

HCVF/AoR Technology Transfer Workshop – Edmonton, May 17 and 18, 2005

Participant's closing remarks (compiled May 27, 2005):

Comments about the HCVF framework and AoR tool	
Participant Comments	WWF Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One participant was still uncertain how the two tools relate and are best used together. • Not convinced HCVF is a good concept – instead should consider all values. Need a logical tool for identifying all values, not just outstanding, high values • Strength of the approach: flexibility. Weakness: open to different interpretations • Tools are too focused on protection and not on best management • HCVF framework is good in part because of subjectivity – local knowledge can be added • Concerned about the quality of protected areas and that too many are long and narrow (i.e., river corridors): incorporate area to boundary ratio function in the AoR tool. • Need to document the known limitations of AoR tool 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The HCVF framework provides guidance to practitioners for implementing Principal 9 of the FSC Canada National Boreal Standard; it can also be applied independent of a FSC certification process. The concept focuses on an ecoregion scale assessment of the environmental, social and/or cultural values that make a particular forest area of outstanding significance. A wide range of conservation values at multiple scales are considered in the assessment, but only those determined to be critical and/or outstanding are identified as HCVs. The intent of Principal 9 is to manage those forests in order to maintain or enhance the identified HCVs. That management may or may not include full or partial protection, depending on the value. The AoR tool is intended to assist with the identification of deferral areas within a comprehensive conservation planning context where the objective is to fill gaps in a network of protected areas representing all major habitat types.. The AoR tool is best applied at an ecoregional scale (e.g., across multiple tenures). The HCVF framework and AoR tool can be used in a complementary fashion to strategically identify HCVs at multiple scales. The role of HCVF assessments and the AoR tool in comprehensive conservation planning will be addressed in more depth in the HCVF Support</i>

	<p><i>Document</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Documentation for the ArcGIS 9 version of the AoR tool will include a list of known issues and limitations, both in terms of its application and technical issues</i>
<p>Comments about WWF's HCVF support document</p>	
<p>Participant Comments</p>	<p>WWF Comments</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be explicit about management practices for different values and about practices considered not acceptable for maintaining certain values. • Try developing the HCVF framework as a gaming tool in which HCVs would be assigned different ratings and user could see impacts of potential changes on the landscape • Several participants said they would like to see HCV 5 and 6 more directly addressed. • Still unclear about aspects of HCVF framework and two apparently different avenues: protected and spatially defined (e.g., bird nesting sites) vs those not spatially defined (e.g., old growth). Are HCVs static or dynamic temporally and spatially? If an HCVF burns, is it still an HCVF? • Add guidance on dealing with lack of data. Need to understand why enduring features are being used and the implications of using this data set vs. other and/or additional data sets (e.g, a vegetation data set) • Recognize the tool is evolving and the geographic context. The following need to be addressed more explicitly to allow for more 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The concept of static vs. dynamic HCV zones will be explored in more detail in the HCVF Support Document. We recommend that HCV zones be spatially delineated (mapped) and can be adjusted over time based on changes in the distribution, condition and threat of the conservation attribute.</i> • <i>Additional sources of data for HCVF Assessments, including potential methods of analysis utilizing widely available datasets, will be addressed in the HCVF Support Document</i> • <i>WWF-Canada's FTP site (ftp://ftp.wwf.ca login: forests pw: gc678yy) is developing a repository for HCVF resources, and these will also soon be available via our website.</i> • <i>WWF will recommend in the Support Document that threats assessments be incorporated as part of HCVF assessments.</i> • <i>Lack of data is often treated in terms of a precautionary approach. The HCVF Support Document will address this issue.</i>

<p>rational decisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ecological context – scale up from the management unit 2. Ecological context of species 3. Threats issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request that WWF and FPAC provide information and links on their websites, to have websites serve as clearinghouse for contacts, reports, more HCVF resources. • Recommend a formal threats assessment be conducted prior to starting HCVF assessments – this will provide important context. 	
<p>Comments about application of the HCFV framework and AoR tool</p>	
<p>Participant Comments</p>	<p>WWF Comments</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCVF management strategies already exist in every FMP- this is simply a formal checklist • One participant questioned how the HCVF framework and AoR tool fit into non-FSC frameworks • Migratory bird/partners in flight boreal bird data is missing from analyses • Use existing protected areas as nucleus for additional/new protected areas • Concerns about consistency of application of the HCVF framework – would like to see it used as tool for teasing out values and management scenarios more than for determination of specific values and management prescriptions. • Assessments need to move outside management unit boundaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The HCVF framework can verify that an attribute of critical and/or outstanding value (i.e. an HCV) is being managed appropriately. Outside of FSC, the HCVF framework can be used as a filter to review the identification and spatial delineation of conservation values and management practices to maintain the attribute. There are at least three possible recommendations that may emerge from such a review: 1) the spatial delineation and management prescription to maintain a value is confirmed; 2) modified (enhanced) management is proposed; and 3) permanent protection is recommended to maintain the HCV. • The HCVF Support Document works through examples that consider an ecoregion scale and a tenure scale.

<p>and include a larger scale analysis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data access: we cannot arrive at a meaningful measure without a full data set, therefore we need a different model of data sharing, or we need to give thought to how to accomplish the assessments with partial data. • Be cautious about adding more data, unless you know it is good data. These are just tools, starting points which need to be followed up with reality checks. 	
<p>Comments about application of HCVF framework as related to oil & gas development (also could have application to other resource sectors)</p>	
<p>Participant Comments</p>	<p>WWF Comments</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oil and gas overlap is the political reality – what to do about it? It negates all the good work that goes into the HCVF and certification assessments. At what level can we address this? • Primary interest is in the outstanding questions in Alberta and NE BC about how to address multi-tenure issues: Should oil and gas be consulted? Is the process a stakeholder and industry issue or is a government issue? • It is difficult to know where oil and gas fits. The line between Al-Pac’s business decision and land use decisions is blurry. Need regional approach to land use. • HCVF assessments must consider full context (e.g., enduring features, politics, social issues); because of oil and gas some management and/or deferral options are not feasible. These tools provide information that needs to be applied on the ground and in the proper context (e.g., government, oil and gas contexts) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The HCVF assessment is not intended to replace comprehensive conservation planning. Many, if not all, of the conservation elements (goals and targets) within comprehensive conservation planning are included in the HCVF framework. Hence, the HCVF framework can help in identifying the distribution of conservation values and forest companies can safeguard those values in a Forest Management Plan. However, the HCVF framework needs to be embedded in a broader land use planning process to allow other land users to adjust their activities, if necessary.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government makes land use decisions. Energy is the primary industry in Alberta. Forest products companies' decisions to pursue certification in no way obligates government or oil and gas sector. WWF should invest time and effort in working with government to help resolve these issues. • Have to have leadership – without Al-Pac's leadership their HCVF assessment would not have happened. If oil and gas had been at the table from the start they would still be working on terms of reference 3 years later. 	
Comments about the workshop	
Participant Comments	WWF Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several participants had expectations that workshop would be a hands-on GIS workshop using case studies. Suggested such a workshop with a few different groups working on the same scenarios. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WWF is reviewing the structure and audience of it's next scheduled workshop.