

Summary Notes Meeting 11 | February 5, 2013 | Teleconference Call

Meeting Participants:

Sector	Member	Alternates Present
Commercial Fisheries	Jim McIsaac	
Local Communities (Strathcona Regional District)	Jim Abram	
Marine Conservation	Kim Wright	
Marine Transportation	Kaity Stein	Sean Lahodie
Recreation	Nick Heath	

Facilitator:

Craig Darling

Observers and Ex Officio:

Sheila Creighton	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Steve Diggon	Coastal First Nations
Hilary Ibey	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Matthew Justice	Province of British Columbia
Candace Newman	Department of Natural Resources
Bruce Reid	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Charlie Short	Province of British Columbia
Ross Wilson	Central Coast

1. Overview of Work to Date

Bruce Reid opened the call with an apology for the late cancellation of this week's IOAC meeting, and expressed appreciation for members' patience and understanding. The Planning Office and Steering Committee worked hard to get a draft of the plan out on schedule, however a number of outstanding issues still being discussed between collaborative governance partners have meant that the plan is not yet ready to circulate. The Steering Committee felt that the meeting would be more productive for members if a revised draft could be shared in advance to inform discussions.

We recognize that this has been a great inconvenience for some IOAC members. DFO will cover expenses associated with cancelling travel plans. Travel claims should be submitted to Dayna Leganchuk as usual. In the meantime, we are working to reschedule the meeting to a time convenient for as many as possible

Action: DFO to post instructions to Basecamp for claiming expenses related to travel cancellations.

Review of feedback received on Draft 2 of PNCIMA plan

Substantial input was received from all IOAC sectors except tourism. The effort invested by IOAC members in the review process was much appreciated.

Feedback was received in a timely manner, and was constructive. 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. The input from the IOAC demonstrated the range of interests at stake in this process and the challenges faced in developing a plan that is mutually acceptable.

Development of Draft 3

The Planning Office reviewed all feedback received, responding to each comment and incorporating changes into the plan. All comments were entered into a spreadsheet that also recorded responses and rationale. Outstanding issues that could not be addressed by the Planning Office were taken to the Steering Committee for discussion and decision. Many issues were resolved; however there are still on-going discussions on others.

Revised timelines

As a result of the delayed release of the draft Plan, timelines have been revised. The aim is to have a draft out for public consultation by early March, with public consultations completed by mid-April. The next IOAC meeting will be held in late March or early April, focusing on the same content as was planned for this week. The plan is expected to be finalized in June, following the provincial election.

Q&A

- The document that summarizes feedback received from the IOAC will be circulated with materials for the next IOAC meeting.

2. Revised Diagrams

As a result of IOAC feedback on the previous draft of the plan, ION Design was contracted to revise existing figures and develop some new ones for the PNCIMA plan. The figures were developed to be visually appealing and consistent with the PNCIMA brand identity.

PNCIMA Planning Process Structure (3.1)

This figure was revised to more accurately reflect the nature of the planning process. Short descriptions of the roles of each body have been added, and the size of the IOAC box has been reduced.

Action: Planning Office to ensure that names of IOAC and Steering Committee participants listed in the plan are up to date.

PNCIMA Engagement Structure (3.2)

This figure originally appeared in the stakeholder engagement strategy, and has been revised to be more visually appealing.

Process Timeline (3.3)

This is a new figure developed for the plan, at the request of the IOAC. It is intended to reflect the significant volume of work that has been invested in the planning process. Recognition of the changes that occurred in the planning process will be built into the next version of the timeline

Discussion

- revised dates for plan review, endorsement, and implementation should be reflected in the next version of the timeline figure.
- Consider including reference to the introduction of the *Oceans Act* and *Oceans Strategy* – key documents that influenced the process.

EBM Framework (4.1)

This figure now depicts the flow between various stages of the framework and includes a feedback loop to show how implementation links back into the framework. Actions have been removed from the framework, and the terminology is now consistent with what appears in the EBM table (4-1)

Discussion

- The figure is much clearer
- Consider adding arrows that connect the “adaptive management cycle” back to objectives and goals as well. This could be done by including references to short term (revise strategies) and long term (review goals and objectives).

Process for Selecting Ecological Valued Ecosystem Components

This is a new figure developed in response to a suggestion to provide a summary of the process used for selecting ecological Valued Ecosystem Components. The idea behind this figure is that it can be a tool to assist in identifying VECs for other plans or processes at different scales. If the concept proves valuable, the look of the diagram will be revised to be consistent with the others.

Discussion

- The diagram is too complex. It would be helpful to have more information provided with explanations/definitions to support what appears in the text boxes.
- It is not clear how this process connects to the EBM framework
- Will there be a similar figure for identifying VSECs?
- There are more steps beyond step 6 in the figure that should be included.
- If the figure is to assist others to identify VECs, much more information is needed (e.g. what are the criteria? How do you select relevant criteria?) To be a useful model, the steps need to be more clearly defined.

- It may be more useful to keep the figure high level and then show more specifically what was done for PNCIMA as an example. Being clear about how a list of VECs was developed for PNCIMA is more important than having the VEC identification process available to others as a tool.

Marine Activity Profile Summary

A new figure has been developed in response to the IOAC's request to provide a visual summary of Appendix 6 (Marine Activity, Current Status, Future Outlook), which would be included at the end of the "Future of the Planning Area" section. Please note that at this stage, the figure does not reflect feedback received from the IOAC on the table.

For consideration:

- Does the format of the figure provide added value? If not, can you suggest another way of visually representing the content of appendix 6?
- Are the summaries accurate?

Action: DFO to post all revised/new figures to Basecamp

Action: IOAC members to review figures and provide any **additional feedback by February 19**, to allow time for final revisions prior to the plan being shared for public review.

3. Dates for Next IOAC Meeting

We would like to schedule a 2 day meeting, if possible. A doodle poll has been initiated to assess availability, and **it will remain open until the end of day on February 7, 2013**. Rescheduled meeting dates will be confirmed this week.

Action: All IOAC members to visit the doodle poll and indicate availability ASAP:

Discussion

- Details of Steering Committee membership can be found on the PNCIMA website
- How will the federal government address the issue of not being involved in other marine planning processes once PNCIMA is endorsed? The plan has been drafted to allow flexibility in implementation of the plan so that one department or organization is not responsible for implementation of all of the objectives and strategies. There will be time at the next IOAC meeting for further discussion of plan implementation.

4. Wrap up

Bruce Reid thanked members for their ongoing commitment to the process. We look forward to sharing the next draft of the plan with the IOAC shortly.

Meeting adjourned at 2pm