

# Session 4: Gearing Up

## Questions to Consider

- What is stopping us from being the very best example of a full-cycle, circular-economy, sustainable forest in the whole world?
- Which of these obstacles could be resolved with greater knowledge and further research?
- What are the linkage partnerships that need to be established for a successful model to be implemented?
- In order to have an equitable system that distributes a community resource/ asset, who gets the wood? What happens to the wood? Who “profits”?

- What is stopping us? The number of players, so many types of people seem invested;
- There are legal blocks; there is a will there, embrace that;
- What policy directs this? Will be part of the urban forest plan, what are the possibilities, seems hopeful. If the ACT can do something in this area, we can show leadership; we have the wealth to show something in this sphere to show leadership.
- How do we fairly distribute this resource? A third party non-profit could be seen as independent and fair;
- ANU research staff setting this problem shows that there is research skill to harness this, and have access to grant money, so can access grant \$\$ and that opens a path;
- Distributing resources and who profits? An NGO, making use of current efficiencies such as wood dumps;

- Take advantage of the possibility of grad students;
- Using seed funding to develop database and to give grants to students to develop those databases;
- What's stopping us? Gov and processes; perceived lack of markets, or ignorance around those markets; lack of effectiveness in delivering benefit in a circular market?
- How valuable is the commodity to the community? Capture the "intangibles"
- A vocal minority that may be hostile to the scheme;
- Can solve this by trying to make it cost effective; passionate bureaucrats; allow private enterprise to take on some of the operation, a pre-qualification process, vertical integration with multiple levels of the supply chain;
- Partnerships: the arborists, coordinate with them; look at the supply chain; gov to makers to private enterprise; working with CIT and ANU to develop next gen makers; placemakers; look at how TAS has promoted products and schemes, maybe Design Canberra?
- Who gets the wood? Maybe a pre-qual process, make sure who is getting it is feeding back into the circular economy, has greater good in mind

- Grading the trees in place, having the removalists putting the grading through from the beginning so there is a real process around where the wood will go;
- There should be training for the existing on the ground staff to be educated in grading timber; may resist change, needs time;
- Let contractors have autonomy in the process;
- Not just who profits, but who benefits on the whole;
- Train arborists to cut “sawlogs”; that solves 90% of the problem; if you cut it to the right length, you have merchantable timber;
- Consult with arborist association;
- Conflict around who is competing for the timber; grading is important from the beginning in this, what is mulch, biomass, veneer, sawlogs; need a Czar who can make the decisions very quickly or the log will lose value;

- The training in cutting sawlogs is not so straightforward in the urban timber setting, so training is necessary;
- Surely we can have the inventory standing by in a database so this is ready, scanned and geo-located when the removal occurs; use technology on the front end;
- Products, marketing, approaches, none of that means nothing until we have the data and the human resources behind the scenes before anything can happen;
- Need to quantify the resource; need to know rate of supply; need to quantify all the grades that will come available;
- Need to understand the markets;
- Need \$\$\$\$ , from gov, from grants. NGOs and universities can apply for gov funding that our local agencies cannot;

- Partnerships is the most important thing pre-market, pre-process; bring the stakeholders together, on a larger scale than this symposium, to work out the training needed, the parameters;
- Certification could be really useful;
- Government is a varied range of departments; environment, education, federal;
- We are just ACT, but NCA and many other land managers would need to be consulted and brought in;
- need to get the Indigenous perspectives and partnerships; these are resourceful people;
- Detainees and ex-detainees could have workforce development so they can re-enter society;
- Using the right language to create the right partnerships with passionate people is the starting point.

- Hope!
- Yes we Can-berra!
- Scaling up: unintended consequences happen on the way, the pragmatics of the kilns, the storage,
- Existing sawmill in Canberra could be a place where it could start as a co-op;
- The branch, so funny!!!
- The community could be involved in the making, but specialists need to do the milling because of the risk, the liability;
- Plenty to do to define the research, the mapping, the public-private partnerships;
- How to become cost neutral;
- How to sort the value of all the possible products we could possible have;

- Certification for engineering, building standards, zero waste goals:
- look at the Green Building council, get it built into the system, get the timber as part of the star ratings;
- It has to be meaningful: if it is not doing the community good, if it is not meaningful, don't bother!
- Jet lag, arg!
- A role for everyone. Kum Bay Ya!
- Carbon offsets and the carbon economy, carbon credits for furniture; lots of ideas and opportunities, but will take research;
- Niche markets can be successful b/c not direct competition with industry; specialty timber harvested at full moon.