



## Request for Proposal: Assessing the impact of implementing FSC protection measures for Intact Forest Landscapes in Canada.

November 6, 2020

### FSC CANADA'S WORK TO MANAGE AND PROTECT LARGE LANDSCAPES

Since 2014 with the passing of Motion 65, Intact Forest Landscapes (IFLs) have become an important component of FSC's approach to forest management and the protection of important forest values. At the 2017 FSC General Assembly, Policy Motion 34 was passed requiring FSC National Offices to conduct assessments of the short- and long-term positive and negative impacts associated with the management and protection of IFLs. FSC Canada is undertaking the alignment of the National Forest Stewardship Standard (NFSS) for Canada (2018) with Version 2 of the International Generic Indicators which include direction related to IFL requirements. The outcome of this process will be a phase-out of the FSC International IFL Interim Guidance (2017) with a phase-in of Canadian IFL NFSS requirements. FSC Canada recognizes that there are concerns about the possible economic consequences of implementing protection of IFLs and as well as the interest in ensuring important societal and ecological values of IFLs endure in managed forest landscapes. The impact assessment aims to identify the possible positive and negative economic, social and environmental impacts.

### TERMS OF THE PROPOSAL

The successful candidate will deliver an Impact Assessment Report that will meet FSC requirements, including:

1. **Collect and analyze data on the economic impacts for forests with IFLs.** It should be noted that some work is already completed including the identification and representation of management units with IFLs and the mapping of these. In addition, a survey was sent to managers who have IFLs in their forest management unit, and while there was a low response rate to the survey, this serves as a good methodological base and information source.

The consultant is expected to expand the methodology using other relevant data sources and sampling from British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec, at a minimum. **In your proposal please include a description of the methods (including sampling size) and data sources, providing options and related costs where appropriate.**

2. **Collect and analyze other stakeholder and member perceptions and experiences of impacts.** It should be noted that some work is already completed including the identification of impacts to two scenarios (implementation of low FSC protection



measures and implementation of high protection measures) and the discussion of these with FSC Canada's cross-chamber Standard Development Group. It is the intent by FSC to collate this document and send this out as a discussion report to a wider stakeholder and membership list asking for additional feedback.

The consultant will be expected to utilize and analyze the data generated through this work for, and this will be made available early in the contract. In your proposal, if there are additional methods that are recommended to augment this information (e.g. targeted interviews, on-line surveys), please describe and include the costs.

- 3. Survey literature for relevant data.** A modest amount of data has been identified and there may be other sources that can contribute to the assessment. A modest review of literature is required.
- 4. Analyze inputs identifying trends and outcomes in an Impact Assessment Report.** The successful candidate will deliver an Impact Assessment Report that will meet FSC requirements (see below FSC guidelines).

All relevant FSC Canada information will be provided prior to the issuing of the contract, and once it has been established that there is mutual interest to proceed. The consultant is expected to work with FSC Canada to agree on the methodology and to ensure compliance with FSC requirements.

The completion of the contract including submission of the Impact Assessment Report must be finalized by February 1, 2021

The proposal for how you plan to fulfill the work is due including timeline and a breakdown of costs by November 16, 2020. Please send this to Vivian Peachey, Director of Standards and Policy, [v.peachey@ca.fsc.org](mailto:v.peachey@ca.fsc.org). Questions will be fielded until November 12. The notice of selection will be made by November 23 and the contract is expected to start December 1, 2020.



## Annex 1.

### **IMPLEMENTATION OF MOTION 34 FSC-GA-2017**

#### **GUIDELINES FOR STANDARD DEVELOPMENT GROUPS**

##### **PURPOSE**

Motion 34 (for text: see annex 1) requires FSC to 'enable the conducting of regional assessments of the short and long-term impacts – positive and negative – of the management and protection measures associated with the implementation of Motion 65/2014 and the International Generic Indicators (IGI)'. This document describes the framework in which these regional assessments will be developed.

FSC has prioritised the following countries for the development of the assessments in 2018:

- Russia / Boreal
- Canada / Boreal
- Brazil / Amazon
- Congo Basin

Other countries / SDGs may follow but will also be required to take this Framework / Guidelines into account when working on the assessments.

The Framework / Guidelines have 2 major fields of required compliance:

1. Process of assessments of impacts in the implementation associated with Motion 65/2014
2. Minimum content requirements in the assessment of impacts in the implementation associated with Motion 65/2014

Motion 34 can be applied at 2 moments in the standard setting processes:

1. To develop indicators: During the standards development process, before the SDG decides on a standard, to see what the implications would be of the different options for wording of the indicator that are discussed in the SDG; OR
2. To monitor developed and agreed indicators: When the standard has been approved, assessing what the implication of the indicators are for managing Intact Forest Landscapes.

The Standard Development Group agrees in the first stage of implementing Motion 34 which approach will be taken and communicates this with PSU and the Motion34 Steering Committee members.

## Process of assessments of impacts in the implementation associated with Motion 65/2014

### Summary illustration:

## FSC Motion 34 Steering Committee

checks ToR towards Framework, checks Quality of reports towards ToR / advises on global implementation of findings in the reports

### Canada

1. appoints a chamber balanced Task Force
2. TF develops ToR
3. TF appoints an independent, external consultant
4. TF receives and checks report of consultant, formulating outcomes and actions

### Russia

1. appoints a chamber balanced Task Force
2. TF develops ToR
3. TF appoints an independent, external consultant
4. TF receives and checks report of consultant, formulating outcomes and actions

### Amazon/Brazil

1. appoints a chamber balanced Task Force
2. TF develops ToR
3. TF appoints an independent, external consultant
4. TF receives and checks report of consultant, formulating outcomes and actions

### Congo Basin

1. appoints a chamber balanced Task Force
2. TF develops ToR
3. TF appoints an independent, external consultant
4. TF receives and checks report of consultant, formulating outcomes and actions

## 1. International level

### 1.1. FSC International appoints a Motion 34 Steering Committee of 3 FSC directors:

- 1.1.1. Hans Joachim Droste (Chief Policy Officer)
- 1.1.2. Jeremy Harrison (Chief Marketing Officer)
- 1.1.3. Gemma Boetekees (FSC Stakeholder Solutions Director)

### 1.2. The role of the Motion 34 Steering Committee is to:

- 1.2.1. Agree the ToR to be compliant with the Framework in this paper



- 1.2.2. Agree the report of the external independent consultant appointed by the regions/countries to be compliant with the ToR and the expected quality.
- 1.2.3. Develop a plan of outcomes, proposed actions and solutions for FSC International and the SDGs to address the identified solutions in the reports delivered.

## 2. National/Regional level

- 2.1. the (prioritised) SDG allocates a part of the FSC Activity Compensation Fee towards the development of the impact assessment. This figure is agreed between FSC International and the FSC National Office in the 2018 work plan.
- 2.2. The SDG appoints a 3-chamber based Task Force for the impact assessment research, with at least:
  - 2.2.1. One social chamber member of the SDG
  - 2.2.2. One economic chamber member of the SDG, and
  - 2.2.3. One environmental chamber member of the SDG.
- 2.3. The SDG Task Force for the impact study develops and approves Terms of Reference for the Impact Assessment Research, based on paragraph 3 of these Guidelines as mandatory elements of the research.
- 2.4. The SDG Task Force for the impact Study sends the ToR for a check on compliance with the Framework to the Motion 34 Committee. If needed, the SDG Task Force adjusts the ToR in agreement with the Global Motion 34 Committee.
- 2.5. The (Board of the) FSC National Office runs a selection process to appoint an independent consultant for the Impact Assessment, based on the approved Terms of Reference.
- 2.6. The Board of the FSC National Office selects an external and independent consultant to commit the Impact Assessment, in line with the approved Terms of Reference of the Task Force of the SDG.
- 2.7. The Task Force of the SDG for the Impact Assessment assesses the selected candidate for the impact assessment, for compliance with:
  - 2.7.1. The Terms of Reference
  - 2.7.2. The available budget
  - 2.7.3. The independence of the consultant from any specific environmental, economic or social interest in forests.
  - 2.7.4. If compliance is achieved, the consultant is appointed.



2.7.5. If compliance is not achieved, the consultant cannot be appointed and a renewed call for candidates is needed.

2.8. The report of the consultant is presented to the SDG Task Force and the Board of the FSC office and compliance with Terms of Reference is assessed and ensured.

2.9. The report is sent to the Motion 34 Steering Committee, for a consistency check with these Global Guidelines. The report sent to the Motion 34 Steering Committee includes outcomes and actions and is solution oriented.

### **3. Minimum content requirements in the assessment of impacts in the implementation associated with Motion 65/2014**

The following elements shall be addressed in the Terms of Reference of the impact studies.

#### **3.1. General aspects**

3.1.1. What is the place of the (potentially interested) certificate holders' forest area in the Intact Forest Landscape (IFL) in the region/country?

3.1.1.1. A small map of the IFL, with the boundaries of the certificate holders indicated

3.1.1.2. An indication of protected area within the IFL

3.1.1.3. An indication of known settlements, communities and indigenous area

3.1.1.4. An indication of the extend (in ha) of IFLs in the region and its development since 2000?

3.1.1.5. What is the overlap of FSC certified area with IFLs?

#### **3.2. Economic Impacts**

The economic impact assessment shall at least respond to the following questions:

##### **3.1.1 Is the implementation of Motion 65 economically viable, attractive and/or acceptable to all interested parties?**

3.1.1.1 How much of the total revenue and how much of the annual harvest of the company is coming from Intact Forest Landscapes?

3.1.1.2 What are the costs and benefits flow for (potentially interested) certificate holders?

3.1.1.3 How do IFL IGI and the Instructions for Standard Developers contribute to minimizing the economic burden and improving economic viability for (potentially interested) certificate holders / stakeholders (scenarios: no protection, 30% protection, 50% protection, 80% protection)?

3.1.1.4 What is the economic impact of protecting a percentage (see scenarios in 3.1.1.3) of a Management Unit for different stakeholders (e.g. Indigenous and



Traditional Peoples and local communities) living in or adjacent to the Management Unit?

3.1.1.5 What do (potentially interested) certificate holders / stakeholders consider as an acceptable economic threshold of protecting IFL areas within the MU (i.e. % of MU)?

**3.1.2 What are the budget and financial sustainability implications of the implementation of Motion 65 for the certificate holder?**

3.1.2.1 What investments of the (potentially interested) certificate holders were / will be required which are specifically related to the implementation of M65/2014 on In-tact Forest Landscapes? (e.g. funds needed to cover operating expenses)

3.1.2.2 What are the cash flow implications for the (potentially interested) certificate holder over time? How does this influence sustainable management of the forests?

3.1.2.3 How stable and predictable are the costs and benefits flows for the (potentially interested) certificate holder?

**3.1.3 Are subsidies, investments or other incentives received to make the implementation attractive?**

**3.1.4 How do affected stakeholders react to various economic impact scenarios? (e.g. continuing certification, dropping certification, moving to a less demanding certification scheme)**

**3.1.5 What indirect/intangible economic benefits may arise from the implementation of Motion 65? (e.g. protecting IFLs improves the image and value of the FSC brand)  
What risks may arise from the implementation of Motion 65?**

**3.2 Social impacts**

The social impact assessment shall at least respond to the following questions:

**3.2.1 How are the returns and costs of the implementation of Motion 65 benefitting or disadvantaging the different stakeholder groups?**

3.2.1.1 To which degree do they impact on

3.2.1.1.1 Social services (access to health care, schools, security) of the rural municipalities and indigenous peoples

3.2.1.1.2 Tax from the concessions

3.2.1.1.3 Employment of forest workers

3.2.1.1.4 Indigenous peoples access

3.2.1.1.5 Recreation



**3.2.2 How are Indigenous Peoples, traditional peoples and/or forest dependent communities recognized and impacted (positively and/or negatively) by the Intact Forest Landscape, particularly within the certified concession?**

3.2.2.1 With respect to traditional knowledge?

3.2.2.2 With respect to land use priorities and intactness?

**3.3 Environmental impacts**

The environmental impact assessment shall at least respond to the following questions:

**3.3.1 What is the historical background of the IFL in which the (potentially interested) certificate holders is operating?**

3.3.1.1 Is fragmentation happening in the IFL in which the (potentially interested) certificate holder has its operations? If so, what are the main reasons?

**3.3.2 What mechanisms or policies are in place to protect the IFLs in the region/country? How are they effective?**

The expectation of the report coming from this impact assessment is a report of maximum 10 pages.

## **4. Timeline**

The SDGs develop a timeline, in which:

- The moment in the standard setting process is identified to address Motion 34, and
- The 4 steps are planned as planned in the summary illustration on page 1.

This timeline is sent to the Motion 34 Steering Committee before 31 December 2018.

The process as described above is finalized by the Standard Development Committee, latest August 2020.

**ANNEX 1aTEXT OF THE AMENDED MOTION 34**

<b>34 / 2017</b>	<b>Regional assessments of the impacts of the implementation of Motion 65/2014</b>		
	Policy Motion	Original language: English	
<b>Name:</b>	<b>PROPOSER:</b> Benoit Jobbe Duval	<b>1<sup>st</sup> SECONDER:</b> Dr Marie Mbolo	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> SECONDER:</b> Mr. Elie Olivier Ngoa
<b>Organization:</b>	ATIBT	Individual	Individual
<b>Chamber:</b>	Economic North	Social South	Environmental South
<b>E-mail:</b>	benoit.jobbeduval@atibt.org	mbolo821@gmail.com	Elie.Ngoa@gfa-group.de

**Policy Motion** (high-level action request):

**Enable the conducting of regional assessments of the short and long-term impacts – positive and negative – of the management and protection measures associated with the implementation of Motion 65/2014 and the International Generic Indicators (IGI) which are the starting point for developing National Standards. In accordance with item 5 of the Motion, these assessments should compare various scenarios of implementing Motion 65/2014 and the IGIs and consider the environmental, social, and economic dimensions. Particular effort will be made to ensure the inclusion of impacts on indigenous Peoples, traditional peoples and forest dependent communities in these assessments.**

### **FSC Canada's work to manage and protect large landscapes**

**Since 2014 with the passing of Motion 65, Intact Forest Landscapes (IFLs) have become an important component of FSC's approach to forest management and the protection of important forest values. At the 2017 FSC General Assembly, policy motion 34 was passed requiring National Offices to conduct assessments of the positive and negative impacts associated with the management and protection of IFLs. FSC Canada is undertaking the alignment of the National Forest Stewardship Standard (NFSS) for Canada (2018) with the Version 2 of the International Generic Indicators including IFL requirements. The outcome of this process will be a phase out of the FSC International IFL Interim Guidance (2017) with a phase-in of Canadian IFL NFSS requirements. FSC Canada recognizes that there are concerns about the possible economic consequences of implementing protection of IFLs and as well as the interest in ensuring important societal and ecological values of IFLs endure in managed forest landscapes. This survey is an attempt to identify the possible economic consequences, potential benefits and the IFL 'Solution Space' by gathering information from forest managers. Please respond to the survey based upon your experience as a manager of a Forest Management Unit or operating within a Timber Supply Area (TSA).**

**If you feel you are not the right person to fill in the survey please forward the link to an appropriate colleague.**

How is an intact forest defined?

**An intact forest landscape is a territory within today's global extent of forest cover which contains forest and non-forest ecosystems minimally influenced by human economic activity, with an area of at least 500 km<sup>2</sup> (50,000 ha) and a minimal width of 10 km (measured as the diameter of a circle that is entirely inscribed within the boundaries of the territory) (FSC CA NFSS)**

**To provide practical guidance to companies FSC Canada developed a Delineation Document (2017) that provides guidance and some flexibility around details left unaddressed by the definition, such as buffers around anthropogenic features, how to deal with natural disturbances, etc. To review this document please visit <https://ca.fsc.org/preview.delineating-intact-forest-landscapes.a-2420.pdf>**

**To understand the distribution, size and context of IFLs in Canada, FSC CA has used Global Forest Watch International (2016) datasets. Please contact FSC CA to retrieve the data we have related to your forest, or use your data.**



1. Contact details

**Name**

**Organization**

**City/Town**

**Province**

**Email Address**

**Phone Number**

2. Do you have more than one forest management units (FMU)/Timber Supply Area (TSA) with IFLs?

Note: If so, please fill out survey for each.

Yes

No

3. What is the name of the forest management unit (FMU)/Timber Supply Area (TSA)\*?

Note: \* Area based tenure or all or significant part of a volume based tenure (ie Timber Supply Area)

4. What is the total IFL Area (ha) in FMU/TSA (as of 2016)\*\*?

\*\* FSC Canada has data by FMU based on Global Forest Watch (2016)

[http://data.globalforestwatch.org/datasets/44bbf06379f545daa149ee7b237b9e18\\_1?selectedAttribute=shape\\_Area](http://data.globalforestwatch.org/datasets/44bbf06379f545daa149ee7b237b9e18_1?selectedAttribute=shape_Area). Contact FSC Canada for statistical information or provide best available information for the FMU.

5. If you are using your own data, please indicate when it is current as of (date/year)?

6. What is the estimated area of IFL(s) not available for harvest for the next 10 years or greater as a result of regulatory or non-market related operability requirements (ie. wetland, non-forest, prohibitive access constraint, regulated protected area, caribou conservation measures, old growth areas, ecological reserves, Indigenous values, stakeholder values, other tenure holders or other ) in the FMU/TSA?

Note: Please read question 7 before answering.

7. If the FMU is FSC certified, what is the estimated area (ha) of the IFL(s), not identified in Q5, that overlaps with other voluntary FSC requirements (ie conservation areas, Indigenous values, stakeholder values, community use areas)?

8. What is the net area of IFL(s) planned or available (taking into account Q5 & Q6) for possible timber harvest in the FMU in two periods?

2020-2030

2030+

9. What is average estimated total yield (m<sup>3</sup>/hectare) of all species and products in the net IFL area?

Note: Please refer to Q8 when answering.

10. What is the forest product mix from FMU (% of total yield by species)?

sawlog

pulp

veneer / plywood

other panel products (ie  
OSB)

biomass

other

11. Where applicable, describe the potential economic impact (cost, wood supply, employment) of the IFL area (identified in Q7 above) being unavailable for harvest in the two periods?

2020-2030

2030+

12. What economic values are represented in the IFL?

- Tourism economic values (e.g. remote fishing lodges)
- Timber
- Non-timber forest products
- Contributions to broad economic values – clean water, air purification, etc.

Other (please specify)

13. What social values are represented in the IFL?

- Indigenous cultural values
- Employment
- Community social values, including recreation
- Scientific and educational value

Other (please specify)

14. What forest health and global cycles values are represented in the IFL?

- Carbon sequestration and contributing to climate change mitigation
- Contribution to ecological processes (e.g. hydrological cycles, natural disturbances)

Other (please specify)

15. What biodiversity values are represented in the IFL?

- Provision of habitat for wildlife, including species at risk
- Biological "storehouses"

Other (please specify)

16. Identify any potential opportunities or synergies that could result from IFL protection on the FMU/TSA? (ie. Carbon sequestration, contribution to ecological processes, climate change mitigation, wildlife habitat protection including species at risk, environmental monitoring, research)?

17. Please offer any suggestions that you feel would support economically viable forest management and the maintenance of IFL values on the FMU/TSA?



**Thank you for providing input.**

18. Please email or provide links to any impact studies related to the management and protection of IFLs.

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

19. Are you willing to discuss the economic Impacts of IFLs and potential alternatives to current IFL protection measures with FSC Canada and/or the FSC User Group?

- Yes
- No

## **FSC Canada's work to protect large landscapes**

**As directed by a membership motion (M65) FSC Canada is working with the standard development group to develop indicators that aim to protect the vast majority of intact forest landscapes (IFLs). A second motion (M34) directs us to assess the short and long-term impacts – positive and negative – of management and protection measures associated with the implementation of Motion 65.**

**Key to the assessment is to gather the perspectives, experiences and findings across affected groups that will be used to map the possible range of impacts (economic, social and environment) for two scenarios –**

- **What are the impacts for implementing lower IFL protection measures?**
- **What are the impacts for implementing higher IFL protection measures?**

**This conceptual map of possible impacts will complement other assessment methods, like economic projection modeling.**

**Please share with us your experiences and perspectives around large landscapes.**

**1. Contact details**

**Name**

**Organization**

**City/Town**

**Province**

**Email Address**

**Phone Number**

**2. What chamber or interest do you belong?**

- Aboriginal chamber
- Social chamber
- Environmental chamber
- Economic chamber

Identifying the positive & negative impacts for having **lower** protection requirements

**Drawing from your professional experience or research you have conducted or reviewed please help us understand the possible impacts that may occur.**

**Where applicable, please make a note if the identified impact occurred in a particular place or under an unique context.**

**In this section we will be identifying positive and negative impacts for having lower IFL protection requirements.**

3. What are the **positive economic impacts** for having lower protection requirements for IFLs (e.g. a forest company will have less harvest and management restrictions)?

1. very unlikely   2.   3. some evidence suggests   4.   5. highly likely

Timber-supply is greater, more secured, & available

          

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

There is increased revenue and forest industry profitability

          

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

There is a larger tax base & more 'stumpage' fees

          

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

There are more secure & prosperous social services

          

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

There are more jobs & more secure jobs

          

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

4. What other economic impacts could occur?

5. What are the **positive social impacts** for having lower protection requirements for IFLs (e.g. a forest company will have less harvest and management restrictions)?

1. very unlikely      2.      3. some evidence suggests      4.      5. highly likely

More forest activity leads to increased road access for Indigenous Peoples & local community

          

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

6. What other social impacts could occur?

7. What are the **positive environmental impacts** for having lower protection requirements for IFLs (e.g. a forest company will have less harvest and management restrictions)?

1. very unlikely      2.      3. some evidence suggests      4.      5. highly likely

Financial and human resources are reinvested on other activities that support the environment

          

Additional comments or please findings that support this.

8. What other environmental impacts could occur?

9. What are the **negative economic impacts** for having lower protection requirements for IFLs (e.g. a forest company will have less harvest and management restrictions)?

1. very  
unlikely

2.

3. some evidence  
suggests

4.

5. highly  
likely

Long term forest sustainability & productivity is diminished

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

Long term economic viability (taxes, loss of jobs) is jeopardized

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

Long term community health (social services) is jeopardized

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

10. What other economic impacts could occur?

11. What are the **negative social impacts** for having lower protection requirements for IFLs (e.g. a forest company will have less harvest and management restrictions)?

1. very unlikely      2.      3. some evidence suggests      4.      5. highly likely

Indigenous peoples large landscape dependent values, like trap lines may be jeopardized

          

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

Indigenous peoples engagement in other forest management possibilities (Indigenous conservation areas) is diminished

          

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

Aesthetic & remoteness jeopardized

          

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

If disagreement about land management persists this may result in conflicts between stakeholders

          

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

12. What other social impacts could occur?

13. What are the **negative environmental impacts** for having lower protection requirements for IFLs (e.g. a forest company will have less harvest and management restrictions)?

1. very unlikely      2.      3. some evidence suggests      4.      5. highly likely

Species loss, deforestation, cumulative effect activities on habitat and species & climate resiliency and carbon storage

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

Intact forests are converted, degraded, & fragmented by roads, & harvesting increasing the cumulative impacts from various activities (forestry, mining, oil & gas, urbanization)

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

Habitat conditions for large landscape dependent species like caribou & wolverine are diminished & populations are in decline

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

Ecosystem health (hydrological systems, climatic functions) is diminished, carbon sequestration reduced

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

Roads allow for increased access accelerating degradation of primary forests

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

14. What other environmental impacts could occur?

Identifying the positive & negative impacts for having **higher** protection

Drawing from your professional experience or research you have conducted or reviewed please help us understand the possible impacts that may occur.

Where applicable, please make a note if the identified impact occurred in a particular place or under an unique context.

In this section we will be identifying positive and negative impacts for having higher IFL protection requirements.

15. What are the **positive economic impacts** for having higher protection requirements for IFLs (e.g. a forest company will have more harvest and management restrictions)?

1. very unlikely      2.      3. some evidence suggests      4.      5. highly likely

Other economic & socially beneficial opportunities, like ecosystem services (carbon sequestration and climate resiliency) may thrive

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

Maintained remoteness improves recreational opportunities & outfitter business

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

Economy is diversified

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

16. What other economic impacts could occur?

17. What are the **positive social impacts** for having higher protection requirements for IFLs (e.g. a forest company will have more harvest and management restrictions)?

1. very unlikely      2.      3. some evidence suggests      4.      5. highly likely

Aboriginal communities that inhabit the frontier boreal forest of northern Canada practice their traditional way of life and depend upon the forests for their food, medicines, and economic livelihood

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

Other benefits important to Indigenous communities and local communities, such as improved trap lines, and hunting opportunities benefit from intactness

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

Long term resiliency of local community diversify improves

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

18. What other social impacts could occur?

19. What are the **positive environmental impacts** for having higher protection requirements for IFLs (e.g. a forest company will have more harvest and management restrictions)?

1. very unlikely      2.      3. some evidence suggests      4.      5. highly likely

Habitat conditions for large landscape dependent species like caribou & wolverine are improved and populations are more likely to remain stable and/or increase

Additional comments or please findings that support this.

Overall biodiversity is maintained and/or improved

Additional comments or please findings that support this.

Large landscape related ecological functions like hydrological processes and carbon sequestration are maintained and enhanced

Additional comments or please findings that support this.

20. What other environmental impacts could occur?

21. What are the **negative economic impacts** for having higher protection requirements for IFLs (e.g. a forest company will have more harvest and management restrictions)?

1. very unlikely      2.      3. some evidence suggests      4.      5. highly likely

There is a less secure & available timber supply, decreased revenue, and forest industry profitability

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

There is less of a tax base

1. very unlikely      2.      3. some evidence suggests      4.      5. highly likely

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

There is a loss of jobs

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

Long term social services (health care, schools, security) is less secure & prosperous

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

Contravention of legal wood supply agreement with government results in possible loss of allocation and loss of "forest royalties" for the province

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

Current government policy varies across provinces and in many cases would be very difficult to support formalized protection measures making implementing protection difficult

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

22. What other economic impacts could occur?

23. What are the **negative social impacts** for having higher protection requirements for IFLs (e.g. a forest company will have more harvest and management restrictions)?

1. very unlikely      2.      3. some evidence suggests      4.      5. highly likely

The livelihood of people affected by possible job loss etc. is diminished

          

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

If disagreement about land management persists this may result in conflicts between stakeholders

          

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

24. What other social impacts could occur?

25. What are the **negative environmental impacts** for having higher protection requirements for IFLs (e.g. a forest company will have more harvest and management restrictions)?

1. very unlikely      2.      3. some evidence suggests      4.      5. highly likely

The boreal forest is a young, dynamic & resilient ecosystem often changed by fire, insect & storm events, forest management enhances the forest condition

          

Additional comments or cite findings that support this.

26. What other environmental impacts could occur?

