

CANADIAN COUNCIL OF FOREST MINISTERS'  
CRITERIA AND INDICATORS OF  
SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT  
INDICATOR REVIEW



SECOND TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETING  
25 & 26 April, 2002, Ottawa, Ontario

**CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES**

**TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP PRELIMINARY LIST  
OF IMPROVED CCFM INDICATORS  
FOR SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT**

June 21, 2002

## INTRODUCTION:

Five Technical Working Groups for reviewing the indicators in the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers' (CCFM) framework of Criteria and Indicators (C&I) of Sustainable Forest Management held their second meeting at the Delta Hotel and Suites in Ottawa, Ontario on April 25 and 26, 2002. Each Technical Working Group has been assembled to review and revise the indicators under one of Criteria 1, 2, 3, 5, or 6 in the CCFM C&I framework.

At their previous meeting, on March 15, 2002, members of the Technical Working Groups (TWG) were each asked to individually submit an initial list of potential indicators for their Criterion to the Secretariat. The submitted indicators for each group were compiled and these compiled lists were provided back to the groups prior to their meeting on April 25 and 26. These lists of initial indicators provided a starting point for the groups' discussions on revising the indicators at their April 25 and 26 meeting.

The resultant lists of preliminary indicators developed by the Technical Working Groups during this meeting are available in two accompanying documents:

1. "Summary List: Technical Working Group Recommendations for Improved CCFM Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management."
2. "Working Document: Technical Working Group Preliminary Recommendations for Improved CCFM Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management."

As a result of their meetings, the Technical Working Groups identified a number of issues that cross between criteria, such as similar indicators being suggested by different working groups and common terminology between groups that may require common definitions. A list of these issues has been developed in consultation with the TWG chairs and is given below. This list should stimulate discussion within the Technical Working Groups. This list is not exhaustive and group members are encouraged to contribute further to this list through email and conference call discussions with their groups before the final Technical Working Group meeting in August 2002. The TWG chairs will be contacting members during the summer for their input. Where possible, TWG chairs will try to resolve issues through group discussions during the summer. In other cases, issues may be dealt with at the final Technical Working Group meeting in August.

## CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES BETWEEN CRITERIA

The Technical Working Groups identified a number of indicators or values, issues or concerns addressed under one criterion in the current CCFM C&I framework that they felt should be moved to a different criterion. There was also some overlap between indicators identified by different Technical Working Groups.

Indicator	Issue
<b>TWG 1</b>	
Area of forest types in protected areas	May be better suited under Criterion 6 rather than criterion 1
<b>TWG 2</b>	
Annual removal of wood products compared to amount determined to be sustainable	Addressed under Criterion 5 in current framework but may be better suited under criterion 2
Percentage and extent of forest type and age class by ecoregion	The same indicator was also suggested by TWG 1, but may be well suited here.
Density of linear features defined by linear feature type by ecoregion	Very similar to the indicator suggested by TWG1, "Road/linear corridors density/use type and location
Nutrient export from forested watersheds	May be better suited under criterion 3
<b>TWG 3</b>	
Percentage of managed forest area used for main	Overlaps with indicators 1.1.5 suggested by TWG 1

roads, haul roads, landings, staging areas, secondary roads and trails having received more than four passes of machinery without impact mitigation measures	and 2.1.4 suggested by TWG 2.
Percent of forest landbase occupied by permanent access	Some overlap with indicator 1.1.5 suggested by TWG 1 and 2.1.4 suggested by TWG 2
Area of forest harvested using full tree harvesting	Overlap with indicator 2.1.1.3 suggested by TWG 2, although slightly different slant
Area, percentage and representativeness of soil types in protected areas	For consideration of TWG 1 as indicator under criterion 1
Percentage of managed forest area dominated by plant species capable of degrading the ecological capacity of soil (e.g. ericaceous shrubs)	For consideration of TWG 1 as indicator under criterion 1
Loss of productive landbase expressed as % landbase not sufficiently regenerated (or as hectares of forest land)	For consideration of TWG 2 as indicator under criterion 2, opposite of indicator 2.2.2
Amount of harvested area successfully reforested and certified as achieving site renewal objectives at year 7 regeneration survey	For consideration of TWG 2 as indicator under criterion 2, similar to indicator 2.2.2
<b>TWG 5</b>	
Availability of recreational opportunities by type of activity and by province	Some overlap with indicator 1.1.3 suggested by TWG 1
Area and percent of forest land available for subsistence purposes	Under criterion 6 in current framework but may be better suited under criterion 5
Percent authorized (available) harvest area actually harvested// Annual removal of industrial roundwood relative to the sustainable level of harvesting// Annual removal of wood products compared to volume determined to be sustainable	Overlaps with indicator 2.1.2 suggested by TWG 2.
Annual removal of non-timber products relative to the sustainable level of harvesting	Very similar to potential indicator "Annual removal of non-timber products" suggested by TWG 2
Element 6.3 (community sustainability) indicators	May be better suited under Criterion 5 because there is a socio-economic benefit
Indicators related to resource productivity	May be better suited under Criterion 2
Indicators related to investment in R&D, etc	May be better suited under Criterion 6
Degree of recycling of wood forest products	Indicator 4.4.1 in current framework, but may be better suited under criterion 5

Technical Working Group 5 also felt that moving indicators under element 6.3 to criterion 5, moving resource productivity indicators from criterion 5 to criterion 2, and moving indicators related to investment in R&D, etc. from criterion 5 to criterion 6 may help better align the CCFM criteria with the Montreal Process Criteria such that the relationship between the two frameworks will be:

CCFM	Montreal Process
1	1
2	2 & 3
3	4
4	5
5	6
6	7

In addition to moving indicators between criteria, there is also an issue of common terminology. The most obvious example is the use of the term "forest type", which is used in many indicators. The Technical Working Groups should consider either better defining what is meant for their indicators or else consider

using a common definition. Possible uses of this term could include: Forest type as used in Canada's Forest inventory (i.e. Softwood, mixedwood, hardwood, unclassified); Forest Type as used by the Global Forest Resource Assessment (i.e. Conifer, broadleaf, mixed, palm) (these are not identical to Canada's Forest Inventory); species groups; or ecozones. Technical Working Groups are encouraged to watch for other possibly confusing terminology during their deliberations.