

INTEGRATED OCEANS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Summary Notes

Meeting 9 | June 20- 21, 2012 | Delta Vancouver Airport Hotel, Richmond, BC

Day 1: June 20, 2012

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	Bill Wareham
Marine Transportation	Stephen Brown	Ross Cameron Phil Nelson
Recreation		Alan Thomson
Recreational Fisheries	Urs Thomas	
Non-renewable Energy		Christa Seaman
Renewable Energy	Matt Burns	Jessica McIlroy
Aquaculture	Richard Opala	

Facilitator:

Craig Darling

Observers and Ex Officio:

Bonnie Antcliffe	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Arwen Bird	Oregon State University
Jenn Burt	CPAWS
Karen Calla	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Sally Cargill	Province of British Columbia
Sheila Creighton	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Steve Diggon	Coastal First Nations
Diana Freethy	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Hilary Ibey	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Allan Lidstone	Province of British Columbia
Rebecca Martone	UBC
Siobhan O'Meara	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Bruce Reid	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Charlie Short	Province of British Columbia
Angela Stadel	Environment Canada

1. Opening

Craig Darling welcomed IOAC members and other meeting participants. The agenda was reviewed, and attention was drawn to the fact that the role of the IOAC will be transitioning from providing input to the plan, to reviewing, assessing and advising on draft products as they are developed over the next several months.

No comments were received on action items from the March 21 meeting.

2. Planning Process Update

Karen Calla (Manager of Species at Risk Program, DFO) spoke on behalf of Bonnie Antcliffe who couldn't attend the first day of the IOAC meeting. Karen reiterated that DFO is committed to producing an IOM Plan for PNCIMA by December 2012. All efforts are being made to ensure that the Plan is effective and feasible to implement. Recent work on the Plan has focused on two themes: 1) assessing valued components of the PNCIMA ecosystem; 2) assessing regulatory overlaps and gaps to facilitate greater coordination and integration among management processes. The approach to both themes has been risk-based to enable development of priorities.

Bruce Reid provided an update on **engagement in the PNCIMA initiative**:

- Skeena Queen Charlotte Regional District has submitted a letter to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, withdrawing from the IOAC. Bruce recognized Des Nobel's contribution to the planning process, and indicated that DFO would follow up with the Regional District.
- A Letter of Intent has recently been signed between DFO, Coastal First Nations, and the North Coast Skeena Stewardship Society. The letter addresses various aspects of the re-engagement of First Nations in the PNCIMA Initiative. While DFO has continued to share planning materials with First Nations since September 2011, further discussion on key aspects of the plan will be needed. Steve Diggon indicated that First Nations expect to meet with PNCIMA technical and governance teams in July.
- Nanwakolas Council has withdrawn from the PNCIMA Collaborative Governance MOU. DFO will continue to share information on the planning process with Nanwakolas, and provide them with opportunity for input as is the case with other First Nations that are not currently signed on to the MOU.
- Letters have been sent out to all First Nations communities who are not part of the Collaborative Governance MOU to keep them informed on planning process developments.

Discussion:

DFO has indicated that the PNCIMA Integrated Management Plan is intended to set a strategic framework for planning in the region. Once completed, the plan may be used to inform other planning processes as they arise and evolve. It was noted that DFO's absence from the MaPP Initiative raises concerns from a jurisdictional perspective.

Ecological Risk Assessment Framework (ERAF)

- The ERAF has been developed with the intent to be applicable at a variety of spatial scales (one tool in PNCIMA toolbox).

- A workshop of the Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat (CSAS) was held May 8-10, 2012 to provide peer review of the framework. The workshop was well attended (industry, academics, Province, First Nations, MaPP, NOAA) and constructive feedback was received.
- The final working paper and Science Advisory Report will be shared later this summer.

Discussion: Invitations to attend the CSAS Review Workshop were not extended to the IOAC as the workshop was science based. Formal scientific peer review is not intended to include sectoral representation. The purpose of the review was to ensure that the framework, which incorporated elements of other risk assessment frameworks that have also been reviewed in the scientific literature, is sound before being “run” for PNCIMA. Once the framework has been run, there may potentially be another CSAS review to assess its implementation. While implementation of the framework will continue through July 2012, preliminary results of the ecological risk assessment are available now, and have been used to inform draft priorities and strategies.

Currently, there is no framework for assessing socio-economic risks. DFO hopes to be able to find a way to incorporate VSECs with VECs, keeping in mind that there is more than just risk to consider on the socio-economic side.

Action: DFO to provide confirmation of when the Science Advisory Report will be available and share a list of participants with the IOAC.

Valued Ecosystem Components:

- Since the last IOAC meeting, the list of VECs was finalized with expert input from Parks, Environment Canada, Province of BC, UBC, UVic, and MaPP.
- The Level 1 risk assessment of VECs is currently under way. The original collection of 143 activity-stressor combinations was narrowed down to 80, and 20 of these have been screened to date.
- Preliminary results have informed the development of priorities, and final results will be shared when they are available.
- While VEC work was used to inform priorities, risk assessment work will continue towards more quantitative analyses of risk, and assessment of cumulative effects.
- It is expected that the VEC list will remain part of the PNCIMA toolbox and may be used to develop indicators and inform other planning processes.

Action: DFO to share final list of VECs with IOAC.

Valued Socio-Economic Components:

- Uuma Consulting produced a report identifying a methodology for grouping VSECs and identifying a list of 95 VSECs for PNCIMA. The list was narrowed down to 50 VSECs through a coarse screening for relevance to PNCIMA scope, scale, and objectives and distributed to IOAC for review.
- The IOAC asked to 1) confirm whether all valued components relevant to PNCIMA had been captured in the list, and 2) rate each VSEC as high, medium, or low importance to achieving EBM objectives.

- Input on the exercise was received from the following sectors: Recreation, Renewable Energy, Non-Renewable Energy, Conservation, Commercial Fisheries and Recreational Fisheries. The results of the review helped to identify priority issues and strategies.
- As with VECs, it is expected that the original VSEC list will remain part of the PNCIMA toolbox and may be used to develop indicators and inform other planning processes.

3. EBM Framework

Presentation: A Marine Ecosystem Based Management Framework for the Pacific North Coast Integrated Management Area

Charlie Short reviewed the history of how various components of the EBM framework were developed by the IOAC for PNCIMA over the last 3 years. Many of the pieces have now been completed (draft form), and the plan is taking shape. The work of the IOAC is now focused on identifying strategies.

Discussion

As a result of the changes that took place in September 2011, it was necessary to review what was achievable in the Plan with limited capacity. While the Plan will remain true to the outputs of the EBM framework, it will not cover the same level of detail that was initially envisioned. Key elements that remain in the Plan and process include: values, priorities, a risk based approach, and a strategic orientation of the plan. Working Groups were not used in the planning process.

The EBM Framework follows a very logical order. It is challenging to see how newer developments, such as priority issues, fit within the framework. It would be helpful to have this connection illustrated. DFO recognized that the priorities are a challenging piece, and noted that this would be the focus of the work at the meeting.

4. The Big Picture – Plan Overview

Presentation: Strategic Planning

Charlie Short outlined the differences between strategic and operational planning and how the PNCIMA plan is shaping up.

Strategic plans cover a large area (small scale), and establish high level, overarching goals and objectives. They set the context/direction, and provide less detail.

In comparison, Operational Plans cover a smaller area (large scale) and establish more specific objectives. They are informed by strategic planning, and provide more detail.

Charlie also provided examples of different planning processes at various scales, noting that while MaPP falls within both the LOMA and sub-regional categories, its outputs are applicable at the sub-regional scale.

In some cases, (e.g. Massachusetts Oceans Plan and the Netherlands' Integrated Management Plan for the North Sea) attempts have been made to comprehensively cover both strategic and operational considerations into one overall plan. Generally, this approach tends to take much longer and is much more expensive.

Other planning processes (e.g. ESSIM, Beaufort IOM Plan) have attempted to blend strategic and operational components into plans. The challenge with this approach is that it results in a very long list of objectives and associated strategies that becomes difficult to implement.

Examples of strictly operational level plans include Marine Protected Areas Management Plans (federal), Integrated Fisheries Management Plans (federal), Coastal and Marine Plans (provincial), and Marine Conservation Management Plans (provincial).

In consideration of the challenges and limitations associated with these different approaches, the strategic and operational levels of planning will be separated in the PNCIMA region. The PNCIMA Plan is a strategic plan that will:

- Focus on developing a plan that covers a large area;
- Develop high level goals, objectives and strategies;
- Provide context and direction for integrated ocean management;
- Develop tangible results in the form of priorities and strategies; and
- Develop a knowledge base to inform other processes.

Discussion:

Jurisdictional considerations tend to complicate the various levels/scales of planning and there are not always linkages between them (e.g. DFO is not participating in MaPP, however MaPP may work towards implementing PNCIMA strategies).

Complexity and inconsistency are challenging issues within planning. One goal of PNCIMA is to efficiently integrate processes within the region. The Province of BC is interested in seeing how their cumulative effects framework lines up with PNCIMA, and is hoping that there can be cross-over in terminology, concepts, methodology, tools etc. Where there is agreement on key concepts, it will be important to transfer those pieces over to other processes, to help ensure consistency.

It was noted that as much operational level planning and decision making takes place at the level of local governments, it is important that both federal and provincial governments stay current in terms of technology and inventories. PNCIMA and MaPP could help improve this, and support local government in providing accurate, detailed information to help inform decision making.

PNCIMA Table of Contents

Hilary Ibey reviewed the draft Table of Contents, emphasizing that the Plan will take a more strategic, focused approach, while still producing something tangible. Many sections of the plan are already in draft form, and DFO anticipates having a full draft plan completed by early September, 2012.

Discussion:

- It was suggested that Section 4 could be titled “The Plan” to clearly guide the reader to the “heart” of the document.
- Section 6 – We are not likely to be conducting detailed performance monitoring for PNCIMA. We could monitor achievement of objectives, and look at how other planning processes are

feeding into the plan objectives. Performance measures can be related to strategies (e.g. how are short term priorities progressing vs. long term priorities?)

- Section 6.2 (Performance evaluation) could focus on implementation, looking at how often the plan has been referenced in other processes. Indicators for this could come from frequency of instances of PNCIMA Planning Team being asked to provide input on other plans. The Planning Team may also need to assess and follow up directly with plan “users”. More clarity is needed on what the monitoring component of the plan will look like.
- Section 3 - The trends section of the plan may speak to some of the issues that would typically be identified in an SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis. Perhaps there is a way to show a SWOT analysis in the plan.
- It is important that the plan addresses the need for balance between ecological and human well being. The SECOA highlights human well being and socio-economic hardships as being compromised in the region and the PNCIMA Initiative has an opportunity to address this. While some of the details on these issues may be more relevant to operational planning, human well being is embedded in PNCIMA goals and objectives.

5. Setting Priorities

Presentation: Developing Priorities for PNCIMA

Hilary Ibey reviewed details on how draft priority issues have been identified for PNCIMA.

Priorities are emerging in an iterative way through various mechanisms, including:

- VEC and VSEC identification;
- Coarse screening for PNCIMA scope, scale and relevance to objectives;
- Risk Assessment/ IOAC review; and
- Management screening.

It has been challenging to determine exactly how priorities fit into the EBM framework (Before strategies? After strategies?) The list of draft priorities shared with the IOAC is not in any particular order (i.e. they have not been prioritized).

Prior to looking at some of the priorities that have emerged, a lengthy discussion was held relating to the process and intention of identifying priority issues for PNCIMA.

Discussion:

Priorities Timeframe

- Concern was expressed over the timeframe for providing comments on the priorities document circulated prior to the meeting.
- DFO acknowledged that the timeframe is short and that while additional time for review would be desirable, it is not possible.
- Sectoral approval of or consensus on the priorities is not being sought. Instead, the aim is to tap into broad sectoral understanding of the key issues and ensure that these are framed in the plan.
- The role of the IOAC now is to review and comment on the developing priorities. There will be additional time for detailed sectoral review once the draft plan is circulated in the fall.

Priorities Development and Review Process

- It was noted that it would be more desirable to develop the priorities collaboratively (e.g. socio-economic priorities that emerged from IOAC review of VSECs were not shared in advance of the meeting). As it is, the rationale behind why these specific priorities have emerged is not clear to some IOAC members.
- It may not be possible to endorse a planning document if sectors don't have the information they need and the time to comment on various components, and identify potential gaps.
- Rebecca Martone advised IOAC members to take confidence in the scientific expertise that fed into the review of the Ecological Risk Assessment Framework, and indicated that she would be willing to discuss the process further with IOAC members who are interested.
- Concern was expressed that while there has been a risk assessment conducted on the ecological side, there is no equivalent on the socio-economic side. This is a critical missing element.
- The Province of BC confirmed that it was involved in the review of management considerations.
- First Nations have not yet reviewed the list of priorities. Re-engagement with Coastal First Nations and NCSFNSS through the Letter of Intent has begun, and information on the planning process will continue to be provided to other First Nations who are not signed on to the MOU. It was noted that First Nations are a part of the PNCIMA Steering Committee and as such are leaders in the process, within a government to government relationship.

Action: Planning Team to share with the IOAC revisions to the draft priorities and strategies that reflect outcomes of the IOAC meeting, as well as any further revisions that result from meeting with First Nations in July.

Plan Review Timeframe

- DFO confirmed that it intends to have a draft plan ready for public and IOAC review in September. Comments will be accepted until November, at which point final revisions will be made to the Plan.

Presentation: Qualitative Risk Assessment of VECs

Rebecca Martone (UBC) provided an overview of the Ecological Risk Assessment Framework and some of the preliminary results that have emerged from the Level 1 assessment to date. The framework is founded on the concept that risk to valued components is determined by a combination of exposure (spatial scale, temporal scale, and intensity) and consequence (effects on the VEC if exposed to a stressor, potential long term harm). She shared a preliminary listing of 25 VECs that are potentially at greatest cumulative risk in PNCIMA.

Discussion:

The cumulative risks outlined in Rebecca's presentation are "potential" risk; they may not be actual risk. Uncertainty is a big consideration in the analysis. Much more is known about the impacts of some activities, (e.g. commercial fisheries), so it is easier to quantify the risk. It is also

important to note that cumulative risk is not the only consideration in developing priorities. In some cases, exposure may be high, but consequences may be low. Different values of uncertainty weigh in. This is one example of how adaptive management will need to be an ongoing output of PNCIMA, to help fill in knowledge gaps. VSECs were not included in the risk assessment framework.

Presentation – Using VSECs

Sheila Creighton presented details on the VSEC Review Exercise.

- Uuma Consulting’s list of 95 VSECs was narrowed down to 50 through a coarse screening for relevance to PNCIMA scope and scale and objectives, and subsequently distributed to the IOAC for review on May 4, 2012.
- The IOAC was asked to confirm whether all valued components relevant to PNCIMA had been captured in the list, and to give each VSEC a rating of high, medium, or low importance to achieving EBM objectives.
- Input was received from the following sectors: Commercial Fisheries; Recreation, Renewable Energy; Non-Renewable Energy; Conservation; and Recreational Fisheries
- While the level of response on rating the VSECs was not as high as expected, the following VSECs were rated as highly important by all sectors that completed the exercise: Stakeholder relationships, Marine resources, and Environmental quality.
- VSECs that received at least 2 “high importance” ratings have been considered in identifying priorities and associated strategies for PNCIMA.
- The rating exercise highlighted emergent patterns and areas of agreement across the IOAC sectors that participated.
- Many of ratings and comments received on “high priority” VSECs affirm messages we’ve been hearing throughout the planning process around the importance of economic, environmental, and process based considerations.
- IOAC members also highlighted a range of VSECs to consider as “missing” priorities from the list. These VSECs were originally removed through the coarse screening for PNCIMA scope, scale and objectives.
- IOAC “high priority” issues have been considered and “rolled up” into strategic level priority statements that have helped to inform the development of strategy statements. They will also help to identify which strategies/actions can be achieved within the short, medium, or long term timeframe.
- While not all VSECs will be priority issues reflected in the strategic plan, the full list of VSECs will continue to be a useful longer term tool for PNCIMA, possibly serving as indicators to include in a future monitoring framework, and contributing to a common socio-economic language for other planning processes.

Discussion:

- DFO is interested in keeping the list of priorities manageable so that the plan can realistically respond with implementable strategies that respond to the issues.
- Concern was expressed over how the VECs and VSECs that “didn’t make the cut” are being handled. It is important to ensure that these priorities are not lost, as perhaps these can be addressed in other processes. There will be a full listing of VSECs and VECs in the Appendices of the PNCIMA Plan.

- It was suggested that it may be worth having short, medium and long term priorities. This would be one way of not “losing sight” of the other priority issues. DFO agreed that we could consider this approach to describe the order in which issues might be addressed, keeping in mind that the plan needs to be focused.
- Caution was issued against “going after the low hanging fruit” when identifying priorities. It is important the priority issues be things that are best for the region, and there was agreement that adopting categories of short, medium, and long term priorities might be one way of ensuring this.

General Priority Issues Discussion:

In reviewing the draft priorities, IOAC members were asked to consider the following question:

1. How well do the draft priorities resonate with you (as a “wise” person?)

They were also asked to assess the draft priority issues against the following criteria:

1. Consistent with PNCIMA scope and scale
2. Linked to multiple objectives
3. Implementable in the short term (1-3 years)
4. Limited in number (no more than 15)

An alternative way of understanding priority issues is that they answer the question, “what should we do first?” Setting priorities means we recognize we can’t do everything.

Several concerns around the priority issue statements were tabled:

- Priority statements are broad and read more like vision or mission statements. In this context, there was agreement that they were ok, so long as further details are developed through strategies.
- The Province cautioned that in making things more specific, we run the risk of going back to silos and losing integration.
- “Lumping” priorities leads to important details being lost. One way around this problem might be to adopt a longer time frame for the plan, and break the strategies and actions into chunks of time (short, medium and long term). Another suggestion was to categorize the priorities as was done in the PBGB Integrated Management Plan.
- Each planning initiative that uses PNCIMA as an “umbrella plan” will need to look at the VSECs relevant to that particular area.
- Priority issues don’t speak about jobs, business stability, human well-being etc, which are all significant issues. While strategies and actions can speak to well being, they need to be more specific. A preamble to the plan may need to speak to how the plan addresses jobs, or it could appear as a priority statement.
- Looking at the suite of priority statements, the first three are broader, and relate to issues that DFO doesn’t have authority/jurisdiction over. Collaboration will be required in these areas that are more process based priorities. P1 and P3 seem to be about communities using the marine habitat to sustain themselves. In this context, perhaps the priority statement doesn’t have to specify jobs. It may help to break these out into short, medium and long term components.

- The last eight priority statements are more specific, and there was greater comfort with these around the table. (e.g. P7 connects clearly to jobs). There was agreement that P7, P8, P9, and P11 are “properly specific”. P12 may not be specific enough.
- P7 – certification would not be a priority issue for the commercial fishing caucus and some fisheries would find this offensive. While some fisheries are working on this, it doesn’t work for all. Is there something else we can work on at the PNCIMA scale?

After a lengthy discussion, it was suggested that going back to the PNCIMA EBM framework might help to clarify some of the questions and confusion around priority issues. Connecting strategies directly to objectives may help a reader of the plan to connect with the material and, within the planning process, help us to identify specific gaps that still need to be addressed. VECs and VSECs can be used as tools or screens to help identify anything missing. It was agreed that even if this approach results in repetition of strategies for objectives, this is not a concern. Repetition is not uncommon in plans, and in some cases can be helpful. It is better to err on the side of “too long” and “too thorough” than to narrow things down too soon. It was also suggested that not all strategies will be only for DFO to implement; some may be for other agencies to focus on.

The Planning Team agreed to spend time that evening reviewing priorities and strategies within the context of the EBM framework.

7. Wrap Up

Karen Calla closed the meeting, observing that a lot of work had been done to date by the IOAC and that the work being done to re-focus the plan at the strategic level is challenging. She reminded all that it is important to make use of the work that has already been accomplished. While the specific task of the IOAC may have changed, the input received from the group continues to be very important to the overall process.

Summary of Action Items

Action Item
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFO to confirm when the Science Advisory Report will be available and share a list of participants.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFO to share list of VECs with IOAC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Team to share with the IOAC revisions to draft priorities and strategies that reflect outcomes of the IOAC meeting, as well as any further revisions that result from meeting with First Nations in July.

Day 2: June 21, 2012

Note: overnight, the Planning Team spent time aligning draft strategies and priorities with PNCIMA EBM objectives, and conducted a gap analysis, which was shared in 2 separate matrices with the IOAC on Day 2 of the meeting. The emphasis of the work on Day 2 of the meeting was to explore the gaps and generate additional strategies and related actions that address those gaps.

1. Presentation: Developing Strategies for PNCIMA

Hilary Ibey presented an overview of the “role” of strategies in the PNCIMA Plan, and considerations in developing strategies. She also used the example of process coordination to illustrate how objectives, strategies and priorities all connect across the EBM framework.

Goals answer the question: “What must be accomplished to realize what we want?”

Objectives answer the question: “What steps are required to achieve the goal?”

Strategies answer the question: “What specific measures or actions are required to make progress towards the goals and objectives?”

Strategies should be integrated, enable actions on priority issues, and address what we want to do to make progress towards EBM goals and objectives.

The 12 draft strategies have been developed in a step-wise approach to implementing EBM goals and objectives to help advance priority issues in PNCIMA. They have been designed to guide the development of action plans and set a general direction for future work.

Criteria for identifying strategies:

- Strategic; yet specific
- Strive to implement multiple objectives

Discussion:

- It was suggested that it is an oxymoron to say “strategic; yet specific”. If we are looking for focused strategies that result in something, perhaps a better criterion to keep in mind is that the strategies need to be achievable.
- There was agreement that the process coordination example of how the plan components connect to each other was a useful tool, but that including the priorities column complicates it.
- Priorities may be helpful for:
 - identifying specific actions, and narrowing down which aspects of the objectives we can work on;
 - identifying short, medium and long-term priorities, and
 - checking for why we have identified certain actions over others.
- Example actions listed are only examples of what could be done. True action planning will come with implementation of the plan. To implement actions, we’ll need to break things down even more. Priorities will be advanced through the implementation of actions.

2. Identifying Strategies:

The IOAC was asked to populate the EBM objectives with strategies, keeping priorities in mind. The focus of the work done was on strategies, exploring priorities as required. Draft strategies were used as a “starting point” for consideration, recognizing that they may need revising to incorporate other considerations. Key questions asked through the exercise were:

- Is there one strategy that stands out and helps to advance this objective?
- Are other strategies needed?

General comments on strategies:

- The first 6 strategies seem to be based on the ecological risk assessment framework. The last 3 don't really relate to socio-economic issues or opportunities. The strategies need to speak to other issues, such as green infrastructure, recycling on vessels, energy use on the water, vessel efficiency, communities being efficient, etc. Currently, the balance doesn't exist between the risk-based strategies and others. There is no framework for the socio-economic side of things, which is a significant gap. A strategy needs to be developed around this priority so that it stands out in the plan.
- The concepts that go into developing a socio-economic risk assessment could be similar to those of the ecological risk assessment; however the stressors would be different. It could be a compatibility matrix, showing which activities impact another. UBC is beginning some work on ecosystem services, which could be a potential tool to assist with this.
- PNCIMA needs to address barriers to socio-economic success. The SECOA goes some way towards this, but industry's knowledge needs to be integrated. Government, industry and stakeholders need to work together to identify and address barriers in the region.
- Strategy 1 links up to many socio-economic objectives. It is not just risk to ecological values. Actions can fan out and be more specific.

Through the course of the day, the IOAC worked collaboratively to identify at least one key strategy for each EBM objective. The detailed changes will be circulated in a revised list of draft strategies after they have been shared with First Nations in early July. Some additional work is required on the drafting of some strategies.

Action: Planning Team to “clean up” the draft strategies, with assistance from a few IOAC members (Jim Abram, Jenn Burt at CPAWS, Jim McIsaac, Christa Seaman, Al Huddlestan, Kim Wright available after July 3rd, Matt Burns)

Action: Planning Team to share draft strategies and priorities with IOAC on Basecamp, after meeting with First Nations. Send out “original” strategies (cleaned up) as well as changes that come from meeting with First Nations.

3. Taking Stock:

Bonnie Ancliffe took the opportunity to review the progress that was made over the course of the meeting:

- Day 1 was a difficult and frustrating meeting, yet progress was made.
- Significant effort went into the development of the framework and it is an achievement that the IOAC should feel good about. There is interest from others in the framework, and while some pieces have been flagged for further review, there is overall comfort in the product.
- Internal discussions helped to shape the draft Table of Contents. We now need to decide how to handle priorities and reflect this in the Table of Contents. This meeting was the first opportunity for the IOAC to see how the pieces are coming together.
- There remains some frustration around the assessment and analysis of VECs and VSECS, and concern that not enough time was allowed to do this work. There are also questions surrounding the methodology. DFO recognizes that it could be improved, but we have to work within our capacity and look for opportunities to improve it as we move forward.
- Nesting priorities within the EBM framework, as was suggested at the meeting, makes sense. This will allow us to see the gaps. Keep in mind that the strategies can tie back to the objectives, but they can also be transferred to other planning processes.
- Looking ahead, much work now has to be done to prepare the plan.
- There has been a transition from where we started to where we are now, but the Plan is shaping up to be effective and strategic. We want to showcase tools and approaches. The Plan will contain an incredible amount of information that will be hard to ignore.

Discussion:

- The Commercial Fishing Caucus expressed concern that issues relating to sectoral access to the marine environment and competing uses have not been adequately addressed. They are also concerned about the imbalance between treatment of ecological and socio-economic issues within the Plan. They feel that VSECs require further attention, especially as the SECOA has identified the human well-being issue as significant for the region.
- DFO acknowledged that the Department has been challenged with the socio-economic piece and that it is helpful to reiterate these concerns as we begin writing the plan,
- Concern was also expressed around the need for the PNCIMA framework to connect with MaPP and other regional plans. DFO expressed hope that the PNCIMA plan will enable other processes. The Province of BC indicated that MaPP will build from the products that are developed in PNCIMA and seek complementarity with PNCIMA strategies.

4. Path Forward

Timelines for Plan Completion

- DFO intends to have the draft plan ready for the end of the summer, and is committed to have the plan completed for Dec 2012.
- The SECOA appendix will be provided after it has been reviewed.
- The draft will be shared with the IOAC and the public prior to the next IOAC meeting (Sept 19-20).

- DFO expects the plan will change as a result of IOAC and public input. If input is received from the public prior to the IOAC meeting, we can discuss that in September.
- The November IOAC meeting will focus on a more polished draft and report out on feedback received.
- Finalizing the plan will take place in December 2012 and submission for approval.

The Province of BC expressed concern over the tight timelines. They have obligations to have it reviewed according to certain procedures and protocols. The timelines are also tight for IOAC and public review. The Province requested that DFO investigate flexibility around timelines. It was also noted that the re-involvement of First Nations into the planning process will bring additional challenges to meeting the tight timeline.

Action: DFO to follow up with Province on timelines.

Action: DFO to consider option of sending out chapters as they are ready, as a means of helping the tight timelines within the review process.

5. Wrap Up

Summary of Action Items (Day 2)

Action Item
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Team to clean up the draft strategies, with assistance from a few IOAC members (Jim Abram, Jenn Burt at CPAWS, Jim McIsaac, Christa Seaman, Al Huddleston, Kim Wright available after July 3rd, Matt Burns)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Team to share draft strategies with IOAC on Basecamp, after meeting with First Nations. Send out “original” strategies (cleaned up) as well as changes that come from meeting with First Nations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFO to follow up with Province on timelines
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Team to consider option of sending out chapters as they are ready, as a means of helping the tight timelines within the review process.

Next IOAC meeting: September 19-20, 2012, Richmond, BC

Meeting Adjourned.