

**Summary Notes**

**Meeting 8 | March 21, 2012 | Delta Vancouver Airport Hotel, Richmond, BC**

**Meeting Participants:  
Members and Alternates:**

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Alternates Present</b>
Commercial Fisheries	Jim McIsaac Lorena Hamer	
Local Communities (Mount Waddington Regional District)	Al Huddleston	Doug Aberley
Local Communities (Strathcona Regional District)	Jim Abram	
Local Communities (Skeena Queen Charlotte Regional District)	Des Nobels	
Marine Conservation	Kim Wright	Bill Wareham
Marine Transportation	Ross Cameron	Kaity Stein Phillip Nelson
Recreation	Nick Heath	
Recreational Fisheries	Urs Thomas	Gerry Kristianson
Non-renewable Energy	Christa Seaman	
Renewable Energy	Jessica McIlroy	
Aquaculture	Richard Opala	

**Facilitator:**

Craig Darling

**Observers and Ex Officio:**

Jenn Burt	CPAWS
Colin Campbell	Sierra Club - BC
Sheila Creighton	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Neil Davis	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Steve Diggon	Coastal First Nations
Diana Freethy	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Sabine Jesson	CPAWS
Keeva Kehler	Province of British Columbia
Jeffrey Lemieux	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Allan Lidstone	Province of British Columbia
Rebecca Martone	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Céline Ménard	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Candace Newman	Natural Resources Canada
Bruce Reid	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Mary Rothfels	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Charlie Short	Province of British Columbia
Amy Wakelin	Fisheries and Oceans Canada

### 1. Opening

Craig

- Welcome & identification of IOAC and participants
- Review agenda

### 2. PNCIMA Update

Update status of collaborative governance / Overview of work done since November 29, 2011 meeting

Bruce Reid

- Discussions are ongoing between DFO and First Nations groups to determine their interests and facilitate engagement in PNCIMA planning processes.
- We are still working towards plan completion target of December 2012.

Allan Lidstone

- Process coordination is an important topic of discussion, which will be explored later in this meeting.

#### Discussion

- Other federal departments engaged: Natural Resources Canada, Parks Canada, Environment Canada, and Transport Canada.

### 3. EBM Objectives – IOAC Recommendations

#### **Presentation: Ecosystem based Management: Provisional Objectives for PNCIMA**

Charlie Short reviewed the IOAC recommendations on EBM objectives, indicating where changes were adopted and explaining why certain revisions were not made.

- The objectives remain provisional pending discussions with First Nations. Consequently, the changes proposed by the IOAC to objectives that may have implications for First Nations' interests are 'on hold'.

#### Discussion

- Access to Food terminology alteration – Charlie referred discussion to DFO (Bruce Reid). In discussions with process participants to date, DFO has been clear that other existing advisory processes inform fisheries access and allocation discussions. Access and allocation are beyond the scope of the PNCIMA planning process. Suggestion to retain EBM Objective 2.5 with a wording revision. There is a question of differing interpretations of the objective – the IOAC is interpreting in a broad and philosophical context, while DFO is interpreting in a more operational 'fisheries access and allocations' context. Federal and provincial collaborative governance partners will revisit the wording of the objective.

- Objection to removal of “Canadian” from EBM Objective 2.1. There is concern of foreign interests and implications for coastal communities, and interest in including wording to capture communities and businesses that operate within Canada within this objective.
- Discussion of terminology change of “manage” to “mitigate” in EBM Objective 1.4 – response from the federal and provincial collaborative governance partners was that “mitigate” provides managers with greater direction than “manage”.
- Question on what sustainable economic opportunities means in EBM Objective 2.1 – suggestion of a glossary to more clearly define terms.
- Clarity on definition of “support certainty” in EBM Objective 2.2 was requested – response from federal and provincial collaborative governance partners was that this was altered to reflect the fact that regulatory regimes change over time, but that they are seeking to communicate regulations and regulatory processes clearly to ensure all parties are clear about what is required of them.

### **Actions**

Federal/Provincial partners will revisit the following elements:

- Review geographic context within EBM Objectives to affirm that objectives are specific to the PNCIMA planning area, rather than implying a broad Canadian or international context (i.e. EBM Objective 2.1).
- Address potential for various interpretations of certain terms – look at a potential glossary to clarify definitions (i.e. EBM Objective 1.4, 2.1, 2.2).
- Seek to clarify EBM Objective wording:
  - 2.5 – accessibility to food, & allocation aspects
  - 3.5 –insertion of “in a fair and equitable manner” after “considered”
  - 2.6 – safety security and accessibility wording concerns – suggestion of “support marine safety security and accessible waters”.

## **4. Process Coordination**

### **Presentation: Process Coordination**

Charlie Short reviewed current processes, governance, linkages among outputs from different processes

- The presentation summarized various scopes of marine planning areas that include the PNCIMA area, Northern Shelf Bioregion, MaPP and process, etc. This variety of scopes illustrates a divergence of outputs with regard to scale.
- Three large planning processes within the PNCIMA area: PNCIMA (LOMA scale – strategic & integrated scope), MPA strategy (Bioregional scale – operational & ecological scope), MaPP (Bioregional scale & sub-regional scale – operational & integrated scope). Scope, input, and stakeholders vary between the processes.
- Goals, scales, strategies, actions, etc among processes differ, however there are linkages – we are working toward coordination of processes and outputs to inform each other.

- Moving forward, process coordination seeks to address: uncertainty, identify gaps, increase understandings, and work towards an implementation plan.

### Discussion

- Suggestion to support inclusion of land-oriented authorities as well as water-oriented jurisdictions in planning conversations.
- Objectives from PNCIMA EBM principles, goals and objectives can become guidance or inputs into other processes – process coordination is a strategic approach that supports one of PNCIMA’s EBM goals, by efficient and complimentary processes.

### **Action**

- The Federal/Provincial partners will articulate the role and contribution of local government in marine planning processes.

### **Presentation – Coordinating Advisory Processes for Marine Planning in PNCIMA / the Northern Shelf Bioregion**

Neil Davis reviewed marine planning advisory processes in the Northern Shelf Bioregion, scoping of potential strategies to address identified issues.

- There are currently multiple PNCIMA area/Northern Shelf Bioregion processes with various timelines with advisory structures – there are potential challenges regarding process fatigue and a need to find efficiencies.
- Three primary themes (with different scales): LOMA/Bioregional planning (PNCIMA, MaPP, Canada-BC MPA Network Strategy), ongoing MPA management, Sub-regional planning (MaPP).
- We are using ongoing MPA management as a case study today to explore ideas for advisory body coordination to streamline processes, increase communication, and increase integration.
  - Proposal for annual or semi-annual advisory forum bringing together all MPA advisory bodies.
  - Breakout groups after lunch will discuss this proposal and brainstorm on how forms could work.
    - What are implications of forums and how could we address them?

### Discussion

- The number of MPAs in the coordination process will determine the nature and scope of the implications (i.e., a large number of MPAs will create more coordination challenges).

## **Breakout Sessions**

### Group 1 Summary of Outputs

1. Need to clarify role and scope of forum
2. Limited scale of current planning process (i.e., bioregional) – there is a potential to incorporate an integrated coast-wide approach
3. First Nation inclusion needs to be addressed
4. Numerous forum logistics challenges to address, including funding

### Group 2 Summary of Outputs

1. Supportive of forum idea – recognizing that individual processes would also need to continue
2. Forum would likely require longer timeframe of several days
3. forum format suggestion to address overlaps between processes – plenary, individual advisory sessions, followed by plenary again
4. Conduct survey to ascertain overlap between processes
5. Need for ongoing overarching advisory structure – in a broad marine planning role
6. Need clarity on:
  1. IOAC/PNCIMA post 2012
  2. Relationship between PNCIMA and MaPP and need/rationale for independence of processes and overlapping membership
  3. Consolidated effort regarding communications between processes

### **Action**

- Members to provide any further comments and additional thoughts, upon reviewing meeting summary notes. **Comments are to be submitted to Sheila Creighton by April 11, 2012.**

## **5. Valued ecological components (VECs)**

### **Presentation: VEC Selection for PNCIMA**

Rebecca Martone described revisions to the draft list of VECs

- The November 2011 workshop helped inform the identification and categorization of VECs (species, habitats, and community & ecosystem properties).
- IOAC advice (Basecamp feedback) contributed to the revision and shortening of the VEC list.
- A summary report is currently being drafted (incorporating additional feedback) to inform CSAS review in May 2012.

### Discussion

- CEAA work that has already identified VECs and VSECs will be used, as appropriate, depending on scale/relevance.

## **5. Valued social-economic components (VSECs)**

### **Presentation: Identifying Valued Socio-Economic and Cultural Components (VSECs) for PNCIMA**

Neil Davis introduced the methodology for identifying and synthesizing VSECs.

- The objective of identifying VSECs is to generate/develop products for tangible application to PNCIMA planning, such as input into identification of priorities and strategies, and longer-term indicator and monitoring development.
- VSECs work to capture values that are challenging to measure, such as spiritual and social aspects.
- Criteria for selecting and prioritizing VSECs identified in existing literature and by participants in the VSEC workshop include: practicality (e.g., is there information available on a VSEC); broad support for VSECs; relevance to PNCIMA scale; risk to VSEC, communication (can people understand & recognize VSECs?). Key point: prioritization based on considerations of risk alone may be inappropriate.
- Currently conducting literature research to develop a preliminary list of VSECs for IOAC review.

#### Discussion

- VSECs and VECs will be viewed from a PNCIMA perspective; note that VSEC and VEC lists are not mutually exclusive.
- Comfort level with VECs and VSECs varies among participants, as does understanding. PNCIMA process is working towards developing increased understanding with IOAC members through the literature review discussion paper drafted for the VSEC workshop, draft VSEC development, IOAC review and discussions, and development of input into future VSEC revised list.

## **6. Path Forward**

### **Presentation: The Path Forward**

Neil Davis described the focus of future IOAC meetings and potential work between meetings.

- Spring work: process coordination discussion follow-up, begin prioritization work, draft VSEC list for review.
- CSAS scientific review of risk assessment approach is scheduled for May 8-10
- Next IOAC Meetings – June (discussion of VSEC revised list), September (discuss public review comments), & November (discuss what we've heard and potential revisions to PNCIMA plan) – (meetings may be 2 days each) – work between meetings will likely occur.
- Public review & consultation will likely occur in the fall, followed by PNCIMA plan revision before submission into the review and approval process by the end of the calendar year.

### Discussion:

- Request that the Federal/Provincial partners consider options for walking through an example or scenario of plan implementation.
- PNCIMA planning is working towards balancing multiple interests through an EBM approach. The development of VECs and VSECs can support this by identifying the specific things that are of particular significance to various interests. Such information could inform considerations of trade-offs between various interests in other decision-making contexts that happened outside of the PNCIMA planning process.
- Suggestion to include an implementation plan in the PNCIMA plan as an appendix.

## **7. Wrap Up**

### **Basecamp Discussion**

- Basecamp was implemented to facilitate between-meeting work as an economical, practical time management tool. Need to restrict use to professional context only for disciplined use; bearing in mind, all postings are viewed by all participants.
- Members voiced no objections to continued use of Basecamp and made the following suggestions to optimize use:
  - Avoid socializing on Basecamp to avoid email overload
  - If possible, Include PowerPoint presentations on Basecamp prior to meetings
  - Confirm that subscribers (members and alternates) are listed on the sidebar in Basecamp
  - If possible, maintain the continuity of the record on Basecamp for future reference (avoid deletions without prior consultation with members). Confirm that files and postings can be deleted only by the administrator (Craig) and that the administrator is identified on the site
  - Clarify how conference calls associated with Basecamp will be set up (e.g. quorum of minimum participants)
- Participants on Basecamp should assume that posts and files are 'public' (i.e., that the contents of the site are subject to Access To Information and Privacy).

### **Future IOAC meeting dates**

- June 20-21
- September 19-20
- November 13-14

### **Expense Claims**

- Reminder to file expense claims promptly to meet fiscal year-end deadlines for payment.

Announcement (Bruce Reid)

- Neil is taking on an assignment as of April 16, 2012 as Pacific Regional Groundfish Manager. On behalf of the group, Bruce expressed thanks for Neil’s dedication to the PNCIMA initiative and his hard work. Hilary Ibey will be assuming the roll of PNCIMA Coordinator in April 2012.

**8. Action Item Summary**

<b>March 21, 2012 IOAC MEETING – ACTION ITEMS</b>	
<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Follow Up Actions</b>
Revisit elements of EBM Provisional Objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review geographic context within EBM Goals and Objectives to affirm that objectives are specific to the PNCIMA planning area, rather than implying a broad legal Canadian context (i.e. EBM Objective 2.1).</li> <li>• Address potential for various Interpretations – look at a potential glossary to clarify definitions (i.e. EBM Objective 1.4, 2.1, 2.2).</li> <li>• Seek to clarify EBM Objective wording:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.5 – accessibility to food, &amp; allocation aspects</li> <li>• 3.5 –insertion of “in a fair and equitable manner” after “considered”</li> <li>• 2.6 – safety security and accessibility wording concerns – suggestion of “support marine safety security and accessible waters”.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Federal and provincial collaborative governance partners to revisit wording and make changes as appropriate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further comments and additional thoughts on process coordination issues to be provided by members by <b>April 11, 2012</b> to Sheila Creighton</li> </ul>	IOAC members
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clearly articulate local government inclusion /role within planning processes</li> </ul>	Federal and provincial collaborative governance partners to revisit PowerPoint presentation schematics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider options for modelling plan implementation through a hypothetical ‘straw dog’ type scenario</li> </ul>	Federal and provincial collaborative governance partners to consider
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion to include an implementation budget in the</li> </ul>	Federal and

<b>March 21, 2012 IOAC MEETING – ACTION ITEMS</b>	
<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Follow Up Actions</b>
PNCIMA plan as an appendix	provincial collaborative governance partners to consider
• Respond to Basecamp suggestions	Craig will respond