

INTEGRATED OCEANS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Summary Notes

Meeting 10 | November 13-14, 2012 | Delta Vancouver Airport Hotel, Richmond, BC

Note: As discussed, these notes are being circulated without the benefit of prior review by IOAC members so as to permit timely reference by members and their constituents in the sector review process. The meeting recorder (Sheila Creighton) and facilitator (Craig Darling) have done their best to ensure the notes accurately reflect the presentations and table discussion. Please contact Sheila or Craig in the event readers discover errors or omissions.

Meeting Participants:

Members and Alternates:

Sector	Member	Alternates Present
Commercial Fisheries	Jim McIsaac Lorena Hamer	
Local Communities (Mount Waddington Regional District)	Al Huddlestan	
Local Communities (Strathcona Regional District)	Jim Abram	
Marine Conservation	Kim Wright	
Marine Transportation		Ross Cameron (Nov 13)
Recreation	Nick Heath	Alan Thomson
Recreational Fisheries	Urs Thomas	
Non-renewable Energy	Kim Johnson	
Renewable Energy	Matt Burns (Nov 13)	Bill Johnson
Aquaculture	Richard Opala	

Facilitator:

Craig Darling

Observers and Ex Officio:

Angela Stadel	Environment Canada (Nov 13)
Bonnie Antcliffe	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Bruce Reid	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Charlie Short	Province of British Columbia
Chief Harry Nyce Sr.	Nisga'a Lisims Government
Georgia Papadimitriou	International Ship Owners Alliance
Hilary Ibey	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Jas Aulakh	Environment Canada (Nov 14)
Jason Sherr	Prince Rupert Port Authority
Jenn Burt	CPAWS
Jodi Stark	David Suzuki Foundation
Matthew Justice	Province of British Columbia
Megan Mach	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Sheila Creighton	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Steve Diggon	Coastal First Nations

Day 1: November 13 , 2012

1. Opening

Bonnie Antcliffe and Craig Darling welcomed everyone to the meeting. The agenda was reviewed, and Bonnie introduced the draft plan, highlighting the following key aspects:

- The plan is intended to be high level and strategic. The EBM framework is intended to be enabling for other planning processes in the region
- The plan provides information and tools that can be used by governance partners when making regulatory decisions and by other planning processes.
- A fundamental concept of the plan is that implementation will occur through current, existing, and ongoing programs.

Another draft of the plan, which reflects feedback from the IOAC, will be produced in December and shared with the public early in 2013.

2. Plan Review Process

Bruce Reid provided a summary of the plan review process to date:

Review stage/draft	Dates	Reviewers
1	Aug 29-Oct 5	PNCIMA Steering Committee
2	Nov 5- Dec 17	IOAC and Non-MOU First Nations
3	Early 2013	general public

Significant input received on first draft of plan from all governance partners: Province of BC, Environment Canada, Transport Canada, Parks Canada, Natural Resources Canada, Coastal First Nations, North Coast Skeena First Nations Stewardship Society, Nisga’a Lisims Government.

General comments from the internal review spoke to the need to:

1. improve readability of the plan;
2. focus on unique aspects of the plan; and
3. ensure priorities and strategies link back to EBM framework.

IOAC comments and Non-MOU First Nations will be incorporated into another draft to be shared with public; a plan endorsement process will follow in spring of 2013.

The focus of this meeting is to delve into the details of the plan; document impressions and concerns; find areas of agreement; develop constructive edits to strengthen the plan; and collect feedback on design of sector review of plan. Between now and December the Planning Office will incorporate feedback from the IOAC and anticipate further comment from constituent sectors. IOAC members have a role in facilitating the review of plan within their sectors, and consolidating all sector comments prior to posting them to Basecamp. **All comments are due back by Dec 17, or earlier if possible.**

Discussion:

A table has been produced that compares the PNCIMA plan with other LOMA plans. There are no dramatic differences between this plan and others, although the PNCIMA plan does feature the following aspects more prominently:

- an EBM framework that has been developed in collaboration with IOAC and governance partners)
- information/tools associated the plan that are available for other processes to use
- a formalized collaborative arrangement

3. The PNCIMA Strategic Plan

Hilary Ibey walked the group through the sections of the plan. Much work has gone into getting the plan to this stage, with great collaborative input. Timelines have shifted and Hilary thanked the group for their flexibility and patience. The plan is still a work in progress and we are eager to incorporate feedback. Much of the plan should be familiar; it reflects significant work done by this group over the past 9 meetings.

General changes based on internal review included the following:

- Removed references in text to source documents
- Front end of plan shortened and tightened to make it more readable
- Significant edits to strategies
- Reorganization of priorities and implementation section and addition of new priorities
- Body text moved to appendices where not essential to understanding of plan context

Discussion

- Once all comments are received from IOAC and non-MOU First Nations, the Planning Office will work to produce the next draft, addressing conflicts/concerns as they arise. The earlier that comments can be submitted, the more time the Planning Office will have to work to address potential issues of concern. The next draft will be shared with the Steering Committee in December for approval, prior to public release. Sectors and IOAC members will have an opportunity to comment on Draft 3 of the plan in the new year.
- The IOAC expressed an interest in seeing Draft 3 prior to public release, to ensure that comments have been appropriately addressed. It was noted that tight timelines likely will not allow for this.
- Nisga'a Lisims Government, while still an observer to the planning process, hopes to sign on to the Collaborative Governance MOU soon. Nisga'a has legal rights under treaty and does not want to be grouped with the other First Nations.
- The draft was developed over the summer by DFO, with significant input from others in the Planning Office. Much of the text of the first draft was extracted from existing documents. DFO's role over the past two months has been to collect all of the input on the draft from others and integrate it into the second draft.
- While the IOAC's role is to provide recommendations for strengthening the draft plan (consensus based if possible, but not required). Comments and suggestions will be noted, documented and addressed by Planning Office.
- It was noted that the plan should not be presented to the public in a way that assumes agreement within the IOAC on all aspects of the document.
- The PNCIMA plan will ultimately undergo legal review by the Department of Justice. Coastal First Nations will also seek legal review of the document, and the Province of BC will seek legal advice on some sections of it.

- It was recommended that DFO should look at recommendations that have emerged from the Cohen Inquiry, noting that there are relevant recommendations that would help to strengthen the plan.

Action: Conservation sector to include relevant Cohen recommendations in their feedback.

4. Table Review Process

Craig Darling outlined the suggested process for the table to review the plan through the course of the meeting. The meeting has been designed to structure review of the plan on a section by section basis, with the members of the planning team available for explanation and clarification. Each section of the agenda will provide insight to issues and concerns that were raised in the internal review, providing a departure point for the table to discuss their comments and concerns.

It is important to remember that the draft plan is (and will continue to be) a product of collaborative negotiation at the Steering Committee level. Comments and advice from the IOAC will help to inform this discussion. All comments will be recorded and consensus recommendations will be flagged in the notes (these show in orange text in the plan review “companion document”). Agreement in some cases may be characterized as an “invitation to revisit certain aspects of the draft”.

Action: PO to provide slide decks to IOAC via Basecamp

5. Table Review – Context, Planning Area, Process

Presentation:

Sheila Creighton walked the group through key issues flagged through the internal review, how they were addressed, and any outstanding considerations:

Issue	How it was resolved	Additional Considerations
Strategic nature of the plan & how it is to be operationalized not totally clear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater clarity in text around strategic scope 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contemplating case studies to demonstrate operationalizing plan. Seeking IOAC assistance to develop examples.
Missing content for planning area description (e.g. climate change)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missing information incorporated into planning area description • Marine activity profiles moved to Appendix 6 	
Description of engagement process too detailed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deleted much text, leaving description of IOAC as key element of engagement; • reference to <i>PNCIMA Engagement Strategy</i> 	

Gaps in links to other planning processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expanded upon links to other processes Added next steps to Priority 1 around integration with other processes 	
PNCIMA Process Structure diagram (figure 3-1) needs refining	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This has not yet been addressed 	Is it necessary to revise this diagram? Seeking suggestions from IOAC.

Discussion:

The Table reviewed many aspects of the first three sections of the draft plan, reaching agreement on many suggested changes. See accompanying document for details of comments and suggested edits for this section of the plan.

6. Table Review – EBM Framework (Generally)

Charlie spoke with the group about general changes to the EBM framework, as noted below:

Principle 7

Original version: EBM approach accounts for the views of First Nations on aboriginal rights and title and self-governance

Current draft: The EBM approach *respects* First Nations aboriginal rights and title and self governance.

Discussion:

- Use of the word “respect” is common now.
- Where there are treaty rights, respecting these is critical; where there is no treaty, is there a difference in wording required to acknowledge this? Response: Principle 7 is not referring to treaty rights; it refers to aboriginal rights and title and self-governance.

Descriptive text for principles

Descriptive text has not been discussed in detail at this table.

Action: IOAC to review and ensure that wording conveys the meaning of the principles

Changes to objectives post June IOAC meeting

Through the internal review, some edits were made to improve clarity of understanding of objectives, as noted below:

Objective	Previous Objective Statement	Current Objective Statement
1.2	conserve the productivity, trophic structure, and <i>mean generation times of populations so ecosystem components</i> can play their natural role in the food web.	Conserve the productivity, trophic structure of ecosystems so they play their natural role in the food web.
2.3	Respect culturally and spiritually important marine traditions, sites and artifacts.	<i>Protect</i> culturally and spiritually important marine traditions, sites, and <i>archaeological and natural heritage</i>

		<i>resources.</i>
2.5	Support the maintenance of natural resource systems that deliver marine goods and services	Support the maintenance of natural resource systems that deliver marine goods and services <i>at multiple scales.</i>
2.7		New: Support First Nations and local communities in benefitting from the ecosystems in which they live.
3.2	Provide opportunities for the participation of First Nations, coastal communities, marine user groups, federal government agencies, provincial government agencies, and other interested parties in ocean management, planning, and advisory processes.	Provide opportunities for the participation of <i>First Nations, federal and Provincial Government agencies, coastal communities</i> , marine user groups and other interested parties in ocean management, planning and advisory processes
3.4	Support mechanisms that enable the effective development and review of stewardship and development plans by First Nations.	Continue to build respectful relationships (including Governance mechanisms) among federal, provincial/local and First Nations governments and authorities. Note: remove slash between provincial/local
3.5	Ensure all relevant interests are considered in a respectful, transparent and inclusive manner that follows due process.	Ensure all relevant interests are considered in a respectful, transparent and inclusive manner.
4.1	Support information sharing among First Nations, coastal communities, marine user groups, federal government agencies, and provincial government agencies.	<i>Promote and facilitate</i> information sharing among <i>First Nations, federal and provincial agencies, coastal communities</i> , and marine user groups.

Action: All IOAC members to review changes to EBM objectives and provide comment as relevant.

Discussion:

It is important to be clear about the audience(s) of the plan; this will influence the wording of objectives and strategies. It sounds likely that regulatory authorities and other planning authorities will be using the plan to create their processes. Is it also for businesses, or those with economic interests in the region?

Planning Office response: The target audience is government, as well as other interested parties. Some parts of the plan may be more relevant to particular interests than others.

EBM Framework Diagram

- Much time was spent developing this framework and the associated figure 4-1.
- Detailed suggestions for improving the diagram can be found in the “companion document”.

7. Table Review – EBM Framework (Strategies)

Hilary Ibey spoke to some of the overarching issues that arose around strategies from the internal review:

Issue	How it was resolved	Additional Considerations/IOAC Discussion
Need for accountability with respect to the strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> commitment to work plans and accountability frameworks in implementation section (won't be completed with plan though) Work won't take place until plan is released. 	<p>Concern from IOAC that developing work plans won't happen until plan is released</p> <p>The PO expects this to be the first task of the "implementation body". The workplans would look at priorities (not individual strategies). Next steps currently identified under priorities represent a starting point for work planning. . DFO would lead collaborative partners through this process</p>
There were a large number of strategies – are they achievable?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> timelines associated with strategies that link to priorities 	Are timelines clear? Realistic?
EBM Framework should focus on main strength of the planning process – its integrated and multi-sectoral nature.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> strategies revise to focus on integrated activities as opposed to single sector work. 	Action: IOAC to review strategies with an eye to integration

Discussion:

- Hilary noted that most strategies developed at the June IOAC meeting still appear in the plan, and that some of the "example actions" now appear as additional strategies.
- There was discussion around the budget required to implement this plan over the next five years. DFO clarified that the plan will be implemented with existing resources. The plan will go through an endorsement process, which represents a mechanism for ensuring support for implementation. The principles of the EBM framework can help to refine the work and meet plan objectives. There is no fixed budget for implementation, although implementation is still identified as a work plan item in the Oceans program budget.
- Other detailed comments and suggestions for strengthening the strategies can be found in the "companion document".

8. Wrap up

Meeting adjourned at 4:20pm

Day 2: November 14, 2012

1. Table Review – Strategies Continued

The morning began with a continued discussion of plan strategies, as detailed in the plan review “companion document”.

2. Table Review - Priorities

Issues relating to priorities that arose from internal review included:

Issue	How it was resolved	Additional Considerations
Priorities as a stand-alone section do not logically link to EBM framework or to implementation.	Priorities rolled into implementation section to demonstrate their importance to implementation. Priorities are near term	
Original list not balanced with respect to EBM framework.	Priorities were added and reorganized to reflect strategies related to all four EBM goals.	
Introductory text describing priority-setting was too long.	Removed introductory section	Should we still describe factors considered in how priorities were derived?

Discussion:

- The IOAC table agreed that combining priorities and implementation sections is appropriate.
- There was agreement around the table that if there were criteria used for identifying priorities, these should be transparent. Others using the framework may have different priorities than those identified by the collaborative governance partners.
- Next steps identified for priorities may feed into future work plans. The bullets aren’t necessarily ordered sequentially.

Priority 1: Governance arrangements for implementation

Issue	How it was resolved	Additional Considerations/IOAC Discussion
Need to emphasize ongoing governance to enable implementation of the PNCIMA plan	Added a priority (1) that is focused on ongoing governance arrangements	Focused governance body for PNICMA or integrate with broader governance bodies?
How to integrate the EBM framework into existing programs	Priority identifies need to integrate EBM framework into existing programs	implementation phase
Linkages with other planning processes	Priority identifies need to integrate with other scales of planning	Implementation phase
Need to emphasize ongoing stakeholder engagement	Priority identifies need to integrate with other scales of planning – including advisory processes	Looking for IOAC input on building efficiencies and maximizing inclusiveness

Discussion:

See plan review companion document

Priority 2: Integrated Economic Opportunities

Issue	How it was resolved	Additional Considerations/IOAC Discussion
Original list of priorities not sufficiently reflective of EBM Goal 2 (human well-being). Speaks more to FNs and local communities, but not industry	Priority added to address integrated economic strategies	Priority as written is not balanced – seeking IOAC input on next steps

Discussion:

See plan review companion document

Priority 3: Marine protected area network planning

Issue	How it was resolved	Additional Considerations/IOAC Discussion
Priority originally imbalanced towards MPA network development	Combined both MPA network development with coordinated stakeholder engagement processes and other planning processes	IOAC suggestions on better (more efficient) coordination – communication

Discussion:

See plan review companion document

Priority 4: Monitoring and adaptive management

Issue	How it was resolved	Additional Considerations/IOAC Discussion
Original draft of plan lacked comprehensive commitment to ongoing monitoring	Added priority describing monitoring and adaptive management	Monitoring to be based on work already under way – can IOAC help identify some of this work?
Original draft of plan mentioned adaptive management a lot, but did not specify what this meant.	Added priority describing monitoring and adaptive management	Does the priority sufficiently describe how monitoring information will be used to inform adaptive management?

Discussion:

See plan review companion document

Priority 5: Tools to support Plan implementation

Issue	How it was resolved	Additional Considerations/IOAC Discussion
Original list of priorities focused heavily on tool development, to the exclusion of other considerations from EBM framework	Combined tool development into one priority	Are there other tools currently being developed that could supplement this section?
Original list lacked focus on traditional knowledge	Added next steps to risk assessment tool to incorporate TK considerations	
Original list lacked focus on socio-economic considerations	Added next steps to risk assessment tool to incorporate socio-economic considerations	Does this sufficiently cover need for a s/e tool, given concerns with taking risk-based approach to s/e assessment?

Discussion:

See plan review companion document

3. Table Review – Implementation

Issue	How it was resolved	Additional Considerations/IOAC Discussion
Lack of concrete timelines	Established 5 year review period	Is it clear enough that this 5 year period should cover priorities identified, but not longer term strategies?
Outreach and communications section weak	Not yet resolved	Seeking IOAC assistance to strengthen this section
Need for strengthened accountability around plan implementation	Commitments to work plans and accountability framework for implementation Priority on ongoing governance structures to support implementation.	

Discussion:

See plan review companion document.

4. Table Review – Appendices

Issue	How it was resolved	Additional Considerations/IOAC Discussion
VEC list incomplete if to be used as broadly applicable tool	Resolution under way – list to be generalized and example VECs to be identified; clarity in introductory text around limitations of list	could establish sub WG of IOAC to refine VEC list

Discussion:

- IOAC has been privy to conversations on VECs through Basecamp. Original species list (66) appears in Appendix 2 of the plan. The list is compiled from EBSAs document (2006) and Species at Risk and is recognized to be incomplete
- need to focus more on sub-category level and have more info about diversity of organisms at each of these levels.
- a broader VEC list will inform RA and may also be used by other planning processes as a tool. Revised list should recognize diversity of species and identify which species we have information available for
- See plan review companion document for further discussion

5. Statement from Marine Transportation

Marine transportation sector representatives are not available to attend today. Bruce Reid was requested to read from a prepared statement.

- With respect to the comment on removing “accessible waters” from Strategy 2.6.3, the marine transportation sector does not agree.
- The plan needs to be broadened to take into account international trade/gateway and the well being of the Province and Canada as a whole, as the area is important locally for communities, but also nationally to the Gateway to Asia and Canada’s international trade priorities.

6. Sector Review Process

Summary notes from the meeting will be provided, as well as a plan review companion document that further records specific recommendations, suggestions and points of agreement (subject to sector review).

Discussion:

- The Planning Office will incorporate sector feedback into the next draft of the plan for consideration by the Steering Committee.

- IOAC members may wish to circulate the plan accompanied by the meeting notes and plan review companion document to provide context for preliminary discussion and assist with building recommendations
- rather than providing the IOAC with a week to review the notes, a disclaimer will be included that they reflect to the best of our knowledge and understanding discussion that took place at the table.

Action: PO to remove text from “timelines” column in EBM framework and post “clean” draft of the Plan to Basecamp with summary notes on Monday November 19.

Guiding Questions:

- Can be shared on Basecamp – can also provide in pdf format to help
- IOAC requested to consolidate sector responses and post to Basecamp. Please avoid individual submissions from sector members.
- Concerns beyond scope of the questions can appear as a separate message.
- it may be challenging to boil down conflicting views from within sector. Members are not expected to mediate competing views; there may be value in sharing both sides of a discussion.
- Members are encouraged to do the best they can in the time available to elicit feedback from their respective sectors.

Q&A

- Is there any flexibility with December 17 deadline for comment? No, timelines are extremely tight. IOAC will have opportunity to meet again in mid-February to discuss public draft, reflect, consolidate and comment further. This would happen in parallel with the public review.
- Which LOMA plans can we refer to for comparison? Beaufort (similar governance structure and emphasis on ecology of the region)
<http://www.beaufortseapartnership.ca/documents/Integrated%20Ocean%20Management%20Plan%20for%20the%20Beaufort%20Sea.pdf> and ESSIM <http://www.mar.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/e0010316>

Action: Craig to post guidelines for Basecamp review of draft plan

5. Path Forward

- Meeting notes, summary table, clean draft of plan, review questions and other tools to be circulated on Monday, November 19 to assist IOAC with guiding sector review.
- **IOAC comments on plan due by December 17**
- Input and feedback will be compiled by Planning Office, reviewed by Steering Committee and where possible, incorporated into a 3rd draft of the plan.
- Draft 3 will be circulated for public review in early 2013.
- IOAC will meet again in February, 2013 to review draft 3 and provide further input.

6. Wrap Up

Next IOAC meeting: February 2013 (date TBC).

Action: PO to poll for IOAC availability for February meeting and confirm dates.
Meeting Adjourned at 3:00pm

DRAFT