

FFP Edmonton Workshop, 2008 12 01 - Results of Scenario Discussions

Forest Futures Project of the Sustainable Forest Management Network

Transcribed from flipchart notes and workshop recorder files by Kyle McKenzie, Project Research Associate

Scenario A - Goods from the Woods

Important messages

- Privatization of land
- Individualism – lack of community spirit
- Consumerism
- Large multinationals
- Stressed society
 - Conflict: internationally + locally
- Survival of the fittest
- Wood is king
- Excellent technical resource management is implicit
- Failure at socio-political level creates conflict
- Forests set aside for designated uses and managed well to achieve objectives
- Public are excluded from decision making
- More optimistic than competition can create – hard to understand
- Despite competition and corporate control, you still have biodiversity
- Demographic projections: recall 2050 is end point: 2 billion more worldwide
- Corporations and industry take care of environmental concerns and values
- Who is doing forest recreation when people are cynical about participation?
- But corporations provide these goals to make money.
- Forest industry would need to evolve and deal with market opportunity (Disney or Tembec?)
- Exron – what consolidation may occur? [SCARY!]

Current policies out of sync with this scenario

- Multiple use policies without defined targets
- Need more specific targets
- Lack of management in past + non-contributing areas
- Policies that do not have a provision for valuing [water – low implicit water value; ecological goods and services, non-timber forest products]
- Policies that do not clarify ownership of carbon
- Policies are in sync with this one
- There is a lack of policy-oriented think tanks now (relates to Question 3 regarding needs)
- Individualism theme would continue that trend
- Community organizers out of work except maybe in cities
- Governments moving to regulatory role and walking away from hinterland, reducing employee numbers, offices (consistent with this scenario)

Changes to policies needed, 2010-2020

- Investment in state-of-the-art technologies
 - Canada as teacher in innovation
 - Insufficient incentives
- Revisit land use plan
 - Tough decisions needed
 - Can't be "all things to all people"
 - Need defined targets / thresholds / values based on knowledge of land capability
- Improved 'hosting conditions' to attract investment (multinationals)
- Facility capacity development in aboriginal communities
- Facility development of larger Canadian companies
- Stewardship would become an issue as a result of increased use for fibre and recreation
 - Yet corporations may invest in quality
 - Policy needed to regulate the users – the weekend warriors might trash the place

Solutions and Hurdles

- Privatization of Crown land
 - Positive: for forestry, not agriculture
 - Negative: associated regulatory environment
- Lack of clear policies and processes to facilitate timber growing investment
- Centralization of power raises issues
 - Where will innovation come from?
 - How will crises be handled?
 - Information not shared among the major actors – also less information is available

Plenary Comments

- Culture, music, education, etc. made Finland a very innovative country
- Nationalism was a driving force
- Because we believe they are the leaders, we tend to buy their technology
- Research and development grew in Finland while it shrank here, so we may pay for that over the next 40 years

Scenario B - Peace in the Woods

Important messages

- Thinking people (Collective vs. individual viewpoint) have contributed
- Public has responded
- Innovation has taken us above 'production' / mode commodities
- Empowerment at community level

- A learning society has produced this
- Changed values brought about by?
 - People being pushed to the brink – \$, water, ...
 - Canada's political / financial clout
- First Nations are better off financially
- Cooperation theme
- Internally consistent
- Are there common objectives in this scenario? – Yes
- What is the purpose of the forest management in this scenario?
- To happen, government needs to lead

How people feel

- I feel cynical

Current policies out of sync with this scenario

- x 1. Giving huge tracts of lands to companies for years (tenured)
- x 2. Annual allowable cut less import compared to value of timber and other forest resources, e.g. water
- ✓3. Bottom-up policy – making, devolution (not there yet)
- x 4. Industry's pushback against policy
- x 5. Integration of decision making (lacking); interdepartmental
- x 6. Policies for aboriginal entitlement (lacking)
- x 7. Conflicting policies among departments (fiefdoms)
- ✓8. Provincial, governments allowing communities to have access and control
 - Land Use Planning
 - Lack of land valuation system
 - Process and policies
 - Access management

Changes to policies needed, 2010-2020

- Eco Services – value + tradeoffs
 - Development of markets for
 - Biodiversity services
 - Carbon trading is moving
- We need policy in areas listed in answer to Question 2

Solutions and Hurdles

- Tenure Systems
- Fish and Wildlife Policies – guidelines in protected zones
- Aboriginal rights are low now in terms of clarification and resolution of them
 - e.g. Indian Act changes were in trouble
 - e.g. courts
 - 30 day referrals – courts reject

- Some provinces not following SCC (e.g. Alberta)
- Re: biodiversity - there is a lack of policy at present for reaching those goals
- Parallels – *Fisheries Act* is stronger than *Wildlife Act* but *Fisheries Act* is under attack on this
- Wood policy supports commodity not value added
 - e.g. corporate support not community support
- Devolution
 1. Land use framework + management planning in place
 2. Aboriginal entitlement
 3. Process of public education (including ways of including urban demographic) to support changes
 4. New mechanisms for conflict resolution
 5. Feasible + effective conservation incentives
 - Tough decision-making
 - Lack of public awareness / concern
 - 'NIMBY' / local concerns dominating
 - Short term mandates for governments
 - Encumbered policy process
- Lack of political will to address policy that favour non-commodity values
- Inaction
- Power of current interests limit development of new energy sources; contrast to Germany where pilot projects were possible
- Lack of specific persons to lead on certain issues (Obama – envy)
- Individualistic actions seem to dominate – need more cooperative impulses
- Issue of what values immigrants bring
 - Family support – cooperative?
- NAFTA has limits on Canadian policies
 - e.g. Tag system on Lake Nipigon fisheries!
- More NAFTA – commodities flowing to USA can't be limited (by Canada)
 - Oil
 - Water
 - Agricultural products
 - Other new products
- Municipalities are ill prepared to manage forests. In Ontario and Alberta rather, other parties take the lead (e.g. corporations, First Nations)
- Hurdles
 - Capacity of First Nations, cities
 - Co-management for wildlife management with First Nations is prohibited by Provincial policy
 - Similarly, the tenure system limits co-management with communities of all kinds
 - (Inconsistency in governance between provincial regulations and devolution?)

- How is greater urbanization consistent with more commercial forest? Urban voters have quite different views about forests (e.g. protected areas vs. utilization in sustainable manner, zero cut ideas)

Role of Research in Scenario B?

- Networks needed for local innovation
- Current centralization focuses on commodities, not ecosystems and societies
- Community-based research would go with this scenario

Other thoughts

- 'Top-down' is faster but does not lead to effective devolution

Scenario C - Turbulence in the Woods

Important messages

- Uncomfortable about state of biodiversity
- 'Told you so'
- Urban forestry, an important issue here but not in Scenario B
- Fiefdom strange
- Not enough visualization of consequences of climate change
- Still an extractive industry in Canada, alive and well
- Still lack of coordination between governments regarding natural resources policy
- Failure to deliver non timber values to a society that wants them
- Weak policy and institutional change (except with regard to goods)
- Looks like now with regard to Alberta issues
- Systems beyond recovery (Jurassic Park scenario); irreversible changes occur
- We're still adapting - in climate change world
- Governance - backing away from tenure, public ownership
 - Few safe guards for community biodiversity
- Traditional ecological knowledge affected (can't predict)
- Conflict on urban fringe
- Aboriginal people are not 'disconnected' - different relationship emerges - implausible

How people feel

- Status quo amplified
- Reality of where we're going

Themes to discuss

- Role of government, jurisdictions
- Need for federal policy
- Need for aboriginal affairs policy
- Need for improvement of institutions and policies for forests

- Need for debate over national vision for 10 jurisdictions
- Revision of aboriginal policies with regard to land management
- First Nations don't have relations with provinces, so don't get adequate input into forest policy
- Practicing foresters should be out on land with aboriginal elders

Current policies out of sync with this scenario

- Degradation related to tenure (more stable tenure would result in more fruitful investment in restoration) (in theory but not in practice?)
- Certification schemes
- No urban forest policy
- We need to rethink public participation and how public values are implemented so that people don't lose interest in participating
- Biofuels policy (impact on forests)
- Reforestations in climate changed world.
- Role of federal government
- Precautionary policies don't exist
- Lack of protection for public good
- Capacity for urban-led governance?
- Forests "disconnected" from public
- Agriculture?

Changes to policies needed, 2010-2020

- Procedure to enforce input from public participation
- Clear division / devolution of power
- Better valuation of water
- Revalue non-timber products
- Companies could be reimbursed for good natural resources management
- Vulnerability (climate change) assessments
- Thinking about sustainability of bioenergy
- Mitigate climate change (adapt too!)
- Education / immigration issues
- Do not decentralize control – protect public goods
- Realistic capture of range of forest values
- Build capacity and competence, commitment
- Reward innovation / technology change that benefits the environment
- 'Stewardship ethic'
- Export policies

Solutions and Hurdles

- Money
- Valuation of non-timber things
- History of relationships between parties

- Lack of economic instruments to promote healthy environment
- Established commitments to tenure, industry, etc.
- Institutional sluggishness
- Vested interest

Plenary Comments

- Terms of tenure may be more important than length of tenure
- Proposed biofuels policy here would work better in scenario A
- Regardless, a biofuels policy would be quite different in scenarios A and C
- Standards would need to be different for each scenario
- Even if on the same topic, a policy would have to be very different under each scenario
- We may need to adopt policies that cover problems of all scenarios

Scenario D - Restoration in the Woods

Important messages

- More amenity values but degraded forest???
- Aboriginal empowerment key to dealing with ecological uncertainty (history and land ethic)
- New technologies import / new markets
- Canada unable to compete in traditional commodity markets; particularly in the face of poor productivity
- Devolution of central controls to communities
- Greater privatization – tenure to communities
- Restoration an “industry”
- Shift in public values from commercial industrial utilization
- Building towards something better
 - Obama world
 - Governance more responsive
- Climate change “crisis” led to change in “attitudes”?

Current policies out of sync with this scenario

- Current “use it or lose it” tenure structure
- Allocation of forest land base for industrial use; little latitude for community forests
- No provision for climate change in current policies
- Toolbox for land designations not broad enough
- No links between water policy and ecosystem integrity rather than quantity / quality for human use
- Reduce apathy, increase engagement
 - Education
 - Experiences

Changes to policies needed, 2010-2020

- Aboriginal policy (current) won't lead to empowerment
- Innovation to replace environment services (that were from forest in the past)
- Policies to deal with future scarcities in water, environmental services
- Mitigation makes sense (but did stewardship arise from "crisis")
- Policies to re-enforce stewardship ethic
 - Requires involvement – bottom-up; participatory; inclusive
 - Devolution requires investment in capacity and resources.
 - Mechanisms for co-ordination required
- Policies for rural areas, Aboriginal People to thrive

Solutions and Hurdles

- Species at risk – crisis response won't work, reactive not proactive legislation
- Shift to forest restoration requires educational changes
- Human Nature (as historically defined) (hurdle)

Plenary Comments

- Species-at-risk policies would be very different under different scenarios
- Should species-at-risk designation be specific to small geographic regions or jurisdictions?
- Relax some restrictions on species at risk as habitat for them expands

Final Discussion

- Need research to have new policies
- Need policies for change

Peter Duinker: Were the scenarios useful?

- Some nuances of drivers may not be addressed in all scenarios (based on just Peter's views)
- Useful approach for collecting many views on diverse issues
- Timely given the current chaos in the sector
- Opportunities are emerging from the chaos
- Professional and public response to the project makes it difficult for decision-makers to ignore
- Like dancing with a package of marshmallows
- Not all may have liked the structure but it allowed all to make a contribution
- Research Planning Committee of SFM Network should have done this sort of thing 15 years ago and we'd be very good at it by now
- Difficult to step back from the path you're on and view other possibilities
- Good for education
- We could be in a better situation to manage our future state and focus on the things related to the direction we want to go in

- How do we get to the point of making policy decisions without evaluating the probability of different scenario aspects?
- Scenarios are about value systems, so we can prioritize according to values
- This discussion should have pushed us out of our comfort zone
- The scenarios suffer by not looking at the potential for lose/lose scenarios
- If Aboriginal issues aren't settled, best scenarios may still not be good because the Aboriginal peoples may decide they've had enough and take drastic action
- The exercise wasn't structured to take it to a logical conclusion, so it has failed
- All are clients
- Think about what the indicators would tell us if we're heading in a particular direction
- This would inform a decision
- There are actions we can take that make sense no matter what scenario may come to pass