

Minutes of the Steering Committee

Date: 08 March 2007

Time: 08h00 – 17h00

Venue: Southern Sun, O. R. Tambo International Airport.

Present:

Ms Gugu Moloi	- Chairperson
Mr Moses Qomoyi	- Member
Mr Dinga Mncube	- Member
Mr Themba Siyolo	- Member
Mr John Hunt	- Member
Mr Angus Currie	- Member
Mr John Barton	- Member
Mr Bailey Bekker	- Member
Mr Jaap Steenkamp	- Member
Mr Sakhiwo Zako	- Member
Mr Peter Keyworth	- Member
Mr Mike Tlhoale	- Member
Mr Daniel Netsianda	- Member
Ms Mary-Anne Mngomezulu	- Member
Mr Mike Edwards	- Member
Mr Aubrey Nsuntsha	- Member
Dr Moshibudi Rampedi	- Member
Ms Queen Filani	- Observer
Mr Mnyamezeli Dlamini	- Observer
Mr Kobus Breed	- Observer

Secretariat:

Dr Themba Simelane	- Head of the Secretariat
Mr Erik Buiten	- Technical Advisor
Ms Pumeza Tunzi	- Secretariat
Ms Dimpho Maleka	- Secretariat
Ms Lesego Malete	- Secretariat
Ms Mpho Khumalo	- Secretariat

Apologies:

Ms Thamsanqa Zimu	- Member
Mr Rico Hamman	- Member
Dr Moenieba Isaacs	- Member
Ms Tshepo Khumbane	- Member
Mr Gwanya Tozi	- Observer
Ms Jeanette Clarke	- Secretariat

Absent without apology:

Ms Patricia Mbethe-Mnisi	- Member
--------------------------	----------

Item	Matters For Discussion and Approval	Action
1.	<u>Opening and Welcome</u>	
1.1	The acting Chairperson, Mr Moses Qomoyi, welcomed all present and formally opened the meeting.	Noted
2.	<u>Apologies</u>	
2.1	Mr Qomoyi apologised on behalf of the Chairperson, Ms Gugu Moloi who was experiencing problems with her flight and stated that she would join the meeting later.	Noted
2.2	Mr Qomoyi raised a concern about the absence of Ms Patricia Mbethe-Mnisi, who has not been attending meetings and without tendering any apologies. The Secretariat was requested to liaise with her and find out about her membership and attendance of the Steering Committee meetings.	Noted Secretariat
2.3	Apologies were noted as above	Noted
3.	<u>Adoption of the Agenda</u>	
3.1	The agenda was adopted without any alterations or additions.	Approved
4.	<u>Minutes of the Previous meeting</u> The minutes were approved and adopted after the following corrections were made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Item 5.2.5.2, add that “Mr Gwanya to respond to the questions in writing” • Mr Edwards indicated that item 6.2.2 is ambiguous and does not reflect the true picture of what was discussed by the Grower’s Working Group meeting held on 17 January 2007. It was agreed that the extract of these minutes would be recorded as follows: “As different sub-sectors have differing characteristics and requirements it is requested that the Steering Committee determines possibility of allowing different size classifications to be applicable to different sub-sectors within a consolidated sector scorecard situation. If this is possible then each sub-sector to recommend sub sector specific size classifications. If this is not possible then all sub-sector working groups to attempt to find consensus. If no consensus then to adopt size classification as determined in the final Codes of Good Practice.” 	Noted Noted

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Item 6.3.2.1 Mr Edwards pointed out that he thought indigenous forests were not to be included in the Charter. It was agreed that the item has been recorded correctly and that this matter be dealt with under “Matters Arising”. 	Agreed
5.	<u>Matters Arising</u>	
5.1	<u>Land Reform Issues</u>	
5.1.1	Dr Simelane reported that Mr Gwanya who was supposed to submit a written response to the Committee was unable to attend the meeting and has therefore sent Mr Dlamini on his behalf.	Noted
5.1.2	Mr Edwards was requested to briefly go through the questions he has raised with Mr Gwanya for the benefit of Mr. Dlamini. The questions were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If a company has been through the process of land restitution, and the land issue has been settled, can the transfer of land qualify for contribution to the ownership element of the scorecard? Are there any guarantees that the restored land would still be used for forestry? 	
5.1.3	Mr Dlamini confessed that he is not familiar with the scorecards but stated that his office in KwaZulu-Natal (KZN) together with the Chief Land Claims Commission has developed models that will enable forestry operations to continue. This included a lease back agreement with the community.	Noted
5.1.4	The Committee agreed that they still need a written response from the office of the Chief Lands Claim Commissioner on the issue of ownership in the scorecard.	Agreed
5.2	<u>Inclusion of Indigenous Forests in the Charter</u>	
5.2.1	Dr Simelane reported that the Secretariat has consulted SANParks and Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT). A presentation was made to DEAT during their strategic planning session, where DEAT informed the Secretariat that DEAT is willing to be part of the Forestry Charter process even if it is at this late stage. They are also considering embarking on the development of the Charter for Parks and People for Conservation Areas. DEAT had also invited the Tourism Charter Council Secretariat as they wanted to ensure that their interests are reflected in both the Tourism and Forestry Charters.	Noted Noted Noted
5.2.2	SANParks indicated that they are willing to be part of the Forest	Noted

5.2.3	<p>Charter. They confirmed that their interests are accommodated in the draft Forest Charter.</p> <p>Mr Edwards raised the point that commercial timber in indigenous forestry is a unique feature, but if SANParks is satisfied to be included in the Charter this should be accepted. Mr Nsuntsha pointed out that the reality of the matter is that commercial activities occur in the indigenous forests and if an opportunity to deal with this in the Charter arises, people should make use of it.</p>	Noted
5.3	<u>Gaps in the Charter</u>	
5.3.1	<p><u>Clarification from the DTI on Scorecards Issues</u></p> <p>Dr Simelane reported that the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) had informed the Secretariat that someone would attend the meeting. In their absence, Mr Buiten presented the response obtained from the DTI as outlined in Annexure 1.</p>	
5.3.1.1	<p><u>Dealing with Measured Enterprises that operate in more than one sector and/or more than one forest sub-sector</u></p>	
5.3.1.1.1	The DTI has responded that they will look into the proposal contained in par. 7.1(a) of the draft Charter and that statement 002, which is still be published, will also provide guidelines in this regard.	Noted
5.3.1.1.2	Mr Siyolo and Mr Qomoyi pointed out that statement 002 does not exist in the Codes of Good Practice and cannot be used as a guide; therefore the Committee cannot commit itself to something that is not available. They further proposed that DTI be request to respond to the Charter proposal.	Noted Agreed
5.3.1.2	<p><u>Exempted micro-enterprises that qualify for promotion as Level Three Contributor</u></p> <p>DTI confirmed that the reference to “50% owned by black people or by black women” is correct.</p>	Noted
5.3.1.3	<p><u>Recognition for past B-BBEE ownership deals</u></p>	
5.3.1.3.1	DTI indicated that their intent is to recognise past B-BBEE ownership transactions and undertook to clarify this in relation to sale of assets and where there has been a loss of shares by black participants before the effective date of the Codes.	Noted
5.3.1.3.2	Mr Qomoyi highlighted the need to get written confirmation from DTI in this regard.	Agreed
5.3.1.3.3	The Secretariat was tasked to pursue this matter and send the	Secretariat

	response to members as soon as it is available.	
5.3.1.4	<u>Bonus points for EAP targets</u> The DTI will clarify the application of this new indicator through scorecard guidelines they intend to issue. This will be pursued by the Secretariat.	Noted/ Secretariat
5.3.1.5	<u>B-BBEE Procurement Spend from Black Owned Enterprises</u> The DTI confirmed that in the scorecard for medium and large enterprises the reference should be “and” not “or”.	Noted
5.3.1.6	<u>Definitions used in the enterprise development scorecard</u> The DTI will investigate the issue of uncertainty with regard to the meaning of “beneficiary entities” and “beneficiary communities” and provide response to the Secretariat.	Noted/ Secretariat
5.3.1.7	<u>Enterprise development spend linked to procurement contracts</u>	
5.3.1.7.1	Mr Buiten confirmed that DTI was of the opinion that company expenses to support emerging grower contracting schemes can be claimed as enterprise development spend, only in so far as market prices are paid for the timber. However, the Codes do not clearly state this when defining eligible enterprise development spend. The DTI undertook to investigate the need for greater clarity on this matter	Noted Noted/ Secretariat
5.3.1.7.2	Mr Bekker wanted confirmation that where companies facilitate access to soft loans from public funds, these loans cannot be claimed as enterprise development contributions by those companies.	Noted
5.3.1.7.3	Mr Qomoyi said that double-dipping should not be allowed but this issue should be left to the DTI to investigate further.	Secretariat to follow up with DTI
5.3.1.8	<u>Definitions used in the socio-economic development scorecard</u>	
5.3.1.8.1	Members wanted to get clarity on the definition of Socio-Economic contributions as being contributions that “facilitate sustainable access to the economy for those beneficiaries”. Mr Buiten said that it is often difficult to prove that a community contribution will improve access to the economy. The DTI has requested the Steering Committee to come up with guidelines to be applied within the forest sector.	Noted
5.3.1.8.2	Mr Nsuntsha said that the problem for black people involved in the forestry industry is that they are expected to make money from the	Noted

5.3.1.8.3	<p>eradication of alien species and this is not economically viable.</p> <p>Ms Mngomezulu said that her understanding of socio- economy is giving back to the community even if it is in terms of greening but, the Committee should stress the significance of enterprise development as it is vital for the small emerging enterprises.</p>	Noted
5.3.1.8.4	Mr Qomoyi suggested that reference be made to the legislation that regulates forestry to find out what they say about this matter. He gave the example of fire fighting as a socio-economic contribution.	Noted
5.3.1.8.5	Mr Mncube suggested that the Committee should have a re-look at the Codes of Good Practice to find out what they say about this matter as people have been benefiting from other activities that have not been considered as yet.	Noted
5.3.1.8.6	Mr Siyolo reminded the members that the bottom line is that the DTI said that the Committee must give guidelines to what they think has sector specific relevance.	Noted
5.3.1.9	<u>Use of bonus points in the forest sector scorecard</u>	
5.3.1.9.1	Mr Buiten reported that the DTI did not have any problems with the introduction of additional bonus points in the Charter as incentives to achieve higher sector targets.	Noted
5.3.1.9.2	Mr Siyolo asked for clarity on whether bonus points can be earned even if the baseline targets for a particular indicator have not been met. The Committee agreed that bonus points can only be earned if the original targets have been met.	Agreed
5.3.1.10	<u>Industry code of conduct</u>	
5.3.1.10.1	The DTI welcomed the proposal made by the Steering Committee that Exempted Micro-Enterprise should also comply with the industry codes of conduct.	Noted
5.3.1.10.2	Members requested the Secretariat to circulate the amended version of Annexure 1.	Secretariat

5.3.2	<p><u>Input on NSF from the Department of Labour</u></p> <p>Dr Simelane reported that DWAF was tasked to ensure that the Department of Labour (DoL) is satisfied with the undertakings in the Charter that refer to the role of the National Skills Development Fund (NSDF). The following was noted:</p> <p>(a) DoL is satisfied that there is no conflict between NSDF policy framework and the undertakings included in the Charter.</p> <p>(b) Funds can be accessed through Forest Industry Education and Training Authority (FIETA) for the Charter as long as the needs of the sector are covered by the National Skills Strategy.</p>	Noted
5.3.3	<p><u>FSA Input on Skills Development Levy Funds</u></p> <p>Mr Edwards reported that he has been unable to secure feedback from FIETA on the wording of the undertaking regarding access to the Skills Development Levy Fund in the Charter. The Secretariat was requested to assist in securing feedback from FIETA so that the Charter can be finalised.</p>	Noted Secretariat
5.3.4	<p><u>Sector - wide application of Industry Codes of Conduct, par. 12.2.1 of the Charter</u></p> <p>Mr Buiten explained how the request made at the previous Steering Committee meeting to provide for a sector wide approach to the application of the Industry Codes of Conduct has been accommodated in the Charter document. This was possible with regard to the codes for employment practices which now apply to all sub-sectors. However the remaining codes of conduct are specific to particular areas of contracting i.e. forestry contracting, forest grower schemes and charcoal contracting and will therefore only apply where enterprises are engaged in such contracting arrangements.</p>	Noted
5.3.4.2	<p>Mr Hunt disagreed with the change made to the employment equity scorecard for medium/large enterprise by allocating points to fibre enterprise that comply with the Codes of Conduct on employment. He argued that all medium/large enterprises must comply with these Codes and hence there is no need to offer points for doing so.</p>	Noted
5.3.4.3	<p>Mr Buiten pointed out that the DTI Codes of Good Practice (Statement 400) requires compliance with Skills Development Act and the Skills Development Levies Act as minimum requirements to be able to score under the skills development element of the scorecard. He suggested that the meeting could consider applying a similar arrangement with regard to compliance with the Codes of Conduct on employment to the employment equity element of the scorecard.</p>	

5.3.4.4	It was resolved that compliance with the Industry Codes of Conduct on employment would not be included as an indicator in the scorecard for medium/large enterprise, but be specified in the Charter text as a minimum requirement for scoring under the employment equity element of the scorecard.	Agreed
5.3.5	<u>Input on Codes of Conduct for Charcoal Industry</u>	
5.3.5.1	Dr Simelane said that there were no inputs from the Charcoal Producers on the Codes of Conduct as a meeting to discuss this with them was postponed. Mr Currie offered to assist in calling another meeting, but pointed out that there has been poor response from industry in the Pole and Charcoal Working Group.	Noted
5.3.5.2	Mr Qomoyi confirmed that Mr Currie has done a lot to try to engage the charcoal industry representatives on the matter, but indicated that the Charter process cannot be held back because some representatives do not respond to invitations and requests.	Noted
5.3.5.3	Mr Qomoyi suggested that an attempt be made to convene another meeting with Charcoal representatives. If not successful, the Steering should proceed with the inputs that have been received thus far.	Noted/ Secretariat
5.3.6	<u>DLA Input on Land Reform Support Costs</u>	
5.3.6.1	Ms Filani reported that the Department of Land Affairs (DLA) met and discussed in detail the issue at hand and agreed that the DLA has a key role to play to support afforestation. Due to the importance of this matter, DLA will be having a meeting on the 15 th March 2007 to discuss and to set up a forum that will deal with this matter. Ms Filani assured members that the DLA is taking forestry land issue very seriously.	Noted
5.3.6.2	Mr Qomoyi said that the DLA has a crucial role to play in implementing the Forest Charter and requested that next time DLA representatives should make documentation available when reporting.	Noted
5.3.6.3	Ms Filani responded by sharing the following information from a document she had received on the matter: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Forestry Enterprise Development Office (FEDO) strategy identifies potential land for afforestation in both the Eastern Cape (EC) and KwaZulu-Natal (KZN). FEDO then looks into environmental implications of afforestation. • The FEDO strategy is divided into two: (a) Community initiated forestry where they are offered access to equity and finances. (b) Company initiated projects where SAPPI in KZN approached individuals who are interested in forestry 	Noted Noted

	and assisted them with finances. There are guidelines on how to apply for the licences and other requirements for implementation. This defined the role of the municipalities, DLA and DWAF.	
5.3.6.4	Mr Bekker said that it is not only SAPPI that is involved in these kinds of projects and that other and smaller companies should be allowed to participate equally. Mr Zako stated that no individual company should be allocated first right to forestry land just because they have more financial resources than others. The Charter should make sure that this does not happen. He said that transformation should be placed at the fore when it comes to matters such as this one.	Noted
5.3.6.5	Mr Mncube said that SAPPI went to individuals and informed them about their product and then liaised with DLA for land. He said that the Charter must not be used to stall initiatives of companies that take the lead, just because others are slow to act on development opportunities.	Noted
5.3.6.6	Dr Rampedi indicated that the FEDO document from which Ms Filani quoted (item 5.3.6.3) is not confidential and should be made available to members to avoid misunderstandings.	Ms Filani to give document to Secretariat
5.4	<u>Comments on the Appointment of the Charter Council and changes to the Council budget</u>	
5.4.1	Dr Simelane reported that the Secretariat was tasked to come up with a model on the financing of the Council. The Secretariat has reviewed the Financial Services Charter and the Tourism Charter. The former is industry funded while the latter is government funded. The route taken by the Tourism Council is not advised as industry does not fully own and commit to the process. The co-funding model (Government 60% and Industry 40%) agreed to by this Steering Committee offers the best prospects for commitment and success.	Noted
5.4.2	Members raised a number of questions including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since the industry is paying for some of the Council members, will they nominate and the Minister appoints? • Looking at the funding ratio does it mean that the Minister appoints 60% of the members of the Council? • How many of the nine representatives from industry would come from organised industry as opposed to non-organised industry? • Will the private sector funding contribution compromise government's intent to transform the sector? 	Noted
5.4.3	It was suggested that the minutes of the previous minutes be looked at to see what was requested from the Steering Committee. It was	Noted

<p>5.4.4</p>	<p>established that members were required to comment on the proposal for the appointment of members of the Charter Council that was presented by the Secretariat at that meeting. It was also established that no comment was received from the members thus implying the acceptance of the proposal.</p> <p>In response to some of the questions raised above, Dr. Rampedi said that DWAF will facilitate and ensure that the Council is appointed; the composition and funding as proposed is acceptable to DWAF.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>5.4.5</p> <p>5.4.6</p>	<p>The Committee wanted to hear from the Secretariat what the Minister's view is on the appointment members to the Charter Council. Dr Simelane said that the Secretariat had presented the matter to Minister but has not received confirmation of the Minister's view. The Secretariat was requested to follow this up with the Minister's office. (Ms Moloji showed her disappointment in the Secretariat for not knowing the Minister's view on a crucial matter such as this one)</p> <p>The meeting's attention was drawn to the fact that a decision was also required on the proposed Charter Council budget increase of R277 200/annum. This is required for the remuneration of the independent Chairperson and Board members not representing government and organised industry/labour.</p>	<p>Secretariat to get Minister's view</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p>5.4.7</p>	<p>It was agreed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trade unions will elect two representatives to be appointed by the Minister of Water Affairs and Forestry. • Industry will elect nine members to be appointed by the Minister of Water Affairs and Forestry. • Since certain sub-sectors do not have representative industry bodies, the election of their representatives will be done at a general meeting called by DWAF for that purpose. • Provision must be made for inputs from non-aligned enterprises in the election of representatives. • The three representatives from Government will come from the Departments of Water Affairs and Forestry, Trade and Industry and Land Affairs. • National Forestry Advisory Council will nominate two of its members with the required credentials to represent broader stakeholder groups. The appointment will be made by the Minister of Water Affairs and Forestry. • The Independent Chairperson will be appointed by Minister of Water Affairs and Forestry in consultation with stakeholder constituencies. • The proposed Charter Council budget will be increased by R277 200/annum to pay for remuneration costs. 	<p>Agreed</p>

6	<u>Finalisation of the Charter</u>	
6.1	<u>Charter Text</u>	
6.1.1	<p>The following amendments were proposed to the draft Charter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 6 – include definition for “industry • Page 7 – include acronym for EPA (Economically Active Population) • Page 11 point (a) - a reference is made to statement 002 whereas this does not exist – must be taken out. • Page 11 point (e) – capping of bonus points can be removed (refer to item 1.3.5.9) • Page 12, par. 8.1 – “increase the target to <u>15%</u>” • Page 14, par. 11.2.1 – abbreviated words must be given in full • Page 15, par 11.2.2 – remove undertakings and move reference to “development of business plans.” elsewhere • Page 16, par. 12.2.1(b) – remove reference to “The codes will also set guidelines on when support given to emergent forest grower schemes can qualify for enterprise development support under the forest sector scorecard.” • Page 19, par. 13.2.4 – clarify definition of “state forest land” • Page 22, par. 15.2.2 – replace “sawtimber” with “sawlogs”. • Page 25, par. 16.2 – replace “independently audited report” with “compliance report, subject to the requirements outlined in the Codes of Good Practice”. 	Agreed
6.1.2.1	Mr Barton requested that the last sentence under point (d), par. 12.2.1 on page 16 should be removed as the Charter is voluntary and it would be inappropriate to refer to punitive measures. He added that the threat portrayed by that last sentence could place the Charter under legal scrutiny. He therefore suggested that the matter be worded differently.	Noted
6.1.2.2	Mr Hunt said that points (a, b & c) on page 16 regulate the commercial relationship, but do not force compliance. Mr Qomoyi said that government has the right to take punitive measures if terms and requirements are not met. Ms Mngomezulu stated that there is no need to remove the last sentence. Mr Steenkamp said incentives for scoring points are more important than punitive measures.	Noted
6.1.2.3	Dr Rampedi argued that the last sentence should not be removed as the government and the buyer get into contract and non-compliance should be seen as a breach of contract. It was agreed that Par. 12.2.1 (d) on page 16 will remain as is.	Noted Agreed
6.1.3.1	DWAF requested that the following be added to par. 13.2.4 (c) on page 19: “Preference will be given to enterprises that comply with the forest sector Charter code” to make government’s position clear	Agreed

	in this regard.	
6.1.3.2	Mr Siyolo requested clarity on what level of compliance would be needed across the various elements of the scorecard to be able to meet government's requirement in this regard. Dr Rampedi reinforced the principle that applicants would need to prove their compliance and stated that the technical details of setting targets for levels of compliance should be left to the Charter Council.	Noted Agreed
6.1.3.3	Mr Siyolo wanted to know how this would apply to afforestation in the Eastern Cape where the license applicants are community members backed by big companies. Dr Rampedi answered that DWAF preference will be given to communities.	Noted
6.1.2.3	Mr Qomoyi wanted to know whether government has the power to recall/cancel/refuse to renew current licenses if companies do not meet B-BBEE requirements. The Chairperson responded by saying that this should be left to DWAF to investigate.	Noted/DWAF
6.1.4	<u>Page 23, par. 15.2.7: Expediting restitutions claims</u>	
6.1.4.1	Mr Bekker wanted to find out what does "industry" include under par. 15.2.7 (a) of the Charter because, in practice, the accords are reached with the different companies and not with the sector as a whole. This results in specific companies securing the contracts for timber supply from restitution beneficiaries. Mr Bekker reiterated the need for DWAF and DLA ensure that all stakeholders have equal opportunities to have contracts with communities that receive forest land.	Noted
6.1.4.2	Ms. Mngomezulu wanted to know what opportunities are available for communities and whether communities will be in a position to choose between options for contracting timber. Mr. Nsuntsha added that there is a need for a sector-wide approach to dealing with the 30% of forest land under claims and how to develop this in the broader national interest.	Noted
6.1.4.3	The meeting agreed that the undertaking under par. 15.2.7 should be broadened to refer to "the development of a coordinated strategy" for the settlement of land claims in which all sector stakeholders should participate.	Agreed
6.1.5	<u>Page 26, Signatories to the Charter</u> The Committee agreed that Amahlathi and DEAT should be added to the list. It was agreed that Mondi and SAPPI will sign under FSA on the grower's side and sign under PAMSA on the fibre side.	Agreed
6.1.6	<u>Scorecard</u>	

	The members agreed that apart from item 5.3.4.4 above, the scorecard need not be further discussed as there was agreement on the scorecard at the previous meeting.	Agreed
7	<u>Finalisation of the Charter Companion Document</u>	
7.1	The following amendments were proposed to the Charter Companion Document: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Page 20, par. 5.4 (b) e.</u> should read “The Chief Executive Officers shall make other staff appointments” • <u>Page 22, in the table –</u> remove all reference to turnover, only use NPAT • <u>Page 35, point (b), a –</u> last sentence – “learnerships” must be replaced with “learning programmes” • <u>Page 38, par. (b) a.,</u> second bullet, it was agreed that price be based on the representative market price by the promoting enterprise • <u>Page 39, 1st bullet</u> – middle sentence – “know” must be replaced with “known” • <u>Page 40:</u> all references to employees must read employers 	Agreed
7.2	Mr Edwards objected to a number of the additions and changes made by the Secretariat to the guidelines for the Industry Codes of Conduct for Forestry Contracting [par. 8.4 (a) of the Companion document]. He pointed out that allocation of responsibilities included is in many respects incorrect. He requested that changes to the text in red should revert back to the original text. The Secretariat undertook to make the necessary corrections.	Noted Agreed
8	<u>Comment on the Charter User Guide</u>	
8.1	Page 3 - keep with the definition of “Black” as it appears in the Act	Agreed
8.2	Page 14 - include an example of how you calculate “net equity interest”.	Agreed
8.3	Page 18, second sentence under “how is management control score calculated?” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A definition should be given for M&L as it does not appear in the Charter’s Abbreviations. • One of the formulas applied in the example to calculated Gender Recognition is incorrect and should be corrected. 	Agreed Agreed
8.4	Page 28, Table 9.3, 1 st row - TELKOM is not a monopoly.	Agreed
8.5	Page 35, Item 10, paragraph 3- check whether verification	Secretariat

8.6	certificates are always required. Page 36, item 11, Committee did not understand why reference should be made to the Tourism Guide as interpretation can be different. It was agreed that this reference should be deleted.	Agreed
8.7	Ms Filani suggested that guidance should be provided in the User Guide on how land reform beneficiaries could use/benefit from the Charter. The Chairperson indicated that this issue have not been explored in this meeting and that DWAF and DLA should come up with strategies on how to approach this matter.	Noted DWAF/DLA
9.	<u>Forest Charter Indaba</u>	
9.1	Ms Pumeza Tunzi gave a presentation on DWAF's plans for the Forest Sector Indaba to launch the draft Charter document and the post Indaba consultation process. She reported that DWAF intends to hold the launch of the Charter document at an Indaba for about 300 people on the 17 th May 2007 in Gauteng. She mentioned that the Secretariat is requesting the Committee's comments on the following:	Noted
9.1.1	(a) Indaba agenda circulated to the members during the meeting. The Committee approved the draft agenda that was presented.	Approved
9.1.2	(b) List of stakeholders: this will include people who were involved in developing the Charter and the civil society. A draft list will be sent to members for their comment.	Noted
9.1.3	(c) Budget of R3 489 063 including the consultation process.	
9.2	Mr Qomoyi commented that regional stakeholder consultation workshops are more important than the launch as a wider audience could be reached and where more time could be allocated to discuss and explain the Charter. He suggested that more resources should be allocated to the workshops than to the launch.	Noted
9.3	Ms Moloi said that the proposed media budget is too excessive and the Secretariat should look at ways of approaching different radio stations to negotiate opportunities to air the Charter rather than paying for advertisements.	Noted
9.4	The members remarked on the high costs of the Indaba wanted to know who would be paying for this. Dr Simelane responded by saying that DWAF has and will continue to approach individual companies to assist with funding for the Indaba. He also reminded the Committee that SAFCOL offered DWAF R1m towards the Indaba launch.	Noted

<p>9.5</p>	<p><u>Steering Committee's participation at the Indaba and consultation workshops.</u></p> <p>It was agreed that the Chairpersons of the Working Groups and the Chairperson of Steering Committee would form part of the panel at the Indaba.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>9.6</p>	<p>Mr Tlhoale suggested that the launch of the Indaba should be held in one of the forestry provinces. Mr Netsianda advised the Secretariat to conduct some research on where most people who will be attending the launch would be coming from and choose the location based on this.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>9.7</p>	<p>Mr Barton pointed out the importance of reducing costs by using the industry's venues for the regional workshops. He referred to the Mondi Auditorium in KZN as a possible venue.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>9.8</p>	<p>The meeting agreed that consideration must be given to structuring the Indaba as a media briefing and to place emphasis on the regional stakeholder consultation process. The Committee also noted that this consideration will depend on the Minister preference on the structure and size of the launch event.</p>	<p>Agreed Secretariat to find out from the Minister</p>
<p>10</p>	<p><u>Way Forward</u></p>	
<p>10.1</p>	<p>It was agreed that final amended documents be sent to members for their final comments. The deadlines for submission of comments to the Secretariat will be communicated.</p>	<p>Secretariat Members</p>
<p>10.2</p>	<p>Members wanted to know when the Charter will be signed and Dr Simelane responded that stakeholder consultations will take place within the six week period after the launch. After comments have been received from stakeholders, they will be incorporated and presented back to the Committee who will finalise the Charter thereafter the Charter will be signed.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>10.3</p>	<p>It was agreed that approximately eight (8) weeks after the Indaba, the Committee will meet to consider the comments received and finalise the Charter.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>10.4</p>	<p>The Secretariat was tasked to circulate the Indaba programme to the Committee members on time.</p>	<p>Secretariat</p>
<p>10.5</p>	<p>Mr Mncube advised that the Charter should be made available on the DWAF's website for public comment.</p>	<p>Secretariat</p>
<p>10.6</p>	<p>In terms of process, the Committee was reminded there is a need to present the results of the Steering Committee to the Minister. The Secretariat was tasked to schedule a meeting with the Minister</p>	<p>Noted Secretariat</p>

	within two weeks and the Chairpersons of the Working Groups were tasked to accompany the Steering Committee Chairperson to present the Charter to the Minister.	Chairpersons
11.	<u>Any Other Business</u>	
11.1	Mr. Barton informed the Committee that an article appeared in the Business Day of 28 February 2007 on government support for growth in the forest sector. He indicated that the information in the article on how much is to be invested in the sector would be useful to include in the pre-ambule to the Charter as this is the kind of “good news” that is needed by the sector.	Noted
11.2	It was noted that the Communications person from the Department assigned to the Charter must be replaced and the Secretariat was tasked to follow up on this matter.	Secretariat
11.3	The Committee agreed that the all the documentation related to the Charter must be translated into languages of the Forestry Provinces, i.e., Eastern Cape, KwaZulu Natal, Western Cape, Mpumalanga and Limpopo.	Secretariat
12.	<u>Closure</u>	
	The Chairperson thanked everyone present and reminded members that the next meeting will be in eight weeks after the Indaba. She wished everyone a safe journey back home and declared the meeting formally closed.	