What would an ideal model for the forest practices system look like?

Facilitator for Group 1A: Ben Cashore

Facilitator for Group 1B: Rob de Fegley

Discussion starters:

Is a co-regulatory approach appropriate?

Should the forest practices system be focussed on prescriptions/processes or outcomes?

How can certification fit into the picture?

How do we foster continuous improvements of forest practices in ways that reward rather than punish?

1A

Co-regulation = Skills

⤷ can't transfer	Knowledge
• to developing countries	Pride
⤷ wages, corruption	Cost of non-comp high
• larger population	Culture
• outside system	small population
⤷ small block owners	trust

Prescriptions? → HYBRID objective
   ⤷ Perverse outcomes   clear
      - Culverts 3x600
      - Flexibility / Monitoring
      - Habitat clumps
      - Balance
      - Prescriptive ## restrictive
      - Discretion
      - Certainty

1A

Certification
  ⤷ for highly prescriptive jurisdictions
      ⤷ Good gov'ce countries
      ⤷ YES → markets w/ international
          - Assurance / Quality control
          - Third Party
          - Group scheme
          - small owners

  ⤷ Reserve system
      - FSC vs PEFC

Reward Not Punish

      ⤷ Trust → Turn word ng around   value
      Reserve - economic benefit
          - customers must pay
          - Professionalism   → Pride
          Reward beyond   sticks

1B Model FPS?

- Co-regulatory appropriate (cf eg NSW/ Qld/ Vic)

- Clear prescriptions/ process > outcomes

- Certification goes further than FPS,
  but FPS contributes to certification

- Training & education are primary means for changing behaviour; sanction necessary but last resort

What should a new Forest Practices Code look like?

Facilitator for Group 2A: Stephen Walker

Facilitator for Group 2B: Ann La Sala

- Discussion starters:
- How should different types of operations and land uses be treated?
- How might we use technology to develop simpler outcome-based regulation?
- What level of skill should be expected of practitioners around the Code?

2A.

__A NEW CODE?__   EXISTING FPC PRINCIPLES ARE SOUND. —
FOR PLANTATIONS AND NATIVE FORESTS AND QUARRY?

__PLANNING FUNCTION?__   A RISK BASED MODEL.

CODE

- BETTER INTEGRATION OF STREAMS FOR PLANTATION IN CODE.

- PHYSICAL REMODEL FOR QUICK REFERENCE IN FIELD.

- OUTCOME BASED. i.e. GPS BOUNDARIES vs TAPING c.1.5

PLANNING FUNCTIONS

- RISK BASED DECISION TREE.

- 2 PAGE FPP (TIGHT PRESCRIP-TIONS) FOR PLANTATIONS - SAMPLE

- FULL FPP FOR NATIVE FOREST.

- Technology based Template for FPPS
  - Plantation
  - Native ??

PEOPLE?   ADDRESSING ALL NEEDS - OPERATORS

- SECTORAL WORKERS (HARVEST / SILVICULTURAL)

- TRAINING.

2B – FPC review

- Renewal agreed, building on current Code

- Who's the audience – contractors, supervisors, planners

- One code or two?? – just one thanks …

- Outcomes-focused/ risk-based,
  which helps future-proof/ enable new tech

- "will" vs "should" – limit the latter

- socio-economics incorporated into planning process

- some specifics – eg searchable pdf

- don't extend Section E reform too far forward

How can the socio-economic impacts of proposed regulations be best addressed in the forest practices system?

Facilitator for Group 3A: Jacqui Schirmer

Facilitator for Group 3B: Terry Edwards

- Discussion starters:
- Effects on timber yield
- Effects on infrastructure for agriculture and urban developments?
- Effects on community well-being (bushfire prevention, air quality, road safety)
- Effects on community values such as cultural heritage and sense-of-place.

3AB Socio-economic

- This is an issue broader than the forest practices system
- Retrospective - Evaluate socio-economic impacts of existing regulation, evidence based, peer reviewed and objective
- Prospective –
- Develop policy framework that sets principles, values that underpin decision making eg around social justice, equity, fairness, land use – needs to be whole of government
- Develop clear metrics people can use to measure and report
- Better information and transparency at landscape scale not just individual property/coupe (not FPOs)
- Care needed to avoid polarisation of values – decision maker required/ impasse breaker

3AB continued

- How to have a good process at coupe/property/small scale level
  - Don't require impact assessment for everyone – cost and time
  - Ensure people have opportunity to have a say on proposed activities – appropriate notification going beyond adjacent landholders as needed
  - If concerns raised, assess need to investigate (independent assessor)
  - Investigate where necessary using broader policy principles
- Focus on supporting people to design well in the first place when developing proposals rather than being punitive afterwards
  - Toolboxes, design support etc
- What issues to be considered: timber yield, non timber products, ecosystem services, investment, community viability, community/ cultural values, weeds, fire (air quality), roads, access, recreation…

How could we best monitor the effectiveness of guidelines and prescriptions delivered through the forest practices system?

Facilitator for Group 4A: Sarah Munks

Facilitator for Group 4B: Fred Duncan

- Discussion starters:
- What is the relative importance of the different types of monitoring – compliance (have we done what we said we would do?), effectiveness (has it worked?) and trend monitoring (e.g. population changes over time)? Which should be the focus of the FPA?
- How confident are we that the Code provisions are effective?
- Whose responsibility is it to monitor and report data on fauna and flora population trends in areas subject to forestry?
- Are current reporting systems adequate (compliance audits, annual reports, State of the Forests reports)?
- Is the continual improvement process understood and is it effective?

4A – monitoring

- all types of monitoring
(compliance, effectiveness, trend)
  - trend – by others, FPS contributing
(more frequent, live, centralised?)
  - prioritised, clear question
  - clarity about use of results
  - increased FPO role in compliance monitoring
- new technologies for sharing across govt
- need for landscape scale monitoring
  - impact of firewood harvesting

4B - Monitoring

- current reporting adequate at some levels
- potential better use of tech for compliance/ on ground works
- monitoring – FPA/ DPIPWE/ companies/ small landowners?
- role of citizen science
- biodiversity – eg WHS
- socio-economic – water quality

Do we need to increase community understanding of the forest practices system within the broader Tasmanian community and beyond?

Facilitator for Group 5A: John Hickey

Facilitator for Group 5B: Mark Leech

- Discussion starters:
- Why is this important?
- What information do various communities require?
- Do effective regulatory systems increase community acceptance?
- Can effective regulatory systems increase market access (or is this better addressed through certification)?
- How can regulatory authorities increase community understanding of complex systems.

5A Community Understanding

internal + external to the industry

YES!

* assist with improving trust.
* increase uptake of FPC with agriculturalists
* assist with compliance

* Communication methods — drain the FP swamp!

* dispell the fear of forestry

invest in communication exploration in engagement + time

* social licence

* confidence in 3rd party independance

* categories of community — affected vs interested
  influence
  influencers
  dis interested

* understanding values
* political dynamics
* population bases
* direct + indirect interests
* durable is not guaranteed
  never

5B - community understanding

Who do we need to influence & educate?

- Education is the key, at multiple levels;
short-term (Kids/ parents)
long-term (intergenerational)

- primary, secondary, tertiary
  - eg Yola School (Utas)

- review work to date (Tas, nationally)
  - eg various models (FEF, Arbre Hub)

- increase collaboration (…)