Eco-Notes

NEWSLETTER OF THE POLIS PROJECT

WINTER 2002/2003

In This Issue:

Ecological Governance
Our Mission
Canada vs. Sweden
Community University Connections
Community Forestry
Growing Healthy Communities Project
Urban Growth Management
Hul'qumi'num Territory
The Dogwood Initiative
Convention on Biological Diversity
UVic's Campus Plan
Mining Sector Alternatives
Staff Notes
Publications

University of Victoria

Message from the Chair

Ecological Governance: Sustainability through Democratic Community

By Michael M'Gonigle

As POLIS embarks on its second year of activities, we have a long list of exciting projects underway, and several more in development. Unifying our mission is a commitment to understanding "ecological governance," and to helping put it into practice.

This fall, POLIS will be embarking on a program to formalize its internal structure, and to embed its operation in the broader community. POLIS is a unique research organization, linked to the university through the Eco-Research Chair of Environmental Law and Policy, and to the regional and provincial community through the diverse work of its many Research Associates.

POLIS was created to be a connecting vehicle for university-community research and policy development. This mission will be enhanced as we increase our outreach to the community. To draw on the rich experience around us, we will soon be establishing a number of advisory boards for individual project areas, and for the organization as a whole. This process of self-definition and outreach began in September. A new staff member, UVic graduate Anne Nguyen will lead this process, in conjunction with POLIS's tireless secretary and office manager, Liz Wheaton.

Meanwhile, of course, the work goes on. This work is designed to liberate the potential where people *in place* work together to develop sustainability in that place. This basic ethos motivates our research, writing, and policy practice.

The forest policy work of Brian Egan, Lisa Ambus, Gail Hochachka and Jessica Dempsey focuses on tenure reform and the potential for community forestry. The publication of our Community Ecosystem Trust report in the spring of 2001 spawned intense interest throughout the province. The trust concept is now a central strategy being considered in the negotiations over the future of the Great Bear Rainforest on BC's Central Coast.

But its implications are even larger. Take, for example, the continuing conflict over First Nations' treaty negotiations. On all sides, these negotiations are bogged down in the quest of First Nations for title recognition and the province's resistance to such recognition. A very complex issue, nevertheless, this is essentially a backwards-looking conflict with both sides arguing over who has what entitlements

(continued)

The challenge is to move beyond conflict and create future-oriented solutions - and the key to these solutions is the sustainable community.

based on what pre-existing rights.

The challenge is, of course, to get past such conflicts and create future-oriented solutions-and to do so fast. How can we get to a place where all sides — government, First Nations, environmentalists, and local communities — begin to put in place novel long-term institutional arrangements in which these competing title interests might be accommodated and embedded? The goal is to create respectful solutions NOW that will generate sustainable and innovative options to resolve the seemingly interminable crisis in our forest lands and communities, both aboriginal and non-aboriginal.

And the key to these solutions is the sustainable community. This approach also underpins the excellent policy work of our offspring, Forest Futures (recently renamed The Dogwood Initiative). Under the far-sighted leadership of environmental lawyer, Will Horter, this now three-year old organization has been providing real options in the ongoing softwood lumber dispute. Many local communities in BC support these options, and American negotiators have publicly recognized them as holding a key to the solution — but Victoria and Ottawa still choose not to listen.

Even closer to home, POLIS has been actively involved in trying to stimulate a public debate over the future of the UVic campus. The university has completed a draft Campus Plan for the next 15 years, and will be making a decision on it early in 2003. Unfortunately, this Plan falls far short in realizing the university's potential.

POLIS staff (including Research Associate Emily MacNair, summer student Nancy Klenavic and our new Campus Plan coordinator Justine Starke) has participated in the internal university discussion for two years, and are now working with the larger community to help bring the university's "smart growth" potential to light. A big lesson of this project is (again) the difficulty of translating broad policy and research into on-the-ground local innovation. One might "think globally", but "acting locally" is another matter, even in a place with such potential as the University of Victoria. Big institutions learn, and change, slowly.

A lawyer and political economist, Dr. Michael M'Gonigle holds the Eco-Research Chair of Environmental Law and Policy at the University of Victoria. Dr. M'Gonigle leads the POLIS team in investigating new strategies for developing sustainability and in the pursuit of ecological alternatives in economic and constitutional policy.

As this newsletter reports, the list of our projects is long — from David Boyd's national environmental law reform, to Emily MacNair's community garden planning, to Kelly Bannister's work in developing research protocols between the university and First Nation's communities. In recent months, we have also been awarded a large research grant to develop our work in urban water management (through a new Research Associate). In another new project, we are working with the Hul'qumi'num Treaty Group to explore alternatives to the land selection model.

In all these areas, the theme of ecological governance pervades. Despite the obstacles to our long-awaited ecological transformation, it is rewarding work.

Whether we are researching and writing for academic publication, organizing a conference or workshop, working with community groups or advising government policy-makers, our work is pervaded by a common excitement — the greatest significance can be found in the smallest of places. Foster the community, and we will change the world.

Definition:

Polis (noun)

1. (orig.)city state, as in Greek polis
2. (gen.)participatory community
3. (phil.)highest aspiration of social life via collective rational and ethical decision-making.

Polis (verb)

Where ethics and politics promote the cultivation of the virtuous character with political wisdom, corresponding judgement and action, and a good and just life for citizens.

What is Ecological Governance?

By Michael M'Gonigle

Governance is a new concept bred of the modern age. In addition to government, it embraces two other pillars of social decision-making — business, and what is loosely called "civil society" in all its attendant forms. In countless ways, this complex matrix of governance moulds our world, and how we each live in it. With the anti-globalization protests of recent years, the quest for new forms of 'global governance' is the most visable level on which concerns about emerging trends in governance are being played out. After all, today's global regimes are situated in a global environment, one that is dramatically deteriorating at all levels. Inevitably, a central challenge of the 21st century is to reinvent these processes of governance onto an ecologically sustainable basis.

All this is widely apparent; it is common sense. But our assessment at POLIS is a specific one. We look to the ever-growing scale of our institutions and ever-expanding levels of their appetites. And we address this growth as the major force driving our global ecological overshoot. Ever bigger, faster, higher, we have ourselves become lost in systems of our own creation; meanwhile, our daily experience is cut off from the earthly sources of our sustenance.

This assessment provides its own response — the need to take responsibility for what happens locally. A healthy planet must necessarily be composed of many healthy local places. To understand the world, we must connect what we seek to know with what we actually do. Everywhere, global sustainability inevitably begins in one's home place. In POLIS, the phrases "ecosystem-based" and "community-based" reverberate through all our work. Town and country, North and South, POLIS is about people participating in place.

This is a bedrock foundation for ecological governance, but it is not the whole. In rebuilding this foundation from the bottom up, the practice of ecological governance will help reform those many levels of regional, provincial, national and global governance.

With a diverse foundation of stable places, global sustainability is possible.

Our Mission: Research, Education, and Action

Based at the University of Victoria, the mission of the POLIS Project on Ecological Governance is to cultivate ecological governance through innovative research and policy development.

In the pursuit of its mission, POLIS:

Research

- Undertakes interdisciplinary research in conjunction with a variety of academic and civil society institutions
- Investigates how social wealth is situated in the natural world, and how decisions are made about this nexus (ecological political economy, law)
- Studies models of ecosystem and community-based innovation, and the institutions that might support them
- Considers especially the role of place-based solutions in the quest for sustainability at all levels
- Works to advance these solutions, locally and globally

Education

- Disseminates its work to a wide range of audiences (including civil society, public and private innovators, and the general public), and does so through a range of media including popular writing
- Challenges conventional thinking and traditional institutions to take sustainability seriously by acknowledging, understanding and practising it

Action

- Bridges the gap between theory and practice, research and implementation, by working to advance new policies, laws, management practices as well as enhanced democratic and community participation.

New Report

Canada vs. Sweden: An Environmental Face-off

By David Boyd

Sweden, unlike Canada, uses innovative economic policies to reduce pressure on the environment – in particular, Sweden is moving toward full-cost pricing of environmental goods and services by removing subsidies and implementing environmental taxes.

Early in 2002, Canada's national hockey team (the men, that is) suffered a surprising 5-2 defeat at the hands of the Swedish squad in the opening game of the Olympic tournament. National and international media attention spotlighted Canada's poor performance in this match-up of hockey nations. Less well known was the fact that Sweden also clobbered Canada 9-1 in a head-to-head environmental comparison based on ten key indicators, according to a study by the University of Victoria's Eco-Research Chair in Environmental Law and Policy.

Canada and Sweden are widely regarded as environmental leaders. The Canadian government claims "Canada's environmental record is among the best in the world." However, compared to Sweden, Canada's environmental performance is unlikely to win any medals.

Canadians, both in total and on a per capita basis, create more air pollution than Swedes, generate more municipal waste, use more pesticides, and produce far more greenhouse gases. We use more than five times as much water per person. We use energy much less efficiently. More of our sewage goes untreated. Our fisheries are being depleted more rapidly. We provide substantially less assistance, as a percentage of GDP, to developing countries to facilitate their sustainable development. Canada avoids a shutout in the environmental comparison by protecting a slightly higher percentage of land in parks than Sweden.

Sweden's superiority comes despite close similarities between the two nations in economy, climate, and standard of living. Both of these northern, industrialized nations derive 2% of their GDP from agriculture, 27% from industry, and 70% from services. The average annual temperature in Toronto is the same as in Stockholm. Canadians enjoy a slight edge in average per capita income. As a result, differences in environmental law and policy appear to be the main reason for the difference in environmental performance between the two nations.

David R. Boyd is an environmental lawyer, professor and author of numerous reports and publications. As a Senior Researcher with POLIS, his work focuses on developing practical ways to incorporate ecological principles into our legal and economic systems. For more information about his work on environmental indicators, see www.environmentalindicators.com.

Unlike Canada, Sweden has a comprehensive national strategy to achieve sustainability within a generation (i.e. by the year 2025). Swedish laws set general goals, specific targets, and timelines for improving environmental performance in 15 key areas. The Swedish government recognizes that "the use of resources in this part of the world must be reduced significantly if the earth's ecosystems are to be capable of maintaining a growing population and if living standards are to be raised in the developing world."

Sweden, unlike Canada, uses innovative economic policies to reduce pressure on the environment. In particular, Sweden is moving toward full-cost pricing of environmental goods and services by removing subsidies and implementing environmental taxes. Sweden is also aggressively pursuing improvements in efficiency, using less energy and fewer resources to produce the same quantity of goods and services.

For example, Sweden implemented a tax on carbon dioxide, the main greenhouse gas responsible for global warming. Revenue from the tax is invested in renewable energy and public transit. As a result, Sweden stabilized its greenhouse gas emissions at 1990 levels, created thousands of new jobs, and became a world leader in renewable energy. In contrast, Canada relied on ineffective voluntary programs to address global warming and Canadian greenhouse gas emissions are up 20% since 1990.

By increasing water prices to reflect the cost of water infrastructure, Sweden decreased total water use by 34% since 1980. Revenues have been invested in upgrading sewage treatment so that almost 90% of Swedes are served by tertiary treatment, the most environmentally friendly technology. In Canada,

continued on next page...

NEW REPORT:

Wild by Law: A Report Card on Laws Governing Canada's Parks and Protected Areas, and a Blueprint for Making these Laws more Effective

Canadians are deeply passionate about our parks and the diversity of life that these spectacular landscapes protect. Former Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau referred to Canada's parks as "the greatest environmental treasures of the world."

Thus it is deeply disturbing to discover that the laws intended to protect these priceless treasures for present and future generations of Canadians are, for the most part, grossly inadequate for such an important task. This report card, *"Wild by Law"*, prepared by POLIS researcher David Boyd, examines legislation governing parks and protected areas from Canada's provinces, territories and the federal government and awards grades based on ten key legal criteria such as prioritizing ecological integrity, prohibiting industrial activities like logging, mining, and oil and gas development, and ensuring park boundaries are permanently protected.

The report reveals that only the federal government, Nova Scotia, and Newfoundland achieve passing grades. Every other province and territory gets a failing grade. Alberta and Ontario deserve special mention for earning F- (F minus), the worst grade possible. In many provinces, out-dated legislation continues to permit industrial activity, thus undermining the key distinction between parks and the rest of the land base.

"Wild by Law" includes a blueprint containing the best provisions for each of the ten legal criteria from laws across Canada. The blueprint is intended to be used by activists, lawyers, politicians and bureaucrats working to improve protected areas legislation.

where water prices are among the lowest in the OECD and consumption is among the highest, total water use is up 25% since 1980, and only one in three Canadians is served by tertiary sewage treatment.

Another innovative Swedish environmental policy targets nitrogen oxides, an air pollutant that causes acid rain. Swedish electricity producers are charged for each kilogram of nitrogen oxide they emit, then given a rebate based on the amount of electricity they produce. The policy rewards efficient companies, penalizes inefficient companies, and provides an incentive to further reduce emissions.

Similarly, Sweden increased taxes on pesticides,

resulting in an impressive 80% drop in pesticide use since 1980 and strong growth in organic agriculture. In Canada, where pesticides enjoy an exemption from the GST, pesticide use continues to rise.

When it comes to protecting the environment, Canada has plenty of natural talent but suffers from a lack of leadership and poor coaching. Sweden provides a role model for Canada to emulate.

Canada has a long history of importing the best Swedish hockey players, dating back to Borje Salming's debut with the Toronto Maple Leafs in the 1970s. Now Canada needs to begin importing the best of Sweden's environmental laws and policies. Critics said Borje Salming would never adjust to the different style of hockey played in North America. However, Salming and his countrymen put those fears to rest. Swedish environmental laws and policies will need to be adjusted but should prove equally effective in Canada.

Differences in environmental law and policy appear to be the main reason for the difference in environmental performance between Canada and Sweden.

By Kelly Bannister

Feature Article

Community-University Connections

Co-developing Protocols and Guidelines for Research

Many Canadian researchers are recognizing the contributions to scientific and other research made by people who live in direct relationship with land and natural resources. Increasingly, the cultural knowledge and local expertise of many Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities are seen as important to understanding the natural as well as our constructed human world, and thus to promoting both human and ecosystem health.

As such, there is growing awareness that research with communities must move away from subject-centered models of 'studying communities' to more equitable and respectful practices, wherein community members are partners in defining and conducting collaborative research.

Federal funding trends in Canada are starting to reflect this paradigm shift. For example, the visionary Community-University Research Alliance (CURA) program of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) is a major initiative that gives university and community partners an opportunity to jointly address locally-relevant problems. Likewise, incorporating local and traditional ecological knowledge of communities into academic sciences is part of the Major Collaborative Research Initiative (MCRI), a joint funding venture between Canada's two major research funding bodies — the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) and the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC).

The desire and incentive to work with local communities to solve social and ecological problems through research is encouraging. But do the processes really exist to facilitate this kind of collaborative research?

Building research relationships and mutual understanding are prerequisites to working collaboratively, and essential to ethical research practices. However, adequate time and funds to build relationships, develop informed consent, and establish appropriate research goals and processes are often overlooked by even the best-intentioned research granting agencies and university administrations. Conducting collaborative research, therefore, may lead to significant tensions for researchers — as a result of entrenched norms in academic reward structures, research timelines, research and ethics policies, and publication practices.

At most universities in Canada, we still have several challenges to surmount, in both social and natural sciences, before many of the well-meaning intentions for community-university collaborative research can happen. That is, we are largely lacking a process to facilitate these collaborations. How, then, do we move our ideals of collaborative research practices into practice itself? This is the theme being explored through the Community-University Connections initiative of the POLIS Project.

Community-University Connections draws upon the Dutch 'science shops' concept — which is an attempt to make university resources and research more accessible and responsive to the interests and problems faced by civil society. The three general goals of Community-University Connections are:

- To build a regional network of community groups, First Nations and university researchers that is linked nationally and internationally
- To identify ethical and other policy issues in research collaboration that serve as barriers to mutually-beneficial partnerships
- To establish a process that facilitates meaningful collaboration between university researchers and community groups.

Community-University Connections is pleased to welcome:

- Mr. Bryce Gilroy-Scott (Victoria) as the new outreach coordinator and webmaster;
- Mr. Gerry Schreiber (Ucluelet) as community liaison for the Clayoquot Alliance Protocols Project;
- Dr. Rod Dobell (UVic, Public Administration) as academic advisor and Science Shops collaborator through the Clayoquot Alliance for Research, Education and Training; and
- Ms. Jo Render (First Nations Development Institute, Virginia) as international collaborator on community protocols.

We gratefully acknowledge the personnel and project support to Community-University Connections provided by the MCRI Coasts Under Stress project and the Clayoquot Alliance for Research, Education and Training.

We see collaborative research as an important tool, both for better science and for more effective policy decisions on social and environmental issues. But collaboration must be built on a foundation of mutual understanding, which requires clarity and transparency about how, why, and for whom we do research. Laying that foundation ought to begin with agreement on the ground rules of research conduct, i.e., consensus on protocols and guidelines for collaborative research.

Some key questions arise: Are existing university research and ethics policies consistent with the paradigm of a 'participatory' science? Can university policies accommodate existing customs or protocols of the Indigenous or other community partners in research? In other words, on whose terms should the research be conducted — and how do we decide this?

As a concrete example, Community-University Connections has been facilitating the development of consensus protocols with communities in the Clayoquot Sound region, to guide research sponsored by the Clayoquot Alliance for Research, Education and Training, headed by UVic's Professor of Public Policy, Dr. Rod Dobell

The Clayoquot Alliance Protocols Project was unanimously approved in principle by the Nuu-chah-nulth Central Region Chiefs in April of 2002. We have used small group meetings, public workshops, a discussion listserve, and formation of a local Working Group to identify existing university policies and community protocols that should be used as starting points. The philosophical starting point for agreement has been identified as respect for the well-being and interconnectedness of individuals, communities and ecosystems — which is embodied by the Nuu-chah-nulth principles of *Iisaak* "living respect" and *Hishuk ish ts'awalk* "everything is connected, everything is one".

The protocols will be composed of guiding principles and practical tips that are specific to the people and place of the Clayoquot Sound region, but they will no doubt offer insights to other peoples, places and circumstances. They will represent a hybridisation of existing university policies and local First Nations protocols and will also reflect new understandings of wider community needs/interests.

A broader goal of the Clayoquot Alliance Protocols Project is to explore and understand how to extend the concepts underlying current thinking about 'research involving human subjects'. That is, to recognize that 'research involving human subjects' must include humans, human well-being and the dynamics of human systems *in context*, as subsystems of overarching natural systems. Protocols are needed to reflect mutual expectations around research into community institutions and collective decision-making groups, non-human subjects, regional ecosystems and physical issues around a particular territory just as much as they are to govern interview studies or survey techniques.

Ecosystem well-being and human well-being are intimately linked, and the people and communities of a region develop interests, concerns and even rights around the well-being of adjacent resources and ecosystems; they may legitimately hold expectations of an opportunity to know of, and even influence, any plans for academic (and other) research that may intrude upon these local arrangements and surrounding ecosystems.

We are learning that co-development of research protocols and guidelines with communities can take time and a commitment beyond the academic system's comfort zone. But we are also learning that building a process to answer the question of "on whose terms should research be conducted?" is as important as the answer itself.

For more information, see the Community-University Connections website at: http://web.uvic.ca/~scishops or e-mail Kelly Bannister at kel@uvic.ca.

The Clayoquot Alliance for Research, Education and Training is a partnership of the University of Victoria (through the Centre for Public Sector Studies) with the people and communities — including First Nations — in the Clayoquot Sound region of Vancouver Island (through the Clayoquot Biosphere Trust). The partnership was established in Sept 2001 and received three-year funding through the path-breaking CURA program of SSHRC (mentioned above). The goals of the Clayoquot Alliance are to develop innovative links between the University and the Clayoquot Sound communities, to provide a forum in which community interests and needs become academic concerns, and to make the educational and training resources of the University more accessible to all the people in the Clayoquot Sound region. For more information on the Clayoquot Alliance, see http://web.uvic.ca/padm/crt/

Dr. Kelly Bannister joined POLIS as a Research Associate in 2000. She developed the Community-University Connections initiative as a postdoctoral fellow with the MCRI Coasts Under Stress project. She recently received a SSHRC postdoctoral fellowship to conduct a case-based analysis comparing legal and ethical elements of university research, ethics, and intellectual property policies with the customary protocols of Indigenous communities.

Community Forestry

Putting Communities First

Community forestry, where the community has greater control over management of local forests, is increasingly viewed as a viable alternative to industrial and corporate forestry.

By Brian Egan

British Columbia has approximately 60 million hectares of forest — covering almost two-thirds of the entire provincial landbase — with 95 percent of this forest found on public land. Throughout the 20th century, these forests were viewed primarily as sources of timber to drive the expansion of the economy. During the post WWII period in particular, vast areas of public forest in BC were allocated to private interest for logging to feed an ever-growing network of processing facilities.

For many years this policy seemed effective, as sawmills and pulp and paper operations spread across the province, jobs were plentiful, wages were high, and the timber supply seemed inexhaustible. Since the early 1980s, however, this industrial forestry approach has been heavily criticized for failing to sustain the environmental values of the forest; and today it is increasingly clear that it is also failing to sustain the economies of forest-dependent communities.

Hit hard by mill closures and layoffs, and often watching logs being exported from local forests, communities across BC are questioning the way public forests are allocated and calling for increased local control over these forests. Indeed, community-based forest management (or community forestry) is increasingly viewed as a viable alternative to industrial and corporate forestry. At its core, community forestry means that the local community gains more decision-making control over the way local forests are managed. For this reason, community forestry is sometimes promoted as a process of democratization, of giving local citizens a meaningful role in decision-making about critical local resources.

Providing increased economic opportunities for the community, through retention of resources and revenues in the local area, is a key goal of the community forestry approach. And, because the costs and benefits of forest management are more directly borne by the decision-maker (i.e., the community), the expectation is that the community will manage the forest in a conservative manner, for sustainability over the long-term rather than to maximize profit over the short term. Because of the diverse interests within communities, the approach to managing community forests tends to be broader; rather than oriented primarily to timber production and extraction, community forestry practitioners tend to manage for a wide range of values, such as water, non-timber forest products, and recreation.

Brian Egan is a Research Associate with POLIS, where he works on community-based natural resource management initiatives.

BC's Emerging Community Forestry Movement

A growing number of communities in BC are looking at establishing community forests, in an effort to achieve a variety of economic, social and ecological objectives. Communities such as Mission, Revelstoke, Creston and Kaslo have established community forests using conventional timber tenures (e.g., tree farm licenses, forest licenses) while other groups have established, or have been given the opportunity to establish, community

Dennis Morgan leads a tour of Bamfield's Community Forest

forests under the Community Forest Agreement, a new tenure created in 1998. Many other communities across the province are seeking to create community forests. Despite this high level of interest, the opportunity to create new community forests is very limited as most of the province's public forest land has been allocated to private forest companies.

The strong interest in community forestry was evident at the BC Community Forestry Forum, a conference organized by POLIS and several other groups in the spring of 2002. Close to 250 people gathered in Victoria (the largest community forestry meeting ever held in BC) to learn about the benefits and challenges of community forestry, to assess existing initiatives, and explore future opportunities for this model of forestry in BC. The Forum featured leading community forestry practitioners and advocates from across BC, Canada, and from a half dozen other countries.

Inaugaural meeting of the BC Community Forest Association

The potential for community forestry in BC is immense. As one speaker pointed out, if there were 100 community forests in BC each with an annual cut of 40,000 cubic metres of timber, this would be a major step forward and provide significant benefits to virtually every sizeable community in the province — and yet, this would still account for only about 6 percent of the total timber cut in the province each year. The challenges are also significant, particularly the need for supportive policies from government. At a time when countries around the world are moving to increase local participation in forest management, BC's new provincial government is going in the opposite direction, introducing policies that will provide more flexibility to non-local corporations in the control and management of public forests.

The Forum proved a landmark event for community forestry, signaling the arrival of a vibrant movement for community forestry fed by energetic advocates and emerging initiatives from across the province. The Forum also was the venue for the creation of the BC Community Forest Association, with a mission to "promote and support the practice and expansion of sustainable community forest management in BC". The next few years will be challenging for community forestry practitioners and advocates in British Columbia; we will need to both support established and emerging community forest initiatives and resist new policies designed to increase private control of our public forests.

Opportunity to create new community forests is very limited as most of the province's public forest land has been allocated to private forest companies.

Forum Highlights Local, National, and International Community Forestry Initiatives

The BC Community Forestry Forum, co-sponsored by POLIS and held in Victoria (March 14-16, 2002), provided a unique opportunity to examine community forestry initiatives in British Columbia, in Canada, and across the globe. Speakers from Africa, Asia, Latin America and Europe provided a global context, describing how communities are gaining increasing control over local forests in countries as diverse as Tanzania, Gambia, Mexico, India, and Nepal. Progress towards community forestry is less pronounced in North America, although there are certainly many exciting initiatives underway. British Columbia is clearly a leader in this regard, with a good number of community forests already established and several more in the works. For a full summary of the BC Community Forum, visit the Forum web site (www.cf-forum.org) where the Forum proceedings are available.

Perspective

Developing Sustainability through Local Control

By Lisa Marie Ambus

Developing sustainability means transforming national and international systems to restore forests and communities, by giving greater power and control to local peoples. Through community forestry, we can develop sustainability

Modifying the catch phrase sustainable development to developing sustainability appears to be a very subtle shift, a mere reordering of words. But if we look at this seemingly harmless semantic difference more carefully, we see that it forces a radical rethinking of the entire sustainable development paradigm.

Sustainable development has come to mean sustained economic growth and industrial expansion. In contrast, the concept developing sustainability goes beyond marginal reforms and actively addresses the root causes of ecological decline. One of these roots causes is the dislocation of power from communities. Therefore developing sustainability requires a re-visioning of governance systems and political-economic arrangements that perpetuate unsustainable patterns of growth. From the local to the global, how might we (re)create and support institutions, trade, and development practices that serve to maintain and protect ecosystem integrity and social justice? This point of inquiry is at the heart of POLISs research and policy work.

Lisa Ambus works with the POLIS Project on issues related to community and ecosystem-based forestry, in both an academic and activist capacity. Joining POLIS in April 2000, Lisa assists with the coordination of the International Network of Forests and Communities.

In the area of community-based natural resource management, POLIS' research has illustrated how experiences in the South have much to teach the North about developing sustainability. In "developing" countries, approximately 22 percent of forests are held in common by community or indigenous groups. In "developed" countries, only 3 percent of forests are commonly held. For example, Mexico's land tenure system gives people usufruct rights to a territory, the ejido, which are lands held in common. The extent of community control of renewable natural resources in Mexico is demonstrated by the fact that more than 70 percent of all forestlands are held by ejidos or indigenous communities.

In upwards of twenty-five countries across Africa, proposed forest laws include provisions for more equitable forest management relations between the government and local people. Uganda, Tanzania and Mozambique are implementing this new legislation, thus enabling customary tenure arrangements over common, publicly owned lands. For example, Tanzania's new tenure laws by-pass the district level government and directly empower local communities. Villages are the designated 'forest managers' and have successfully created and implemented local by-laws with visible improvement in the forest as a result. The government forester acts as technical advisor, a liaison between central and local government, a watchdog on progress, and a mediator in dispute resolution among village forest managers. Forest policy analyst Liz Alden Wily points out that this system has been effective because village groups have the freedom, authority, rights and responsibilities to make and enforce local rules which apply to people inside and outside of the community.

These cases are exceptions to the rule where centralised power structures hold dominion over forests, often compromising or outright disrespecting the rights, needs, and desires of local peoples. Recognising this imbalance of power as one of the underlying causes of the global forest crisis, how can we address the void of effective forest governance in a proactive way? How might we support, advance and secure the land and tenure rights of indigenous and traditional peoples, local communities, and other non-corporate user groups?

Recognising the linkages and lessons from across the globe (mainly from the South), POLIS has proposed a new process for developing sustainability in the British Columbia context. This model, the Community Ecosystem Trust Facilitation Act, outlines a way to work towards these goals. While the model has yet to be elaborated upon or even tested in a pilot project, it stands as a concrete example of what is possible. And makes us aware of opportunities that may exist merely by rephrasing the challenge of sustainable development to one of developing sustainability.

For more information on the Community Ecosystem Trust and community control of natural resources, see:

M'Gonigle, Michael, Brian Egan, and Lisa Ambus. 2001. When there's a Way, there's a Will: Developing Sustainability through the Community Ecosystem Trust. Victoria: Eco-Research Chair, University of Victoria.

Available from POLIS - Tel (250) 721-6388 or ewheaton@uvic.ca

Community Health, Urban Sustainability and Food Security

The Growing Healthy Communities Project

By Emily MacNair

In January of this year, without so much as a whimper, "Our Backyard" disappeared. Our Backyard was a tiny garden (800 square feet) tucked away on View Street beside St. Vincent de Paul — Victoria's only community garden in the heart of downtown. Its gardeners were primarily low-income residents, though for two years local preschool children learned the rudiments of gardening there. During the day, the garden was open to all free of charge. Our Backyard was owned by the Catholic Diocese and was recently sold for the development of rental apartments.

The loss of Our Backyard followed closely on the heels of the development of the Gordon Head Allotment Gardens. Located in Saanich, these gardens were the largest in the region, providing food and flowers for 200 gardeners every year for almost 30 years. The land, also owned by the Diocese, was sold for housing development last year.

The development of these two community gardens has spurred POLIS to continue its work on the Growing Healthy Communities Project. Thanks to support from the Vancouver Foundation and the McLean Foundation, POLIS is producing two research reports that will serve as guides for those interested in community gardens in the region.

The first report, *The City of Gardens Handbook*, will offer an analysis of the significance of community gardens in the region and will provide recommendations for improving community access to gardens. The Handbook will also offer practical guidance for citizens on how to secure land for community gardens, and how to ensure their longevity.

Emily MacNair is a Research Associate with POLIS, working on food security and urban sustainability. Currently she is coordinating the Growing Healthy Communities Project and working with local groups on food security issues. Emily studied Cultural Anthropology at the University of British Columbia and completed her Masters of Environmental Studies in December of 1999 at York University.

Seattle's P-Patches

A second publication, *Seeds of Success* will explore how other cities have successfully supported and protected their community gardens for the future. As part of the research for the Growing Healthy Communities Project, I visited Portland and Seattle to see how these cities have encouraged community gardens. The experience in Seattle was particularly interesting, with a growing network of gardens enjoyed by citizens and supported by local government.

Belltown, one of Seattle's trendiest neighbourhoods, is filled with funky loft apartments, cafes and stores. While looking for the local community garden, I stepped into a coffee shop to ask for directions. I was met with blank stares, and then sudden recognition — "Oh you mean the P-Patch?" — and several people started at once to point and talk excitedly.

For the gardener, urban green space advocate, or anybody who loves local fresh food, visiting Seattle's community gardens is an inspiring and encouraging experience. In addition to their ecological, aesthetic and social values, Seattle's P-Patches donate between seven and ten tonnes of organic produce to the City's food banks and emergency shelters each year.

The P-Patches are named after the city's first community garden, started in 1973 on the donated Picardo family truck farm. Today the original Picardo Farm P-Patch lives on, and Seattle is home to over 55 P-Patches, each a reflection of its unique location and community. The P-Patches are often park-like with seating, fountains and public art.

In some cases P-Patches are standalone, and in others they are combined with other park uses. At Bradford Garden Park, a basketball court runs along one side of the P-Patch plots. There are demonstration gardens, a pond, benches and a covered seating area.

Aside from the great care and attention these gardens receive, the most unusual thing about Seattle's P-Patches is that they are strongly supported by the City through both funds and staff. Seattle is proud of its P-Patches. The City incorporated them into its 1994 City Plan, making it a goal to provide a P-Patch for every 2,500 households.

Seattle's P-Patch program will be described in more detail in *Seeds of Success*, a POLIS publication outlining successful approaches to protecting and managing community gardens (available in late 2002).

In addition to their ecological, aesthetic and social values, community gardens also provide fresh and nutritious food to urban residents; some gardens, such as those in Seattle, donate fresh organic produce to food banks and emergency shelters.

Smart Growth BC

Innovative Approaches to Urban Growth Management

By Deborah Curran

Smart Growth BC is dedicated to creating more liveable communities.

Smart Growth BC (SGBC), co-founded by the Eco-Research Chair of Environmental Law and Policy (now the POLIS Project on Ecological Governance), is completing its second full year of operations and continues to excel in innovative land use projects. It is the first province-wide public interest growth management organization in Canada dedicated to creating more livable communities through building a grassroots movement to address local community by supporting existing community organizations as well as helping to create broader coalitions. This approach is complimented by promoting smart growth policies and strategies with local government and professionals, e.g. planners, architects, and developers, and of developing strategic partnerships that advance smart growth in communities.

As a former Research Associate at the Eco-Research Chair, Deborah Curran co-founded Smart Growth BC. She recently returned to Victoria from San Francisco, where she completed her LLM degree at the University of California at Berkeley. Now a land use lawyer at West Coast Environmental Law Association, she is also the Chair of the Board at Smart Growth B.C.

The focus of this year's work has been to partner with communities to highlight their smart growth potential. This includes delivering a workshop tailored to the needs of small communities in town and small cities across the province. SGBC has also developed a five year project with the James Taylor Chair at the University of British Columbia to design and implement three neighbourhoods as examples of smart growth at the street level. Titled "Smart Growth On The Ground", communities across the province are invited to apply to work with SGBC through the charette and design processes to develop a concensus vision of livability for urban and suburban neighbourhoods.

SGBC has partnered with the Greater Vancouver Regional District in the ten-year evaluation of their Livable Regions Strategy. SGBC held an environmental sustainability forum in May to canvas how environmental sustainability fits in with social and economic sustainability, and what focus the GVRD should take in improving its regional visions. SGBC has also partnered with a range of organizations and individuals interested in the long-term protection of the Agricultural Land Reserve to explore how best to protect that important provincial land use zoning through local support.

SGBC is now dedicating most of its resources to developing a voter education guide for the upcoming municipal elections. The guide will outline the elements of smart growth, provide statistics on development, and suggest questions that can be asked of municipal candidates. It will be distributed in September through community organizations, with whom SGBC will work to host all candidate's meetings in several regions across the province. Finally, SGBC will be hosting the first Canadian meeting of organizations working on smart growth issues in Vancouver in the spring of 2003. This conference will coincide with a meeting of the Growth Management Leadership Alliance, a coalition of U.S. smart growth groups, of which SGBC is the only Canadian member.

For more information, see www.smartgrowth.bc.ca

Treaty-Making in Hul'qumi'num Territory

Developing Alternatives to the Land Selection Model

By Brian Egan

With the results of the treaty referendum in their back pocket, the BC Liberal government is resuming negotiations with First Nations and the federal government in an effort to resolve longstanding concerns over Aboriginal title to land and resources. Also integral to the BC treaty process is the need to develop new relationships between First Nations and the federal and provincial governments. The treaty referendum generated considerable heat but little light, with the negotiating principles remaining essentially unchanged. Unfortunately, the referendum did little to increase public understanding of the need for modern treaties or the challenges facing treaty negotiators.

The challenges to treaty-making are significant; a decade after First Nations and the provincial and federal governments committed themselves to treaty-making, the BC treaty process has yielded no such agreements. Across British Columbia, treaty-making has foundered on the governments' insistence that treaties be based on the 'extinguishment' of Aboriginal title and expectation that First Nations will agree to sever their ties with most of their ancestral lands. First Nations generally reject this approach to treaty settlement, of selecting a small amount of their traditional land base for outright ownership while losing control and connection with the remainder of their territory. Alternatives to this land selection model are needed, to reconcile Crown sovereignty and Aboriginal title, and for the successful resolution of treaties across the province.

For most First Nations, giving up rights to most of their traditional lands and resources is not acceptable and they are seeking alternative ways to maintain some degree of connection to, and control over, their traditional territory. Given the constraints of the treaty process, how might this be possible? POLIS is working with the Hul'qumi'num Treaty Group (HTG) to explore this question. The HTG represents six different First Nations on southeast Vancouver Island, with their territory stretching from Saanich Inlet to Ladysmith, including the Cowichan Valley and most of the southern Gulf Islands, as well as part of the lower reaches of the Fraser River. Treaty-making is particularly challenging in this territory because of the scarcity of Crown land. About 85 percent of the area is private land — most of it owned by two large forest companies (TimberWest and Weyerhaeuser).

Over the next six months, POLIS will be working with the HTG to identify lands for inclusion in the treaty proposal and to identify strategies, apart from gaining exclusive ownership over land, for the Hul'qumi'num to continue managing, and protecting, their traditional territory.

New Project in Urban Water Management

The Walter and Duncan Gordon Foundation has recently confirmed support to POLIS for a two year project in the area of urban water management. With the hiring of a new research associate, the project will allow POLIS to enter into the water policy area in a much fuller way than we have been able to do to date.

In recent years, the Canadian public has become highly sensitive to the quality of Canada's municipal water supplies. As important is the less-appreciated (but related) issue of the quantity of urban water uses, where existing pricing and regulatory practices encourage highly wasteful and costly levels of consumption. The project will address how provinces and municipalities can begin the shift to much greater efficiency in urban water uses through a focus on "demand management."

As part of our research, POLIS will be making contact with leaders in this field across the country — academics, government officials, entrepreneurs, planners and activists. As part of this work, we will help to establish a network of demand management experts and practitioners so that many individuals who today are working separately will be able to co-ordinate policy development much better in the years ahead.

This project will also fit within the larger family of water-related projects that the Gordon Foundation is developing to address a growing national water crisis. We are excited by our project, and by the prospect of participating in this broader foundation initiative.

The Dogwood Intitiative

Catalyzing Solutions for Land and People

By Noba Anderson

Community forests are just as diverse as communities. No two are alike. That is why we set out to identify the common threads that distinguish community forest initiatives.

The most important issues facing the people of British Columbia are who has control of the land and what they are doing with it. Control is power; the power to make decisions about our lives, about our land, about our future.

Dogwood Initiative, formerly known as Forest Futures, is a non-profit organisation catalyzing sustainable community solutions for lands and people in British Columbia. We were created to change the dynamics of who controls the land base in British Columbia. And that is what we aim to do. Our mission is to increase the opportunity for community-centred and ecosystem-based alternatives to corporate forestry activities.

Although an astonishing 96% of the land in British Columbia is publicly owned, large corporations control almost all of our public forests. Since forestry is one of B.C.'s major industries, these corporations control not only our land and resources but also exert tremendous influence over decisions made at all levels of government. Dramatic changes to the current land tenure system are needed in order to shift this power dynamic. Significant reforms are long overdue to settle First Nations land claims, create sustainable communities and establish a sustainable industry.

We believe British Columbia needs a political/legal framework that will allow communities that show interest — and the capacity — the opportunity to step forward and assume the role of local stewards, to practice better forestry and retain more local jobs. The necessary reforms will not happen without focused political pressure. To thrive, the push to diversify control of the land base must include First Nations, labour, environmentalists, communities, municipal leaders, wood workers, the small business sector, non-timber interests, woodlot associations, youth and others.

One way we have been building alliances and bridging historical mistrust is through our 'Creating Dialogues' project. We have toured British Columbia, identifying lessons from existing community forests and passing along these lessons and stories to other communities interested in local control of lands and resources.

Community forests are just as diverse as communities. No two are alike. That is why we set out to identify the common threads that distinguish community forest initiatives. What makes some succeed and others fail? What obstacles do they face? What are the most important keys to their success?

Photo: Ursula Heller

In the fall of 2002, Dogwood Initiative released a report summarizing our findings on the state of community forests in British Columbia. This report highlights the socio-economic, political and legal obstacles community forests face along with how various communities have responded to these challenges. In a follow-up report (to be released later this fall) we will recommend reforms, along with a political strategy to create leverage to implement them, in order to help sustainable local initiatives become a significant part of British Columbia's future.

For copies of our community forest reports, or for more information on community control, please contact us at:

Dogwood Initiative (formerly Forest Futures)
info@forestfutures.org
P.O. Box 8701,
Victoria, British Columbia, Canada,
V8W 3S3
Tel: (250) 370-9930
Fax: (250) 370-9990
www.forestfutures.org

The Convention on Biological Diversity

Slow Progress Towards Forest Protection

By Jessica Dempsey

From April 8-19th, 2002, the 6th Conference of Parties (COP 6) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) took place in the Hague, The Netherlands. The International Network of Forests and Communities (INFC) and POLIS were present at the CBD, and a statement calling for the adoption of community-based solutions to forest management and protection was read in the plenary, reaching the ears of government delegates from 182 countries. It highlighted the importance of addressing issues of power and governance over forest lands and resources, and of livelihood security within any strategy to conserve forest biological diversity.

This statement, drafted by the INFC, was endorsed by many NGO and Indigenous Peoples representatives such as the Environment Liaison Centre International, World Rainforest Movement, Friends of the Earth International, Institute of Cultural Affairs - Ghana, Kalpavriksh: Environmental Action Group - India, the Indigenous People's Biodiversity Network, and Greenpeace International.

The three objectives of the CBD are to promote "the conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable use of its components, and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources." However, looking at the lack of progress made over the last decade to halt deforestation and degradation, these forms of state-centric agreements appear to be limited in their ability to produce substantive action. (Since the CBD was adopted at the Earth Summit in 1992 an area the size of Iran has been deforested.)

At this most recent meeting of the CBD, forest biological diversity was a main thematic area on the agenda, and the parties adopted an eight year work programme. While there are commendable elements to this programme (for example, one recommendation was to "Enable indigenous and local communities to develop and implement adaptive community management systems to conserve and sustainably use forest biological diversity"), decades of unimplemented UN commitments left many NGO representatives wary of how this work programme will translate into changes. (The work plan is accessible at http://www.biodiv.org/doc/meetings/cop/cop-06/information/cop-06-inf-09-en.pdf)

Jessica Dempsey joined POLIS in January 2002 and has worked on numerous projects, mostly related to international ecological governance and forests. She participated in the CBD (Convention on Biological Diversity) and conducted research on issues related to globalization, international law and forests. Jessica graduated from the University of Victoria with her B.Sc. in 2002, and entered graduate school at the University of British Columbia in September 2002.

Many NGOs and Indigenous Peoples organizations also expressed concerns over some missing pieces to the programme, particularly those that address underlying causes and precautionary approaches to preventing forest degradation. For instance, within the eight year work programme, there is scant reference to reducing Northern consumption patterns — a major contributing factor to forest destruction and degradation.

At the CBD, and in preparation for the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg, there is growing awareness among civil society organisations of the need for approaches that enable 'good forest governance' and restoration, rather than liquidation forest economies. In other words, in order to halt forest biodiversity losses, both power and political economy must be addressed — who controls the forests, who benefits from their use, and the most basic ideas of growth and progress.

It will continue to be the role of forest users, communities, activists, academics, organisations, and indigenous peoples to push for and to create tangible changes and opportunities on the ground. Transformative shifts which attend to both power and political economy are likely to emanate from a strong worldwide movement of diverse grassroots actors committed to building alternative relations with forests. The INFC and POLIS, along with a number of partners, are in the process of organising support for such a local-global forest campaign, focused on the World Forestry Congress in Quebec City, September 2003.

Many NGOs and Indigenous Peoples organizations expressed concerns over some missing pieces to the CBD work programme, particularly those that address underlying causes and precautionary approaches to preventing forest degradation.

UVic's Campus Plan Requires Innovation and Vision

By Nancy Klenavic and Justine Clarke

The University of Victoria has a remarkable opportunity to become a leader in sustainable, innovative growth - sadly, the draft Campus Plan fails to embrace this possibility.

Having recently released a draft Campus Plan to guide physical development on campus, the University of Victoria has a remarkable opportunity to become a leader in sustainable, innovative growth. With vision, fortitude, and the adoption of strong principles and land-efficient planning techniques, the Campus Plan could ensure the development of a truly unique campus set in a context of protected and restored natural areas.

Nancy Klenavic and Justine Starke are UVic students working with POLIS to promote the adoption of smart growth planning as a model for campus development.

Sadly, the draft Campus Plan fails to embrace this possibility. This is not entirely surprising, considering the nature of the process that led to creation of the Plan. To adequately address the development challenges of the 21st century, a policy-driven, inclusive planning process is required. The Campus Plan, however, was developed in a system that sacrificed meaningful policy development to the goal of maintaining operational flexibility. Combined with the University's failure to involve the wider community throughout the process, this resulted in a Plan that reflects no collective vision, lacks inventive planning ideas and addresses only the concerns of its authors.

As a result, the Plan spells real problems for UVic's future. Buildings will sprawl over the campus, devouring playing fields, forests and gardens. The campus' cherished natural areas will be given "Special Study Area" status, opening them to future development. No priority is assigned to restoring these areas, despite the threats they face from invasive species, run-off and fragmentation. The University will progressively lose the magnificent green spaces that are currently so admired.

No procedure for reducing private vehicle use on campus is adopted within the Plan. Instead, coping with increased demand for parking is given priority. In addition, no vision is laid out under which a complete community would be created at UVic that would reduce the need for car-use to accomplish every day tasks. These omissions will only encourage automobile use, overloading traffic and infrastructure systems that feed UVic and contributing to a car-dominated campus.

The Plan further fails to commit to employing "green" building technologies despite their financial and ecological benefits. This ensures conventional construction methods will continue and UVic will pay the price in increased operating costs and a degraded environment.

POLIS has long been advocating a better, more inclusive planning process at UVic. In the fall of 2001, POLIS released *A Path Less Taken: Planning For Smart Growth at the University of Victoria*, a document exploring how smart growth planning could be used at UVic. POLIS members have also participated actively within UVic's internal processes for over two years. During the summer and fall of 2002, POLIS worked to encourage local community associations and members of the university community to actively engage in the brief public consultation sessions held by the University. This work involved educating the public on the inadequacies of the Plan, for which POLIS prepared a detailed analysis of the Plan, with support from VanCity Credit Union.

Currently, POLIS is working with community groups, students, faculty and staff to ensure that public concerns are adequately addressed in the final draft of the University of Victoria campus development plan. The community movement for sustainability at UVic is growing fast and POLIS is playing a central role in advocating for smart growth alternatives to be embraced by the university.

The Plan can be found at www.uvic.ca/draft-campusplan, where a feedback form is also located. Comments can also be copied and sent to POLIS at justines@uvic.ca, or by regular mail at: PO BOX 3600, University of Victoria, Victoria BC, V8W 3R4.

For more information regarding the issues of UVic's development plan, please visit www.demandsmartgrowth.org or call Justine Starke at (250) 472-4637.

New Project

Exploring Economic and Ecological Alternatives in the Mining Sector

By Alan Young

The extraction and use of minerals and metals has a significant impact on the economic and ecological health of nations in the global North and South. The substantial transfers of wealth, the extensive social impacts, the unprecedented ecological liabilities and the powerful political strategies associated with mineral development are all critical in shaping the current political economy of the Americas and Europe.

In recent years the collision of economic, social and ecological forces concerned about the mineral sector have resulted in a broad array of high profile conflicts. These conflicts have included mining-related constitutional challenges for the rights of aboriginal peoples in Canada, the massacre of local villagers in Bolivia at a Canadian-owned mine, the rejection of a billion dollar copper mine in favour of a World Heritage Site in British Columbia, major toxic spills in Romania, Spain, the US and Guyana, and critical challenges of the mining-related lending policies of institutions such as the World Bank and Export Development Corporation.

Arising from these scenarios, there are a series of important questions to be highlighted and explored in the coming years, if we are going to improve the way in which we extract, manufacture and use minerals and metals in our societies. POLIS is launching a new initiative — the Mineral Efficiency Policy Project — to explore these problems. Led by Alan Young and Maria Laura Barreto, the project is designed to identify policy options, and develop recommendations for further research and promote promising alternatives to existing unsustainable and unjust approaches to mineral development.

For more information about the Mineral Efficiency Project, contact Alan Young at alan@miningwatch.org.

Dr. Maria Laura Barreto is a Visiting Scholar at POLIS Project. For the last 13 years she has been a senior researcher from the Center for Mineral Technology, in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. She has a degree in law from Eduardo Mondlane in Mozambique, a Master's degree in Legal Science and International Relations from Catholic University in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil and a PhD. in Mining Engineering from Sao Paulo University in Sao Paulo, Brazil. She has published over 40 books and papers on mineral policy and law.

Alan Young joined the POLIS Project as a Research Associate in September 2002. He is currently serving as Director of Corporate Accountability for the Environmental Mining Council of BC — an NGO coalition focused on reforming mining policy and practices. Prior to this he worked as Executive Director of the EMCBC for 8 years. He is a founder and co-chair of MiningWatch Canada. Mr. Young studied Applied Communications and Geography at Simon Fraser University and Ottawa University.

Staff Notes

Anne Nguyen: Manager, Development and Outreach
We are pleased to announce the appointment of Anne Nguyen as our new Manager for Development and Outreach. Anne graduated from the University of Victoria in May 2001 and has spent the past year studying at the University of Guanajuato (Mexico) as a Rotary Ambassadorial Scholar. Her primary role will be to strengthen links between POLIS and the local community. Welcome Anne!

Gail Hochachka: Research Associate
After completing her MA degree at UVic in May 2002, Gail Hochachka has joined POLIS to pursue her research interests in integral community development, with a particular focus on natural resources in coastal El Salvador.

Liz Wheaton: Office Manager
Liz Wheaton continues her stellar work at POLIS, where she helps to keep us all organized and informed. Especially appreciated is her (never-ending) work on budgets and financial management, without which we'd all be in a financial muddle! She is always at the centre of the action at POLIS, and is the key moving force behind the fabulous POLIS lunches!

Farewell Katherine!
For the past two years Dr. Katherine Barrett has worked as a Research Associate with POLIS, focusing her work on food and agricultural issues, with a particular emphasis on application of the precautionary principle. This fall, Katherine accepted a job with the federal government and is now living in Ottawa. We will miss Katherine and wish her success in her position.

Recent and Forthcoming Publications and Conference Presentations

David R. Boyd. 2001. *Canada vs. The OECD: An Environmental Comparison.*

David R. Boyd. 2001. *Sea Change: Strengthening Bill C-5, the Species at Risk Act, to Protect Marine Biodiversity.*

Emily MacNair and Shannon McDonald. 2001. *A Path less Taken: Planning for Smart Growth at the University of Victoria.*

Kelly P. Bannister. 2002. *Ethnobiological Research: on Whose Terms?* Paper presentation at the 8th International Congress of Ethnobiology. Addis Abada, Ethiopia. September 16-19, 2002.

Kelly P. Bannister, Heather Mahony and R. Michael M'Gonigle. Forthcoming. *Plants and Knowledge, Power and Wealth: The Political Economy of Ethnobotany and Traditional Medicines.* Invited paper accepted for publication in Michael Steinberg (ed.) Forest, Field and Fish: Politicized Indigenous Resources. University of Texas Press, Texas.

Michael M'Gonigle. 2002. *Between Globalism and Territoriality: The Emergence of an International Constitution and the Challenge of Ecological Legitimacy.* Canadian Journal of Law and Jurisprudence, Special Issue in International Law Theory. Vol XV, No. 2.

Michael M'Gonigle and Jessica Dempsey. *Envisioning Ecological Innovation in an Age of Bureaucratic Closure: The Future of the Global Forest.* Forthcoming in Studies in Political Economy.

Michael M'Gonigle, Brian Egan, and Lisa Ambus. 2001. *When there's a Way there's a Will Report 1: Developing Sustainability through the Community Ecosystem Trust.*

Brian Egan and Lisa Ambus. 2001. When there's a Way there's a Will Report 2: Models of Community-based Natural Resource Management.

Bryan Evans and David R. Boyd. 2001. *When there's a Way there's a Will Report 3: Review of Provincial and Federal Legislation Related to Community-based Natural Resource Management in British Columbia.*

Brian Egan and Lisa Ambus. 2002. *Highlights of the BC Community Forestry Forum: Exploring Policy and Practice.* Electronic (CD) proceedings of a conference held March 14-16, 2002 in Victoria, British Columbia.

Lisa Ambus, Brian Egan, Heather Mahony, and Michael M'Gonigle. 2002. *A Territorial Compact: Global Forest Governance in an Era Beyond State Failure.* Discussion paper #6 of "Global Forests, Global Citizens: A Discussion paper Series on the Future of Forests and Communities." Published by the International Network of Forests and Communities (POLIS Project, University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia).

To order copies of any of these publications, contact the POLIS office at ecochair@uvic.ca or (250) 721-6388.

Coffee with Pleasure: Just Java and World Trade

This new book, by POLIS Research Associate Laure Waridel, reveals the destructive effects of plantation-grown coffee — poverty, injustice and environmental degradation — and describes how "fair trade" coffee can avoid these. "Coffee with Pleasure" situates the coffee industry within the broader context of global production and trade, particularly the trend towards economic globalization dominated by large corporations, and describes how the conventional coffee economy provides only minimal benefits for coffee growers.

Much of the book is devoted to describing a "different path" for coffee growers, one where growers have a better chance to get a decent price for their product and where they do not have to destroy the environment to do so. The fair trade and organic food movement is growing rapidly, and this is particularly the case for coffee. Today, there are dozens of different brands of organic and/or fair trade coffee and they are gaining a larger share of the coffee market. "Coffee with Pleasure" focuses on the fair trade coffee movement in Mexico, and documents the experience of one group of producers in the Oaxaca region.

The book is an important contribution to the fair trade movement. "We need to increase awareness about fair trade," says Waridel, "and people need to realize that, as consumers, they can put pressure on corporations and have a positive impact."

"Coffee with Pleasure" is published by Black Rose Books. To order a copy, call 1-800-565-9523 or go to www.web.net/blackrosebooks

Up in the Air: Canada's Mixed Record on Ozone Depletion and Climate Change

The report, *"Up in the Air"*, is a joint publication by the David Suzuki Foundation and the University of Victoria Eco-Research Chair that compares Canada's response to ozone depletion and climate change. The report examines Canada's record on these two problems and addresses several questions: Why has Canada been at the forefront of global efforts to protect the ozone layer while showing little leadership in defusing the threat posed by global warming? Why is Canada's domestic strategy for tackling ozone-depleting chemicals fully developed and implemented while our approach to climate change remains up in the air? What steps are needed in Canada to implement solutions that have succeeded elsewhere?

Canada's successful response to ozone depletion provides a powerful symbol of environmental optimism. Governments used effective laws and innovative policies to produce a remarkable 95 per cent reduction in Canadian consumption of ozone-depleting chemicals since 1987. In contrast, when addressing climate change, Canadian governments have ignored the lessons learned in protecting the ozone layer.

Although the Kyoto Protocol was negotiated in 1997, Ottawa has only recently started to take small steps to fulfill its international commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. At the same time, resistance from some provincial governments and industries continues to threaten the legal ratification of the Kyoto Protocol by the federal government. In the meantime, Canadian greenhouse gas emissions increased by more than 15 per cent between 1990 and 2000.

The findings of the report are particularly important in light of recent scientific evidence indicating that climate change may interfere with the recovery of the ozone layer.

Our Vision for the Year Ahead

Our vision for the upcoming year is to build on POLIS' existing research and policy advocacy work, initiate new research initiatives, and increase linkages within the University and in the wider community through outreach and collaborative projects. We are presently building our capacity to achieve these objectives through two means: increasing POLIS' permanent base of financial support, and strengthening our institutional ties with the University of Victoria.

In 1995, grants from the BC Real Estate Foundation, the BC Notary Foundation and the BC Ministry of the Environment established an endowment for the Eco-Research Chair in Environmental Law and Policy (ERC). Presently, POLIS does not receive funding from the general university budget but relies on the support of the ERC endowment to cover core operational costs. Research and policy advocacy projects carried out by POLIS associates are financed by funds raised from foundations and research granting agencies.

As POLIS' current core budget is insufficient to cover our annual operational expenses, this year, we will be launching a campaign to raise core funds. Increasing POLIS' base financial support will provide the funds needed to strengthen our current research and advocacy initiatives, enable the initiation of new research projects and increase our capacity to bring our work to the university and wider community in the form of seminars, lectures and conferences. POLIS actively seeks donations from organisations and individuals to support our work.

This year, we will also work to expand the participation of interested UVic faculty, students and community members in POLIS. This effort will involve enhanced ties with other departments and centres at the University, and more collaborative initiatives (such as co-sponsored events). We will also be organising a number of special fundraising events in the coming months that will be an opportunity for our supporters to get to know POLIS' team of researchers and activists and to network with one another. We will also build a board of advisors consisting of faculty, community members and POLIS staff to provide strategic direction and expertise over the coming years.

Thanks to Our Supporters

The work of POLIS would not be possible without the generous support of the following funders:

- University of Victoria
- Vancouver Foundation
- Walter and Duncan Gordon Foundation
- Endswell Foundation
- Ford Foundation
- American Lands Alliance
- Natural Resources Canada/Canada Forest Service
- Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)
- International Development Research Centre (IDRC)
- Canadian Rural Partnership
- BC Ministry of Forests
- MCRI Coasts Under Stress (SSHRC and NSERC)
- The Clayoquot Alliance for Research, Education and Training and The Clayoquot Biosphere Trust
- Forest Extension Research Partnership (FORREX)
- Human Resources Canada
- The Volulntary Sector Initiative (Government of Canada
- VanCity Credit Union
- Mountain Equipment Coop
- Law Foundation
- Real Estate Foundation
- Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council
- McLean Foundation
- HTG
- private donors

CONTACT US

POLIS Project on Ecological Governance
PO Box 3060, University of Victoria, Victoria, BC V8W 3R4

Tel: (250) 721-6388, Fax: (250) 472-5060
Email: ecochair@uvic.ca, Web: www.polisproject.org

Support Us!

The POLIS Project on Ecological Governance is a not-for-profit organization based at the University of Victoria. Donations from concerned individuals and organizations help make our work possible. If you would like to support POLIS, please contact our office manager, Liz Wheaton. We can issue tax receipts for all donations.

Paper: 100% post-consumer, PCF
Newsletter Design: Brad Hornick Communications