

# INTEGRATED OCEANS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## Summary Notes

Meeting 12 | April 2-3, 2013 | Delta Vancouver Airport Hotel, Richmond, BC

### Meeting Participants/Members and Alternates:

Sector	Member	Alternates Present
Commercial Fisheries	Jim McIsaac Lorena Hamer	
Local Communities (Strathcona Regional District)	Jim Abram	
Marine Conservation	Kim Wright	
Marine Transportation	Stephen Brown (April 2)	
Recreation	Nick Heath	Alan Thompson
Non-Renewable Energy	Kim Johnson	Ken Macdonald
Recreational Fishing	Urs Thomas	
Aquaculture	Richard Opala (April 2)	
Local government	Jim Abram	

### Facilitator:

Craig Darling
---------------

### Observers and Ex Officio:

Alexandra Barron	CPAWS BC
Sheila Creighton	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Steve Diggon	Coastal First Nations
Hilary Ibey	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Sabine Jessen	CPAWS BC
Sean Lehodey (April 2)	Chamber of Shipping
Karen Magnuson Ford	Living Oceans
Andrew Mayer	Prince Rupert Port Authority
Candace Newman	NRCAN
Chief Harry Nyce	Nisga'a First Nation
Georgia Papadimitriou	International Ship Owners Alliance of Canada
Bruce Reid	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Charlie Short	Province of British Columbia
Angela Stadel	Environment Canada (April 3)

### Day 1 (April 2)

#### 1. Opening

Bruce Reid welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked everyone for their patience in awaiting the third draft of the PNCIMA plan. The focus of the meeting is to review the current draft and spend time looking at implementation of the plan. The meeting hasn't been designed to collect sector input; there will be ample opportunity for IOAC members to collect input from sectors between now and the end of the public review period. At this meeting, we hope to build understanding on why the plan reads as it does.

The group acknowledged the passing of Al Huddleston. Al's contributions to local government, community planning, marine planning, and the PNCIMA planning process were invaluable and he

will be greatly missed. A memorial for Al Huddleston will be held on May 4, at 1pm at the Port Hardy Civic Centre.

### 2. Plan Review and Revision Process

#### **Overview of IOAC plan review process**

Hilary Ibey shared a presentation (“PNCIMA Plan Review and Revision Process”) that provided an overview of the plan review process.

#### **Overview of IOAC input**

- Substantial comments on the second draft submitted by all IOAC sectors except tourism
- Significant effort invested by IOAC members was greatly appreciated
- Additional comments received from non-MOU First Nations and further review undertaken by collaborative governance partners
- IOAC comments generally reflected a “roll up” of input from sectors, however in some cases input was received from individual organizations within sectors
- IOAC input ranged from general comments on the utility of the plan, to detailed input on the EBM framework, to requests for legal review of particular sections of the plan, to detailed suggestions for implementation, and suggested references to background material.
- All comments reviewed and responded to as possible, and compiled into a feedback table that has been shared with the IOAC
- More challenging issues flagged for discussion and decision with the Steering Committee

#### **Public Review of Draft Plan**

- Plan to be released for public review from mid-May – June 2013 and will be available on [www.pncima.org](http://www.pncima.org)
- Short public survey developed to help structure public response to the draft plan. Survey to be available online as well as at community meetings.
- Community meetings likely to be held in June in Prince Rupert, Campbell River, Port Hardy, and Masset.
- Community meeting objectives will be:
  - to clarify the scope and scale of the PNCIMA plan and its associated tools;
  - to enable the public to provide input as the initiative moves forward and consider and integrate feedback as possible to strengthen the PNCIMA plan; and
  - to provide a forum for other related marine planning processes to share information on the status of their projects.

#### **Discussion:**

- The plan will be formally endorsed by PNCIMA governance parties. Endorsement will likely happen at the RDG/DM level, within the Pacific region. If the IOAC is interested in endorsing the plan in some form (e.g. letter?) this is also a possibility.
- A final gathering of the IOAC in the fall is anticipated to celebrate the release of the final plan.
- **The current draft of the plan that has been shared with the IOAC is not intended for public review.** IOAC members are asked not to share the document outside of their sector until the public review period commences (dates still to be confirmed). The Planning Office does not anticipate significant changes being made to the plan prior to public release.

- IOAC members are invited to provide comment on the current draft plan up until the end of the public review period. Any comments received from IOAC sectors will be considered as part of the public review.

### **3. The Revised Plan – Draft 3**

Hilary Ibey shared a presentation with the group that provided an overview of changes made to the plan as a result of the latest review of the draft plan. The Planning Office was grateful for the significant effort that IOAC members invested in reviewing the draft plan and providing comment.

Most changes to the plan were made for the purposes of:

- Providing greater clarity relating to planning process and/or plan content;
- revising wording based on outcomes of legal review;
- reordering plan elements for better flow or readability; and
- responding to specific input received from IOAC

#### **Overview of IOAC comments**

- Seeking description of Sept 2011 changes to planning process
- Concerns with details of VEC and VSEC lists
- Desire to better describe important role of municipal governments
- General mention of overlapping jurisdictions requires clarification
- Broader description of international context within which plan is situated
- Numerous requests for legal review of plan
- Seeking better outline of socio-economic and cultural picture
- Suggestion for 3<sup>rd</sup> party review of plan implementation
- Need to emphasize EBM Framework as foundation for plan
- Detailed implementation suggestions (commitment, accountability, resources detailed program suggestions like staffed lighthouses, enabling framework)

Details on changes to each section of the plan can be found in the presentation “PNCIMA Plan – Draft 3” which will be posted on Basecamp, as well in the detailed plan feedback table which was shared with the IOAC prior to the April 2-3 meeting.

#### **Participatory Panel and Table discussion**

- The definition of risk that appears in the glossary seems to focus on ecological considerations, and doesn't include socio-economic risk (as per EBM framework)
- Timelines in the EBM framework now read as short-term/ongoing/long-term. The periods of these terms are yet to be defined, but the intent is to provide further details around timelines in section 4. Timelines were developed in consideration of how strategies link with plan priorities. It is unrealistic to think that every strategy will be implemented right away. Short term strategies are likely to take place within 5 years.
- Strategy 2.3.3 – recommendation that local communities should also be included in this strategy. Local governments/communities were included in Objective 2.7, but not in 2.3.3.
- Local government would like to be referenced in Appendix 8 where tenure of aquatic lands is referenced (p.74).
- There has been incredible halibut recovery in the Cape Mudge area recently, yet dumping and dredging continues. Local government recommends that the plan needs to indicate

that such activities are not desirable in the discussion of future outlook for ocean disposal in Appendix 8 (p. 74)

- Members expressed concern that recommended references to staffed light stations do not appear in the draft plan. Staffed light stations are not just a navigational aid; they include communications, weather observations, scientific observations, staffing, search and rescue, oil spill response equipment, liaisons with local communities, emergency response, etc. The Steering Committee opted not to include reference to staffed light stations in the plan, as it was deemed too detailed and program-oriented for a strategic plan. The IOAC disagrees with this rationale.

**Recommendation:** The IOAC recommends that the Steering Committee reconsider including staffed light stations in the plan, specifically in strategy 2.6.3.

**Action:** Planning Office to take recommendation on including staffed light stations in section 2.6.3 to Steering Committee for consideration

- What are implications of the new federal budget for next steps identified in the plan? Bruce Reid confirmed that there is funding available for this next fiscal year to finish the PNCIMA plan and to begin work on implementation. The budget will be similar to what it was last year. Details beyond next year are unknown at this point.
- The latest changes to EBM Principle A were questioned. It was explained that the latest change to this statement resulted from an attempt to clarify the language. Previous statements included the word “maintain”, which indicates that ecological integrity already exists; not all were comfortable with this implication.
- Strategy 2.6.1 is new. The intent of this strategy to build understanding around the roles of government in marine security, safety, and accessible waters. The intention is to roll this information into one single reference document that does not yet exist. First Nations feel that they have an increasing responsibility to monitor what is happening in this regard, as is evident in their involvement in the Guardian Watchmen program.
- Suggestion to remove specific reference to decline of different species in section 2.3 (line 612). Species will change over time (e.g. eulachon saw an excellent return this year) and some species are cyclical in nature. The reference as it now appears was drawn from the SECOA.
- Suggestion from Commercial Fisheries to include “democratic” in EBM Goal 3 as it is a fundamental right. Discussion around what additional value this would bring to the goal statement followed. The goal statement refers to governance; not government. Including “democracy” in Goal 3 may suggest a process for implementation of the plan, which isn’t the intention. It was also cautioned that the inclusion of “democratic” might necessitate the development of new objectives and strategies.
- The PNCIMA boundary does include the Portland Canal, however it does not appear on the map on p. 8 due to the scale of the map.
- The table discussed including the IOAC in the disclaimer language that appears on p.2 of the draft. After lengthy discussion (that continued into day 2 of the meeting) it was agreed that the table would like to include a disclaimer statement for IOAC stakeholders similar to what appears for federal, provincial, and First Nation governments. It was noted that as the disclaimer language that appears in the current draft has already undergone significant legal review, the request from the IOAC to be included in the disclaimer language may require further legal review and that final wording may not appear as recommended by the IOAC.

**Recommendation::** The IOAC recommends inserting the following language in the public draft of the plan after line 31-32 on page 2: *“This Plan does not limit or prejudice the positions IOAC members may take in any negotiations, legal or administrative proceedings.”*

**Action:** Planning Office to request that the Steering Committee consider the proposed amendment.

- References to consensus recommendations from the IOAC have been removed from the plan, however there is still concern within the IOAC that the nature of the engagement process is not accurately described in the plan. While it was recognized that the IOAC did reach agreement on a number of things (up until EBM Goals), there is concern that the process be accurately reflected in the plan, noting that the role of the IOAC transitioned from seeking consensus to more consultative after September 2011.

**Recommendation:** The IOAC recommends inserting the following language in section 3.2 of the public draft of the plan at line 673: *The PNCIMA Steering Committee considered the role of the IOAC important in developing the integrated management plan. Throughout the planning process, advice and recommendations from the IOAC were shared with the PNCIMA Steering Committee. Outcomes of the Steering Committee review were shared with the IOAC which, prior to the September 2011 changes to the planning process (referenced in section 1.4), provided an opportunity to resolve differences by consensus, allowing for broad support across participating sectors and interests. After September 2011, the IOAC’s role was changed from consensus-seeking to a consultative model. Therefore, IOAC members are not in consensus on all elements of the plan.*

**Action:** Planning Office to request that the Steering Committee consider the proposed amendment.

- It was suggested that the disclaimer statement that appears at the beginning of section 2.2 (line 477) is harshly worded. It would be helpful to provide context for why not all parties agree to the details that appear in the section. (i.e. because much of BC’s early history is based on oral communications).

The Planning Office confirmed that all feedback shared at the IOAC meeting will be considered as part of the public review phase. The specific items flagged for inclusion in the public draft by the IOAC (disclaimer, consensus language, and staffed light stations) will be discussed with the Steering Committee at the end of April.

The IOAC will not see another draft between now and when the public review period begins. Any further input from IOAC sectors will be considered alongside input from the general public, with revisions to be made over the summer.

#### **4. PNCIMA – The Way Forward**

Hilary Ibey shared a presentation (“PNCIMA – The Way Forward”) that detailed preliminary ideas for the design of an implementation work plan. IOAC members were asked to identify specific tasks to help advance next steps associated with plan priorities. The considerations and tasks identified will help to inform the development of an implementation work plan for PNCIMA.

- A detailed work plan will clarify specific actions, timelines for completion
- Main branches of the work plan based on the 5 implementation priorities identified in the plan

- Must also link to the EBM framework
- Product of the meeting intended to be a preliminary implementation work plan for

## 5. Governance Priority

Next Steps (from plan)	Recommended Tasks	Considerations
Revise Collaborative Governance MOU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explore ongoing role of Steering Committee</li> <li>• Incorporate aspects of work plan into revised MOU</li> <li>• Involve local governments in the revised MOU</li> <li>• Build on tripartite arrangements between FNs, feds and province to assist with implementation of FN marine use plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expansion of governance structure should include opportunity for stakeholder engagement in development of an MPA network (more than sub-regional forum; input to design of MPA).</li> <li>• Consider including local government in the revision of the MOU</li> <li>• Affirm the role of local governments in the implementation of the PNCIMA plan</li> </ul>
Foster transparent stakeholder engagement through ongoing communications and advisory processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engage stakeholders in process design (at what level?)</li> <li>• Incorporate opportunity for process review by stakeholders (assessment + design)</li> <li>• Identify key roles for stakeholder table (conflict resolution, monitoring, etc.)</li> <li>• Identify criteria for stakeholder engagement process to fulfill integrated management for EBM approach (collaboration, conflict resolution, etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Options: use existing bodies, form new body; a combination of approaches may be needed</li> <li>• New process needs to consider: time challenges, mechanism for conflict resolution (e.g. PNCIMA may provide a forum/venue to allow for conflicts to be resolved), monitoring etc.</li> <li>• Table may be more issue driven; governed by PNCIMA principles</li> </ul> <p><b>Role for IOAC/stakeholders:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engaging stakeholders in process design is critical to resolving conflicts as they arise</li> <li>• IOAC was designed to provide for integration across sectors. The need for integration will continue with implementation of EBM approach.</li> <li>• Process monitoring and evaluation – how are we doing? Annual meeting? May also be appropriate for stakeholders to provide advice on new business. Problem solving – collective wisdom</li> <li>• Who collects data/monitoring for evaluation process?</li> </ul>
Facilitate accessibility to and exchange of environmental and socio-economic data	<p>Conduct SWOT assessment, including the following steps</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify existing tools for information exchange across programs, sectors etc.</li> <li>2. Identify shortcomings/gaps in data -</li> <li>3. Identify means/potential for</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to identify what data will be used for (application)</li> <li>• Significant costs associated with maintaining data portals</li> <li>• Data needs to be compatible/scalable/standardized</li> <li>• Key issues include knowing what information you need and knowing where to find it – can</li> </ul>

Next Steps (from plan)	Recommended Tasks	Considerations
	<p style="text-align: center;">greater integration of data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop centralized integrated data portal (economic, social, ecological in one place)</li> <li>• Identify roles for governments (e.g. data coordination)</li> <li>• Develop structured search engine website to direct/assist in data searches</li> </ul>	<p>PCNIMA facilitate these?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Search engine site would be simpler than centralized database</li> </ul>
Integrate EBM framework into current fisheries management and marine policy initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine which programs/initiatives are already using the EBM Framework to some extent</li> <li>• Identify what level of integration of the framework is desirable (goals, objectives, strategies?)</li> <li>• Identify gaps in integration across policies/programs – where can things be improved?</li> <li>• Determine what commitment looks like.</li> <li>• Identify/clarify which authorities are responsible for implementation of plan strategies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will/can EBM framework influence how policies are applied/implemented? (e.g. Sustainable Fisheries FW) How can they mesh/complement each other? Supplementary considerations? National policies to be applied with regional/sub-regional considerations taken into account e.g. cumulative effects framework, Environmental assessment work, MPAs</li> <li>• Will the plan still be referenced 5yrs from now? How do we keep this ongoing/living doc?</li> <li>• Aquaculture –area based planning – how to incorporate EBM objectives?</li> <li>• People will only implement the framework if it is in their best interest – need to take ownership in parts of the framework. IOAC could monitor which parts of the framework are being taken up</li> <li>• Maintaining a stakeholder table creates buy-in and helps to ensure that the plan is referenced and used</li> </ul>
Integrate with other processes and different scales of planning		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To sustain integration, commitment is required. How do we build this? How to integrate commitment into future policies and plans?</li> <li>• How do PNCIMA boundaries align with boundaries for other policies and programs?</li> </ul>

## 6. Integrated Economic Opportunities Priority

Next Steps (from plan)	Recommended Tasks	Considerations
Assess current and emerging social and cultural	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordinate information gathered from EA processes, monitoring etc. over time. Sector by sector? Project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information gathering needed</li> <li>• Draw on university resources</li> <li>• Social/cultural elements are referenced in EA processes but not considered in subsequent</li> </ul>

Next Steps (from plan)	Recommended Tasks	Considerations
<p>conditions in PNCIMA and the economic opportunities available to sub-regions</p>	<p>basis? Did predictions on impact assessments come to fruition?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify experts who can scope socio-economic and cultural issues and identify indicators (connect with user associations)</li> <li>• Coordinate workshop to bring experts together to frame issues and assess barriers to economic opportunities (infrastructure, policy, technological limitations)</li> <li>• Conduct further analysis of SECOA trends; update and feed into existing processes.</li> <li>• Identify more sector trends, identify localized opportunities and/or barriers (scale research down to finer scale geographically)</li> <li>• Identify socio-economic and cultural indicators for PNCIMA</li> <li>• Conduct Economic analyses of how Protected Areas benefit communities</li> <li>• Design protected areas in a way that communities at large benefit (not just environment)</li> </ul>	<p>analysis. Need to know what you want to assess and design a process around those things. Determine what elements are important in order to determine if existing processes can be used. What cultural/economic opportunities are we talking about?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is SECOA helpful? Identified broad trends – can the plan address these</li> <li>• Conservation measures in MPAs also need to support human well-being trends?</li> <li>• EBM FW should have conditions built in – how are measures supporting social and economic well-being. Well-being stems from the environment. Are these indicators? Standardized check list? Link to EA process or separate?</li> <li>• Balancing opportunities with hardship: opportunities also bring costs</li> <li>• Who would do the assessment? Is it an extension of the SECOA?</li> <li>• What point do we want the analysis to take us to?</li> </ul>
<p>Assess social, cultural and economic effects of resource management decisions on users</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resource development impacts on communities are under-recognized – emphasis is usually on environmental side.</li> <li>• Support/infrastructure required for smaller communities/FNs to navigate social and economic challenges - what can industry bring to this?</li> <li>• Consider Family Training/education needs</li> <li>• What monitoring is done on socio-economic effects?</li> <li>• Should assessment stage address “climate” of communities? What needs exist?</li> </ul>

## Day 2 - April 3, 2013

### 1. Way Forward – MPA Network Planning

Question raised as to whether reference to food, social and ceremonial use in MPA Networks priority description may exclude the consideration of some IUCN categories. It was noted that the statement qualifies FSC use provided that these uses are consistent with the objectives of the MPA.

#### MPA Network Planning Priority

Next Steps (from plan)	Recommended Tasks	Considerations
develop an enduring collaborative governance structure for MPA network planning and management that adopts or expands existing governance structures, as appropriate;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build into TOR the ability to have the right parties at the table who can exercise necessary management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Management structures need to be created to operationalize management objectives for MPAs.</li> <li>Is the collaborative structure MPAIT? (only Prov/Fed at this point) – task is to revise the structure or develop a new one to suit needs.</li> </ul>
identify ecological, social, cultural and economic objectives and zoning designations for a Northern Shelf Bioregion MPA network;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Take agreed management intent of an area and map out enabling legislative tools to enable this management approach</li> <li>Seek greater participation of relevant parties in early development of MPA recommendations</li> <li>Develop an Enabling framework that considers look at equity between costs benefits and risks within the network amongst sectors and government.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large forum occurred in March 2012 – input to drafting objectives. Part of the engagement model could include a follow up meeting (task)</li> <li>MaPP objectives should support MPA Network objectives</li> <li>Benefits will be created by a network, and there will be costs as well – ensure equitable distribution of costs and benefits.</li> </ul>
compile and share best available scientific data and traditional and local knowledge, where appropriate;		
review how existing conservation and protection tools in the Northern Shelf Bioregion contribute to the MPA network objectives, and identify sites and recommended tools for area-based protection;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess existing protected areas to ensure that management intents are being met</li> </ul>	
propose a timeline and identify resource requirements for the		

Next Steps (from plan)	Recommended Tasks	Considerations
development of this MPA network that integrate with existing planning and governance processes, where possible;		
coordinate stakeholder engagement through biannual sub-regional forums for MPAs, and identify common principles for engagement; and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify opportunities for meaningful stakeholder input</li> <li>• Evaluate and align options around stakeholder engagement in relation to MPA network development, given other processes underway. Find the fit to address the gaps. Address full range of engagement opportunities.</li> <li>• Establish a body and get it up and running</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sub-regional forums may be a difficult and uncertain way to provide useful advice and may not engage people appropriately</li> <li>• Coordination language was developed in response to concerns over process overload for stakeholders/stakeholder fatigue</li> <li>• Ensure the appropriate level of engagement at the appropriate time.</li> <li>• SFAB currently reviewing their engagement in various processes – may prove insightful</li> <li>• MPA network planning process, likely to overlap with PNCIMA and MaPP planning timelines</li> <li>• National MPA Network Strategy – regional strategy hasn't been released yet. Still working to build work plan around MPA development despite this.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• incorporate inputs from other processes and scales of planning to support development of an MPA network for the Northern Shelf Bioregion</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MaPP can be considered “another process” coming up with MPA recommendations</li> </ul>

## 2. Way Forward - Monitoring and Adaptive Management Priority

Next Steps (from plan)	Recommended Tasks	Considerations
Develop a monitoring and adaptive management framework for PNCIMA that integrates with	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assemble comprehensive list of indicators available and determine appropriateness for PNCIMA</li> <li>• Assess potential for</li> </ul>	<p><b>Existing work to draw on:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staffed light stations collect data and monitor for specific agencies; distribution could be reassessed.</li> <li>• Working to develop indicators of ecological health for MPAs</li> <li>• Puget Sound has identified 16 indicators (narrowed down from longer list)</li> </ul>

Next Steps (from plan)	Recommended Tasks	Considerations
<p>other processes and different scales of planning as appropriate.</p>	<p>contributions from local governments in identifying socio-economic indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explore opportunities for information/data sharing with industry (link with environmental assessments)</li> <li>• Three phases: 1) review wide range of potential indicators; 2) narrow indicators down to toolbox to allow processes to choose their own indicators as relevant (effective, efficient indicators); 3) look for recommendations for appropriate indicators for sub-regions based on information/data available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• West Coast Aquatic has done work on ecological indicators with Puget Sound</li> <li>• Review Fraser Basin Council’s State of the Basin Reports for examples of indicators, monitoring, and reporting out</li> <li>• EBM human well-being/ecological indicators developed through CCLRMP (terrestrial/coastal indicators) are being evaluated 8 years after being identified</li> <li>• Formalizing a reporting structure may help to ensure that data gets to the right place (bird monitoring, mammal movements, fish/boat movement, )</li> <li>• Salmon enhancement groups have volunteers collecting a lot of data in many areas</li> <li>• Issue is more about sharing and housing of data</li> <li>• Province has a well-being index – how accessible is this data? (identified in SECOA) – basic economic data (jobs, income level etc.)</li> <li>• BC Stats also has useful data (population growth)</li> <li>• Catchment monitoring working groups</li> <li>• Guardian Watchmen Program (observe, record, report) trained in science, observation, regime of data collection, website linked to GBI</li> </ul> <p><b>Role for Stakeholders</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Role for stakeholders in monitoring at community level is huge, but funding needs to be identified and training well thought out</li> </ul>

### 3. Way Forward: Tools

Next Steps (from plan)	Recommended Tasks	Considerations
<p>Collaboratively develop risk assessment tools for PNCIMA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build understanding around risk assessment and cumulative effects frameworks and how they are to be applied</li> <li>• Identify where the two frameworks overlap and how they differ.</li> <li>• Look at values at different scales, risk assessment is done from a cumulative perspective.</li> <li>• Bring together technical people to discuss how the two decision support tools can be aligned and coordinated so as to avoid duplication</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the common elements of the two frameworks and how do they differ?</li> <li>• Recommend a new approach be taken for the 2 assessments that brings them together and incorporates VECs and VSECs in a better way</li> <li>• Stakeholders don’t have the technical ability to comment on how they work together/can integrate</li> </ul>

Next Steps (from plan)	Recommended Tasks	Considerations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bring assessment of the two tools back to stakeholders for review and further input</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May be worth looking at CEAA to see how they deal with cumulative effects</li> </ul>
Develop methods to incorporate traditional and local knowledge into risk assessment		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staffed light stations and community volunteer groups may be a useful source of regularly collected information</li> </ul>
Develop methods to incorporate socio-economic values and interests into risk assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hold an “experts” workshop on indicators to ground-truth a list of indicators (consider a joint PNCIMA/MaPP workshop)</li> <li>Provide opportunity for stakeholders to review refined list of indicators as developed by experts</li> <li>Identify opportunities for training and resourcing community volunteers for monitoring of indicators as possible (e.g. shorekeepers, streamkeepers)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seek mutual benefit and start building linkages across planning processes.</li> <li>MaPP just undertook an expert workshop to review a long list of potential human well-being indicators. Participants were not MaPP or PNCIMA specific – tried to draw on existing knowledge.</li> <li>Experts are better suited to identify indicators</li> </ul> <p><b>Potential sources of expertise:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional Districts – economic development officers.</li> <li>In lieu of economic development officers in some Regional Districts, there are groups like Discovery Islands Chamber of Commerce and community associations for the outer islands</li> </ul>
Establish a cumulative effects working group that involves First Nations, federal and provincial governments to streamline efforts in assessing cumulative effects and develop a methodology that is consistent across organizations		Local government should also be included in the CE working group; not just collaborative governance parties. Local government has a significant role on the socio-economic side of things.

### Valued Ecosystem Components Discussion:

- Recognizing that people aren’t comfortable with the current list of VECs, the list has been removed from the plan and instead the document simply outlines a process for identifying VECs. DFO would still like to develop a list of VECs for the Ecological Risk Assessment Framework, but recognizes that process needs to be acceptable for all.

- MaPP is considering DFO's efforts to identify ecological components and socio-economic features, but would like to adopt a slightly broader approach. MaPP hasn't yet finalized lists of VECs or VSECs.
- To understand the VEC list better, one needs to understand how the Risk Assessment tool is being developed and applied (e.g. applied when new activities are being proposed? For developing baseline information?) VEC lists need to be customized for both the scale and region being worked in.

### **Cumulative Effects Framework:**

Local government should also be included in the cumulative effects working group; not just collaborative governance parties. Local government has a significant role on the socio-economic side of things.

**Action:** Jim Abram to review specific places in the draft plan where local government should be included and flag for Planning Office before the end of the public review period

### **4. Way Forward – Performance Measurement**

#### **How to evaluate effectiveness of process?**

- Coast Guard does a 5yr cyclical review for light stations that works its way around the coast every 5 years. It may be a model that could be adapted for PNCIMA.

**Action:** Planning Office to investigate CCG's 5yr cyclical review within the context of PNCIMA performance measurement

- Develop a checklist for different sectors to see the degree to which different EBM strategies had been implemented. Stakeholders could have a role in this in terms of assessing the extent to which the framework is being incorporated.
- Develop an accountability matrix to allow tracking of progress against objectives and strategies (plan performance and effectiveness of the plan on the water)
- PNCIMA goals/objectives aren't very measurable and are therefore hard to evaluate. A Red/yellow/green scale may be a more useful approach.
- It may be easier to evaluate performance on the work plan instead of looking at the overall plan which speaks more to making progress "on the water".
- The work plan should incorporate an "accountabilities" column to assist with tracking/monitoring.
- The work plan should also have a timeline (one aspect of performance measurement is timeliness).
- Frequency: 5yr big picture; 1-2 yr performance review.
- Third party auditor should be independent of the initiative (commissioner of environment?) and their review would involve consultation with the stakeholders.
- Ecological responses to management actions can take 10+ years.
- Timing for performance (work plan deliverables) review may be different that ecosystem review/state of the system.
- Identify plan performance indicators (e.g. effectiveness: engagement, endorsement, conflict resolution, certainty, reduction of process)
- Check for existing precedent with other LOMAs.

## 5. Path Forward/Next Steps

Ongoing work on outstanding elements for final draft (case studies, diagrams, layout, legislative and regulatory overview)	May 2013
Review of IOAC recommendations with Steering Committee	May 2013
Public review phase	May/June 2013
Final document drafted	Early summer 2013
Internal approvals	Late summer 2013
Plan endorsement	Early fall 2013
Celebration of accomplishments	Fall 2013

The public draft will be posted on the PNCIMA website and emailed out to the PNCIMA listserve. IOAC members are invited to circulate the public draft when they receive it and to provide additional comments on behalf of sector through public review period. Another meeting of the IOAC may take place once the plan has been endorsed.

Charlie Short commended everyone for their extensive efforts and contribution to the PNCIMA planning process. The draft plan is no small accomplishment and folks should be proud.

**Action:** Planning Office to source photo of IOAC for inclusion in the plan

**Action:** DFO to post IOAC meeting presentations to Basecamp

**Action:** Planning Office to share details of feedback received during public review period with IOAC

Thanks were expressed by the IOAC to all Planning Office staff members for navigating and steering a complex piece of work under changing and challenging circumstances. All three levels of government were commended for their work in responding to all the changes throughout the planning process.

Bruce Reid thanked all IOAC members for their ongoing participation and dedication to the planning process. Meetings have been challenging at times, and the parties to the collaborative governance MOU have been grateful for contributions from all sectors. The EBM framework is a lasting legacy to emerge from the planning process. It is something to be proud of and a strong testament to the contributions and patience of the group.

Bruce also thanked Craig Darling for his ongoing leadership in the planning process and keeping us all focused, on task and in good humour.

Finally, thanks were extended to Hilary Ibey for her excellent leadership in the PNCIMA process over the past year.

## Summary of IOAC Recommendations

The IOAC recommends that the Steering Committee reconsider including staffed light stations in the plan, specifically in strategy 2.6.3.
The IOAC recommends inserting the following language in the public draft of the plan after line 31-32 on page 2: <i>“This Plan does not limit or prejudice the positions IOAC members may take in any negotiations, legal or administrative proceedings.”</i>
The IOAC recommends inserting the following language in section 3.2 of the public draft of the plan at line 673: <i>The PNCIMA Steering Committee considered the role of the IOAC important in developing the integrated management plan. Throughout the planning process, advice and recommendations from the IOAC were shared with the PNCIMA Steering Committee. Outcomes of the Steering Committee review were shared with the IOAC which, prior to the September 2011 changes to the planning process (referenced in section 1.4), provided an opportunity to resolve differences by consensus, allowing for broad support across participating sectors and interests. After September 2011, the IOAC’s role was changed from consensus-seeking to a consultative model. Therefore, IOAC members are not in consensus on all elements of the plan.</i>

## Summary of Action Items

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning Office to take recommendation on including staffed light stations in section 2.6.3 to Steering Committee for consideration</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning Office to request that the Steering Committee consider the recommended addition to disclaimer language for inclusion in public draft of plan.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning Office to request that the Steering Committee consider the proposed amendment to text starting at line 673 for inclusion in the public draft of the plan</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jim Abram to review specific places in the draft plan where local government should be included and flag for Planning Office before the end of the public review period</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning Office to investigate CCG’s 5yr cyclical review within the context of PNCIMA performance measurement</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning Office to source photo of IOAC for inclusion in the plan</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DFO to post IOAC meeting presentations to Basecamp</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning Office to share details of feedback received during public review period with IOAC</li> </ul>

## Summary of Suggested Changes to Draft 3

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revisit definition of risk in glossary to ensure it includes socio-economic elements</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review and confirm timelines within EBM framework</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include <i>local communities</i> in strategy 2.3.3</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include local government in Appendix 8 where tenure of aquatic lands is referenced (p.74).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan should indicate that dumping and dredging in Cape Mudge area are not desirable activities in the discussion of future outlook for ocean disposal in Appendix 8 (p. 74)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove specific references to declining species in section 2.3 (line 612)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider including the term “democratic” in Goal 3</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide context to the disclaimer statement in section 2.2.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include local government in the cumulative effects working group outlined in the priority’s next steps.</li> </ul>