

HLPO Suite Steering Committee

Face-to-Face meeting minutes

Sep 8, 2016 1:30 PM

Present: Ian Parfitt (SGRC), Ian Dennis (SGRC), Beth Macleod, Kathy Howard, Ron Ozanne, Loreen Hodgkinson, Ron Palmer, Peter Lewis, Tyler Hodgkinson, Kailee Woodbeck

Missing: Ian Wiles, Frances Swan, Karl Sommerfeld, Tom Bradley

Chair; Julie Castonguay

Scribe: Loreen Hodgkinson

1. Introduction of committee members

Introductions made in person, none called in

2. Adopt July 7th minutes (see attached July 14th email) - ADOPTED

Review of previous meeting's action items, Julie suggested to defer clarification of Project Manager's financial responsibility when over-budget, item will be resolved by newly formed financial subcommittee. Group to discuss VRI update today; cost update is parked for discussion later in the meeting; suite project priorities – some have been worked on, if not they will be discussed this meeting

Ian asked for clarification on UWR Boundary action item. Peter says he is surprised that Ian is asking for clarification. There may be error with the code that Ian Dennis wrote (and thousands of dollars have been spent) because it is not working. Julie says this item is parked for discussion later in the meeting.

3. Report on financial sub-committee first meeting and review sub-committee Terms of Reference - APROVED

First meeting happened last week, Julie, Frances and Ian Parfitt participated, no minutes taken, just completed the TOR. Drafted Terms of Reference for HLPO Financial sub-committee. Deadline is Nov 30, 2016

Peter says we can't spend any more money this year because it is already over budget. Ian says the deficit was created two years ago.

The plan is for the financial subcommittee to meet every two weeks until the TOR is complete.

Beth suggests to monitor when the budget is going over by a certain amount. Julie confirmed that it was the intention of the financial sub-committee to incorporate a tight budget notification mechanism.

ACTION 1: Next financial subcommittee meeting is scheduled for next week.

ACTION 2: Finalize work related to approve Terms of Reference for HLPO Financial sub-committee by Nov 30, 2016

4. Review current financial report and review detail info spending for YTD

The suite reporting tables do not work which create risks to both the suite investors -forest licensees (legal risk of not meeting the KBHLPO) and Selkirk College (financial risk - who is carrying the debt).

Ron Ozanne says FLNRO should make a stable financial commitment. Right now, the FLNRO's contribution fluctuates every year because the contribution is from "March madness" money. The money may or may not be there next year. The group thinks there should be a commitment from government to make this project successful.

ACTION 3: Ian Parfitt to draft a letter to Selkirk DM district level on behalf of group, letter will request a stable contribution from FLNRO, letter to be signed by all licensees and request that government be actively involved in the monitoring of the KBHLPO.

Due: letter to be ready for next meeting

ACTION 4: subscriber contribution will have to be reviewed looked at, by financial sub-committee and make recommendation to the steering committee in 2017.

5. Brief discussion regarding Selkirk Geomatics grants

Selkirk College is eligible for federal funding every year. Ian wants to repurpose the budget and get NSERC to match the subscriber contribution in this project. Specific project ideas are due Oct 27. Data could be leveraged as in-kind contribution, e.g. Canfor has 5 million dollars invested in LIDAR data.

LIDAR might be able to be used for depletions.

Ian would need to sell what this group is doing right now as a research project.

ACTION 5: Kalesnikoff, Interfor, Ian, and Kathy H. to strike sub-committee to come up with potential research ideas by October 27th.

6. Review new reporting suite table format (THLB columns deleted and zero "0" operability field fixed) (see attached August 9th email)

Two fixes made to tables. Inop area has been fixed and THLB column was removed because it was all zeros anyway.

Request to make spatial data a project deliverable. Ian thinks this is already a deliverable. Resultant to be split by TSA. Depletion layers to be split by TSA. Group asks Selkirk to spend no more than ½ day to deliver depletion by FTP.

ACTION 6: Ian Dennis to make geodatabase available for the spatial data used to create the suite tables (resultant file and depletion files).

Action 7: Suite user to review new table format for approval next meeting

7. Discuss options to update reporting suite in light of further VRI delay (options: status quo or update depletion/grow stock)

VRI Update, at least two months away. What do we want to do?

Once VRI update will be completed, it may be interesting to compare government depletion layer with Selkirk newly created depletion layer.

Update suite with depletion layer and no VRI

Action 8: Ron Palmer to get back to group by Sept 14, to confirm if Interfor can forgo the update this year. Rest of group is ok with not updating the suite tables

Completed - On September 23, Ron confirmed that "Interfor is okay with not updating the data at this time - as per the rest of the licensees in the group, with the understanding the data will be updated in March or April and the biodiversity tables will be current at that point."

In the future, Selkirk College to update the suite annually at the end of March with depletion only if VRI update is not available.

8. Status of UWR Boundary and next steps

Issue regarding the UWR Boundary: the iPac numbers are different from the Selkirk numbers for net planning cell areas. Gross Ha - Open Forest ha - Open Range ha = Net Area ha. There may be an error with the iPac numbers which happen to coincide with the GAR order numbers but these numbers disagree with Selkirk's numbers.

Action 9: Ian to spend no more than a full day to compare iPac AML logic to the new Selkirk Python logic to find the source of the area discrepancies between Selkirk and GAR Order which is the same as the iPac areas. Ian to come up with a cost estimate to correct the area differences.
Due: Friday, Sep 23

Compare the report areas with GAR order, Randy to be available to answer questions.

9. Any other reporting suite issue to discuss

Action 10: Ian is to post logic to the website, action carried forward from previous meeting.
Due: Next meeting

Action 11: Beth and Kailee to share their how-to/flowchart with the group; running the suite.

Due: Next meeting

10. Next meeting: Thu, Sep 29, by phone