

## ACTION PLAN - FREP REPORT #18

### Recommendation 1:

Document the prevalence, content, and effectiveness of strategies or protocols developed by proponents through various “non-legal” mechanisms for CHR management. These mechanisms may include (but are not limited to):

- FSP supporting documents
- Information-sharing agreements or protocols
- Cultural resource management agreements (e.g., cultural cedar management strategies)
- Sustainable forest management plans (or equivalent plans developed for sustainable forest certification purposes)

### Rationale:

Proponents have asserted that various non-legal mechanisms are being widely used in lieu of legally binding FSP results and strategies, ensuring sufficient detail and direction for the effective management cultural heritage resource values. Given the emphasis within the results-based FRPA model on professional reliance as opposed to regulation, documenting the prevalence and content of CHR-related strategies in these other documents will be a critical next step in furthering the dialogue around this issue. Combined with results from field monitoring, it will be possible to begin evaluating the effectiveness of various approaches on the ground.

Agreed to Action(s)	Responsibility	Due Date
<b>Phase 1:</b> Select a subset of FSPs reviewed for this paper (~ 25–30%) and review all associated non-legal documents (see above). Analysis will mirror what was done for this paper (i.e., trends analysis), with an added focus on the time required to amass the necessary documents.	Forest Practices Branch – Lisa Levesque	May 2009
<b>Phase 2:</b> Develop an approach for evaluating the relative effectiveness of legal FSP results and strategies versus non-legal management approaches. FREP routine field monitoring results for the CHR value will be utilized as a primary data source.	Forest Practices Branch – Lisa Levesque	2009–2010

### Recommendation 2:

Assess the effectiveness of information-sharing strategies and protocols.

### Rationale:

Establishing information-sharing protocols can be a very useful tool for all parties involved, serving to provide certainty, and to clarify expectations, timelines, and the type of information to be shared.

Many licensees have included information-sharing strategies containing varying levels of detail in their FSPs. It is unclear whether more detailed strategies (defined as “explicit” in this paper) are more effective than those with less detail (defined as “vague or undefined” in this paper). Also, no data exist to assess whether protocols or strategies established through non-legal mechanisms are effective or adhered to. Monitoring the effectiveness of various approaches could lead to the establishment of formal “factors to consider” for decision makers reviewing these strategies, or “best practices” for practitioners developing information-sharing strategies with First Nations.

Agreed to Action(s)	Responsibility	Due Date
<b>Phase 1:</b> Select 4–6 pilot districts and complete an inventory of all information-sharing protocols developed by proponents, and all documented agreements in place between (a) First Nations and proponents and (b) First Nations and government.	Forest Practices Branch (Lisa Levesque) to manage project. Work will be completed by a co-op student or auxiliary hire, and support from both FORREX staff and First Nations Coordinated Consultation Teams will be actively sought.	August 2009
<b>Phase 2:</b> Building on past work of the CHR Process Working Group, develop a strategy and associated evaluation tools to compare the effectiveness of different information-sharing protocols, agreements and (or) strategies being used in pilot districts.	To be completed in collaboration with CHR Process working group members in collaboration with First Nations Coordinated Consultation Teams where possible.	2009-2010

## Recommendation 3:

Develop guidance for professional due diligence in the completion of “pre-harvest cultural heritage resource assessments.” This guidance should identify:

- all appropriate information sources and how to access them (respecting any confidentiality concerns);
- the types of sites, features, and values to record for a given area or region; and
- effective methods of collecting and managing CHR information.

### Rationale:

Detailed data about where cultural heritage resources, sites, or features are located on the land base as well as information about which CHRs require management at either a site-specific or landscape scale is often not available

or accessible to land managers. In the absence of this information, it is difficult to both develop landscape level management targets or approaches, and extremely difficult to modify forest practices at the operational level to address critical site-specific concerns.

Some pre-harvest CHR assessments are being completed by First Nations, but coverage is limited and their completion often sporadic due to a lack of resources. Many proponents have included commitments to completing “cultural heritage resource assessments” in their FSP, presumably due to this critical information and knowledge gap. Although professional guidance exists for the completion of archaeological surveys (PFRs, AIAs, AOAs), none currently exists for CHR surveys.

This task should be completed in collaboration among First Nations, proponents, professional archaeologists, and government staff.

Agreed to Action(s)	Responsibility	Due Date
<b>Phase 1:</b> Work with First Nations partners, MFR district FN Liaison staff, the Archaeology Branch, professional associations, and FORREX to inventory existing protocols that have been developed by First Nations across the province.	This work will be completed under contract managed by the Forest Practices Branch (Lisa Levesque) in collaboration with multiple partners.	March 2009
<b>Phase 2:</b> Work with multiple partners (see above) to develop professional guidance documents.		March 2010

## Recommendation 4:

Develop a FREP Extension Note or FREP Bulletin identifying high-priority CHR features or values (at local, regional, and provincial scales) that professionals should consider when developing results and strategies in FSPs, or for other planning processes. This document will include specific examples from existing FSPs, strategic plans (e.g., South Central Coast and Central and North Coast Orders), local knowledge, and results from 2008 pilot FREP field monitoring.

### Rationale:

At present, legislation defines a “cultural heritage resource” in a broad sense, and many FSP authors have not attempted to provide more clarity on this point for various reasons (see section 4.1.2). The inclusion of CHR objectives in land use orders on the Coast, and the specific examples highlighted in this paper (for cedar, CMTs, birch, cultural plants, rock art and pit houses) suggest that an opportunity exists to more clearly define CHR definitions or legal objectives (in the case of an LUO) at a landscape scale without compromising the flexibility of proponents to develop locally applicable results and strategies.

Agreed to Action(s)	Responsibility	Due Date
Develop a FREP Extension Note or FREP Bulletin identifying high priority cultural heritage resource features or values at multiple scales (local, regional, provincial).	Cultural Heritage Resource value working group (lead: Lisa Levesque) in collaboration with appropriate partners.	March 2009

