



Key Findings

- The Department's three-year harvest planning uses evidence based systems and is consistent with FMP sustainable harvesting settings. However, the transparency of the Department's decision-making could be improved by keeping records that show why areas are excluded from or included on the harvest plans. These records would also assist the Department in ensuring its compliance with requirements of the *State Records Act 2000*.
- Operational harvest planning guidance material drafted in 2008 is still to be finalised by the Department. Whilst there is some risk that the absence of this guidance material may lead to inconsistencies in how the harvest plans are developed and that plans may not be consistent with FMP modelling, we found that other planning processes and controls do in part address this risk. When developed the guidance material will increase the transparency of the harvest planning process and support the Department's succession planning in a highly technical and specialised field of work.

Read More – Harvest Planning

- The Commission monitored harvest contractor compliance with contractual obligations but monitoring was limited. We saw instances of inconsistent product recovery and grading practices at forest coupes and evidence of breaches of environmental standards. Non-compliance weakens the effectiveness of harvest planning processes and can lead to undesirable impacts on the forest.

Read More – Monitoring and Review

- The sale of product, other than by competitive tender, was not controlled by Commission policy and procedure and was not always supported by documented reasons. At least 60 per cent of product was sold by private treaty but only three of the eight private treaties we reviewed were disclosed on the Tenders WA website. Whilst private treaty contracts are an effective way for the Commission to sell product the lack of documented reasons leaves the Commission open to allegations of bias.



- Changes to customer delivery schedules were not supported by documented reasons. The Commission may be perceived as favouring some customers, particularly by others with contracts for similar highly sought after product.
- The Commission's systems for managing contracts and tracking deliveries were not compatible. Staff could not efficiently monitor and manage deliveries against contracted volumes. There is increased risk that contract volumes might be exceeded or not met, and that contract variations might not be reflected in changes to deliveries.
- The contracts database was limited and only recorded current information for current contracts. Historical information was not retained so it was not possible to view contract information prior to any change. The database did not allow the Commission to report contract information over the life of the FMP.
- The Commission did not have procedures for handling customer complaints and grievances, and did not record verbal or contractual complaints in its complaints register. The Commission does not know the level of customer dissatisfaction and may be missing opportunities to identify and respond to systemic issues.

[Read More – Sale and supply of product](#)

[Previous: Conclusion](#)

Page last updated: June 26, 2013

[Next: What Should Be Done?](#)

Give your feedback

Name *

Email *

Did you find this publication valuable?

Yes

No

Which category best describes you?



-- Please select --



Why did you give this rating?

What is the answer to:

5 + 4

Send

wa.gov.au

Copyright

[Home](#) - [Privacy Policy](#) - [Disclaimer](#) - [Help](#)

