

EBMWG Project Close-Out Report

Project #: HWB 02

Project Title: Human Well Being Indicators – Baseline Report

Steering Committee Members: Grant Scott, Wally Eamer, Dorthe Jakobsen, David Flood, Glen Farenholtz, Ralph Matthews, Terre Satterfield

1.0 FUNDING

The total cost of the project identified in the ATF will not exceed \$90 000. Final billings are outstanding and the project will be completed within budget.

2.0 EXTENT TO WHICH PROJECT OBJECTIVES WERE ACHIEVED

The Ecosystem Based Management Working Group (EBM Working Group) issued an RFP requesting services that would seek to;

1) Conduct a review and assessment of the HWB indicators compiled by Rubus EcoScience Alliance (Rubus) with respect to the relative effectiveness of the indicators in measuring human wellbeing at multiple levels (e.g. community and region), and the cost and practicality of collecting baseline data using them. Provide recommendations to the Human Well Being Program Steering Committee (HWB PSC) on the optimal set of indicators to use to collect baseline data for human wellbeing, given their relative effectiveness and the costs and practicality of gathering data using them. The HWB PSC will give priority to those indicators either drawn from or directly related to the list of indicators in Schedule C and G1.

2) Recommend modifications or additions to the list of indicators generated in 1 provided there is a clear rationale for doing so

3) Collect baseline data using the indicators selected by the HWB PSC in 1 and 2 above

4) Recommend methodology and/or rationale for setting targets for the indicators in 2 and 3 above

Subsequently the services of Sheltair were acquired to complete the requested work as identified in there detailed proposal – see below.

| Objective | Description | Evaluation (Text) | Summary* |
|-----------|--|---|-----------|
| 1 | Review existing indicators in Schedules C and G, and the full suite of indicators compiled by Rubus during Phase 1 of this project. | Sheltair was provided all relevant materials by PSC to complete this task. | Fully Met |
| | Provide recommendations to the HWB PSC on the optimal set of indicators to use given: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The priority the PSC places on indicators drawn from or directly related to schedules C and G. | Materials generated for PSC by Sheltair to begin improving understanding of desired indicators and data sources to support establishing a baseline. | Fully Met |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|-----------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relative effectiveness of the Rubus and C and G indicators in measuring human wellbeing. • The costs and practicality of gathering data using any of the indicators from Rubus and schedules C and G. • Any recommended modifications/additions to the Rubus and schedules C and G list. | | |
| 2 | Attend a one-day workshop with the HWB Project Steering Committee (PSC) and other invitees identified by the HW PSC to discuss project deliverables, context, the recommended indicator list, and data collection methods | Workshop provided framework for PSC and participants to improve understanding of the value in selecting relevant indicators and data availability pit falls. Outcomes incorporated – New Theme and Sub-Theme Areas; Identification and addition of suitable C/G indicators; Identification of core indicators, future indicators and those that will be in an appendix. | Fully Met |
| 3 | Finalize data collection and target methodology by generating an outline describing (i) the scale(s) at which data for each indicator will be collected (e.g. First Nation, local community level, regional district level, region, etc.); (ii) the source (see Appendix B for examples of potential sources) and the method to be used to collect the data (e.g. if secondary, what is the source, if primary, what is the method), and (iii) cost and collection cycle for monitoring (iv) contingency plans if data are not accessible for identified indicators (v) preliminary recommendations for a methodology to select targets for the indicators. | Meeting and follow up email correspondence provided interaction with PSC and Sheltair to finalize indicators survey methods and requisite data sources. | Fully Met |
| 4 | Submit a draft report to the PSC based on the outcomes of Tasks 2 -6. The report will be graphically appealing and desktop published in Adobe InDesign, as well as a soft copy in PDF format. | Revised by PSC August 26th , 2008 New information source identified for detailed community data through Pacific North Coast Integrated Management Area initiative. | Fully Met |
| 5 | Incorporate inputs from three | Revised by PSC August 26th , 2008 | Fully Met |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-----------|
| | sources into the draft report 1) outstanding indicator data 2) employment surveys (proxy and PNCIMA) 3) Report revisions from discussion with PSC on draft. | New objective that revised the delivery date of the draft final report to January 2009. | |
| 6 | Within two weeks of submitting the draft report, attend a one-day workshop with the HWB PSC, PIMCs, other EBM WG members, and possibly others interested to discuss the findings in the draft report. | Revised by EBM EWG – Jan 23rd, 2009 Decision was made to provide draft Final Report to first workshop participants due to revised timeline for Final Report. Participants asked to review and provide any substantive comments for consideration by the PSC. | Fully Met |
| 7 | Prepare and submit a final draft report and draft indicator database (with specifications, protocols, manual, and general maintenance requirements for the database), based on the discussions and feedback provided at the second Workshop | Sheltair works to provide a timely delivery of both deliverables after receiving community survey data from the PNCIMA data technicians. | Fully Met |
| 8 | Incorporate feedback from project steering committee and submit final report in addition to the indicator database (with specifications, protocols, manual, and general maintenance requirements for the database) | Review by the PSC and workshop participants is limited to substantive errors or omissions. No Peer Review proposed however ILMB technicians reviewed the Technical Report for data collection. | Fully Met |
| 9 | Deliver Final Report and Final Technical Report | Deemed complete on the basis that major errors or omissions would be categorized in close out report. | Fully Met |

* Use: Fully met (100%), Substantially met (75%-100%), Partially met (50-75%), Marginally met (25%-50%), Not met (0% - 25%)

3.0 MAJOR TASKS COMPLETED

| Task | Description | Date |
|------|--|-------------------------------|
| 1 | RFP draft and posted on BC Bid | Dec 23 rd , 2007 |
| 2 | Contract awarded and workplan deliverables set with Sheltair | Feb 13 th , 2008 |
| 3 | Approval to Fund – established and approved. | March 20 th , 2008 |
| 4 | First Workshop – Indicator Selection with community representatives, | March 7 th , 2008 |

| Task | Description | Date |
|-------------|--|------------------------------|
| 5 | Preliminary meeting with PSC – review ToC for draft report and proposed indicators as workshop outcomes. | April 1 st , 2008 |
| 6 | PSC and Sheltair meeting to review to confirm indicators and identify data sources. | May 6 th , 2008 |
| 7 | Establish Workplan for Community Surveys | May 20 th , 2008 |
| 8 | Deliver a draft HWB and Technical reports. | Aug 15 th , 2008 |
| 9 | Deliver a Final HWB Baseline Report | Jan 13 th , 2009 |
| 10 | Deliver Final Technical (Methodology) Report | Feb 16 th , 2009 |

4.0 KEY PRODUCTS

| Item # | Description | Completion date | Location |
|---------------|--|-----------------------------|---|
| 1 | Central and North Coast - Human Well Being – Indicators Report | Jan 16 th , 2009 | Delivered to the LRF Final Report on CLUDI Website |
| 2 | Technical Report | Feb 16 th , 2009 | ILMB |
| 3 | Data Package | Feb 16 th , 2009 | ILMB |

5.0 PEER REVIEW

Program Steering Committee was deemed adequate for providing reviews of the various draft products leading up to the final version of the HWB Indicators report. Additionally, the technical report on methodologies has been circulated to ILMB GIS staff to ensure the approach allows for replication of the baseline and that the data tables submitted are useable by ILMB as the future data custodians.

6.0 MAJOR FINDINGS

Consultant recommendations (For exact wording please reference relevant section of the report)

HWB Indicator Report

The following recommendations are proposed for future updates of the HWB indicators:

1. Incorporate the HWB indicators and monitoring program into the EBM Adaptive Management Framework.
2. Update indicators every five years. The data collection period should follow the release dates for the census data. Census data is released approximately 2-years following each census. The first 5-year report would therefore be developed in 2013.

3. When selecting staff or consultants to update the indicators, ensure that they have access to GIS software and are able to work with GIS data.
4. Maintain existing list of indicators over time and limit adding and amending the measures to ensure consistent reporting year to year so that a trend in the indicator can be tracked.
5. A focus on improving community scale data is recommended using the existing community survey tool (see the accompanying Technical Report) and build on it.
6. INC-2 should be amended to measure Household Income Distribution, rather than individual income. As discussed in the write-up for INC-2 (see Pg 64) household income distribution is a more meaningful measure.
7. Much of the GIS based data are reported at coast area scale that requires solutions for reporting at community scale where deemed important to do so.
8. Future updates may want to include additional indicators. In the future, funding should be secured to explore ways to collect the data.
9. Identify additional, appropriate indicators for implementation targets – see proposed target setting methodology (p. 143) for details.

Technical Report

The following are recommendations for the data:

1. Develop arrangements or agreements between the Ecosystem Based Management Working Group (EBM WG) and data providers, identifying what data is needed, when it becomes available, any associated costs, and the required level of data disaggregation.
2. Archive data for the baseline year (2006), including all files.
3. Ensure the person assigned to update the indicator has access to GIS software and is skilled in conducting simple GIS work.
4. Ensure that the community survey tool used in generating the 2006 baseline is also used to update the relevant indicators.
5. Although significant amounts of the data used was available for free, it may be worthwhile to consider a custom extraction of data from Statistics Canada. There is a minimum charge of \$1115 for up to 100,000 data cells, and the extraction required for statistics using census data may be acquired with minimal additional cost. There is typically a four to six week lead time required before delivery of the data. The up front cost of purchasing data will reduce the amount of time required to collect the data manually.
6. Repeat the timber harvesting and processing employment survey conducted by Pierce Lefebvre Consulting using the same methodology in order to obtain comparable data for the EMPL-3 indicator, with the exception of determining the timber harvest (see recommendation 7).
7. Determine harvest levels for the plan areas using timber marks for greater accuracy (in relation to EMPL-3). In the Pierce Lefebvre Consulting report, harvest data was received at the licences level and assumptions were made to determine the mainland portions of timber harvest where licences cover portions of Vancouver island.

7.0 STEERING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) Accept the attached report as a meaningful start point for a future measure of Human Well Being.
- 2) In March of 2012 the existing LRF or governance structure should initiate a resourced committee to oversee the development and completion of an updated baseline report for March 2013.
- 3) For the period of January to March of 2013 the existing LRF or governance structure should engage in a synthesis discussion on the status of HWB in the plan areas in relation to HWB strategies that have been initiated or implemented and informed by Adaptive Management.
- 4) Discuss the setting of targets for the various HWB indicators as part of the synthesis discussion and further development of future HWB strategies.

8.0 RELEVANCE/SIGNIFICANCE FOR EBM IMPLEMENTATION

The definition of EBM seeks to ensure the co-existence of healthy, fully functioning ecosystems and human communities. The HWB Baseline report identifies 28 indicators if monitored and updated can provide insight on the level of HWB achieved and a perspective on performance through time that ideally would be evaluated over the long term.

Integrating future HWB monitoring requirements into Adaptive Management will be necessary to inform and facilitate meaningful discussions related to future course corrections, decisions and changes within the regulatory regime that would be deemed necessary to support the EBM implementation.