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## Forest Management Leadership Team Building Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Discussion Topic</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8:30 am| **Welcome and Introductions**  
Introduce Regional Facilitator and review Agenda for the day | District Host & Hal  | 5 min    |
| 8:35   | **Session Opening Remarks**  
Introduce Licensee Host and reflect on local circumstances, i.e. where we have come from and where we need to go. | District and Licensee Host | 10min   |
| 8:45   | **Ministry’s Speech**  
Pre-recorded opening remarks from the Minister of Forests and Range | Pre-recorded          | 5 min    |
| 8:50   | **Drivers of Change in MFR** | Hal                   | 5 min    |
| 8:55   | **Goals for Today**                              | Hal                   | 5 min    |
| 9:00   | **Background (what is latest source of energy)**  
- Desired shift  
- Government FRPA goals  
- Operational Issues Forum Quick Win Process | Bob                  | 10 min   |
| 9:10   | **Why is this Important?**  
Identify symptom (possible challenge wall discussion during morning coffee break) | Bob                  | 5 min    |
| 9:15   | **Local Examples of Symptoms**  
Identify symptom (possible challenge wall discussion during morning coffee break) | District and Licensee Host | 15 min   |
| 9:30   | **Morning Coffee**  
Participant post professional reliance symptoms and issues on challenge wall |                       | 20 min   |
| 9:50   | **Professional Reliance and Professionalism**  
- Explain format of professional reliance discussion and present professional reliance scenarios | Chuck Rowan           | 10 min   |
| 10:00  | **Professional Reliance and Professionalism**  
- What is professional reliance  
- Who are professionals  
- Fundamental concepts  
- Roles and responsibilities | Mike Larock           | 20 min   |
| 10:20  | **Professional Reliance and Professionalism**  
Revisit professional reliance scenarios considering messaging | Chuck Rowan           | 15 min   |
| 10:35  | **Trust and Relationships** | Gary                 | 10 min   |
| 10:45  | **Innovation Defined** | Gary                 | 20 min   |
| 11:05  | **CRIT and OIF Presentation**  
Including success measures action plan items | Chuck                | 10 min   |
| 11:15  | **A Charter for Professional Reliance** | Chuck                | 5 min    |
| 11:20  | **Presentation acknowledgements and thank you** | Hal                 | 10 min   |
| 11:30  | **Building Your Team (Introduction)** | Hal                   | 10 min   |
| 11:40  | **Building Your Team (actions)** | District Host       | 10 min   |
| 11:50  | **Dealing with local Issues**  
Next steps | District Host       | 10 min   |
| 12:00  | **End of Meeting** |                       |          |
Good morning, my name is Hal Reveley from the Coast Forest Regional office. I’m very pleased to be here along with my colleagues to spend the morning with you. This culture change session has the strong support of Minister Bell, who recorded a message for you; the Ministry’s Regional Management Team and provincial executive; the Coast Forest Products Association and the co-chairs of the regional Operational Issues Forum and the Coast Region FRPA Implementation team or CRIT. These are the two teams which work on coastal issues on your behalf and have representation from large and small licensees as well as government agencies. These groups will be described in more detail later.

Today is a continuation of the culture change which was initiated when government adopted results based legislation under FRPA and the Foresters Act. Hopefully for most of you in government and industry, that was the start of your journey up the hill to a more efficient and effective means of achieving our collective goals. Some of you have already reached the top of that hill, others may be part way up, but hopefully all are somewhere along the way.

The points we want to make this morning are going to be significant for some, even troubling, while for others you may recognize that we’ve done a good job of describing what the top of the hill looks like because you are there already.

The project team is confident that you will all get something out of what we’re offering. Whether it be new ideas, an improved understanding of concepts and models or an opportunity to get involved to make a difference for the forest sector as a whole.
Identify presentation speakers for the morning
• Hal is the session opener followed by the local DM and industry champion
• Bob does Background and why is this important (if not available for Chilliwack/Squamish consider Jeff Fisher)
• District host to review local examples of professional reliance symptoms.
• Chuck to read out the two scenarios of professional reliance
• Mike will do the professional reliance
• Chuck to read out the replay of the two scenarios
• Gary to do Trust through innovation
• Chuck to do CRIT and OIF, the charter and first slide of building your team.
• Hal to do Building your Team
• District to take over at building your team second slide

Identify what’s in handout package
• Copy of agenda
• PowerPoint presentation with speaking notes
• Professional Reliance Scenario Discussion and
• Appendix material including
  • A Charter for Professional Reliance
  • Summary of Professional Reliance and Innovation and Key Messaging
  • Forest Management Team Linkage diagram and contact information and
  • Forest Management Leadership Team Draft Terms of Reference

Introduce District host(s) to provide opening remarks.
Introduce the District Manager and local industry champion if one was identified.

Talk briefly about benefits of recognizing and using strong professional reliance model locally
• Welcome the audience and the team presenting to them.
• Identify local successes and challenges
• Identify local examples of innovation or improved working relationships
• Identify local issues that could benefit from use of professional reliance and a local team approach
• Speak briefly about the change in emphasis inside MFR as a result of the strategic session with senior managers (note that there are 3 slides on this already so be brief).

*Re-introduce Hal to queue up Ministers pre-recorded speech (next slide)*
Ministers Speech
Drivers of Change for MFR

Why does the Ministry need to change?

Our internal and external operating environment is changing:
  - the resource
  - the industry and sector (domestically and internationally)
  - our workforce

Government is clearly giving us direction for new activities:
  - Throne speech
  - Election Platform Commitments
  - Roundtable Report
Drivers of change cont’d

Big Picture Changes

- Enhance industry competitiveness.
- Identify clear outcomes and associated strategics for all forest and range resource investments.
- Enhance our results based regime/professional reliance.
- Build a culture of wood first.
- Facilitate innovation in the sector.
- Simplify/streamline business processes and practices (e.g. stand as a whole pricing/cruise based billing).
- Seek efficiencies in all of our ministry activities and operations.
- Coordinate service delivery between natural resource ministries.
Drivers of change cont’d

OUR VISION
A prosperous forest and range sector based on sustainably managed resources that provide benefits now and for generations to come.

OUR MISSION
To provide superior service to resource stakeholders by supporting competitive business conditions and by managing forest and range values.
Drivers of change cont’d

Core Functions
- Forest and Range Resource Investments
- Forest & Range Practices
- Forest Analysis and Inventory
- Tree Improvement

Key Transformative Changes
- Redesigned Forest & Range Management & Investment Delivery Model.
- Acceleration of activities to move to a true professional reliance model
- Area based AAC determination model.
First and foremost, our goal for today is to help facilitate an understanding on what is and isn’t professional reliance and define innovation. This will hopefully lead to consistent implementation across the forest sector in all coastal districts.

Key to the success of the above will be to improve trust and relationship. Our goal is to help create an environment locally to achieve what has been achieved at the regional level through CRIT and the OIF.

One of the primary reasons we are here today is to help you build and maintain an effective team. Using a proven structure that fits local needs will reduce the risk of the team losing direction. The regional CRIT and OIF teams have been successful in part due to the structure that is used to run these groups. While each district team will look a bit different because of local needs, it is our goal that a fully functioning team will be created in every district.

Of course there would not be a team without members. So we are going to be looking for volunteers willing to participate on the team to improve the policy and practices environment that you all work within. As well, we are looking for all licensees and district staff to endorse the team as your voice for making change.

Lastly, we are looking to get started to resolve some local issues.

Introduce Bob or Joe to provide background discussion
This was from the original presentation material when FRPA was brought into force. It is still relevant today although we recognize that considerable progress has been made. We also note that in the last frame, we are working towards a professional business relationship with all government agencies, not just the Forest Service.

If we deliver our goals, we should be able to move from:

To:

So that:

Key point is that our vision and goals from the past when FRPA was brought in is still valid today but we haven’t reached these goals. Today is a new beginning to finally reach the top of the hill.
In moving forwards with any culture change initiative, it’s always important to reflect back on the original goals for the initiative that brought about the change in the first place. These are the original goals of FRPA as part of a move towards results based legislation. We do want to emphasize, however, that our presentations today crosses all business areas, not just FRPA.

The Goals of FRPA include the following:

**Maintain**
- Current Code’s high environmental standards.
- Public acceptance of forest and range management.
- Balance of social, economic and environmental interests.
- Sustainably enhances the Province’s timber supply.

**Reduce**
- Transactional and operational costs to industry and government.
- Administrative complexity – lower than existing Code.

**Strengthen or Enhance**
- Industry’s global competitiveness by improving its ability to exercise government granted timber harvesting rights on a timely, economic and environmentally sound basis.
- Government’s compliance and enforcement regime.
- Industry’s “freedom to manage” in delivery of defined results.

All these objectives must be achieved within the resource capacity of government and industry.

Also, if you recall the FRPA model, Professional Reliance was one of the key supports for FRPA.
The start of this latest culture change initiative was the realization that the professional reliance model had not progressed as far or effectively as it could have. This message was heard loud and clear through the Ministers’ Quick Win initiative. While we went through a culture change process previously, we didn’t follow through to make sure everyone made it to the top of the hill. We want to prevent any slippage back into old habits. This is not to say that significant progress hasn’t been made, but clearly there is room for much more.

The joint MFR and Industry Coast Region Operational Issues Forum (OIF) co-chaired by Jim Gowriluk and Otto Schulte (Interfor) was tasked (as part of a broader provincial initiative) to identify and implement cost saving measures that will help ensure the competitiveness of industry/BCTS during these very difficult times. This was initiated by the Minister of Forests in November 2008 with a commitment to identify 15 quick wins in 15 weeks. Each region was asked to identify their own quick wins and implement them. A large number of ideas were generated in this region but not all could be accomplished within 15 weeks.

Various quick win proposals have been assigned to one of 7 different teams. The “FRPA in the context of Professional Reliance” team is working on a number of quick wins with the aim of reducing transactional and operational costs and generally increase efficiencies. The team that worked on this initiative included: Hal Reveley (MFR), Chuck Rowan (MFR), Gary Gwilt (MFR), Bob Craven (Interfor), Joe LeBlanc (Interfor), Terry Sullivan (BCTS), Mike Larock (ABCDF), Brian Chow (MFR), Steve Drozdovech (Consultant).

A number of quick win ideas originated from the concern that innovative ideas put forward by licensees and BCTS as part of FSP review and approval process met stiff and perhaps unwarranted resistance and an overall sense that professional reliance is not working as intended. Also many of the quick wins suggested professional reliance expectations were not being met. The group interpreted the root cause to be a lack of trust and relationship upon which to build an effective professional reliance model. It was noted a lack of trust and relationships was a common theme throughout many of the proposed quick wins that covered a wide range of business areas and legislation regimes, e.g. FRPA, Forest Act, GAR, Wildfire Act, etc. With increased trust and relationship to support the professional reliance model, we should see an increase in innovative thinking from all resource professionals which will provide the possibility of further gains in efficiencies.
Why is this Important

- Finish Implementation of FRPA
- Professional Reliance will not foster Itself
- Missed opportunities
- Status quo is not an option
- Accountability
- Local decisions fit better
- We need to concentrate on results

• We must complete the implementation of FRPA. All of the mechanics of FRPA are in place. The last real hurdle that we need to clear is in ensuring we have a fully functioning professional reliance model. The analogy is that of a bus climbing a steep hill and slowing to a crawl just before the crest of the hill. Like this bus, we are in danger of rolling backwards into a prescriptive forest management regime if we don’t keep up efforts to push this bus over the top of the hill. We have seen examples where stocking standards or results and strategies have been challenged on the basis of a lack of mutual understanding of what is being proposed. This is reminiscent of the days under the Forest Practices Code.
- Professional reliance will not foster itself thus requires a concerted effort on the part of every practicing professional to achieve our goals. Key to delivering on professional reliance model is fostering a culture of mutual trust and relationships. It is the responsibility of all professionals to build and maintain this culture. Professionals must also fully understand and embrace their respective roles.
- Without change, we are missing opportunities to do better forest management. The Code regime boxed professionals into prescriptive forest management that discouraged thinking outside the box. Without the freedom to manage, there was little opportunity for forest professionals to be creative and think innovatively. The result was that we were handcuffing professionals faced with an every increasing number of forest management challenges. We need to collectively come to the table with a “Can Do” attitude and take advantage of our abilities to be innovative.
- Status quo is not an option, especially given the current economic situation. Government, industry, BCTS, etc. are having to do more with less all the time and the challenges are increasing. There is a real need to “share the load” through the use of professional reliance. We have to work in an environment that allows us to take advantage of cost savings and revenue opportunities where ever they may exist.
- Professional reliance, however, can not succeed without accountability. We need to ensure that all professionals understand their roles and responsibilities and be totally accountable for their actions. Professionals are charged with maintaining forest resource values and social and economic needs. Greater accountability will result in better on the ground results, improved trust and reduced transactional costs.
- Local decisions are often a better fit. In the past, when confronted with a challenge, we have collectively been too quick to “raise it up the line” for resolution. Many times, this results is a resolution that is imperfect because it needs to consider factors not relevant to the local circumstance. In all cases, this will increase the time, cost and resources needed to reach a resolution. We need to keep up efforts to “push down” and empower local staff with the authority to reach resolution that best meets the local needs but within the context of the policy framework.
- We must also focus on the results being achieved. Long, drawn out debates between submitting and reviewing professional’s takes time away from the professional’s ability to get out in the field to look at the results. We spend too much time concerning ourselves with “what if” scenarios but spend little time looking at the results that allow us to learn.

Introduce District Host(s) to review local professional reliance symptoms.
Reintroduce district and licensee hosts.
First point of engagement with the audience.

1. Identify symptoms of professional reliance challenges (keep generic) using local examples, e.g. Licensee complaint letters, long drawn out review processes, communication breakdown (email versus phone call), no field trips to review issue, discussions lacking identifiable scope

2. Identify examples of local forest management implementation issues that could be used to kick start local FMLT session.

• Give local examples that were provided by licensees as part of the mail-out. If you don’t get enough then provide local sense of professional reliance concerns or expectations for improvements.
• Need to reinforce opportunities and positive messaging, i.e. Identify local successes.
• Open up discussion from the floor for additional examples of successes and challenges or ask participant to take time during the morning coffee break to add their thoughts to post on the challenge wall. These will be passed along to your local team.

*Break for 20 minute coffee and ask participants to take time to add their local professional reliance symptoms and forest management implementation issues to the challenge wall (if available).*
Use of professional reliance scenarios is optional (slide 15 and 16). If not using in presentation format, advise participants that this information is included in companion guide and encourage them to review at later date.

To help describe how professional reliance needs to be utilized to meet governments results based legislation goals, we have provided a number of professional reliance scenarios designed to highlight the risks of not embracing professional reliance. We will then provide you with a description of how the professional reliance model should be working. We will then revisit the scenarios to see how these specific examples should have played out under a functioning professional reliance model.
Review handout material as time allows, i.e. Two available scenarios.

Introduce Mike Larock of ABCFP (Director of Professional Practice and Forest Stewardship) to lead Professional Reliance and Professionalism discussion.
**Professional Reliance Scenarios Introduction**  
Attachment to the “Culture Change/Professional Reliance” PowerPoint Presentation

To help describe how professional reliance needs to be utilized to meet governments results based legislation goals, we have provided two professional reliance scenarios designed to highlight the risks of not embracing professional reliance. Please take the time to review these and consider how you would respond to the associated questions.

Following the presentation on Professional Reliance and Professionalism we will revisit these scenarios and questions to help illustrate how the professional reliance model should be working.

**Scenario 1 - Timber Supply Review Scenario**
As part of a DFAM Timber Supply Area Timber Supply Review (TSR), a licensee submitting professional supplied a MFR reviewing professional with operability mapping used to define the operable land base as part of the base case study.

In reviewing the operability mapping, the reviewing professional noticed that the conventional harvest operability lines included a significantly large amount of area that had been excluded from the operable land base in the two previous TSR’s because the area was considered too unstable to accommodate road construction and conventional harvesting methods. A number of risk factors were also known to the district office but not noted in the submission.

In reviewing the submission, the reviewing professional noticed that there was no professional sign off of the operability mapping. The reviewing professional contacted a regional expert about completing an evaluation of the operability mapping to determine if it was reasonable.

**When asked your opinion as part of a peer review, how would you respond to the following questions?**

1. What responsibilities do the submitting professional need to pay attention to and what information should that professional provide?
2. What points are important for the reviewing professional to consider?
3. What is the role of the decision maker?
4. What is the preferred approach for these professionals to approach this scenario?
5. What is the risk of not using professional reliance in this scenario?
Scenario 2 – FSP Amendment Scenario

A licensee professional has signed, sealed and submitted a Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP) minor amendment to the MFR that added areas to a Forest Development Unit (FDU) within the FSP. The implication is that a minor amendment is exempt from a number of the administrative requirements found in legislation, e.g. public review and comment and approval by the Delegated Decision Maker (DDM) and is not routinely subject to FN consultation and accommodation requirements.

The MFR staff member reviewing the submission noticed the amendment to the FDU included an area of significant size (100’s of hectares) and included areas significantly different from the original FDU. In this scenario, some portions of the amendment included areas in different watersheds, significant stretches of area adjacent to sensitive waterfront and some areas not even adjacent to the original FDU.

The reviewing professional became concerned that the submission may not meet the legislation definition of a minor amendment, i.e. what would be considered a material change to a FDU. However, he notices that the submitting professional makes the statement in the submission that “...Per FRPA Sec. 20(1)(a), this amendment does not require approval and does not conform to the circumstances requiring approval as specified in FPPR Sec. 29(b)...”

The rationale for the amendment is that the amendment area encompasses expired Timber Licences which were part of the previously approved Forest Development Plan. Due to a mapping oversight, the amendment area was inadvertently excluded from the FDU when the FSP was prepared.

In the proposal, the submitting professional makes a statement that “...I have determined that the proposed amendment does not materially change the intended results or strategies specified in the plan for the FDU...” The reviewing professional become curious about this statement and wants to find out more about how the submitting professional arrived at this conclusion but before he does, he discusses the merits of doing so with a peer in the regional office.

What advice would you offer to the reviewing and submitting professionals in this scenario?
The definition of professional reliance is not found in FRPA. It is found in guidance documents produced by the ABCFP and approved by a resolution of council.

The concept of professional reliance incorporates a reliance on both the judgement and advice of resource professionals and on the accountability of resource professionals.

Professional Reliance = Rely on Judgement and Advice + Accountability.

Professional reliance is not a result or an activity; it is not an objective or a strategy, instead, professional reliance is an approach or attitude and involves two parties and two behaviours – one party which accepts or relies upon the other, and another party which accepts responsibility and can be held accountable.

Professional reliance is not unique to forestry. It is a part of all professions that have significant impact on our society including engineering, architecture and medicine. The forestry profession, employers and government have come a long way with professional reliance since the initiation of FRPA just over five years ago; however, there is still much to be accomplished.
Professional reliance works in parallel to other legislations.

FPC era: prescriptive content that indicated what and who would undertake and approve certain functions. There was less reliance on professional judgement and therefore less accountability. Very few benefits of professional reliance.

FRPA era: not a demand side legislation and no direction regarding the specifics of who and what are required. There is greater reliance on professional judgement and therefore greater accountability. If transacted correctly there can be many benefits of professional reliance.

Forest professionals work within many legislative frameworks that utilize professional reliance in different ways, e.g. Workers Compensation Act BC; Heritage Conservation Act
While there are other professionals besides foresters, as an example of the legislation we have used the profession most familiar to you all.

- Foresters Act:
  Establishes the practice of professional forestry
  Establishes the registered practitioner
  Establishes the ABCFP as a responsible entity
  Establishes duties and objects for the profession

- Foresters Act:
  - Ensure only registered members practice professional forestry
  - Ensure everyone practicing professional forestry is accountable for matters of conduct and competence, and
  - Establish standards of practice
  - Ensure employers and those undertaking activities on forests or forest lands use the services of registered professionals

Like other regulators such as WorkSafeBC, the Foresters Act also enables the ABCFP to make law by set bylaws and for the council of the ABCFP to pass resolution.
Fundamental Professional Concepts

- Safety of people and protection of the environment
- Practice only within bounds of authority, training and experience;
- Adherence to standards of professional practice
- Base professional judgement on sound knowledge and science
- Work to a standard that meets the test of a reasonable professional, judged by peers
- Act honestly, fairly and courteously in interactions with others

- Safety of people and protection of the environment is paramount
- Practice only within bounds of authority, training and experience; **understand personal limitations**
- Adherence to standards of professional practice, including the due diligence standard
- Base professional judgement on sound knowledge and science
- Carry out work to a standard that meets the test of a reasonable professional, judged by peers
- Act honestly, fairly and courteously in interactions with others
Roles
Submitting professional responsibilities
• Are to their employer and Delegated Decision Maker
• Ensure work meets legal tests
• Show due diligence commensurate with risk
• Be accountable
Reviewing professional responsibilities
• Are to the DDM
• Determine accountability use probing questions
• Support the work of the submitting professional
• Provide information regarding the submission and risk
Decision Maker
• Guided by legal tests
• Consider all information from all sources.
• Draft a rationale available to the public

Submitting Professional is relied upon by their licensee employer to ensure the work meets legal tests and as to present implications and risks associated with non routine recommendations. The work of that professional as part of their due diligence, must be commensurate with the level of risk or departure from the norm and would generally require assessments, documentation or a rationale where required and specific expertise and/or experience. They must clearly identify who is accountable for the supporting assessments and evaluations and recognize their role in supporting the delegated decision maker with their submission.

Reviewing Professionals are relied upon by a delegated decision maker to ensure submissions meet legal requirements and are professionally supportable. The reviewing professional, who does not own the work of submitting professionals, should also not need to review it unless evidence suggests there are problems with the professional quality. Reviewing professionals, may, however, use probing questions to build their rationale for supporting the proposal to present to the decision maker. Those probing questions are to; confirm that the professional has documentation available upon request, identify who is accountable for the work, ascertain that all relevant factors were considered and in some cases may be to confirm that the professional was qualified. Under a professional reliance model, government professionals should ideally be in a position to support the work of another professional without actually reviewing the work first hand. The only time this would not be the case is where new information becomes available to the reviewer which suggests that continued support would not be reasonable and the reviewing professional has the necessary expertise to make that judgement. In other words, the only grounds for not supporting would be if the submission does not meet the legal requirements or is not professionally sound, not because the reviewer disagrees with the balance point between social, economic or ecological. The reviewing professional, however, should inform the Decision Maker about any known risks and other relevant factors and describe how they were addressed in the proposal.

Statutory Decision Maker is guided by statute on how to base any legal determination including the information that can be requested. These decision makers make their decisions on the basis of all relevant information brought to their attention from any source, but they also rely on the advice of professionals on staff. Legal determinations usually require a written rationale available to the public, in support of the decision. This is especially tricky for an AAC determination. In some cases the Chief Forester may require that the work be reviewed by government in order to be included in his rationale. It is the role of the decision maker, when reviewing the context of the situation and all of the information provided to determine the appropriate balance point between social, economic and ecological. It is also their role as to the level of risk to accept.

Licensee is a contractual partner that is provided the management prerogative to exercise the actions and treatments necessary to achieve their obligations. The actions and treatments that fall within the practice of professional forestry are based on the professional work, advice and judgement of a registered forest professional.
Responsibilities

- Prior to submission for determination
- After submission for determination

Prior to submission for determination
Both can have debates and technically detailed discussions as part of the team before a formal submission is completed. Such discussions are intended to inform each other of risks, factors and assumptions to be considered in the submission. Submitter has a responsibility to seek out information relevant to contemplated submission. Reviewer has a responsibility to provide relevant information to submitting professional.

After submission for determination
• Once a formal submission is made, the reviewers role as professionals is not to challenge the work, unless we have strong evidence to suggest errors were made. Instead it’s only to ensure that the work meets the legislation requirements, was done to professional standards and considered all of the risks, factors and assumptions using probing questions.
• The reviewer then has a responsibility to provide the submission to the decision maker and to stand behind it as professional work done to appropriate standards. We should not share personal opinions or disagree with the findings. Instead, that role is to inform the decision maker of the risks, factors and assumptions that were considered by the submitting professional and any other relevant information we have to help inform the decision. Again, we do not disagree or challenge the quality for the work.
• The decision maker, in considering the risks, factors, assumptions and other information makes an informed decision based on the information provided by the submitting professional (the proposal) and information provided by the reviewing professional (review comments).
• Once a decision has been made, there is no longer a relationship between the submitting and reviewing professional for the matters pertaining to this decision. Any questions or challenges should go between the licensee and the decision maker.

As a summary statement: Under a professional reliance model, we all have a role to inform the decision maker with the best available information done to professional standards. Prior to a submission we inform each other with relevant information but once a submission is made, we accept each others work as professionally sound unless we have evidence to the contrary. A decision maker must then balance a number of factors in making the informed decision but once made, any questions or challenges go to the decision maker.
Although FRPA does not regulate the relationship between employers and resource professionals, a primary concept of FRPA is Professional Reliance.

It is important to understand that professional reliance applies only to those individuals who have met the entrance requirements, adopted a code of ethics and standards of practice, and can be held accountable by their profession.

Professional Reliance Model is predicated on the assumption that Society and Users of professional service can rely on decisions and advice of professionals. Also, that employers and government will rely on advise of professionals and support professional independence.

Professionals are competent and dedicated resource professionals who:
- Apply knowledge, expertise and judgment in providing recommendations for decision makers.
- Are accountable and identifiable in carrying out the independent role related to the specific job function.
- Exercise professional independence.
- Implement cooperative team work with communities of professionals and others.

Team work:
- Increases input
- Assists in addressing due diligence
- Shares knowledge
- Provides for greatest chance of success.

FRPA relies on competent and dedicated resource professionals in two ways:
- As individual practitioners within their area of practice and
- As members of the collective community of professionals’ acting within their regulatory licensure.

- Link to guidance documents is http://www.abcfp.ca/regulating_the_profession/guidelines.asp
Professional Reliance and Professionalism cont’d

. Scenario 1 - Timber Supply Review Scenario
  1. What responsibilities does the submitting professional need to pay attention to and what information should that professional provide?
  2. What points are important for the reviewing professional to consider?
  3. What is the role of the decision maker?
  4. What is the preferred approach for these professionals in this scenario?
  5. What is the risk of not using professional reliance in this scenario?

Use of professional reliance scenarios is optional (slides 26 -34). Advise participants that this information is included in companion guide and encourage them to review at later date.

In this scenario, it should be pointed out that the first contact between the submitting and reviewing professionals should have been early in the process and preferably in the field to allow for sharing of information and opinions regarding risk and assessment requirements.

1. What responsibilities does the submitting professional need to pay attention to and what information should that professional provide?
   *The deviation from default increases risk so additional attention to development of rationale is warranted.
   *The submission needs to clearly identify who the accountable professional is.
   *The submitting professional should be prepared to address probing questions commensurate with risk.
   *The rationale needs to be kept on file and available to the decision maker if needed.

2) What points are important for the reviewing professional to consider?
   *Test the need to gather additional information from the submitting professional
   *Don’t ask to see work, just confirm that it was done to appropriate standard.
   *Point out and supply relevant information that will improve submission - role is not to personally review the work.
   *Leave opinions regarding the submission to decision maker – role is to identify risks and support the professional unless evidence suggests the work was not done to a professional standard.
   *Ensure appropriate level of expertise is applied to the review process.
   *Provide a balanced rationale to the decision maker.

3) What is the role of the decision maker?
   *Deliver determination as directed by legislation – no more, no less.
   *Request additional information within the authority of legislation
   *Provide rationale for determination.

4) What is the preferred approach for these professionals in this scenario?
   *Submitting professional engage reviewing professional before submission.
   *Review submission questions with real life examples, e.g. in the field if possible.
   *Provide mutual support to place a consensus submission before the decision maker.

5) What is the risk of not using professional reliance in this scenario?
   *Operating outside scope of training, expertise or experience
   *Lack of Trust risks ability to come to consensus submission.
   *Increased cost and time to complete determination process.
Professional Reliance Scenario Replay

Scenario 1 - Timber Supply Review

1) What responsibilities do the submitting professional need to pay attention to and what information should that professional provide?
   - The operability analysis provides a result that is significantly different from previous TSR studies therefore the submitting professional should consider the risk associated with this proposal and build a rationale for the analysis commensurate with the level of risk.
   - In this example, it was not evident who was accountable for the operability analysis. The submission should clearly identify the professional who did the work or supervised the work. The professional submitting the proposal must be prepared to be accountable for the work.
   - Because the results of the operability analysis were significantly different from the previous TSR studies, the submitting professional should have been prepared to provide full responses to any reasonable request for information from the reviewing professional. It is not appropriate to simply respond with “I’m a professional, trust me”. The submitting professional should be able to identify the considerations, level of risk, factors, sources of information, specialized training, staff expertise, technology, etc. used to inform the submission.
   - The rational does not have to be submitted with the proposal but it should be documented and kept on file. The rational is needed as evidence of professional due diligence or in the event that it is required by the Chief Forester to make a determination.

2) What points are important for the reviewing professional to consider?
   - The reviewing professional should test the need to gather additional information from the submitting professional, i.e. is there evidence of risk to a resource value that would support the need to seek additional information? In this example, if the area in question is small such that there is no material effect on the decision, then there isn’t a strong case for seeking additional information.
   - The reviewing professional doesn’t need to see the terrain stability studies and other analysis work of the submitting professional. However, the reviewing professional is acting on behalf of the decision maker so he/she may need to confirm that this work has been done and is available should it be required by the decision maker. It’s more important to know how the submitting professional arrived at his/her conclusions than what those conclusions were.
   - The reviewing professional should not act to challenge the submitting professional’s work. If the reviewing professional has access to information, studies, etc from past TSR decisions that appear to contradict the work of the submitting professional, then this information should be shared. It is then up to the submitting professional to consider this information as part of the submission package.
   - The reviewing professional is not the decision maker so it is not important for the reviewing professional to agree or disagree with the conclusions of the submitting
professional. Approval of the proposal rest solely with the decision maker. The role of the reviewing professional is to communicate to the decision maker the elements and information that are of importance to the decision maker in his/her role of making a legislative determination and how those were addressed by the submitting professional. In this example, the reviewing professional could point out the risks and implications associated with using the licensee’s operability study results as a basis for the AAC determination. It would then be up to the Chief Forester to consider the need for additional information.

- The reviewing professional needs to ensure that he/she has the appropriate training, experience, tools, etc. for the purpose of the review process. In order to adequately inform the decision maker, the reviewing professional may need to recruit a terrain stability expert to help inform the decision maker. However the scope of this review should be limited to understanding the process used to inform the operability study. If the process used to develop the submitting professional operability study is reasonable, then there is no need to challenge the work.

- The reviewing professional has a duty to the decision maker to provide a relevant information sufficient for the decision maker to consider the determination. This includes information regarding the risk associated with utilizing the submitting professional's operability study as well as other relevant factors addressed in the submission. It is appropriate for the reviewing professional to utilize information from the submitting professional to support this rationale.

3) What is the role of the decision maker?
- Directed by legislation, the AAC determination must consider;
  - Rate of timber production
  - Implication of alternate harvest rates
  - Economic and social objectives of government
  - Abnormal infestations and salvage programs

- Legislation authorizes the chief forester to require the TFL licensee to prepare and supply plans, studies, analyses and information considered adequate to assist in the AAC determination. In this scenario, if there is significant risk related to the capacity of the area to produce timber, the chief forester may wish to see the operability study to better understand that level of risk.

- As a professional, the chief forester must have documented rationale available to both support legislated determination and to support the professional reliance model. The rationale may rely on information provided by the submitting and reviewing professional.

4) What is the preferred approach for these professionals in this scenario?
- Preferred approach is to have the participating professionals engage in conversation prior to submission so that there are no surprises and there is less back and forth discussion which costs time and money. It also allows for an exchange of known information about risks. In this scenario, the submitting professional could notify the reviewing professional about the significant change in operability study results and in
turn the reviewing professional could then identify information needs to support the submission.

- Any concerns about the nature of the operability study are best addressed through field trips or preliminary meetings. A field trip will help the reviewing and submitting professional more clearly identify the relevant risk factors associated with a submission, i.e. there will be less time spent debating theoretical implications of the submission.

- Both the submitting and reviewing professional need to support each other in development of submission that will be presented to the Chief Forester. The submitting professional should ensure that the presentation to the decision maker includes relevant information regarding known risk factors considered in the proposal. If the reviewing professional has no reason to suspect that the submitting professional is not qualified, has ignored known risk factors, or has not done their due diligence, then the reviewing professional should support the proposal when presenting to the decision maker.

5) What is the risk of not using professional reliance in this scenario?

- Operating outside scope of training, expertise or experience. Reviewing professional could start to question elements of the submission to which he/she has insufficient expertise, training or experience in, e.g. terrain stability and/or economic analysis.

- Lack of Trust: Submitting professional fails to be accountable for the proposal by refusing to respond to information requests.

- Costs: Worst case scenario is that reviewing professional undertakes a “shadow analysis” as means of proving or disproving the submitting professionals work, i.e. doubling of time and effort necessary to reach a determination.

- Time: We have seen too many examples of decisions in abeyance due to ongoing debates between professionals. This is a significant cost to both government and industry. Professionals must know their role and be accountable for their work and show professional respect.
Submitting Professional

- Must understand and consider legislative content, legislative interpretation and legislative processes.
- Consider the risks associated with the submission, e.g. public or FN interest concerns expressed over this area in the past?
- What is the implication (risk) of implementing the FSP R/S, stocking standards, measures over this additional land base? Example; is there temporal versus spatial implications? Landscape level implications?
- Open up pre-submission conversation with the reviewing professional to 1) seek additional information as needed and 2) discuss the implication (risk) of the proposed submission.
- Prepared to have open conversation about the process used to prepare the submission.
- Documented rationale of what has been considered in the submission and be prepared to provide to the decision maker within His/her legislative authority to request.

Reviewing professional

- Provide relevant information and considerations to submitting professional (pre and post submission)
- Identify the risks associated with the submission and document (risk – legislative content, legislative process, legislative interpretation).
- Identify need to additional conversation with the submitting professional i.e. explore his/her own rationale for questioning this submission.
- Have conversation with submitting professional about content and process risk (leave to submitting professional to address).
- Have conversation with decision maker about legislative interpretation prior to going back to the submitting professional, i.e. The legislative interpretation is ultimately up to the decision maker.
- Provide opportunity for submitting professional to modify or add information the submission based on conversation of risk.
- Provide the decision maker with the information necessary to make a determination, legal tests, risk, process used to support submission, etc. e.g. but has no role in making the determination.
Scenario 2- FSP Amendment

What advice would you offer to the reviewing and submitting professionals?

- The reviewing professional should explore his/her own rationale for questioning this submission. What information, evidence, expertise, training, etc. is there to suggest that the amendment may not meet the legislative test? Example, has there been significant FN or public interest in the area in question?
- The reviewing professional should assess the implications associated with the submission. Is there significant risk to a forest resource value associated with this submission?
- If it is not clear whether the submitting professional adequately considered all relevant factors in coming to his/her conclusions and there is evidence risk associated with the amendment, e.g. FN consultation, the reviewing professional should be having a dialogue with the submitting professional. In this example, the submitting professional fails to provide any evidence in the rationale that all relevant factors were considered in his/her conclusion(s).
- The dialogue should focus on risk and assessment carried out in support of the proposal. The nature of the dialogue should be about determining if the appropriate assessments, analysis, evidence, etc have been produced to an acceptable standard, are documented and are available for review by the decision maker if required. In this scenario it may be that the submitting professional has done a detailed analysis of their obligation related to R/S, stocking standards and measures to reach this conclusion and documented this analysis. Likewise, it could be that the submitting professional was able to utilize previous FN information sharing data and stakeholder and public review and comment process to address FN and stakeholder input issues.
- Submitting professionals’ rationale should be documented and filed. It’s not required that this information be provided to the reviewing professional, but the results of any analysis should be documented and available for the decision maker’s determination if and when needed. The important point in discussion with the submitting professional is that he/she needs to be able to stand behind his/her conclusion in a meaningful way (reasonable, documented evidence).
- Based on the conversation the reviewing professional can confidently build a rationale to advise the decision maker that the proposal appears to be appropriate based on the process used to support the associated conclusions.
Summary

- A professional **must be accountable** for his/her decisions and advice provided.
- Professionals must understand each others roles as reviewers and submitters.
- Professionals must be competent and maintain sufficient knowledge and expertise in their area of practice.
- Professional show due regard and respect
- Deference is not blind

Otherwise we only have a discussion between professionals but no professional reliance model.

Differences of opinion are best discussed in a field setting but once part of a formal proposal for which a professional is accountable, deference to the professional should be given unless supported by evidence to the counter.

There must be a mutual professional respect when having discussions.

This is not blind deference and use of probing questions is reasonable.

*Introduce Gary Gwilt (A/Operations Manager) to discuss trust and relationships and Innovation Defined*
When assessing the problem of a lack of innovation in FSPs, it was concluded the root problem wasn’t innovation but a lack of trust. Trust is a behavioural thing just as important if not more than the model of innovation. The differences in behavioural responses to something innovative is a key element of the problem. Trust must be earned, respected and nurtured on an ongoing basis. Accomplished through open, transparent and early communications, professionals being accountable for their work, demonstrating due diligence, only practicing in the fields for which they have sufficient experience and knowledge and being open to learn from each other. Working together early on in the development of new ideas, discussing differences of opinion in an open and transparent way will lead to a foundation of trust.

Conceptual thinking vs reality thinking: Where there is a lack of trust and professionals submit new ideas to the district without prior engagement the result can be an office based conceptualization of how something new might be applied in the field based using worst case assumptions that approval would lead to a negative outcome. Especially true where the intended application is not well defined in scope, scale or application. This does not create an atmosphere that embraces development of trust or promotion of change. On the other hand, a field trip which allows the submitting professional to define how something is intended to be applied usually results in reality based thinking and a broader understanding of scope, scale and intended application. Also builds the level of trust.

Contract of trust: Under a professional reliance model where professionals work towards common goals using field trips to discuss and resolve their differences, it should be possible to also develop a relationship based on trust. The reviewing professional and possibly the statutory decision maker should be able to say “I understand your intent as you have described it and I trust you to your word.” Such a contract of trust would lead to reduced correspondence, increased professional reliance of their work and shorter approval times. That trust would be tested through C&E inspections and/or FREP monitoring. The value of this contract of trust would be lost if it was ever shown that the professional was not trustworthy in their implementation consistent with their description.

The single field trip: A single field trip can reduce the need for countless e-mail exchanges, phone calls and/or office meetings. That field trip should take place prior to developing a submission and would allow for professional to exchange information, ideas and opinions thus improving the quality of the resultant submission. When professionals come to an understanding of how something is intended to be applied in the field setting, it makes it easier for the reviewing professional to support submissions which are not defined by scope or scale or are otherwise difficult to understand when presenting to the decision maker. Differences of opinion should be discussed in a field setting with an understanding that it is okay to disagree but ultimately the proposing professional, informed by the discussions and accountable for the submission, makes the final submission. These field exchanges should ensure submitting professionals consider all known information to improve their due diligence. It should also result in that submission being accepted as professionally sound by the reviewing.

We should also remind ourselves that at the end of the day, we’re a distinct group under the Foresters Act. When we come from different backgrounds or have different cultures (industry role versus government), it isn’t unexpected that the parties would have somewhat different interpretations on something. Where the parties have come together with a common understanding of forestry principles, the differences are in context often relatively smaller. Part of the cultural change is to make sure we all view things through the same lens as professionals with the same professional attitude (culture). Professionals working for an interest group (public, forest sector, government etc.) may differ only in the balance point between environment, society and economics. It is important to recognize the scale of the balance point as well – is it a stand level or outblock level difference of opinion; or something much larger and of watershed or landscape significance? Given these considerations, it should be reasonable for professionals to develop a team outlook on that balance point. The end goal is for the decision maker to be presented with proposals that are supportable by both the reviewing and proposing professionals.
Innovation is one of the benefits of using the services of professionals.

In the simplest sense Innovation means to bring in new ways of doing something; successful implementation of new ideas or processes

We will explain what we mean by “successful implementation” in the next slide but first some background.

Licensees, agencies and government look to innovation to solve some of the current problems in the forest business.

While innovation might be the common word between the parties, the expectations of innovation can be different. Some views of innovation include increased efficiencies, while others include reduced risk, and still others include both. Applying these independent views can become barriers to innovation. For example, the Forest Practices Code used pre-established values, science, logical principles and proven methodology as a basis for practice rules. The FRPA framework anticipates that a reduction in rules and increase in professional reliance will be more effective and efficient. Some have interpreted this to mean ‘practice without rules or standards’ and others have interpreted it to mean ‘proof before practice’. A more inclusive perspective is science, logical principles and established methods are part of professional rationale in support of innovative practice.

Forestry is a science and relies on scientific method, tested processes and monitored outcomes. How we manage our forests is constantly changing so we must constantly be re-evaluating the science and processes we use and be ready to adapted as needed, i.e. the status quo is not a viable option. Example internal and external forces that challenge the status quo include 1) economic uncertainty, land use decisions, regulatory change, MPB, etc. Therefore, we need to be able to think out side of the box, i.e. be innovative.
Innovation is new ideas applied successfully.

“Applied successfully” refers to the manner and method employed in pursuing the creative idea. It does not refer to the result of the creative idea. The risk associated with a creative idea is part of the method and includes risk assessment. The full meaning of the innovation definition might best be understood by observing the component parts of the definition. Innovation is a function of specialized knowledge, experience, and creativity, weighed against the inherent risks and the outcome is analyzed and communicated to others.

It might be helpful for us to view Innovation as a set of functioning component parts that must be considered as a whole. Truly “successful” innovation considers all of the functional elements as a package.

In other words, Innovation is natural culmination of a creative idea that is pursued by testing using facts, logic and reason.
Professional reliance will really benefit our forest resource businesses. Successful innovation is dependent on how we transact professional reliance.

**Principles of Innovation**

No clear understanding of the roles and expectations of each group of professionals (Licensee and MFR) when something new is submitted however that are some clear principles that each should abide by. An example would be the greater the risk, the greater the expectation for adaptive management and supporting information. The greater the trust and/or the lower the risk, the less need for formal monitoring and information exchanges required to support something innovative.

**Individual Roles**

The role of a professional **prescribing** innovation includes the development of a professional rationale sufficient to explain and support the design to a reasonable extent.

The role of the professional **assessing** the prescribed innovation includes a reasonable professional diligence relative to the purpose of the assessment.

The role of the professional **implementing** a prescribed innovation includes sufficient comprehension and monitoring to achieve the designed outcome. In addition, the implementing professional has the added duty to modify the prescribed innovation based on monitored results.

Note; Professionals don’t have the innovation market cornered. Innovative ideas can and do regularly initiate from non-professionals and it is often non-professionals who are tasked with implementing innovative ideas, however, to the extent an innovative idea covers the practice of forestry, a professional needs to be involved.
Innovation is one of the benefits of using the services of professionals where those professionals are allowed to use their discretion and judgement as opposed to shoe horning professionals into cookie cutter approaches.

Impact of economic issues – if one determines that innovation has a positive economic impact, then the view would be that tough times breed innovation (i.e. – having to do more with less as set out above). However, care must be exercised to ensure that what is occurring is indeed innovative and not unscrupulous.

As with any increased freedom there is a caution of care relative to the mandates of the professions and the individual professionals.

Freedom to be innovative is directly proportional to the rigor of the innovation process. The main point is, the greater a proposal varies from standard accepted practice, then greater is the effort devoted to the functions of the innovation process, e.g. building an adaptive management regime, document this process, monitor the implementation results and communicate the results so others learn.
A word about Caution.

There will always be a need for standards in certain areas. Rules, for example, can provide for a predictable approach that leads to comparable results. While this may be desirable and in some cases legally required, this kind of approach can be the antithesis of innovation. Therefore, caution should be exercised around the application of rules, and the call for innovation be based on some foundation principles.

**Principles of Innovation**

The innovation process in FRPA can be implemented immediately within operating areas by following these principles:

- **The roles are applied correctly.** The roles described above are supported by the employers in FRPA and are neither applied to a minimal degree or with extraordinary zeal. The effort is moderate to a sufficient extent.

- **Innovation process includes all of the key foundation components.** The extent to which each component is addressed is related to achieving sufficiency without excess. For example, sufficient knowledge refers to the amount of information and the quality or balance of information, necessary to measure, monitor and report the outcome.

- **There is a proactive communication and sharing of information between the parties involved to a reasonable and proportional extent.** The proportion refers to the complexity and risk.

- **Effort is proportional to the scale and scope of the prescribed innovation.** The greater the complexity and risk of a prescribed innovation, then the more effort and emphasis will be necessary in the roles of prescription, assessment and implementation. (i.e. background information, monitoring, reporting, etc.)

- **A sharing and continuous learning process is carried out with a reasonable regularity.**

- **Collaborative approach to innovation is the best chance for significant innovative gain (giant steps forward)**
Innovation – role and goals

What increased role can innovation play in delivering forest management goals?

- Key goals guiding the development of FRPA
- Drivers of Change in MFR

Key goals guiding the development of FRPA (as discussed earlier in slide #11)
- Reduce transactional and operational costs
- Reduce administrative complexity
- Provide freedom to manage
- Maintain high environmental standards
- Balance social, environmental and economic interests
- Maintain and enhance public acceptance of forest and range management
- Be within resource capacity of government
- Strengthen C&E regime
- Enhance global competitiveness
- Maintain and enhance timber supply

Drivers of Change in MFR (as discussed earlier in slide #6)
- Enhance industry competitiveness.
- Identify clear outcomes and associated strategies for all forest and range resource investments.
- Enhance our results based regime/professional reliance.
- Build a culture of wood first.
- Facilitate innovation in the sector.
- Simplify/streamline business processes and practices (e.g. stand as a whole pricing/cruise based billing).
- Seek efficiencies in all of our ministry activities and operations.
- Coordinate service delivery between natural resource ministries.
Advise participants that slides 43-46 include deals on the three listed examples of innovation put into practice within the coast forest region. We will not review as part of presentation but they are included in the companion guide for your information.

Open floor to see is participant have any local examples of innovation that has been accepted and implemented (as time permits).
Examples of Innovation

Cruise Based Old Growth Permits
*Forest Act S.106*

- With the approval of the regional executive director, the amount of stumpage payable on Crown timber may be calculated using the information provided by a cruise of the timber conducted before it is cut, instead of the volume reported in a scale of the timber made under Part 6.

- Licensee granted one old growth cruise based permit in the XYZ TSA. Innovative, cost savings, low value timber at minimum stumpage that eliminates the need to stick scale every piece.
Accuracy of information submitted
Forest Act S. 105.1

- A holder of an agreement under this Act who
  - (a) is required under this Act, or
  - (b) obliged under the agreement
- to submit information to the government for use in determining, re-determining or varying a stumpage rate, or for any other purpose under this Act, must ensure that the information is accurate.
- Appraisal estimates have been signed and sealed by Forest Professionals.
In this case the DDM requested information regarding wind firmness, lost harvest opportunities (what will become of the adjacent timber, aerial photography), does this wildlife tree retention area provide the same value as the original one, give me some evidence that leads me to believe you.

Under a professional reliance model, it’s possible that the submitting and reviewing professionals would have had previous field trips regarding this specific situation, or one like it. In any case, the reviewing professional, through probing questions, should be in a position to ensure the DDM that the submitting professional has considered all of the relevant factors, has demonstrated a due diligence and is accountable for the documentation. If this had been the case the DDM would be less likely to be requesting to see the professionals work. Note, however, the role of the DDM is to decide if an exemption is reasonable based on the balance of all the information available at the time of the decision.
Acting as a professional means that professionals have been afforded the opportunity to exercise discretion and judgment as opposed to operating in accordance with checklist and defined protocols.

Affording professionals the opportunity to work with other professions and professionals will often result in synergy – the total is greater than the sum of the parts.

*Re-introduce Chuck to present CRIT, OIF information.*
One of our goals today is to help you create your own local team. Your team would then be linked with the two regional teams that deal with all aspects of forest management. These two teams have been very successful in delivering on the goals of government and licensees. For those not familiar with these teams, we wanted to familiarize you with them. They are the Coast Region FRPA Implementation Team, better known as CRIT, and the Operational Issues Forum or OIF.

Important note: CRIT and OIF create an environment to promote innovation and a competitive forest industry.
The team includes representatives from the Ministry of Forests and Range, the Ministry of Environment, the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and the Arts, the Ministry of Agriculture and Lands Integrated Land Management Bureau, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, BC Timber Sales, the Coast Forest Products Association (CFPA) and non-CFPA members. CRIT membership list is posted on the CRIT web site (address included later on in this presentation).

- Each team is co-chaired by one MFR member and one CFPA member.
- Each team has a secretary who looks after administration issues.
- Each team strikes working groups to address specific issues from time to time. E.g. CRIT has two standing working groups 1) Silviculture and 2) Resource Planning (new in 2009) and OIF has struck “Quick Win” working groups.
- Each member is responsible for communicating forest management implementation issues and solutions between itself and it’s constituents and clients that they represent.
- Each team strives to keep the group as small as possible to make sure all participants are engaged and focused.
CRIT / OIF Cont’d

What does CRIT and OIF do?

Builds relationships and trust between forest resource practitioners by;

- Meeting to resolve forest management implementation issues, e.g. OIF Quick Win Process
- Developing guidance and messaging
- Monitoring practices
- Sponsoring training and workshops
- Supporting policy and legislation

The primary role of CRIT and OIF is to
1) act as a communication and collaboration tool between forest resource practitioners
2) provide a forum where members can table operational issues and work together to seek resolutions
3) Promote effective, results-oriented business culture founded on trust and relationships.

These teams;

• meet face to face 2-3 times per year and via conference call 2-3 more per year. CRIT meeting and conference call minutes are posted on the CRIT website. OIF used the Quick Win process to deal with economic driver issues provided by industry.
• develop or direct the development of guidance and messaging that acts as single voice for all forest resource practitioners in defining acceptable planning and practice resolution options.
• work to monitor practices within the scope of each team. Example, CRIT has carried out monitoring of silvicultural systems applications and used its professional wisdom to improve planning and practices results. This monitoring also provides the opportunity for mentoring and field exchanges between experienced professionals. OIF is monitoring the effectiveness of the Quick Win process.
• develop or direct the development of training and workshops to support forest resource practitioners, e.g. Hardwood Management in the Coast Forest Region workshop.
• support provincial level policy initiatives as needed.
• Each of the three levels of FRPA Implementation Teams (PFIT, CRIT and District teams) provides forest professionals with a forum to identify and resolve FRPA planning and practices implementation issues.

  Provincial FRPA Implementation Team - http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hth/timten/FRPA_implementation/
  Coast Forest Products Association - http://www.coastforest.org/
  Truck Loggers Association - http://www.tla.ca/

• The CRIT web site is a useful source of information related to FRPA implementation issues containing CRIT publications and messaging.
• The PFIT has developed a FRPA Issues Management Process, to help staff understand how implementation issues can be addressed, and a Policy Initiation Form to help document information necessary to address the issue. Forest planners and practitioners are encouraged to utilize this process and forward completed initiation forms to the appropriate implementation team representative. For questions or comments regarding how to initiate a policy initiation form, please contact the CRIT secretary.
• CRIT often brings in experts and other staff to help frame and find solutions to FRPA implementation issues. Turn over of CRIT members provides opportunity for new participants. Each of the nine member groups are responsible for identifying participants. Contact your respective representative with your expression of interest in joining CRIT or one of the CRIT standing working group, i.e. Silviculture or Resource Planning.
What Makes These Teams Successful?

- Common/clear purpose/vision
- Clear Roles / responsibilities
- Members are accountable to the Team
- Structure, e.g. TOR, scheduled meetings, action plan, etc.
- Trust / relationship /mutual respect
- Continuity in membership/attendance
- Members see a benefit/incentive to be on the team
- Putting collective needs at par or above personal interests
- Equality of power within the team
- Team and team members empowered to make decisions
- Individual client needs are dealt with as part of the ‘Teams’ Interests
- Recognize achievements and celebrate success
- Understanding of the foundational aspects of the team
- Humour
- Regular check-ins on performance of meetings and action items

The “team” needs to be committed to the effort to successfully launch itself.

Need strong champion to keep pushing through the hard times.

Identify quick wins to focus team and build sense of accomplishment, i.e. Identify incentive to return for the next meeting.

Don’t take the team for granted, i.e. Requires nurturing to remain relevant to participants.

Participants will benefit from being part of the time equivalent to what they put into it.

Regular check-ins on performance of meetings should be formal meeting evaluations which can be anonymous or verbal but should be included with meeting minutes. Performance review should also include informal calls of members but such calls would not be documented.
Based on show of hands record the level of awareness for each of these questions below (Good, Fair, Poor)

1. How many of you are aware of CRIT or OIF?
2. How many of you can identify your CRIT or OIF representative?
3. How many of you have visited the CRIT web site?
4. How many of you have utilized or benefited from products or outputs of CRIT?
5. How many of you know how to get your FRPA or Forest Act implementation issues addressed?

We are looking to make contact with forest resource practitioners to raise the awareness of CRIT and help guide future activities of CRIT. We will be using contact information derived from this meeting to follow up with each of you to ensure CRIT is working to meet your needs.
This charter is on the wall. We ask that at some point during the day you read this (which is also in your package) and sign it to demonstrate your support for professional reliance and your local team.

*Re-introduce Hal to wrap up messaging portion of the presentation.*
That concludes the presentation from the team. We would like to ensure that you are aware of the sources where you can get assistance to support your local team and local professionals. Your sources for finding contacts are:

• CRIT web site
• Local CRIT or OIF members
• Chuck Rowan from the regional office

Open it up to the floor with request for feedback on utility of session just heard.

We would now like to turn the meeting over to the district to continue with the development of your local team and address local issues. But prior to turning the floor over, I’ll provide an introduction to the Building the Team portion of this presentation.
The Ministers’ quick win process resulted in numerous good ideas coming forwards. Most of these came from operational foresters like yourselves. Having a local team with a powerful voice creates an opportunity to continually improve forestry from all perspectives just as the Minister stated in his opening remarks. It’s reasonable to state that there is room to improve the level of trust and relationship and quality of communications in many coast districts which was a stated goal of this initiative. Creating a local team to manage the use of the resource should improve on these. With high operating costs and reduced resources, status quo is not an option.

We are looking to duplicate the successes we have seen with CRIT and OIF at the district level with the formation of Forest Management Leadership Teams in each of the eight coast region districts. These two teams manage issues arising from all business areas but are currently lacking a strong linkage to the field level. Both CRIT and the OIF believe that having a team to communicate and work with would increase our ability to continually adapt and achieve our collective goals. This also then provides a more direct connection with provincial teams who initiate policies and programs. This provides you with a voice when it’s time to amend legislation or policies.

Vision: Structured teams at the district level making a difference locally, regionally and provincially in the sustainable and economic use of the timber resource.

Goal: Build Forest Management Leadership Teams as district forest management forum.

Integral to achieving this goal is for each member to come to the table with an open mind and willing to listen and engage with the understanding that his/her input will be heard and acted on appropriately.
Review linkages to other issues management teams that are relevant to the FMLT.

Identify how FMLT may opt to structure itself in relation to small technical sub groups to take on projects and explore innovative ideas, e.g. Creation of local TSA silviculture strategy. They may also want to create a link with any DFAM or ministry TSR technical team. This may be the case where the district Forest Management Leadership Team takes on a management role for the TSA.

Reference diagram and various issues management group contact information provided in back of handout material.

Goal should be to reduce the reliance on provincial and regional level teams so that more the solutions to implementation issues come from local practitioners.

*Reintroduce the district host to lead “Building your Team” discussion.*
Building your Team

Benefits
- Increased trust and relationship
- < transactional costs and overall > efficiencies
- Team approach to promoting innovation
- Community of practice / environment for learning
- Improved communications
- Resolution of local issues
- All licensees big and small have a voice
- All Business Areas on the table but
  - Need to manage expectations

As noted throughout the presentation, building on trust and relationship is essential for success under professional reliance. The local team can build on this.

- Reduced transactional costs associated with resolving conflicts and feeding inefficiencies through lengthy debates
- Allows upfront discussion on new innovative ideas which could be set up as a trial locally. Shares the burden.
- Creates the opportunity for mutual learning and mentoring by creating a community of practices.
- Improves communications
- Opens doors to manage and resolve local issues.
- strong local representation which can send new ideas and resolutions to local problems up the line
- Coordinate FSP submission schedules.
- voice for referral issues such as IPPs,

But must stay within existing policy and legislation although we encourage the teams to identify any and all barriers to your success and take your proposed changes up the line through either CRIT or OIF.

Limitations on what can get done given current resources but all suggestions put forwards by a team will be considered.
What’s Involved?

- Identify Team Membership
- Set meeting schedule
- Confirm Terms of Reference
- Identify issues and expected outcomes
- Reporting progress
- Commitment

• DM co-chairs (for at least first year) with industry/BCTS representative as the other co-chair.

Identify forest management sectors to sit on the team as core members, e.g. MFR stewardship/tenures, CFPA, FN licensee, Woodlot/Community Forest licensee, other agencies. Identify secretary to manage meetings. Identify local champions from CRIT and/or OIF where possible to foster linkage to these teams. Recommend keeping core group small and either bring in technical experts based on nature of topic being discussed or farm out work to sub-teams of technical experts. Core team primary responsibility is to “manage” the issue first and resolve it secondly.

• Determine frequency and method for meeting. Face to face better than conference call but may not be possible.

Should meet total of 4 in the first year, at least 2 face to face. Familiarization builds trust and relationships. Scheduled meetings provides initiative to deliver results. CRIT / OIF members can be called upon to help.

• To assist with maintaining team structure necessary to keep on track, a Terms of Reference has been developed for use by each team. TOR include shared vision, goals, team purpose, team structure, roles and responsibilities, etc. The template TOR narrow in scope and expected to be base to work from. It does not include other agencies or broader management issues but you can build on this to meet local needs.

• People don’t want to go to weak meetings. They want resolution of issues that affect them. Build sound agendas with issues that members have a vested interest in. Team members need to canvas their constituents to build agendas with an understanding of whether the topic is for discussion, decision or assignment to a working group.

• To help maintain forward momentum, there is an expectation of progress reports from the FMLT as stated in the TOR.

• The level of commitment made to this team is proportional to the benefits you can expect to receive from it. Your support is necessary to address the challenges. It is extremely important that all of the participants take ownership in finding the means of reaching resolution to district forest management issues. If you have a good idea, it needs an appropriate venue to get it expressed and acted on otherwise it will go nowhere.
List of possible topics on this slide is only there as an example.

- Including the other agencies and addressing multiple agency issues.
- Utilization of the FREP program to meet local needs such as monitoring the outcomes of innovative results and strategies. Local input on priorities for FREP monitoring and ability to discuss results.
- Provide local input into the Fire Management Planning which is intended to protect values at risk.
- Local management of FIA funds on the TSA, and joint decisions on priorities in silviculture.
- Identify and support local training on various forest practices and forest health issues.
- Get more involved in the management of the TSA similar to the Fort St John Pilot.

Use this slide as discussion point with the audience to solicit agenda topics to help kick of first FLMT. Developing a solid agenda is key to attracting attention, i.e. we want to build interest.
Dealing with Local Issues

- What local issues did we receive
- What can we work on today?
- What can we assign to the team
- Who wants to be part of this team.
- Follow-up commitments
- Signing the Agreement (or declaration?) of Professional Conduct.

Use this slide to have open dialogue about what next steps need to be taking with the district and identify what support is needed from CRIT, OIF, etc. and get commitment to have follow up meeting.
Next Steps

- Membership
- Terms of Reference
- First meeting date
- First meeting agenda
- Other?

Use this slide as discussion point with audience to get commitments to move forward on the listed element for building your team. The key is to solicit as much commitment to support the team building process as possible. **Need to push hard if no volunteers!**

Advise participant that companion package includes information about the Fort St. John FSP pilot project that highlights some of the advantages of working collaboratively (slides 63 and 64).

*Introduce speakers and topic for afternoon portion of the district all licensee meeting, i.e. Normal district all licensee meeting agenda topics.*
Benefits of Fort St John Code Pilot

- Allows licensees within a timber supply area with volume based tenures to operate with the planning certainty and control of an area based tenure similar to a TFL.
- Approval of SFMP is subject to MoF as well as MoE (additional government oversight)
- Allows participants to manage the land base using professional reliance and innovation
- Coordinated planning among participants allows easy measurement and a coordinated approach to achieving landscape level targets
- Ease of measurement of cumulative impacts to land base of proposed forest activities from all licensees across the TSA
- Reduced costs to Participants: Coordinated planning reduces costs of redundant analysis by multiple licensees and overlap of proposed activities.
- Increased public involvement in the planning process, knowledge of what is occurring on the land base and acceptance of activities.
Why it is Working

- Trust, Respect and Co-operation
  - Between the participants
  - Between government and participants
  - Between the public and the participants

- Research and expert advice
  - The Fort St. John Pilot Project Participants enlisted the help of respected experts in their fields from government (regional and provincial experts), academia (PhDs) and industry to assist in devising appropriate strategies for the Fort St John TSA, or adopting their existing work to suit the Fort St. John TSA.

- Accountability
  - Many of the Landscape Level Strategies and indicators identified in the SFMP are legal and enforceable by C&E, and the participants are required to report out on compliance, conformance and success in meeting targets identified in the SFMP in annual reports.
Appendix to
Forest Management Leadership Team Building Session
Culture Change Presentation Companion Guide
A Charter for Professional Reliance
2010 Forest Management Leadership Team Building Initiative

We are responsible for understanding, acknowledging and adhering to the standards of professional practice.

We support increased use of Professional Reliance, described here today, as a means of improving how we do business.

We endeavour to work as a collective community to achieve common goals and outcomes by:

1. Showing respect and trust in professionals:
   - Listen and be open to new ideas and opinions
   - Resolve our differences in the field where possible
   - Strive to support the work of professionals without challenge
   - Consider the needs of others

2. Practicing due diligence within our scope of expertise and training

3. Being accountable to the products produced and the advice given

4. Looking for common goals/objectives when interacting

5. Supporting professional development among our peers

6. Accepting the different roles and responsibilities of our peers.

7. Working as a team to resolve forest management issues

8. Recognizing the need for professional independence

9. Committing the time and resources to the culture shift necessary to implement the professional reliance model.

10. Supporting your local team to the degree possible.

“All parties share the challenge of communication, and especially in the need to maintain a dialogue that provides for clarification, feedback and continuous improvement.”

“From Concept to Practice: Professional Reliance in Forest and Range Management in British Columbia, ABCFP, July 2006.”

We, the undersigned, independently agree to the charter of professional reliance and support the contents of the charter as one means for furthering professional reliance in forestry.
Coast Forest Region
Forest Management Leadership Team All Licensee Meeting
Professional Reliance and Innovation Key Messages

Background
The Honourable Minister Pat Bell, Minister of Forests and Range (MFR) initiated an Operations “Quick Win” process through MFR staff and licensees to support the forestry business in BC. One result of the deliberations was the recognition that innovation has an important role in future opportunities, improvements and efficiencies.

Quick Win # 2.6 “enable innovation as promoted in FRPA”.

For the tenure relationship between the MFR and the tenure holder, innovation in forestry will continue to be an important force to reduce costs, improve growth, find solutions to problems, and create products, build industries, and so on. Innovation in the forestry context will require expertise, trust and common understanding in order to be effective. An Innovation Planning Team was established to produce a document containing the common understanding of terminology and concepts. This paper is intended to cultivate that common understanding of innovation.

During the Coast Forest Region’s Forest Management Leadership Team All Licensee Meetings held in early 2010, a number of key messages related to the definition of innovation and the role of professional reliance were discussed. This document has been developed to capture these messages.

1) Professional Reliance Key Messages

i) Roles/Responsibilities of theSubmitter, Reviewer and Delegated Decision Maker.
In the realm of practicing forestry under forest legislation and within the context of professional reliance, there are differing roles and responsibilities three of which are distinct and described here.

Fundamental professional concepts:
• safety of people and the environment is paramount
• practice only within bounds of authority, training and experience; understand personal limitations
• standards of professional practice, including the due diligence standard
• base professional judgement on sound knowledge and science
• carry out work to a standard that meets the test of a reasonable professional, judged by peers
• act honestly, fairly and courteously in interactions with others

Submitting Professional is responsible to identify and clearly present implications and risks associated with recommendations and exercise due diligence including adequate documentation of a rationale in support of the recommendations. The work of that
professional must be commensurate with the level of risk or departure from the norm and would generally require assessments, documentation where required and specific expertise and/or experience. They must also clearly identify who is accountable for the supporting assessments and evaluations. Where a professional is relying on the work of others in providing advice, that professional should confirm that the work he is relying on was completed by suitably qualified and experienced individuals and that the work he is relying on is of acceptable quality and standard. Further, in relying on work of others, the professional must understand the implications of that reliance with respect to the resulting advice being provided.

Reviewing Professionals are relied upon by a delegated decision maker to ensure submissions meet legal requirements and are professionally supportable. The reviewing professional should not challenge the work of professionals unless evidence suggests there are problems with the professional quality of the work. Reviewing professionals, may, however, use probing questions to build their rationale for supporting the proposal to present to the decision maker. Those probing questions are to confirm that the professional was qualified and experienced to be making the proposal, has documentation available upon request, identify who is accountable for the work and ascertain that all relevant factors were considered. Under a professional reliance model, government professionals should ideally be in a position to support the work of another professional without actually reviewing the work first hand. The only time this would not be the case is where new information becomes available to the reviewer which suggests that continued support would not be reasonable and the reviewing professional has the necessary expertise to make that judgement. In other words, the only grounds for not supporting would be if the submission does not meet the legal requirements or is not professionally sound, not because the reviewer disagrees with the balance point between social, economic or ecological.

Statutory Decision Maker is guided by statute on how to base any legal determination including the information that can be requested. These decision makers make their decisions on the basis of all relevant information brought to their attention from any source, but they also rely on the advice of professionals on staff. Legal determinations usually require a written rationale in support of the decision. This is especially tricky for an AAC determination. The Chief Forester must produce a rationale to support the determination which is reviewable by any member of the public. In some cases the Chief Forester may require that the work be reviewed by government in order to be included in his rationale. It is the role of the decision maker, when reviewing the context of the situation and all of the information provided to determine the appropriate balance point between social, economic and ecological. It is also their role as to the level of risk to accept.

ii) Conceptual thinking versus reality thinking: Where there is a lack of trust and professionals submit new ideas to the district without prior engagement the result can be an office based conceptualization of how something new might be applied in the field
based on worst case assumptions and a concern that approval would lead to a negative outcome. This is especially true where the intended application is not well defined in scope, scale or application. This does not create an atmosphere that embraces development of trust or promotion of change. On the other hand, a field trip which allows the submitting professional to define how something is intended to be applied usually results in reality based thinking and a broader understanding of scope, scale and intended application. This also builds the level of trust.

iii) **Contract of trust:** Under a professional reliance model where professionals work towards common goals using field trips to discuss and resolve their differences, it should be possible to also develop a relationship based on trust. It should be possible for the reviewing professional and possibly the statutory decision maker to say “I understand your intent as you have described it and I trust you to your word.” Such a contract of trust would lead to reduced correspondence, increased professional reliance of their work and shorter approval times. That trust would be tested through FREP monitoring. The value of this contract of trust would be lost if it was ever shown that the professional was not trustworthy such as where something was not implemented consistent with their description.

iv) **The single field trip:** A single field trip can reduce the need for countless e-mail exchanges, phone calls and/or office meetings. That field trip should take place prior to developing a submission and would allow for professional to exchange information, ideas and their opinions thus improving the quality of the resultant submission. When professionals come to an understanding of how something is intended to be applied in the field setting, it makes it easier for the reviewing professional to support wording that might be less than clear when presenting to the decision maker. Differences of opinion should be discussed in a field setting with an understanding that it is okay to disagree but ultimately the proposing professional, who is accountable for the submission, makes the final call on what is proposed. These field exchanges should ensure that the submitting professional considers all known information and improves their ability to show due diligence. It should also result in that submission being accepted as professionally sound by the reviewing professional based on an increased knowledge of the intended application and the background work by the submitting professional.

2) **Innovation Definition, Principles, Roles and Responsibilities**

i) **Definition**

Dictionaries have variously defined innovation as the “act of introducing something new” ; “to bring in new methods, ideas, etc; make changes; introduce for the first time,

---


especially to the market”. Some dictionaries go further and describe innovation not only from the “output of a process” but also from the perspective of the process itself.

Forestry is a science and relies on scientific method, tested processes and monitored outcomes. It can be many years before the results of actions applied today are realized. Therefore, forestry is also an expertise to balance social, economic and environmental values through the application of professional judgment. Innovation in forestry can best be defined as a new idea, applied successfully.

“New idea” includes such things as an approach, product, result, method, system, etc. “Applied successfully” refers to scientific foundation, logical and constructed processes of application and not necessarily to the successful conclusion of results.

The likelihood of a desired outcome or result is increased by applying an accepted process, composed of key foundation components. The foundation components of innovation include a specialized knowledge or expertise, the experience necessary to consider the potential outcomes, a clear purpose, a working environment for creativity, a discipline of experimentation, analysis, risk assessment and the ability to communicate the results broadly.

**Basic definition: Innovation is a new idea, applied successfully.**

The Innovation Equation:  
\[ \text{Innovation} = (\text{purpose} + \text{specialized knowledge} + \text{experience} + \text{creativity} + \text{test} + \text{risk assessment} + \text{analysis} + \text{communicate}) \]

Applied Definition: Innovation is a creative idea that is pursued through successful application by using facts, logic, reason, testing and reporting.

**ii) Principles of Innovation**

The innovation process in FRPA can be implemented immediately within operating areas by following these principles:

- **The roles are applied correctly.** The roles described above are supported by the employers in FRPA and are neither applied to a minimal degree or with extraordinary zeal. The effort is moderate to a sufficient extent.
- **Innovation process includes all of the key foundation components.** The extent to which each component is addressed is related to achieving sufficiency without excess. For example, sufficient knowledge refers to the amount of information and the quality or balance of information, necessary to measure, monitor and report the outcome.

---
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- There is a proactive communication and sharing of information between the parties involved to a reasonable and proportional extent. The proportion refers to the complexity and risk.
- Effort is proportional to the scale and scope of the prescribed innovation. The greater the complexity and risk of a prescribed innovation, then the more effort and emphasis will be necessary in the roles of prescription, assessment and implementation. (i.e. background information, monitoring, reporting, etc.)
- A sharing and continuous learning process is carried out with a reasonable regularity.
- Collaborative approach to innovation is the best chance for significant innovative gain (giant steps forward)

iii) Roles, Rules and Expectations
Licensees, agencies and government look to innovation to solve some of the current problems in the forest business. While innovation might be the common word between the parties, the expectations of innovation can be different. Some views of innovation include increased efficiencies, while others include reduced risk, and still others include both. Applying these independent views can become barriers to innovation. For example, the Forest Practices Code used pre-established values, science, logical principles and proven methodology as a basis for practice rules. The FRPA framework anticipates that a reduction in rules and increase in professional reliance will be more effective and efficient. Some have interpreted this to mean ‘practice without rules or standards’ and others have interpreted it to mean ‘proof before practice’. A more inclusive perspective is science, logical principles and established methods are part of professional rationale in support of innovative practice.

The role of a professional prescribing innovation includes the development of a professional rationale sufficient to explain and support the design to a reasonable extent.

The role of the professional assessing the prescribed innovation includes a reasonable professional diligence relative to the purpose of the assessment.

The role of the professional implementing a prescribed innovation includes sufficient comprehension and monitoring to achieve the designed outcome. In addition, the implementing professional has the added duty to modify the prescribed innovation based on monitored results.

The professional’s role in the process demonstrates that innovation in FRPA is a useful and necessary value that is everyone’s responsibility. However, care must be exercised to ensure that what is occurring is indeed innovative and not just opportunistic. He freedom to exercise innovation is a balanced by the rigor of the innovation process.
February 24, 2010
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Chair(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provincial FRPA Implementation Team (PFIT)</td>
<td>Strategic FRPA Implementation Issues</td>
<td>Brian Westgate, A/Manager of Policy Implementation / PFIT Chair, MFR. <a href="mailto:Brian.Westgate@gov.bc.ca">Brian.Westgate@gov.bc.ca</a> 250 387-8620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Issues Management Working Group</td>
<td>Technical FRPA Implementation Issues</td>
<td>Tracy Andrews, A/Senior Timber Tenures Forester, MFR. <a href="mailto:Tracy.Andrews@gov.bc.ca">Tracy.Andrews@gov.bc.ca</a> 250 387-8328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Silviculture Sub-Team</td>
<td>Technical Silviculture Implementation Issues</td>
<td>Brian Westgate, A/Manager of Policy Implementation / PFIT Chair, MFR. <a href="mailto:Brian.Westgate@gov.bc.ca">Brian.Westgate@gov.bc.ca</a> 250 387-8620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Region FRPA Implementation Team (CRIT)</td>
<td>Technical FRPA Implementation Issues</td>
<td>Hal Reveley, Manager, EBM Implementation, MFR. <a href="mailto:Hal.Reveley@gov.bc.ca">Hal.Reveley@gov.bc.ca</a> 250 751-7097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joe LeBlanc, Senior Forester, International Forest Products Ltd. <a href="mailto:joe.leblanc@interfor.com">joe.leblanc@interfor.com</a> 250 286-5148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Region Silviculture Working Group (SWG)</td>
<td>Technical Silviculture Implementation Issues</td>
<td>Craig Wickland, Silviculturist, MFR. <a href="mailto:Craig.Wickland@gov.bc.ca">Craig.Wickland@gov.bc.ca</a> 250 751-7094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Region Resource Planning Working Group (RPWG)</td>
<td>Technical FRPA planning and practices issues.</td>
<td>Angus Hope, Canadian Overseas Log and Lumber Limited <a href="mailto:ahope@coll.bc.ca">ahope@coll.bc.ca</a> 604 682-0425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM/VP Policy Group</td>
<td>Forest Management Policy Issues</td>
<td>Contact Brian Westgate for more information <a href="mailto:Brian.Westgate@gov.bc.ca">Brian.Westgate@gov.bc.ca</a> 250 387-8620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM Operations Industry Forum</td>
<td>Forest Management Policy Issues</td>
<td>Contact Brian Westgate for more information <a href="mailto:Brian.Westgate@gov.bc.ca">Brian.Westgate@gov.bc.ca</a> 250 387-8620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Operations Issues Working Group</td>
<td>Forest Act Implementation Issues</td>
<td>Wayne Martin, Regional Services Manager-Stewardship, MFR. <a href="mailto:Wayne.Martin@gov.bc.ca">Wayne.Martin@gov.bc.ca</a> 250 565-6102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Les Kiss, Vice President, Forestry, Coast Forest Products Association <a href="mailto:kiss@coastforest.org">kiss@coastforest.org</a> 604 891-1239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Region Operational Issues Forum (OIF)</td>
<td>Forest Act Implementation Issues</td>
<td>Sharon Hadway, A/Regional Executive Director, MFR. <a href="mailto:Sharon.Hadway@gov.bc.ca">Sharon.Hadway@gov.bc.ca</a> 250 751-7163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Otto Schulte, Vice President, Coastal Woodlands, International Forest Products Ltd. <a href="mailto:Otto.Schulte@interfor.com">Otto.Schulte@interfor.com</a> 250 286-5106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Forest Management Leadership Teams (FMLT)</td>
<td>Technical FRPA and Forest Act Implementation Issues</td>
<td>Local District Manager or appointee. <a href="http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/mof/regdis.htm">http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/mof/ regdis.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District TSA Steering Committee</td>
<td>Local Forest Management Issues</td>
<td>Local District Manager or appointee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSR Technical Team</td>
<td>Timber Supply Issues</td>
<td>Local District Manager or appointee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 District teams to be formed in 2010.
Terms of Reference

District Forest Management Leadership Team

Objectives

To enhance trust and relationships to resolve local issues.

To provide the local forest sector with a stronger voice at the Operational Issues Forum and the Coast Region FRPA Implementation Team.

To improve the efficiency of the forest sector overall by providing an organized structure for clear and productive communications and promoting cooperation in management.

To support continued learning for licensee/BCTS and MFR professionals by sharing innovative ideas, transferring new or current technological information and working to understand the challenges faced by all members of the group.

Mandate

Work in a team environment to resolve local forest sector issues, communicate direction and guidance from OIF and CRIT, and provide a forum to voice local issues and to raise issues to a regional level through OIF or CRIT.

Guiding Principles

The following general principles will govern the team:

✔ Foundation of professional reliance
✔ Build open, strong relationships and teams
✔ Respectful regard for different points of view
✔ Seek to understand issues with an open mind
✔ Apply science, logic and reason
✔ Practice only within bounds of authority, training and experience
✔ Seek help in resolving disputes
✔ Promote the understanding of professional reliance and the concept of the contract of trust
✔ Promote the use of field trips to improve decision making and forest practices
✔ Uphold legislation and policy

Scope

The focus will be on resolving local operational issues under the Forest Act and FRPA. The team will seek a balanced approach to issues by considering all the objectives established under the Ministry of Forest and Range Act

✔ Encourage maximum forest productivity
✔ Manage protect and conserve the forest resources
✔ Plan the use of forest resources and other natural resources in consultation and cooperation with other ministries and the private sector
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- Encourage a vigorous, efficient and world competitive timber processing industry
- Assert the financial interest of government fairly
- Resolve local issues within provincial and/or regional interpretations of current policy and legislation.
- Discuss and propose amendments to policies and legislation to improve efficiencies and forest stewardship.

Structure

Each district will have a working team. The team is comprised representatives of local licensees, preferably including all the different tenure types, BCTS and ministry staff. The membership will be flexible and based on the agenda topics but should strive to have the following core people:

- District and licensee/BCTS co-chair
- Local CRIT representative or
- Local OIF representative

Meetings will be scheduled as required but there should be no less than 4 team meetings/year in the first year at least one of which should be face to face (due to economic conditions, it may be necessary to conduct these meeting by conference call initially). Members from CRIT and OIF will provide updates from regional meetings and ensure they represent local interests at those meetings.

Team ‘Minutes’ or ‘Decision/Action Items’ will be recorded and kept by the chairpersons.

The team will conduct an evaluation of each meeting to assess effectiveness. Evaluation can be done anonymously or verbally. Results of evaluation are to be documented as part of meeting minutes.

The team will elect its own chairs and develop its own TOR based on the core principles described in this document, except that the District Manager will act as the MFR co-chair for the first year. The TOR should consider how other local groups such as First Nation licensees, woodlots or other small tenure holders are represented and consider whether to include other agencies as core members, adjunct members or invited guests.

Requirements for Success

- Leadership support from managers of Licensees/BCTS, MFR, and other agencies to support staff participation.
- Managing the size of the team and representation of the different interests.
- Clarity on roles and responsibilities of members for communicating to and representing their constituents
- Co-chairs of the working group will be responsible for ensuring that their team looks after its own administrative needs (e.g. meeting arrangements, document preparation and distribution, records of decision etc.).
- Focus on forest management issues (Forest Act, Forest and Range Practices Act, related resource legislation) at the local level
- Plan to Celebrate the Successes.
- Continued focus on mandate
- Effective communications
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**Documentation**

Relevant documentation for working group meetings, including agendas and decision records will be sent to participatory working group members in a timely manner and kept on a central file for future reference.

**Reporting**

Provide annual summary report to regional OIF and CRIT by mid March for the previous year. The summary report will outline, as a minimum, the issues addressed and the results, and describe planned actions for the new year.

District level teams should also routinely share information with CRIT or OIF consistent with the scope of these two teams regarding any local level solutions which might be useful elsewhere in the region or province, and forward topics which require resolution at the regional or provincial level to the appropriate regional team (CRIT or OIF).