the process. While the adoption of a national approach to the general criteria created an excellent starting point for the Model Forest, the development, application and monitoring of the indicators must be done at a local level. This is necessary because only at the local level can there be a true account of local level achievement regarding forest management. What was agreed upon nationally and adopted locally was that the indicators selected should allow us to analyze the forest in terms of environmental, social and economic issues. The criteria that are identified by the CCFM are:

1. Conservation of biological diversity;
2. Maintenance and enhancement of forest ecosystem condition and productivity;
3. Conservation of soil and water resources;
4. Forest ecosystem contributions to global ecological cycles;
5. Multiple benefits to society; and
6. Accepting society's responsibility for sustainable development.

The six criteria are broken out into a total of 22 elements with 83 indicators. Together they provide a description for the status of the forest and a measure of progress in achieving sustainable forest management.

By building on the national process and ensuring that the full range of partners are involved at the local level, the work being conducted by the NFA should have application beyond the NFA boundaries. This would include industrial processes and even provincial reporting schemes. Furthermore, those partners interested in certification can use the results from the NFA process and adopt those indicators that make sense for the certification or registration process they are pursuing. The NFA process is participatory and inclusive of all partners and includes local values and goals. All these elements factor into the

certification process. The ground work conducted by the NFA on indicators including the measurement and reporting approaches developed, can be used directly by other processes, if the data is appropriate and at the right scale. Local data sets can be substituted into the approach to make the indicator sensitive to the local condition.

PROGRESS TO DATE

The progression of the local level indicators for the Nova Forest Alliance has followed a carefully planned set of meetings. Each one building on the previous and helping the partners reach agreement on the next steps and on a final set of acceptable indicators for testing. Meetings have incorporated representatives from each of the NFA sectors. Meetings progressed from the general scope of sustainable forest management to one that focuses on the description and selection of local level indicators. The task of developing a C & I process is huge and presents challenges for involving partners who feel they have a limited knowledge of the indicator process. It is easy to lose sight of the objective as one delves into the technical aspects of indicator definitions, measurements and reporting. The process focuses on developing valid, affordable and timely measures that all parties are comfortable with.

The NFA process began in the fall of 1998 with a general discussion of the Criteria and Indicators process at the Management Committee level, followed by a broader meeting of partners on October 20th where the framework for developing the criteria and indicators for the NFA was discussed.

- A January 14th, 1999 meeting concluded that indicators or measures should be relatively simple and that there should be a relatively small suite of indicators. This would make monitoring, reporting and communication relatively easy.
- At a February 16th meeting the committee discussed the need to reach consensus on the definition of sustainability. It was further agreed that the Nova Forest Alliance partners would be the principle decision makers on the indicators, given the broad make-up of the partnership. The general public would also be polled on their values. The committee also recognized the need for scientific expertise as a part of the process to help alleviate some potential oversights. The committee discussed the creation of committees to co-ordinate input and analysis.

At this stage the committee began to discuss projects that might assist in the determination of the indicators. Two such projects were the Ecosystem Classification Project and the Fisher studies.

- The meeting on March 8th focused on three project proposals; the Ecosystem Classification project; the Genuine Progress Index (GPI) project; and the Fisher study. Each of the proposals were considered to be valid background research activities and funds were allocated for each. Further discussion was on the committee structure needed to deal with the C & I process. The committee agreed that the C & I committee should remain in place and oversee the process. Smaller teams or groups would be tasked to carry out the analysis of components. They also agreed to develop a document on

sustainable forestry having regard for the following values: Wood Supply; Wildlife; Air, Water and Soil Quality; Non-Timber; and Aesthetics/Recreation. A further meeting in March amongst the industry and provincial partners resulted in the firm commitment to participate in the NFA C & I process and produce a State of the Forest Report for the Nova Forest Alliance.

On May 21st the committee began the development of a workplan for the criteria and indicators process. A four-phased approach to the criteria and indicator process was suggested, this included:

- a) Workshop in early June, 1999
- b) Develop a set of indicators by December, 1999
- c) One year testing (2000) – measurement, techniques
- d) One year (2001) to finalize data for reporting levels in NFA area

Discussion also focused on the design of an up-coming workshop. Bringing the national process to the local level and discussion of scale issues, format, content, and pre-workshop preparation of participants were all discussed. There was a brief discussion from parties present on individual partner involvement with C & I presently:

- a) DNR - national reporting requirements, build on IRM process on Crown land, led by Central Region to get to local level.
- b) Stora - public input process with DNR, NFA would act as pseudo public. DNR-IRM process repackaged, many issues of scale.
- c) Kimberly-Clark – involved in environmental management systems approach through ISO – uses most C & I criteria and elements-common sense approach – using outside groups for input
- d) Bowater – general framework applicable – use general approach
- e) MacTara – part of ISO process; work with associated large landowners to respond to flexible requirements from market place
- f) N.S. Woodlot Owners & Operators – focus on local issues with respect to woodlots, focus on small number of important indicators.

Measurement issues were also discussed. There is a need for reliability, utility, predictive and simple screening measures to be considered in the process.

At the June 16th workshop, which involved a larger attendance of partners, the four-phased approach was adopted. The NFA four-phase approach includes:

- Phase 1:** Workshop
- Phase 2:** Choosing a set of indicators to be completed by December 30/1999
- Phase 3:** Testing the Indicators
- Phase 4:** State of the NFA forest by December 30/2000

This workshop completed a dialogue on the six CCFM criteria. After some discussion it was agreed to use the CCFM criteria. The wording of these criteria were also agreed on. Three groups were formed and each group was assigned the task of developing the elements and indicators for two criteria. Finally, the committee defined the need to secure an active chair to deal with this complex problem.

- On July 21st the committee reviewed numerous sets of indicators and adopted the preliminary set for the Nova Forest Alliance. Not only were the CCFM and Fundy Model Forest's indicators examined, but a review of the Ontario, Newfoundland, and SNB indicators also occurred. It was agreed that the criteria and indicators committee would work from the Fundy Model Forest set as a starting point. A student was hired to provide a matrix of all indicator sets to provide a picture to the C & I committee.
- Representatives from the whole group met on September 14th to discuss the indicators. Each of the groups had evaluated the indicators against the 10 screening criteria (measurable, practical, understandable, relevant, specific, meaningful in decision making, sensitive to change, response-oriented, predictable and positive). The committee discussed at length each group's report on the indicators. Also discussed was the need to finalize the indicators to be incorporated into the NFA set, which would be derived from SNB and FMF sets of indicators. Each of the group leads were asked to revisit the indicators from the meeting.
- On October 22nd a second round of detailed discussions of the LLI set was held and small changes were made where the committee felt changes were needed. It was agreed that the next step should be to produce a near final set of indicators as revised at this meeting and then to hold a workshop-type meeting with as many partners participating as possible. A broad commitment to the indicators is needed before investing resources into the testing phase.
- A workshop was held on December 9 at the United Church in Stewiacke, Nova Scotia. A workbook including the agenda, a description of the purpose of the workshop, profiles of the proposed suite of indicators and a rating guide to help participants rank indicators in terms of priority were distributed to all participants either in advance of the meeting or at the meeting. Participants from all NFA sectors were present. Industry, government, private landowner, academia and environmental representatives were in attendance representing a diverse cross section of forest stakeholders. Mi'kmaq representatives although invited chose not to participate in the process.

The overall purpose of the workshop was to review the set of indicators developed by the Criteria and Indicators Committee (Chaired by Peter Jones) and to place priority on those indicators that the NFA should test and begin to report on. The rationale for establishing priorities and selecting a smaller suite of indicators was primarily driven by the practicality of what can be delivered within the budget and time available from NFA and its Partners. While the indicators are an important element of the NFA agenda it is recognized that this effort needs to be carefully balanced with the need to advance SFM through the completion of projects that produce more measurable impacts on SFM in the short term (i.e. that directly influence the direction that indicators take).

Peter Jones outlined the process followed by the committee to date. To the extent possible the NFA partnership has been engaged although it is clearly recognized that indicators are a difficult concept at best and have a complexity that makes it difficult to engage those who feel they are not experts in the field.

Much of the indicator selection process centered around getting a common understanding of the meaning of the indicator and its usefulness in reporting on Sustainable Forest Management. Descriptions of each of the indicators were developed as a start point and incorporated into the workbook for the indicators workshop on December 9th.

Following Peter Jones' overview of the process for developing the suite of indicators, experiences of the Fundy Model Forest (FMF) were highlighted. In general, FMF advised NFA to adopt a suite that can be accomplished within the time and resources available and that would not distract the partners from on the ground activities that influence change. The recommendation from Fundy was to make sure the indicators were relevant to SFM, practical and understandable.

At the workshop three discussion groups were formed and each assigned an equal number of indicators to discuss and prioritize. Groups generally assumed responsibility for 2 Criterion.

- Group 1 – Conservation of Biological Diversity and Maintenance and Enhancement of Forest Ecosystem Condition and Productivity
- Group 2 - Conservation of Soil and Water Resources and Forest Ecosystem Contributions to Global Ecological Cycles and part of Multiple Benefits to Society
- Group 3 - Multiple Benefits to Society and Accepting Society's Responsibility for Sustainable Development.

The groups spent the morning discussing each of the indicators. At the start of the discussions the approach for the remainder of the day was outlined; with the morning providing an opportunity to ask questions about the indicators and better able participants to make informed choices for priorities. The afternoon involved individual priority setting and group priority setting followed by a plenary session covering all criterion towards the end of the day. The challenge given to participants was to learn enough during the morning session to make an informed ranking based on the relevance, practicality and ease of communicating the indicator to a public audience.

The groups were comprised of approximately 12 participants which to the extent possible included representation from all sectors. Each of the indicators was discussed within the groups following a brief introduction by one of the C&I Committee members.

Prior to lunch participants were given an opportunity to complete the ranking forms, basically scoring each of the indicators in their group on a scale of 0 to 5 with 0 being does not meet the criteria and 5 fully meets the criteria. Criteria ranked included the degree to which they were a) relevant to SFM, b) practical and c) understandable. During lunch the individual rankings were aggregated and a preliminary categorization of indicators into High, Medium and Low priority was made. Each of the groups then discussed the results of the ranking exercise. Groups were asked to ensure that there was at least one indicator per element within each Criterion and to be diligent in selecting a smaller number of indicators to test (i.e. two per element – 32 indicators).

Once the individual groups were comfortable with the priority ranking of the indicators a plenary session was held. One member of each group highlighted the indicators selected and the rationale for categorizing them as high, medium and low priority. The following provides a numerical summary of the indicators selected while the attached provides a list of indicators selected for testing and the list of lower priority indicators.

	# started	# selected as priority
Group 1	23	10
Group 2	19	12
Group 3	22	15 (incl. 2 from group disc.)

As the workshop progressed notes were made of suggested changes to the indicator profiles and in some cases ideas were generated on practical approaches to measuring the indicator. For example, Group 2 decided that an annual field tour could be used to measure many of the indicators under Physical Environmental Factors and Productive capacity. For example, indicators such as 3.1 a – extent of soil disturbance, 3.2c - percentage of stream crossings constructed and maintained to standard and 5.1h - volume of merchantable wood left on site after harvest could easily be assessed by an organized and structured field day or series of field days.

Another important observation was that some indicators while deemed to be important would require significant research (i.e. practical methodology not available) and therefore were not placed as a high priority in this stage of the indicator process. These will be addressed in subsequent steps and where possible linkages made with findings of other model forests.

The partners were provided with a decision point. Eldon Gunn asked the Partnership whether they were prepared to proceed to a testing phase on the selected indicators. Participants agreed we should proceed to test the priority indicators. Each of the participants were asked to identify which indicators they would like to be involved with during the testing phase and which ones they were prepared to lead.

Present Situation

After the December 9th workshop the focus was placed on the priority local level indicators (LLI). From the 65 proposed indicators a total of 36 local level indicators for the NFA were established (from the workshop). A criteria and indicators co-ordinator was hired to focus attention on the LLI and provide support for the teams assigned to the LLI. Towards the end of February team leaders for the indicators were recruited and eight teams were assembled to focus on certain similar indicators.

A meeting on March 10th was held for the team leaders to discuss the next steps for the LLI process. The teams were asked to meet and decide on the final descriptions of the indicators, assign responsibilities to team members for the indicators and identify any

resource requirements. Late June was set for a meeting to discuss progress and a meeting at the end of September to submit testing results in a draft report on the LLI. In terms of Core support, it was agreed that the C&I budget for the coming year needs to incorporate some base funding for a GIS analyst's time and a Criteria and Indicators co-ordinator, to facilitate the teams. The first State of the Forest Report for the Nova Forest Alliance was also discussed. The report is to contain what is happening in the forests today or the 'baseline' information; it was decided that focus will not be placed on any trends within the forest. Future scenarios will be the focus of subsequent reports. Two target audiences were defined, the first was the technical audience and the second was the general public. It was agreed that the C and I committee would strive to have the technical report available for the indicators by the end of 2000. The public State of the Forest Report would follow in early 2001.

INDICATORS TO BE TESTED BY THE NFA

The Nova Forest Alliance approved 36 local level indicators for testing. These indicators have been renumbered from the original CCFM set. This was done so that there would be less confusion and greater ease of identifying the indicators chosen by the Nova Forest Alliance. The new numerical listings for the indicators (appendix 1) follow the criterion number for the section and for each indicator in that section there is a corresponding letter assigned.

Teams Working on Indicators

Eight teams have been assembled to pursue the indicators. The indicators have been distributed to each indicator team (appendix 2) in terms of common traits or ease of measurement. The members of each team are volunteering their time to the indicator process.

Indicators

A list of the final first priority indicators for the Nova Forest Alliance has been completed. The list can be found below.

Local Level Indicators For Nova Forest Alliance

Indicator 1.A: *Total forest area by percent and extent in all the combinations of forest cover types and maturity classes.*

Indicator 1.B: *Area of forest permanently converted to non-forest land use, e.g., urbanization. Also includes agriculture and golf courses.*

Indicator 1.C: *Number of known forest-dependant species classified as endangered to vulnerable and the number of recovery plans for these species.*

Indicator 1.D: *Area of habitat suitable and available for selected species and/or species guilds.*

Indicator 1.E: *Amount of area with natural cover type suited to the Acadian Forest Region and Site.*

Indicator 2.A: *Climate indices: (pH and amount of precipitation).*

Indicator 2.B: *Area and type of human disturbances specific to forest harvesting.*

Indicator 2.C: *Percent and extent of forest cover types and maturity classes.*

Indicator 2.D: *Percent of area meeting expected growth targets for site type.*

Indicator 2.E: *Growing stock by forest cover type.*

Indicator 3.A: *Extent of harvest area with significant soil disturbance.*

Indicator 3.B: *Percentage of watershed area in a recent cut condition.*

Indicator 3.C: *Percentage of forest managed under BMP's and other guidelines.*

Indicator 3.D: *Percentage of riparian zones meeting specifications.*

Indicator 3.E: *Percentage of stream crossings constructed and maintained to standard.*

Indicator 5.A: *Annual removal of forest products.*

Indicator 5.B: *Landbase available for production of forest products.*

Indicator 5.C: *Volume of merchantable wood left on site after harvest.*

Indicator 5.D: *Annual volume of forest by-products and waste.*

Indicator 5.E: *Contributions to Gross Provincial Product by specific timber and non-timber sectors.*

Indicator 5.F: *Employment in specific timber and non-timber sectors.*

Indicator 5.G: *Use of forests for non-market goods and services.*

Indicator 5.H: *Area and # of special forest places.*

Indicator 5.I: *Landscape visual aesthetic appeal.*

Indicator 5.J: *Density/Quality/Diversity of interpretative trails.*

Indicator 5.K: *Quantity of litter/garbage collected.*

Indicator 5.L: *Satisfaction levels of users with forest recreation opportunities.*

Indicator 6.A: *Degree of involvement of Mi'kmaq and/or Aboriginal people in SFM process.*

Indicator 6.B: *Level of understanding of all parties involved in SFM of Mi'kmaq issues.*

Indicator 6.C: *Percent of households with forest based employment full or part time.*

Indicator 6.D: *Number of communities (households) with a significant forestry component to their economic base.*

Indicator 6.E: *"Index of diversity" of local industrial base with significant forest economic base.*

Indicator 6.F: *Degree of public participation in SFM process.*

Indicator 6.G: *Investments in forest related research and technology transfer.*

Indicator 6.H: *Percentage of forest area under SFM plans.*

Indicator 6.I: *Degree of public is knowledge of SFM.*

GLOSSARY

Biodiversity: The total variability of life on Earth, including the diversity of genes, species and ecosystems.

Non-Timber Values: Includes all forest-related values that are not derived from timber harvesting and the subsequent production of forest products.

C and I: Criteria and Indicators.

CCFM: Canadian Council of Forest Ministers.

Canadian Council of Forest Ministers: The council was established in 1985 to give sufficient attention to forest issues. It expedites the development of policies and initiatives for strengthening the forest sector, including the forest resource and its use. It provides leadership, addresses national and international issues and sets the overall direction for stewardship and sustainable management of Canada's forest.

Criteria: Distinguishable characteristics of sustainable forest management.

Indicator: A quantitative or qualitative measure that is capable of showing the status and/or direction of change.

LLI: Local Level Indicator.

Local Level Indicator: An indicator which has local attributes.

SFM: Sustainable Forest Management.

Sustainable Forest Management: Management that maintains and enhances the long-term health of forest ecosystems for the benefit of all living things while providing environmental, economic, social and cultural opportunities for present and future generations.

Value: Principles, standards or qualities considered worthwhile or desirable.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX 1

Numeral Listing Change of Nova Forest Alliance Local Level Indicators

Task Team One

New Indicators: 1.A, 1.B, 1.C, 1.D, 1.E, 2.C

Old Indicators: 1.1a/b, 1.1f, 1.2a, 1.2b, 1.3a, 2.2a

Task Team Two

New Indicators: 2.A, 2.B, 2.D, 2.E, 3.A, 3.B

Old Indicators: 2.1h, 2.1i, 2.2c, 2.3b, 3.1a, 3.1b

Task Team Three

New Indicators: 3.C, 3.D, 3.E

Old Indicators: 3.2a, 3.2b, 3.2c

Task Team Four

New Indicators: 5.A, 5.B, 5.C, 5.D

Old Indicators: 5.1a, 5.1b, 5.1h, 5.1i

Task Team Five

New Indicators: 5.E, 5.F, 5.G

Old Indicators: 5.2a, 5.2b, 5.3a

Task Team Six

New Indicators: 5.H, 5.I, 5.J, 5.K, 5.L

Old Indicators: 5.3c, 5.3e, 5.3g, 5.3h, 5.3i

Task Team Seven

New Indicators: 6.A, 6.B

Old Indicators: 6.2a, 6.2g

Task Team Eight

New Indicators: 6.C, 6.D, 6.E, 6.F, 6.G, 6.H, 6.I

Old Indicators: 6.3a, 6.2g, 6.3a, 6.3b, 6.3f, 6.4b

APPENDIX 2

Criteria and Indicators – Indicator Teams

Task team 1 - Conservation of Biological Diversity

Indicators: 1.A, 1.B, 1.C, 1.D, 1.E, 2.C

Lead: Colin Stewart

Team: Bruce Stewart, Peter Jones , Crawford MacPherson ;Peter Duinker, Mike Radar, Mark Elderkin

Task Team 2 - Maintenance and Enhancement of Forest Ecosystem Condition and Productivity

Indicators: 2.A, 2.B, 2.D, 2.E, 3.A, 3.B

Lead: Eldon Gunn

Participants: Jorg Beyeler's group, Alex Mosseler, Dave Wartman, Peter Neily

Task Team 3. Conservation of Soil and Water Resources

Indicators: 3.C, 3.D, 3.E

Lead: Bevan Locke

Participants: Peter Jones, Steve Talbot, Bob Bancroft

Task Team 4. Productive Capacity

Indicators: 5.A, 5.B, 5.C, 5.D

Lead: Peter Jones

Participant(s): Bevan Locke, Bruce Stewart

Task Team 5. Market Values and Services

Indicators: 5.E, 5.F, 5.G

Lead: Peter MacQuarrie

Participant(s): Brian Sykes, Steve Talbot; Derek MacFarlane

Task Team 6. Non-Market Values and Services

Indicators: 5.H, 5.I, 5.J, 5.K, 5.L

Lead: Crawford MacPherson

Participants: Chalmers MacLeod, Ian Miller, Allan Peters, River Country,

Task Team 7. Accepting Society's Responsibility for Sustainable Development

Indicators: 6.A, 6.B

Lead: Brian Sykes

Participants: Bevan Locke, Peter McQuarrie

Task Team 8. Communities and Decision Making

Indicators: 6.C, 6.D, 6.E, 6.F, 6.G, 6.H, 6.I

Lead: Derek MacFarlane

Participants: Ian Miller, Tom Beckley, Chalmers MacLeod, Peter MacQuarrie

APPENDIX 3

Meetings and Workshops

Organization	Name	01/14/99	02/16/99	05/21/99	06/16/99	07/21/99	09/14/99	10/22/99	12/09/99	03/10/00	
Pulp and Paper Industry	Bevan Locke			x	x	x			x	x	
	Peter Jones			x	x	x	x	x	x		
	S. Rutledge		x	x	x						
	Shawn Smale			x	x						
	J. Porter		x								
	Marshall Bateman				x	x			x		
	Chalmers MacLeod					x	x		x		
Lumber Industry	Tara Hefler	x	x								
	J. MacLellan			x							
	Calvin Lambert				x				x		
	Maria Burgess				x						
	Downey Thompson				x						
	Kim Langille								x		
Small Private Landowners	Wade Prest	x	x	x	x				x		
	John Roblee	x	x		x				x		
	Keith Ellwood								x		
Government Sector	Ian Millar	x	x		x				x		
	Peter Neily	x	x								
	Dean Toole	x	x					x			
	Jorg Beyeler	x									
	Mike O'Brien		x								
	Phil Taylor	x									
	M. Hingston		x								
	P. MacQuarrie			x			x		x	x	
	Julie Towers				x	x					
	Kate Moir			x							
	Tony Duke			x							
	Bob Bancroft				x	x	x				
	Ed MacAulay				x						
	John Theakston					x	x				
	Derek McFarlane									x	
	Tim Whynot							x			
Bruce Stewart								x			
Francine Rousseau								x			
University and Research	Eldon Gunn	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
	Peter Duinker	x		x	x	x		x	x		
	Tom Smith	x									
	Lauranne Sanderson					x					
Education											
	Environmental Groups	Colin Stewart				x		x	x	x	x
		Kermit deGooyer				x					
		Allen Peters				x				x	
Minga O'Brien					x				x		
Local Government	Craford MacPherson								x		
First Nations	William McKay				x						
General Forestry Sector	S. Manley		x	x							
	Tim Keenan			x							

Other	Rob Cameron			x				
	B. Edwards	x						
	Glen Watt		x					
	Julian Armstrong			x				
	Derek Prest		x					
	Allan Smith		x					
	Brian Sykes				x	x	x	x
	Jason Kostopoulos						x	x
	Kelly Dalling				x	x	x	x