

Woodlot eFM Project – Issues Prioritization Summary Listing – (results from broad group only) as of June 30, 2008

Theme: CONF = Confusion, DCU = Data Clean Up, DEP = Data Entry Problem, NAFS = Non-Audience-Focused Systems

Priority: 1 = top priority, 2 = next priority, etc

System/Business: EFM = possibly relates to all MFR applications; RTEB = Resource Tenures & Engineering Branch; FPB = Forest Practices Branch

#	Priority	Theme	Issue/Question	System/ Business
1		CONF	Avg vol/tree marked as mandatory in ECAS but all boxes are actually mandatory??	ECAS
2		CONF	Term discrepancies in ECAS - different terms all meaning the same thing?? = allocated, apportioned, amortized	ECAS
3		CONF	Despite ECAS manual and screen indicating search requires timbermark AND effective date, can actually search by timbermark only -- so why indicate otherwise?	ECAS
4	9,1	CONF	Different definitions in each application for what appears to be the same field (eg. SP exempt, Gross Area, Mature, etc)	EFM
5		CONF	Pine shown as Pli in RESULTS vs LO in Revenue systems (ECAS & WASTE)	EFM
6	9	CONF	Not knowing how/where to apply for a BCeid	EFM
7	7	CONF	"Submit" has different meanings depending on which application or which screen one is in -- confusing as to when is it the final submission vs one where changes can be made??	EFM
8	8	CONF	Changes to systems and legislation/regulations are too frequent --- just figure out what to do and changed again	EFM/Business
9	2,1,1	CONF	If external WTPs are included as part of opening definition's gross area in RESULTS, then the block hectares are greater than those in FTA which causes an error message during MFRs block retirement process (see example pages)	RESULTS
10		CONF	What if WTPs were not included as part of opening definition but are then included as part of Forest Cover?	RESULTS
11		CONF	What happens if go back into block for bugs after indicating block completion date on previous annual report?	RESULTS
12		CONF	Too much information collected by RESULTS for woodlots - should be limited to key data of spatial map where harvesting occurred, date harvesting began, and free growing date including forest cover	RESULTS
13		CONF	What's required if spur roads within clearance area of existing road permit connecting main road permit road to on-block roads?	RTEB
14	7	CONF	Inconsistency across districts with respect to skid trails that are main access to blocks - some require road permit submission or include trails as part of cutting permit submission while others may require nothing	RTEB
15	8,1	CONF	What are the reporting requirements for Wildlife Tree Patches - internal vs external and if assigned to block vs entire woodlot?	RTEB/FPB
16		CONF	Confusion over annual reports vs annual reporting requirements	RTEB/FPB
17	3,8,5	DCU	Blocks incorrectly positioned on base maps	FTA
18		DCU	Not all associated files (private timber mark and/or road permit) are showin up in "Associated-Use table" under "Associated file ID" with Woodlot # under Forest File Id	FTA
19		DCU	Many management unit and quota types are still incorrect in FTA	FTA
20	4,2	DCU	Blocks or openings not in FTA and/or RESULTS	FTA/RESULTS
21	1,3	DCU	Legacy data in LRDW - old cutblocks incorrect & no official provincial map for private lands	LRDW/FTA
22	2,2,3,2	DCU	Data clean up contracts not being fully completed (ie. not all spatial data being entered) = concern for future free growing submission 15 years from now when licensee's spatial file could be in wrong format or lost = more cost to licensee	RESULTS
23	9,8	DCU	FTA data clean up often did not include spatial so no spatial available for uploading to RESULTS (ie. "Include Exhibit A spatial" checkbox won't work)	RESULTS
24	5,5,3,1,9	DCU	Much more resourcing needed to both clean up RESULTS backlog and add missing info and ensure new data is clean	RESULTS
25	7,10	DCU	Data entry errors in RESULTS	RESULTS
26		DEP	CIMS is not available on any website - so even if licensees wanted to use electronic notice of commencement, they can't	CIMS

Woodlot eFM Project – Issues Prioritization Summary Listing – (results from broad group only) as of June 30, 2008

Theme: CONF = Confusion, DCU = Data Clean Up, DEP = Data Entry Problem, NAFS = Non-Audience-Focused Systems

Priority: 1 = top priority, 2 = next priority, etc

System/Business: EFM = possibly relates to all MFR applications; RTEB = Resource Tenures & Engineering Branch; FPB = Forest Practices Branch

#	Priority	Theme	Issue/Question	System/ Business
			find the application	
27		DEP	FRBC codes (and other old funding sources) are unavailable to those doing RESULTS data clean up - even though appear in drop down list	RESULTS
28		DEP	"No regen obligation" option is confusing as woodlots don't have regen obligations but this option is actually for intermediate cuttings or commercial thinning	RESULTS
29		DEP	Why are silviculture system, variant and/or cutphase all required?	RESULTS
30		DEP	In ezlink, prime licence is mandatory but very unclear as to where you enter it	RESULTS
31	6	DEP	Schedule A - Indian Reserve – unable to report in RESULTS since not in FTA – cutting authority issued by feds as timber permit not a cutting permit in our system	RESULTS
32	6,9	DEP	Spatial only submissions can blow away some existing data in RESULTS = caution -- know the right way to submit spatial only submissions	RESULTS
33	10,6	DEP	Stocking standards regime id unchangeable - unable to correct if select the wrong one by mistake?	RESULTS
34	5,10	DEP	Getting woodlot stocking standards ids into RESULTS - who's responsible?	RESULTS
35	2,10	DEP	Partially harvesting of blocks over several years does not fit in RESULTS (disturbance hectares keep doubling) - suggest RELOG code for those who want to track their activities annually rather than just at block completion	RESULTS
36		DEP	How to deal with Sect 22.01 sites planted & reported before FTA & RESULTS submissions?	RESULTS
37		DEP	Reserve – what codes should be used for single tree or clearcut with reserves where leaving all of the fir?	RESULTS
38	3	DEP	Hectares – what to use for non-completed single tree or salvage or group selection??	RESULTS
39		DEP	Free Growing – what kind of survey data needs to be submitted?	RESULTS
40		DEP	Planting areas that are not obligations – do they need to be reported?	RESULTS
41		DEP	If so, how to report areas planted that are not associated with a particular block?	RESULTS
42		DEP	Amalgamations - issue with areas = NAR can be changed but Exhibit A and Forest Cover areas not changeable; - issue with approval time for stocking standard amendments	RESULTS
43	7	DEP	Previous stand info requirement for old blocks	RESULTS
44	6	DEP	Free Growing survey can only be submitted once early free growing date is reached even if only doing a light selection cut where survey done immediately after harvest	RESULTS
45	3,4	NAFS	Apparent lack of communication or communication not reaching affected audiences around major changes to systems/applications before changes occur (eg. timbermark designate, previous stand type, etc)	EFM
46	10,3,4,2	NAFS	BCeId expires every 2 years – why?	EFM
47		NAFS	Salvage type options in ESF cutting permit submission not appropriate for woodlots - woodlot option required	ESF-FTA
48		NAFS	If type link for Woodlot RESULTS guide into Internet Explorer, guide won't come up; however, if send link in email and click on link, then guide is available	RESULTS
49		NAFS	One report of RESULTS access deactivation without notification if haven't used it in awhile = is this true??	RESULTS
50	3,1,4,6,4	NAFS	Frustration with lack of knowledge and understanding of RESULTS requirements	RESULTS
51	8,9	NAFS	Private timber marks not tied to Woodlot Licence in RESULTS	RESULTS
52	5,8	NAFS	RESULTS not working properly with different internet browsers	RESULTS

Woodlot eFM Project – Issues Prioritization Summary Listing – (results from broad group only) as of June 30, 2008

Theme: CONF = Confusion, DCU = Data Clean Up, DEP = Data Entry Problem, NAFS = Non-Audience-Focused Systems

Priority: 1 = top priority, 2 = next priority, etc

System/Business: EFM = possibly relates to all MFR applications; RTEB = Resource Tenures & Engineering Branch; FPB = Forest Practices Branch

#	Priority	Theme	Issue/Question	System/ Business
53	5,10	NAFS	RESULTS online data entry screens very unfriendly -- "add" button needs to be hit before entering data but is at bottom of screen	RESULTS
54	4,7	NAFS	Access to waste system not easily recognizable	WASTE