

**Morice and  
Lakes  
Timber  
Supply  
Areas**

# Technical Indicator Monitoring Report (Operational) Lakes TSA

*(Reporting Period: April 1, 2007 – March 31, 2008)*



Photo courtesy of [www.trailpeak.com](http://www.trailpeak.com)



***March 31, 2009***



# The Morice and Lakes TSAs Innovative Forest Practices Agreement Technical Indicator Report Operational Indicators Lakes TSA

*Prepared for:*

Morice and Lakes Timber Supply Areas  
Innovative Forest Practices Agreement



*Prepared by:*



***For more information please contact:***

Jim Burbee, General Manager  
Morice and Lakes IFPA  
3003 Riverview Road  
Prince George, BC V2K 4Y5  
Tel: 250-564-1518  
Fax: 250-562-1518  
Email: [venturefc@telus.net](mailto:venturefc@telus.net)



## Table of Contents

Purpose .....	6
Indicator L2: Number of Communications by Licensee .....	7
Indicator L4: Number of Participation Opportunities by Opportunity Type .....	8
Indicator L5: Number of Aboriginal Participation Opportunities by Licensee .....	10
Indicator L6: Percentage of AAC Harvested by Licensee .....	12
Indicator L7: Percentage of Identified High Risk Stream Crossings in Sensitive Watersheds with Action Plans Implemented by licensee.....	15
Indicator L14: Percent area retained in WTR by LU by BEC by licensee .....	16
Indicator L19: Percentage of Blocks Meeting NAR Disturbance Objectives by Licensee.....	22
Indicator L20: Percentage of Total Goods and Services Provided by Local Vendors by Licensee.....	23
Indicator L24: Percentage of Forest Management Commitments Completed on time Resulting from Consultations Regarding Non-timber Features and Interests by Licensee.....	24
Indicator L28: Percent species composition of harvest volume by licensee.....	26
Indicator L33: Area treated by treatment type by licensee.....	28
Indicator L34: Area (ha/yr) harvested within the Agricultural/Settlement RMZ by licensee.....	30
Indicator L35: Benefits Directed into the Local Communities by Licensee.....	31
Indicator L42: Public Advisory Group Established and Maintained According to Approved Terms of Reference.....	32
Indicator L46: Percent of Harvesting by Licensee Where Recommended Operational Guidelines Have Been Applied to Retain Structural Habitat Elements .....	34
Indicator L47: Percentage of Comments Receiving Response by Type by Licensee.....	35

## **Purpose**

The purpose of the Technical Indicator Report is to support the SFM plan in terms of operational indicator monitoring, reporting and continual improvement. As such, this technical indicator report compiles the updated information for the applicable indicators which is obtained from the participants in order to observe how management and practices are performing to the targets that have been established for each indicator. This provides feedback to evaluate whether management and practices have been effective in achieving the indicator targets or whether adjustments have to be made.

To ensure consistency and enable comparisons from year to year, the licensees and the IFPA have reported indicator status guided by Standard Operating Procedures for indicator reporting. In addition, comments and recommendations have been provided by the licensees that will assist the IFPA in evaluating each indicator and any changes that may be required. This information will assist the Technical Committee in making continual improvement recommendations for each indicator. Once these recommendations have been approved by the Tweedsmuir Board of Directors, the results from the Technical Indicator Report will be summarized in a Public SFM report.

**Indicator L2: Number of Communications by Licensee**

**Indicator Linkages:**

<u>M&amp;L IFPA Framework</u>	<u>CSA/CCFM SFM Framework</u>
Applies to the M&L IFPA process as a whole	<p><b>Criterion: 6</b> Accepting Society's Responsibility for Sustainable Development</p> <p><b>SFM Element:1</b> Aboriginal and Treaty Rights  <b>Value: 1</b> First Nations' Aboriginal and Treaty rights  <b>Objective: 1</b> Duly- established First Nations' Aboriginal and Treaty rights are recognized and respected.</p> <p><b>SFM Element:3</b> Public Participation  <b>Value: 1</b> Fair, equitable and effective public participation  <b>Objective: 1</b> An open public involvement process designed and implemented to the satisfaction of participants.</p> <p><b>SFM Element:4</b> Information for Decision-Making  <b>Value: 1</b> Informed decision-making and increased knowledge  <b>Objective: 1</b> Relevant information is exchanged between interested parties to support decision-making and increased knowledge of ecosystem processes and human interactions with forest ecosystems.</p>

**Indicator Status:**

	IFPA Reporting Period	Communication Type	2005 Status	2006 Status	Current Status (2007)		Target	Variance	Target Met (Yes / No)
					# of Contacts				
Canfor	Apr. 1 – Mar. 31	Written	66	20	<b># of Contacts = 17</b>	68	Minimum of one written communication annually to each contact on the licensee's contact list	none	Yes
		Verbal	0	0		0		none	N/A
		Media	0	0		0		none	N/A
BFP	Apr. 1 – Mar. 31	Written	80	162	<b># of Contacts = 100</b>	101		none	Yes
		Verbal	0	0		0		none	N/A
		Media	0	6		0		none	N/A
BCTS	Apr. 1 – Mar. 31	Written	649	775	<b># of Contacts = 1123</b>	1062		none	Yes
		Verbal	0	25		57		none	N/A
		Media	4	6		4		none	N/A
IFPA	Apr. 1 – Mar. 31	Written	4000	4200	<b># of Contacts = 4200</b>	4254	none	N/A	
		Verbal	0	0			none	N/A	
		Media	2	0			none	N/A	

IFPA Technical Committee Recommended Actions for Improvement	
<b>If target has not been met:</b>	
Implications of not meeting target:	N/A (Targets met)
Remedial action(s) proposed	N/A
Time estimated to meet target:	N/A
<b>Effectiveness of this indicator/target as a measure towards achievement of the objective:</b>	This Indicator appears to be effective.
<b>Effectiveness of objective as a means of describing the desired future state of the applicable value:</b>	
<b>Recommendations for Improvement</b>	No actions at this time.

**Indicator L4: Number of Participation Opportunities by Opportunity Type**

**Indicator Linkages:**

<u>M&amp;L IFPA Framework</u>	<u>CSA/CCFM SFM Framework</u>
Applies to the M&L IFPA process as a whole	<p><b>Criterion:</b> 5. Multiple Benefit to Society  <b>Critical Element:</b> 2. Communities and Sustainability  <b>Value:</b> 1. Healthy and sustainable communities  <b>Objective:</b> 1. Communities that exhibit economic, environmental and social well being through time.</p> <p><b>Criterion:</b> 6. Accepting Society’s Responsibility for Sustainable Development  <b>SFM Element:</b> 3. Public Participation  <b>Value:</b> 1. Fair, equitable and effective public participation  <b>Objective:</b> 1. An open public involvement process designed and implemented to the satisfaction of participants</p>

**Indicator Status:**

	Reporting Period	Opportunity Type	2003 Status	2004 Status	2005 Status	2006 Status	Current Status (2007)	Target	Variance	Target Met (Yes / No)
M&L IPFA	Apr. 1 – Mar. 31	Meetings	2	1	5	2	3	2	None	Yes
		Workshops	1	1	2	3	1	≥ 1 per year	None	Yes

Participation Opportunities included:

- Three PAG meetings
- Knowledge Transfer session
- FIA FN information sharing invitation to comment/meet to discuss Investment Plan

**IFPA Technical Committee Recommended Actions for Improvement**

<b>If target has not been met:</b>	
Implications of not meeting target:	N/A (Targets met)
Remedial action(s) proposed	
Time estimated to meet target:	
<b>Effectiveness of this indicator/target as a measure towards achievement of the objective:</b>	Meetings and workshops are reasonable measures of participation opportunities.
<b>Effectiveness of objective as a means of describing the desired future state of the applicable value:</b>	
<b>Recommendations for Improvement</b>	No actions at this time.

**Indicator L5: Number of Aboriginal Participation Opportunities by Licensee**

**Indicator Linkages:**

<u>M&amp;L IFPA Framework</u>	<u>CSA/CCFM SFM Framework</u>
Applies to the M&L IFPA process as a whole	<p><b>Criterion:</b> 6. Accepting Society's Responsibility for Sustainable Development  <b>SFM Element:</b> 1. Aboriginal and Treaty Rights  <b>Value:</b> 1. First Nations' Aboriginal and Treaty Rights  <b>Objective:</b> 1. Duly-established First Nations' Aboriginal and Treaty Rights are recognized and respected.</p> <p><b>SFM Element:</b> 2. Respect for Aboriginal Forest Values, Knowledge and Uses  <b>Value:</b> 1. Indigenous Knowledge of forest values and uses  <b>Objective:</b> 1. Forest management incorporates Indigenous Knowledge of forest values and uses</p>

**Indicator Status:**

Licensee	Licensee Reporting Period	First Nations	First Nations Subgroup	2006 Status	Current Status (2007)	Target	Variance	Target Met (Yes/ No)
Canfor	Apr. 1 to Mar. 31	Lake Babine Nation	Lake Babine Nation	4	2	2 per group per year	None	Yes
			Fort Babine Office	2	1			
			Nedo'ats Band Office	2	1			
			Tachek Band Office	3	2			
		Nee Tahi Buhn		3	4		None	Yes
		Office of the Wet'suwet'en		2	35		None	Yes
		Skin Tyee Nation		4	10		None	Yes
		Carrier Sekani	Wet'suwet'en First Nation	6	9		None	Yes
		Yekooche First Nation		3	2		None	Yes
		Moricetown Band		N/A	12		None	Yes
		Cheslatta Carrier First Nation		N/A	2	None	Yes	
BFP		Lake Babine Nation		2	0	2 per group per	None	No
		Tl'azt'en Nation		2	0		None	No
		Wet'suwet'en First Nation.		2	0		None	No

**Morice and Lakes IFPA – Technical Indicator Monitoring Report (Operational) - Lakes TSA**

Licensee	Licensee Reporting Period	First Nations	First Nations Subgroup	2006 Status	Current Status (2007)	Target	Variance	Target Met (Yes/ No)
		Wet'suwet'en		2	0	year	None	No
		Burns Lake Band		2	0		None	No
		Skin Tyee Nation		2	0		None	No
		Cheslatta Carrier Nation		2	0		None	No
		Nadleh Whut'en		2	0		None	No
		Stellat'en		2	0		None	No
		Yekooche First Nation		2	0		None	No
BCTS	Apr. 1 to Mar. 31	Lake Babine Nation		7	6	2 per group per year	None	Yes
		Nee Tahi Buhn		6	6		None	Yes
		Nadleh Whut'en Band		6	5		None	Yes
		Office of the Wet'suwet'en		9	11		None	Yes
		Skin Tyee Nation		6	6		None	Yes
		Stellat'en First Nation		8	6		None	Yes
		Tl'azt'en Nation		N/A	N/A		None	Yes
		Ulkatcho Band		N/A	N/A		None	Yes
		Wet'suwet'en First Nation		9	9		None	Yes
		Yekooche First Nation		9	6		None	Yes
		Cheslatta Carrier First Nation		N/A	N/A		None	Yes
		Burns Lake Band		9	9		None	Yes
		Gitxan		N/A	5		None	Yes

Note: In 2007 BFP logged primarily Timber Sales and Category A (Sec 196) blocks that went through the planning (info sharing/participation) phase several years prior. So technically, BFP did not have any participation opportunities in 2007. Whenever BFP sends out referral letters there is an open ended invitation to participate/info share in the planning phases.

IFPA Technical Committee Recommended Actions for Improvement	
<b>If target has not been met:</b>	
Implications of not meeting target:	
Remedial action(s) proposed	
Time estimated to meet target:	
<b>Effectiveness of this indicator/target as a measure towards achievement of the objective:</b>	
	Appears to be effective in ensuring that we are providing opportunities for first nations to be involved in the planning process.
<b>Effectiveness of objective as a means of describing the desired future state of the applicable value:</b>	
	These objectives are effective.
<b>Recommendations for Improvement</b>	
	No actions at this time.

**Indicator L6: Percentage of AAC Harvested by Licensee**

**Indicator Linkages:**

<u>M&amp;L IFPA Framework</u>	<u>CSA/CCFM SFM Framework</u>
<p><b>Resource:</b> Timber  <b>Value/Issue:</b> Harvest Flow Policy</p>	<p><b>Criterion:</b> 2. Maintenance and Enhancement of Forest Ecosystem Condition and Productivity  <b>SFM Element:</b> 2. Ecosystem Productivity  <b>Value:</b> 2. Productive capacity of the forest resource base.  <b>Objective:</b> 1. The biological productive capacity of the forest resource base is sustained over time.</p> <p><b>Criterion:</b> 5. Multiple Benefits to Society  <b>SFM Element:</b> 1. Timber and Non-Timber Benefits  <b>Value:</b> 1. The supply and variety of timber and non-timber products services and benefits on the DFA  <b>Objective:</b> 2. A sustainable harvest and use of non-timber forest products, services and benefits.</p>

**Indicator Status:**

Licensee	Licensee reporting Period	2003 Status	2004 Status	2005 Status	2006 Status	Current Status (2007)	Target	Variance	Target Met (Yes/No)
Canfor	Jan 1 – Dec 31	79%	184%	416%	214%	<b>0</b>	100% of AAC Apportionment	AAC Apportionment - 50%	<b>No</b>
BFP	Jan 1 – Dec 31	103% Babine 78% Decker	92% Babine 75% Decker	73% Babine 59% Decker	162%	<b>52%</b>	100% of AAC Apportionment	AAC Apportionment - 50%	Yes
FLSM	Jan 1 – Dec 31	126%	62.8%	91%	79%	<b>65%</b>	100% of AAC Apportionment	AAC Apportionment - 50%	Yes
L&M	Jan 1 – Dec 31	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	100% of AAC Apportionment	AAC Apportionment - 50%	<b>No data</b>
BCTS*	April 1 to March 31	99.3%	56%	<b>38.96%</b>	<b>88.67%</b>	<b>100%</b>	100% of AAC Apportionment	AAC Apportionment - 50%	Yes

\*based on billed volumes

**Notes:**

Canfor target was not met due to applying a periodic cut to this license for accelerated harvest of Mountain Pine Beetle. The AAC was harvested in the 2002 to 2006 cut control period. The next cut control period has no allowable cut until 2012.

For B C Timber Sales, the indicator reports on volumes sold as the program licensees have the option of extending harvest the length of the term of the timber sale licence which is beyond the control of BCTS.

**IFPA Technical Committee Recommended Actions for Improvement**

**If target has not been met:**

Implications of not meeting target:	Canfor: No harvesting is taking place on the A16824 licence. As a result, benefits that could have flowed to the Lakes area have not. Concentrating harvest in the Morice Licence area allows Canfor to address beetle issues in more recently
-------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>IFPA Technical Committee Recommended Actions for Improvement</b>	
	attacked stands removing a portion of live beetle in the process.
Remedial action(s) proposed	
Time estimated to meet target:	
<b>Effectiveness of this indicator/target as a measure towards achievement of the objective:</b>	For Canfor's forest license A16824 this indicator and target is not an effective measure of the value and objective. Achievement of value and objective can be through regulatory compliance of the forest act. Licensees with larger cuts can influence the value and objective and maintaining this indicator for larger licensees may be applicable.
<b>Effectiveness of objective as a means of describing the desired future state of the applicable value:</b>	
<b>Recommendations for Improvement</b>	No actions at this time.

**Indicator L7: Percentage of Identified High Risk Stream Crossings in Sensitive Watersheds with Action Plans Implemented by licensee**

**Indicator Linkages:**

<u>M&amp;L IFPA Framework</u>	<u>CSA/CCFM SFM Framework</u>
Applies to the M&L IFPA process as a whole	<p><b>Criterion:</b> 3. Conservation of Soil and Water Resources  <b>SFM Element:</b> 2. Water Quality and Quantity  <b>Value:</b> 1. Productive capacity of water resources is conserved  <b>Objective:</b> 1. Water quantity and quality are sustained through their characteristic range of variation, on the DFA through time.</p>

**Indicator Status:**

Licensee	Licensee reporting Period	2006 Status	Current Status (2007)	Target	Variance	Target Met (Yes/No)
Canfor	Jan 1 – Dec 31	100%	N/A	100%	- 50%	N/A
BFP	Jan 1 – Dec 31	No Data	No Data	100%	- 50%	N/A
L&M	Jan 1 – Dec 31	No Data	No Data	100%	- 50%	N/A
BCTS	April 1 to March 31	No Data	No Data	100%	- 50%	N/A

This is a new indicator for Version 2.0 of the Lakes SFM plan. There would not be any data for 2007 as this replaces L3. Surveys will need to be done based on the watersheds identified in indicator detail sheets for L33, L37 and L45. Training is also required before assessments can be done. Canfor: Canfor operating area/DFA has been allocated to other forest tenure holders therefore there are no structures to survey.

<b>IFPA Technical Committee Recommended Actions for Improvement</b>	
<b>If target has not been met:</b>	
Implications of not meeting target:	
Remedial action(s) proposed	N/A
Time estimated to meet target:	N/A
<b>Effectiveness of this indicator/target as a measure towards achievement of the objective:</b>	
This Indicator is expected to be effective when implemented.	
<b>Effectiveness of objective as a means of describing</b>	
N/A	

IFPA Technical Committee Recommended Actions for Improvement	
the desired future state of the applicable value:	
Recommendations for Improvement	BCTS and BFP to implement programs in 2008.

**Indicator L14: Percent area retained in WTR by LU by BEC by licensee**

**Indicator Linkages:**

<u>M&amp;L IFPA Framework</u>	<u>CSA/CCFM SFM Framework</u>
<p><b>Resource:</b> Landscape and Stand Level Biodiversity</p> <p><b>Value / Issue:</b> Wildlife Trees &amp; Wildlife Tree Patches</p> <p><b>Value / Issue:</b> Habitat Element – Snags</p> <p><b>Value / Issue:</b> Habitat Element – Large Live Trees</p> <p><b>Value / Issue:</b> Habitat Element – CWD</p>	<p><b>Criterion:</b> 2. Maintenance and Enhancement of Forest Ecosystem Condition and Productivity</p> <p><b>SFM Element:</b> 1. Forest Ecosystem Productivity</p> <p><b>Value:</b> 1. Stand-level ecosystem functionality across the landscape</p> <p><b>Objective:</b> 1. Stand-level ecosystem processes and conditions are maintained within the natural range of variability.</p>

**Indicator Status:**

Licensee	Licensee Reporting Period	Landscape Unit	BEC	2005 Status	2006 Status	Current Status (2007)	Target	Variance	Target Met (Yes / No)
BCTS	April 1 – Mar. 31	Babine West	ESSFmc	No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest	>=7%		N/A
			SBSdk	No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest	>=7%		N/A
			SBSmc2	3.3%	11.0%	No Harvest	>=7%		Yes
		Bulkley	ESSFmc	0.3%	No Harvest	No Harvest	>=7%		N/A
			SBSdk	4.3%	16.1%	No Harvest	>=7%		N/A
			SBSmc2	1.8%	11.5%	No Harvest	>=7%		N/A
		Burns Lake	ESSFmc	No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest	>=7%		N/A

Morice and Lakes IFPA – Technical Indicator Monitoring Report (Operational) - Lakes TSA

Licensee	Licensee Reporting Period	Landscape Unit	BEC	2005 Status	2006 Status	Current Status (2007)	Target	Variance	Target Met (Yes / No)
		East	SBSdk	10.5%	20.6%	19.0%	>=7%		Yes
			SBSmc2	5.5%	32.0%	No Harvest	>=7%		N/A
		Burns Lake West	ESSFmc	No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest	>=7%		N/A
			SBSdk	No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest	>=7%		N/A
			SBSmc2	2.1%	No Harvest	12.3%	>=7%		Yes
		BULDLA	SBS dk	No Harvest	No Harvest	16.1 %	>=7%		Yes
		BUIILLA	SBS mc2	No Harvest	No Harvest	8.4%	>=7%		Yes
		Chelaslie	ESSFmc	No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest	>=9%		N/A
			SBSdk	11.8%	No Harvest	No Harvest	>12%		N/A
			SBSmc2	20.6%	No Harvest	No Harvest	>12%		N/A
		Cheslatta	ESSFmc	No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest	>=9%		N/A
			SBSdk	14.7%	No Harvest	No Harvest	>12%		N/A
			SBSmc2	10.8%	16.5%	No Harvest	>12%		N/A
		Fleming	ESSFmc	No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest	>=7%		N/A
			SBSdk	No Harvest	16.4%	16.7%	>=7%		Yes
			SBSmc2	22.7%	13.4%	14.6%	>=7%		Yes
		Francois East	ESSFmc	No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest	>9%		N/A
			SBSdk	13.1%	No Harvest	No Harvest	>14%		N/A
			SBSmc2	6.6%	No Harvest	No Harvest	>14%		N/A
		Francois	ESSFmc	No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest	>12%		N/A

Morice and Lakes IFPA – Technical Indicator Monitoring Report (Operational) - Lakes TSA

Licensee	Licensee Reporting Period	Landscape Unit	BEC	2005 Status	2006 Status	Current Status (2007)	Target	Variance	Target Met (Yes / No)
		West	SBSdk	4.1%	No Harvest	No Harvest	>13%		N/A
			SBSmc2	3.6%	No Harvest	No Harvest	>13%		N/A
		Intata	ESSFmc	No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest	>9%		N/A
			SBSdk	7.4%	No Harvest	No Harvest	>16%		N/A
			SBSmc2	No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest	>16%		N/A
		Ootsa	ESSFmc	No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest	>9%		N/A
			SBSdk	1.9%	No Harvest	No Harvest	>12%		N/A
			SBSmc2	2.9%	No Harvest	No Harvest	>12%		N/A
		Taltapin	ESSFmc	No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest	>=7%		N/A
			SBSdk	0.8%	No Harvest	No Harvest	>=7%		N/A
			SBSmc2	6%	12.3%	12.5%	>=7%		Yes
		CANFOR	April 1 – Mar. 31	Babine West	SBSmc	No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest	N/A
Bulkley	ESSFmc			No Harvest	0%	0%	>=7%	N/A	No
	SBSdk			9%	8.4%	8.4%	>=7%	N/A	Yes
	SBSmc			9%	9.7%	9.7%	>=7%	N/A	Yes
Chelaslie	SBSdk			No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest	N/A	N/A	N/A
	SBSmc			No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest	N/A	N/A	N/A
Francois West	SBSdk			15%	10.7%	10.7%	>13%	Period 2	Yes
	SBSmc	No Harvest	14.0%	No Harvest	N/A	N/A	N/A		

Morice and Lakes IFPA – Technical Indicator Monitoring Report (Operational) - Lakes TSA

Licensee	Licensee Reporting Period	Landscape Unit	BEC	2005 Status	2006 Status	Current Status (2007)	Target	Variance	Target Met (Yes / No)
			SBSmc2	13%	No Harvest	14%	>13%	Period 2	Yes
			ESSFmc	5.0%	0%	0%	>12%	Period 2	Yes
		Intata	SBSdk	No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest	N/A	N/A	N/A
			SBSmc	No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest	N/A	N/A	N/A
BFP	Jan. 1 – Dec. 31	Babine East	ESSF	9.9%	11.0%	13.3%	6		Yes
			SBS	12.3%	13.71%	13.9%			
		Babine West	ESSF	No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest	6		No
			SBS	9.2%	0%	9%			
		Bulkley	ESSF	No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest	7		Yes
			SBS	13%	14.96	12.4%			
		Burns Lake East	ESSF	No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest	6		No
			SBS	18.4%	20.95%	22.6			
		Burns Lake West	ESSF	9.8%	10.9%	10.9	6		Yes
			SBS	12.2%	7.95%	13.1			
		Cheslatta	ESSF	No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest	12		Yes
			SBS	12.4%	14.24%	14.3%			
		Flemming	ESSF	6.6%	7.08%	7.2%	6		Yes
			SBS	14.7%	15.91%	15.9%			

**Morice and Lakes IFPA – Technical Indicator Monitoring Report (Operational) - Lakes TSA**

Licensee	Licensee Reporting Period	Landscape Unit	BEC	2005 Status	2006 Status	Current Status (2007)	Target	Variance	Target Met (Yes / No)		
		Francois East	ESSF	No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest	14		Yes		
			SBS	26.0%	35.07	35.1%					
		Francois West	ESSF	No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest	13		<b>No</b>		
			SBS	7.6%	7.90	9.4%					
		Pierre	ESSF	No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest	6		N/A		
			SBS	No Harvest	No Harvest	No Harvest					
		Taltapin	ESSF	10.3%	11.45%	11.4%	8		Yes		
			SBS	14%	14.64%	16.2%					
		FLSM	Jan. 1 – Dec. 31	Francois East	SBSdk	10.9%	10.9%	17.8%	> 14		Yes
					SBSmc2	14.2%	29.9%				
ESSFmc	No Harvest				No Harvest	No Harvest	> 9	N/A			
Cheslatta	SBSdk			7.7%	7.7%	20.5%	> 12		Yes		
	SBSmc2			8.9%	10.1%						
	ESSFmc			6.4%	6.4%	No Harvest				> 9	N/A
Chelaslie	SBSdk			17%	17%	No Harvest	> 12		N/A		
	SBSmc2			12.4%	14.2%	No Harvest	> 12		N/A		
	ESSFmc			11.2%	11.2%	No Harvest	> 9		N/A		
Intata	SBSdk			14.2%	14.2%	No Harvest	> 16		N/A		
	SBSmc2			16.6%	16.4%	No Harvest	> 16		N/A		
	ESSFmc			14.1%	14.1%	No Harvest	> 9		N/A		

**Morice and Lakes IFPA – Technical Indicator Monitoring Report (Operational) - Lakes TSA**

Licensee	Licensee Reporting Period	Landscape Unit	BEC	2005 Status	2006 Status	Current Status (2007)	Target	Variance	Target Met (Yes / No)
		Ootsa	SBSdk	9.6%	10.7%	No Harvest	> 12		N/A
			SBSmc2	15.8%	15.8%	No Harvest	> 12		N/A
			ESSFmc	0.3%	0.3%	No Harvest	> 9		N/A

Notes: Canfor - Because of the small area of harvest in the ESSFmc in the Bulkley. The target will easily be achieved when future blocks are harvested with an adequate amount of retention to meet or exceed the target.

<b>IFPA Technical Committee Recommended Actions for Improvement</b>	
<b>If target has not been met:</b>	
Implications of not meeting target:	Timber supply will be impacted where target and variance are continually exceeded over time (long term). Similarly, where retention is below target biodiversity will be impacted.
Remedial action(s) proposed	Under FRPA legislation, licensees are required to meet a specified WTP percentage over a one-year period. Therefore, licensees do not have the flexibility as before in increasing or lowering the WTP percentage within a landscape.
Time estimated to meet target:	This will vary by LU and BEC combination and harvest rate for the LU.
<b>Effectiveness of this indicator/target as a measure towards achievement of the objective:</b>	
<b>Effectiveness of objective as a means of describing the desired future state of the applicable value:</b>	This is effective
<b>Recommendations for Improvement</b>	No actions required at this time.

**Indicator L19: Percentage of Blocks Meeting NAR Disturbance Objectives by Licensee**

**Indicator Linkages:**

<u>M&amp;L IFPA Framework</u>	<u>CSA/CCFM SFM Framework</u>
Applies to the M&L IFPA process as a whole	<b>Criterion:</b> 3. Conservation of Soil and Water Resources <b>SFM Element:</b> 1. Soil Quality and Quantity <b>Value:</b> 1. Productive capacity of soil resources are conserved <b>Objective:</b> 1. Soil quantity and quality are sustained through their characteristic range of variation.

**Indicator Status:**

Licensee	Licensee Reporting Period	2003 Status	2004 Status	2005 Status	2006 Status	Current Status (2007)	Target	Variance	Target Met (Yes/No)
Canfor	Nov 1 – Oct 31	100%	100%	100%	100%	<b>100%</b>	100%	none	Yes
BFP	Jan 1 – Dec 31	100%	100%	100%	100%	<b>100%</b>	100%	none	Yes
L&M	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	100%	none	N/A
BCTS	Jan 1 – Dec 31	Unknown	98%	96%	100%	<b>100%</b>	100%	none	Yes

**IFPA Technical Committee Recommended Actions for Improvement**

<b>If target has not been met:</b>	
Implications of not meeting target:	None
Remedial action(s) proposed	None
Time estimated to meet target:	N/A
<b>Effectiveness of this indicator/target as a measure towards achievement of the objective:</b>	This indicator and target is an effective measure of the objective and CCFM element.
<b>Effectiveness of objective as a means of describing the desired future state of the applicable value:</b>	This is an effective objective in meeting the values.
<b>Recommendations for Improvement</b>	No actions required at this time.

**Indicator L20: Percentage of Total Goods and Services Provided by Local Vendors by Licensee**

**Indicator Linkages:**

<u>M&amp;L IFPA Framework</u>	<u>CSA/CCFM SFM Framework</u>
Applies to the M&L IFPA process as a whole	<p><b>Criterion: 5.</b> Multiple Benefits to Society  <b>SFM Element: 2.</b> Communities and Sustainability  <b>Value: 1.</b> Healthy and sustainable communities  <b>Objective: 1.</b> Communities that exhibit economic, environmental and social well-being through time.  <b>SFM Element: 3.</b> Fair distribution of Benefits and Costs  <b>Value: 1.</b> Fair distribution of timber and non-timber benefits and costs over time  <b>Objective: 2.</b> Timber and non-timber benefits and costs a fairly and equally distributed at a range of scales for current and future generations.</p>

**Indicator Status:**

Licensee	Licensee Reporting Period	2003Status	2004 Status	2005 Status	2006 Status	Current Status (2007)	Target	Variance	Target Met (Yes / No)
Canfor	Jan 1 – Dec 31	6.05%	13.1%	17.91 %	12.82	<b>12.82%</b>	3.3	-10%	Yes
BFP	Jan 1 – Dec 31	No data	84%	79.4%	N/A	<b>85%</b>	84%	-10%	Yes
L&M	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	0.6	-10%	N/A
BCTS**	April 1 - March 31	46.88%	No data	24.21%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

\*\* Starting in 2006, BCTS will not be reporting this indicator.

This indicator is based on a 5-year rolling average.

<b>IFPA Technical Committee Recommended Actions for Improvement</b>	
<b>If target has not been met:</b>	
Implications of not meeting target:	No adverse implications
Remedial action(s) proposed	N/A
Time estimated to meet target:	N/A

IFPA Technical Committee Recommended Actions for Improvement	
Effectiveness of this indicator/target as a measure towards achievement of the objective:	This indicator provides a general measure of the extent of local economic benefits derived from local spending habits.
Effectiveness of objective as a means of describing the desired future state of the applicable value:	This objective is effective
Recommendations for Improvement	No actions required at this time.

**Indicator L24: Percentage of Forest Management Commitments Completed on time Resulting from Consultations Regarding Non-timber Features and Interests by Licensee**

**Indicator Linkages:**

<u>M&amp;L IFPA Framework</u>	<u>CSA/CCFM SFM Framework</u>
Applies to the M&L IFPA process as a whole	<p><b>Criterion:</b> 1. Conservation of Biological Diversity  <b>SFM Element:</b> 4. Protected Areas and Sites of Biological Significance  <b>Value:</b> 1. Protected areas and sites of biological significance are identified and managed appropriately  <b>Objective:</b> 1. A sustainable harvest and use of non-timber forest products, services and benefits</p> <p><b>Criterion:</b> 5. Multiple Benefits to Society  <b>SFM Element:</b> 1. Timber and Non-Timber Benefits  <b>Value:</b> 1. The supply and variety of timber and non-timber products services and benefits on the DFA  <b>Objective:</b> 2. A sustainable harvest and use of non-timber forest products, services and benefits  <b>Value:</b> 3. A variety of recreational experiences are provided on the DFA.  <b>Objective:</b> 1. Multiple Use Recreation Opportunities are provided on the DFA.</p> <p><b>SFM Element:</b> 2. Communities and Sustainability  <b>Value:</b> 1. Healthy and sustainable communities  <b>Objective:</b> 1. Communities that exhibit economic, environmental and social well-being through time.</p> <p><b>Criterion:</b> 6. Accepting Society's Responsibility for Sustainable Development  <b>SFM Element:</b> 2. Respect for Aboriginal Forest Values, Knowledge and Uses  <b>Value:</b> 1. Indigenous Knowledge of forest values and uses  <b>Objective:</b> 1. Forest management incorporates Indigenous Knowledge of forest values and uses</p>

**Indicator Status:**

Licensee	Licensee Reporting Period	2003 Status	2004 Status	2005 Status	2006 Status	Current Status (2007)	Target	Variance	Target Met (Yes / No)
Canfor	Jan 1 – Dec 31	N/A	75%	100%	100%	<b>100%</b>	100%	-10%	Yes
BFP	Jan 1 – Dec 31	50%	83%	100%	100%	<b>100%</b>	100%	-10%	Yes
L&M	Jan 1 – Dec 31	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<b>N/A</b>	100%	-10%	N/A
BCTS	April 1 – March 31	100%	100%	100%	100%	<b>100%</b>	100%	-10%	Yes

**IFPA Technical Committee Recommended Actions for Improvement**

<b>If target has not been met:</b>	
Implications of not meeting target:	
Remedial action(s) proposed	None (see above)
Time estimated to meet target:	N/A (see above)
<b>Effectiveness of this indicator/target as a measure towards achievement of the objective:</b>	
	This indicator is effective in gauging if commitments linked to identified values/objectives are being met.
<b>Effectiveness of objective as a means of describing the desired future state of the applicable value:</b>	
	The objectives are effective
<b>Recommendations for Improvement</b>	
	No actions required at this time

**Indicator L28: Percent species composition of harvest volume by licensee**

**Indicator Linkages:**

<u>M&amp;L IFPA Framework</u>	<u>CSA/CCFM SFM Framework</u>
<b>Resource:</b> Timber <b>Value / Issue:</b> Harvest Profile	<b>Criterion:</b> 5. Multiple Benefits to Society <b>SFM Element:</b> 2. Communities and Sustainability <b>Value:</b> 1. Healthy and sustainable communities <b>Objective:</b> 1. Communities that exhibit economic, environmental and social well-being through time

**Indicator Status:**

Licensee	IFPA reporting Period	Species	Status 2004	Status 2005	Status 2006	Current Status (2007)	Target (based on modelling assumptions)	Variance	Target Met (Yes / No)
Canfor	Nov. 1 to Oct. 31	Pine	83%	81%	84.4%	<b>69%</b>	>17 for periods 2-4	none	No
		Balsam	0%	2%	3.8	<b>9%</b>	N/A	N/A	No
		Spruce	17%	17%	11.7	<b>22%</b>	N/A	N/A	Yes
BFP	Jan. 1 to Dec. 31	Pine	64.4%	78%	66.8%	<b>56.3%</b>	>10 for periods 2-4	none	Yes
		Balsam	6.9%	3.3%	7.2%	<b>23.6%</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Spruce	28.7%	18.7%	26%	<b>20.1%</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
FLSM	Dec. 1 to Nov. 30	Pine	74.2%	74.3%	74.4%	<b>74%</b>	7-86 for periods 2-4	none	Yes
		Balsam	3.4%	4.9%	5.8%	<b>6%</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Spruce	22.4%	20.8%	19.8%	<b>20%</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
L&M	No data	Pine	No data	No data	No data	<b>No data</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Balsam	No data	No data	No data	<b>No data</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Spruce	No data	No data	No data	<b>No data</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
BCTS*	No data	Pine	79%	71.54%	81%	<b>77%</b>	20-76 for periods 2-4	none	<b>No</b>
		Balsam	4%	0%	1%	<b>No Data</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Spruce	17%		17%	<b>No Data</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A

\*based on billed volumes

Notes: Canfor - Harvest consisted of completion of a previously partially logged block. Total harvest was only approx. 6800m3. Sample too small to apply a target against.

<b>IFPA Technical Committee Recommended Actions for Improvement</b>	
<b>If target has not been met:</b>	
Implications of not meeting target:	There are no adverse implications to not meeting the Balsam and Spruce targets. The focus for this indicator is meeting or exceeding the pine targets to address the MPB.
Remedial action(s) proposed	None
Time estimated to meet target:	N/A
<b>Effectiveness of this indicator/target as a measure towards achievement of the objective:</b>	
	Target is meaningless for Balsam and Spruce.
<b>Effectiveness of objective as a means of describing the desired future state of the applicable value:</b>	
	These objectives are effective.
<b>Recommendations for Improvement</b>	
	No actions required at this time

**Indicator L33: Area treated by treatment type by licensee**

**Indicator Linkages:**

<u>M&amp;L IFPA Framework</u>	<u>CSA/CCFM SFM Framework</u>
<b>Resource:</b> Timber <b>Value / issue:</b> Vegetation Management (maintain Base Case) <b>Value / issue:</b> Fertilization <b>Value / issue:</b> Density Management <b>Value / issue:</b> Contributing land base conversion <b>Value/issue:</b> Wood quality	Not applicable

**Indicator Status:**

	IFPA Reporting Period	Treatment Type (incremental silviculture Only)	Status 2005	Status 2006	Current Status (2007)	Target	Variance	Target Met (Yes / No)
All Licensees	Canfor: Nov. 1 to Oct. 31 BFP: Jan. 1 to Dec. 31 FLSM: Jan. 1 to Dec. 31 BCTS: N/A	Vegetation Management	0 ha for all incremental treatment types	0 ha for all incremental treatment types	0 ha for all incremental treatment types	None	N/A	N/A
		Fertilization				None	N/A	
		Density Management				None	N/A	
						None	N/A	

**IFPA Technical Committee Recommended Actions for Improvement**

<b>If target has not been met:</b>	
Implications of not meeting target:	No targets
Remedial action(s) proposed	N/A
Time estimated to meet target:	N/A

<b>IFPA Technical Committee Recommended Actions for Improvement</b>	
<b>Effectiveness of this indicator/target as a measure towards achievement of the objective:</b>	Effectiveness of this indicator will be reviewed with the PAG annually.
<b>Effectiveness of objective as a means of describing the desired future state of the applicable value:</b>	As above
<b>Recommendations for Improvement</b>	Recommendation that the reporting frequency be changed to 5 years.

**Indicator L34: Area (ha/yr) harvested within the Agricultural/Settlement RMZ by licensee**

**Indicator Linkages:**

<u>M&amp;L IFPA Framework</u>	<u>CSA/CCFM SFM Framework</u>
<b>Resource:</b> Agriculture <b>Value/Issue:</b> Agriculture Lease Land Expansion	<b>Criterion:</b> 5. Multiple Benefits to Society <b>Critical Element:</b> 1. Timber and Non-Timber Benefits <b>Value:</b> 2. Agricultural Products <b>Objective:</b> 3. A variety of agricultural products are provided from the DFA

**Indicator Status:**

Licensee	Status 2005	Status 2006	Current Status (2007)	Target	Variance	Target Met (Yes/No)
Canfor	67.1	67.1	N/A	<200	0	N/A
BFP	0	0	0	0	0	Yes
FLSM	0	0	0	0	0	Yes
L&M	0	0	No Data	N/A	N/A	N/A
BCTS	441.7	441.7	490.7	<1200	<1600 period 2	Yes

This indicator will be reported annually starting in 2006 and updated periodically (every 5 years).  
 The reporting period for this indicator is April 1 To March 31 (for all licensees).

<b>IFPA Technical Committee Recommended Actions for Improvement</b>	
<b>If target has not been met:</b>	
Implications of not meeting target:	N/A
Remedial action(s) proposed	N/A
Time estimated to meet target:	N/A
<b>Effectiveness of this indicator/target as a measure towards achievement of the objective:</b>	
<b>Effectiveness of objective as a means of describing</b>	

IFPA Technical Committee Recommended Actions for Improvement	
the desired future state of the applicable value:	
Recommendations for Improvement	No actions required at this time.

**Indicator L35: Benefits Directed into the Local Communities by Licensee**

**Indicator Linkages:**

<u>M&amp;L IFPA Framework</u>	<u>CSA/CCFM SFM Framework</u>
Applies to the M&L IFPA process as a whole	<p><b>Criterion:</b> 5. Multiple Benefits to Society  <b>Critical Element:</b> 3. Fair Distribution of Benefits and Costs  <b>Value:</b> 1. Fair distribution of timber and non-timber benefits and costs over time  <b>Objective:</b> 2. Timber and non timber benefits and costs are fairly and equitably distributed at a range of scales for current and future generations</p>

**Indicator Status:**

Licensee	Licensee Reporting Period	2003 Status	2004 Status	2005 Status	2006 Status	Current Status (2007)	Target	Variance	Target Met (Yes / No)
Canfor	Jan 1 – Dec 31	\$2,326	\$1,114	\$2,289	\$2703	\$2162	\$2000	-10%	Yes
BFP	Jan 1 – Dec 31	\$62,478	\$79,448	\$20,780	\$27,577	\$18,569	\$25,338	-10%	<b>No</b>
L&M	Jan 1 – Dec 31	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BCTS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

<b>IFPA Technical Committee Recommended Actions for Improvement</b>	
<b>If target has not been met:</b>	
Implications of not meeting target:	No adverse implications.
Remedial action(s) proposed	None
Time estimated to meet target:	N/A
<b>Effectiveness of this indicator/target as a measure towards achievement of the objective:</b>	When combined with the other indicators linked to element 5.3, this indicator and target represent a reasonable measure of the objective and value.  BCTS: Cannot report on this indicator given BCTS's unique situation as a government ministry.
<b>Effectiveness of objective as a means of describing the desired future state of the applicable value:</b>	This objective is effective
<b>Recommendations for Improvement</b>	No actions required at this time.

**Indicator L42: Public Advisory Group Established and Maintained According to Approved Terms of Reference**

**Indicator Linkages:**

<u>M&amp;L IFPA Framework</u>	<u>CSA/CCFM SFM Framework</u>
Applies to the M&L IFPA process as a whole	<p><b>Criterion: 6.</b> Accepting Society's Responsibility for Sustainable Development</p> <p><b>SFM Element: 3.</b> Public Participation</p> <p><b>Value: 1.</b> Fair, equitable and effective public participation</p> <p><b>Objective: 1.</b> An open public involvement process designed and implemented to the satisfaction of participants.</p>

**Indicator Status:**

	Licensee Reporting Period	2003 Status	2004 Status	2005 Status	2006 Status	Current Status (2007)	Target	Variance	Target Met (Yes / No)
M&L IPFA	Apr. 1 – Mar. 31	Approved PAG TOR on File  No review or revision took place in this reporting period	Approved PAG TOR on File  No review or revision took place in this reporting period	Approved PAG TOR on File  Reviewed February 7, 2006	Approved PAG TOR on File  No review or revision took place in this reporting period	Approved PAG TOR on File  <b>Reviewed April 4, 2007</b>	Review and update (as required) TOR on file.  (Minimum of 1 review annually in conjunction with annual indicator review)	N/A	Yes

**IFPA Technical Committee Recommended Actions for Improvement**

<b>If target has not been met:</b>	
Implications of not meeting target:	Not consistent with IFPA process; cannot achieve IPFA strategic objectives.
Remedial action(s) proposed	PAG meeting occurred April 4, 2007.
Time estimated to meet target:	N/A
<b>Effectiveness of this indicator/target as a measure towards achievement of the objective:</b>	Indicator is effective and essential part of the IFPA process.
<b>Effectiveness of objective as a means of describing the desired future state of the applicable value:</b>	Objective is effective and essential part of the IFPA process.
<b>Recommendations for Improvement</b>	No actions required at this time.

**Indicator L46: Percent of Harvesting by Licensee Where Recommended Operational Guidelines Have Been Applied to Retain Structural Habitat Elements**

**Indicator Linkages:**

<u>M&amp;L IFPA Framework</u>	<u>CSA/CCFM SFM Framework</u>
<p><b>Resource:</b> Landscape and Stand Level Biodiversity  <b>Value / Issue:</b> Habitat Element – CWD  <b>Value / Issue:</b> Habitat Element – Snags  <b>Value / Issue:</b> Habitat Element – Large Live Trees</p>	<p><b>Criterion:</b> 1. Conservation of Biological Diversity  <b>SFM Element:</b> 2. Species Diversity  <b>Value:</b> 1. Abundance and distribution of common and rare habitats within a range of variability over time to conserve species in the DFA  <b>Objective:</b> 1. A constant supply of habitats and/or attributes sufficient to conserve species that occur naturally on the DFA through time.  <b>Criterion:</b> 4. Forest Ecosystem Contributions to Global Ecological Cycles  <b>SFM Element:</b> 1. Carbon uptake and storage  <b>Value:</b> 1. Storage of Carbon in forest ecosystems and products  <b>Objective:</b> 1. Forest ecosystems are net carbon sinks over time on the DFA</p>

**Indicator Status:**

Licensee	Licensee Reporting Period	Status 2006	Current Status (2007)*	Target	Variance	Target Met (Yes / No)
Canfor	April 1 – March 31	100%	100%	100%	0	Yes
BFP	April 1 – March 31	100%	100%	100%	0	Yes
FLSM*	April 1 – March 31	N/A	N/A	100%	0	N/A
BCTS	April 1 – March 31	N/A	100%	100%	0	Yes

\* FLSM to begin reporting on this indicator in fiscal year 2008-2009. FLSM will begin implementing Best Practices once Contractor training is complete. There is a proposed IFPA project that includes training of Contractors for addressing "Course Woody Debris" in which FLSM Contractors will participate.

IFPA Technical Committee Recommended Actions for Improvement	
<b>If target has not been met:</b>	
Implications of not meeting target:	
Remedial action(s) proposed	None
Time estimated to meet target:	N/A
<b>Effectiveness of this indicator/target as a measure towards achievement of the objective:</b>	
<b>Effectiveness of objective as a means of describing the desired future state of the applicable value:</b>	
<b>Recommendations for Improvement</b>	FLSM to begin reporting on this indicator in fiscal year 2008-2009

**Indicator L47: Percentage of Comments Receiving Response by Type by Licensee**

**Indicator Linkages:**

<u>M&amp;L IFPA Framework</u>	<u>CSA/CCFM SFM Framework</u>
Applies to the M&L IFPA process as a whole	<p><b>Criterion:</b> 6. Accepting Society’s Responsibility for Sustainable Development</p> <p><b>SFM Element:</b> 1. Aboriginal and Treaty Rights</p> <p><b>Value:</b> 1. First Nations’ Aboriginal and Treaty rights</p> <p><b>Objective:</b> 1. Duly- established First Nations’ Aboriginal and Treaty rights are recognized and respected</p> <p><b>SFM Element:</b> 3. Public Participation</p> <p><b>Value:</b> 1. Fair, equitable and effective public participation</p> <p><b>Objective:</b> 1. An open public involvement process designed and implemented to the satisfaction of participants.</p> <p><b>SFM Element:</b> 4. Information for Decision- Making</p> <p><b>Value:</b> 1. Informed decision- making and increased knowledge</p> <p><b>Objective:</b> 1. Relevant information is exchanged between interested parties to support decision-making and increased knowledge of ecosystem processes and human interactions with forest ecosystems</p>

**Indicator Status:**

Licensee	Licensee Reporting Period	Response Type	2004 Status	2005 Status	2006 Status	Current Status (2007)	Target	Variance	Target Met (Yes / No)
Canfor	Jan 1 – Dec 31	Written	80%	100%	100%	<b>100%</b>	100%	none	Yes
		Verbal	100%	100%	100%	<b>100%</b>	100%	none	Yes
BFP	Jan 1 – Dec 31	Written	100%	100%	100%	<b>100%</b>	100%	none	Yes
		Verbal	100%	100%	100%	<b>100%</b>	100%	none	Yes
L&M	Jan 1 – Dec 31	Written	N/A	N/A	N/A	<b>N/A</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Verbal	N/A	N/A	N/A	<b>N/A</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
BCTS	Jan 1 – Dec 31	Written	100%*	96%	100%	<b>100%</b>	100%	none	Yes
		Verbal		100%			100%	none	Yes

**IFPA Technical Committee Recommended Actions for Improvement**

<b>If target has not been met:</b>	
Implications of not meeting target:	
Remedial action(s) proposed	
Time estimated to meet target:	N/A
<b>Effectiveness of this indicator/target as a measure towards achievement of the objective:</b>	Appears to be effective at gauging our level of response to public comments.
<b>Effectiveness of objective as a means of describing the desired future state of the applicable value:</b>	These objectives are effective
<b>Recommendations for Improvement</b>	No actions at this time.