

THE SOUTH EAST FOREST ALLIANCE

C/- Total Environment Centre
18 Argyle Street
Sydney 2008
Telephone: (02) 27 4714



10 July 1980

R C Ellis
President
The Institute of Foresters
P O Box E73
Queen Victoria Terrace
Canberra 2600

Dear Mr Ellis,

Thank you for drawing to our attention your concerns about the brochure on the Cook/Causley Committee.

I have noted your views and have referred it to the next South East Forest Alliance meeting for any further action.

Yours sincerely,

Jeff Angel
Convenor

RCE

28th June 1980

The Chairperson
The South-East Forestry Alliance
c/- Australian Conservation Foundation
Level 3, 18 Argyle Street
SYDNEY NSW 2000

Dear Sir/Madam,

May I draw your attention to inaccuracies in a leaflet that was prepared apparently for the South East Forestry Alliance, about the Cook-Causley Committee's forthcoming report. (A copy of the leaflet is attached).

The leaflet claims that five members of the Committee are experts in logging. This is not so. There are five members of the committee who have professional forestry qualifications. None of them is an expert in logging, and they should be described as "forest scientists" who are expert in forest soils, forest ecology, forest measurement, data analysis and in silviculture - the art and science of growing trees. It is therefore incorrect to argue that the committee was not competent because some members were "loggers".

The letters that members of the public are being urged to send to the Prime Minister repeat these inaccuracies. In fact the public are being asked to defame the scientists whose names you list in the pamphlet.

For these reasons I request you to see that this leaflet is not distributed. I must point out that while many members of the forestry profession and of the Institute of Foresters of Australia, are very sympathetic to the conservation movement's causes, their support will be lost by the scurrilous tactic of denigrating professional foresters.

Yours sincerely,

R C Ellis

R C ELLIS
President

SEFA STRUCTURE: DRAFT MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Dear SEFA folks

Attached is a rework of the draft MOU circulated at the May SEFA meeting. Apologies for lengthy slippage in timing: combination of slow feedback and my absence overseas in June.

This draft is set out differently to the first one. Attachment 1 is a draft MOU on basic meeting structures and administrative procedures. Some of the more bleeding obvious 'parenthood' stuff has been dropped too. I still feel that SEFA as a whole has to decide what SEFA is, and the low level of feedback on the first draft has made it impossible for me to advance definitively on this question:

- . Is SEFA an alliance of established, autonomous groups, ie. an umbrella for co-operation; or is it an organisational entity in its own right, to which member groups have agreed to yield some sovereignty (eg, administrative/ financial) in the interests of more formal collective action?

I see two models:

Co-operative / Alliance model

- . Individual groups (attached list is guide to existing extent of 'membership') conduct forest campaign as see fit from own geographic/organisational perspective, networking with other groups in interests of efficiency and co-operation. Groups meet as SEFA as required to agree on overall strategies and policies, within which parameters groups agree to work. 'Joint action' as SEFA is for 'big' occasions - responses to major developments. Individual group action in day-to-day campaigning is as determined by individual groups, in context of parameters for co-operative action established by SEFA meetings.

Formal / Institutional model

- . 'SEFA' is paramount over groups for purposes of SE forest campaign. Requires "common SEFA services": administration and budget (fundraising and funding of groups); employment of staff; formal decisionmaking; an elected, accountable but quite 'powerful' Convenor and formalised delegate structures and regional groupings and meetings with quid pro quo safeguards against centralisation and 'power blocs.

In my view, there is a 'third model', which is how SEFA operates at the moment, which is an amalgam of models 1 and 2,

2

according to convenience and what suits/drives some groups and individuals. It seems to me that a lot of the disputes over SEFA structure arise from this grey area situation where both models appear to operate at various times and indeed, sometimes, at the same time.

Attachment 1 is a draft MOU on meeting procedures and administration/consultation for a SEFA operating according to the Alliance model.

- The second part of the draft MOU raises issues which still need to be resolved, even within the 'Alliance' model. Presumably these will need to be thrashed out at the next SEFA meeting - the written/oral feedback process is not democratic or transparent enough, even if everybody did it !!!

Attachment 2 poses (again) the questions which it seems to me need to be addressed if SEFA is to have a formalised institutional framework and be - to whatever degree - organisationally pre-eminent over groups for the purposes of forest campaigning.

- . In both models, the text in square brackets represents my attempt to tease out further questions / implications which need to be addressed, based on views expressed in feedback process.

Annex 1 is a List of currently participating Groups as a guide to 'membership'.



Rachel Thompson
Con.Council South East Region & Canberra
8 July 1990

Attachment 1

SECOND DRAFT MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING ON BASIC PRINCIPLES
(Model 1 on 'Alliance' structure)

- . Recognising that shared commitment to save forests of high conservation value is a basic reason for SEFA's very existence;
 - . Reaffirming that goodwill among groups and individuals, and commitment to consultation and co-operation, are central guiding principles;
 - . Recognising that SEFA is an Alliance of individual groups (see Annexed List), all of which
 - have their own autonomous existence and the right to make their own decisions relating to their own internal structure and operations, and
 - have equal rights to participation in the collective SEFA process.
 - : Local affiliates of national organisations (eg. Sydney and Canberra TWS) are each regarded as individual members for the purposes of the Alliance.
 - . Recognising that whereas 'Basecamp' was once regarded as a somewhat nebulous 'common SEFA property', Forest Rescue Camp is now an autonomous group associated with SEFA in its own right;
- There have been a couple of queries as to whether it implies special treatment to specify one group. I feel it clarifies a grey area.
- . Recognising that each constituent group in SEFA will contribute different skills and perspectives to the overall campaign and take on different roles, and that at the same time, all groups are entitled to contribute to the overall campaign formulation and evaluation process through equal representation at SEFA meetings and participation in the consultation process between meetings;
 - . Recognising that the commonly agreed roles of each group contribute to the overall campaign effort and while different priorities may be accorded various roles, the contribution of all is collectively invaluable and highly valued;

Attachment 1

Recognising that the concept of peaceful resistance is an important part of campaigning and that decisions on broad strategy for peaceful resistance are a collective SEFA responsibility. It follows from this that Forest Rescue Camp will receive full moral support for and recognition of its contribution to implementation of any agreed strategy;

It has been queried as to whether this para also implies some special status for peaceful resistance over other functions.

the affiliated member groups of SEFA (Annexed List) agree to the following basic principles and rules for the conduct of SEFA meetings, consultation procedures and administrative systems.

SEFA meetings

Recognising that whereas effective day to day communication among groups is of paramount importance, there is also a need for collective meetings of SEFA groups at regular intervals

- Full SEFA meetings will thus be held every three months, or at more frequent intervals as agreed appropriate.

Recognising that the purpose of full SEFA meetings is for the Alliance to have the collective opportunity to evaluate campaign progress, review and if necessary change policies, agree to a budget, exchange information and views and to make clear, coherent decisions about the campaign.

- Proper preparation for a SEFA meeting thus includes adequate notice of the meeting to all groups; co-ordination of logistics; consultation and agreement on purpose and objectives of the meeting; preparation and timely distribution of background papers; and advance agreement on the agenda outline. The importance of commitment by all groups of adequate resources for this process is recognised.

Affirming that SEFA meetings are to be conducted according to a few basic principles:

- To the greatest extent humanly possible, the meeting agenda is to be agreed by all groups and its final form circulated to all groups before the meeting. The agenda can be modified by agreement in the course of the actual meeting.

5

Attachment 1

- Each affiliated group is to nominate two delegates with rights to speak for their group, with a mandate based on prior discussion by their group of pre-circulated agenda issues. Observers accredited by any affiliated group are welcome to attend but do not have speaking rights.
 - : It is for member groups to decide whether to invest their representatives with the power to agree to decisions at SEFA meetings.
 - : Redress for any group which is dissatisfied with the decisions reached by representatives at SEFA meetings is to change their own representatives or, in extreme situations, to leave SEFA.
 - The meeting will appoint, at the outset, competent facilitators in whom the meeting will vest trust, respect and responsibility for ensuring fair debate according to the agenda.
 - As a general rule, decisions will be taken by consensus. However, any group may request that a vote is taken on any proposed decision (eg. when a matter is contentious or where that group believes a majority view is being thwarted by the consensus process.)
- All decisions reached at SEFA meetings are to be recorded and circulated to all groups and guide collective action until changed by collective agreement. In all but extraordinary circumstances, a decision to change SEFA policy should be taken at a full SEFA meeting.

SEFA Administration

Recognising that there is a need for a degree of collective administration, particularly regarding communication, flow of paperwork, some finances and co-ordination of the implementation of agreed campaign objectives, it is agreed that:

- Sydney will co-ordinate the Reporting/Flow of Information process
 - Forest Report
 - Weekly Activity Report: who's where, doing what, to be distributed to all groups. Circulation within groups is the group's responsibility. Activity Report to include items such as

Attachment 1

: News, Finances, summary of media activity/press releases, political activity update (ie, like Glyn Mather used to do).

- . Sydney will also manage, on SEFA's behalf, the SEFA administrative data base and SEFA finances.
- . Each group will circulate to all other groups (including as updated)
 - individual group policies
 - regular individual group financial statements.
- . SEFA will task someone to develop and circulate to all groups a co-ordinated, clearly spelt out policy which is accessible and provides an introduction/overview of SEFA and the campaign.
- . Regional groupings (Sydney, Canberra, South East) have responsibility to improve communication within their region.
- . Pegasus is to be utilised as much as possible to improve communication.

It has been suggested that SEFA set up a new 'closed' conference on Pegasus for internal SEFA use (access by password only). This conference would require a facilitator, and would be for sharing drafts on press releases, lobby documents, statements, etc; display minutes of meetings, swap ideas and generally keep in touch. It has also been suggested that greater use needs to be made of the 'Ozforests' conference on Pegasus, for all press releases, by individual groups as well as SEFA itself, major policy submissions, eg. RAC, policy statements, appeals for help and support, etc.

. Principles for Decision-making in a hurry:

- A Phone Link Up (PLU) as per existing resolution to be set up by the SEFA Networker.
- Participants to be [one?/two?] representative/s from each regional grouping (Sydney, Bega, Canberra), with provision for other (logistically, most likely to be campaign workers) to attend to listen.
- Provision for Canberra and NSW NLOs to also participate (speak) when issue for decision warrants it.

Attachment 1

- Summary of minutes and decision to be networked immediately.

There has also been a couple of requests that procedures be developed, for incorporation in this section, regarding the appointment (and review of appointments) of the SEFA Convenor, and definition of the purpose, scope, responsibilities and accountability of the Convenor's role. The question as to whether a Convenor's position is needed has also been begged.

Still To Be Resolved on 'Alliance' model (at next SEFA meeting?)

- . Convenorship queries
- . Appointment by SEFA of a person to work specifically on SEFA Networking/Communications (with scope to be a "rover" to increase face-to-face networking).

One response queried who will pay, and assumed that SEFA's general account would. It was also stated that a full-time fundraiser is needed for Sydney, and a part-time fundraiser for Canberra.

- . Idea that groups should formally affiliate with SEFA through payment of nominal (say \$5) affiliation fee and acceptance of the affiliation at a full SEFA meeting.
- . SEFA Accounts: Groups to have the right to raise money for the forests. Any funds raised by a group in the name of the South East forests which that group agrees are surplus to its own operational requirements are to be deposited in the SEFA fund. Allocation of SEFA funds to be resolved by SEFA according to agreed priorities. Management of SEFA account to be transparent with regular circulation of financial summaries.

One response to this idea termed it a 'parenthood' statement. In my view it is not, because of the implication that surpluses funds would go to the central SEFA account.

- . Publicity/Media Response on behalf of SEFA (as opposed to normal responses by groups under banner of groups) - who can do it??

Responses to this one were:

Attachment 1

(i) A spokesperson for SEFA to be appointed in each region (Sydney, Canberra, South East).

(ii) A media response can be initiated from any regional centre. However, it must be networked to the other two centres in draft form (fax or Pegasus) for recirculation as appropriate. SEFA member groups must nominate who is to be consulted in such instances. At least an hour or so is needed for adequate input. If there is no consensus, it doesn't go out as a SEFA response. This presupposes active, staffed offices in each centre during working hours. Individual groups are also free to put out their own statements on their own letterheads. These should be circulated (fax or Pegasus) as a matter of courtesy, but do not need advance consultation.

A proposal has also been made in the course of this feedback exercise for consultation between the three regional centres over SEFA correspondence, which as I understand it would operate according to the consultation/consensus between the three regional spokespersons referred to in (ii) above on press releases.

Is a "Co-ordinating Group" of one or two reps from each region needed for ongoing co-ordination between regional groupings?

Views on this were:

(i) Without more information on what it would do, cannot comment.

(ii) Likely to evolve anyway given process for PLUS and press releases/correspondence.

Attachment 2

NEW OPTIONS FOR DECISION MAKING TO BE DISCUSSED/RESOLVED
(more formalised structures, SEFA as organisational entity of its own)

Views expressed on these ideas in feedback exercise were essentially to try Attachment 1 process first. Specific comments expressed in square brackets underneath each item).

Group One suggestion (May SEFA meeting)

- . SEFA to elect an "Executive/Steering Committee" to act in between SEFA meetings. Consist of rep/s from South East, Canberra and Sydney ; a Convenor, Deputy Convenor, Secretary and Treasurer.

Executive members should not be paid employees within SEFA (not just by SEFA itself but by SEFA groups too)

- 'Management' positions are non-voting, report to executive and attend executive meetings.

[Needs spelling out. Strong doubts about need for an 'Executive'. Individuals appointed to PLUS who report back to their group is more in keeping with existing 'federal' structure. However, workers must be on any 'Executive' if there is to be one, because they have so much of the skills and experience.]

- . SEFA to become incorporated, to protect those who speak on its behalf.

[Would need a constitution then. MOU is hard enough!!! No guarantee incorporation would protect fully in defamation cases anyway.]

- . SEFA to have a constitution, with guidelines to be followed.

[Ditto comments above.]

- . Possible rep from NEFA.

- . Meeting procedures could be either adoption of a set of standing orders or consensus, or work the two concepts together. All delegates should have full understanding of how these systems work.

[See comments made in Attachment 1 re: SEFA meeting decisions to be binding on groups or else group can change its representatives or leave SEFA.]

- . Exec. to meet frequently

Attachment 2

- . Exec plus delegates (similar to now) to meet less frequently
- . SEFA Conference to meet eg. 2 times a year.

Proposal 2 (Kai)

- . Regional Groupings (Canberra, South East, Sydney based) meet weekly; and
- . Central Delegated decision making meeting monthly
- . Additionally, quarterly Conference.

How is all this to be paid for? What would rules on reimbursement for travel cost to all these meetings be?

General comments received on Attachment 2:

(i) In a more formalised SEFA structure, question of Convenorship of great importance. Role should be defined, in terms of purpose, scope and responsibilities. If can't agree on these, there should not be a Convenor. What are Jeff Angel's views on these matters? Could we invite him to submit them?

(ii) Need to ensure accountability of SEFA staff. General meetings not appropriate mechanism for this (lack of time, information, etc). Make staff accountable to Convenor? - s/he should be in regular contact with them anyway. Or accountability via regional groupings, or 'seconding' staff to member groups, which take responsibility for accountability.

(iii) Paid SEFA staff needed in all three centres. Minimum of one in each centre. SEFA could contribute some funds for second person where needed.

JUL 10 90 14:15
Other general comments put forward on relationship between SEFA and NSW and Australian Forest Campaigns by Sid Walker, Canberra FWG:

4a I think that Sydney should provide a service facility for the entire NSW Forest Campaign. This could facilitate a regular flow of information between participating groups in the campaign, help implement agreed strategy (lobbying, media work etc) on behalf of the whole NSW campaign, and provide a focal point for activity in the run-up to the next State election. Such a step is - or should be - contingent on the development of a commonly agreed NSW Forest policy. The process of developing such a policy is underway - although it has not yet been completed. NEFA, and all other groups in the state working on forest issues, should be consulted on this idea. If there is a general perception that such a facility is needed, we should give some thought to how it could be done - and the potential overlap in staffing between SEFAcrats and NSWForestCampaignocrats.

4b I would make almost an identical proposal in relation to Canberra, and the desirability of a facility based here to service the national forest campaign. I believe this is needed as well as 4a, that it would clearly work closely with its Sydney equivalent, but would carry out the peculiar set of tasks applicable to a Federally-oriented campaign. I would see its work as complimentary to the role of the ACF and TWS NLO's.

I believe that an Australian forest action network campaign center is necessary if we are to build, over the medium- and long-term, a major campaign with a high profile and widespread, well-integrated grass-roots support. In the absence of such a campaign, I don't believe we will achieve our objectives (I'm assuming here that we all share as general objectives the desire for high standards of native forest

management continent-wide, and a restructured national wood and wood products industry. If so, I believe the former could in theory be achieved mainly on a State by State basis, but the latter can only realistically be undertaken by the Commonwealth. Moreover, working together with a modicum of unity on the national level can, I believe, help us to achieve some of our policies more rapidly than were we to work only on lower levels.

4c In both cases, I suspect that considerable funds would be available from public support, wealthy patrons etc., as long as the concept of both was thought through clearly, widely supported and well presented. A fundraiser could be appointed to get each/both projects underway. I intend to write a paper advancing the case for such facilities to be precirculated before the next A.F.A.N. meeting.

10th July 1990

20

Attention SEFA,

Sorry for the impersonal address! I'm in a hurry as usual to post these to you all.

Please find enclosed:

- 1// Draft Structure for SEFA papers compiled by Rachel Thompson, kindly forwarded by Sid Walker.
- 2// Correspondence from Jeff Angel re RAC hearings and two letters
- 3// "Alas for SEFA" letter from Jim Collins. (Sorry for "doubling up" if I have ...)
- 4// EGC campaigner ad.

N.B Draft Policy Papers (from Syd) will be circulated to you all THIS WEEK. Both Structure and policy papers were agreed to at last big SEFA meeting, as an attempt to formalize Policy and structure for SEFA

PLEASE prepare to make comments on the Policy Papers when they arrive, and peruse the structure papers now, as comments are requested back to

SYD WALKER AT C.C.S.E. RAC by

062477808

END OF JULY !!! (ie 31.7.90) - so as to facilitate processing and publication of comments prior to the next SEFA meeting - which is now proposed for the ...

11th and 12th August in Canberra

(I am still contacting people to discuss this change - a difficult situation).

P.T.O.

Please kindly forward any discussion papers for precirculation (prior to SEFA meeting in August now) to Syd Walker - (who will be helped in that massive task as much as possible by me). All papers for precirculation must also be with Syd at end of July.

The meeting was changed from the original date at end of July in Canberra to 11th + 12th August. because it was felt that meaningful comments and discussion/reflection upon Policy + Structure Draft papers was essential to contribute to the success of the SEFA meeting.

Please make comments ^{on Policy + Structure} and prepare succinct precirculation discussion papers of your own, if you wish, and forward them to Syd Walker at C. C. S. E. R. + C.

THANKYOU SYD!, Syd is also co-ordinating accommodation for us all at our big meeting.

Summary - Draft Policy Papers to follow

Also Updated Who's Who List to Follow this week.

Take care everyone.

Jo Morgan